



## Additional Documents List City Council Regular Meeting June 1, 2022

Item No.	Agenda Item Description	Distributor	Document
12	<b>Review of Fiscal Year 2022- 2023 Annual Budget Adoption of the Five-Year Capital Improvement Program</b>	Ken Louie, Interim Finance Director	Memo provides correction.
12	<b>Review of Fiscal Year 2022- 2023 Annual Budget Adoption of the Five-Year Capital Improvement Program</b>	Ted Gerber, Public Works Director	Two memos provides correction.
13	<b>Direction and Approval of Policies and Procedures</b>	Ken Louie, Interim Finance Director	Memo provides correction.
	<b>Emailed Public Comment Item #2, Item</b>	Christina Muñoz, Deputy City Clerk	Attached are emailed public comment.



## City of South Pasadena Public Works

# Memo

**Date:** June 1, 2022

**To:** The Honorable City Council

**Via:** Arminé Chaparyan, City Manager

**From:** Ken Louie, Interim Finance Director

**Re:** June 1, 2022 City Council Meeting Item No. 12 Additional Document –  
Review of Fiscal Year 2022- 2023 Annual Budget Adoption

---

Finance Department staff has noted that a column on Page 12 did not total correctly.

The detail is accurate but the final column did not foot. Please see attached correction as the total is now \$17,055,074 and the grand total of General Fund is now \$21,290,289.



## City of South Pasadena Public Works

# Memo

**Date:** June 1, 2022

**To:** The Honorable City Council

**Via:** Arminé Chaparyan, City Manager

**From:** Ted Gerber, Public Works Director

**Re:** June 1, 2022 City Council Meeting Item No. 12 Additional Document – Staff Report Designated Fund Balances Adjustments and Attachment 2 Proposed FY 22/23 Budget - Committed Fund Balances

---

**Please note correction to Item 12 Staff Report in the center of Agenda Packet Page 12-5:**

**Designated Fund Balances Adjustments:**

The following designated fund balances will now be renamed:

- “SR-110 Interchange Rogan Match” becomes “Transportation Projects-Rogan Fund Match”
- “Slater Reimbursement” becomes “Caltrans 626 Prospect Prospective Litigation”

**Please note correction to Item 12 Attachment 2 – City of South Pasadena Proposed FY 22/23 Budget – Committed Fund Balances:**

Caltrans/ 626 Prospect Litigation Reserve	\$345,876
---	-----------



## City of South Pasadena Public Works

# Memo

**Date:** June 1, 2022

**To:** The Honorable City Council

**Via:** Arminé Chaparyan, City Manager

**From:** Ted Gerber, Public Works Director

**Re:** June 1, 2022 City Council Meeting Item No. 12 Additional Document –  
Adoption of the Five-Year Capital Improvement Program

---

**Please note correction to Page 12-45 Project Description for the Golf Course /  
Driving Range Netting Replacement:**

This project replaces the pole and netting along the west and south sides of the Arroyo Driving Range.



## City of South Pasadena Finance Department

# Memo

**Date:** June 1, 2022

**To:** The Honorable City Council

**Via:** Arminé Chaparyan, City Manager

**From:** Ken Louie, Interim Finance Director

**Re:** June 1, 2022, City Council Meeting Item No. 13 Additional Document –  
Direction and Approval of Policies and Procedures

---

**Please note the correction on Page 13-11 for Acknowledgment of Manual Content:**

Routine changes and updates to this manual will be made on an as-needed basis upon recommendation from the Finance Director and after approval of the Finance Commission **and the City Council.**

**Public Comment  
Agenda Item #2**

## Christina Munoz

---

**From:** Chris Bray [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 31, 2022 10:00 AM  
**To:** City Council Public Comment  
**Subject:** General Public Comment, June 1  
**Attachments:** care first may 24 1.png; care first may 24 2.png; pizza party a.png; yes on a facebook.png

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the City of South Pasadena. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Councilmembers,

In 2019, the City of South Pasadena told local voters that the city faced serious structural deficits that would quickly grow worse over the next few years, threatening basic city services. The city's solution was a sales tax measure, Measure A. The campaign for Measure A repeatedly and explicitly told voters that a vote for that measure was a vote to **fund basic city services** and avoid insolvency.

Here's Bill Glazier in the South Pasadenan, reporting on the Measure A pizza party: "City officials say the increase will protect services like fire, police, library, senior and youth services and the ability to maintain roads, sidewalks, parks storm drains, and more."

