

**City Council Meeting**  
**eComment Report | November 17, 2025**

Agenda Item	Name	Comment	Position	Attachment URL
12	Tony for Public Safety Town Halls	<p>Dear City Council,  Dear CM Napolitano,</p> <p>The public safety town hall was a big step forward in encouraging meaningful community engagement; but it needs some work.</p> <p>The town hall was billed as an opportunity to speak a variety of public safety issues.</p> <p>But after 50 minutes of staff presentations that probably should have been limited to 15 there was only an hour and ten minutes left for public questions.</p> <p>Then after a 50 minute segment on ebike road &amp; strand safety the town hall briefly moved onto homelessness and then we were out of time.</p> <p>Hopefully there will be a followup Public Safety Town Hall in the not too distant future.</p> <p>i wanted to talk about the apparent lack of police enforcement targeted against hazardous driving behavior on busy RESIDENTIAL collector roads like Prospect, Hermosa Ave and 27th Street.</p> <p>For instance, on 27th we have six to ten thousand cars a day and we have constant speeding and vehicles and at least 20 vehicles per hours rolling through stop signs at 3+ MPH at the school safe crosswalk at the NW corner of a busy park.</p> <p>27th's residential collector road is a magnet for distracted driving and late night non stop bar traffic and who knows how many are driving while impaired.</p>	For	

**City Council Meeting  
eComment Report | November 17, 2025**

Agenda Item	Name	Comment	Position	Attachment URL
		<p>My PRRs revealed not a single speeding ticket or late night citation for obnoxiously loud vehicles on 27th between Morningside &amp; Manhattan Ave has been issued in at least the last 5 years; yet hazardous driving is a constant.</p> <p>And here has never been a DUI Road Check on 27th.</p> <p>We are told that because our Residential road segments do not have as high coffin-count as the the roads in the business district or the highway; traffic enforcement should be prioritized there AND those unfortunate souls that live on busy residential road should just grin and bear the lack of enforcement as a matter of the greater good.</p> <p>Then there was former Councilman Massey's dismissive statements that the 27th's residents knew what they were getting into when they bought their homes!</p> <p>i wanted to again drive home the point that strong enforcement targeted against all forms of hazardous driving on our busy RESIDENTIAL Collector Roads citywide will likely have a positive spillover effect that will reduce hazardous driving in the high risk areas on PCH &amp; pier ave.</p> <p>We are a 1.4 sq mi city and our busy residential collector roads are only a minute or two from the high risk areas. Its essentially all tightly connected. If i get a ticket for hazardous driving on a busy residential collector road there is no way that doesn't impact my driving habits in nearby high risk areas.</p> <p>Coffin Count Policing is not always the Bee's Knee.</p> <p>Also, a LACK of enforcement on busy residential collector roads will likeky encourage hazardous behavior in high risk areas leading to more accidents.</p>		

**City Council Meeting  
eComment Report | November 17, 2025**

Agenda Item	Name	Comment	Position	Attachment URL
		<p>I wanted to point out that its probably much easier to spot hazardous driving behavior on these busy residential collector roads than on a 3 lane highway with no stop signs to blow through.</p> <p>i wanted to point out that speeding and loud vehicle enforcement would likely be easier too</p> <p>Drivers wanting to avoid the Police station on Pier Ave likely use 27th if they have been drinking, popping pills or smoking pot and i suspectthe police are probably just as likely to find a gun or narcotics in a late night traffic stop on a busy residential collector road like 27th or Hermosa ave as on PCH or Pier ave</p> <p>And i wanted to point out that my suggestions that traffic calming measures like reducing the speed to 20mph on 27th, on Gould adjacent to Valley Park have been repeatedly ignored.</p> <p>i would also like to have asked that given we 27 patrol officers on staff, how many hazardous behavior tickets are issued per week per officer?</p> <p>That said, the town hall with zoom is a big step forward</p> <p>It was a good thing that demonstrates the city is headed in the right direction</p> <p>thank you tonyhiggins</p>		

