



City of Sierra Madre

Office of the City Clerk

232 W. Sierra Madre Blvd.,

Sierra Madre, CA

(626) 355-7135

THE BROWN ACT PROVIDES THE PUBLIC WITH AN OPPORTUNITY TO MAKE PUBLIC COMMENTS AT ANY PUBLIC MEETING.

THE FOLLOWING WRITTEN COMMENTS WERE RECEIVED IN ADVANCE OF THIS MEETING AND WILL BE POSTED ONTO THE CITY'S WEBSITE FOR PUBLIC ACCESS AND TRANSPARENCY. ANY ATTACHMENTS TO THE E-MAILS MAY BE PUBLICLY INSPECTED BY CONTACTING THE CITY CLERK'S OFFICE DURING NORMAL BUSINESS HOURS.

THE COMMENTS ATTACHED ARE SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC. THE CITY DOES NOT CONFIRM THE VERACITY OF THE STATEMENTS PROVIDED BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.

From: [Rachelle Arizmendi](#)
To: [Public Comment](#)
Cc: [Robert Parkhurst](#); [Laura Aguilar](#); [Michael Bruckner](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] September 23, Discussion Item 4 Public Comment
Date: Monday, September 22, 2025 11:40:13 AM

CAUTION: This message is from an EXTERNAL SENDER - be CAUTIOUS, particularly with links and attachments.

Good evening Mayor and City Council Member,

Please accept this email public comment for Discussion Item #4 Sporting Events Ad Hoc Committee as I am unable to attend this meeting in person.

I would be honored to be considered for the Ad Hoc Sports committee and believe I have valuable experience and relationships in the community that would be of value to this group. I currently serve as the Vice President of the Sierra Madre of Chamber of Commerce and can effectively **Promote Business Engagement** from a credible vantage point. Moreover, in my previous employment role, I worked with cities throughout the Western States on their Short Term Rental (STR) ordinances, monitoring, collections, reconciliations, and enforcement policies. My exposure to different ordinances and modifications to STR practices and ordinances will be extremely helpful to the Committee as it may be charged to provide input around the STR ordinance. Lastly, with my community involvement, like a Board Member on the Foothill Workforce Development Board and other community organizations- along with my prior service on the City Council, I can confidently **Coordinate with Regional Efforts** and **Recommend/Plan Local Programming**. I will ensure that coordination and programming aligns with our Sierra Madre community and **Fosters Civic Pride**. I believe I can not only be a resource to the Committee and the City Council, but I can provide valuable input, feedback, and guidance to this important Sporting Events Ad Hoc Committee.

Thank you for your consideration. Mahalo!

Rachelle Arizmendi

--



Rachelle Arizmendi



From: [Ashley Bonenfant](#)
To: [Public Comment](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Public comment for City Council Meeting 9/23/25
Date: Tuesday, September 23, 2025 1:26:36 PM

CAUTION: This message is from an EXTERNAL SENDER - be CAUTIOUS, particularly with links and attachments.

Ashley Bonenfant

Tuesday September 23, 2025

[REDACTED]

Re: Public comment for items not on the agenda, as well as comments for items on the meeting agenda for 9/23/25.

To the Honorable Mayor Parkhurst and Members of City Council,

While I do enjoy adding public comments at council meetings to my repertoire, upon looking at this week's agenda and its potentially lengthy presentations and discussions, I figured a simple letter would suffice. I had the opportunity to voice my concerns about the Automated Downtown Parking Enforcement Pilot Program at the meeting a month ago, and was in attendance to hear about multiple line items at the last meeting a few weeks ago. It has been fascinating to see more of the ins and outs of city business, but attached with that comes a new set of frustrations. So, without further ado, here we go!

