



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.

Amber Tardif

From: Barbara Vellturo [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, October 9, 2022 2:06 PM
To: Rachele Arizmendi; Gene Goss; Edward Garcia; Kelly Kriebs; Robert Parkhurst; Public Comment
Subject: IS THE CITY VULNERABLE NOW UNDER RLUIPA?
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

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

DID THE CITY ATTORNEY SUGGEST THAT SIERRA MADRE IS ALREADY IN VIOLATION OF RLUIPA?

The City Attorney, City Council and our (Developer funded) opponents have all warned that our measure HR, rezoning the Mater Dolorosa property to Hillside, might restrict any needed Religious use by the Retreat center. If that were true, they allege, the City might be in violation of a Federal law which protects religious development in all zones.

Ironically, City Attorney Giragosian's presentation of the possible impacts of the People's initiative measure HR shows that Sierra Madre may already be in Jeopardy of violating the RLUIPA based on THE CITY'S EXISTING ordinance.

The City Attorney's presentations in support of his Report to the City Council included some slides (added ONLY after our Attorney's Legal Analysis discussed the R-1 ordinance he mentioned in that slide). That ordinance was not mentioned AT ALL in the City Attorney's ORIGINAL 9212 Report.

One of his slides included the statement:

"The Hillside Management Zone permits all uses permitted or conditionally permitted within the R-1"

"R-1 conditionally permits "churches, temples and other places of worship", Recreational Centers, Privately Operated ", or "nonprofit organizations".

(Actually R-1 code 17.20.025 - **Conditionally permitted uses.** States that:

"The following uses shall be allowed subject to the granting of a conditional use permit pursuant to the provisions of [Chapter 17.60](#) of this title:

A. Conditional uses allowed under [Section 17.60.030](#).

17.60.030 - Conditional use permits—When required includes

A Conditional Uses—All zones except the OS and R-C Zones.

Churches, temples and other places of worship, provided they shall be excluded from the C (commercial) zone, except as provided in [Section 17.56.120](#) of this title;)

Although WE feel that most reasonable people would agree that the wording of that ordinance would include ANY religious use AS REQUIRED BY FEDERAL LAW - RLUIPA, apparently our City Attorney is NOT SURE that our ordinance as drafted would legally apply to the Retreat Center, as the law requires!

His next slide to the City Council included the question:

Q1: "Is the Retreat Center a "church, temples and places of worship", Recreational Center Privately Operated ", or "nonprofit organizations" as contemplated by SMMC 17.60.

And concluded: "Unclear - requires a formal Director's Interpretation."

The City Attorney has provided this analysis OF AN EXISTING CITY ORDINANCE as part of his consideration of the City's potential exposure to a claim of VIOLATION OF FEDERAL RLUIPA LAW under our initiative Measure HR. He suggests that if the Retreat Center parcel was zoned Hillside, future religious needs might NOT be accommodated under our ordinance. (Despite the fact that the CITY is required to accommodate religious needs in all zones under federal law!)

He has said that he is uncertain whether, under our CURRENT ordinance, certain religious uses might be denied in the Hillside Zone! Or, for that matter, in any other zone but Institutional, if he thinks that the City's present code as written might not apply to the Passionist Retreat Center!

He failed to advise the City that if ANY religious use is excluded from ANY zone, Sierra Madre is ALREADY IN VIOLATION OF RLUIPA! And ALREADY IN JEOPARDY OF A LEGAL CHALLENGE!

AND, somehow, he also thinks that the Planning Director is qualified to make a legal assessment of what HE FEELS is included in those terms, to be sure that the City's zoning ordinance is not in violation of the Federal RLUIPA law?? Which it certainly would be if It could be presumed to EXCLUDE a Retreat Center and Stations of the Cross from any Zone which allows building!

City Attorneys are required to Draft City Ordinances specifically SO those Ordinances will be adequate to protect the City from potential legal claims.

And, ludicrously, Attorney Giragosian plans to ask a PLANNING DIRECTOR to make that interpretation? When he himself has said it is not legally clear to HIM? Would an interpretation by a Planning Director prevail against a legal challenge?

