

From: Sanford Krasner
Sent: Monday, February 2, 2026 2:47 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Letter regarding Special Item A -SoCal Gas presentation - Feb. 2, 2026

Some people who received this message don't often get email from

[Learn why this is important](#)

[!] 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.

Dear Councilmembers,

I write to address Item A on the Feb. 2,2026 agenda - PRESENTATION BY LANA O'SHIELDS, SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY, PROVIDING INFORMATION ON WILDFIRE REBUILDING RESOURCES AND ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

We (the City of Pasadena, the State of California, and the United States) should not be encouraging the development of new natural gas infrastructure, especially in the fire burn areas. There are 3 main reasons for this:

- 1.) Health
- 2.) Costs
- 3.) Climate impacts.

'Natural' gas is burned in the home for space heating, water heating, cooking and clothes drying. For each of these, superior all-electric appliances are available at lower cost, and lower impact to health and the climate.

Health

About 90% of 'natural' gas is methane, combined with a number of other contaminants. When gas is burned in the home it emits several pollutants – nitrogen oxides, carbon monoxide, particulates (including PM 2.5), formaldehyde, and volatile organic compounds. Gas pipes and appliances have some amount of leakage and combustion is not 100% efficient, so some amount of unburned methane is also emitted in the home.

These indoor pollutants contribute to a number of diseases.

Some studies attribute about 12% of asthma cases to gas stoves. Put another way, having a gas stove in the kitchen increases the likelihood of having asthma by about 45%.

With a gas stove in the kitchen, the frequency of respiratory infections is about the same as having a cigarette smoker in the home.

There is no need for California or the world to pay for new gas infrastructure. We have cheaper, clean all-electrical appliances, which grow cleaner as the grid grows cleaner each year.

Sanford Krasner

Citizens Climate Lobby chapter lead and Pasadena 100 member

Altadena, CA

From: Cynthia Cannady
Sent: Monday, February 2, 2026 3:22 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Letter re special item from So Cal Gas on tonights agenda

 **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.

Dear Councilmembers,

I wish to express my great concern about giving So Cal Gas a forum for promoting methane gas ("natural gas"). Promotion of gas in appliances, building construction and electric power resources must be rejected by all thinking and ethical persons.

1. Just last year, **our own public health department** published a bulletin on the adverse impacts of gas in appliances on residents, especially children. This report followed authoritative studies at both Stanford and Harvard on grave impacts on children and adults from carcinogens and respiratory irritants emitted by gas appliances in their everyday operation.

As we sit here today, Pasadena children are inhaling methane and nitrogen dioxide, that causes asthma, as well as pollutant carcinogens, from gas appliances. The importance of both the Harvard and Stanford 2025 studies is that this pollution occurs under normal operations, not just product defects and migrates to bedrooms. As the Stanford report states:

"Beyond asthma cases, the long-term exposure to NO₂ in American households with gas stoves is high enough to cause thousands of deaths each year – possibly as many as 19,000 or 40% of the number of deaths linked annually to secondhand smoke."

Why are we giving a preferred public platform to someone who is promoting gas that is harming our children as we speak?

What about having a cigarette company come here to speak?

2. We have Climate Emergency Resolution 9977 in Pasadena. We are making a transition from one of the two most potent source of greenhouse gas emissions in California today--methane gas--to renewable resources.

3. No logical person questions that the root cause of the Eaton fire that harmed so many Dena residents is climate change. The greatest contributors to that harm were So Cal Gas. What an insult to all the people who suffered to give So Cal Gas this forum!

Tragically, the gas industry is committed to continuing to do its harm, regardless of the consequences as we saw recently with the proposed expansion of the Magnolia gas plant in Burbank. Shame on the CEC for greenwashing this project in a community that is already heavily burdened by toxic particulate matter.

And when they saw the Stanford and Harvard scientific studies they rushed to try to rebut them with their own report that denied the links between asthma and cancer and gas. Shame on them. Remind you of the tobacco industry? Instead of making a change, they persist and double down.

4. So Cal Gas and its parent Sempra are major contributors to political campaigns. They do this to push their weight around on policy decisions. And shamefully, they add interest to their campaign by hiring minorities and trying to associate the cause of gas with civil rights. All the while that minority children are the greatest victims , who suffer from asthma at much greater rate than white children.

Cynthia Cannady
Pasadena resident District 6

Gao, Beilei

From: Donna Sider
Sent: Monday, February 2, 2026 3:28 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse; Cole, Rick
Subject: Agenda item 7, A and 4

[!] 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.

City council members,

Item 7: I stand with all who affirm: We need to reinstate safe parking as planned at All Saints Episcopal church. This is a program that is working, successfully returning residents to job interviews, and housing!

A: No gas lines in new construction! This is not a time to move backwards. Pasadena needs to lead in rebuilding smart, meaning all electric construction, not rebuilding with fossil fuel gas lines!

4: Yes, on moving forward with all proposed solar installations on city structures.

Thank you,
Donna Sider
D 2

From: Mark Rutkowski
Sent: Monday, February 2, 2026 4:40 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: City Council Agenda Item A on 2/2/2026

Some people who received this message don't often get email from

[Learn why this is important](#)

 **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.

Dear Pasadena City Council,

Regarding City Council Agenda Item A for 2/2/2026 by the Southern California Gas Company on wildfire rebuilding resources and assistance programs, please understand the following.

Our civilization has been given a remarkable gift in the form of solar and wind power coupled with battery storage to power our world and our economy in profoundly less polluting, less costly, and more democratic ways so that we no longer need to burn things in our power plants, factories, cars, kitchens, and basements to get energy. This clean energy transition is key to lessening further global warming. Please consider taking the time to read or listen to Bill McKibben's book *Here Comes the Sun* for a comprehensive hopeful narrative on this subject: <https://billmckibben.com/books/here-comes-the-sun/>

We are in a climate crisis and should not be promoting the rebuild of homes in the burn areas with fossil fuel heating. All-electric rebuilding is cheaper, safer, and quicker. To commit homes to decades of more fossil fuel use makes no sense in the short term or the long term. We should amend policies to eliminate ratepayer-funded energy efficiency incentives for gas appliances including in the rebuild.

Here is an important quotation about what is at stake and our capacity as a world to impact it positively from Christiana Figueres in The Economist November 8th 2025:

"In 2015 global CO₂ emissions were still rising by almost 2% per year; that growth has since slowed to 0.3%. Fossil-fuel demand has plateaued and is falling in several large economies, including China. Then, the world was on course for about 4°C of warming by 2100. Today, projections hover near 2.6°C—still dangerously high, but a profound course correction that must now deepen, and fast."

Thank you,

Mark Rutkowski, MD
Member PASADENA 100