

**CORRESPONDENCE
FROM MAY 3, 2021
CITY COUNCIL MEETING**

Martinez, Ruben

Subject: FW: City funding for Orange Grove safety

From: _____
Sent: Saturday, May 1, 2021 9:01:56 AM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)
To: Kennedy, John <JohnJKennedy@cityofpasadena.net>
Cc: Gordo, Victor <vgordo@cityofpasadena.net>; Mermell, Steve <smermell@cityofpasadena.net>; Hampton, Tyron <THampton@cityofpasadena.net>; Williams, Felicia <fwilliams@cityofpasadena.net>; Masuda, Gene <gmasuda@cityofpasadena.net>; Masuda, Gene <gmasuda@cityofpasadena.net>; Madison, Steve <smadison@cityofpasadena.net>; Wilson, Andy <awilson@cityofpasadena.net>; cityclerk <cityclerk@cityofpasadena.net>; Jomsky, Mark <mjomsky@cityofpasadena.net>
Subject: City funding for Orange Grove safety

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 Mayor Gordo and Councilmembers,
Agenda Item 9, 2022-2026 Capital Improvement Program budget
Please include in the public record.

Keep Pasadena Moving is a grassroots organization dedicated to giving more Pasadenans a voice on important transportation and development issues. We believe this fosters better decision making and ultimately a better future for our city. We would like to express our enthusiastic support for projects 75097 and 75099 in the 2022-2026 CIP budget, for traffic signals at both **Orange Grove and Craig Avenues** and **Orange Grove and Sunnyslope Avenues**.

While both of these projects are currently unfunded, we would like to see them funded and pursued. We believe they will improve both safety and traffic flow in the area. The Sunnyslope signal has been on the CIP since 2015, and the Craig one has been on there since 2019 (and was also previously on there from 2007-2010). There is also support from both sides of the transportation spectrum in the city for the implementation of both of these signals, making implementation a win-win for everyone.

When I drive North on Craig I find that often people ahead of me go straight across, or turn left on Orange Grove in spite of the **Right Turn Only Striping** and **signs** in place. If there is not a policeman visible they ignore the striping. A signal would solve this problem by eliminating the need for Right Turn Only. If these signals were made demand only it would have little effect on the traffic flow on Orange Grove

We would strongly encourage/urge the council to allocate funding for both projects 75097 and 75099.

Thank you,
Dwight S Morgan

Pasadena CA 91104

Martinez, Ruben

From: cityclerk
Sent: Saturday, May 01, 2021 3:00 PM
To: Flores, Valerie; Iraheta, Alba; Jomsky, Mark; Martinez, Ruben; Novelo, Lilia; Reese, Latasha; Robles, Sandra
Subject: FW: Agenda Item 9 (2022-2026 Capital Improvement Program budget)

From: Jeff C <to:
Sent: Saturday, May 1, 2021 2:59:34 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)
To: Gordo, Victor <vgordo@cityofpasadena.net>; Mermell, Steve <smermell@cityofpasadena.net>; Hampton, Tyron <THampton@cityofpasadena.net>; Williams, Felicia <fwilliams@cityofpasadena.net>; Kennedy, John <JohnJKennedy@cityofpasadena.net>; Masuda, Gene <gmasuda@cityofpasadena.net>; Rivas, Jessica <jerivas@cityofpasadena.net>; Madison, Steve <smadison@cityofpasadena.net>; Wilson, Andy <awilson@cityofpasadena.net>; cityclerk <cityclerk@cityofpasadena.net>; Jomsky, Mark <mjomsky@cityofpasadena.net>
Subject: Agenda Item 9 (2022-2026 Capital Improvement Program budget)

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 Mayor Gordo and Councilmembers,

Please include in the public record.

I would like to express my enthusiastic support for new traffic signals at both East Orange Grove and North Sunnyslope and at East Orange Grove and North Craig avenues in East Pasadena. While both of these projects had some funding for 2021, I would like to see them fully funded and pursued. As a resident, I believe they will improve both safety and traffic flow in the area. There is also support from both sides of the transportation spectrum in the city for implementation of the North Craig signal, and I believe implementation of both of these signals would be a win-win for everyone. I would strongly encourage the council to allocate funding for both of the new signals.

Thank you,

Jeff Cyrulewski

05/03/2021
Item 9

Martinez, Ruben

Subject: FW: traffic signals

From: Steve Rayburn <sn>
Sent: Saturday, May 1, 2021 9:48:06 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)
To: Gordo, Victor <vgordo@cityofpasadena.net>; Mermell, Steve <smermell@cityofpasadena.net>; Hampton, Tyron <THampton@cityofpasadena.net>; Williams, Felicia <fwilliams@cityofpasadena.net>; Kennedy, John <JohnJKennedy@cityofpasadena.net>; Masuda, Gene <gmasuda@cityofpasadena.net>; Rivas, Jessica <jerivas@cityofpasadena.net>; Madison, Steve <smadison@cityofpasadena.net>; Wilson, Andy <awilson@cityofpasadena.net>; cityclerk <cityclerk@cityofpasadena.net>; Jomsky, Mark <mjomsky@cityofpasadena.net>
Subject: traffic signals

| |
|--|
| <p>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...</p> |
|--|

