

RECEIVED

2022 MAR 11 AM 9:11

March 10, 2022

CITY CLERK
CITY OF PASADENA

**Ken Kules' comments on the Recommended Water Rate Adjustments
(Pasadena City Council 3-14-2022 Meeting, Agenda Item 14)**

The City Council must not approve the recommended ordinance change that would recover water supply costs through the Capital Improvement Charge (CIC) for the following reasons:

Water Ordinance Section 13.20.030 requires water supply costs to be recovered through the Commodity Rates.

It is clear that Water Ordinance Section 13.20.030¹ requires that costs associated with water supply be paid for by revenues collected under the Commodity Rates and not the CIC. Pasadena Water & Power has asserted that the language limits those costs to O&M costs and are not intended to cover capital costs but the ordinance language does not make that distinction. Accordingly, capital costs associated with new groundwater wells, groundwater treatment facilities, surface water diversion/replenishment or any other local supply source "shall" be paid for through Block 1 of the Commodity Rates.

Shifting cost-recovery for water supply from the Commodity Rates to the CIC would erode the strong signal to consumers to conserve water that is built into the Commodity Rates that will be further strengthened when budget-based pricing is considered in future rate proceedings.

The American Water Works Association Manual M1: "Principles of Water Rates, Fees, and Charges" (AWWA M1) - the water industry standard for setting rates - discusses water rate structures and the relationship between those rate structures and water conservation.

Pasadena's Commodity Rates are "Increasing Block Rates" as defined by AWWA M1 and this is what AWWA M1 says about Increasing block rates and conservation (emphasis added):

*Properly designed increasing block rates recover class-specific cost of service while **sending a more conservation-oriented price signal** to that class.²*

*Increasing block rates should be considered by a water utility when the utility...**Would like to send a strong conservation price signal**³*

*Increasing block rate structures, designed for revenue neutrality and differentiated by customer class, may allow a utility experiencing supply cost escalations to send consistent price signals to customers. For this reason and **because of the heightened interest in water conservation, increasing block rates have been increasingly favored, especially in relatively water-scarce regions.**⁴*

¹

https://library.municode.com/ca/pasadena/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=TIT13UTSE_CH13.20WASERA_13.20.030SECHRA

² AWWA M1, p. 111

³ *ibid*

⁴ AWWA M1, p. 112

*Increasing block rate structures are usually considered to be **conservation oriented**. The most conservation-oriented rate structure maximizes the consistency of the price signal. Under a properly designed increasing block rate structure, no customer within a given class and using similar amounts of water should be rewarded more or less than another customer for saving water. If properly designed, **increasing block rates can send an appropriate conservation signal to certain customer classes.***⁵

Increasing block rate structures have found growing use in areas experiencing growth in water demand that is reaching the safe yield or capacity of the system, where there has been an impetus for improved efficiency in water use. In these areas, there can be a payoff to using price as a demand management tool. Such conservation-oriented rate structures require additional analysis to avoid the over- or underrecovery [sic] of revenue requirements. When legally defensible, utilities willing to undertake the additional analysis in rate design and conduct customer communications may find that increasing block rate structures are valuable tools in the effort to provide demand-side management.⁶

The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) urges water agencies to adopt conservation pricing in water rates:⁷

Conservation pricing is an effective tool to prevent wasteful water use. As a result, it is an important part of the portfolio for local water agencies' efforts to conserve water in the short- and long-term.

Directive 8 of Governor Jerry Brown's April 1, 2015 Executive Order B-29-15 promotes water conservation pricing mechanisms.

All of the Best Practices/Examples cited by the SWRCB include increasing block rates.

Conservation is a key tool in the recently-approved Water System and Resources Plan. Shifting costs for water supply from the Commodity Rate to the CIC as proposed will shrink the "pool" of costs that will be recovered through conservation pricing and weaken the conservation incentives in the water rates. This should not be acceptable as a matter of City Council policy.

⁵ AWWA M1, p. 113

⁶ AWWA M1, p. 116

⁷ https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/drought/pricing/



BRIAN VAN DER BRUG Los Angeles Times

HOUSEBOATS on a receding Lake Oroville last year. "Our drought conditions are becoming more threatening with climate change," an official said Thursday.

'Critical time' to conserve

Citing meager winter precipitation, officials urge Californians to reduce water usage.

BY IAN JAMES

The start of this year has been the driest in California's history. With the severe drought now in a third year, the state faces depleted reservoirs, a meager snowpack in the Sierra Nevada and a

worsening water shortage on the Colorado River.

Under sunny blue skies in Sacramento, where it hasn't rained in two months, officials stood Thursday in front of a mulch-covered garden and appealed for Californians to save water.

"We're asking all Californians to step up," said Wade Crowfoot, secretary of the California Natural Resources Agency. That means reducing water usage immediately and also taking steps that will help conserve

in the long run, he said, such as replacing grass with drought-tolerant plants, or switching to water-saving appliances.

