

## Novelo, Lilia

---

**From:** cityclerk  
**Subject:** FW: Water Restriction Meeting Tonight

**From:** Eric Hayne [mailto:ehayne09@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, May 18, 2015 10:11 AM  
**To:** Morales, Margo  
**Subject:** Water Restriction Meeting Tonight

Dear Ms. McAustin,

My wife and I will not be able to attend the district meeting regarding water use, however I would like to add my thoughts through this letter, so that they may be considered. I have two ideas I would like to advance. The first is how to directly work with the Governor's required restrictions. The second is to address the bigger, statewide water issues.

### First Plan:

Restricting water in Pasadena 28% below 2013 use will be a VERY difficult issue. Everyone I know has already installed low flow toilets, reduced water shower heads and sink faucets, and everyone restricts water to pools and gardens. Asking for further reductions may not be possible in many households. Even if we were to totally eliminate all water to the gardens, most households will not be able to cut another 28% from what we have already cut.

Therefore I think the best plan for the city is simply to increase the price of water. If we impose a tiered system so that those who use the most water also pay the most, everyone will do everything they can to cut their water bill. Imposing fines, or imposing rationing can create an unfair burden on many families, including those who already use the least amount of water. Instead let's impose a tiered system of water billing which charges the highest rates to the households who use the most water. Where the most water is used, is where there is the greatest potential for cuts.

### Second Plan:

In order to solve the statewide problem, we need to look at where all water goes in the state. About 80% of all water goes to the farms in the central valley. About 6% goes to heavy industry. The remaining 14% goes to the cities. Of the amount that goes to the cities, some goes to the San Francisco Bay area, the rest goes to the Los Angeles area. This means that only about 10% actually goes to the Los Angeles area. The Governor's plan calls only for the cities to reduce water use by 25% -30% with no impact to industry or the farms. If we follow his plan the state will save only 2% - 3% of all water and still be in a serious drought next year, unless heavy rains and snow come. Instead we need a plan to conserve much more water than that.

We also need to understand that Los Angeles is NOT a desert. The notion that we live in a desert is a commonly held misbelief. Instead we live in a Mediterranean Climate. If you have ever been to a Mediterranean Climate like Rome, Italy, you know that grass grows naturally and wild in this climate. Even the hillsides around Pasadena have wild grass growing on them (something you do not see in a desert). Indeed, most cactus and succulent gardens fail in Pasadena's climate as they are accustomed to dry winters and rainy (monsoonal) summers, which is the opposite of what we have. Further, grass helps water be absorbed into the ground, which helps local aquifers and the many communities who use local well water (something I believe Pasadena does in part).

06/01/2015  
Item 26

Therefore, the solution to our drought is not for Pasadena to remove our grassy gardens, or for us to burden deeper restrictions to our water use. Rather the solution is to tap into the untapped and easy restrictions which have not yet been imposed.

I recently read in the LA Times that a farmer in the central valley said, "how are we wasting water when we flood irrigate?" He went on to imply that flood irrigation returns water to the streams on the back side of the field. This farmer was mistaken, as flood irrigation is the most wasteful way to use water of all.

Since the farmers use 80% of the state's water, and since they have never attempted any water restrictions at all, there is a huge amount of water which can be saved with very little effort. Anyone who lives in Southern California can tell you that reducing the initial 10% was the easy step. We have all been reducing our water use since the 1980's. It was easy initially to reduce. Now that we have, finding more reductions is much more difficult. If the farms would flood irrigate for 9 days instead of 10, there would be an 8% savings in water statewide. That's more than double the amount of water the Governor has proposed and nearly enough water to meet the entire demand for all of Los Angeles for a year.

Further, if the farms could go a little more and flood irrigate 8 days instead of 10, there would be a 16% savings in water statewide! Compare this to the Governor's current plan which imposes 30% on only 10% of the users (3% total on statewide resources).

Southern California has been reducing water use for over 30 years. There are not too many more places for us to cut. Even if we did, we simply do not use enough of the state's water to make a major impact. It is time to share the burden with those who use the most water. Anyone who has ever grown a home garden knows that crops can grow very well without flood irrigation. Crops simply do not need that much water. The farms could easily cut 25% of the water they use, still have very productive farms, and California would have water to last for a very long time.

We also need to examine why the Governor imposed his restrictions on those who have already reduced the most. I do not know all the reasons for his decision, but his plan creates an extreme hardship for many of us, and for those of us who have already worked hard to conserve. I believe that if water restrictions are not placed on the farms, then Pasadena must become a leader and file a lawsuit against the Governor and the State for the discriminatory policy which the Governor put in place. Only when the farms reduce their water use will the drought actually be something we all care about.

