

**CORRESPONDENCE
FROM 05/19/2025
CITY COUNCIL MEETING**

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: cityclerk
Sent: Monday, May 12, 2025 9:23 PM
To: Iraheta, Alba; Jomsky, Mark; Robles, Sandra; Sabha, Tamer; McMillan, Acquanette (Netta); Soo, Christine; Ashikyan, Elizabeth; Padilla, Adrian
Subject: FW: MSC Item 2-A FY 2026 RECOMMENDED OPERATING BUDGET: PUBLIC WORKS

From:
Sent: Monday, May 12, 2025 9:22:18 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)
To: Jones, Justin <justinjones@cityofpasadena.net>; Hampton, Tyron <THampton@cityofpasadena.net>; Rick Cole <rick.cole@cityofpasadena.net>; Lyon, Jason <jlyon@cityofpasadena.net>
Cc: cityclerk <cityclerk@cityofpasadena.net>
Subject: MSC Item 2-A FY 2026 RECOMMENDED OPERATING BUDGET: PUBLIC WORKS

[!] **CAUTION:** This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you *know* the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. For more information about the Phish Alert Button view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

Despite warnings about city budget constraints, Public Works has proposed a total of more than ten new positions.

SLIDE 4 lists five positions to be paid by the City General Fund but does not give salaries.

SLIDES 9 & 10 "Enhancement Requests" list five positions with salaries ranging from more than \$100,000 to \$199,000, some of which also include General Fund dollars.

Enhancement Requests (SLIDES 9 & 10)

Position	Fund	FTEs	Amount	Total Salary
Program Coordinator II	243	1.00	\$141,883	\$141,883
Stormwater Engineer	243 301	0.20 0.80	\$39,830 \$159,319	\$199,149
SLATS Engineer	101 301	0.10 0.90	\$19,915 \$179,234	\$199,149
Management Analyst I	101 301	0.28 0.09	\$38,426 \$11,762	Implied salary \$135,643
Sr. Admin Specialist	406	1.00	\$107,672	\$107,672
Code Compliance	406 101	0.50 0.50	\$57,909 \$57,909	\$115,818
Total FTE/Salaries		5.37	\$813,859	
Total 101 General Fund			\$116,250	

MSC should consider whether these salary levels are appropriate at this time.

Sincerely,

Genette Foster
Council District 2

Robles, Sandra

From: cityclerk
Sent: Tuesday, May 13, 2025 11:28 AM
To: Iraheta, Alba; Jomsky, Mark; Robles, Sandra; Sabha, Tamer; McMillan, Acquanette (Netta); Soo, Christine; Ashikyan, Elizabeth; Padilla, Adrian
Subject: FW: Public Comment to Municipal Services Committee

From: Victor Caballero
Sent: Tuesday, May 13, 2025 11:27:23 AM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)
To: cityclerk
Subject: Public Comment to Municipal Services Committee

[You don't often get email from v . Learn why this is important at
<https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

[!] CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you know the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. For more information about the Phish Alert Button view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

Please confirm receipt.

Dear Municipal Services Committee Members,

The state of EV Fast Charging in Pasadena is atrocious.

Millions of dollars have been spent and the current condition of EV DC Fast Chargers at city facilities is an embarrassment and needs to be addressed ASAP. Why people haven't been fired over this is mind boggling. It is a complete dereliction of duties.

Chargers have screws falling out. connectors are broken, cables are laying on the ground with exposed wires. Chargers are on and do not work. Chargers are off and have no signage.

DC Fast Chargers:

At Victory Park there are three DC fast chargers, one works.

At Robinson Park there are five chargers, and only two of the five work.

At Glenarm - ZERO fast chargers work. One is on with a red light on top..

At Del Mar, one works sometimes.

At Shoppers Lane - occasionally two work.

At Marengo Plaza, once touted as one of the largest EV Fast Charging West of the Rockies.

Close to 50 DC Fast chargers and maybe a handful work.