"Our drought conditions are becoming more threatening with climate change," Crowfoot said. Warmer winters are reducing the snowpack that accumulates in the Sierra Nevada, he said, and hotter temperatures in the spring and summer "mean that more of that snow absorbs into very dry

[See Drought, B2]

[Drought, from B1]
soils or evaporates into the air.”

In July, Gov. Gavin Newsom called for Californians to voluntarily reduce water use by 15%. Most areas of the state have fallen far short of that target.

The latest conservation figures for cities and towns across the state through December showed cumulative water savings of 7.5% compared with a year ago, and that’s “not going to be enough” in many communities, said Joaquin Esquivel, chair of the State Water Resources Control Board.

The levels of many major reservoirs in California, from Lake Oroville to the San Luis Reservoir, remain far below average. The snowpack in the Sierra Nevada, which feeds the state’s reservoirs, now stands at just 60% of average for this time of year.

Large water suppliers throughout the state have responded with drought measures including advertising campaigns that encourage conservation. The state’s Save Our Water campaign, together with the State Water Contractors, released an animated video to spread the message. With the handwritten slogan “Doing your part” on a whiteboard, the video shares water-saving tips, such as installing drip irrigation systems, using a smart irrigation controller and taking five-minute showers.

The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California has announced it is spending an additional \$10.5 million to expand its ad campaign calling for the public to conserve.

“Our reservoirs continue to decline, and so we are really in a critical time to move on our efforts to fortify our water supply,” Adel Hagekhalil, MWD’s general manager, told the district’s board this week.

In announcing the expanded advertising campaign, Hagekhalil said the less water Southern California uses now, “the longer we can stretch these stored supplies into the summer and fall, and next year, if needed.”

During the last drought, which lasted from 2012 to 2016, the state imposed mandatory conservation measures and required local agencies to meet water-saving targets. The conservation gains made then have had a lasting effect in reducing residential water use.

State officials haven’t yet turned to mandatory restrictions during the current drought, which began in 2020. They have instead focused so far on strengthening requirements for local water agencies to create more comprehensive contingency plans for water shortages.

“Right now, we’re working with our local water agencies and really being very clear about our expectation that they’re stepping up and they’re taking action through those water shortage contingency plans, which may involve mandatory restrictions on a local or regional basis,” Crowfoot said.

Heather Cooley, a water researcher at the Pacific Institute, said she thinks California needs to strengthen its response and shift to mandatory restrictions.

“Given how severe the drought is and how low our reservoirs are, and the low snowpack, I’m not sure 15% is enough. We’re going to have to do more,” Cooley said.

Cooley said the last drought showed that conservation mandates work. California has over the last several years developed better data on water use and efficiency, she said, which can be used to create more customized mandates that

reflect the local drought conditions as well as past progress on conservation.

Southern California relies on imported water from the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta and the Colorado River, both of which have been severely affected by the drought.

The Colorado River supplies water for approximately 40 million people and vast farmlands from Wyoming to Mexico. The river has long been overallocated, and the levels of its reservoirs have declined dramatically during the stretch of hot, dry years since 2000.

Scientists have found that the extreme dryness across the West, from Montana to northern Mexico, is now the driest 22-year period in at least 1,200 years, a megadrought that research shows is being worsened by humanity’s heating of the planet.

Water cutbacks have already taken effect for Arizona and Nevada, and officials representing California agencies recently joined those two states in an agreement to take less from the river.

The declines on the river have worsened during the dry winter. Lake Powell, one of the river’s two major reservoirs, has declined to about 25% of full capacity.

Water managers with the federal Bureau of Reclamation said this month that the reservoir on the Arizona-Utah border will soon decline below a key threshold of 3,525 feet elevation. Officials had agreed on that threshold in 2019 because if the reservoir declines to 3,490 feet, the water would reach “minimum power pool,” the lowest point at which Glen Canyon Dam can generate hydropower.

There is now a 1 in 4 chance that could happen in 2023 or 2024, according to the latest projections from the federal government.

Jomsky, Mark

From: richard luczynski
Sent: Tuesday, March 1, 2022 5:36 PM
To: Thomas, Shari; Gordo, Victor; Williams, Felicia; Jomsky, Mark; Pasadena Now
Subject: Re: Questions - Pasadena Water Rates Adjustments

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...](#)

Shari, Here are a few of my new Questions:

You mentioned that we have 18 water wells in your last presentation. I have a Table 4-1 resource that says only 9 wells are active, the others are out of service because of water quality or mechanical issues. Could you tell us now what the real numbers are? Data Sept. 2020

The Table 4-1 underlines the contaminants for each well. They all seem to state they have Nitrates in the water. So tell us more about what nitrates are and what they do to our health?

The same thing can be asked about Perchlorate? It looks like 6 of the active 9 wells have Perchlorate to treat in the wells? Could you tell us what the health risk is for Perchlorate?

