

CORRESPONDENCE FROM

2/3/2026

LEGISLATIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
MEETING

Sabha, Tamer

From: cityclerk
Sent: Tuesday, February 3, 2026 8:22 AM
To: Iraheta, Alba; Jomsky, Mark; Robles, Sandra; Sabha, Tamer; McMillan, Acquanelle (Netta); Soo, Christine
Subject: FW: Public Comment - Pasadena Legislative Policy Committee Meeting 02/03/26
Attachments: Public Comment - Pasadena City Legislative Policy Committee 02-03-26 2026 Legislative Platforms.pdf

From: Yadi ·
Sent: Tuesday, February 3, 2026 8:21:05 AM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse <correspondence@cityofpasadena.net>; cityclerk <cityclerk@cityofpasadena.net>
Subject: Public Comment - Pasadena Legislative Policy Committee Meeting 02/03/26

You don't often get email from

[Learn why this is important](#)

[!] **CAUTION:** This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you **know** the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. For more information about the Phish Alert Button view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

Hi,

Please find attached my public comment for the February 3, 2026 Pasadena Legislative Policy Committee Meeting, agenda item 2. 2026 Federal and State Legislative Platforms.

Thanks,

Yadi

2. 2026 Federal and State Legislative Platforms

I support the initiatives in the climate change, public health, digital inclusion, public transportation infrastructure and housing.

Thank you for the inclusion of Zone Zero related legislation, specifically asking for science-backed and evidence-based reasonable measures. In addition, I ask the inclusion of support for the restoration and preservation of Eaton Canyon and our natural resources.

I also support calling for technology regulation, including your call for the FAA to establish guidance on the use of drones and the transparent and responsible use of AI. However, these three statements conflict with the City's opposition on "Efforts to preempt local regulation of drone use in communities" and the support for "automated speed enforcement".

The Pasadena Council has not regulated use of drones whatsoever, that duty has been relegated to PPD. Furthermore, the opposition of drone regulation is really a desire of PPD, and they have other lobby arms like the California Police Chiefs Association "CalChiefs" and Peace Officers Research Association of California (PORAC) that are lobbying that position on behalf of law enforcement. Especially absent City regulation, the City absolutely should support regulation of these technologies. Especially since speed cameras, drones and AI have serious privacy issues and are a matter of safety and affect quality of life.

Regarding the Emergency Operations Center, the foundation for that initiative must be based on sound facts and logic, and the City has not provided the public justification for building a command center in the middle of a high fire hazard severity zone. I also ask why instead, the City isn't advocating for further funds and support for the Fire Department and the Fire Chief's strategic plan priorities. Federal funds have been used for projects listed in the strategic plan in other cities, and it is a missed opportunity for Pasadena to not be advocating for them as well. Because the City of Pasadena is failing advocating for federal and state dollars, it is placing the costs of this public infrastructure squarely on the shoulders of property owners in Pasadena in the form of a property tax. I most definitely support our Fire Department and commit to advocating for the support of this public infrastructure, but ask that the financial burden be diversified.

Yadi

Pasadena Legislative Policy Committee

February 3, 2026

2. 2026 Federal and State Legislative Platforms