So far the grade for Pasadena EV Fast Charging is an F - FAIL!

Promises had been made by PWP that half of all "broken" chargers would be repaired by the end of April, that came and went and nothing changed as a matter of fact things may have gotten worse. PWP also promised that the remaining DC Fast chargers would be repaired in three months.

The PWP site is littered with bad info related to EV charging including omission of the Robinson Park DC Fast chargers, and the claim that the Marengo Plaza is the largest EV charging facility in the nation, which is false.

Meanwhile there are no clear signs for EV charging, no time limits, to overstay fees, and worse of all is that the PWP chargers are priced so low that you will see Tesla drivers charging at a PWP Fast charger vs using an Tesla Supercharger which is shouldn't be discouraged. Also seeing vehicles parked that are not charging in EV spots and blocking needs to be cited and parking enforcement should be armed with the tools to monitor and enforce.

Meanwhile Tesla chargers there are dozens around the city and 99% of the chargers work.

PWP and staff make justifications for why the chargers are not working, blaming Shell or Tritium, PowerFlex, contractors, supply chain, but that is even more evidence that the issue is chronic and that is not being handled properly. The City of Pasadena never should have let this happen, and it's shameful to realize that our city's EV chargers are in this state of disrepair without a PLAN?

All city council members must go see the facilities for themselves to see the state of EV charging in Pasadena. And speak to the people who are frustrated trying to use the chargers that DO NOT WORK. City council should also demand a full audit and accounting of all EV charging facilities.

Taxpayers and the community deserve answers and action to resolve the disastrous state of DC Fast charging provided by PWP..

Regards,
Victor Caballero

RECEIVED

SONJA K. BERNDT
Pasadena, CA

2025 MAY 19 AM 8:15

CITY CLERK
CITY OF PASADENA

May 16, 2025

Mayor Victor Gordo
Members of the Pasadena City Council
Pasadena, CA
(By Email)
(By Email correspondence@cityofpasadena.net)

Re: City Council Meeting May 19, 2025, Agenda Item #15: The Recommended FY 2026 Police Department Operating Budget

Dear Mayor Gordo and Members of the City Council:

I am a long-time resident of Pasadena and a longtime advocate for the unsheltered residents of our city. This letter is to express my deep concern about the FY 2026 Recommended Police Department Operating Budget. Year after year, the Pasadena Police Department (PPD) receives a grossly disproportionate level of General Fund appropriations as compared to other vital departments in this city. Critical services for our unhoused and especially our unsheltered residents are vastly underfunded because PPD, with its escalating salaries and pension costs, continues to swallow up our General Fund, leaving insufficient crumbs for departments that serve our most vulnerable residents.

The Recommended FY 2026 Operating Budget shows the following appropriations from the General Fund:

- Police Department: \$111,285,954 (91.7% of its total proposed FY2026 appropriations)
- Housing Department: \$2,638,887 (2.4% of its total proposed FY2026 appropriations)

A look back at the adopted FY2022 Operating Budget reveals the huge escalation in General Fund appropriations to PPD over the last four years:

- Police Department: \$84,605,000
- Housing Department: \$1,475,000

While the Housing Department receives grant funding from county, state, and federal governments, city staff members recognize that federal grant funding is currently substantially at risk due to proposed cuts in the federal budget and the policies of the Trump administration. At the City Council meeting May 5, 2025, City Manager Marquez specifically referenced the draconian cuts currently in the proposed federal budget for services for our most vulnerable residents. YET, the proposed FY2026 Housing Department Operating Budget notes 76% of its \$48,814,656 Operating Budget as coming from the federal government! This shows a clear lack of planning and preparation for anticipated challenges.

The January 2024 homeless “point in time” count, noted over 500 unhoused persons, 321 of which had no shelter at all. Year after year our city fails to move the needle in the right direction because it fails to provide any meaningful interim and permanent housing to end homelessness in our city.