We the people of Pasadena really don't know what is in the water we drink. We have to rely on your words. So tell us more about the treatment process? Tell us more as a wonderful community of health providers just how many people in our community have water borne problems such as thyroid disease that could be caused by drinking water. If it wasn't a problem then why treat with additional chemicals?

I'm not against raising our water rates. I'm against not making it fair when who pays the lion share of the bill. I'd like to hear more about the total water connections with heavy water user who deduct the costs where residents get no rebates. We are just asked to conserve more and our thank you is a water raise and PEP's is another pay raise.

Richard

On Tue, Mar 1, 2022 at 4:59 PM richard luczynski wrote:

Shari, Here we go again. Not one question was given a straight answer. Can't you give me 5 straight numbers instead of sending me on another diversion?

I asked for an allotment number? Again another diversion response. (What amount did we purchase) That wasn't the question but it can be another to add.

My third question I didn't ask if we used 100% of our available water. Do you know what gallons and acre feet numbers represent that people can understand?

Question 4 is really far out with your answer. There wasn't one.

Question 5: another dud for an answer. You must be making up your answers at one of your silent meetings?

What ever happened to those "WILL Serve Letters" for the 20 years period? does that really mean nothing anyway? I would hope that any new development projects would have to satisfy Water, Power, Sewer, Trash determinations before building. Our Planning Department make the rules and whatever they want gets done. If you asked the public if Pasadena was already big enough what would their answer be?

Question 6 another diversion. There aren't really any new Federal standards and they all, even the State standards change. My question was is the water safe? Why can't anyone speak and write an answer to a questions? You seem to always turn to someone else to get the answer. What do you get paid to do? Please start communicating with the public

On Tue, Mar 1, 2022 at 1:37 PM Thomas, Shari

wrote:

03/14/2022
Item 14

Dear. Mr. Luczyski,

Thank you for your recent participation in the virtual public meeting to discuss Pasadena's recommended adjustments to the water rates. We appreciate your thoughtful questions and your interest in Pasadena's Water System.

In response to the questions you raised in writing through the Mayor's office, I have attached two documents:

1. General information about the recommended increases for the Public Hearing
2. Specific responses to the written questions you submitted - please note that some of your questions have been paraphrased to add clarity so other customers may also benefit from the responses

Just a reminder that the recommended rates are scheduled to be considered by the City Council at a Public Hearing scheduled for Monday, March 14, 2022 at 5:00 p.m. Thank you again for your valued interest and participation in the activities of PWP.

Shari

Shari M Thomas
Assistant General Manager
Pasadena Water and Power
626-744-4515
sthomas@cityofpasadena.net

-----Original Message-----

From: richard luczyski
Sent: Wednesday, February 16, 2022 3:29 PM
To: Gordo, Victor <vgordo@cityofpasadena.net>
Subject: Virtual Public Outreach Meeting - Water Rates Adjustments

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://ww5.cityofpasadena.net/water-and-power/event/waterratesmeeting0216/>

I have several questions to ask for tonight's meeting on why water rates need revaluation. I will list them starting with number one

- 1) How much do we pay for MWD water now and what did we pay these past 5 years?
ELENA/CLARENCE/CHRIS - copy of MWD's rate schedule from 2018-2022 (effective January 1 of each year when MWD does its effective rate increases)
- 2) What is Pasadena's water Allotment from MWD today and what has it been the past 5 years?
BRAD/GARY/ROUMIANA - someone in water who is familiar with PWP's purchases from MWD - how much did PWP purchase, what is the contractual allotment if there is any limit?
- 3) What amount of water have we used from that allotment these past 5 years?

BRAD/GARY/ROUMIANA - this is about whether or not PWP is using 100% of the MWD water available for us to use. This is a simple percentage calculation of what was delivered to PWP/maximum amount that PWP could get. If it is essentially unlimited, we can say that.

4) What will be our entitlement if the drought continues and our ground water continues to be depleted?

BRAD/GARY/ROUMIANA - does MWD have a formula for limiting deliveries to its member agencies in prolonged drought conditions? What happens if there are multiple years of zero allocation on either the Colorado or State Water Projects?

5) You mentioned insufficient rates now to meet projected revenue for the future. How far out is your future projections? Why haven't we

stated all the new water needed for all the new construction that has been built and is continuing to be built without considering the need for

all that new water? Wouldn't those estimates have been factored into the past rates even though conservation of water by the residents

has taken place?. We need more details on your projections?

ELENA/CLARENCE/CHRIS - PWP uses a five-year projection cycle and we can respond to how water costs are included in the projections.

BRAD/GARY/ROUMIANA - assuming the Water department is engaged with Planning and Economic Development at some level, what is the response about PWP's ability to provide a sustainable water supply to new projects? General response only, here.

6) I think we are in greater need of information concerning our ground water use? Is it safe to drink, even though we know there are toxic

chemicals to be treated for public safety. We hope to use more ground water for citizens needs but will it have been treated to a

standard greater than State and Federal Standards without taking any shortcuts in the treatment process whatever that is now?

