

## Martinez, Ruben

---

**From:** Joan Hearst <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Saturday, July 17, 2021 8:19 PM  
**To:** Hampton, Tyron; Kennedy, John J.; Masuda, Gene; Gordo, Victor; Madison, Steve; Wilson, Andy; Ventura, Elisa; Lori Paul; Marietta Kruells; Ann Scheid; bourel; Tim Brick; Tim Wendler; Darren Dowell; Laura Garrett; Cindy Clark-schnuelle; Shackelford  
**Subject:** PublicComment-AutoResponse  
Re: Arroyo Seco Canyon Project appeal to Council, 7/19/21. Where things stand:the citizen view.

**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. [Learn more...](#)

Thank you, Hugh for a excellent statement outlining what we all want to see for the future of our precious Arroyo Seco.

You have my support.

To the Pasadena City Council...please add my name as a supporter of the requests made in this letter.

Thank you.

Joan Hearst

Pasadena, 91105

Joan

---

**From:** Hugh Bowles <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Saturday, July 17, 2021 3:58:18 PM  
**To:** thampton@cityofpasadena.net <thampton@cityofpasadena.net>; johnjkennedy@cityofpasadena.net <johnjkennedy@cityofpasadena.net>; gmasuda@cityofpasadena.net <gmasuda@cityofpasadena.net>; Victor Gordo <vgordo@cityofpasadena.net>; smadison@cityofpasadena.net <smadison@cityofpasadena.net>;

**Subject:** Arroyo Seco Canyon Project appeal to Council, 7/19/21. Where things stand:the citizen view.

This e-mail is addressed to the Mayor and Members of the City Council, Trustee Agencies for the Arroyo Seco Canyon Project ASCP, and members of the public who have commented on and followed the ASCP.

On June 7th, the Appeal hearing for the PWP Arroyo Seco Canyon Project was "continued" (postponed) to July 12th. The July 12th hearing was "continued" to July 19th. It is now Agenda Item #13 on Monday, July 19th 2021:

**CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING: APPEAL OF THE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS' DECISION ON MODIFICATION TO CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 6222 REGARDING THE PROPERTIES LOCATED AT 3420 AND 3500 N. ARROYO BLVD (ARROYO SECO CANYON PROJECT).**

The reason for the initial continuation was a communication from PWP to the Appellants that PWP was willing to meet with the Appellants to hear their concerns.

Two meetings were held at the PWP offices and with the City's attorney via Zoom. The first meeting, held on June 16th, was mostly in person, all parties vaccinated, masks worn. Participants included the Appellants, PWP's General Manager, and two water employees, and the Deputy City Attorney.

At the first meeting, the Appellants requested that minutes of the meeting be taken for the record.

This request was turned down by PWP management and the City Attorney.

PWP General Manager Gucharan Bawa asked: "What are you concerned about, that we will agree on something and then deny it later?"

One of the Appellants said: "There have been numerous examples over the years where encouraging comments have been made 'off the record' and then never admitted or reflected publicly or in documentation."

The goal of this e-mail is to report to the Mayor and City Council, the public and Trustee Agencies the arc of those meetings and where things lie between the Appellants and PWP. It is important that this background is available prior to the Appeal Hearing.

The Appellants consist of the Arroyo Seco Foundation represented by Tim Brick, Pasadena Audubon represented by Laura Solomon and Mark Hunter, Ken Kules a former MWD water engineer, and Hugh Bowles a local resident living adjacent to Hahamongna. All are PWP customers.

As Appellants, we had to make clear that we were not affiliated with a single organization and we covered a broad range of interests relating to Hahamongna. However, we have common cause on the issues of water management, protection of the aquifer as an essential resource for the City, and protection of the natural environment through sound stewardship.

Underlying this common interest is a sense the City of Pasadena must commit, in deed, to the intent of its re-establishment of the area's Native American name: Hahamongna — flowing water, fruitful valley. This name is never used by PWP or the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

The Appellants have been clear that the ASCP EIR needs to be returned with instruction to include an "environmentally superior alternative" (required under CEQA) that adheres to the conditions of approval outlined by the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA).

The BZA conditions include:

1. Measuring the percolation capacity of the stream; maximizing that percolation and working to receive pumping credit for flows absorbed by the stream.
2. Providing for fish passage around or through structures in the stream in line with California Department of Fish and Wildlife codes.
3. Looking at ways to arrest the decline in our local aquifer.

The first meeting opened with discussion on the need to provide for fish passage from the outset of the project. It is well known now, and reported in the LA Times, that fish live in the Arroyo. This is contrary to the claim in the EIR that there are no fish.

