

CORRESPONDENCE

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Kayleen Maya-Aviles
Sent: Wednesday, March 4, 2026 8:21 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Cc: Gil Aviles -ICE
Subject: Proposed rate increases for power

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from
at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

[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.

Good morning,

I am a 30 year resident of the city and I am opposed to this rate increase.

With the cost of living already at record highs, the city should not be increasing our electric rates right now. The fires, cost of food and gas are impacting this community.

Please do not increase our electric rates.

Thank you.

Kayleen Maya

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Hormann, Anne S.
Sent: Wednesday, March 4, 2026 11:57 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: PWP Proposed Electric Rate Adjustments

[] 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.

I'm writing to protest the proposed PWP rate adjustments. Although the change is deceptively presented as a 7% increase, if approved it will trigger two additional increases for a total of 21% in just one year! If the total is 21%, it should certainly be presented for a vote as 21%, not 7%.

This is a large increase that will fall heavily on many people's budgets.

Are there no infrastructure funds available at the state or federal level that could reduce the need for such a huge rate increase? People are already struggling with the inflated cost of living across the board: housing, gas, health insurance, food, etc. This is a terrible time to slap a 21% increase on basic necessities like water and power.

I hope you will reconsider this rash move.

Sincerely,
Anne Hormann

Pasadena, CA 91104

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Valerie Wilson [mailto:valerie.wilson@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 4, 2026 3:45 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Electric bill increases

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [redacted]. [Learn 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. For more information about the Phish Alert Button view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

I understand that rising costs are inevitable. However, I am on social security and at this time, due to smaller yearly increases in the social security monthly allotments, cannot afford to pay for the three upcoming payment increases. My name is Valerie Wilson, [redacted] Street. My account number is [redacted]. Please do not increase my electric bill this year. I already struggle to make ends meet. PLEASE!!

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Cynthia Torres
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2026 2:59 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Objection - 7% rate electricity rate increase by Pasadena Water and Power

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [redacted]. [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 Manager and City Council:

I object to the proposed 7% adjustment in electrical rates which would be followed by two additional 7% increases in October and March 2027.

I would like to see the evidence, backed by an impartial consultant's report, that the City's utility has been making a good-faith effort to continue upgrading the aging power grid and infrastructure costs while ensuring the system's reliability. Where is the report that lays out the argument for the increase in electrical rates?

What is the City doing to upgrade the power grid with renewable energy, which should cost less? In what ways are savings being passed on to ratepayers?

If anything, I would like for entities such as data centers to be levied a premium charge so that residential ratepayers are not left to foot the bill.

I would like for this matter to receive further study. Where is the link to the report justifying the recommendation?

Sincerely,

Cynthia Torres
Owner,

Pasadena, CA 91106

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: mb kalir
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2026 6:11 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Electricity Rates proposal

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

I keep having trouble leaving my comments, hope this works.

I did the online rate calculator using my Feb bill and it would be at least \$ 6.00 more.

The Electricity bill is already much higher than the Gas one.

On top of gasoline prices, rent, and other basic needs hit by inflation , this is poor timing .

It isn't clear who those fortunate customers will be to get a lower rate.

(Ms) MB Kalis.

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Kathleen O'Kane :>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2026 6:45 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: New Electricity rates comments

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.

Please read the article below in Pasadena Now. My comments are in alignment with

Guest Opinion: Sam Berndt | Pasadena's Power Play: Residents Pay More So Big Business Can Pay Less

Published on Tuesday, December 9, 2025 | 4:40 am

I don't think that most people understand that the way much of this is being presented is that "The proposed change calls for a 7% system-wide increase applied in THREE PHASES — March, October 2026 and March 2027. Because each increase compounds on the previous one, the total cumulative revenue increase would be about 22.5% over two years." FOR OUR BRUTAL HOT SUMMERS and the need for air conditioning... no one except maybe those with solar systems will be comfortable. That also means that the largest impact will start to be felt and hit during the summer months of March of 2027.