Sincerely,  
Eric Hayne  
District 2 Resident  
5th Generation Pasadenian

**Public Landscape Signatories**  
**c/o James P. Folsom**  
**Telleen & Jorgenson Director of the Botanical Gardens**  
**The Huntington Library**  
**1151 Oxford Road, San Marino, CA 91108**

**June 1, 2015**

Mayor & City Council Members  
City of Pasadena  
100 N. Garfield Avenue, Room S228  
Pasadena, CA 91109

Re: Water Conservation and Proposal to Implement Level Two Restrictions

Dear Mayor & City Council:

Pasadena and the entire region are presently confronting two tremendous water use challenges. One is the urgent short-term need to meet state-mandated water use reduction targets to deal with the present drought. The other is the even more urgent long-term need to achieve water sustainability through significant changes in how we use water and completion of major infrastructure projects.

The signatories to this letter acknowledge the very difficult job that you and other government officials presently face. We often take water for granted when it is plentiful, but it times of scarcity, providing adequate water to some users often deprives others of water they want or need. Nevertheless, all water uses are not equally meritorious; some deserve preferences.

We believe that using water to preserve critical public landscapes,<sup>1</sup> i.e., important public landscapes or hard-to-replace public landscape components such as mature trees, is one such especially meritorious use. Pasadena's 2009 Water Waste Prohibitions and Water Supply Shortage Plans ordinance (2009 Ordinance) gives critical public landscapes little or no special protection, while, for example, entirely exempting commercial nurseries from any restrictions on water use. The reservation expressed by Pasadena Water & Power that "providing exemptions for public lands can create an image that diminishes the significance of the drought and need to conserve"<sup>2</sup> is short-sighted. There are better ways to address the drought than allowing valuable or hard-to-replace public landscapes wither and die.

The signatories to this letter support the proposal presently before you to implement Level Two water use restrictions under the 2009 Ordinance, but we also urge the City Council to amend that ordinance to protect critical public landscapes by waiving or modifying certain restrictions that otherwise would apply to them and by formally giving Pasadena Water & Power the discretion to approve additional accommodations needed to protect critical public landscapes.<sup>3</sup> We would be happy to work with Pasadena officials to develop a proposed amendment that would provide that protection.

---

<sup>1</sup> By "public landscapes," we mean all wild or cultivated areas that belong to public agencies or that are reasonably open to the public, including such things as street trees, parks, schools, colleges, museums, churches, botanical gardens, and the public areas of commercial properties, such as golf courses, hotels, and shopping areas.

<sup>2</sup> Attachment C to the Municipal Services Committee's May 26, 2015 agenda item 3.A.

<sup>3</sup> We understand that a proclamation the City Council adopted around the time it enacted the 2009 Ordinance may give Pasadena Water & Power that discretion. Even so, we still believe it would be appropriate to amend the 2009 Ordinance to grant it sufficient discretion so that its discretion is clear on the face of the ordinance. This would formalize its discretion, make sure that it is broad enough, make its discretion readily ascertainable, and help beneficiaries

We further urge the City Council and Pasadena Water & Power to incorporate the following principles into their water conservation and sustainability efforts, to the extent they are not already being followed. We suggest that the City Council consider formally incorporating these and other guiding principles into the 2009 Ordinance when it next amends it.

1. **Achieving sustainability does not mean that all landscapes must be desert or Mediterranean:** Provided that we do what we need to do to achieve water sustainability, we should not ban or demonize public landscapes that are more water intensive. They add to the quality of our community. For example, when the short-term water crisis passes, the City should turn its fountains and water features back on. Likewise, public landscapes, such as lawns used for events or the Huntington's Chinese Garden, serve extremely valuable purposes and deserve a place in our region even if they use more water than other landscapes.
2. **Better public education is needed:** The public needs to be educated about the importance of public landscapes to our community, their responsibility to water street trees adjacent to their properties, how to water trees and other plants properly and efficiently, and many other things. Some of the signatories to this letter have active educational programs. The City and Pasadena Water & Power may wish to partner with some of them in designing or implementing education programs.
3. **Short-term conservation measures should be truly effective and do no long-term harm:** Some of the measures currently being considered, such as wholesale turf removal, may not save water in the near-term, may cause significant long-term damage, such as street tree losses, and may not be cost-effective. We acknowledge that most private and many public landscapes in our region need to be replanted with plants and trees that are more appropriate to our Mediterranean climate, but the current rushed effort to do this likely will not save water in the near-term, will be extremely costly, and will have unattractive and unfortunate results. Replanting should be a long-term effort.
4. **Water use restrictions should be goal-oriented rather than means-oriented:** The 2009 Ordinance and its various plan levels (e.g., Level 1 and Level 2) prescribe *methods* of conserving water, rather than mandating *actual* water savings. This approach is too prescriptive in that it denies property owners any flexibility in how to achieve water savings and bakes in water conservation techniques that made sense when the ordinance was enacted that might be superseded by newer technologies or approaches. It also is a potentially ineffectual approach because it does not mandate actual reductions in use. For example, it is easy to overwater even when watering one-day a week, and in some cases it might save water to water more frequently but for a shorter time, e.g., to avoid run-off. At a minimum, the 2009 Ordinance needs to be amended to deem a water user to be in compliance if the user achieves appropriate reductions in water use even though the owner is not following the methods the 2009 Ordinance otherwise requires. We recognize that Pasadena Water & Power may have discretion to authorize alternative methods of compliance. That may be a workable solution for very large customers, but it is unlikely to be workable for anyone else.
5. **To achieve long-term sustainability, all sensible infrastructure improvements need to be implemented as soon as possible even after the present drought has ended:** Pasadena could have completed its pending reclaimed water pipeline project years ago, but the project was shelved because it no longer seemed imperative after the last drought ended. Pasadena needs that reclaimed