*Traffic signals at both Orange Grove and Craig Avenues and Orange Grove and Sunnyslope Avenues. I believe we don't need to waste money on traffic signals. I see no problems on Orange Grove. I see over building in Pasadena to be a problem! Where are you going to get all the water, power and parking for all this building plus th trash that it brings to dump and traffic that you make by over building? GOOD JOB PASADENA.
Steve Rayburn
Pasadena ca*

05/03/2021
Item 9

Martinez, Ruben

Subject: FW: Agenda Item 9 (2022-2026 Capital Improvement Program budget)

From: Jeff C

Sent: Saturday, May 1, 2021 2:59:34 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)

To: Gordo, Victor <vgordo@cityofpasadena.net>; Mermell, Steve <smermell@cityofpasadena.net>; Hampton, Tyron <THampton@cityofpasadena.net>; Williams, Felicia <fwilliams@cityofpasadena.net>; Kennedy, John <JohnJKennedy@cityofpasadena.net>; Masuda, Gene <gmasuda@cityofpasadena.net>; Rivas, Jessica <jerivas@cityofpasadena.net>; Madison, Steve <smadison@cityofpasadena.net>; Wilson, Andy <awilson@cityofpasadena.net>; cityclerk <cityclerk@cityofpasadena.net>; Jomsky, Mark <mjomsky@cityofpasadena.net>

Subject: Agenda Item 9 (2022-2026 Capital Improvement Program budget)

| |
|--|
| <p>CAUTION: 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. Learn more...</p> |
|--|

Dear Mayor Gordo and Councilmembers,

Please include in the public record.

I would like to express my enthusiastic support for new traffic signals at both East Orange Grove and North Sunnyslope and at East Orange Grove and North Craig avenues in East Pasadena. While both of these projects had some funding for 2021, I would like to see them fully funded and pursued. As a resident, I believe they will improve both safety and traffic flow in the area. There is also support from both sides of the transportation spectrum in the city for implementation of the North Craig signal, and I believe implementation of both of these signals would be a win-win for everyone. I would strongly encourage the council to allocate funding for both of the new signals.

Thank you,

Jeff Cyrulewski

05/03/2021
Item 9

RECEIVED

SONJA K. BERNDT
Pasadena, CA 91107

2021 MAY -3 AM 8: 33

CITY CLERK
CITY OF PASADENA

May 2, 2021

Mayor Victor Gordo
Members of the Pasadena City Council
Pasadena, CA
(By email to correspondence@cityofpasadena.net)

Re: Agenda Item #9: Capital Improvement Program Budget Items of \$4.2 Million (Total) to be Funded from the General Fund to Renovate the Police Department Building and Develop a Mobile Command Center Truck

Dear Mayor Gordo and Members of the City Council:

The City Manager has recommended that the Council adopt, at its May 3, 2021 meeting, the proposed Fiscal Year 2022-2026 Capital Improvement Program Budget. That proposed budget includes \$3 million from the General Fund for the renovation of the Police Department Building. The proposed budget also includes \$2.2 million for the design and construction of a new Mobile Command Center Truck (“MCC Truck”) and related expenditures, \$1.3 million of which is to be funded from the General Fund.

In better times, perhaps these expenditures could be considered. But we have just endured a prolonged pandemic and are just now emerging from it. Families and businesses are burdened with substantial debt. Many of our residents have lost jobs, and/or are housing insecure and fear eviction. We have an affordable housing shortage that is beyond critical. And tragically, we have hundreds of persons experiencing homelessness who sleep on the streets every night. Instead of renovating the Police Department Building at this time, we should be using our General Fund to address all of these crises in the coming fiscal year and beyond.

Attachment D to Agenda Item #9, at page 5, says the funds from the General Fund for the building renovation and MCC Truck are necessary “as there were critical public safety and workplace elements that needed to be addressed.” But according to the City’s project description of the Police Department Building Renovation, the renovations and improvements include “creating a more open floor plan,” painting,

upgrading flooring, a new kitchen addition to the Large Assembly Room, new furniture and computers for the First Floor, and upgrading the break room with new furniture, paint and ceiling tile replacement. (Recommended FY2022-2026 CIP Budget, Tab 2, pp. 1.8-1.9.) The description does not support the assertion that \$3 million are needed for “critical” renovations of the Police Department Building.

Juxtapose that description with a description of the plight of our unsheltered residents: persons pushing grocery carts filled with all they have to stay alive; persons with plastic ponchos as their only shelter from the rain or cold; and persons clearly suffering from substantial health or mental health problems that remain unaddressed. And while persons experiencing homelessness in our City have suffered the most during the pandemic, many, many other residents live in fear of losing their jobs, losing their housing, or even having enough food to feed their families.

Will there be sufficient funds in the General Fund this coming fiscal year to address these urgent human crises? The Council has to look ahead and weigh each request for funds from the General Fund to help ensure that sufficient funds are available to meet the most pressing needs of our residents. In April 2020, during the pandemic and without competitive bidding, the Council authorized the expenditure of \$420,000 from the General Fund for a helicopter camera surveillance system *to replace a system that was still functional*. Last winter, our City did not have sufficient resources to provide motel vouchers to all unsheltered persons during the rain and cold.

Budgets are moral documents. You have the awesome power to decide the priorities of our City and whether you will use our financial resources to protect our most vulnerable residents. I urge you to scrutinize the Capital Improvement Program Budget, and reject the budget items related to the Police Department Building Renovation and the MCC Truck. Thank you.