As you well know, the last meeting included our code enforcement annual report. Within that discussion, there was a back and forth about the time frames regarding written notices and subsequent citations. As a tenant of a property that the City considers "substandard housing", I could not be more taken aback by the lack of follow through with our code enforcement and its pending cases. This property has had a constant stream of shoddy maintenance, haphazard repairs, and unpermitted work over the past several years. Recently, we got to witness sewer and water line replacement that included filling a black mold lined trench with gravel as the permanent fix. On the second day of sewer work, I did see code enforcement stop by as they hadn't pulled permits for the project. Another case of asking for forgiveness instead of permission, I suppose. I know my frustrations in this case are not things the City can handle, as it's not the City's responsibility to mediate landlord/tenant disputes, but what the City can do is hold those property owners accountable. To hear that our code enforcement issues written notice after written notice, but not citations because they want to 'work with the owners' is insulting to those of us

dealing with issues constantly. Additionally, I lost count during the meeting of the times I heard the City's budget or lack thereof brought up. I'm sure revenue from citations like these is barely a drop in the bucket, but how does the City expect the behavior to change if there are no consequences to the violations?

Now that we're on the topic of unchecked behavior, this brings me to my next point: the desperate need for a solution to the pedestrian safety issue at the Highland Ave & Auburn Ave intersection, as well at intersections surrounding Sierra Madre Middle School. While this has been a topic of discussion during at least three council meetings this year, pedestrian safety has been an issue at the SME intersection for much longer than that. Way back in 2021, on November 30th to be exact, I got to see a crosswalk sting happening right at that very corner. No crossing guard was put on duty that day and our children were put in danger for SMPD's chance to issue a ticket. At that time, I was beyond frustrated at all they were doing to issue tickets and for removing the crossing guard, which at that intersection is absolutely vital for not only our children's safety but for keeping any semblance of traffic flow at pickup and dropoff. Fast forward to today, where funny enough, my current frustration is with SMPD's lack of action and endless excuses for not ticketing the unsafe and illegal driving around a school. Even as of last week's Support Local Access parking meeting when the pedestrian safety issue was brought up in a conversation prior to the meeting time, I was informed by our police chief that one of the suggested solutions was buying a motorcycle (which I see was added to the staff report at a cost of \$45,000) because when cars are double parked, it's difficult for a squad car to get around them. Firstly, double parking is illegal, isn't it? Issue a ticket! Rolling through a stop or speeding, especially in a school zone? Issue a ticket! If I remember correctly, at the last council meeting, the cost of a speeding ticket in that area was around \$250. To just throw some numbers around, if they hypothetically issued two tickets (just two!) a day, with 180 days of instruction in the school year, that would be a grand total of \$90,000. Voila! You've got your crossing guards' part time payroll costs covered, and then some! Secondly, not only is that missed revenue for the city, but that's the chance to have any kind of correction on the terrible driving behavior that has certainly escalated in recent years, both surrounding Sierra Madre Elementary as well Sierra Madre Middle School. Fines are the consequence and should be the first and easiest avenue that helps work towards an active solution, but without SMPD enforcing in these zones, I'm afraid that even with adding new school zone signage and repainting crosswalks, the same unsafe driving behaviors will continue.

Now that we're on the topic of SMPD's lack of action, this brings me to my last point and one I've already spoken about. The Municipal Parking Services Pilot Program (previously referred to as the Automated Downtown Parking Enforcement Pilot program, or Support Local Access). This program is not well researched, poorly planned, and an outright waste of the City's time. Municipal Parking Services currently holds an F rating with the Better Business Bureau, has a whopping 52 customer complaints (12 new in the last three weeks alone), and still has an active class action lawsuit regarding driver data privacy violations.