ELENA/CLARENCE/CHRIS - include links to publicly available reports on Pasadena's water quality.

I will have other comment but would like to hear answer I have proposed first.

Richard Luczynski

your committee is working on. This is a problem, your committee will be visible and it has been.

I noticed that the question from Patricia Williams wasn't answered in the story. It was defused with an straight answer. PWP are you telling the residents of Pasadena that this water increase is going to be an aging water infrastructure? Or will you continue to come back and say the same thing 3 years from now, maybe 5 years from now? I never see PWP having public meetings, even with timely mean meeting explaining our water system in some details using real numbers of costs. It seems to me that you have an unlimited credit card that no one get to view and makes excuses to your desires. Why is it that all new construction of larger buildings that get building bonus's, get more water for the bonus? Water that should be part of conservation efforts the residents are having to pay for as rates go higher. All the new equipment used for the new buildings that PWP is now responsible for over time cost so much more than our standard water meters, now read by new methods using satellites. Maybe what is needed is a break down all users of water by each council district as well as the water we supply for non Pasadena residents who get water from our system? Let's see the break down from all commercial users including all those that use district water bills on their taxes. Normal residents can't have that advantage. Talk some more about advertising Raymond Basin water? More about toxic chemicals? Neutralizing them for safe use for consumption. For description of our Water system, the life of Pasadena is very vague. The city seems to think that the amount of water is unlimited and rain will come to save us. I was looking at the tree rings of a 100 year tree and the yearly life the rings were wide. Then there was a time for 40 years in a row that the rings were very close together that maybe a drought lasted for an extended time. Maybe the climate is changing. Information from Planet Lab to give us an idea of our daily water needs and if we can save it.

Jomsky, Mark

From: richard luczynski
Sent: Tuesday, January 25, 2022 11:15 AM
To: Williams, Felicia; Jomsky, Mark; Wilson, Andy; Gordo, Victor; Tim Brick; Hampton, Tyron; Masuda, Gene; Kennedy, John J.; Madison, Steve; Rivas, Jessica; Pasadena Now; Flores, Valerie
Subject: Today's water department discussion

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...](#)

Felicia, Once again I seem to get my news from the Now News when relating to city Business. I'll bet you won't get a handful of comments from your district and that's because no one has any clue about how the water department works. They turn on their water and it still comes out but I see big changes coming on who will be able to use a declining water supply for a city not using future planning needs by continuing to over build the city demand. I have a body of questions I've asked the water department with equal amounts of answers. Some of those answers just don't relate to the questions.

In today's discussion the first thing I would like to know is why are we beginning the discussion talking about the supply starting in 2025 - 2040? Why not start with today's water supply and all the proposed new buildings including hotels which will use most of today's water supply. Why are homeowners who have been the backbone of Pasadena the ones who will suffer the most? We don't get to deduct our water bills on our taxes like all the businesses are allowed to do. Homeowners have landscaping to preserve in the form of our tree inventory to start. Many trees in our district are dying already and the plan will be to cut back even more in the future. Who is going to police how many people are in your residence to see that the correct amount is used each day?

I have great interest in the Raymond Basin water table where toxic chemicals exist and a complete inventory of where they exist I believe is unknown. So as the basin starts to get filled those chemicals will move around with the new water coming in. I'm told that perchlorate acts just like water. So more testing will need to be done just for this one chemical and a blending of MWD water and other added chemicals will be needed to make water safe to drink. If not possible thyroid problems will be inflicted on an unknowing public. It would be nice to have our water department give the interested public water tours of the water filtration system. Our water department does so little to advise the public about our water in live discussions even before Covid.

I'd like to know how much it costs to pump our existing water from the Basin and if we will use even more when we get the water. What will that cost add up to? How many acre feet are now pumped in a year? What is our water allotment per year from MWD.

Tell us more about the lost water that never gets billed out to a customer? I've heard it is 8% of our water use? How come PWP is talking about excess water being bought from MWD and stored when I was told MWD doesn't sell discount water, it is allowed to flow to the ocean.

Tell us more about a desalination program and what that will cost?

Lastly for now: What is parcel level water infiltration? Why a mystery term I've not heard before?

So Felicia I do hope your commission (MSC) does a good job asking questions and getting answers today for questions asked instead of getting back to you later?