<https://southpasadenan.com/measure-a-pizza-party-this-sunday/>

Here's Bill Glazier again, reporting on a public comment on Measure A from Kim Hughes:

"The additional funding, say supporters, will continue to improve and maintain infrastructure, roads and sidewalks, provide resources to reduce traffic congestion, and maintain parks and recreation facilities."

<https://southpasadenan.com/seeking-support-for-measure-a-resident-rallies-others-to-vote-yes-on-tax-ballot/>

Here's what the "Yes on Measure A" page on Facebook promised:

"Vote YES on Measure A to protect high-quality paramedic, fire, police, library, senior and youth services and our city's ability to maintain our roads, sidewalks, storm drains, and parks."

Now comes Care First South Pasadena, which reports the remarkable discovery (in a May 24 letter submitted as public comment) that the City of South Pasadena – described in 2019 by city officials as a city *on the verge of insolvency* and at risk of losing police and fire services – has such enormous cash reserves that it doesn't know what to do with all the extra money:

"Going into the upcoming fiscal year, the City General Fund is projected to have a balance of \$23,481,130. This represents money collected through taxes for public goods, which to date hasn't been spent to deliver public goods. Looking at the City's total fund balance, including enterprise accounts and various grants and revenues received mostly for infrastructure improvements, there is an additional \$56,934,032 that's accumulated and hasn't been spent to improve infrastructure or provide public services. That brings the City's total unspent reserves to

\$79,779,992. This doesn't count federal Coronavirus State and Local Fiscal Recovery Funds, which adds another \$6 million to the General Fund reserve balance. And while the list of needs grows – including the state's number one problem of affordable housing and a deepening canyon of economic inequality – under the proposed budget, reserves are projected to grow to \$87,341,135 by the end of fiscal year 2022-2023, not counting whatever will be left of federal funds granted for pandemic relief."

And so, Care First argues, a city bursting at the seams with massive sums of extra cash should fund a variety of new social justice initiatives, including rental assistance, an expanded menu of free child care services, and a city position for diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Two observations:

First, a small city government with year-end fund balances totaling \$80 million cannot possibly have been telling the truth in 2019 when city officials said that the city was nearing insolvency and would be unable to fund basic city services without new taxes. The implication of the fund balances reported in the city's proposed budget document is that the Measure A campaign was nakedly and aggressively dishonest, and the city's extra sales tax should be repealed.

Second, it would compound the lie to tell voters that extra sales tax revenue would fund basic services – police, fire, library, parks, streets – and then to use the extra revenue to fund income redistribution and social justice programs. If that's what you intended to do with the money, then that's what the city should have said the money was for. It's inescapably dishonest and manipulative to ask voters to approve a tax increase so you can pay for the fire department and street maintenance, and then to use that money to pay for DEI staff and rent money giveaways.

At the very least, *do what you said you would do*. I see that basic honesty is a heavy lift, but at some point consider having a sense of shame.

Chris Bray  
South Pasadena resident



Going into the upcoming fiscal year, the City General Fund is projected to have a balance of \$23,481,130. This represents money collected through taxes for public goods, which to date hasn't been spent to deliver public goods. Looking at the City's total fund balance, including enterprise accounts and various grants and revenues received mostly for infrastructure improvements, there is an additional \$56,934,032 that's accumulated and hasn't been spent to improve infrastructure or provide public services. That brings the City's total unspent reserves to \$79,779,992. This doesn't count federal Coronavirus State and Local Fiscal Recovery Funds, which adds another \$6 million to the General Fund reserve balance. And while the list of needs grows—including the state's number one problem of affordable housing and a deepening canyon of economic inequality—under the proposed budget, reserves are projected to grow to \$87,341,135 by the end of fiscal year 2022-2023, not counting whatever will be left of federal funds granted for pandemic relief.

**Rather than spend more on policing, the City should fund programs and positions that promote the health and safety of our entire community. Care First proposes the following: Rental Assistance Program; Housing Resource Center; City Position Dedicated to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion; and Expanded Child Care.**

City officials say the increase will protect services like fire, police, library, senior and youth services and the ability to maintain roads, sidewalks, parks storm drains, and more.



**South Pas Yes On A**

2019 अक्टोबर 25 • 🌐

Vote YES on Measure A to maintain important city infrastructure and services that promote South Pasadena's quality of life and safeguard our community.

Vote YES on Measure A to protect high-quality paramedic, fire, police, library, senior and youth services and our city's ability to maintain our roads, sidewalks, storm drains, and parks.

