



# 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.

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.

## Denise Mendoza

---

**From:** John Trager [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 25, 2025 12:23 PM  
**To:** Public Comment  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Parking vs. speed bumps on W. Grandview

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

---

Dear Council Members,

I have reviewed the traffic studies and laud the Council for supporting the reduction in speed limit from 30 to 25 for several sections of Sierra Madre roadways in the interest of pedestrian and driver safety. However, I fear that prohibiting parking on the south side of W. Grandview Ave. may only encourage drivers to take advantage of the more open roadway to step on the gas.

Despite the 25-mph speed limit posted in this school zone and the presence of several poorly patched potholes that make for a rough ride at almost any speed, the stretch of W. Grandview between Michillinda and Sunnyside seems to be one that many drivers want to get through as quickly as possible.

The crash data for this segment of road shows zero crashes for the study period of 1/1/22 - 12/31/24. In the four decades that we have lived along this road, we have had three cars parked at the curb on the N side smashed by reckless drivers. All of these drivers were headed W from a stop at the Grandview & Sunnyside intersection. Drivers seem to like to test their vehicles' 0 to 60 potential in this block.

As annoying as potholes are, perhaps the best way to control speeding in this stretch of road might be speed bumps. The increased traffic during school drop-off and pick-up creates a perilous situation. While the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile of drivers at these and other times observe safe driving speeds, those 15 percenters may not be controlled by any other means than the physical deterrents of speed bumps.

Sincerely, John N. Trager  
[REDACTED]

## Denise Mendoza

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 25, 2025 4:45 PM  
**To:** Public Comment  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Consideration of new Parking Rules on W Grand View Ave

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

Dear City Council Members,

I have lived on W Grandview for over 30 years and have watched the traffic become heavier and faster. Grandview is one of the wider residential streets in Sierra Madre and gets extra traffic for those wishing to speed across town from Michillinda all the way to Santa Anita. Implementing parking restrictions Monday through Friday only makes this a much more desirable street to use as a throughway and speed across from one side of the city to the other. Implementing restrictions from 7 am to 10 am and then again from 2 p.m. to 5 p.m basically means no parking during the weekday.

For months I sat and watched the giant dump trucks traverse across Grand View in both directions with no problems, even with cars parked on both sides of the street. Literally I have counted 20 plus trucks pass my house in less than 5 minutes.

Honestly there are never many cars actually parked on Grand View. This restriction is totally unnecessary and a hardship to it's residents, especially seniors like myself. On the rare occasions that I do park on the north side I take my life into my own hands trying to cross the street as the cars speed by. Now you are proposing that I do this unsafe crossing during peak traffic hours. Having residents park across the street will put pedestrian safety at stake.

What needs to happen is drivers need to slow down and not use Grand View as a throughway.

Also, it was a bit disappointing that I just received this notice (August 23) for a meeting on August 26.

I hope you reconsider this recommendation as it is not in the best interests of the residents of Grand View.

Regards,

Valerie Grant  
[REDACTED]

## Denise Mendoza

---

**From:** John Lloyd [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 26, 2025 7:28 AM  
**To:** Public Comment  
**Cc:** Robert Parkhurst  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] 2025 Engineering and Traffic Survey Report

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

---

Dear Mayor Parkhurst and Council Members,

I am urging you to use the 2025 Engineering and Traffic Survey Report as a step in a broader conversation around traffic safety and active transportation.

I have several questions about the report. What are the recommendations of the report? It is alarming to see the report recommend raising the speed limit on east Sierra Madre Blvd. (which I am glad was not accepted), but it makes me concerned about the basis and scope of the report's recommendations. Are there other streets where speed limits are to be raised? Did the personnel doing the engineering and traffic survey use the 85th percentile method to determine speed limits? Were they aware that the state no longer mandates use of the 85th percentile method when determining speed limits because of concerns about safety? Are there recommendations for infrastructure improvements that go beyond stop signs and include other proven traffic calming measures? If so, where? How is this report to be used in conjunction with an earlier traffic safety report by Berkeley SafeTREC, completed a few years ago?

