

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: William M. Paparian
Sent: Monday, March 30, 2026 6:29 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Item 4: AMENDING THE LIGHT AND POWER RATE ORDINANCE

[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.

The Pasadena City Council's unanimous of a three-phase electric rate increase — 7% now, another 7% in October, and a final 7% in March 2027, compounding to roughly 22% — is not responsible governance. It is a betrayal of the very residents who elected these officials. In a city already groaning under sky-high housing costs, insurance premiums, gas prices, and grocery bills, the council chose to squeeze families, small businesses, and major employers even harder rather than demand real efficiency from Pasadena Water and Power (PWP).

Mayor Victor Gordo himself admitted during the hearing, "None of us ran for office on the platform that we would increase electric rates." Yet here we are. The council patted itself on the back for "reducing" an earlier, more draconian proposal that would have socked residential customers with nearly 35% over two years. Congratulations — you only hit us with 22%. That is not leadership. That is surrender dressed up as compromise.

The Chamber of Commerce and Caltech — institutions that employ thousands and drive Pasadena's economy — publicly opposed the hike. Caltech alone faces an extra \$2.6 million a year in power costs. Councilmember Gene Masuda captured the cynicism perfectly: "We don't want to see any kind of increase, but we have our expenses to take care of." Translation: the bills must be paid, and you, the ratepayer, are the easiest ATM.

Let's be brutally honest about who is really paying. Ratepayers are being triple-taxed for the same electrons. First, we foot the bill for PWP's ambitious rush to 100% carbon-free power by 2030 — an expensive leap that requires massive new infrastructure for intermittent renewables, batteries, and grid upgrades. Second, a mandatory percentage of PWP revenues is siphoned every year into the city's General Fund to subsidize police, parks, libraries, and other non-utility services — a transfer that grows automatically with every rate increase. Third, we now get these explicit 22% hikes to plug the very shortfall those transfers and green mandates helped create. This is not sustainable finance; it is a self-licking ice-cream cone that leaves residents licking their wounds.

PWP's own documents show 77% of its costs are fixed. That is code for "we have little incentive to cut fat." The council's big concession? Using \$36 million in cash reserves to soften the immediate blow and promising to "revisit" the third phase after the second. How reassuring. After months of meetings and public comment, the best accountability they could muster is a future meeting that may or may not kill the final increase. Ratepayers have heard this song before.

Meanwhile, the council and PWP brass tout "months of review" and "six committee meetings." Wonderful. Yet somehow the result is still higher bills for everyone while the utility's aging poles, wires, and transformers

3/30/2026

Item 4

supposedly teeter on collapse. If the system is that fragile after years of rate revenue, perhaps the problem is not insufficient money but insufficient discipline.

Pasadena families and businesses are not opposed to reliable power or even reasonable investments in the grid. What we oppose is being treated as an unlimited credit card for ideological timelines and bureaucratic bloat. We oppose being told “this hurts, but it’s necessary” by the same people who just voted themselves another bite of our paychecks.

The council had choices. It could have demanded deeper operational cuts at PWP. It could have reined in the automatic General Fund transfer that turns every rate increase into a citywide subsidy. It could have slowed the green transition to match what ratepayers can actually afford instead of racing toward 2030 virtue-signaling. Instead, it chose the path of least resistance: make the customers pay.

This decision will not be forgotten. Every time a Pasadena household opens its power bill and sees another jump, every time a small business owner debates whether they can stay open, every time Caltech or another major employer weighs its footprint here, they will remember the night the City Council decided ratepayers could absorb one more hit.

Enough. It is time for real accountability — not staged “revisits” after the damage is done. Pasadena ratepayers deserve a utility that lives within its means, not one that keeps expanding the means at our expense. The council just proved it cannot be trusted to protect us. The next election — and every public hearing until then — must be a reckoning.

