

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: humaira afzal
Sent: Monday, July 13, 2026 2:16 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Items 7 & 8 - MOUs with PPD - City Council July 13 2026

[!] **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.

Here we go again with another item on the consent agenda – this time for increased pay for PPD officers -- that will substantially add to the City's budget not just for 2027, but for EVERY SINGLE YEAR after that. I ask that items 7 and 8 be pulled from the consent agenda and discussed separately. It'd be incredibly irresponsible to vote to add over \$10 million in annual costs to the budget via the consent agenda MOUs with PPD officers (items 7 & 8) on the very same evening that there's also an agenda item (16) to discuss new revenue streams to balance the City's budget.

Here's what items 7 and 8 would add to the City's budget:

Item 7 – MOU with Pasadena Police Officers Association

\$17.6 million for 2027, 2028 and 2029 (an average of \$5,866,666/yr) and then it increases to \$9.6 million/year for subsequent years

Item 8 – MOU with Pasadena Police Lieutenants Association

\$466,000 for 2027, then \$809,000 for subsequent years

Combined, this is an additional \$6,561,333 cost for 2027 – 2029 and an even higher additional cost of \$10,409,000 for future years!!!!!!

(and none of this includes costs for all the new equipment and surveillance technology in the pipeline)

Meanwhile, from the Staff Report for Item 16 on the agenda:

"Balancing the budget has become increasingly challenging as the City continues to operate in an environment marked by economic uncertainty, persistent inflationary pressures, and concerns about a potential economic slowdown. The City has relied upon one-time revenues and reserves for the past three fiscal years. The widening structural deficit—driven by expenditure growth that consistently outpaces revenue growth—underscores the need for proactive fiscal management. Without adjustments to service levels, staffing, or long-term financial strategies, the gap between revenues and expenditures will continue to expand."

Increasing PPD officer pay to the proposed levels will significantly drain general funds while Council is simultaneously considering new taxes to help balance the budget, losing funding for other important programs (like Public Health Dept), are way behind on maintenance of infrastructure, and have no dedicated funding source for affordable housing besides in lieu funds.

Here's what's not included in the Staff Reports for Items 7 & 8

- Data, analysis or comparisons of the pay structures/scales for police departments in other cities
- Documentation of a causal relationship between pay and the recruitment and retention of police officers. Is pay the primary factor, or are there other factors?
- For police officers who have left PPD since January 2025, how many have left due to
 - Retirement
 - Took a comparable position with another law enforcement due to higher pay
 - Put on administrative leave due to things like engaging in horseplay with guns or getting arrested for felony vandalism of an ex-girlfriend's property
 - Took a higher paying position in the private sector
 - Other reasons such as injury, illness, etc

**07/13/2026
Item 7 & 8**

Don't approve the MOUs at the requested levels. These increases are not justified on the unsubstantiated claim that they're needed to "support both the recruitment of Police Officers and the retention of trained and experienced personnel". Simply saying something is true doesn't make it true.

Sincerely,
Humaira
Pasadena District 7 resident

Sent with Proton Mail secure email.