The PWP position is that the project is better for fish than the current conditions. The project will have a grill to prevent fish being sucked into the diversion pipe; fish will be able to migrate upstream when the dam gate is down.

The Appellants pointed out that the new dam gate will only be down when flows exceed 25 cubic feet per second (cfs). This condition occurs only during, or shortly after, storm events. These high flows, compared to the norm, are not conducive to fish migration. Fish will migrate during spring and fall when flows are closer to 5 to 10 cfs. Under the project, the dam gate will be up at these rates, all flows will be diverted, no water will pass below the dam.

The Appellants clarified their position that provision for fish passage around or through any structure in the stream needs to be present right from the start of the project.

With this explanation, PWP engineer Brad Boman stated: "I apologize, the project does not provide for fish passage."

We spent time re-working the language in the fish mitigation measure of the EIR to what appeared to be a satisfactory outcome.

A second area of discussion at this first meeting focused on the ability of the natural processes in the basin to enhance percolation and help shore up the declining aquifer.

It was pointed out to PWP that a study they commissioned from Converse Consultants West, as long ago as 1995, found the spreading basin percolation rate to be "by orders of magnitude" worse than the rest of the basin.

Also, in 2000, the City of Pasadena commissioned Philip Williams and Associates (PWA) to look at options for water features to include in the Hahamongna Park Plan. The Williams Study, using the earlier Converse Study as a base, concluded the best water feature was to restore natural flows to the stream and hold water intermittently behind the dam. They estimated this strategy could improve aquifer re-charge by 160% in a normal rainfall year.

With this, PWP was asked how they could be so "incurious" about these scientific studies that the City paid for. The EIR shows percolation rates in the old JPL parking lot are worse than most of the spreading basins.

The Appellants pointed out that the Hahamongna Basin was a natural spreading basin... an alluvial fan — "fan", in this context, synonymous with "spread."

PWP and the City Attorney agreed that they should not be "incurious" about the science.

We discussed the need to measure the percolation capacity of the stream. The Appellants made clear the goal was for PWP to obtain pumping credit for flows percolated through the stream.

PWP expressed concern that the Raymond Basin Management Board (RBMB) might not approve pumping credit for natural percolation.

The Appellants pointed out that with clear measurement, the Appellants and the public can help support a PWP proposal to obtain pumping credit for stream percolation.

The RBMB is chartered to "ensure the sustainability of supply and protection from drought." There is a strong case to maximize the high percolation rate of the stream compared to the spreading basins.

The first meeting was productive, leaving the Appellants hopeful that progress had been made.

A week later, the Appellants received revised language from PWP based on the discussion. While language was changed on fish passage, much of the old contentious language remained. The changes represented no commitment that the project would provide for fish passage from the start. The plan to manually rescue stranded fish when the dam gates were up remained. There was still emphasis on "future" vs "current" fish in relation to steelhead trout. There was no acknowledgement that there are fish living in the Arroyo today.

Language on the measurement of stream percolation was inserted as an aside with no commitment that this should be a key part of the project.

The second meeting, held on July 1, was contentious.

The Appellants pointed out that the language provided by the City failed to reflect the tenor of the constructive first meeting.

David Reyes, City Planning Director, who was not present at the first meeting, stated that there was clearly no agreement and this should be allowed to go to litigation.

This was unhelpful. First, it presumes City Council will certify the EIR without question. It also relies on a public agency having tax payer funded attorneys to represent their position against the public. It shows unwillingness on behalf of the Lead Agent to follow the intent of CEQA and address issues with "meaningful public engagement".

Progress that seemed to have been made in the first meeting reverted back to an impasse.

PWP asked the Appellants to lay out in bullet points what they were looking for. The Appellants pointed out that this had already been done through memos and public comment.

However, after the second meeting, the Appellants submitted a document outlining what they felt needs to occur — including the provision for fish passage, measurement of stream percolation, and plans on how to arrest the decline in the aquifer. PWP informed the Appellants they could not support these requests.

PWP then asked for another continuation and the hearing was moved from July 12 to July 19. PWP wanted this time to "prepare."

We anticipate that PWP will urge the City Council on July 19 to certify the EIR. There will likely be a claim that new language buried in the Mitigation Plan meets the Appellants concerns. It does not.

The EIR must be returned to allow the CEQA process to continue in the public eye. A proper "environmentally superior alternative" must be considered. The Appellants' requests, and the BZA conditions, provide the framework for that alternative. PWP may claim that they are going to follow through, but CEQA requires "meaningful public engagement." Following through on these issues with no public review renders the process worthless.