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Paul Little
Sent: Monday, March 30, 2026 3:35 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Cc: Rivas, Jessica; Gordo, Victor; Jones, Justin; Hampton, Tyron; Madison, Steve; Jomsky, Mark; Masuda, Gene; Márquez, Miguel; Rick Cole
Subject: Re: Electric Rate increase

[!] **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.

This is a letter from me personally, not on behalf of the Chamber of Commerce.

March 30, 2026

Mayor Victor Gordo and Pasadena City Council
Pasadena City Hall
100 North Garfield Avenue
Pasadena, CA 91109

Dear Mayor Gordo and City Council Members,

I fully understand the need to invest in maintenance and upgrades to our Pasadena electric system and grid. I also appreciate the difficulty you face in the decision to make such significant increases so quickly. This proposal is essentially a 22% increase in utility rates over the course of a single year, after all.

First, it is very difficult to gauge the real impact of the increases proposed when the bill calculator only includes the first increase of 7%. While I appreciate that some users will see decreases in their electricity charges after the first increase, we are told the costs associated with that initial increase will not extrapolate to future increases.

Before you finally approve the ordinance, can there be a calculator that accurately shows the impact of each increase for every customer.

I would also note that, while much consideration has gone into this proposal by staff and committee members and the City Council, the public has just recently become aware of the magnitude of the increases and has had little time to consider the proposed increases.

I do have questions:

First, do the increases have to come so quickly and so often? Business owners and operators need to plan for future spending increases of all kinds. Beginning increases this month gives no time for planning. No time to consider cuts in other places or conservation measures that could offset the increases.

For business owners, and residential customers as well, anticipating expense increases in one area may mean planning on reducing costs in other places. For commercial customers and likely many residential users, time to understand the overall added costs and the opportunity to carefully consider how to offset those is very important.

I would ask that any increases begin on July 1, 2026, not immediately. Further, I would request that future increases occur with each new fiscal year. That way, the entire 22% increase would not take effect until July 1, 2028.

Second, will Pasadena Water and Power be spending the new funds collected immediately? Will it be used to guarantee and pay for future indebtedness? It would help me to understand the need for the increases if we were presented with a spending plan for the funds.

Third, will the funds accumulated as a result of these increases be subject to the transfer to the City of Pasadena General Fund. If not, thank you. If so, how much revenue will that mean for the City General Fund? If the increase were not subject to the transfer, could the City budget remain whole, or at least stable? Could that reduction in the amount transferred, in turn, relate to slightly lower increases for customers? What would the impact of that adjustment be on the city budget and on your electric customers?

Finally, what are the real costs of “getting to 0% greenhouse gas emissions” by the end of 2030? We all agree that climate change must be addressed, but we would also like to know the real costs of achieving this goal.

If the costs are significantly higher than current costs, is a more incremental approach possible, or even preferable? Rather than an absolute reduction, could a zero-based approach be preferable? If reductions in other areas bring the net greenhouse gas emissions by PWP to zero what might be the practical and cost advantages using of this approach?

I fully support and embrace a resilient, reliable and cost-effective Department of Water and Power.

This is a very uncertain time for businesses and residents. The world economy is in turmoil. Locally, costs are rising very quickly on everyday necessities, as well as those services and products required to run a business and a household. Please consider that as well.

I respectfully request that you implement any rate increases over a longer period of time and not begin increases until July 1, 2026. Then phase in future increases over the course of the next two years.

Give your residents and your businesses enough time to plan for these increases and take the steps necessary to adjust for them.

Please consider any and all possibilities to mitigate increases, including reduction to the transfer to the General Fund so that the increase can be lessened as much as possible.

And, please look for any other opportunities to reduce costs for your customers.

Also, as you plan for the future, please utilize local resources for assistance, advice and innovation. We have companies and institutions here in Pasadena that build power infrastructure around the world, research climate change and ways to mitigate that and much more.

Thank you for considering my points and concerns before you take the final step to implement this ordinance and rate increase. .

Thank you for your service to Pasadena and your constituents.

Sincerely,

Paul Little