

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Jim Radon
Sent: Saturday, August 1, 2026 9:28 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: parcel tax for fire protection

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [why this is important](#)

[1] **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 (PAB). For more information about the PAB view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

These policies seem to be popular with poorly managed city governments adjacent to LA. Why not extort more money from tax payers from whom you already extract enough funds to cover the cost for fire protection.. Besides, Pasadena is over building to raise more revenue. Where does that money go?
Just another California government ploy.
Jim Radon

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Ken Kules
Sent: Sunday, August 2, 2026 11:56 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: City Council 8-3-2026 Agenda Item 1: Pasadena Fire, Wildfire, Emergency Preparedness and Response Parcel Tax

[!] **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 (PAB). For more information about the PAB view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

The proposed language in the ballot question provides that the tax be in place "until ended by voters." This appears to be an effort to give the impression that the measure gives the voters a say in discontinuing the tax. This is a "red herring" since the voters already have the prerogative to rescind the tax under State law. This is, in essence, a "forever tax" as it would require a voter initiative to rescind it with a majority vote - an effort more daunting than the City faces in getting a 2/3 vote on a City Council-backed initiative.

Ken Kules
District 4