I know this is a very important issue but does it all need to hit Pasadena residents so hard and especially now! Sincerely, Kathleen O'Kane Life long Pasadena resident

Sent from KOK's iPad. 

"being kind doesn't cost anything"

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Kathleen O'Kane
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2026 8:15 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: New Electricity rates comments ONE additional comment on enlightening residents on the true impact.

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

The bill estimator provided and dialogue by PWP for the increase between the rates now and after the change only shows the first impact March or April 2026 of the 7% increase. The tool needs to be updated to clearly show the additional October 2026 compounded 7% and the again compounded March 2027, 7% increase. Full disclosure about what the future really looks like.

Kathleen O'Kane

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: lorraine montgomery
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2026 10:44 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: carbon free electric power

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from [redacted]. 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.

Dear council members.

We all have become increasingly aware of the impact that climate change has had on our lives. I am 80 years old and in my lifetime I have seen the effects that using fossil fuels has had on lives around the world.

Pasadena, my city , must do its part in funding carbon free electric power.

Please strongly support the city's goal of becoming 100% carbon free electric power by 2030.

We owe it to our children and grandchildren!

Sincerely,

Lorraine Montgomery

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: cityclerk
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2026 12:27 PM
To: Iraheta, Alba; Jomsky, Mark; Robles, Sandra; Sabha, Tamer; McMillan, Acquanette (Netta); Soo, Christine
Subject: FW: proposed electric rate increase

From: Jo-ann Savoia
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2026 12:26:41 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)
To: cityclerk <cityclerk@cityofpasadena.net>
Subject: proposed electric rate increase

You don't often get email from [cityclerk@cityofpasadena.net](#). [Learn 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. For more information about the Phish Alert Button view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

DO NOT even consider this move- we already pay extremely high prices and much of the money is wasted.

I am totally opposed to this move.

thanks
js

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Elizabeth
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2026 3:05 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Electric Rate Increases

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

As a retired teacher on a fixed income, 30% increases on my electric rates are unacceptable. I do not support new AI infrastructure, and should not be made to pay for something I don't use. I will be watching my rate increases as I do with all my COLA expenditures. These increases are another reason why many of use don't want to be energy dependent on one source.

Elizabeth Hammond
Sent from my iPhone

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Lynn Walford
Sent: Saturday, March 7, 2026 1:39 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Public Comment in Opposition – Proposed PWP Electric Rate Adjustment

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [redacted] [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.

To the Pasadena City Council and Pasadena Water and Power,

I am writing to formally object to the proposed electric rate adjustment currently before the City Council. As a Pasadena resident and PWP customer, I recognize that infrastructure investment is necessary. However, the proposed rate structure contains serious and interconnected flaws that together will disproportionately harm electric vehicle drivers, low-income homeowners, and seniors — precisely the households the City has publicly committed to supporting through its climate and equity goals.

1. NO TIME-OF-USE (OFF-PEAK) RATE OPTION

Unlike every other major utility in the region — including Southern California Edison and LADWP — PWP does not offer a residential time-of-use (TOU) rate with reduced off-peak pricing. This is a critical omission. Electric vehicle owners who charge at home overnight are performing the most grid-friendly charging behavior possible, yet under this proposal they receive no pricing benefit for doing so. PWP cannot credibly pursue its 100% carbon-free energy goal while offering a rate structure that provides no incentive to shift consumption to off-peak hours. I urge the Council to require PWP to implement a residential TOU rate concurrent with or prior to any rate increase.

2. THE TIERED BASELINE DISPROPORTIONATELY PENALIZES ELECTRIC VEHICLE OWNERS

The proposed rate structure imposes a steep marginal rate of approximately \$0.31 per kWh for usage above the 500 kWh baseline — nearly double the effective rate at lower tiers. This directly punishes EV owners who have made a major financial and environmental commitment based on the expectation that electric driving would remain affordable.