My larger concern involves the apparent dissolution of the city's Transportation Subcommittee on which I have served for the last several years. During my time on the subcommittee I vigorously and regularly pushed the city to use the subcommittee to create a vision for a broader updating of the city's mobility element, especially with respect to the creation of a bike and pedestrian master plan. Without this larger vision, ad hoc efforts such as this report lack a clear direction, context, and connection to clearly articulated goals.

As such, I would urge the council to use this opportunity to explore a way to reconvene the transportation subcommittee and charge it with taking steps to create a bike and pedestrian master plan that places the safety of all road users at the center of its vision.

John Lloyd  
Sierra Madre, CA

## Denise Mendoza

---

**From:** joe [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 26, 2025 10:05 AM  
**To:** Public Comment  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Re\_GATEWAY\_08262025

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

---

TO:

Honorable Members of Sierra Madre City Council (PublicComment@CityofSierraMadre.com via email)

Submitted in advance of Council Meeting: Date August 26, 2025 5:30pm

We, the undersigned residents of Sierra Madre, are a few of the riders who appreciated the Gateway Bus here in town over many years. We are very concerned that the Gateway Bus has not resumed service. It is now more than one full year since service was abruptly halted in July 2024, reportedly due to mechanical breakdown of the vehicle (owned or leased by Sierra Madre, along with regular driver Gilbert who did the route for many years).

Several of us were given repeated assurances (from City employees) throughout the fall of 2024 that it WOULD be returned. To date, not one of us has been contacted by any City representative with any followup plan of action.

The Metro 268 bus does NOT go to Ralph's supermarket, and the extra distance to the SM Villa Station is not feasible for elderly carrying groceries, especially a few regulars with profound disability (in 80s and 90s !). Use of Metro Micro requires crossing Foothill Blvd, and that is a prohibitive challenge for Seniors. In the last year of operation there were at least a dozen frequent riders, each making multiple trips per week. The City of Sierra Madre website still shows both Gateway and Dial-A-Ride as available.

OTHER local cities have made whatever choices were necessary to continue serving their residents transportation needs without stalling and poor excuses.

Please kindly address this matter and respond PUBLICLY with an acceptable plan.

Thank you.

Joe Reid, [REDACTED]

Mei Kwan, [REDACTED]

Rana Ayzeren, [REDACTED]

John and Tomiko McElligot, [REDACTED]

Harriet Johnston, [REDACTED]

A. Tran, ([REDACTED])

(others with known concern were not yet reached for comment)

## Denise Mendoza

---

**From:** Laura Knighten [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 26, 2025 12:39 PM  
**To:** Public Comment  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Public Comment: Auburn/Highland Intersection

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

---

Dear Sierra Madre City Council,

I am writing to follow up on the public comment I made on May 27th regarding safety concerns and the need for a crossing guard at the Auburn/Highland intersection by Sierra Madre Elementary School. At that time, the SME staff members who had been volunteering for crossing-guard duty were no longer willing to work in the intersection because of incidents of almost being hit by cars. As crossing-guard duty is not in their job description, they cannot be required to serve in this way.

School is back in session, and there has been no change at that intersection. Drivers are entering the carline on Highland from three directions, exiting the carline on Auburn, while pedestrians are trying to cross going towards Sierra Madre Elementary and the opposite direction towards Sierra Madre Middle. This is in addition to the traffic generated by the three private schools nearby.

In order to get to and from school, Sierra Madre kids are crossing an intersection that adults have deemed too dangerous to work in. A crossing guard is needed at Auburn/Highland, and simplifying the traffic pattern on the streets around SME during pick up and drop off hours would go a long way toward making that intersection safer.

PUSD's position is that crossing guards are the responsibility of the city. I urge you to find a safety solution for this intersection to keep Sierra Madre kids safe.