There was agreement in the meetings that the CA Department of Fish and Wildlife will likely have requests that need to be met before permits can be issued. The Appellants' position is that the Department's Code requires provision for fish passage from the outset and the project design should be changed publicly to reflect that.

PWP would prefer to negotiate with CA Department Fish and Wildlife privately, out of the public gaze, no doubt with a City Attorney present; this allows PWP to apply maximum pressure on CA Department of Fish and Wildlife to assent to the current design. There will be promises to rescue fish stranded by their operations and build fish passage when "future" steelhead return to the Arroyo.

Similarly, measurement of the percolation capacity will be done privately by PWP. Perhaps by the same engineers who declared publicly that measuring stream percolation was "irrelevant."

The Appellants' position is that these activities should be conducted through the public CEQA process. The environmentally superior alternative should be circulated for public comment and review.

PWP may claim that further delay will damage the local water supply, or public grant funds might be lost due to delays. The fact is, PWP have yet to provide one scrap of science to support their claim that the project will "improve aquifer re-charge."

Sadly, too, the science that opened the window to a water conservation strategy 20 years ago has been ignored. Had there been the slightest curiosity about those studies we could have been banking water underground over the last two decades rather than letting it rot in surface ponds.

There is one tantalizing uptick in the graph marking the steady decline of our aquifer. This was over the 2009/10 rain season. That year there was no diversion because of the high debris flows after the Station Fire. Water flowed down to the dam and was held there for short periods. Wells up and down the Hahamonga basin rose by up to 20 feet and by 40 feet below the dam. The following year (2010/11) the wells dropped by an equivalent amount. Per the RBMB Annual Report for 2010/11 there was a 30% increase in precipitation that year, just a 4% increase in extraction, but a 70% increase in diversion. Water flowing in the stream in 2009/10 was diverted in 2010/11.

When confronted with this data in 2015, PWP responded that in 2009/10 the wells were all offline. However, the RBMB Annual Report for 2009/10 hints that if the stream is allowed to flow, and water is held for short periods behind the dam, the science from 1995 and 2000 appears to hold true. To the curious, this could be a path forward to slowing the decline in the aquifer.

Under the Williams Study, there was also provision for debris removal that could have provided an environmentally acceptable framework for removal of debris from the Station Fire.

Council needs to return this EIR with clear direction to develop an environmentally superior alternative. This alternative should be developed with "meaningful public engagement" and then re-circulated for public comment and review.

Certifying the EIR shuts the public out.

The public know the high stakes of this project: the protection and stewardship of our most valuable local resource, water.

Regards,

Hugh Bowles

> Please feel free to forward this e-mail to any interested parties.

> This e-mail is also submitted to the City Council "correspondence" e-mail to be included in the Council package for Agenda Item 13 on July 19, 2021.



## Martinez, Ruben

---

**From:** Kristen Ochoa <.....>  
**Sent:** Saturday, July 17, 2021 8:50 PM  
**To:** PublicComment-AutoResponse  
**Subject:** RE: Item 13, CUP 6222 Arroyo Seco Canyon Project

**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. [Learn more...](#)

Dear City Council Members, I oppose the Arroyo Seco Canyon Project because.....

We live in Pasadena close to the Arroyo. Our family has spent a significant amount of time there and the land, the plants and the birds are a treasure to us. It's this natural beauty that keeps us connected and invested in our city, and without water flowing in the natural streams, it will all be at risk.

Please don't go forward with this plan. Please create a better one.

--

Sent from Gmail Mobile

07/19/2021  
Item 13

**Martinez, Ruben**

---

**From:** I.  
**Sent:** Saturday, July 17, 2021 9:40 PM  
**To:** PublicComment-AutoResponse  
**Subject:** RE: Item 13, CUP 6222 Arroyo Seco Canyon Project

**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. [Learn more...](#)

Dear City Council Members:

As a member of both the Arroyo Seco Foundation and the Pasadena Audubon Society I wholeheartedly oppose passage of CUP 6222 allowing the \$14 million Arroyo Seco Canyon Project (ASCP) to proceed. This summer in particular, nature has directed us to rethink any 25-year water plan so that we may come up with the best water system and resource plan for the common good.

CUP 6222 should not pass. Any monies that would have been allocated, namely \$14 million, should not be invested in an outmoded plan, but used to come up with a modern and robust plan for the next generation.