In that case, It may be a good idea for the Director of Planning to study the RLUIPA law and case law so he can advise the City Council what wording would allow them to amend their Ordinance in a manner that would CLEARLY protect all religious uses! As required by RLUIPA.

Here's a start, Vincent.

The General Premise of the law is that:

RLUIPA prohibits zoning and landmarking laws that substantially burden the religious exercise of churches or other religious assemblies or institutions or that totally exclude religious assemblies from a jurisdiction.

On December 15, 2016, the Civil Rights Division sent a letter about RLUIPA's requirements to mayors and other local officials to clarify the law. RLUIPA includes a large number of uses in its definition of "any religious assembly or institution"

"While the majority of RLUIPA cases involve places of worship such as churches, synagogues, mosques, and temples, the law is written broadly to cover a wide range of religious uses. The "substantial burden" provision in section 2(a) of the statute applies to burdens on "a person, including a religious assembly or institution." The remaining provisions apply to any religious "assembly or institution." Thus, RLUIPA applies widely not only to diverse places of worship, but also to religious schools, religious camps, religious retreat centers, and religious social service facilities such as group homes, homeless shelters, and soup kitchens, as well as to individuals exercising their religion through use of the property, such as home prayer gatherings or Bible studies." (Emphasis Added)

I think MOST of us would consider Sierra Madre's ordinance to be general enough to cover all these religious uses in all zones. And would never consider attorney Giragosian's alternative question whether the Passionists mission of quiet contemplation and prayer might be considered a recreational center!!

But in the event that the Planning Director (and the City Attorney) DON'T feel that our ordinance clearly conforms to the Federal Law - and the City Attorney has said he DOESN'T think it is clear -

It may be a good idea for the City to Amend its ordinance to conform to Federal Law by clearly allowing ALL religious uses in all zones. Apparently the City is in legal jeopardy if its present zoning does NOT include all religious uses - as the City Attorney seems to question.

(Unless his uncertainty is just the City Attorney's attempt to support the Developer's claim of a potential lawsuit under RLUIPA, when Measure HR. passes 😊)

In which case, ironically, he has shown that it is the City's existing ordinance, and NOT a change in zone that would cause a "substantial burden" and result in a potential legal challenge!

Barbara Vellturo
Steering Committee
Protect Sierra Madre

Amber Tardif

From: Primo J. Castro <primo.castro@cancer.org>
Sent: Monday, October 10, 2022 6:12 PM
To: Public Comment
Subject: October 11, 2022 - Agenda Discussion Item #2 - Support

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

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

October 11, 2022

Dear Mayor Goss and City Council:

The **American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network (ACS CAN)** is committed to protecting the health and well-being of the residents of Sierra Madre, and as such, **the first reading for the implementation of Smoke-Free protections for all multi-unit housing (MUH) residents—those who live in apartments as well as condominiums.** No one should have their health put at risk by others, including their neighbors, and those risks are the same, whether housing is rented or owned. We urge this council to unanimously vote in support of this ordinance that will protect all residents of Sierra Madre, without exemptions.

The negative health effects of secondhand smoke exposure are well documented; secondhand smoke contains at least 7,000 chemicals, including hundreds that are toxic. The U.S. Surgeon General has declared that there is no safe level of exposure to secondhand smoke. Even brief exposure to secondhand smoke can cause serious health effects, especially for the very young, the elderly, or those who are ill. Smoke-Free laws, such as those that eliminate smoking in multi-unit housing, reduce exposure to secondhand smoke and reduce the incidence of cancer, heart disease, and other conditions caused by exposure to smoke, as well as prevent the worsening of symptoms among people who already suffer from those conditions.

Living in MUH requires different standards of behavior due to shared walls and common spaces. Smoke-Free policies are added to the lease and communicated to tenants in the same way other lease provisions are communicated. Signs should be posted on the property, and residents are made aware of the penalties for violating this provision of their lease. Enforcement of Smoke-Free policies is very much like enforcement of all other lease conditions.