**Public Comment  
Agenda Item #12**

## Christina Munoz

---

**From:** Yvonne LaRose [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 1, 2022 10:38 AM  
**To:** City Council Public Comment; Finance Commission Public Comment  
**Subject:** Public Comment: Addition to 2022-23 Annual Budget

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the City of South Pasadena. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

This is a request that the Annual Budget for 2022-2023 have an allowance made for police and law enforcement training regimen to supplement and enhance the knowledge, awareness, and delivery of services (protection, abatement, intervention) provided by our law enforcement personnel in the amount of \$20,000 per year.

This figure includes:

- class trainings of approximately 5 minutes, twice a month
- periodic consultations with supervising officer(s) to ascertain and come to consensus on target topics of review and training
- recommendations to the supervising officer(s)
- research regarding specific topics
- lesson plan preparation
- evaluations of learning and reinforcement
- preparation of reports
- Trainer continuing education via industry conferences and seminars

Yvonne LaRose  
Diversity/Title VII, Harassment, and Ethics Consultant

## Christina Munoz

---

**From:** Ella Hushagen [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, May 27, 2022 3:10 PM  
**To:** City Council Public Comment  
**Cc:** Michael Cacciotti - Personal; Diana Mahmud; Jon Primuth; ezneimer; Jack Donovan  
**Subject:** Public Comment Re: 2022-2023 budget

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of South Pasadena. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.**

Dear City Councilmembers and City Clerk,

As a preliminary matter, at the budget workshop meeting on Wednesday, May 25, the presentation by Chief Solinsky regarding SLFRF funds included slides. I did not see the slide deck in the agenda packet. Could you kindly update the materials, or point me in the right direction?

Please accept this public comment for the next City Council meeting where the fiscal year 2022-2023 budget will be on the agenda.

I am deeply dismayed by the City's proposals for use of the COVID recovery funds.

First, the process to engage the community about how best to spend the \$6 million in SLFRF funding has been completely deficient. There was a staff memo less than a month before the budget workshop, on April 27, regarding use of the funds. That's it. The City has held no community meetings to solicit input.

Second, the proposals are out of sync with the purpose of the American Recovery Act. The final rule regarding the SLFRF funds explains, "the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (ARPA) established the Coronavirus State and Local Fiscal Recovery Funds (SLFRF) to provide state, local, and Tribal governments with the resources needed to respond to the pandemic and its economic effects." The rule goes on that, despite some economic bounce back, "many Americans remain unemployed, out of the labor force, or unable to pay their bills, with this pain particularly acute among lower-income Americans and communities of color."

Here in South Pasadena, the city has been fortunate: its fiscal outlook has remained healthy throughout the pandemic. So, the city does not need SLFRF funds to make up lost revenues due to the pandemic.

But, instead of thinking creatively about how to shore up existing services and offer new services directly to residents who may be experiencing financial, housing and food insecurity in the aftermath of the pandemic, the city is treating the \$6 million SLFRF funding pot as a windfall. Evidently the city would rather use SLFRF funds than general funds or reserves for IT improvements, new tasers for SPPD, and non-specific capital improvement projects.

I am not opposed to all the SLFRF proposals identified at the meeting. Some projects are no doubt overdue and will benefit city residents as well as staff. That is all the more reason to fund such improvements from the general fund.

I am disturbed that the city does not contemplate using any of the COVID recovery funds to offer any services directly to low-income and vulnerable residents. The city's plans are contrary to the spirit of the American Recovery Act, if not the letter.

**Please do not approve these SLFRF funding proposals as part of the FY 2022-2023 budget until the city has undertaken a robust stakeholder process, and is prepared to implement some programs that will offer immediate assistance to South Pasadena residents.**

**Ella Hushagen**

**Christina Munoz**

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 26, 2022 3:47 PM  
**To:** City Council Public Comment  
**Subject:** Fwd: "Public Safety" in Budget Discussions

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Matthew Chan [REDACTED]  
**Date:** May 26, 2022 at 2:24:35 PM PDT  
**To:** CCO <cco@southpasadenaca.gov>  
**Subject:** "Public Safety" in Budget Discussions

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of South Pasadena. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.**

Hello,

In light of the cowardly actions taken during school shootings by law enforcement officers (Parkland and Uvalde), I would like to ask that the budget category currently labeled as "Public Safety" should be renamed or split between Police and Fire safety.

I understand the meeting for public comment regarding the budget has passed, but I encourage the council to re-evaluate their positions on Police funding and the percentage of the budget they receive.

--

Matthew Chan  
[REDACTED]