Sincerely,

/s/

Sonja K. Berndt, Esq. (retired)

Cc: *Pasadena Now*

Martinez, Ruben

From: Ken Perry ·
Sent: Sunday, May 02, 2021 7:52 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Let's Finally Install Traffic Signals on East Orange Grove

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>.

Please post add my comment to Item #9 on the May 3 Agenda.

Dear Council:

Another year, another pass on new traffic signals at Sunnyslope and Orange Grove and at Craig and Orange Grove.

It's way past time to install these two signals. They have been on the approved CIP list for years - and have broad support from residents in East Pasadena.

Please fund these two projects and install the signals. They will help increase safety along Orange Grove and better protect drivers, cyclists, walkers and pets who live and travel in East Pasadena.

I join with my neighbors and insist these two signals be installed. Please listen to your constituents.

Ken Perry
East Pasadena Resident
91104

Sent from my iPad

05/03/2021
Item 9

Martinez, Ruben

Subject: FW: Agenda Item 9, 2022-2026 Capital Improvement Program budget

From: Jeanette Mann

Sent: Sunday, May 2, 2021 9:00 AM

To: Jomsky, Mark <mjomsky@cityofpasadena.net>

Subject: Agenda Item 9, 2022-2026 Capital Improvement Program budget

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 Mayor Gordo and Councilmembers,

I am writing in support of funding Agenda Item 9, 2022-2026 of the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) budget: the traffic signal at East Orange Grove and North Craig and the traffic signal at East Orange Grove and North Sunnyslope.

As many of you know I have appeared before the City Council many times in the past several years with concerns about the accidents at the intersection of East Orange Grove and North Craig. Although a traffic signal has always been the preferred solution, the response I've received has always been that there was no funding for this signal. Last fall there was another fatality at this intersection—a young woman was killed in a single car accident at 2:00 a.m.

As a member of Keep Pasadena Moving, a grassroots organization dedicated to giving more Pasadenans a voice on important transportation and development issues, I no longer feel like a voice crying in the wilderness. We would like to see both of these projects funded and pursued. I believe they will improve both safety and traffic flow in the area. The Sunnyslope signal has been on the CIP since 2015, and the one at Craig has been on there since 2019 (and was also previously on there from 2007-2010). There is also support from both sides of the transportation spectrum in the city for the implementation of both of these signals, making implementation a win-win for everyone.

I strongly urge you to allocate funding for both projects 75097 and 75099.

Thank you,
Jeanette Mann

Pasadena, CA 91104

05/03/2021
Item 9

Martinez, Ruben

Subject: FW: Agenda Item 9 (2022-2026 Capital Improvement Program budget)

From: Susan Buchanan <susan.buchanan@cityofpasadena.net>
Sent: Monday, May 3, 2021 10:52:17 AM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)
To: Gordo, Victor
Cc: Wilson, Andy; Masuda, Gene; Mermell, Steve; Hampton, Tyron; Williams, Felicia; Kennedy, John; cityclerk; Rivas, Jessica; Madison, Steve
Subject: Agenda Item 9 (2022-2026 Capital Improvement Program budget)

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>.

Dear Mayor Gordo and Councilmembers,

The Daisy Villa neighbors and others have requested a traffic signal at Sunnyslope and Orange Grove for over 20 years. This signal, and one at Craig, was also promised to us as part of the safety measures to be implemented when the Orange Grove road diet was removed from the city's plans. As has happened many times in the past, it is promised but remains unfunded. Surely this is just the type of project that would reduce speed and promote pedestrian safety.

I ask that they be included in the upcoming CIP for 2021 and ask that they be fully funded and implemented.

Thank you,
Susan Buchanan
Pasadena resident

05/03/2021
Item 9

RECEIVED

Comments on "Public Hearing: City Manager's Recommended Fiscal Year 2022-2026 Capital Improvement Program Budget, and Adoption Of Fiscal Year 2022 -2026 Capital Improvement Program Budget"
Pasadena City Council May 3, 2021 Meeting (Agenda Item 9)

MAY 03 AM 11:57
CITY CLERK
CITY OF PASADENA

We have concerns regarding the Fiscal Year 2022-2026 Capital Improvement Program Budget with regard to its relationship to the 2020 Water System and Resources Plan that has been developed by Pasadena Water and Power (PWP) but is not expected to be reviewed by the Municipal Services Committee before June 22, 2021. The following comments are offered with regard to those concerns.

The Water System and Resources Plan was finalized in December 2020. It is inexcusable for PWP to have not brought it forward through the Municipal Services Committee for approval by the City Council prior to inclusion of certain projects in the Water System Capital Budget. Those projects are discussed below.

Arroyo Seco Canyon Project (Priority 3). This FIER for this project has been certified by the Hearing Officer and that action has been appealed and confirmed by the Board of Zoning Appeal. Those decisions have been appealed to the City Council and a hearing has not been scheduled. At issue in that appeal are questions regarding impacts on the Arroyo Seco ecology as well as potential for there to be an adverse impact on the Raymond Groundwater Basin. With regard to the Raymond Basin impacts, we have expressed concerns with the dire conditions regarding the systemic decline in Raymond Basin groundwater levels and failure of the WSRP to address those concerns.

Approval of the ASCP capital budget funding for FY 2022 will give the appearance that the City Council has improperly pre-determined its conclusions prior to hearing the arguments regarding FEIR certification.