The very substantial increases in General Fund appropriations to PPD year after year are unsustainable. Personnel expenses are unsustainable. Pension costs are unsustainable. But cost savings can be achieved by decreasing the number of PPD officers while maintaining public safety in our city. In FY 2021, there were 5,766 PPD calls for service listed as “transient-related.” I once asked former Chief of Police John Perez how many calls for service PPD received from Centennial Place, a city housing site that houses formerly unhoused individuals. He said, “almost none.”

Instead of incurring the huge expense of responding to calls for service related to unhoused individuals, PROVIDE HOUSING FOR THEM. This would decrease PPD salary and pension costs and at the same time alleviate suffering and promote health and wellbeing.

Finally, the idea of a “Homeless Court,” which has been raised at previous Public Safety Committee meetings is not sensible. It would be costly in both staff and court time and money and, more importantly, it would require the “defendant/participant,” who may have simply been sleeping on public property, to go through a court process in order to obtain housing. Instead, simply provide the housing sorely needed by our unsheltered residents without the court process.

In conclusion, the enormous General Fund appropriations for PPD and the huge increases in those appropriations year after year leave other critical departments of our city chronically and severely underfunded. The City Council *as a whole* needs to undertake a serious examination of the proposed FY2026 PPD Operating Budget

to look for ways to decrease PPD's General Fund appropriations. Further, the City Council needs to direct PPD to seriously look for greater grant funding opportunities through its Grant Procurement Unit. I urge the City Council to decrease the amount of General Fund appropriations to PPD for FY2026 and to use those funds to provide housing for our unhoused residents. Thank you.

Sincerely,

/s/

Sonja K. Berndt, Esq. (retired)

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Victor Caballero <v
Sent: Monday, May 19, 2025 10:49 AM
To: Reyes, David
Cc: Hampton, Tyron; Márquez, Miguel; Avedian, Varoojan; Jones, Justin; Cole, Rick; Gordo, Victor; Madison, Steve; Lyon, Jason; PublicComment-AutoResponse; Masuda, Gene; Rivas, Jessica
Subject: State of PWP EV DC Fast Charging in Pasadena May 2025

[⚠] CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you know the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. For more information about the Phish Alert Button view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

Mr. Reyes,

Good morning.

As of this morning the state of PWP DC Fast charging is no better and actually worse.

For instance

Robinson Park, only 2 of 5 DC Fast chargers work. One of the 5 is on but does not work.

Victory Park , 1 out of 3 DC Fast chargers works.

Del Mar, 1 of 2 DC Fast chargers works.

Shopper's Lane as of last week it appeared less than half the ports worked. The ports that showed as working, the connector would not work, or the credit card machines did not register.

Obviously this is unsustainable and unacceptable.

Could you please provide an update on where we stand with DC Fast charging in Pasadena?

Also, I want to bring to your attention the inconsistencies in the parking signage at EV parking locations with Del Mar being the most confusing and other locations many not having any signage. But at least Del Mar has signage.

As a rule and common practice is to have a time limit of 30min, or charge 80%. There should be overstay fees implemented. and also CVC 22511 needs to be posted and enforced, if not posted it cannot be enforced.

And, the rates charged at PWP chargers are the lowest around, perhaps to help fund maintenance and abuse, the rates should be comparable

while still be competitive with other EV charging. Nobody charges 20 cents/kWh, let alone 15 cents/kWh unless it is free...For comparison Burbank BWP is .37 cents per kWh on DC Fast Charging and 22 cents/kWh on L2 charging. Tesla is 36 cents per kWh on the lower end and 54 cents/kWh or more.

PWP needs reliable charging if it is going to be in the game, and competitive pricing that is sustainable, but so far it has been a failure. I sure hope PWP can turn this around, otherwise it needs to partner with a provider who can deliver a reliable, consistent and competitive service.

The best analogy I can draw is that PWP is trying to operate gas stations and most of the gas pumps are broken or off. Imagine what people who rely on EV's feel like trying to use the PWP chargers?

I look forward to an update.

Regards,
Victor