

# McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

**From:**  
**Sent:** Sunday, May 5, 2024 7:54 PM  
**To:** Gordo, Victor; Madison, Steve; Hampton, Tyron; Williams, Felicia; Jones, Justin; Masuda, Gene; Rivas, Jessica; Lyon, Jason  
**Cc:** PublicComment-AutoResponse  
**Subject:** Item 20. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING: TO APPROVE SEWER USE FEE RATE STRUCTURE AND RATE ADJUSTMENTS (Public Works Dept.)

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 "KB0010263" on the DoIT portal.

Raftelis, Public Works' consultant for the Rate Study, recommended the third of four scenarios, and a "rate smoothing option". The *recommended scenario 3* and *smoothing option* propose minor timing changes but a comparison of **total dollars collected for each average monthly bill 2024-2029** shows minimal change for the ratepayer. **This is repackaging rather than actual revision.**

**Comparison of "Revised Rate" and "Smoothed Option" to Rate Increase Notice**

Rate Increase Notice	Current	FY 2025	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029	Total	Total Difference from Notice
Avg SFR Bill (*)	\$4.55	\$11.37	\$13.19	\$13.71	\$14.26	\$14.83	\$71.91	n/a
Avg Commercial Bill	\$35.51	\$65.40	\$75.86	\$78.90	\$82.05	\$85.34	\$423.06	n/a
<b>Revised Rate per Att B</b>								
Avg SFR Bill (*)	\$4.55	\$11.05	\$12.81	\$13.33	\$13.86	\$14.41	\$70.01	<b>-\$1.90</b>
Avg Commercial Bill	\$35.51	\$63.48	\$73.64	\$76.58	\$79.64	\$82.83	\$411.68	<b>-\$11.38</b>
<b>Smoothed per Att E</b>								
Avg SFR Bill (*)	\$4.55	\$8.13	\$11.24	\$13.27	\$14.06	\$14.62	\$65.87	<b>-\$6.04</b>
(*) Avg SFR Bill Implied Use (hcf)	13.0	8.0	8.1	8.0	8.0	8.0		

As is apparent from the total of *Average SFR and Commercial Bills* in the table above, there is very little actual change for the ratepayer. Total differences from the Rate Increase Notice for FY 2024-2029 are negligible when spread over 5 years. Note also that PW's **current implied sewer use is 13 hcf** while **FY 2025-29 assume a large reduction to 8 hcf/month**. The sewer rate increase would be even more dramatic if 8 hcf per month were also assumed for the current year.

The Water/Sewer/Refuse Bill Estimator posted on the City website provides a tool for ratepayers to compare the bi-monthly cost of three simultaneous proposed utility rate increases effective July 1, 2024. The calculator uses "proposed" rates for Water, Sewer and Refuse as reflected in the rate increase notices. My PROPOSED July 1, Single Family sewer rate increase would be 340%. My REVISED increase per Attachment B would be slightly better at 329%. **No rate information is provided for the "smoothing" option in Attachment E** which only discusses the effect on sewer department revenues.

Three Separate Pasadena utilities are seeking major rate increases effective July 1. While rate adjustments are needed, three different consultants for Water, Sewer and Refuse, each devised **rates for the maximum benefit of their respective clients**. **The combined effect on ratepayers for three simultaneous rate increases was ignored**. The dramatic proposed rate increases July 1 are only the start; similar increases are proposed annually

for 5 years at compounding rates. Which utility is first in line? Which utility is more deserving? What is fair and reasonable for ratepayers who are also voters? Waiting until the last minute, “running out the clock” is no excuse for not proposing real adjustments to sewer rates that are more equitable for ratepayers.

**PLEASE VOTE NO ON THE “REVISED” AND “SMOOTHED” RATE PROPOSALS. REQUIRE REAL ADJUSTMENTS, NOT JUST “REPACKAGING” OF THE SAME OLD ASSUMPTIONS.**

Genette Foster  
Council District 2

## McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

---

**From:** Rose Malmberg  
**Sent:** Monday, May 6, 2024 11:52 AM  
**To:** Morales, Margo; PublicComment-AutoResponse  
**Subject:** I oppose the proposed Sewer rate increases for 5/6/24 meeting - district 5 resident  
**Attachments:** IMG\_3248.heic; IMG\_3249.heic; IMG\_3250.heic

Some people who received this message 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 "KB0010263" on the DoIT portal.

Please provide the following to Jess Rivas and Mayor Gordo,

Somehow there are other better alternatives than dumping all the proposed needs to rate payers. We have an increased sales tax. Revenue stream could come out of the General fund and the development fees can increase for sewer and storm drains. The increased use and need for more infrastructure like pumps can be passed on to the developers who are developing small properties into large complexes. It could be a specific line item due to the change in the property use.

Mayor Gordo spoke of the three buckets as it pertains to the proposed rate increases:

User fees  
CIP  
Reserves

Only the user fees must be passed on to the users or rate payers.

Capital Improvement Projects seem to be part of the infrastructure and as such could come from the General Fund, with proper planning rather than knee jerk/ emergency related problems.

Reserves were not a part of the equations in the past, so historically speaking, they don't need to be part of this now. In fact the city website shows the City Mission as:, City Mission

The City of Pasadena is dedicated to delivering exemplary municipal services responsive to our entire community and consistent with our history, culture and unique character.

The city should be responsive to our concerns and if the history of the city is not to keep money in reserves in the sewer/ storm drain department, then the city should follow its own mission. It does NOT matter what other cities do. Pasadena should follow its own city mission. These reserves are too great a burden for the rate payers.

P176 of Financial Statements 6/30/23 shows Sewer Fund has Cash \$15.6 million, it's time to use some of the money to invest in future project. Just one resource, some general fund, development fees and limited rate increases.

P178 was the profit and loss from last fiscal year 6/30/23. The fund had small profit \$1.8 mil.

Please maintain our infrastructure properly so we minimize emergencies and the tremendous rate increases to the rate payers.

Rose Malmberg  
Resident of district 5


Sent from my iPhone

## Kenebrew, Jerice

---

**From:** Elizabeth  
**Sent:** Monday, May 6, 2024 3:46 PM  
**To:** PublicComment-AutoResponse  
**Subject:** Solid Waste Collection Fees

[Some people who received this message 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 "KB0010263" on the DoIT portal.

-----

I am writing again, having attended two City Council meetings and finding out once there the discussion of waste collection fees had been rescheduled. I am a property owner in District 2 and am on a fixed income. Being on a strict budget and always looking for ways to conserve and save I believe the proposed rate increases are unreasonable. If the city is doubling down on increases because they haven't attended to planning on an incremental basis, the residents shouldn't be penalized as a result. As a physician once told me, "An emergency on your part doesn't constitute an emergency on mine." Please take your rate increases with what many residents are able to adjust to related to COLA.

Elizabeth Hammond

Sent from my iPhone