Local Non-Potable Water Project (priority 17). This project depends on water from two sources: contaminated well water at two wells in the Arroyo Seco area and ponded water diverted upstream of Devil's Gate Dam.

Contaminated well water. This component of the LNPWP is not "new water" and is simply directing the pumped groundwater to a new customer that can use non-potable supplies for irrigation at a capital cost of more than \$3 million. Other options for use of that safe yield are discussed here but were not evaluated in the WSRP:

- Treatment of the well water similar to that being done for two other wells in the same area (see "Treatment Systems"/CIP Priority 22)
- Construction of two new wells in areas that do not pose similar water quality concerns
- Blending with treated groundwater and imported water

What is unclear about this component of the LNPWP is whether the water will be sold at the same rate as potable water or a different rate (the latter approach would raise Proposition 218 issues). The answer to this question should be clear since facilities have been constructed in the current fiscal year to deliver well water to Muir High School.

05/03/2021
Item 9

Ponded water diverted upstream of Devil's Gate Dam. This plan relies on installation of a pumping system by the Los Angeles County Department of Public works to capture ponded water upstream of Devil's Gate Dam. While LACDPW has done some feasibility investigations, there is no indication that the project will be constructed in the near future.

What complicates this LACDPW project moving forward is the determination by the State Water Resources Control Board that the Arroyo Seco flows have been fully appropriated (see https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/fully_appropriated_streams/docs/fas_maps/los_angeles.pdf).

Notwithstanding the above issues, the Capital Budget projects building a \$4 million pipeline to deliver the water pumped by the LACDPW to Pasadena's spreading basins in FY 2022.

It is worth noting that the total cost of this project element in the WSRP is projected to be at least \$7 million while the Capital Budget is \$4.91 million. Furthermore, the overall cost of the LNPWP once delivery of water to the east-side of Pasadena on built-out could be as high as \$17 million.

While this is not a "new project", the scope of the project has changed from that described in the FY 2021-2025 budget document but is not included in Attachment C to the Agenda Report. The "piecemealing" of this project has the potential to raise issues under CEQA that may very well arise with the first major construction project in FY 2022.

Treatment Systems (Priority 22). This project includes treatment facilities for water produced from the Wadsworth, Woodbury and Craig wells in east Pasadena but that project is not even mentioned in the WSRP as an option for consideration. It is worth noting is that an Eastside Well Collector and Centralized Disinfection Facility Project was completed in 2016 at a cost of about \$8 million with the express purpose of "blending of well water, in reservoirs, to meet current and future water quality regulations."

Non-Potable Water Project (Priority 24). Under the guise of modifying the project description for this project, the budget document creates a new project that has as its purpose the acquisition of potable water from the City of Los Angeles. This is another proposed project that was not discussed in the WSRP and should have been discussed in Attachment B to the Agenda Report (not Attachment C).

Additionally, the budget document refers to "Pasadena's recycled water rights from the Los Angeles-Glendale Water Reclamation Plant." Given PWP's history with the Non-Potable Water Project that was approved in 2016, this assertion that there is an existing right should be questioned.

The above issues should be explored through the WSRP process prior to appropriating funds through the Capital Budget.

Ken Kules PE, Pasadena Resident (District 4)

Morey Wolfson, Pasadena Resident/Former EAC Commissioner (District 3)

Tim Brick, Arroyo Seco Foundation (District 3)

Martinez, Ruben

From: Anthony Manousos <
Sent: Monday, May 03, 2021 12:17 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Concern about additional funding for police. Item #16

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 Mayor and City Council members,

I am writing out of concern that the Proposed Capital Improvement Program Budget includes \$3 million from the General Fund to renovate the Police Department Building and another \$1.3 million from the General Fund to develop a Mobile Command Center Truck. I urge you to eject those budget items and, instead, use the General Funds to alleviate suffering in our City and address our multiple human crises, especially with regards to our homeless neighbors.

I am also writing to express my disappointment with the Police Chief's response to the savage beating of Christopher Ballew by out-of-control Pasadena police who were clearly not upholding the moral and ethical standards that we have a right to expect. I agree with the letter sent to you by the Clergy Community Coalition calling on the **"Pasadena Police Department and the Pasadena Police Officers' Association to adopt and demonstrate a proactive model of being community Peace Officers that hold all of their officers to a higher standard of accountability that serves their mission, rather than the reactive model that is focused on the letter of the law."** Until the police demonstrates a real commitment to making sure that police beatings and killings do not recur, I don't feel that it is not appropriate to reward the police department with funds that could be better used for more urgent needs.

Sincerely,

Anthony Manousos

05/03/2021
Item 9

Martinez, Ruben

From: Jill Shook · n>
Sent: Monday, May 03, 2021 12:31 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse; sonja.berndt19@gmail.com
Subject: re; for #9 on the agenda. Thank you for posting. Jill Shook