Yours sincerely,  
Laura E Scott Sellers

Pasadena, CA 91104

07/19/2021  
Item 13



**Martinez, Ruben**

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 18, 2021 5:34 AM  
**To:** PublicComment-AutoResponse  
**Subject:** RE: Item 13, CUP 6222 Arroyo Seco Canyon Project

**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. [Learn more...](#)

Dear City Council Members, I oppose the Arroyo Seco Canyon Project because ASCP is foolish, old-school solution that will make the whole water problem much worse.

Ignore climate change and it will impact our state negatively.

Support this project and you will forever lose our votes.

The Anderson family - all voters who care deeply about this issue.

07/19/2021  
Item 13

**Martinez, Ruben**

---

**From:** Thomas Palfrey <  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 18, 2021 6:28 AM  
**To:** PublicComment-AutoResponse; Madison, Steve  
**Subject:** Item 13, CUP 6222 Arroyo Seco Canyon Project

**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. [Learn more...](#)

Dear City Council Members,

We are residents of the South Arroyo neighborhood and strongly oppose the Arroyo Seco Canyon Project because of the detrimental impact it will have on the fragile ecosystem of the Hahamonga and Arroyo Seco natural areas. CUP 6222 should NOT be approved, and the river should be allowed to continue to flow. Pasadena deserves a better plan that does not destroy one of the few year-round rivers in the San Gabriel Valley.

Steve Madison, we hope you are listening. Please vote against it!

Sincerely,  
Tom and Cheryl Palfrey

07/19/2021  
Item 13

## Martinez, Ruben

---

**From:** Linda Marquez < >  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 18, 2021 7:39 AM  
**To:** PublicComment-AutoResponse  
**Subject:** RE: Item 13, CUP 6222 Arroyo Seco Canyon Project

**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. [Learn more...](#)

Dear City Council Members,

I oppose the Arroyo Seco Canyon Project because it is a very short-sighted plan that will have long lasting negative impacts on the environment. As a society, we must stop these damaging choices and be responsible for the generations to come. We can do so much better than the current plan - so do better!

Thank you,  
Linda Marquez

07/19/2021  
Item 13

**Martinez, Ruben**

---

**From:** Susie Haleblian  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 18, 2021 9:21 AM  
**To:** PublicComment-AutoResponse  
**Subject:** RE: Item 13, CUP 6222 Arroyo Seco Canyon Project

**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. [Learn more...](#)

Dear City Council Members, I oppose the Arroyo Seco Canyon Project because:

- The Raymond Basin should be healed, not depleted.
- The native fish and wildlife in the Arroyo should be protected.
- A living, natural stream is a better way to conserve water than artificial spreading basins. Let the river flow.
- Pasadena Water & Power should be a steward of the natural resources it exploits.
- Pasadena Water & Power should listen to the community.
- ASCP is a foolish investment in the past. Develop a resilient plan for the future.
- PWP hasn't held a community meeting on water for more than 19 months.

Sincerely,

Susie Haleblian

07/19/2021  
Item 13

## Martinez, Ruben

---

**From:** Jo Anna Ritchey  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 18, 2021 1:32 PM  
**To:** PublicComment-AutoResponse  
**Subject:** RE: Item 13, CUP 6222 Arroyo Seco Canyon Project

**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. [Learn more...](#)

Dear City Council Members,

I oppose diverting the stream. It is rare, especially in So Cal to have a running stream. The idea of destroying it (which diverting it would) is awful. We have so few nature reserves as it is. This is a wonderful place, not just for Pasadena, but for people who live outside of Pasadena like me.

Jo Anna Ritchey  
Monrovia

I oppose the Arroyo Seco Canyon Project because.....

07/19/2021  
Item 13

**Martinez, Ruben**

---

**From:** Barbara Eisenstein  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 18, 2021 3:31 PM  
**To:** PublicComment-AutoResponse  
**Subject:** RE: Item 13, CUP 6222 Arroyo Seco Canyon Project

**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. [Learn more...](#)

Dear City Council Members,

I oppose the Arroyo Seco Canyon Project because diversion of water from the Arroyo Seco to spreading grounds will adversely affect wildlife and habitat along the Arroyo. For the past 15 years I have led volunteer work in South Pasadena's nature park - adjacent to the Arroyo Seco flood control channel. The re-creation of resilient habitat is critical for the health and well being of our region. All of the cities along the Arroyo should be working together to improve habitat, ultimately leading to the re-establishment of a hydrologically functioning waterway that will nurture the health of people and wildlife, and improve water quality. Each day we see more news of how our poorly thought out projects lead to environmental disasters. It is time to stop!