---

of its discretion avoid the complaints and reputational risk they face when they do not follow the water use restrictions (e.g., the days on which watering is allowed) that would otherwise apply to them. We believe that Pasadena Water & Power needs more discretion than just the "flexibility to protect valued landscape provided the customer demonstrates water use reductions." Attachment C to the Municipal Services Committee's May 26, 2015 agenda item 3.A. In some cases, there may not be any feasible way of effecting reductions without doing irreversible damage.

water now, and it will need it for the inevitable drought to come. We are concerned that the present multi-phase schedule for completing the reclaimed water pipeline is too leisurely. Its completion needs to be accelerated. That pipeline is just an example of what needs to be done. Another major example is building the infrastructure needed to capture rain and other run-off water, such as the spreading ponds Pasadena Water & Power wants to build in the Arroyo Seco near JPL. All such projects should be completed as soon as possible.

6. **Long-term efforts are needed to make us use water more efficiently:** For example, to the extent not already mandated and economically feasible, new construction should be required to include rain cisterns and gray water systems, and new landscaping generally should be arid-region-appropriate.

Some of the signatories to this letter have special expertise in water use, public landscapes, and horticulture. If we can assist the City or any of its agencies, such as Pasadena Water & Power, please let us know.

Very truly yours,

The Huntington Library  
Pasadena Heritage  
Pasadena Beautiful  
Arroyo Seco Foundation  
David R. Brown, Executive Director, Descanso Gardens

**Jomsky, Mark**

---

**From:** Peg Rogers <pegjrogers@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 29, 2015 3:30 PM  
**To:** Tornek, Terry; McAustin, Margaret; Gordo, Victor; Kennedy, John; Masuda, Gene; Madison, Steve; Jomsky, Mark  
**Subject:** Include Fine Income and Monitoring Expense of Water Ordinance in Your Budget

I strongly urge you to **fully enforce the water ordinances** you have and will adopt. This means consistent monitoring and levying fines to all residents who do not abide by these laws. **Fines are found to be the most economically effective means of changing water use in communities.**

As a Pasadena resident, I know we will see additional drought challenges ahead, requiring changes in the way each residence lives and thinks. Achieving 28% reduction in water usage will not be achieved without some sacrifices and losses. **It is very important that each resident see our water ordinance as equitably enforced.**

Education alone will not achieve our goals. **If the city does not monitor and fine offenders, you simply will not get the drought compliance that is needed, and it will pit compliant neighbors against those who are not,** and will be perceived as class and economic favoritism on the part of City Officials.

Policies and rules which are not enforced should not exist. **Please include fine income and enforcement expense in your upcoming budget.**

Respectfully,

Peggy Rogers  
700 E Union  
Pasadena CA 91101

06/01/2015  
Item 26

## Jomsky, Mark

---

**From:** Linda Roberts <froghorn7@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 01, 2015 9:49 AM  
**To:** Jomsky, Mark  
**Subject:** Comment for City Council Meeting, June 1st, RE: DROUGHT

Dear Mr. Jomsky,

I am disabled and unable to attend tonight's City Council Meeting. I was told I could email you with my comment for presentation tonight.

Here it is:

With respect to the drought and the many measures to save water including local watering restrictions, etc. no mention has ever been made regarding the impact of the ongoing city-wide intensive building and development of Pasadena and its impact on the water supply. Much of the development needs water for the actual building process, plus adding residential units, hotels, businesses, restaurants, etc, etc, all require additional water usage. What is the impact of all of these projects on the existing and future water supply. during the drought?

Thank you.

Linda Roberts  
3512 Glenrose Ave.  
Altadena  
626-797-8639

(I live in Altadena but frequent Pasadena for all my medical and other needs as I am disabled)