Sincerely,  
Laura Knighten  
Sierra Madre Resident

## Denise Mendoza

---

**From:** T ODonnell [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 26, 2025 1:32 PM  
**To:** Public Comment  
**Cc:** Tim and Julie  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Consideration of New Parking Rules on W. Grand View Ave.

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

---

Dear Sierra Madre City Council:

We support the City of Sierra Madre adopting parking restrictions on the South side of W. Grand View Ave. in the Monday through Friday time frame from 7 am to 10 am and from 2 pm to 6 pm (versus the Study Reports 5 pm recommendation). We suggest the bump up to 6 pm to capture a still busy traffic period with returning workers and possible future truck traffic.

We recently, with the help of our next door neighbor, measured the approximate street widths (inside curb to inside curb) on West Grand View Ave., Alegria Ave. and Fairview Ave. all just east of Michillinda Ave., within Sierra Madre. We also provide some street width clearances with cars parked. We used both a tape measure and a laser range finder, reporting here on just the tape measurements:

### West Grand View Ave width clearance (right where the red curb ends):

1. With no parked cars = 34 feet (smallest width clearance of the 3 noted streets)
2. With two opposite side parked cars = 21 feet
3. With only one street side with a parked car = 27.5 feet

Note: the Federal Highway Administration (FHA) recommends a minimum of 24 feet street width clearance if traffic is mixed dump trucks (12 wheelers) and cars, as could occur with planned housing development at the sold Mater Delorosa Retreat Center property. And, the FHA would assess such street traffic as unsafe if there is only 21 feet of width clearance.

### Alegria Ave. width clearance

1. With no parked cars = 40 feet (largest width clearance of the 3 streets measured)
2. With two opposite parked cars = 27 feet
3. With only one street side with a parked car = 33.5 feet

### Fairview Ave. Width Clearance

1. With no parked cars = 36 feet
2. With two opposite parked cars = 23 feet
3. With only one street side with a parked car = 29.5 feet

The above street width numbers indicate that West Grand View Ave. may be the least safe option for trucks turning east off of Michillinda Ave. or traveling west toward Michillinda Ave. as they head to/from the above mentioned homes development site.

Having lived on the corner of W. Grand View Ave. and Michillinda Ave for almost 40 years, we notice how quickly many vehicles turn right from north bound Michillinda Ave onto W. Grand View Ave. Cars, when parked on the south side of W. Grand View Ave., near Michillinda Ave., can readily cause this right turning traffic to veer a bit toward the center of W. Grand View, making for unsafe driving conditions with west bound W. Grand View Ave traffic. **If/when trucks make this same turn, and encounter parked cars on the south side of West Grand View Ave., it will be an even more serious traffic situation.**

Finally, if the City adopts parking restrictions on the southside of W. Grand View Ave., we assume there will be no restrictions for parking in non red curb space on the northside of W. Grand View Ave. With such a possible south side parking restriction, homeowners on the northside of W. Grand View Ave. may experience a higher rate of cars parked on their side of the street. However, even with possible increased north side parking, individual homeowners would not be entitled to limit such parking. Correct?

Regards,

Tim and Julie O'Donnell

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

## Denise Mendoza

---

**From:** deb sheridan [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 26, 2025 1:51 PM  
**To:** Public Comment  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] City Council Meeting 8/26/25 - Discussion Point 2 Traffic Survey

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

---

Please note that I used the email address in the Agenda, which was bounced back.

----- Forwarded Message -----

**From:** "mailer-daemon@yahoo.com" <mailer-daemon@yahoo.com>  
**To:** "[REDACTED]"  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 26, 2025 at 01:41:29 PM PDT  
**Subject:** Failure Notice

Sorry, we were unable to deliver your message to the following address.