Consider what the math actually shows:

- EV charging cost under new rates: A typical EV requires approximately 286 kWh per month to cover 1,000 miles of driving. At the marginal rate above baseline, that EV charging alone costs approximately \$89.57/month, or \$1,074/year — charged at the above-baseline tier with no off-peak relief.
- Comparison to a gas vehicle: A standard gas car averaging 28 mpg driving the same 1,000 miles per month costs approximately \$160.71/month at current California gas prices (~\$4.50/gallon), or

\$1,929/year. EV owners still save roughly \$71/month over gas — but that gap shrinks significantly under these new rates and disappears entirely for households with higher overall usage.

- High-usage EV household: A household using 500 kWh for home needs plus EV charging could reach 1,200–1,500 kWh/month. At the proposed marginal rate, such a household faces an estimated bill of \$265 to \$422/month — an increase of \$14 to \$157 over the current rate, with no mechanism for relief.

Without a TOU rate, there is no way for EV owners to reduce these costs through behavior change. This rate design actively discourages the electrification the City has set as a cornerstone of its climate policy.

3. THE ORIGINAL EV CHARGER REBATE WAS ALREADY INSUFFICIENT — AND HAS BEEN REDUCED

PWP's original residential EV charger rebate was \$400. That amount was already inadequate. The current rebate of \$250 (\$500 maximum when purchasing from a Pasadena dealer) is worse. Even at the maximum \$500 level, that one-time rebate covers less than six months of above-baseline EV electricity costs under the proposed new rates. It does not begin to compensate EV owners for the structural rate penalty they will face every month for the lifetime of their vehicle. A one-time rebate is not a substitute for a fair rate design.

4. THE ABANDONED GRID ALTERNATIVES SOLAR PROGRAM MUST BE RESTORED

Perhaps the most serious equity failure in this rate proposal is what it omits entirely: any pathway for low-income homeowners to reduce their electricity costs through solar installation.

In 2014, PWP partnered with GRID Alternatives Greater Los Angeles under the "Under One Roof" program to provide free or deeply subsidized solar installations to income-qualified Pasadena homeowners. That program was capable of reducing customers' electric bills by up to 90 percent and was accompanied by job training, home repair assistance, and financial counseling. It has since been discontinued.

My household would have qualified for this program. We were promised — through the City's own public communications — that solar support would be available to low-income homeowners. Now, with solar installation costs typically running \$15,000–\$25,000 before incentives, there is no affordable path to rooftop solar for households like mine.

I respectfully demand that PWP and the City Council commit to one or both of the following:

- Restore a meaningful no-cost or deeply subsidized solar installation program for income-qualified homeowners, in partnership with GRID Alternatives or a comparable organization, funded in part from rate revenues.
- Develop and fund a community solar canopy program on municipal properties (parking lots, facilities, parks) that would allow low-income residents who cannot afford rooftop solar to subscribe to shared solar generation and receive a direct bill credit.

PWP has stated it is exploring solar on municipal properties. That exploration must be accelerated and explicitly tied to low-income bill relief, not simply to system capacity goals.

5. EXISTING ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS ARE INSUFFICIENT

PWP points to its bill assistance programs as protection for vulnerable customers. These programs are inadequate for three reasons:

- Income qualification thresholds are narrow and enrollment is not automatic. Many seniors and low-income households who would benefit are not enrolled and do not know they qualify.
- The discount levels do not offset the above-baseline rate increases affecting EV owners, households with electric heating, and anyone whose usage pushes above the baseline tier — particularly in summer months.
- Seniors on fixed incomes in older, less-efficient homes may not be heavy users by choice, but will be pushed above baseline during heat waves — exactly when they can least afford a higher bill.

Assistance programs must be substantially expanded, thresholds raised, enrollment made automatic or opt-out rather than opt-in, and discount amounts increased to meaningfully offset the new rate structure before any increase takes effect.