Prohibiting smoking in MUH improves the quality of life and helps to protect the health of nonsmoking residents by preventing the unintentional exposure that many receive as the result of smoking neighbors. More than 80% of Californians completely prohibit smoking in their homes, and yet, in MUH, one smoking resident can expose the neighbors in all surrounding units. Californians are making wiser choices for themselves and their families, and they should not have to endure being exposed to the smoke of others.

Everyone has the right to breathe clean air, especially in their own homes. Creating an ordinance that would prohibit all smoking in MUH units, on balconies, patios, and in common areas, as well as within all hotel rooms would help to protect all residents who live in MUH within the City of Sierra Madre. ACS CAN urges this council to make the health of Sierra Madre residents a priority and pass a comprehensive MUH policy as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Primo J. Castro



Primo J. Castro, MPA

Government Relations Director, CA - Los Angeles

626.995.0809 | m: 909.677.0600

fightcancer.org | 1.800.227.2345

This message (including any attachments) is intended exclusively for the individual to whom it is addressed and may contain proprietary, protected, or confidential information. If you are not the named addressee, you are not authorized to read, print, copy, or disseminate this message or any part of it. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately.

Amber Tardif

From: Colette Monell [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, October 11, 2022 8:21 AM
To: Public Comment
Subject: Public Comment: Ordinance Prohibiting Smoking In Multi-Unit Residences

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

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

Good Evening Mayor, Council members and City staff,

Thank you for your consideration of an ordinance that would prohibit smoking in multi-unit residences. As a resident and condo owner in the City of Sierra Madre that has been impacted from secondhand smoking, I am looking forward to the City moving forward with an ordinance. Condominiums have shared walls, patios and balconies and there is little a residence can do to avoid secondhand smoke. An ordinance that prohibits smoking in multi-unit residences would protect the residences from both short-term and long-term health effects from cigarette smoke. Thank you for moving the ordinance forward.

Thank you,
Colette
Condo owner in Sierra Madre

Amber Tardif

From: John Lloyd [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, October 11, 2022 9:49 AM
To: Public Comment
Subject: Ordinance 1642 Comment

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

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

Dear Mayor Goss, Mayor Pro Tem Garcia, and City Council Members,

I am writing regarding Ordinance 1642, especially the proposed revision to Chapter 10.32.040 of the Municipal code which currently limits angled parking on certain streets in downtown Sierra Madre. The proposed revision to 10.32.040 would remove all restrictions on angled parking and allow angled parking to be installed in many more locations throughout the city. There are several reasons this is a bad idea:

-
-
- **Safety:**
 - As the recent removal of the bike lane in front of the Library on Sierra Madre Blvd shows, angled parking may create a hazard for a variety of reasons, including reduced visibility when backing out and the creation of a stressful and hazardous conflict zone
 - (sharrows notwithstanding) that makes the route more dangerous and stressful for people on bikes. A recent study documents
 - [increased collisions that result from angled parking](#)
 - and the [USDOT's own guidelines](#) note that the configuration
 - of sharrows and angled parking that the city has used in front of the library is the least safe alternative available.
-
-
-
- **Changes may conflict with updated mobility element:**
 - As the city prepares to update its mobility plan, it is important that it not institute sweeping changes to its traffic and parking code without consideration of how these affect other mobility goals, such as reduction of trip generation rates and parking
 - needs, safety, sustainability, and equity. The recent removal of bike lanes, for example, was done without public outreach to those most negatively affected by the changes. What future changes to angled parking does the city plan? Has the city completed a
 - [Transportation Demand Management](#) (TDM) study that
 - seeks to optimize travel mode choices and explores alternatives to increasing street parking? What efforts is the city undertaking to solicit input about angled parking from residents who use alternatives such as bikes, ebikes, transit, mobility chairs, and
 - scooters? Changes to street parking configuration should not be made in an ad hoc manner, but should be balanced with other considerations as part of a comprehensive update of its mobility element.

•

There are good reasons to revisit Title 10 (“Vehicles and Traffic”) of the city’s municipal code as part of a comprehensive safe systems approach to traffic demand management and to ensure that the needs of all road users are taken into consideration as part of the process. That has not been done here.

