Acevedo, Gloria

From: Cynthia Cannady
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2025 12:19 PM
To: Acevedo, Gloria; Hampton, Tyron; Rick Cole; Jones, Justin; Rivas, Jessica; Masuda, Gene; Lyon, Jason; Madison, Steve; Gordo, Victor; Márquez, Miguel; Márquez, Miguel
Subject: Letter from PASADENA 100: Budget re-prioritization needed!

[!] **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.

For agenda of joint Finance Committee and City Council meeting today on the Capital Improvement Budget

Dear Mayor, Councilmembers and City Manager,

We ask you to re-prioritize the line items in the Capital Improvement budget so that they align with Climate Emergency Resolution 9977 and with the latest findings of the consultants that are working with PWP to prepare the Optimized Strategic Plan (OSP).

We ask you to affirm by your budgetary decisions that when you approved hiring consultants for more than $1.2 million to develop an Optimized Strategic Plan to achieve our city's carbon free goal, you actually meant that the city should implement the plan.

We are well aware of the budgetary constraints facing the city, and this is why prioritization and coherent policy are essential.

The current modeling and analysis for the OSP has given us excellent news: an increase of 100 MW of **local solar** in the next 5 years (together with storage, demand response and continued renewable power purchase agreements) will enable us to succeed in implementing the carbon free policy goal of Resolution 9977. Accordingly, we need a solar push to add 100 more MW, including local solar on private residential, institutional, commercial and municipal property. Of this total of 100 MW, approximately 36 MW is described by the consultants as "naturally occurring" based on historical adoption rates, and the potential contribution from municipal property alone is 66 MW; so our goal is achievable if the City Council remains supportive.

Increasing local solar is also important for **energy security** given that the Goodrich bottleneck is tighter than the peak load anticipated by 2031.

Public investment in local solar is **financially prudent** because it provides an alternative to increasing costs for imported electricity. We note that our neighbor Glendale is ahead of this with its new Perkins building solar installation.

We in PASADENA 100 were heartened to see that PWP's budget items included items that are critical to the success of the Optimized Strategic Plan, especially funds for electricity storage.

But we were discouraged to see line item 52 for spending $34 million for a new headquarters for PWP. The needs assessment alone is allocated $320,000! At a time when **Pasadena**

ratepayers are suffering from high bills--and when we are trying to recover from a climate disaster-- this is inappropriate. We also question whether a new physical office building makes sense when we are seeing a lot of remote work and empty offices.

Line items 11,12 and 15 propose a total of more than $60 million for "refurbishment" of the Glenarm methane gas plant.

Line item 54 proposes $51M for renovation of the PWP warehouse. That sounds like an overdue investment, but why not put solar on it and combine this with a workforce development program for NW Pasadena?

Line item 60 proposes a shocking $2.8 million for consultants to prepare another Integrated Resource Plan. Filing an IRP is mandated but $2.8 million is not.

There's nothing in the proposed budget for a desperately needed Community Solar investment to help renters and lower income Pasadenans have the benefit of lower bills.

Outside of PWP, the Public Works budget at Tab 2 ($259 million) doesn't mention a single rooftop solar project on any city buildings. Solar on municipal buildings will be an important part of the Optimized Strategic Plan, estimated by the consultants at 66 MW, but where is this in the budget? How can we expect private property owners to invest in solar if the city is unwilling to do so?

The hugely expensive seismic retrofit of the Central Library does not have a plan for a solar canopy that would reduce the library electricity expense and reduce its demand on the grid.

In the Rose Bowl Improvements, we see $2 million for "various upgrades" to the golf course, but nothing for using that parking space for solar arrays, as identified by our consultants.

In Program Technology projects, there's nothing about grid technology or other programs to reduce demand at critical high peak hours.

We have a much-publicized rhetorical MOU with Caltech but where are the funds for actually doing something to make our transition to clean energy a reality?

In the aftermath of the Eaton fire, it is important to take meaningful action to address the root of the problem.

Please re-prioritize.

The PASADENA 100 Steering Committee