Richard

:

03/14/2022
Item 14

Jomsky, Mark

From: richard luczynski
Sent: Wednesday, February 16, 2022 3:29 PM
To: Gordo, Victor
Subject: Virtual Public Outreach Meeting - Water Rates Adjustments

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://ww5.cityofpasadena.net/water-and-power/event/waterratesmeeting0216/>

I have several questions to ask for tonight's meeting on why water rates need revaluation. I will list them starting with number one

- 1) How much do we pay for MWD water now and what did we pay these past 5 years?
- 2) What is Pasadena's water Allotment from MWD today and what has it been the past 5 years?
- 3) What amount of water have we used from that allotment these past 5 years?
- 4) What will be our entitlement if the drought continues and our ground water continues to be depleted?
- 5) You mentioned insufficient rates now to meet projected revenue for the future. How far out is your future projections? Why haven't we stated all the new water needed for all the new construction that has been built and is continuing to be built without considering the need for all that new water? Wouldn't those estimates have been factored into the past rates even though conservation of water by the residents has taken place?. We need more details on your projections?
- 6) I think we are in greater need of information concerning our ground water use? Is it safe to drink, even though we know there are toxic chemicals to be treated for public safety. We hope to use more ground water for citizens needs but will it have been treated to a

standard greater than State and Federal Standards without taking any shortcuts in the treatment process whatever that is now?

I will have other comment but would like to hear answer I have proposed first.

Richard Luczyski

Iraheta, Alba

From: Greg Haines
Sent: Monday, February 28, 2022 1:07 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Cc: Ojeda, Christopher
Subject: Implementation of Water Rate Adjustments

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 am not available to attend the March 14, 2022 meeting on this subject, and therefore am submitting comments via email.

My calculations indicate that the proposed D&C increase is 7.4%, the Commodity Rate increase is 22%, and the CIC increase is 12%. The proposed increase in revenue is to "contribute to the financial stability of the Water System" It's not clear that the commodity costs will actually increase by 22%, nor is it clear how the increased revenue from the commodity charge will be used. The commodity charge is by far the largest part of the water bill, and therefore the 22% increase is particularly challenging for many homeowners, especially seniors with large lots. Also, the 4 Block tiered rate structure based solely on meter size compounds the effect of the 22% increase.

I was a participant in the Pasadena Water Rates Study Group in November, 2016. The resulting cost of service study and recommendations of the study group were never implemented. Proposition 218 requires that the cost of service be the basis behind the water rates.

I believe that this proposed increase in water rates should not be implemented until the rate structure is revised to conform with Proposition 218. Pasadena Water and Power has been in non-compliance with Proposition 218 for many years now, and should delay this proposed increase. Now is not the time to raise rates using an outdated and unfair system that was to be replaced by one developed 5 years ago.

Many of the citizens of Altadena were instrumental in initiating the Howard Jarvis lawsuit of July 2018 that required Pasadena to remove the surcharge added to Altadena residential water bills.

Sincerely,
Greg Haines

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

03/14/2022
Item 14

Flores, Valerie

From: Jeff Bird
Sent: Tuesday, January 25, 2022 3:02 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Written protest to water rate adjustment

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...](#)

Implementation of Water Rate Adjustments

Billing address:

I would like to express my disapproval of the proposed water rate increase that will be discussed March 14th.

This increase would produce about 7 million dollars over the next 2 years without any mention of what it will be used for or why it is needed.

Are we operating a efficient water and power department that these funds are not already available elsewhere? These tax increases have not been justified by the department and seem to come at an inopportune time when many are out of work or working reduced hours due to the pandemic.

The water and power department has asked for these large increased fees without explanation of why they are needed or showing that they are already efficiently using the funds collected. For these reasons I strongly oppose this rate increase.

Thank you for the opportunity to give my opinion.
Jeff Bird

RECEIVED

2022 MAR 11 PM 1:18

Vicky L. Thomas
300 Manford Way
Pasadena, Ca 91105

CITY CLERK
CITY OF PASADENA

March 10, 2022

Re: City Council Meeting 3/14/2022; Agenda item 14 -- Approval of Recommended Water Rate Adjustments
Mayor Gordo and Councilmembers,

Most of us understand the need for water system stability. And, we can see the necessity for expanding "housing availability" our city leaders are trying to balance, which in turn, puts pressure on our current infrastructures. We question if the need to raise the water rates by 3.8 million is driven more by the need to update infrastructures for "high density" housing rather than "system stability", which has not been defined.

The current and proposed billing system for water employed by Pasadena Water and Power imposes inequitable rates on the residents of Pasadena's many and diverse low-density neighborhoods, many of which are historic.

When the last increase went into effect in **2019**, I contacted Pasadena Water & Power to protest the inequity in the **"BLOCK distribution"** system which I find, few of the Pasadena residents understand. I live in the San Rafael Hills on a large lot and I expect to pay more for water than the owner of a home on a smaller lot. But I don't believe it is right that I pay an escalating "penalty" for that water. Logically, a larger piece of land will require more water even if I consume less per foot than the smaller lot.

But, consider "high density" multi-unit development. On a single acre of property, we see development as high as 87 units per acre, or even more. But, for the sake of analysis, assume a lower density of 8 units per acre. Each of those individual units is allotted 96 HCF. Should each unit use all of their 96 HCF, a total of 768 HCF (8 x 96), and the associated bill at BLOCK 1 rates equals \$1,112.46.

But if I, an individual homeowner, consumes 768 HCF, the charge is **\$2,558.71**¹ or more than twice that of the high-density dweller for the exact quantity of water used on the SAME SIZE PROPERTY! This is because each additional Block of water is charged at ever higher rates!