Working with this company would be a liability on many fronts for this city, not to mention what an awful addition to our downtown landscape it would be. Outreach regarding the development of this program was mediocre at best and did not give the public a clear idea of everything this plan entails. The first two meetings waffled on the idea of incorporating technology into downtown parking, but it absolutely should have been made clear that this was a contract with MPS from the start. Staff's lack of research showed again when pressed on specific issues related to the program. For example, when asked what the solution would be for cars that don't have front plates, their response was to install MORE cameras throughout downtown. Plus, questions about the poles in regards to their affect on accessibility in our public spaces were not answered, and now looking at the staff report, they were completely ignored. For businesses with outdoor dining, the poles would take up almost a foot of sidewalk space, thereby lessening the accessible sidewalk space and making the outdoor dining impossible to have as it would be non compliant with accessibility laws, regardless of permits. None of these program factors were put in either the business owner survey or the survey released to residents. The surveys themselves featured leading questions and a continued lack of transparency on staff's plans for the program. Last week's parking meeting included some results of the public survey, which showed only 10% of people even wanted to entertain using technology as a downtown parking enforcement tool. Additionally, for staff to continually say this program comes with no cost is deceptive. According to the estimated revenue table on page 6 of the staff report, the total cost to the city in the first 0-3 months would be \$95,395. Do we need parking enforcement in downtown? Absolutely! No enforcement to parking rules causes downtown congestion, impedes both residents' and visitors' ability to utilize our downtown, plus it hinders our local businesses from consistency in their daily operations. SMPD will suggest a traffic study to find out what our downtown truly needs. Not only does it seem asinine to me that the answer to our parking enforcement problem would mean spending money up front instead of simply enforcing current ordinances, but why wasn't that one of the first suggestions before however many personnel hours went into developing this parking program? At the final parking meeting last week, they still referred to the downtown enforcement program as being about safety, which is a great way to continue to mislead the public. Parking in a twenty minute spot for the entirety of the day is against our ordinances but not inherently unsafe. If we're gonna talk about safety in downtown, I'd love to talk about not one, but two, of our local businesses having break-ins in June. Smashed doors and broken glass that weren't noticed by any downtown patrol, but were called in to PD by a runner hours later.

From a revenue perspective, there's a lot about these points that seem like major missed opportunities for our city. More importantly, they are intentionally ignored issues from both our code enforcement and SMPD that have snowballed into major challenges for the safety of our residents, the safety of our children and the flow of our business district. Instead of throwing our hands up and wondering how we got here, I'd appreciate more accountability

and responsible action taken by the city to remedy these problems. Cite owners if multiple notices have come and gone, manage parking enforcement even if only for the minimal twenty minute spots, and actually ticket drivers for unsafe driving. To make meaningful change, these things have to be made a priority and the first step should be actually following through on the codes, laws, and rules we already have in place.

Thank you all for your time.

Sincerely your local salon owner and concerned citizen that wants to see Sierra Madre thrive,

Ashley Bonenfant

From: [Ali Everett](#)
To: [Public Comment](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 9/23/25 Council Meeting Public Comment - Item #2
Date: Tuesday, September 23, 2025 3:29:03 PM

CAUTION: This message is from an EXTERNAL SENDER - be CAUTIOUS, particularly with links and attachments.

Sierra Madre City Council Meeting - September 23, 2025

Public Comment Regarding Agenda Item #2 - Report, Discussion, and Direction Regarding the Downtown Parking Enforcement Pilot Program

Dear Councilmembers,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on this item and your time in reviewing my feedback below.

Based on the recommendations and information provided in the report, I request that you “**take no action**” or, alternatively, continue the discussion at a future meeting.

I am opposed to the parking enforcement pilot program provided through Municipal Parking Services (MPS) and, therefore, **do not support alternative #1** (see additional information provided below).

I also **do not support the primary recommendation** of pausing the MPS pilot program to conduct a Downtown Parking Study. Given that less than 50% of survey respondents expressed concern about parking downtown, and only 55% of business survey respondents reported parking challenges on a daily or weekly basis, I do not think this issue is currently a community priority, so I do not think it would be a good use of \$30,000-\$50,000 to conduct a parking study. Instead, please consider using those funds to update existing parking signage and take other basic steps that were recommended by staff and community members during the community feedback meetings about the MPS pilot program.