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'd like for you to rethink the 4.2 million CPI expenditure for the Police. Here's why:
What makes for public safety? If is it safer in wealthier neighborhoods, then let's address economic inequities. For years the N. Fair Oaks Empowerment Initiative has been seeking CIP funding make a safer community for a neglected corner of Pasadena from Washington to just above Montana on Fair Oaks. While we appreciate the role of police to keep the area safer, we know the parts of Pasadena are deemed unsafe too often have its roots in inequality and racism. Older Black clergy remember grocery stores, professional offices, a thriving restaurant—a sense of place and community with more affordable housing as a tool to revitalize with eyes on the street which help to keep it safe. Affordable housing has been listed a crime deterrent. Rather than add \$4.2 million to the \$80 million police budget, the city would do well to invest more in equality, the things that make for safety on N. Fair Oaks (complete street in this area, trees, more cross walks), affordable housing (the Housing department receives only \$1.5 million from the general fund) and cost-effective homeless prevention programs that could really use some help right now (i.e. Friends in Deed, Lake Ave. Church's homeless prevention). It is much more cost-effective to keep people housed, as opposed to helping them once they experience homelessness. Keeping people in their homes is a smart and wise investment. I highly recommend that you rethink the additional \$4.2 million for the police department and instead invest in what makes for a safer and more equal community. Too many African Americans and Latinos are killed in high-speed traffic in places like N. Fair Oaks, let's look at safety measures that make for a city that won't need so much policing by doing all we can to undo years of racial inequity.

Jill Shook, Missions Door, Catalyst <http://> _____ [jill](#)
Doctor of Ministry, Bakke Graduate School
Blog: _____ at Websites: _____ and _____
Author/Editor: *Making Housing Happen: Faith Based Affordable Housing Models*
1 Phone: _____

05/03/2021
Item 9



Martinez, Ruben

Subject: FW: Agenda Item 9

From: Doris Christy <dchristy@cityofpasadena.net>
Sent: Monday, May 3, 2021 12:39:30 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)
To: Gordo, Victor <vgordo@cityofpasadena.net>; mermell@cityofpasadena.net <mermell@cityofpasadena.net>; Hampton, Tyron <THampton@cityofpasadena.net>; Williams, Felicia <fwilliams@cityofpasadena.net>; Kennedy, John <JohnJKennedy@cityofpasadena.net>; Masuda, Gene <gmasuda@cityofpasadena.net>; Rivas, Jessica <jerivas@cityofpasadena.net>; Madison, Steve <smadison@cityofpasadena.net>; Wilson, Andy <awilson@cityofpasadena.net>; cityclerk <cityclerk@cityofpasadena.net>; Jomsky, Mark <mjomsky@cityofpasadena.net>
Subject: Agenda Item 9

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 Mayor Gordo and Councilmembers,
Agenda Item 9, 2022-2026 Capital Improvement Program budget
Please include in the public record.

Keep Pasadena Moving is a grassroots organization dedicated to giving more Pasadenans a voice on important transportation and development issues. We believe this fosters better decision making and ultimately a better future for our city. We would like to express our enthusiastic support for projects 75097 and 75099 in the 2022-2026 CIP budget, for traffic signals at both Orange Grove and Craig Avenues and Orange Grove and Sunnyslope Avenues.

While both of these projects are currently unfunded, we would like to see them funded and pursued. We believe they will improve both safety and traffic flow in the area. The Sunnyslope signal has been on the CIP since 2015, and the Craig one has been on there since 2019 (and was also previously on there from 2007-2010). There is also support from both sides of the transportation spectrum in the city for the implementation of both of these signals, making implementation a win-win for everyone.

We would strongly encourage/urge the council to allocate funding for both projects 75097 and 75099.

Thank you,
Doris Christy

Here's the emails of City Council that you can use:

05/03/2021
Item 9

To: Pasadena Mayor Victor Gordo; City Councilmembers Hampton, Mastala, Kennedy, Williams, Rivas, Madison, and Wilson; City Clerk Mark Jomsky

From: Arroyo Seco Foundation, Ken Kules, Hugh Bowles, Laura Solomon, and Morey Wolfson

Date: May 3, 2021

Subject: **Response to PWP's submission that seeks further funding for the \$13,961,754 Arroyo Seco Canyon Project. Agenda Item #9**
[Public hearing: City Manager's recommended fiscal year 2022 – 2026 capital improvement program budget and adoption of fiscal year 2022- 2026 - Arroyo Seco Canyon Project - Item 1040]

RECEIVED
MAY -3 PM 1:16
CITY CLERK
CITY OF PASADENA

The Arroyo Seco Foundation, Ken Kules, Hugh Bowles, Laura Solomon, and Morey Wolfson (“we”) have prepared this response to the Pasadena Department of Water and Power’s (“PWP” or “the Department”) budget submission. This response was prepared for the **purpose of supplying Council** with several matters to consider, and to **offer recommendations**.

Over 700 Pasadena residents have signed the following petition:

We believe the Arroyo Seco Canyon Project and Pasadena's 25-year Water System and Resources Plan, will have detrimental impacts on the habitat, wildlife and water resources in Hahamongna and the Arroyo Seco. We urge the City of Pasadena to protect the natural character of region's greatest environmental treasure by:

- *Using a living stream to capture storm flows and protect precious habitat;*
- *Ensuring an adequate environmental flow for fish and wildlife during the dry season; and*
- *Committing to a plan to stabilize and replenish the Raymond Groundwater Basin.*

Budget submission Item 1040 requests that the Council commit further City financial resources towards the Arroyo Seco Canyon Project (“ASCP” and “the project”). The Department estimates the total project cost at \$13,961,754. To simplify matters, we use a **\$14 million figure**.

We ask the Council to inquire whether the Department has estimated what year they expect the project to yield a simple **return on investment (ROI)**. Subject to check, as detailed below, we estimate that the project **may not achieve a ROI for a minimum of approximately 22 years**. Furthermore, once the City begins receiving a positive ROI, the benefit will be \$640,000 per year. Under the most positive scenario, that distant benefit would only represent an approximate 3% reduction in the City’s approximate average \$22 million cost of water supply, and a reduction of about 1% in the Water Division’s expenses.