SUMMARY OF REQUESTS

For the reasons above, I respectfully request that the City Council:

1. Reject or table the proposed rate structure until a residential time-of-use rate with meaningful off-peak pricing is developed and implemented.
2. Require a dedicated EV rate tier or rider that separates EV charging consumption from household baseline usage, so EV owners are not penalized for clean driving.
3. Restore the GRID Alternatives / Under One Roof low-income solar program, or a comparable initiative, with a commitment to fully subsidized installations for income-qualified homeowners.
4. Develop a community solar program on municipal properties with direct bill credits for low-income subscribers.
5. Substantially expand and simplify access to income and senior assistance programs, with higher discounts that reflect the true impact of above-baseline rate increases.

PWP has built a commendable record of low rates compared to regional utilities, and I appreciate the genuine infrastructure challenges it faces. But low average rates are not sufficient when the rate design penalizes clean transportation, abandons prior solar commitments to vulnerable households, and provides no tools for customers to reduce their own costs. I urge the Council to require a substantially revised proposal.

Respectfully,

Lynn Walford

Pasadena, CA 91103

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Jonah LaFollette
Sent: Saturday, March 7, 2026 5:50 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Proposed Electric Rate Increases | 170 S Sunnyslope

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [\[redacted\]](#) [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.

Hello,

I'm writing to express my input on the proposed electrical rate increase. As the State of California grapples with the high cost of living while raising taxes and fees, life for all but the rich has become unsustainable in regards to affordability.

I'm writing to formally request the City Council reject any such increase to the electric rates, as the water and sewage was recently increased.

Before any increase can be considered a comprehensive study should be done on operational efficiency within the city that identifies ways to reduce cost, reduce employee headcount and if necessary reducing city paid employee benefits.

The proposed increases come on the back of other property tax increases from the Library and PUSD bonds recently approved.

Please vote NO.

Jonah LaFollette

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Sheryl A. Kaplan
Sent: Sunday, March 8, 2026 3:18 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: NO to the PWP's proposed 7% average rate increase

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [redacted] [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.

I am writing to express my opposition to the PWP's proposed 7% average rate increase. If the PWP needs to find the funds to continue upgrading the aging power grid, it should look at itself and how it operates and spends money. So much is wasted on excessive business operations. You should reduce your wasteful internal operating expenses instead of trying to milk the struggling citizens of Pasadena, who own this utility, for more money. Do the work of identifying how you can run this utility more efficiently, instead of taking the easy way out by pleading poverty and raising rates.

And if this has anything to do with the vast amounts of resources needed for AI, it is obvious that most people in Pasadena are against it and do not want it in our city. It is a terrible development that promises only great harm to our residents' quality of life.

Pasadena's utilities are so expensive that I have heard of people who move out of the city because of the high costs. Thank you for NOT raising our electric rates even more.

Sheryl Kaplan
19-year resident of Pasadena

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: vicki
Sent: Sunday, March 8, 2026 8:44 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Proposed rate increase calculator

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [redacted] [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.

Hi!

Are you sure the calculator is working with the new proposed rates properly input?

Because I input my bimonthly usage for 2025 and only got a few cents difference each period.

But I then doubled the usage for each period and got a similar result.

At what bimonthly usage does the actual proposed rate increase impact?

Thanks

Pasadena resident

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Therese Brummel
Sent: Monday, March 9, 2026 6:37 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Agenda item 8

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [redacted]. [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 Mayor and Council,

In 2009 we launched Transition Pasadena, a group of citizens dedicated to transitioning our city off fossil fuels to become carbon free. Pasadena 100 was born under this umbrella. Now nearly 17 years later it is time to prioritize budget to actually implement the plan that the City Council studied and approved 3 years ago.

Please make it happen now for your children and grandchildren and mine!

Sincerely,
Therese Brummel
District 2 resident x 47 years

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Therese Brummel
Sent: Monday, March 9, 2026 6:45 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Climate change

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.