Specifically I strongly urge you to postpone revision of Chapter 10.32.040 until these concerns have been addressed.

Sincerely,
John Lloyd
Sierra Madre, CA

Amber Tardif

From: Mary Monohan [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, October 11, 2022 2:58 PM
To: Public Comment
Subject: Public Comment

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

Good Evening Honorable Mayor Goss & Members of the City Council,

As a condo owner in Sierra Madre, I urge you to approve Ordinance No. 1457 Prohibiting Smoking in Multiunit Residences per staff recommendation.

Secondhand and thirdhand smoke is a major threat to public health. Most people are aware it can cause heart disease and cancer, however, there are over 7,000 chemicals in secondhand smoke, hundreds of which are toxic. ([Source](#)) As a new mother, my greatest concern is for my 8 month old baby. Babies and children exposed to secondhand smoke are more at risk for SIDS, respiratory disorders (ie. asthma), ear infections, and childhood cancers. Additionally, secondhand smoke inhalation puts a child more at risk for learning disabilities and behavioral disorders, including autistic like behaviors.

According to the CDC, "Comprehensive smokefree policies and laws in all workplaces and public places - without exception - and adoption of *smokefree rules for homes* and vehicles are the only way to fully protect people from secondhand smoke exposure." ([Source](#))

Therefore, I kindly ask you to vote yes on Ordinance No. 1457.

Thank you,
Mary Monohan
[REDACTED]

Amber Tardif

From: Jeffrey Monohan [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, October 11, 2022 2:59 PM
To: Public Comment
Subject: Public Comment

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

Good Evening Honorable Mayor Goss & Members of the City Council,

My name is Jeffrey Monohan. I am a resident of an owner-occupied condo in Sierra Madre and a former city commissioner.

As a former public servant, I am asking you to address the public health needs of Sierra Madre by voting yes to approve Ordinance No. 1457 upon first reading, as per staff recommendation.

According to the Technical Assistance Legal Center (TALC) "Under the United States constitution, there is NO CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO SMOKE. No court has ever recognized smoking as a fundamental right nor has any court ever found smokers to be a protected class."

LACDPH has reported "tobacco use is the leading preventable cause of disease and disability in the United States" and that "exposure to secondhand smoke is the third leading cause of preventable death in the U.S." Additionally, "secondhand smoke has been classified by the EPA as a Group A carcinogen, placing it in the most dangerous category, reserved for radon, benzene, and asbestos. The U.S. Surgeon General has concluded that there is no risk-free level of exposure to secondhand smoke." ([source](#))

Furthermore, a recent public opinion survey conducted in the City of Sierra Madre by LACDPH found that 99% of all residents surveyed support a law that bans smoking. Considering 2/5 (40%) surveyed live in multi-unit housing, this issue is of critical importance for the health of Sierra Madre. ([source](#))

Therefore, I ask you to protect the health of Sierra Madre residents by adopting Ordinance No. 1457. The 95% of (surveyed) residents that do not smoke should not have their health in jeopardy by the 5% of (surveyed) residents that do smoke. It is legally defensible for us to take action on this issue and potentially negligent if we do not.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jeffrey Monohan
[REDACTED]

 [_SierraMadre_MUH_POS_Report_04.22.2020.pdf](#)

Amber Tardif

From: Jose Reynoso
Sent: Tuesday, October 11, 2022 2:17 PM
To: Public Comment
Cc: Amber Tardif; Roberta Malfitano
Subject: FW: A letter I hope you can pass onto the city council for me.
Attachments: The Meadows Earns 100 % support.docx; SPEF Fundraiser ONE DAY.docx; Member of the city council. September 27.docx

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Amber,
Please include this in Public Comment.

Thanks,
Jose

Subject: A letter I hope you can pass onto the city council for me.