**City Council Meeting**  
**eComment Report | November 17, 2025**

Agenda Item	Name	Comment	Position	Attachment URL
12	Tony for more traffic enforcement	<p>Dear City Council,</p> <p>Re: Traffic Enforcement</p> <p>I'm looking at the most recent crime report for the week of Nov 2, 2025 and i see that with 27 patrol officers the city issued 26 citations.</p> <p>Assuming that all these citations were ALL for traffic infractions that works out to slightly less than one citation per week per patrol officer.</p> <p>And the truth probably is that several of the 26 citations had nothing to do with traffic enforcement.</p> <p>I hope the Council, the City Manager, Chief Phillips and the entire HBPD mull this over in the context of amount of hazardous driving in our City.</p>	-	
15.j - 25-CDD-164	Randy Balik	<p>I am in favor of this request and see no issues with this as might be perceived by some with respect to a "bar." This business is not a bar, but rather it is a very nice facility for golfers to go and practice their game or play a virtual practice round. And furthermore, it's a members-only business, so the requested license won't increase traffic other than serve as a possible enticement for new members, and thus new business for them. Golfers often enjoy a cold beer on the course, and so this makes sense that the experience for some at this facility would be even better. Note that I am not a member, but have been considering membership and a license like this makes a membership all the more enticing just for the overall experience. There is no reason that I can see not to grant this.</p>	For	

**City Council Meeting  
eComment Report | November 17, 2025**

Agenda Item	Name	Comment	Position	Attachment URL
16.a - 25-CR-087	tony for special event sanity	<p>Dear City Council,</p> <p>It is a relatively small thing but I believe there was no application submitted nor public comment taken in the November 3 Parks Commission meeting related to the World Championship Volleyball Trials from June 15-19, 2026 listed in the Special Events Calendar and included with the Agenda Item 16a staff report.</p> <p>My question is simple.</p> <p>Will the 4 day World Championship Trials Special Event be approved as part of agenda item 16a?</p> <p>The reason i'm asking is the applicant asked to include the World Trials approval as a 4 day addition to the 4 day Beach Collegiate National Training Block event and neither staff nor the commission provided a clear answer on how to proceed.</p> <p>Apparently the same applicant oversees both events.</p> <p>Although i don't personally have any problem with the World Trials themself, we do have a Special Events Policy Guide that among other things is intended to protect residents from Special Event over-saturation.</p> <p>Remember, the \$300,000 Parks Master Plan concluded that residents felt we have about the right number of Special Events already.</p> <p>Im concerned that with the upcoming World Cup &amp; Olympics there is a real risk of event over-saturation &amp; profiteering if the city gets in the habit of giving Special Event Guide event policy-passes.</p>	-	

**City Council Meeting  
eComment Report | November 17, 2025**

Agenda Item	Name	Comment	Position	Attachment URL
		<p>Thank you for your thoughtful consideration</p> <p>tonyhiggins</p> <p>Notes:</p> <p>In terms of over-saturation consider events 11 out 13 days from June 9-21</p> <p>- Beach Collegiate National Team Training Block on Tuesday, June 9, through Friday, June 12, 2026 on the volleyball courts North of the Pier</p> <p>-Out of System 4 eyes volleyball tourney Saturday June 13, 2026.</p> <p>Sunday No Volleyball then</p> <p>- World Championship Trials Monday June 15 2026 through Thursday June 18, 2026</p> <p>- Friday no volleyball then</p> <p>- AAU Southern Grand Series Volleyball Tourney on Saturday June 20 and Sunday June 21, 2026.</p>		

**City Council Meeting  
eComment Report | November 17, 2025**

Agenda Item	Name	Comment	Position	Attachment URL
17.a - 25-AS-088	tony for parking sanity	<p>Dear City Council,</p> <p>Re: ecomment to 11/17 CCM agenda item 17a.</p> <p>When the city put parking meters and created the May 15-Sept 15th 1 hour parking zones in RESIDENTIAL neighborhoods the city created an impacted zone and an implied promise; residents living in the impact zone would be allowed to park their vehicles without restriction in the impact zone IF the home didn't have adequate at-home parking.</p> <p>The city immediately reneged on this promise by charging us for parking permits but that ship has already sailed.</p> <p>Once again, the underlying principle is if you live in the impacted residential zone you should be eligible for parking permit(s) if you DO NOT have adequate at-home parking to accommodate your vehicles.</p> <p>This should be the over-arching goal of the city's parking policy in impacted these impact zones. Period!</p> <p>Common sense also says that to accommodate this purpose, homes in the impacted zone should be eligible for a guest permit and at least one sticker-permit with an absolute minimum of application-hassle; requiring only a valid DL (any address) and a bank statement or utility bill associated to that place of residence.</p>	-	