"Orbiting Earth in the spaceship, I saw how beautiful our planet is. People, let us preserve and increase this beauty, not destroy it!"
Yuri Gagarin, first human in space
(9 Mar 1934-1968)

Inspiring you to budget NOW for carbon free by 2030.

Therese Brummel

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Catherine Shaffer
Sent: Monday, March 9, 2026 4:53 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Subject: Concern Regarding Recent Rate Increase

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [redacted]. [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 Water and Power,

I'm writing to express my concern about the recent rate increase. As a Pasadena resident and customer, I value reliable service, but the rising costs are creating a significant burden for households already dealing with higher living expenses.

It would be helpful to understand how this increase is justified and what measures are being taken to minimize the impact on residents.

I respectfully urge Pasadena Water and Power to reconsider or provide clearer transparency on the factors driving this rate hike and any available relief options for customers.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Catherine Shaffer

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Ellie MacMullin
Sent: Monday, March 9, 2026 8:19 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Cc: Ellie MacMullin
Subject: Regarding the proposed Water and Power Rate Increase

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.

1. I think the public should be advised what the rates are for the City of Glendale and Burbank so we can compare cities.
2. I want more details on what the rate increase will do for residents. The comments in the Star News article, dated March 9, were too vague. " To keep up with rising equipment and infrastructure costs and to continue upgrading the power grid." This is too valuable. Where will the upgrades be? What equipment? Too often residents are taxed with promises to improve schools, roads, etc, but we never see the evidence. I want specifics.
3. I think the rate should cover a span of 18 months vs. 12 months. Residents should be able to plan and make adjustments in their budget.

--Ellie S. MacMullin, PHR, SHRM-CP
The HR Architect©

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: ALTON CULLEN >
Sent: Thursday, March 12, 2026 8:31 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Electric rate increase

[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. For more information about the Phish Alert Button view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

City Council Members,

You have not been transparent in numerous ways:

The amount to be transferred to the general fund has not been disclosed.

Standard practice is to go to bid on construction projects, Too many in house projects are approved without this practice. One is unaware of the true cost by comparison.

Our cost of green energy appears to have been done with approval request without any comparison to other agencies costs, but just pay any price so long as you have a contract.

Too much information is obtained from consultants– why pay the salaries we now pay for so called managers who depend on paid consultants to do the work they were hired to do.

The list could go on and on, but closer supervision and establishment of a group to vet these during and before being presented to committee or City Council should take place immediately.

Let show some leadership not just rubber stamp most all that comes before you!

Al Cullen

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: cityclerk
Sent: Friday, March 13, 2026 1:47 PM
To: Iraheta, Alba; Jomsky, Mark; Robles, Sandra; Sabha, Tamer; McMillan, Acquanette (Netta); Soo, Christine
Subject: FW: PWP Rate Increase Public Comment

From: Mary. Fitzpatrick <...>
Sent: Friday, March 13, 2026 1:46:20 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)
To: cityclerk <CityClerk@cityofpasadena.net>
Subject: PWP Rate Increase Public Comment

You don't often get email from [f](#) [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.

I am in favor of the proposal.

Pasadena 91107

Mary Fitzpatrick

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: cityclerk
Sent: Friday, March 13, 2026 4:12 PM
To: Iraheta, Alba; Jomsky, Mark; Robles, Sandra; Sabha, Tamer; McMillan, Acquanette (Netta); Soo, Christine
Subject: FW: Proposed Electric Rate Increase

From: Elizabeth
Sent: Friday, March 13, 2026 4:11:31 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)
To: cityclerk
Subject: Proposed Electric Rate Increase

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

[] 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.

Why my COLA doesn't keep up with these rate increases causes GREAT CONCERN. I am on a fixed income and as a result DO NOT support infrastructure increases of 30%, especially for AI Centers. The reward for my efforts to conserve water and power are these mind boggling increases. I do not support them no matter how you frame the conversation.