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

September 28,2022

Last night I was so upset when I spoke to the city council I think I forgot to explain this attached idea I got from South Pasadena, a town of similar size and dedicated residents. I gave them the flyer entitled **ONE DAY, ONE CAUSE, ONE COMMUNITY**. I did that because in Sierra Madre we were successful in buying dinners on Thursday and picking the dinners up the following Wednesdays from the participating restaurants. I think the name of the program was Sierra Madre Delivers, but making between 300-500 dinners weekly kept the restaurants solvent during the pandemic. . This was the brainchild of Matt, the owner of Popycakes and Tom Dennison who sits on the Planning Commission. This program could be a fundraiser for those residents who will be dramatically affected by this housing development.

My thought was since the city council **DID NOTHING FOR THE RESIDENTS WHO PARTICIPATED AND DID THEIR CIVIC DUTY** regarding this housing project who will now suffer between 2-3 years with noise, dirt, filth, more gunk in the atmosphere, additional animals including bats and rats and bugs fleeing for their lives as well as additional traffic as the developer now eradicates their environment once they begin to clear the land **perhaps something like this could happen in order to raise funds for sidewalks might begin the healing process**. Thanks to the city council ignoring 1300 signatures that were gathered by local resident volunteers, they interfered with the democratic process that came with those signed petitions. As this housing project was discussed, the town became splintered for or against the project and residents became dug into their assessment of what the project would do to this town. That battle is over, but that does not mean these residents will go quietly. There are a lot of very upset people, I am one of them as I stated last night.

The minimum I expect for this city is to put in sidewalks on those streets which will be affected by more traffic.Sunnyside in the block just below the monastery, Lima above Grandview, Grandview from Michilinda to Baldwin on the northside of the street only, and Carter to Baldwin does not have sidewalks. With increased in traffic those should be put in at city expense. As I said last night, my home is 100 years old and is overdue for a sidewalk so my son and my dog, or I do not get killed by some fast moving car coming down the hill on Lima out of that housing project. My sidewalk will not be straight, but if it keeps me

out of the street, that is a step in the right direction. As you know I went back to my old neighborhood on South El Molino and South Madison Ave in Pasadena and took pictures of those sidewalks and gave them to Chris Cimino. I explained in detail to you how that ramp was built that went over Oak Roots and did not damage the trees. However, those sidewalks should be put in prior to the work at the monastery beginning. You know I have worked hard trying to help this city. The city now needs to help me.

I am attaching a letter I drafted last night as soon as I got home from the City Council meeting. It is attached. Also attached is a flyer New Urban West sent to their followers the day after the vote was cast . I thought you would appreciate seeing that flyer because it includes the fact Carter would be widened and included a pedestrian walkway. I was not aware the county had sold the land to the developer, but maybe this is one more piece of misinformation this developer is so good at putting into print. Finally I am attaching the One Day, One Cause, One Community idea I received from South Pasadena where I worked at the Middle school for over 40 years. I gave the idea last night to each city council member, but I think the letter does a better job of explaining why I gave it to each of them. After watching them negotiate another \$250,000 for the Police building retrofit, they need to do something for those residents who opposed this housing development whose voices they ignored, because those residents will be tremendously affected. Somehow making me pay for the concrete to put in a sidewalk that was unnecessary until now pours salt on an open wound. **The city needs to reach out to this group of residents with something because they have ignored them in favor of the developer.**

Jose, I am sorry for the tone of this letter, but as you saw last night I am furious. Not only did the city council rush two special meetings so they could have their vote and take away the democratic process the petitions put into place for the residents to cast their vote, they continue to ignore the residents who pay taxes to the city in favor of a developer with very deep pockets. I guess this all came down to **MONEY**, and the developer had more than the residents.

Thank you for getting this to the members of the City Council. I am terribly disappointed in them, but if I continue to live in this town, I have to try to continue to suggest solutions to problems that I see.
Thank you for your help.

Nancy Beckham


Amber Tardif

From: Jose Reynoso
Sent: Tuesday, October 11, 2022 2:19 PM
To: Public Comment
Subject: FW: Pictures for the data being presented at city council meeting rg sidewalks...
Attachments: east side S. Madison Ave Pasadena.jpg; Looking south on S Madison. Notice how sidewalk is off set to hjelp thejpg; further south on SMadison Ave.jpg

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Please include in Public Comment

Thanks,

Jose

From: Nancy Beckham [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: Monday, October 10, 2022 10:02 PM
To: Jose Reynoso <jreynoso@cityofsierramadre.com>
Subject: Pictures for the data being presented at city council meeting rg sidewalks...