Thank you,  
Barbara Eisenstein  
Founder and Manager of Friends of South Pasadena Nature Park

07/19/2021  
Item 13

**Martinez, Ruben**

---

**From:** Peggy Stewart <p>  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 18, 2021 3:38 PM  
**To:** PublicComment-AutoResponse  
**Subject:** SAVE Trout

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. Learn more...<[https://mydoit.cityofpasadena.net/sp?id=kb\\_article\\_view&sysparm\\_article=KB0010263](https://mydoit.cityofpasadena.net/sp?id=kb_article_view&sysparm_article=KB0010263)>.

-----

Object to additional water diversion from Arroyo.

For last 40 years I have been studying and sharing Pasadena's extraordinary history. The Arroyo has been pivotal since the city's founding including the trout endemic to the stream. These fish are endangered in this habitat and historically significant. It is the responsibility of The City of Pasadena to protect the animals of the Arroyo.

Sincerely, Peggy Stewart

Sent from my iPhone

07/19/2021  
Item 13



\_\_\_\_\_

1. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 1997; 277: 1039-1043.

100% Confidential

[Home](#)
[About Us](#)
[Contact Us](#)
[Privacy Policy](#)
[Terms of Service](#)
[FAQ](#)
[Blog](#)
[Partners](#)
[Press](#)
[Careers](#)
[Sitemap](#)

1. *U. a. a.* 2. *U. a. a.* 3. *U. a. a.* 4. *U. a. a.* 5. *U. a. a.* 6. *U. a. a.* 7. *U. a. a.* 8. *U. a. a.* 9. *U. a. a.* 10. *U. a. a.* 11. *U. a. a.* 12. *U. a. a.* 13. *U. a. a.* 14. *U. a. a.* 15. *U. a. a.* 16. *U. a. a.* 17. *U. a. a.* 18. *U. a. a.* 19. *U. a. a.* 20. *U. a. a.* 21. *U. a. a.* 22. *U. a. a.* 23. *U. a. a.* 24. *U. a. a.* 25. *U. a. a.* 26. *U. a. a.* 27. *U. a. a.* 28. *U. a. a.* 29. *U. a. a.* 30. *U. a. a.* 31. *U. a. a.* 32. *U. a. a.* 33. *U. a. a.* 34. *U. a. a.* 35. *U. a. a.* 36. *U. a. a.* 37. *U. a. a.* 38. *U. a. a.* 39. *U. a. a.* 40. *U. a. a.* 41. *U. a. a.* 42. *U. a. a.* 43. *U. a. a.* 44. *U. a. a.* 45. *U. a. a.* 46. *U. a. a.* 47. *U. a. a.* 48. *U. a. a.* 49. *U. a. a.* 50. *U. a. a.* 51. *U. a. a.* 52. *U. a. a.* 53. *U. a. a.* 54. *U. a. a.* 55. *U. a. a.* 56. *U. a. a.* 57. *U. a. a.* 58. *U. a. a.* 59. *U. a. a.* 60. *U. a. a.* 61. *U. a. a.* 62. *U. a. a.* 63. *U. a. a.* 64. *U. a. a.* 65. *U. a. a.* 66. *U. a. a.* 67. *U. a. a.* 68. *U. a. a.* 69. *U. a. a.* 70. *U. a. a.* 71. *U. a. a.* 72. *U. a. a.* 73. *U. a. a.* 74. *U. a. a.* 75. *U. a. a.* 76. *U. a. a.* 77. *U. a. a.* 78. *U. a. a.* 79. *U. a. a.* 80. *U. a. a.* 81. *U. a. a.* 82. *U. a. a.* 83. *U. a. a.* 84. *U. a. a.* 85. *U. a. a.* 86. *U. a. a.* 87. *U. a. a.* 88. *U. a. a.* 89. *U. a. a.* 90. *U. a. a.* 91. *U. a. a.* 92. *U. a. a.* 93. *U. a. a.* 94. *U. a. a.* 95. *U. a. a.* 96. *U. a. a.* 97. *U. a. a.* 98. *U. a. a.* 99. *U. a. a.* 100. *U. a. a.*

## Martinez, Ruben

---

**From:** richard luczynski  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 18, 2021 4:13 PM  
**To:** PublicComment-AutoResponse; Williams, Felicia; Gordo, Victor; Jomsky, Mark; Pasadena Now; Madison, Steve; Rivas, Jessica; Masuda, Gene; Hampton, Tyron; Bawa, Gurcharan; Wilson, Andy; Tim Brick; Kennedy, John J.  
**Subject:** Appeal of Modification to CUP # 6222