**City Council Meeting  
eComment Report | November 17, 2025**

Agenda Item	Name	Comment	Position	Attachment URL
		<p>It follows that ideally city parking policies should result in the number of parking permits issued to a given home MATCHING the number of car-owning residents living at that home less the number of available on-site parking spaces.</p> <p>Offering a third permit under the above conditions without requiring providing reasonable proof of inadequate at-home parking is a bit of a give-away but that ship already sailed too and at this point it seems like a reasonable compromise.</p> <p>But for a fourth permit, i believe residents living in the impact zone should be required to provide reasonable proof that there is inadequate at-home parking to accommodate the driving-residents be supported a signed statement identifying the number of available spaces at their place of residence and pictures showing their garages are available for parking.</p> <p>And if the resident misrepresents this, the two year parking restriction should apply.</p> <p>With the the new LPR system enforcement should be easy.</p> <p>Also, residents blocking the sidewalk with their vehicles should have their parking permits suspended.</p> <p>Finally, if the city ever decided to put yellow meters or create a 1hour parking zone between Prospect &amp; PCH then residents living there should be eligible for a parking permit and a guest passes.</p> <p>But this is not the case and generally residents living outside the impacted zone are not being mistreated.</p> <p>Thank you for considering, tonyhiggins</p>		

**City Council Meeting**  
**eComment Report | November 17, 2025**

Agenda Item	Name	Comment	Position	Attachment URL
17.a - 25-AS-088	Vincent Busam	<p>We've heard from many people who feel the old permit system was fine and we should return to that. However, all of these people overly benefitted from the old system. The old system disadvantaged many stakeholders - residents, guests, businesses to the detriment of the city as a whole. We've made small steps in the right direction to make Hermosa a better city, and we should continue that progress.</p> <p>I'd specifically like to point out one group that supposedly benefited from the old system, but really didn't - renters. Hermosa is a market rate market, and the market factors in the true value of those parking permits - probably around \$100/mo. Landlords are able to capture this value with higher rents. This makes Hermosa more unaffordable to locals, and is basically a transfer of value from the city to the individual landlords.</p> <p>We should continue to raise the parking rates. I suggest \$10/yr for the first permit, \$20 for the second, and \$30 for the third. Send a message that the rates will continue to increase to match the market so people have time to adjust.</p> <p>If a 4th or further permits is issued, it should be at a substantially higher amount. I'd suggest \$200/yr to start, then see how many purchase them. This still represents a fantastic value to the user, perhaps too generous, as it's well below true market rates.</p> <p>Finally, instruct staff to look into implementing ParkMobile at the 1 hour spots. Guests and workers should have easier access to a way to park in those spots longer, but we also must make sure they aren't incentivized to park there too long. Correctly pricing these spots is important.</p>	-	

**City Council Meeting  
eComment Report | November 17, 2025**

Agenda Item	Name	Comment	Position	Attachment URL
17.a - 25-AS-088	Carolyn Petty	I appreciate that Mayor Saeman and Councilmembers Francois and Keegan understand that the changes to the parking permit program were punitive and implemented to help visitors, not residents. The city gave up hundreds of thousands of dollars of revenues when they changed everything (pushed by Councilmembers Massey/Jackson/Detoy) , while at the same time, they tried to raise taxes. Does anyone think it is easier to park? Of course not. There can't be that many people who have 4 cars - but if they do, why punish them? The reality is that if both parents work, and there are two kids who have sports or other hobbies, the family may have 4 cars. You cannot register the car under a minor's name. The car must be titled under the parent. Requiring different names will not work in this situation. Please support working moms who can't just drive their kids around all the time and actually have to go to work.	For	