We recommend that the Council-

- Direct the Department to end any further work on the \$14 million ASCP.
- Reject the ASCP as a financially unsound investment due to the length of time to yield a return, and due to the minimal size of the annual benefit once the ROI is achieved.
- Adopt a City policy that protects the Arroyo Seco stream, so it naturally percolates water in to the basin.
- Direct that any funds in the Department’s ASCP account be transferred to water efficiency and water conservation accounts.

Pasadena's water supply – information to consider

- Pasadena uses **~30,000 AF** of water per year.
- The water source percentages change each year, given water availability from the region's two major water sources – the State Water Project, and the Colorado River Aqueduct.
- In recent years, on average, **~ two-thirds** of PWP water is purchased from our regional wholesale water supplier - the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (“MWD,” “Met,” or “Metropolitan”). Other wholesale water suppliers do not exist. Other alternative water sources, such as recycled water or desalination will not be available for at least a decade, and the cost of that water will likely be at least double that of MWD's current cost of water.
- PWP purchases **~20,000 AF/Y** from MWD at **~\$1,000/AF**. This equals an annual purchase cost of **~\$20 million** (the actual in 2020 was \$21.8 million).
- About **one-third** of PWP's water is sourced from Raymond Basin (or “the basin”) ground water, managed by the Raymond Basin Management Board (RBMB).
- PWP pumps **~10,000 acre-feet** from the basin. We calculated it at a cost of **~\$200 AF**. This equals **~\$2 million** per year. (Note that \$200 AF was used to yield the most conservative result. PWP's document “Recharging our Groundwater” (October 2019) states the cost of local groundwater is \$500 AF). If the pumping costs are closer to \$500 AF, the payback for the ASCP will be extended by many years.
- **~\$22 million** is PWP's **combined expense for procuring water** from both MWD and the basin.
- PWP's most recent **annual water revenue was ~\$62 million**.
- About two-thirds of the Department's Water Division's costs are dedicated to the **delivery** and **administrative** cost elements. About one-third is to pay for **water supply**.

Item 1040 states the estimated cost of the project at **~\$14 million**.

We note that the Draft Water Resources and System Plan (**WSRP**), which may come before the Municipal Services Committee and Council in June 2021, had estimated the project cost at **\$7.4 million** (WSRP 5/2020 Appendix F – Water Supply and Options, Page 3).

Council may want to consider seeking clarification on the difference in dollar estimates.

Our financial analysis

PWP's primary justification for the project is to achieve the City receiving a net financial benefit by paying a **lower unit water cost** for more water pumped from the basin, presumably avoiding a higher cost for the same amount of MWD water.

With the exception of the \$14 million ASCP cost, we express all acre-feet and dollar figures as approximations or averages.

To simplify the analysis, we have excluded:

- Speculative future increases in PWP's cost to purchase MWD water.
- Speculative future increases in pumping costs that PWP pays to further draw down water from the basin.
- Speculation about future inflation rates, interest rates, discount rates, etc.
- Consideration of consulting and other expenses that PWP has incurred on the ASCP since it was created as a project in 1995, and first funded in 2001.

A summary regarding the ROI

- We compare PWP's average payment of ~\$200/AF in pumping costs to extract basin ground water to the ~\$1000/AF that PWP pays for MWD water.
- When PWP opts for basin water, it achieves a substantial unit cost saving of ~\$800/AF.
- We then multiply the \$800/AF savings times the presumed new 800 AF/Y that ASCP may receive in pumping rights.
- This yields \$640,000 in projected annual savings to the City.
- How many years must lapse before the \$640,000 in annual savings "pays" for the ASCP?
- We are open to correction if found to be in error. **We determined that the ROI may be approximately 22 years.**

Method

- Assume that the ASCP's diversion of water from the streambed would achieve its stated objective of gaining ~800 AF per year in pumping credits.
- Assume that PWP's aim is to forego purchasing \$1000/AF MWD water, replacing that purchase with 800 AF of water at a cost of \$200/AF that the project is hoping to pump beyond that which is currently approved by the RBMB.
- **Multiply the ~\$800/AF unit savings realized by paying for basin water times the ASCP diverted water pumping credits (~800AF/year) that PWP would seek from the RBMB in the way of new pumping credits due to the diversion.**
Savings of ~\$800/AF * ~800/AF/year from basin water = ~\$640,000 per year.
- **The annual savings in PWP's water cost would be ~\$640,000.**

\$640,000 per year in savings sounds impressive. **But how long will it take before the ASCP would yield a return on investment (ROI)?**

- The cost of the ASCP is \$14 million, excluding any cost overruns.
- The completion may take four years - perhaps 2025.
- After completion, PWP would theoretically start saving ~\$640,000/year in water cost, conditioned by how much water actually flowed in the Arroyo Seco.
- **ROI: \$14 million divided by ~\$640,000 equals a payback in ~22 years.**
- After theoretically saving ~\$640,000/year in water costs, **Pasadena would expect to see a return on the \$14 million investment in 2047.**
- We question if a more profitable investment would be preferred.