**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. [Learn more...](#)

I find it quite interesting that there hasn't been a follow up story or notification effort by the Now News in this weekend's edition concerning what should be the most Important story that citizens should know about, " Water the life of the city"? I also haven't gotten a notice from my council representative of any of the details that should be related to the constituent? Likewise from our Mayor who has been silent on this project, which has been going on as he was a councilman in the city. This project is masked as a plain old CUP that has had legs from public comments from many citizens asking for the best project to be accomplished for the betterment of the entire community. What does the community know or hear from the less communicative PWP about the project? A couple of meetings years ago in which public input never saw the light of day. Should we go back and investigate the public input? See why there is opposition to the PWP plan. With wider eyes asking for a better plan and more cooperation to make a better plan. We find ourselves still waiting and losing more time to understand and fix the problem. This city as well as other cities of the valley continue to search for a more reliable water source. We are all going to have to share what we develop and will it be enough soon enough if we don't do even more conservation efforts first. We won't build our way out of this problem and the State Representatives need to pass laws that come with the resources to fulfill their wishes.

After all these years in the planning state, does PWP have a working Model that would help observe and better understand what a majority of Pasadena Residents have no idea of what the end product would look like? They have had plenty of time to prepare one. The problems probably existed before the 2009 fire and what efforts were put into place to save the runoff water we did get over that time? I'm pretty sure there must have been money spent. Just how much did we spend over these past 11 years rebuilding the flow into the Raymond Basin? How are the costs shared with the other water rights cities that share the basin? If every city pumps their share of water out of the Basin will there be any hope of refilling the basin. There just hasn't been enough communication done by PWP and other cities holding those water rights to understand how we will make up 250 ft. water lost in the basin. Especially when our drought continues and we are not sure where the Jet stream will be in next year's water year level. It will be hard to keep a large number of fish and plant life along the Arroyo Seco if water levels diminish but not completely dry out. Fish are hardy and with some help will find that cooler water to survive. If we can develop a plan for a working stream bed, the great hope to refill the Raymond Basin and create greater recreation possibilities will be a positive advantage to the city. There is the need to talk about buying excess water when it is available at market rates or better. Very little is talked about by PWP, they say because of costs but without water the city will not function.

There is so much more information that should be related to the public on Pasadena's water subject. As well as more time for public input. We need the best supported plan for greater Pasadena success.

Richard Luczynski

07/19/2021  
Item 13

**Martinez, Ruben**

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 18, 2021 4:40 PM  
**To:** PublicComment-AutoResponse  
**Subject:** July 19 - Item 13, CUP 6222 (Arroyo Seco Canyon Project)

**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. [Learn more...](#)

The Arroyo Seco Canyon Project (ASCP) is an ill-advised plan from the past which would contribute to the demise of the Raymond Basin Aquifer. **Depriving the Arroyo Seco of natural stream flow would destroy habitat for birds and fish as well as severely degrade Pasadena's largest open space area, part of the headwaters flowing into the Los Angeles River.**

The 800-acre-foot annual pumping credit which Pasadena Water & Power (PWP) hopes to gain from ASCP is virtually the same as the amount of potable (drinking) water currently used to irrigate the Brookside Golf Course.

PWP is stuck in its old ways, responding to criticism of ASCP, a 16-year-old project, by asserting that *they know best* instead of re-evaluating options for conserving water and taking the lead to preserve and protect the Raymond Basin Aquifer on which Pasadena depends for 30% of its municipal water. ASCP is not an appropriate or effective response to current long-term climate conditions and water shortages. **PWP should be a strong protector of the natural resources it exploits.**

**The City of Pasadena should stop the destructive Arroyo Seco Canyon Project and use the \$14 million to develop and implement a resilient water plan for the future.**

- Irrigate Brookside Golf Course with Grey Water
- Design and Implement a Smart Water Pricing Structure
- Collaborate with Public Works to Capture and Store Storm Water Runoff

**VOTE NO:** Resolution certifying the Final Environmental Impact Report

**VOTE NO:** Resolution adopting a Statement of Overriding Consideration

**VOTE NO:** Board of Zoning Appeal's decision and Modification to CUP No. 6222

Genette Foster  
Pasadena 91106

07/19/2021  
Item 13

**Martinez, Ruben**

---

**From:** NANCY JOHNSON  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 18, 2021 4:35 PM  
**To:** PublicComment-AutoResponse  
**Subject:** RE: Item 13, CUP 6222 Arroyo Seco Canyon Project

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. Learn more...<[https://mydoit.cityofpasadena.net/sp?id=kb\\_article\\_view&sysparm\\_article=KB0010263](https://mydoit.cityofpasadena.net/sp?id=kb_article_view&sysparm_article=KB0010263)>.