<[publiccomment@sierramadre.gov](mailto:publiccomment@sierramadre.gov)>:  
No mx record found for domain=sierramadre.gov

----- Forwarded message -----

Dear Council Members,

I'm sorry I won't be able to attend tonight's meeting. My concern is the Traffic Survey, and what you plan to do with it. The survey seems to have done a somewhat thorough job of monitoring traffic during different hours. However my areas of concern are:

1. Grove Street was totally omitted.
2. Schools are now back in session. Was the increase in traffic fully taken into account? Current school attendance is down because of several unusual circumstances. We can only hope that normal life will resume at some point.
3. How will this data be analyzed and parsed? The Planning Commissioners pointed out to the New Urban West representative hired to study traffic patterns that there were several areas he did not adequately account for, including truck traffic during construction, or future increased traffic flow once the Meadows homes are built. A new study was promised, but this is woefully inadequate as to what was promised.

My additional questions are how you will use this "study" to benefit the residents, especially those who will be directly impacted by the Meadows project. How will the City follow through on pedestrian and biking safety? How will the City mitigate the truck traffic during construction and the resulting harmful dust. Several residents have reported the harmful toxins that are still in their homes, and/or on their property.

Will our residents have any say in solutions and concerns besides their three minutes before City Council? I would suggest a town hall meeting and/or a subcommittee made up of those who will be directly impacted.

Thank you,  
Deb Sheridan



**Denise Mendoza**

---

**From:** Catherine Adde [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 26, 2025 2:54 PM  
**To:** Public Comment  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] T-Mobile grant for our fabulous Library  
**Importance:** High

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

Dear Mayor, Mayor Pro tem and Council members,

Please approve and sign the Sierra Madre Library Foundation's letter of recommendation for a grant called Hometown mobile ( T - Mobile ). The 50K for this grant will provide furniture, fixtures and equipment ( F F & E ) for our new library. Thankful to the foundation and Rob Stockly, chair, for their diligence!

"State grants built the walls — your gifts will fill them with life."

Thank you,  
Catherine Adde  
Trustee  
City of Sierra Madre - Library Board of Trustees



Independent Affiliate  
~ TravelStore Chairman's Club ~



**TRAVELSTORE**

*TravelStore's*



ENDORSED BY  
**Forbes** \*\*\*  
TRAVEL GUIDE

## Denise Mendoza

---

**From:** Keith Farrell [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 26, 2025 3:01 PM  
**To:** Public Comment  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] NEW PARKING RULES: CONSIDERATION OF BAD SELECTION CRITERIA

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

---

Sierra Madre City Council  
YOUR HONORS:

**ERROR IN RATIONALE FOR SELECTION OF North VS South TEMPORARY PARKING RESTRICTION on West Grandview Ave (Michillinda to Baldwin).**

**Please reconsider limiting the parking on the North rather than the South due to the more readily available parking ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF THE STREET.**

The decision-making rationale used to select which side of the street parking should be limited was flawed. The traffic study stated that there was minimal occupancy and it varied between north and south by only 3 percent (5% vs 8%). Generally less than 5% difference is statistically insignificant, especially on such a small sampling, so selection should be a coin toss. I should mention that no statement was made regarding how they determined available parking spaces.

I performed a visual survey of the street and discovered that there is more AVAILABLE parking on the south side than the north. Availability is a better criteria. The study selected based on USED SPACE which was insignificantly different. Available space should be a better criteria for selection. When congestion is highest, there is more curb space available on the south for both sides to park. This can be determined easily by counting the driveways which take up one car length. The street is the same length on both sides so the driveways are the limiting factor. Each driveway varies by width from 8-10 feet but adding the apron and a courtesy distance on each side is the equivalent to one car length.

Simply stated, there are 49 driveways on the north and 23 driveways on the south creating a significant extra amount of parking spaces (26 spaces) on the South for parking during restricted times. This is slightly offset by one more street on the south (Jameson Court) which would delete two spaces, for a **total of 24 more parking spaces on the South side.**

This is the criteria that should have been used for selection. Please reconsider limiting the parking on the North rather than the South due to the more readily available parking space.

Keith G. Farrell, [REDACTED]



\*\*\*\*\*

**This message is confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify us immediately and delete this email. You should not copy it or any of its attachments, or use it for any purpose, nor disclose its content to any other person. Please consider your environmental responsibility before printing this email & any documents.**

□