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

I just sent you two sets of pictures. They are the ones I sent Chris Cimeno and you about a year ago. They show lovely sidewalks that are not straight due to tree roots. However people do not walk in the streets, but on sidewalks instead.

The other sets of pictures are the lack of sidewalks on Lima and the dirt walkways made by the residents because no sidewalks have been provided unless residents install them themselves.

I do not know how these pictures can be shown during the city council meeting but here they are. There are more if you want more, but I think they are quite representative. I can take pictures of Carter(no sidewalks, that block of Sunnyside next to the gates of the. monastery, and pictures from the north side of Grandview....the 4 streets that will be the most affected. Let me know if you want a picture or two of the other streets.
Nancy Beckham

Hope you enjoyed the wedding festivities in Texas. .

September 27, 2022

Dear Members of the City Council,

I spoke passionately regarding the vote of the council to accept the Meadows Housing Project last night. I was undone because everything I worked had to research regarding animals who will lose their habitat, 101 trees that will be bulldozed, including that iconic fig that I made a poster of and brought to meeting after meeting so you would be reminded of what you were allowing to happen. Oh yes, you produced a unanimous vote in favor of the project, but you also took away the right for the residents to vote on the November Ballot. Thank you, City Council. See the attached flyer New Urban West sent out the following day. I was unaware the developer had received the land on Carter to widen the street from the county, but according to the attached flyer circulated by NUW the next day, apparently that is now the case. That is of course if they are not spreading misinformation around again.

I also sat inside the chamber and watched you ask for \$250,000 from New Urban West to retrofit the newly acquired Bank of America that will soon become the new Police Department. You also asked for larger trees that will be planted where the 101 mature trees will be slaughtered. Those trees will require more water because they will be newly planted...Remember there is a drought and we will now find out how much water will be required to plant and maintain these new trees.

Where was the concern for the residents who will have to live through 2-3 years of construction, including noise, dust and dirt.? Where was the concern regarding the lack of sidewalks that do not exist in this north west section of town? As I mentioned last night my home is 100 years old and has never had a sidewalk. We walk our dog in the street, walk from neighbor to neighbor in the street, and the 8 homes that have children walk by my home every morning in the street until they reach the elementary school a few blocks away. Once they reach the south side of Grandview they continue their journey on the sidewalk on the south side of Grandview until the playground is reached. The same thing occurs in the afternoon when the older children walk home. About a year ago I invited Chris Cimino to come to my home at 7:30 am to see what goes on as children try to navigate the streets without sidewalks. I told Chris I would make the coffee so he could see what happens in the early mornings and afternoons five days a week. He never came to visit, but perhaps the entire city council should come and watch what happens on Lima each morning. Where is the help to Lima, Carter, Grove, and Sunnyside....all which will be affected? You expect these streets to now carry more traffic, but you are not willing to help the residents?

I gave you a flyer from SPEF that will take place in South Pasadena...One Town, One Community, One Purpose. In the flyer I gave you it showed the Community is coming together to help raise funds for the school district. Perhaps you could begin to heal the split that has occurred over this housing development by doing a fundraiser like this to help raise the funds for sidewalks for the streets that will have to carry more traffic? I turned in pictures and numbers of home on the upper part of Lima that will need sidewalks. Some residents have put in their own sidewalks, but it is very haphazard. However, I even gave Chris Cimino pictures from S. EL Molino, and S. Madison Ave because sidewalks were creatively put in that went around trees, but residents could still walk on a sidewalk. The sidewalks were not straight but they were effective, because not a tree was lost and those trees are the huge Camphor Trees and Oak Trees that exist in that older neighborhood. I have tried to help solve some of the problems and I even explained to Jose Reynoso in detail how a ramp could be built on North Grandview so a sidewalk could be built and not hurt the tree roots. I have tried to propose solutions to problems, but you have not wanted to hear from me.

Thank you for your attention,
Nancy Beckham