**City Council Meeting**  
**eComment Report | November 17, 2025**

Agenda Item	Name	Comment	Position	Attachment URL
17.a - 25-AS-088	Jules for Parking Permit Additions	<p>Im writing as a daughter living in a multigenerational Hermosa Beach household, and as a mother of two young boys who will soon be part of our school system. My family lives, works, shops, and contributes fully to this community every single day. Because of that, I want to express my strong support for increasing the number of parking permits to five per household without additional restrictions or bureaucratic hurdles.</p> <p>Hermosa Beach is going through a real transition right now. Young families like mine are returning and putting down roots, long-time homes are staying within families, and many households look very different from the traditional model our old parking policies were designed around. In our home alone, we balance multiple work schedules, childcare arrangements, and the needs of three generations living under one roof. This isnt unusual anymore its becoming the norm.</p> <p>A single Hermosa Beach home today may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parents with two full work schedules and two cars</li> <li>Grandparents or relatives helping with childcare</li> <li>Adult children living at home as they navigate career transitions or high housing costs</li> <li>Parents of young children who rely on frequent support from visiting family</li> <li>Households with hybrid or alternating work-from-home/office schedules, all requiring accessible parking</li> </ul>	For	

**City Council Meeting**  
**eComment Report | November 17, 2025**

Agenda Item	Name	Comment	Position	Attachment URL
		<p>These are ordinary, everyday realities not special circumstances that residents should have to prove or justify. Requiring families to document why they deserve parking spots not only adds stress, but also ignores how modern families function and the very people Hermosa Beach has always valued.</p> <p>Raising the limit to five permits per household with no complicated verification layers would:</p> <p>Reduce administrative strain on the city</p> <p>No appeals, no subjective decisions, no unnecessary staff work.</p> <p>Provide fairness and consistency</p> <p>Every household would be treated equally, without arbitrary distinctions.</p> <p>Support young families and multigenerational homes</p> <p>These are the residents who want to stay and invest in Hermosa Beach long-term.</p> <p>Strengthen neighborhood safety and quality of life</p> <p>Families shouldn't be forced to park blocks away late at night or spend time circling streets simply because the policy no longer reflects how people live.</p> <p>For households like mine who have lived here for decades and hope to raise the next generation here this decision matters deeply. Updating the permit limit to five is a simple change that will significantly improve daily life for so many families who love this city.</p>		

**City Council Meeting**  
**eComment Report | November 17, 2025**

Agenda Item	Name	Comment	Position	Attachment URL
17.a - 25-AS-088	Katy Jensen	<p>Dear HB Council,</p> <p>I want to strongly encourage the Council to approve the fourth parking permit without restrictions or additional bureaucratic requirements.</p> <p>Hermosa Beach is experiencing a meaningful shift right now:</p> <p>young families are returning, homes are being passed down through multiple generations, and many households are supporting transitions such as new babies, shared childcare, blended families, or adult children returning home. These are exactly the types of residents the city has always valued, and they are the ones most affected by the current limitations.</p> <p>The challenge is that modern families do not look like they did when the original parking policies were created.</p> <p>A single Hermosa Beach home may now include:</p> <p>Parents with two work schedules and two cars</p> <p>A grandparent helping with childcare</p> <p>An adult child temporarily living at home</p>	For	

**City Council Meeting  
eComment Report | November 17, 2025**

Agenda Item	Name	Comment	Position	Attachment URL
		<p>Visiting family members rotating in to support a new baby or medical situation</p> <p>Couples with hybrid jobs who need vehicles at home on alternating days</p> <p>These situations are normalnot extraordinaryand they do not fit neatly into a rigid proof of need requirement.</p> <p>Requiring residents to justify everyday family life or submit documentation about how many cars they deserve is not only burdensome; its out of sync with the reality of how people live today. A straightforward fourth permit would help ensure stability for families who are trying to make Hermosa Beach their long-term home.</p> <p>Approving the fourth permit without restrictions would:</p> <p>Reduce administrative strain on the city</p> <p>No appeals, no verifications, no staff hours spent analyzing parking layouts.</p> <p>Treat all households equally and fairly</p> <p>Avoiding subjective or inconsistent determinations.</p> <p>Support the young families and generational homes that the city says it wants to retain</p> <p>Parking should not be the reason a family cant comfortably live inor return toHermosa Beach.</p> <p>Promote safety and sanity in neighborhoods</p>		

