

<b>DOCKETED</b>	
<b>Docket Number:</b>	01-AFC-06C
<b>Project Title:</b>	Magnolia Power Project-Compliance
<b>TN #:</b>	267225
<b>Document Title:</b>	SUZANNE Perkins YORK Comments - opposition to Magnolia Power Plant
<b>Description:</b>	N/A
<b>Filer:</b>	System
<b>Organization:</b>	SUZANNE Perkins YORK
<b>Submitter Role:</b>	Public
<b>Submission Date:</b>	11/14/2025 8:53:06 AM
<b>Docketed Date:</b>	11/14/2025

*Comment Received From: SUZANNE Perkins YORK*  
*Submitted On: 11/14/2025*  
*Docket Number: 01-AFC-06C*

**opposition to Magnolia Power Plant**

*Additional submitted attachment is included below.*

I am concerned about Pasadena's continued reliance on the Magnolia Power Plant and the possibility of its expansion. It runs on natural gas — a fossil fuel. The Magnolia Power Plant burns methane gas, which is not carbon-free. Even though it's cleaner than coal, it still emits large amounts of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) and methane leaks occur throughout the supply chain — both major contributors to climate change.

It undermines Pasadena's 100% carbon-free goal. Pasadena has committed to 100% carbon-free electricity by 2030. Continuing to rely on Magnolia contradicts that commitment and delays the transition to renewables like solar, wind, and battery storage.

It's increasingly expensive and outdated. Gas plants like Magnolia are becoming financial liabilities because: 1) They face rising fuel costs and maintenance expenses. 2) Renewable energy and storage are becoming cheaper, and 3) State and (hopefully soon), federal climate policies are pushing utilities to phase out fossil fuels.

Investing more money into an aging gas plant risks stranded assets — infrastructure that soon becomes unusable but still costs ratepayers.

Renewables and storage can replace outdated, toxic, and unsafe plants like Magnolia. California now has reliable grid-scale battery systems and diverse renewable generation that can meet demand more flexibly than gas plants. Pasadena could instead expand local rooftop and community solar, invest in regional battery storage projects, and participate in demand-response programs that reduce energy use during peaks.

There are many health and environmental impacts that impact our choices of energy systems. Even “clean” gas plants emit nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) and particulate matter, which harm air quality and public health — particularly for nearby communities already burdened by pollution.

Keeping Magnolia delays innovation. Every year Pasadena stays tied to Magnolia, it delays investment in modern, zero-emission energy systems. Ending reliance on it would free Pasadena to lead in clean energy innovation — aligning with the city's climate emergency declaration.

In summary, Pasadena should move away from the Magnolia Power Plant because it:

- Burns fossil fuels,
- Undermines climate commitments,
- Costs more long-term,
- Harms air quality, and
- Blocks investment in renewable infrastructure.

Transitioning off Magnolia is essential if Pasadena truly wants to meet its 100% carbon-free electricity by 2030 goal.

Suzanne York, Pasadena, CA