-----

Dear City Council Members,

I, Nancy Johnson, oppose the Arroyo Seco Canyon Project because it will severely change and damage the nature streambed water flow and destroy the habitat of natural vegetation and local birds, reptiles, and mammals. Any schoolchild could tell you it is "Anti Environment" in so many ways. It will destroy Nature as we know it.

Wrong, wrong, this is just a plain, misguided wrong action.

Future generations of historians and residents will disrespect you with contempt. Please, do not go forward with this travesty of a plan.

Nancy Johnson

Altadena, CA. 91001.

Sent from my iPhone

07/19/2021  
Item 13

**Martinez, Ruben**

---

**Subject:** FW: Breaking News

---

**From:** Tim Brick  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 18, 2021 6:09:23 PM  
**To:** Rivas, Jessica <[jerivas@cityofpasadena.net](mailto:jerivas@cityofpasadena.net)>  
**Subject:** Breaking News

<b>CAUTION:</b> This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you <i>know</i> the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. <a href="#">Learn more...</a>
---

Hi, Jess,

Here's some breaking news for you that is relevant to tomorrow's discussion of the Arroyo Seco Canyon Project. PWP General Manager Gucharan Bawa informed me in a message on Friday that PWP water division chief Mitch Dion "has decided to move on." ASCP Project Manager Elisa Ventura resigned several weeks ago.

As you know, ASF, Pasadena Audubon and some concerned residents have been concerned about the lack of focus on key issues related to Pasadena's water challenges, such as the presence of trout, the best way to conserve water in Hahamongna, and how to stop the decline of the groundwater level in the Raymond Basin. I hope that new leadership in the Water division can play a positive role in resolving many of these vital issues and developing a resilient water program.

Sincerely,  
Tim Brick

07/19/2021  
Item 13

**Martinez, Ruben**

---

**From:** Donna Sider  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 18, 2021 7:09 PM  
**To:** PublicComment-AutoResponse  
**Subject:** RE: Item 13, CUP 6222 Arroyo Seco Canyon Project

**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. [Learn more...](#)

Dear City Council Members,

I oppose the Arroyo Seco Canyon Project because ASCP is a foolish foot dragging denial. How can you claim to be serving residents when PWP hasn't held a community meeting in 19 months?!

STOP the depletion of Raymond Basin. It has begun to heal. We must protect native fish, 50+ bird species nesting nearby.

A living, natural stream is a better way to conserve water than artificial means.

PWP needs to listen to the community. BE a steward of the natural resources it exploits.

Develop a resilient plan for the future. How many times do we need to point out Pasadena does not even have a purple piping / recycled water program. START THERE. So far behind even UPLAND has purple piping..... (!)

Wake up climate change is HERE!!!

Donna Sider

07/19/2021

Item 13

**Martinez, Ruben**

---

**From:** Christina Wallerstein ✓  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 18, 2021 8:51 PM  
**To:** PublicComment-AutoResponse  
**Subject:** Arroyo Seco

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. Learn more...<[https://mydoit.cityofpasadena.net/sp?id=kb\\_article\\_view&sysparm\\_article=KB0010263](https://mydoit.cityofpasadena.net/sp?id=kb_article_view&sysparm_article=KB0010263)>.

-----

Responsible stewardship demands that we preserve our natural resources. Arroyo Seco is a natural treasure. It's a precious resource in our urban environment. We need to work together to do all we can to not only preserve but enhance this irreplaceable space and the fish and wildlife that reside there. Water too is a precious resource, one that all living creatures require. I urge the Council to adopt measures that both insure the preservation of Arroyo Seco and maximize water conservation. We need to work with nature, not against it. And we have the knowledge and expertise to do what's best. That means allowing the river to flow. Natural streams conserve water better than artificial spreading basins.

We have to respond to climate change and plan for a hotter and drier future. With that in mind, we have to stop depleting the Raymond Basin.  
Heal the Basin. Being good stewards requires nothing less.

Christina Wallerstein

07/19/2021  
Item 13



**Martinez, Ruben**

---

**From:** -  
**Sent:** Monday, July 19, 2021 4:10 AM  
**To:** PublicComment-AutoResponse  
**Subject:** RE: Item 13, CUP 6222 Arroyo Seco Canyon Project

**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. [Learn more...](#)

Dear City Council Members,

I oppose the Arroyo Seco Canyon Project.