**City Council Meeting  
eComment Report | November 17, 2025**

Agenda Item	Name	Comment	Position	Attachment URL
		<p>Residents shouldn't have to circle blocks at night or park far from home simply because of an outdated policy.</p> <p>I'm grateful that you the Council is reconsidering this measure, and I hope Monday's final decision reflects a modern, family-friendly, and community-centered approach. A fourth permit without restrictions would make a meaningful difference for us and for many others in similar situations.</p> <p>Katy Jenssen 2408 Silverstrand since 1951</p> <p>Thank you again for your support and for keeping the voices of residents at the forefront of this decision. Thank you for taking the time to reconsider this issue and for keeping resident voices at the center of your decision-making. I hope Monday's vote reflects a modern, family-friendly, community-minded approach that keeps Hermosa Beach livable for the families who call it home.</p>		

**City Council Meeting**  
**eComment Report | November 17, 2025**

Agenda Item	Name	Comment	Position	Attachment URL
17.a - 25-AS-088	Randy Balik	<p>While I do not know what stating a position "for" or "against" is here since there is nothing specific being proposed, what I am "for" is returning the parking pass program to something more similar than it was before, and less restrictive than it is now. I'll state my proposed solution here first, and then you can read on if you'd like to understand the basis of my position.</p> <p>Proposed solution: Increase the number of sticker passes per household to at least three (3) at a minimum (and four would be better), along with the additional hanging pass. Provide for an EASY method for property owners who LEGITIMATELY need more passes to appeal and apply for those additional passes. This process would be one where a property owner need only confirm the number of drivers in the home, without other arduous proofs. Such a system would eliminate most of the past abuse, would eliminate the issuance of passes for those who simply have a lot of vehicles that they want to park on the street, and would be fair to those who truly need the passes. Not to mention, the City has LOST revenue by curtailing passes, and for a city who is constantly looking for new revenue, adding back a pass or two will do that without having much impact on the community. So this is a win-win from where I sit.</p> <p>Now I'll provide the basis for my point of view. At the outset, i disclose that I live in the permit zone. However, my opinion here is not a biased one in that sense. In fact, in our household, we only have one sticker pass and one hanging pass. So I'm not an abuser of the system nor am I looking for the ability for additional passes. I tend to have enough parking at my home for our personal use and rarely use the street. And so I could be quiet about this issue.</p>	For	

**City Council Meeting**  
**eComment Report | November 17, 2025**

Agenda Item	Name	Comment	Position	Attachment URL
		<p>However, as I did before, I'm speaking out very loudly about this on behalf of my neighbors, many of whom are truly negatively impacted by the current restrictions because they are generally in one or more of these categories: 1) they legitimately have more drivers in their homes than allowable passes, 2) they have an "old-school" garage design that doesn't fit more than a compact car, 3) They live on an "alley" street where not only garages are small, but parking in the alleys is either very restrictive or non-existent, 4) they live in parking meter zones on or around Hermosa Avenue and they literally have to pay for parking when they have guests at their homes or if they have more than 3 drivers in their household (which is utterly crazy to me!!), or 5) they live in a home where their purchase of that home literally counted on the garage space for other personal use (which is their right, by the way).</p> <p>And so my strong position here is for them, my neighbors. And as a sitting council member, your position is also supposed to consider these same neighbors, who are your constituents who are most impacted by whatever decision you make here. Put yourself in their shoes and truly try to see things through their eyes - all they are trying to do is make their lives easier (and not carrying the expense of parking meters) in front of their own homes. The system favors the multi-unit buildings right now, and we need to bring balance back to the system to bring fairness to single-family properties as well.</p> <p>I totally agree that the previous program that had few limitations made it too easy for some to abuse the system with too many passes (and even some fraudulent ones). And I totally agree that it was time to overhaul and tighten the program a bit. BUT, the changes went too far and negatively impact many residents. In addition to the current allowance for two sticker passes, add back AT LEAST one sticker pass (two would be better) and provide an easy appeals/application method for those who legitimately have a need for more.</p>		