This is inequitable!

Some points for the City of Pasadena leaders to consider:

- The **"BLOCK Commodity"** rates now in place makes it impossible for an "Individual" homeowner to avoid penalty billing rates UNLESS we abandon any notion of preserving landscaping around our homes.
- A large part of Pasadena's charm and real estate value is derived from tree lined streets and beautiful yards. Pasadena even participates in replacing trees lost through development and windstorms. When did growing trees and having landscaping become the new "Anti-Tobacco" movement? Does Pasadena argue with the concepts of "Green Belts?"
- The tiered BLOCK rates favor high-density multi-tenant structures and remarkably, the higher the density rate, the more subsidy allotted! In fact, high-density housing actually consumes **MORE** water

¹ Block 1 = 96 HCF @ \$1.44852 or **\$139.05**; Block 2=280 HCF @ \$3.07637 or **\$861.38**; Block 3 = 204 HCF @ \$3.60615 or **\$735.65**; Block 4 = 188 HCF @ \$4.37569 or **\$832.62**. A total of 768 HCF = **\$2,558.71** . **Same 768 HCF on one acre property.**

per ACRE than the individual resident! Is it high-density development that is putting pressure on the old Infra-structure that once had a one-inch pipe to provide the water to an individual residence, now re-zoned multi-family, thus requiring a larger pipe size? And, if that is the case, shouldn't the high-density developers pay, not only for the upgrades to their development site, but also the upgrades the city now needs as well? And, we are NOT talking about affordable housing being developed. These are multi-million dollar condos and very high market rate rental units!

- Some suggest we are out of water. If we don't have enough water for existing residents, how does the city justify approving more multi-family dwellings? Is it fair to charge us onerous rates so developers can "stuff" more people into our city?
- Many scientists now question if "Xero-scape" landscaping schemes are actually contributing to global warming. Concurrently, they suggest the desirability of establishing "Green Belts" as an offset to density. Pasadena needs to become familiar with various "Carbon Sequestration" programs based on the miracle of photosynthesis. All green plants (not just those in the rain forest) take CO₂ from the atmosphere and (with water) replenishes oxygen back into the atmosphere and carbon into the soil. Plants combat Global Warming and their root systems are the plumbing to help recharge the aquifer! If one were to take a common "temperature gun" and measure the temperature of bare ground it will be hotter and reflects more heat into the atmosphere than the temperature under any plant, tree or lawn. So, **telling people to switch landscaping to "xero-scape" might be saving water in the short run, but it is also contributing to global warming!** The more concrete high-density housing structures approved in Pasadena, the more we need to develop "green belts" to offset their pollution!
- It is every hillside resident's responsibility to maintain their property so it's not a fire hazard requiring us to have 50-foot setbacks planted with fire-retardant landscape to keep erosion at bay. I live on a canyon made up of native plants. We keep it fire safe by planting ice-plant, but we also embrace the need for "Wild Animal" corridors. Shouldn't hillside homes be allotted enough water AT A REASONABLE RATES to fulfill our civic obligations to protect neighbors from fire and preserve wildlife in our hillsides?

My request to you:

- The City of Pasadena Water and Power should reconsider increasing BLOCK tiers for larger lots consistent with **the same rate per acre foot** of high-density dwellings! For example, a single acre property allowed 768 Block 1 pricing if zoning is approved for that density elsewhere.
- Importantly, additional consideration should be given to those homeowners who MUST maintain setbacks to protect **against** fire by taking the perimeter of their property times the setback footage and allowing BLOCK 1 pricing.

I believe it is time for the loyal Pasadena residents who live in and maintain Pasadena's beautiful and irreplaceable neighborhoods to respectfully argue the inequity found in our current water billing system. Thank you for considering reviewing the City of Pasadena water rates for fairness to property owners and for e protection of all tree loving residents.

Sincerely,

Vicky L. Thomas

Vicky Thomas

Iraheta, Alba

From: Nina Chomsky < >
Sent: Friday, March 11, 2022 3:33 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: City Council Meeting 3/14/2022; Agenda Item 14 -- Water Rates Increase

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...](#)

**Linda Vista-Annandale Association
Pasadena, CA**

Re: City Council Meeting 3/14/2022; Agenda Item 14 -- Water Rates Increase

Mayor Gordo and Councilmembers,

The Linda Vista-Annandale Association (LVAA) defers to all of you whether or not to raise significantly Pasadena's Water Rates as proposed by PWP.

However, we note, and ask you to consider, that once again Pasadena's public Urban Forest, essential to the character of our City and to our quality of life, is being ignored in the Water Rate increase context just like it is in the development intensity context.

