

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: William M. Paparian
Sent: Monday, October 5, 2026 4:54 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse; Jomsky, Mark; cityclerk
Subject: City Council Meeting - 10/6/26 - Agenda item #5 Measure PFD

[!] **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 (PAB). For more information about the PAB view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

City Clerk —

Please distribute this comment to the City Council on agenda item #5 recommending a position in support of Measure PFD.

I am writing on the endorsement, not on the election.

In November 2018, Measure I added a permanent three-quarter-cent sales tax, sold at about \$21 million a year. The ballot said the money would maintain essential services "such as fire, police, paramedics, emergency service/response times" and "keep fire stations open." Voters passed it, 69 percent to 31 percent. It is a general tax. The city now reports about \$32 million a year, with about \$10.7 million going to Pasadena Unified under Measure J. None of it was reserved for replacing a fire station.

In June 2019, the first capital budget after that vote recommended \$1.5 million in Measure I funds to design a replacement for Fire Station 37, at 3430 East Foothill, then estimated at \$21.3 million. On June 12, Mayor Tornek said those design dollars would be better used for short-term repairs. On June 17, Public Works item 4 recommended the transfer, and the Council adopted it, Resolution 9725. Station 37 went back on the unfunded list. It is still there. The September 2025 Fire plan puts replacement in 2031–33, at about \$34 million, and says financing was only then being discussed.

An endorsement of Measure PFD does not change that record. Measure I already used the fire-station sentence. The design money for Station 37 was recommended, then moved. The station is still unfunded.

William Paparian
Former mayor, 1995–1997
Former East Pasadena councilmember, 1987–1999

10/06/2026
Item 5

RECEIVED

2026 OCT -6 AM 7:47

CITY CLERK
CITY OF PASADENA

October 5, 2026

Mayor Victor Gordo
Members of the Pasadena City Council
100 North Garfield Avenue
Pasadena, CA 91101

Re: Item 5 – Legislative Policy Committee Recommendations

Dear Mayor Gordo and Members of the City Council:

I was reading Item 5 and was struck by the recommendation that the City of Pasadena take an official position opposing Proposition 39.

What immediately came to mind was SB 79.

I know Pasadena opposed SB 79, and I appreciated the letters the City sent to Sacramento. But SB 79 directly affected Pasadena residents and went to the heart of our ability to govern our own city. It changed the rules for development around our transit stations, affected our historic resources and neighborhoods, and overrode portions of planning work that residents, staff, commissions, and prior City Councils spent years creating.

The City itself argued that SB 79 failed to recognize that hard-won local work.

To me, that is exactly the kind of issue our Legislative Policy Committee should be focused on most aggressively: state and federal actions that directly affect Pasadena residents, Pasadena finances, Pasadena neighborhoods, our infrastructure, our public services, and our ability to govern ourselves.

That is why I am struggling with the recommendation on Proposition 39.

Proposition 39 is a statewide voter-identification measure that Californians will decide at the ballot box. Yet the full Pasadena City Council is now being asked to formally oppose it on behalf of the City, and the staff report does not explain what specific municipal interest of Pasadena is at stake.

I am not writing to debate the merits of Proposition 39. My question is about Pasadena and our priorities.

Pasadena's own State Legislative Platform says the City should protect local funding and local decision-making authority. That makes sense to me. Those are areas where the actions of Sacramento can directly change what happens in our city and where Pasadena's voice is especially important.

SB 79 is a perfect example. When the State is considering legislation that can override our locally adopted plans, change what can be built in our neighborhoods, affect historic resources,

10/06/2026
Item 5

and diminish decisions Pasadena residents spent years helping to make, I want to see enormous urgency from our Legislative Policy Committee and our City Council.

That should be where we are spending our political capital.

There are plenty of people in Sacramento fighting over statewide politics. There are only eight people on the Pasadena City Council whose first responsibility is Pasadena.

I want my City Council focused first on the things only my City Council can do.

Before Pasadena takes an official position on Proposition 39, I would appreciate understanding what specific Pasadena interest is at stake and what standard the Legislative Policy Committee uses to determine which statewide political issues warrant an official position from the City.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Erika Foy