Elizabeth Hammond
Sent from my iPhone

Robles, Sandra

From: cityclerk
Sent: Friday, March 13, 2026 6:59 PM
To: Iraheta, Alba; Jomsky, Mark; Robles, Sandra; Sabha, Tamer; McMillan, Acquanette (Netta); Soo, Christine
Subject: FW: Watts Current - March 2026 (UPDATED)--Please don't.

From: Nancy WK
Sent: Friday, March 13, 2026 6:55:43 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)
To: cityclerk <CityClerk@cityofpasadena.net>
Subject: Re: Watts Current - March 2026 (UPDATED)--Please don't.

You don't often get email from [earn 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.

Electric costs are already so high. So high that sometimes we have to stay cold to keep our costs down. Not ideal in a household with a first grader. Please don't raise rates. Thank you.

Nancy Webster-Thurlbeck

Pasadena CA
91105

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Pasadena Water and Power <pwppcommunications@cityofpasadena.net>
Date: Fri, Mar 13, 2026 at 2:17 PM
Subject: Watts Current - March 2026 (UPDATED)
To: <nancywk@gmail.com>



[View as Webpage](#)

WATTS CURRENT March 2026 (Updated)

Robles, Sandra

From: cityclerk
Sent: Friday, March 13, 2026 9:13 PM
To: Iraheta, Alba; Jomsky, Mark; Robles, Sandra; Sabha, Tamer; McMillan, Acquanette (Netta); Soo, Christine
Subject: FW: Proposed Rate Adjustment

From: Nona Varnado
Sent: Friday, March 13, 2026 9:13:13 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)
To: cityclerk <CityClerk@cityofpasadena.net>
Subject: Proposed Rate Adjustment

You don't often get email from [cityclerk@cityofpasadena.net](#) [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.

Hello,

I am a Pasadena resident but work in the Pricing Design & Research department at SCE. I am impressed and grateful that Pasadena has the lowest rates in the region and has always been a responsive service provider. What I am concerned with in the current and proposed rate design is a lack of acknowledgement in the income inequality in our community. While there is a low income credit available, I would prefer to see something in the new rate that has a structural income/wealth component. While SCE has tiered fixed charges, there are multiple ways to do something to a similar effect. One that I propose is to tie a fixed charge, credit or rate adjustment based on the assessed property value where service is metered. A worker in an older apartment shouldn't have the same burden as one of our many palatial estates.

I agree that Pasadena needs to collect more revenue to ensure the system is safe and reliable. I hope that in doing so we won't further burden the working class when we have so many residents who can easily afford higher rates.

Thank you,
Nona

--



Outlook

PWP rate change proposal

From Mandy**Date** Sat 3/14/2026 7:18 AM**To** CityClerk@cityofpasadena.net <CityClerk@cityofpasadena.net>

[You don't often get email from <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. ----- Good morning: I have calculated my bill under the proposed rate increase, and wonder at the choice to use a winter bill instead of the most important time frame for power usage, summer. I also would appreciate an explanation of the tiers (there has to be more than one) and summer energy charge differences and when (time of day and calendar-wise) they go into effect. Thank you, M Hubner

Robles, Sandra

From: cityclerk
Sent: Saturday, March 14, 2026 11:14 AM
To: Iraheta, Alba; Jomsky, Mark; Robles, Sandra; Sabha, Tamer; McMillan, Acquanelle (Netta); Soo, Christine
Subject: FW: New Watt Adjustment

From: Paul Schlerf
Sent: Saturday, March 14, 2026 11:14:04 AM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)
To: cityclerk
Subject: New Watt Adjustment

[You don't often get email from pjschlerf@aol.com. 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.