How? New "baby" public Street Trees in Pasadena are watered regularly by the City for only three years after planting. Then, the City "transfers" the obligation to water the City's Street Trees to adjacent residential and commercial property owners. Are property owners aware of this obligation? Typically, no, and, after three years, Pasadena's Street Trees usually are on their own. And, what about corner property owners who bear responsibility for Street Trees on two public streets? As water becomes scarce, and rates significantly rise becoming ever more expensive, how can the City justify encouraging property owners (and tenants) to ignore their responsibility to water adjacent mature Street Trees? When will this matter receive attention?

Perhaps, this transfer of responsibility was not that important before the current long-term drought and the current impacts of climate change when the "rainy season" actually provided significant rain and enabled our Street Trees to survive hot periods. This situation is not true anymore, and Pasadena's mature Street Trees are in notable decline. Lack of watering leads to poor Street Tree growth and development and leads to significant Tree health issues.

What is the answer? Taking into account property owners using their private water at their private cost to water Pasadena's public Street Trees within the Water Rate structure does not seem to be feasible but should be considered. LVAA and others in the community think that the real answer is for the City to design and implement a City-wide program to permanently water Pasadena's publicly owned Street Trees, including acquiring necessary equipment and assigning necessary Public Works or other staff to this very important public responsibility. We further suggest that this matter be given attention in the upcoming City Budget process.

Thank you for considering our concerns and comments.

Sincerely,

Nina Chomsky, LVAA President

cc: LVAA Board of Directors

Iraheta, Alba

From: Joei Graham < >
Sent: Friday, March 11, 2022 3:32 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Cc: Dyson, Darla
Subject: Implementation of Water Rate Adjustments, City of Pasadena, CA

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 of Pasadena and PWP-

I am against the increase of the water rates that you are considering doing in April 2022 and January 2023. Please do NOT increase our water rates.

How can you justify building thousands and thousands and thousands of new condominium and apartment units in this city (ruining it) when we don't have enough water in the first place?!? Many Pasadenans want an answer to this question! And then you go and try to increase the rates too?! This is WRONG and a very outrageous decision! It is obvious that Pasadena is being greedy and they want more and more money to come into the City to put in their own pockets (ie, salaries & retirement).

You don't even explain or clarify WHY you are increasing these rates. You don't provide any paperwork showing how much has been spent to run that department and how much money you are taking in. How do we know WHY you need to do this? No information is provided to show if, if, if there's a problem. And don't make us look it up, you should provide it as backup for what you are trying to do.

Having gone thru the pandemic, small businesses going bankrupt, many people dying due to covid, lockdowns, masks, horrible decisions made to keep us all in control etc. and this is what you want to do to us... charge us more!?! In light of ALL the new people Pasadena is trying to cram into our city, you will be making more and more money, you're income WILL increase. Does this mean you'll decrease the rates since you'll surely get that increase in revenue? I doubt it.

Furthermore, even during the years we've had plenty of rainfall since the drought, you send us these monthly "report cards" to tell us how we are doing with water use. You even go so far as to compare us to our neighbors, supposedly comparable, yet how do we know that those people have the same size yard as ours?? True manipulation & a good way to get people to snitch on neighbors that use more water than themselves (I refuse to snitch creating bad juju with people we live by). There are only three houses in this block that have a yard as deep as ours, and yet, you probably compare our water use to somebody that has 40 ft less which is not a fair comparison at all! I doubt that you are doing this "rude" comparison accurately. I just throw away your "report card" without even looking at it. I've asked you to stop sending it and yet you don't care to even listen...

I am against you increasing water rates now or next year, please do not do it!

Joyce I. Graham
District 2

P.S. Darla Dyson, please make sure my council person gets this too. I do not have her email address. Thank you.

03/14/2022
Item 14

P.P.S. PWP... how do we even know what meter size we have!? Is it available somewhere? The information on the blue paper you sent out is not useful unless we know.

RECEIVED *SHERRI H. WRIGHT*

Pasadena, CA 91104-2511

2022 MAR 14 AM 11:00

CITY OF PASADENA
CITY CLERK

1. I have asked the last three Managers of the Munies to please provide me with a complete list of their budget – itemized by item - they each have had some one send me a “pie chart”..

I think it is time for a FORENSIC AUDIT - How much is spent on advertising, social events, such as picnics for residents, credit cards for employees, how many people can write checks without a second signature and then have their supervisor okay it. Remember the nine years of the Embezzlement Millions of dollars. Where did that money go when paid back by insurance to Pasadena – Are his supervisors still working for Pasadena?

2. We had a 1” meter installed by the Water Dept for which we paid \$100 dollars on Oct 22, 1990 so we could have more pressure. We have been charged on each billing now for more than 30 years for having a larger opening. We still only use the amount of water as we would without it. Is this fair?

3. We are paying the highest third rate because of the amount of water we use. We have 7 fruit trees: Peach, Apple, Satsuma Plum, Lemon, Grapefruit and 2 Lime trees. We also had 12 Tomato plants and 10 Bell Pepper plants. We SHARE ALL OF THESE with friends, neighbors, and family. We are encouraged to plant trees to help with the environment as we know that they help clean the air and can help keep air conditioning lower. Yes, we are using more water than others in order to grow these things.