For many years, Pasadena has tried to market itself as being environmentally friendly, when in fact the city in the last 45 years has been just the opposite. About twenty years ago I produced and directed a video for KPAS describing where Pasadena gets its water. Back then Pasadena was having to import about 60% of its water from the Colorado River, the Owens River, and later I believe started using water from the Sacramento Delta. The last 15 years or more has seen an incredible expansion of development within the city of huge multi-unit apartments and office spaces. Just the development and proposed development around the Sierra Madre Villa Gold Line Station alone will bring in close to 2000 additional residents to the city. That is 2000 more thirsty mouths drawing on the water supply and peeing and pooping and sending waste into the sewer and trash fill. And with them come probably 500 or more dogs and cats and pet birds also drinking the water and creating wastes. This expansion is not just around all the Gold Line stations. It is all over the city.

At some point, American politicians will have to come to terms with the erroneous idea that "what is good for business, is good for America." You are still caught up in Manifest Destiny that promotes the idea that every square inch of land must generate wealth and every drop of water must be diverted for human use. I don't know how many development projects I have seen in this town where they fooled the public by saying the massive new buildings offer "open spaces." That is pure BS. If you suck one more drop of water out of the Arroyo Seco, you will have accomplished the complete dismantling of the natural ecosystem. As far as I am concerned the quality of life in Pasadena has plummeted. Increasing the efficiency of water use will never be enough to overcome the fact that Pasadena is using up far more resources than it can produce within its water shed. Not only the water, but the natural gas, electricity, and petroleum. In addition, every green waste bin carried out of the city by the trash companies decreases quality of the topsoil. Please stop raping the environment. Wise up and finally deal with the massive population problems you in city government have created.

Sincerely,  
Kevin Cloud Brechner, Ph.D.  
TIME RIVER PRODUCTIONS  
TIME RIVER LABORATORY  
Pasadena, CA 91107

07/19/2021  
Item 13

## Martinez, Ruben

---

**From:** MARIETTA KRUELLS ✓  
**Sent:** Monday, July 19, 2021 6:40 AM  
**To:** Joan Hearst  
**Cc:** Hampton, Tyron; Kennedy, John J.; Masuda, Gene; Gordo, Victor; Madison, Steve; Wilson, Andy; Ventura, Elisa; Lori Paul; Ann Scheid; bourel; Tim Brick; Tim Wendler; kleford;

v;

**Subject:** Re: Arroyo Seco Canyon Project appeal to Council, 7/19/21. Where things stand:the citizen view.

**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. [Learn more...](#)

The appellants have clearly explained better methods for protecting and enhancing the Raymond Basin Aquifer. Why Pasadena chooses to ignore the health of our surface and underground water supply remains a mystery.

As the Raymond Basin Water Master continues to allow various water purveyors, especially, Pasadena, to claim to percolate water through an inefficient, ineffective manner, it will and does cause overdraft and subsidence. This is leading to the collapse of the aquifer. As this occurs, less and less local water will be available for pumping and more and more imported water will be necessary. This will be a crime.

We stand at a crossroads right now. The Water Master can and must modernize its approach to percolating, metering and crediting water. Pasadena can and must lead this effort. The science is there at our fingertips and better choices are evident.

Pasadena- DO THE RIGHT THING NOW!

Thanks to the appellants for leading this charge.

Marietta KrueLLs  
Lincoln Avenue Water Co. customer

07/19/2021  
Item 13

Sent from my iPhone

On Jul 18, 2021, at 6:59 PM, Joan Hearst <[redacted]> wrote:

Thank you, Hugh for a excellent statement outlining what we all want to see for the future of our precious Arroyo Seco.

You have my support.

To the Pasadena City Council...please add my name as a supporter of the requests made in this letter.

Thank you.

Joan Hearst

Pasadena, 91105

Joan

---

**From:** Hugh Bowles <[redacted]>  
**Sent:** Saturday, July 17, 2021 3:58:18 PM  
**To:** thampton@cityofpasadena.net <thampton@cityofpasadena.net>; johnjkennedy@cityofpasadena.net <johnjkennedy@cityofpasadena.net>; gmasuda@cityofpasadena.net <gmasuda@cityofpasadena.net>; Victor Gordo <vgordo@cityofpasadena.net>; smadison@cityofpasadena.net <smadison@cityofpasadena.net>; awilson@cityofpasadena.net <awilson@cityofpasadena.net>; Elisa <eventura@cityofpasadena.net>; Lori Paul

e