You may also consider using the funding for a **study on traffic safety**, which could look into the safety issues presented by double parking and blocking crosswalks and curbs, as well as other safety concerns raised by residents (such as the possible need for a stop sign at Baldwin and Laurel).

Additional information:

On Tuesday, August 26, I attended a Council Meeting to raise accessibility concerns about the proposed parking enforcement pilot program provided through Municipal Parking Services (MPS). I recommended that the report back on the pilot program include the following information in order to assist you with making an informed decision on how to proceed:

- The results of a preliminary assessment of the impact of the parking poles on pedestrian facility accessibility, specifically maintaining the required 4ft sidewalk clear width, and which restaurants may lose outdoor dining due to the pole installation, or where existing outdoor dining permits will prevent the installation of the parking poles;
 - *Update: I see now that the report states a device will be installed at every parking spot downtown so the latter part of this recommendation is no longer applicable. At the same time, it is likely that restaurants - including Emmi's and Village Pizzeria - will lose some of their outdoor dining due to the installation. Has the City informed them of this? Is the City allowed to revoke or alter their outdoor dining permits for this reason?);*
- The plan for moving and storing the parking poles when necessary for community events and filming, and how the City will ensure this is done in compliance with disability access standards;
 - *Update: City staff informed the community that the parking poles are easily moveable for filming and events, but the report says that if devices are removed, the concrete will need to be patched, repaired, or replaced. How will the City address safety and accessibility of the concrete during temporary removal?*
- Whether MPS will be able to comply with the new ADA requirements for web and mobile app accessibility, including all 50 conformance criteria in the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines; and
 - *Thank you for having your IT staff reach out to me about the new requirements that were published in July 2024. He was unaware of them and very interested in learning so I will be sending him the details and inviting him to upcoming trainings. Perhaps he should be consulted on this topic.*

Information about whether MPS or the City would be responsible for responding to disability related accommodation requests related to implementation of the program.

- *Note: the answer to this question should be factored into the cost and revenue projects for the program.*

None of the items I raised at the Council meeting were considered in the report. Rather, the only references to accessibility are 1) an acknowledgement that concerns were raised about ADA accessibility; and 2) a statement, provided without any supporting evidence, that the program will “..support traffic safety and accessibility.”

I attended three presentations and **none** included discussion of placing the parking poles in locations to deter parking that blocks accessibility (for example, on access aisles of accessible parking spaces or on curb ramps). I cannot think of any other way that this program would support accessibility.

To boldly state, without any supporting evidence or facts, that the parking poles will support accessibility, and not look into even one of the issues I raised at community meetings and at City Council is incredibly disrespectful of the time I took to make the City aware of potential disability access issues, and the time it is now taking me to write this public comment. The report could have at least said that the ADA compliance concerns require additional research, rather than ignoring them and instead asserting that the program will support accessibility. I am very disappointed in the City's approach to its obligation to meet Federal and State disability access compliance requirements.

I do not intend to engage further on the automated parking enforcement pilot program provided through Municipal Parking Services (MPS) - I think I have made my concerns about accessibility clear. But, I do intend to request the name and job description of the City's ADA Coordinator so I can discuss with them the City's approach to ensuring new programs like this are assessed for accessibility at the outset - which is the most effective and cost efficient way to ensure compliance.

Aside from accessibility, I am concerned about the risk that working with MPS presents to the City - the class actions that have been filed against them, the potential legal obligations that would prevent the City from terminating the contract prior to the end of the pilot program, and lack of data to project revenues past 2 years. On the last point, “Attachment 1 - Estimated Revenue” was very misleading due to the “total estimated revenue” at the bottom of the pages representing different periods of time (Page 1 - six months total; Page 2 - 1.5 years total; Page 3 - 2 years total). If this is a good deal for the City, why do the numbers need to be obscured?

Thank you, again, for your time.

Ali Everett, J.D., M.P.A., CAsp, ADAC