ASCP Environmental Impact Report procedural update

- A Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the ASCP was prepared. Despite comments presented on a variety of factual matters by a variety of organizations and individuals, the FEIR was certified in January 2021 by a City of Pasadena Hearing Officer.
- That action was appealed, and the matter was heard by the City's Board of Zoning Appeals ("BZA" or "the Board").
- The Board approved the FEIR with conditions that bent slightly favorable to the appellants, and the conditions may likely not have been welcomed by the applicants - PWP.
- Those decisions have been appealed by the Arroyo Seco Foundation, the Pasadena Audubon Society, and others, to the City Council and a hearing has not been scheduled
- At issue in that appeal are questions regarding impacts on the Arroyo Seco ecology as well as potential for there to be an adverse impact on the basin. We have expressed concerns with the systemic decline in the basin's groundwater levels, and the inability of the WSRP to adequately address the decline. We urge the Municipal Services Committee and Council to review the FEIR.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide the Council with this information.

Martinez, Ruben

Subject: FW: CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

From: Russell Bukoff <russellbukoff@cityofpasadena.net>
Sent: Monday, May 3, 2021 1:09:29 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)
To: Gordo, Victor <vgordo@cityofpasadena.net>; Mermell, Steve <smermell@cityofpasadena.net>; Hampton, Tyron <THampton@cityofpasadena.net>; fwiliams@cityofpasadena.net <fwiliams@cityofpasadena.net>; Kennedy, John <JohnJKennedy@cityofpasadena.net>; Masuda, Gene <gmasuda@cityofpasadena.net>; Rivas, Jessica <jerivas@cityofpasadena.net>; Madison, Steve <smadison@cityofpasadena.net>; Wilson, Andy <awilson@cityofpasadena.net>; cityclerk <cityclerk@cityofpasadena.net>; Jomsky, Mark <mjomsky@cityofpasadena.net>; KeepPasadenaMoving <contactKeepPasadenaMoving@gmail.com>
Subject: Fwd: CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

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 Mayor Gordo and Councilmembers,
Agenda Item 9, 2022-2026 Capital Improvement Program budget
Please include in the public record.

Keep Pasadena Moving is a grassroots organization dedicated to giving more Pasadenans a voice on important transportation and development issues. We believe this fosters better decision making and ultimately a better future for our city. We would like to express our enthusiastic support for projects 75097 and 75099 in the 2022-2026 CIP budget, for traffic signals at both Orange Grove and Craig Avenues and Orange Grove and Sunnyslope Avenues.

While both of these projects are currently unfunded, we would like to see them funded and pursued. We believe they will improve both safety and traffic flow in the area. The Sunnyslope signal has been on the CIP since 2015, and the Craig one has been on there since 2019 (and was also previously on there from 2007-2010). There is also support from both sides of the transportation spectrum in the city for the implementation of both of these signals, making implementation a win-win for everyone.

We would strongly encourage/urge the council to allocate funding for both projects 75097 and 75099.

In addition, I would like all projects related to the Pasadena Bicycle Program and Bike Lane Improvements be suspended for the time being as a result of a bicycle safety and outreach program (Program) not being reviewed before the public and successfully implemented. I was informed a couple of years ago by then-Councilperson Gordo that there was a Program in effect; however, I have not seen evidence of a Program successfully implemented as bicyclists ride down sidewalks nearly knocking pedestrians down, ride down streets the wrong way, do not stop at intersections with signals or stop signs, and

behave like they are immune to the rules of the road. I understand the City allows people to ride on sidewalks, even though the State considers bicycles to be motor vehicles in terms of the vehicle code, but the City needs to re-assess if the public safety is served by this allowance before Program projects are funded and approved.

Thank you,

Russell W. Bukoff

Pasadena, CA. 91104

Martinez, Ruben

Subject: FW: Agenda Item 9 (2022-2026 Capital Improvement Program budget)

From: Janet Cooper ·

Sent: Monday, May 3, 2021 1:15:54 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)

To: Gordo, Victor; Mermell, Steve; Hampton, Tyron; Williams, Felicia; Kennedy, John; Masuda, Gene; Rivas, Jessica; Madison, Steve; Wilson, Andy; cityclerk; Jomsky, Mark

Subject: Agenda Item 9 (2022-2026 Capital Improvement Program budget)

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>.

Subject: Agenda Item 9 (2022-2026 Capital Improvement Program budget)

Dear Mayor Gordo and Councilmembers,

Please include in the public record.

I would like to express my enthusiastic support for new traffic signals at both East Orange Grove and North Sunnyslope and at East Orange Grove and North Craig avenues in East Pasadena. While both of these projects had some funding for 2021, I would like to see them fully funded and pursued. As a resident of Daisy Villa for over 20 years, I believe they will improve both safety and traffic flow in the area. There is also support from both sides of the transportation spectrum in the city for implementation of the North Craig signal, and I believe implementation of both of these signals would be a win-win for everyone. I would strongly encourage the council to allocate funding for both of the new signals.

The residents of Daisy Villa have requested the traffic signal at Sunnyslope and Orange Grove for many years. And we continue to oppose any road diet on Orange Grove.

Thank you,

Janet Cooper
District 4 - Daisy Villa 20 years

05/03/2021
Item 9

B.R.E.A.T.H.E. JUSTICE 365

May 3, 2021

RE: AGENDA ITEM #9. Reject \$5.2 million Pasadena Police Department Projects.