**City Council Meeting  
eComment Report | November 17, 2025**

Agenda Item	Name	Comment	Position	Attachment URL
17.a - 25-AS-088	mc guerry	I am for making it stricter to get parking permits and to raise the prices of the parking permits. I don't know why the council wants to allow the storing of private property on public land. That land would be better used for money-spending visitors to the city or to make the streets safer with enhanced infrastructure. Parking is at high demand and should be priced accordingly. If someone wants multiple passes, they should pay for it. Especially because of the disastrous City Manager decision, the city needs money and pricing these parking permits will help. In addition, the council should focus on full-time (voting) residents, and thus only these residents should be granted permits.	No Position	

**City Council Meeting**  
**eComment Report | November 17, 2025**

Agenda Item	Name	Comment	Position	Attachment URL
17.a - 25-AS-088	Anthony Higgins	<p>Dear City Council,</p> <p>Why should some Hb residents be allowed to park for free in front of their own home and others be charged for a permit to park in front of their house?</p> <p>In order to pass the ordinance allowing the placement of parking meters and the creation of the May 15-Sept 15th 1 hour parking zones in RESIDENTIAL neighborhoods the city implied residents living in these impacted zones would not be impacted.</p> <p>That is, residents living in the impacted zone would be allowed to park their vehicles without restriction in front of their homes and on nearby residential streets- IF the home didn't have adequate at-home parking.</p> <p>The city reneged on this promise by implementing paid parking permits and every time the parking permit rise it just amplifies the injustice that some have to pay for the exact same thing that others living in our city get for free.</p> <p>Residents living in the impacted zone should be provided one FREE sticker pass and one FREE hanging placard - no questions asked.</p> <p>If these residents require a 3rd or 4th pass that should also be issued FREE of charge PROVIDING the resident provides reasonable proof that there is inadequate at-home parking to accommodate the vehicle-driving-residents.</p> <p>The proof should be a simple signed form identifying the number of available spaces at their place of residence, the name and number of vehicle-driving residents lusing that home as their primary residence and pictures showing their garages are available for parking.</p>	-	

**City Council Meeting**  
**eComment Report | November 17, 2025**

Agenda Item	Name	Comment	Position	Attachment URL
17.a - 25-AS-088	Ann Gotthoffer	Re; 4th Residential Parking Permit. I understand the argument that a minor child may not be a registered owner and could have their own car to drive / park. I think Option B would address that, while still requiring an additional step to obtain a 4th permit and not cause staff too much extra work. It seems like a fair compromise?	No Position	

**City Council Meeting**  
**eComment Report | November 17, 2025**

Agenda Item	Name	Comment	Position	Attachment URL
17.a - 25-AS-088	Rebecca Doyle	<p>Hello Council,</p> <p>Im writing again "for" parking reform and to address how the current parking policy disproportionately impacts less affluent full-time residents. I currently rent in the impact zone and recently moved out of another rental unit in the impact zone with multiple roommates. Im writing on behalf of them and other neighbors in similar situations.</p> <p>Two of my former roommates are full-time residents who are saving up to purchase cars and are temporarily renting vehicles privately. The requirement that a vehicle be registered in the drivers own name effectively penalizes residents who cannot afford to buy a car immediately. Meanwhile, there is already an exception for residents whose vehicles are registered in their parents names. Im requesting a comparable exception for residents who are paying to be the primary or exclusive driver of a vehicle not registered to them.</p> <p>I fully understand the need to prevent fraud, but full-time residents who can document that they are the primary drivers of the vehicles they are paying for should be treated the same as residents who are privileged enough to borrow a car from Mom &amp; Dad for free. A two-year ban can still apply if someone is found to be abusing the system.</p> <p>Ive also seen many community members request a fourth unrestricted permit. This would have been extremely helpful in my former household, which had (and still has) four unrelated full-time adults - all legitimate residents.</p> <p>Lastly, Ive repeatedly seen the comment that weve only had a few dozen complaints, so the system must be working. This is discouraging to hear. It implies that as long as the policy curtails excessive car storage by wealthy households, it is considered acceptable for a few dozen full-time, lower-income residents to be collateral damage. While it is</p>	For	