So why are we penalized to be paying the highest third rate? Is this fair?

Again, I believe we need a Forensic Audit to see if we could cut back some of the expenditures and to be sure there is no fraud going on.

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From:
Sent: Monday, March 14, 2022 1:13 PM
To: Hampton, Tyron; Williams, Felicia; John Kennedy; Masuda, Gene; Rivas, Jessica; Madison, Steve; Wilson, Andy; Gordo, Victor
Cc: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: March 14, Agenda Item #14 - Approval of Recommended Water Rate Adjustments

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...](#)

On the same day that a water rate increase is being considered by City Council, I received yet another email from PWP, the "Watts Current Special Water Edition". Pasadena Water & Power seems to spend much more effort with public relations than with actually saving water. This "Special Water Edition" just lists the same programs which have been offered to residential customers for several years and mentions again their few small "demonstration projects".

- Where is the report of water conservation by big water users, especially the Brookside Golf Course, a part of the Rose Bowl Operating Company which is losing money and is directly subsidized by the City of Pasadena and its residents? Brookside is one of the biggest water users in the City and is irrigated with drinking water (potable water) with no accountability to the public.
- Why hasn't PWP initiated a largescale program to irrigate public parks and golf courses with non-potable water?
- When I walk in the morning, I see many yards that are being irrigated on NO WATER DAYS (e.g. not Monday or Tuesday); this is especially noticeable on weekends. PWP says it sends representatives to check on watering in order to warn homeowners of infractions to current drought regulations. What have they accomplished?

Rate adjustments may be necessary but City Council must demand more accountability and transparency from PWP. The City of Pasadena needs pro-active measures to save water, not just a few small demonstration projects with no follow-through to large, meaningful projects.

Genette Foster
Pasadena 91106

1070 E. Green Street, Suite 100
Pasadena, CA 91106

PASADENA  FOOTHILLS
REALTORS

RECEIVED (626) 795-2455
info@pfar.org

2022 MAR 14 PM 4: 02

CITY CLERK
CITY OF PASADENA

March 14, 2022

Pasadena City Council
City of Pasadena
Via Email

RE: Agenda Item 14

Dear Honorable Mayor Gordo and City Council:

City Council will be discussing upcoming water rate increases in the amount of 7.1% beginning April 2022 with an additional increase of 7.2% taking effect in January of 2023. Pasadena-Foothills REALTORS® request that you keep a few factors in mind as you discuss the future of the city.

The Pasadena REALTORS® represent not only our REALTORS® members but also homeowners and small housing providers. We believe that it will be necessary to increase water rates to continue providing essential services for the city. However, this rate increase is ill-timed for the community. Water is essential. Homeowners and housing providers are just beginning to recover from the financial and health effects of COVID-19. Our lower to moderate income homeowners are already feeling overwhelmed by the cost of living in California. Inflation and necessary living expenses have ballooned in recent months and our small housing providers are still struggling financially due to the continued eviction moratorium within Pasadena and Los Angeles County. Those same small housing providers still face overwhelming hurdles such as unpaid rents due to the eviction moratorium. Their operational costs have increased and the city is adding another burden to those housing providers by not allowing them to share these increased cost with their tenants. We urge the City Council to take immediate action to revisit the City's eviction moratorium and to establish a certain date for its expiration. This would be a first step on the road to recovery for many of your small housing providers.

We ask the City Council to thoroughly contemplate the proposed water rate increases, and we request the Council to be thoughtful in the implementation of those fees and the impact of the increases will have on the City's lower to moderate-income homeowners and our small rental housing providers. We respectfully request a postponement of rate increases to those that are currently affected by the eviction moratorium. They have been unable to financially recover due to COVID-19 related issues too.

03/14/2022
Item 14

PASADENA REALTORS

INFO@PFAR.ORG

We request that the City Council consider reductions in the proposed fee increases. It is best to provide an opportunity for residents and rental housing providers financially impacted by the pandemic to seek rate increase deferments, and/or postponement of the proposed increases until the expiration of the City's eviction moratorium, inclusive of the deferred rent repayment period, to allow individuals time to financially recover.

Sincerely,
Rian Barrett, Government Affairs Director
Pasadena-Foothills Association of REALTORS®

Iraheta, Alba

From: Kevin Singleton <
Sent: Monday, March 14, 2022 5:30 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Protest to Pasadena Water Rate Increase from PDW&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...](#)

Attention PDW&P,

Please do not raise the water rates !

Times are financially tough right now for many citizens including myself.

I am currently on a fixed SS Retirement Income and I will be adversely affected by any rate increases.

I always conserve water and always get a good water saving rating every time you mail out the water use score cards.

My property is located at 2248 Oakwood St. Pasadena, CA 91104.

Please do not raise the water rates !

Please reply back.

Thank You.

Sincerely,

Homeowner

Kevin Singleton