Dear Pasadena City Council Members

As a collective of Pasadenans striving for justice and equality in our City, we write to ask you to **reject the addition of two new capital improvement projects for the Pasadena Police Department totaling \$5.2 million.**

If these projects are of importance to the Pasadena Police Department (PPD), they possess the means to re-allocate their current resources to fund the projects. **A recent budget breakdown study revealed that reduction in PPD overtime spending alone would equate to a savings of \$4.6 million per fiscal year.**¹ Furthermore, officer-involved shootings and beatings of Pasadena residents continue to cost Pasadenans millions of dollars in settlements.

Our community viewed the brutal beating of Christopher Ballew by PPD officers Lujan and Esparza with our own eyes.² Allegedly stopped for having no front license plate, Ballew was insulted, cursed at, beaten, had his face slammed into the ground, and suffered numerous lacerations and a broken leg bone. Despite compelling video evidence including Officer Lujan's body worn camera footage (officer Esparza did not activate his body worn camera until after Ballew's beating), and the footage of a bystander, the Pasadena Police Department took nearly *four years* to police themselves, and only last month, announced that neither officer would be fired from the Department.

City funding of the Pasadena Police Department must be focused on improving police-community relations, eliminating racially biased policing, and eliminating pre-textual stops as they, too often, result in violence or the death of Pasadena residents.

When you watch the news and view the unrest in communities across the nation due to minority populations' frustration with policing, please remember that these same incidents happen right here in Pasadena.

Do not reward a police department that declines to hold its officers accountable for their actions with more money for pet projects, especially when they appear to demonstrate improper use of previously allocated resources. Reject the two proposed projects and corresponding funding requests.

Respectfully Submitted,

The B.R.E.A.T.H.E. Justice 365 Team

A Pasadena-based collective of physicians, attorneys, executives, educators, clergy, activists, parents and everyday citizens united for equity in policing.

05/03/2021
Item 9

References

1. Virani, A., Gasser-Ordaz, L. (2021). "Pasadena Police Department: A Budget Breakdown" Criminal Justice Program, UCLA School of Law. https://law.ucla.edu/sites/default/files/PDFs/Criminal_Justice_Program/PPD.Budget.Brief.2021.pdf?fbclid=IwAR3451bcvjDR-TycSYtyPGqGTvK3k9roGuMQdEBP1FRAtdpXeBtwIRKUAgE
2. Staff. June 15, 2018. "Civil Rights Attorney Says Police Officers Deliberately Lied about Chris Ballew Beating." Pasadena Independent. <https://www.pasadenaindependent.com/news/civil-rights-attorney-says-police-officers-deliberately-lied-about-chris-ballew-beating/>

Martinez, Ruben

Subject: FW: Catering too much to bikers

From: Kim santell

Sent: Monday, May 3, 2021 3:56:31 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)

To: Gordo, Victor <vgordo@cityofpasadena.net>; Mermell, Steve <smermell@cityofpasadena.net>

Cc: Hampton, Tyron <THampton@cityofpasadena.net>; Williams, Felicia <fwilliams@cityofpasadena.net>; Kennedy, John <JohnJKennedy@cityofpasadena.net>; Masuda, Gene <gmasuda@cityofpasadena.net>; Rivas, Jessica <jerivas@cityofpasadena.net>; Madison, Steve <smadison@cityofpasadena.net>; Wilson, Andy <awilson@cityofpasadena.net>; cityclerk <cityclerk@cityofpasadena.net>; Jomsky, Mark <mjomsky@cityofpasadena.net>

Subject: Catering too much to bikers

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 Mayor Gordo and Councilmembers,
Agenda Item 9, 2022-2026 Capital Improvement Program budget
Please include in the public record.*

Keep Pasadena Moving is a grassroots organization dedicated to giving more Pasadenans a voice on important transportation and development issues. We believe this fosters better decision making and ultimately a better future for our city. We would like to express our enthusiastic support for projects 75097 and 75099 in the 2022-2026 CIP budget, for traffic signals at both Orange Grove and Craig Avenues and Orange Grove and Sunnyslope Avenues.

While both of these projects are currently unfunded, we would like to see them funded and pursued. We believe they will improve both safety and traffic flow in the area. The Sunnyslope signal has been on the CIP since 2015, and the Craig one has been on there since 2019 (and was also previously on there from 2007-2010). There is also support from both sides of the transportation spectrum in the city for the implementation of both of these signals, making implementation a win-win for everyone.

We would strongly encourage/urge the council to allocate funding for both projects 75097 and 75099.

*Thank you,
Kim Santell*

05/03/2021
Item 9

Martinez, Ruben

From: Allison Henry <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, May 03, 2021 4:35 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Item 9 City Council Agenda 5-3-21

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 and Mayor;

Greetings, I am a long-time tenant resident of Pasadena, and active in housing issues. I write re the Capital Improvement Program Budget, specifically the items related to the Police Department budget: the building renovation and the MCC Truck.

Please reject these items--that same amount of money could be used as additional housing and rental assistance. The community has voiced often that housing costs are high, and that people are drowning. We know that more people applied for rental assistance than received it. Please reconsider putting those funds instead into additional housing and rental funds to prevent homelessness and crushing debt from unpaid/back rent for tenants in Pasadena. Keeping people housed is also ensuring public safety. The proposed expenditures also seem a little "tone deaf" given the year humanity has had, and where funds can be effectively used.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Allison Henry

Pasadena resident 91104

05/03/2021
Item 9