**City Council Meeting**  
**eComment Report | November 17, 2025**

Agenda Item	Name	Comment	Position	Attachment URL
17.b - 25-CR-080	kathy dunbabin	The Hermosa Beach Museum needs more space for its growing educational materials and collections as well as staff. Please allow the Museum to use the additional space on the lower level of the Hermosa Beach Community Centers south wing by voting yes. Thank you.	For	
17.b - 25-CR-080	Michelle Crispin	Im proud to support the Hermosa Beach Museum and their vision for expansion. Their team preserves and shares our citys history with so much heart, and expanding their capacity will only strengthen the way they serve our community. These improvements will help the Museum meet national standards for collections care, staff support, and public access - all things Hermosa deserves.	For	
17.c - 25-AS-093	tony against government wasting resources	<p>Dear City Council.</p> <p>Its simply inconceivable that with 1 in 3 california adults speaking spanish the city would waste paying \$10,500 in bonuses to two employees over 3 years because they speak spanish.</p> <p>How about a bonus for reading or writing or for brushing your teeth too.</p> <p>This is just another poorly negotiated giveaway the city cant afford.</p> <p>They add up.</p>	Against	

**City Council Meeting**  
**eComment Report | November 17, 2025**

Agenda Item	Name	Comment	Position	Attachment URL
17.c - 25-AS-093	Laura Pena	<p>Dear Mayor, Council Members, and Staff - As you consider this item, I encourage the Council to balance the value of human bilingual service with the City's fiscal reality. While AI translation tools have expanded our ability to translate documents and basic communications, they do not replace the accuracy, cultural nuance, or trust that trained bilingual employees provide, particularly in front-facing or sensitive situations. Maintaining this human capability remains important for service quality and for Title VI and accessibility compliance.</p> <p>At the same time, our five-year financial forecast shows expenses outpacing revenue. Even modest increases should be evaluated in terms of measurable operational need. It may be helpful to ask for:</p> <p>Usage metrics showing how often bilingual skills are being used across departments.</p> <p>A clear policy outlining when human bilingual support is required versus when AI translation is appropriate.</p> <p>Consistency and equity in how bilingual premiums are administered, especially as grandfathered arrangements can create long-term disparities.</p> <p>This is not an argument against the premium, only a suggestion that its structure be aligned with data, need, and our broader fiscal strategy. A thoughtful framework will help the City preserve essential service quality while demonstrating prudent financial stewardship.</p> <p>As always, I appreciate your thoughtful consideration.</p> <p>Laura Pena</p>	No Position	

**City Council Meeting**  
**eComment Report | November 17, 2025**

Agenda Item	Name	Comment	Position	Attachment URL
17.f - 25-AS-087	Laura Pena	<p>Dear Mayor, Council Members, and Staff - I appreciate our City's efforts to improve citation processing and streamline parking enforcement. But I'd like to raise a few considerations that I believe are important to build public trust as this system expands.</p> <p>While the contract improves operational efficiency, it still lacks some clarity and basic data privacy and transparency safeguards. For example, there's no defined breach notification timeline, no language about who owns the data, and no clear limitations on how long personal information is stored once it's collected through citations or ALPR scans.</p> <p>As we integrate Turbo Data with ALPR systems and real-time enforcement tools, I encourage the Council to consider adding a Privacy and Data Governance Addendum in the near future. Other cities like Redondo Beach have adopted strong safeguards such as formal data sharing agreements, 24-hour breach notifications, audit logs, and clear use limits and our City should do the same.</p> <p>These protections don't prevent modernization. They ensure it's done thoughtfully with accountability, oversight, and public confidence in mind.</p> <p>As always, I appreciate your thoughtful consideration.            Laura Pena</p>	No Position	