We need to find a way to discount any rate adjustments so that people over the age of 65- are excluded from the continuing price hikes. People on fixed incomes do not need to be a part of this price hike! When looking at new increases across the board from gas, electric, water, trash please consider people in their later years deserve a break. I'm 73, have pulled my weight for 50 years of raising costs.
Sent from my iPhone

Robles, Sandra

From: Stephanie Foust
Sent: Saturday, March 14, 2026 12:44 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Proposed electric rate adjustments

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [\[redacted\]](#). [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.

We're on a fixed income. We can't afford such an outrageous rate increase.



[Draft] Rate adjustment

From

Draft saved Sat 3/14/2026 6:01 PM

To cityclerk <cityclerk@cityofpasadena.net>

You don't often get email from

[Learn why this is important](#)

[A] 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.

Everything is going up, please no rate increases.

Lisa love

Yahoo Mail: Search, Organize, Conquer

Robles, Sandra

From: Rashna D
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2026 1:40 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Cc: Rivas, Jessica
Subject: Attn City Clerk - Re PWP Rate Increase

Some people who received this message don't often get email from . [Learn 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. For more information about the Phish Alert Button view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

Hello,

I am writing to oppose the proposed rate increase for PWP. At a time when costs for basic necessities are sky rocketing the city should not be increasing utility rates. The city has the money to fund updates and should not pass this burden onto residents. As it is, over the last few years PWP and sanitation have had multiple rate increases and should not be proposing another increase at this time. The city should find another way to fund updates to PWP and not pass this burden onto consumers.

Increasing rates affects low income consumers unfairly who are already struggling under the current utility rates. Especially when most state and federal programs for utility assistance have had their funding cut.

Regardless of what the surrounding cities are doing, Pasadena should not be increasing PWP rates. Especially for PWP customers who are low-income and conserve electricity. I myself am one of those consumers who uses less electricity than most efficient users and every year I receive a letter showing that I am using 40% less electricity than efficient neighbors. Even with all my conserving I can barely afford the \$100-\$150 PWP bill.

Increasing rates does not make sense and I strongly urge PWP to not increase rates at this time.

Thank You,
Rashna D.
District 5 Resident

Robles, Sandra

From: J Raney <jetraney99@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2026 12:01 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: PWP rate increase

Some people who received this message don't often get email from jetraney99@gmail.com. [Learn 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. For more information about the Phish Alert Button view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

Dear City Council Members:

Please note the following information about human caused CO2 production in Pasadena:

The city of Pasadena, California, constitutes a negligible fraction of total global human-caused carbon dioxide production. Studies show that all of California combined accounts for approximately 1% of global fossil fuel emissions.

NASA CMS (.gov) +1

Given that Pasadena is one of over 480 cities in California, its individual contribution to the total human-caused CO₂ is extremely low, likely in the range of one-thousandth of a percent or less, although a precise percentage of the global total is not available in the provided documentation.

Key Data Regarding Pasadena's CO₂ Production:

Regional Context: Researchers studying the Los Angeles basin have noted that decaying urban vegetation in areas like Pasadena contributes significantly to local levels, with some studies suggesting natural sources might be misunderstood, yet the city remains a focus for human-caused emission reductions.

Climate Action Plan - City of Pasadena

CO₂ Emission Sources: A 2009 inventory showed Pasadena's emissions primarily come from transportation (approx. 52%) and energy use (approx. 47%).

Reduction Goals: The city has set ambitious goals to source 100% of its electricity from carbon-free resources by 2030, which would significantly reduce its local CO₂ footprint.

Significant Finding: While fossil fuel emissions drive climate change, studies focusing on the LA basin have highlighted that CO₂ measurements must distinguish between anthropogenic (human-caused) and biogenic (natural decay) sources, as

the latter contributes to about 20% of the CO_2 observed in the region.

City of Pasadena +2

Bottom line:

Does adding to the already heavy burden of the cost of living in California warrant the cost of Resolution 9977

for so little gain? Should we not instead focus on controlling the CO_2 emissions from decaying urban vegetation, which might also serve fire prevention purposes?

Thank you for your consideration of the facts,
Janice Raney