

From: Laura Ellersieck <eewna@earthlink.net>

Date: August 2, 2009 3:58:45 PM PDT

To: bbogaard@cityofpasadena.net, Margaret McAustin <mmcaustin@cityofpasadena.net>, Jacque Robinson <jacquerobinson@cityofpasadena.net>, cholden@cityofpasadena.net, Steve Haderlein <shaderlein@cityofpasadena.net>, vgordo@cityofpasadena.net, ttornek@cityofpasadena.net, "Madison, Steve" <smadison@cityofpasadena.net>

Cc: "Jomsky, Mark" <mjomsky@cityofpasadena.net>, mbeck@cityofpasadena.net

Subject: New Questions/Comments re Ice Rink, item 7A1 Aug 3

Honorable Mayor and Councilmembers,

1. With this proposed ground lease arrangement, who is going to pay the tab for the traffic signal, the access road, the lease from Edison, and for bringing the utilities to the site? The staff report says "The City would continue to secure agreements with PCC and SCE for access to the site and complete the infrastructure for the facility."

If those costs come out of the city taxpayer's pockets, then the ground lease deal also requires a bunch of up front investment from the city (in addition to the land). The pull is just being shifted from one city accounting pocket to another.

2. Who would own the building with such a ground lease arrangement?

What would happen at the end of the ground lease?

What would happen if PIV fails?

Can PIV sell the lease to another entity and what say would the city have in that?

3. If the profit of a new ice skating facility is going to be so great, why isn't there a corporation already chomping at the bit to purchase commercial land and build and run their own center?

Of course, no one wants to try to compete with a taxpayer funded and/or backed project. It made some sense for the city to make a sweetheart deal to free up the civic center ballroom, but that excuse for using city resources has past.

Do/did the other commercial recreational rink facilities that have been used for comparison (Valencia, Toyota, Disney) rely on municipal freebies? What are they?

Is it really necessary for the city to provide open space land and the access and utility improvements to make it commercially viable? Land that is situated in such a way that there are tremendous additional costs for foundation, utilities, and access? Of course any savvy business might jump at the chance to get those provided free or heavily subsidized. If the city had realized the costs involved in using this parcel to begin with and other parcels were available as is happening now as a result of the economy, those costs would be put to better use to purchase land in a better location, somewhere that already has access, electricity, water, and sewer and is near other commercial establishments.

4. A lot has been made of the "public benefit" piece. But much of that is just good promotion policy. Any smart business wants to get new people in to see and experience what they have to offer and hopefully get hooked. It might be interesting to see what promotions are run by

8/03/2009
7.A.1.

management at other ice rink facilities without being required to do so by a municipal contract.

5. What kind of development results when city land is leased for private development? Which city permitting process is applicable? If it would be a private development, why won't it need to go through the process required of private developments instead of the much more lax process it has been subjected to as a city development?

6. Regarding the Edison lease.

The staff report states: "In regard to SCE land required for access and overflow parking, staff is working with SCE on a long term lease. It is expected that the lease will include market rate compensation for the use of their property, which is included in the current operating pro forma."

a. Staff may need to be reminded that if the SCE land is used for overflow parking, then the CUP needs to be revised. (CUP condition 9.)

Putting overflow parking on the Edison land east of the facility would also make continuing avoidance of any public knowledge or scrutiny of the lease terms or the design of the access route and parking all the more aggravating.

b. At the July 13 meeting, staff indicated the Pro Forma only included an old guesstimate of the cost of the Edison lease and that Edison was performing a market rate study with results expected later that week. Since the numbers in the pro forma provided for the August 3 agenda report are identical to that of July 13, but the staff report says the Edison market rate compensation is included in the pro forma, then they are saying their previous guesstimate was dead on?

7. One of the letters in the correspondence file, from a Stephen Jones, RCE, claims that the new facility "will hold 25 to 30 large weekend events per year. Hockey alone will have around 8 tournaments each year that are 3 to 4 days long plus another 6 or 7 weekend events; figure skating events will hold another 12 to 14 events per year and then there is the daily visits by the users (approximately 400 per day)."

If this is true, it is completely out of line with the claims in the approved Environmental Initial Study which was used to support a "Negative Declaration with Mitigation Measures". It claimed there would be major events at most once or twice per year on weekends. From item

8. Description of the Project (this language is also repeated in the CUP):

"As a condition of approval to the CUP for the Project, prior to the issuance of a building permit, the City and the Project's operator shall be required to seek additional parking options and submit parking management and traffic control plans for major events, such as a sold out performance and a hockey tournament, anticipated to occur once or twice a year during the weekend."

Also, in the Initial Study, item 18 f: "Additional parking spaces may be needed to serve the Ice Rink at peak usage times, such as during a tournament or major event. Tournaments and other major events are expected to occur only once or twice per year. Thus, this limited exceedance of onsite parking is not considered a significant impact."

8. The same letter sent to you says that all the families visiting the rink will bring lots of additional business to the city's hotels, restaurants, stores. If the site were in a commercial

area, especially closer to downtown Pasadena, this would be a lot more likely. Located where it is, they are just as likely to hop on the freeway and go somewhere else. East Pasadena doesn't have hotels, it has motels, and many of those aren't within the city limits and have dubious reputations. East Pasadena has some restaurants, but they are well dispersed and for the most part visitors from out of town are going to find them hard to locate and/or their hours too limited. Stores? I suppose a few might be interested in taking advantage of being near the big box retailers of Hastings Village such as Best Buy, but there isn't much out on the town stuff out here. There's not even a movie theater anymore. They're more likely to go to Arcadia (which is what many east Pasadenans do in preference to dealing with traffic and parking in downtown Pasadena).

Thank you for your consideration,

Laura Ellersieck
3175 Del Vina St.
eewna@earthlink.net

From: Susan Friedman [mailto:susan_friedman@sbcglobal.net]

Sent: Sunday, August 02, 2009 11:24 AM

To: Jon Dudley; Bogaard, Bill; Robinson, Jacque; McAustin, Margaret; Jomsky, Mark; Beck, Michael

Cc: Holden, Chris; Haderlein, Steve; Madison, Steve; Tyler, Sid

Subject: New Ice Rink Support

Begin forwarded message:

From: poppyfields@earthlink.net

Date: August 2, 2009 10:21:34 AM PDT

To: Susan Friedman <susan_friedman@sbcglobal.net>

Subject: usa hockey reg - zayn thompson

Reply-To: poppyfields@earthlink.net

8/03/2009
7.A.1.

July 12, 2009

Dear Mayor of Pasadena, Council Members and Council Representatives:

As a resident of Pasadena and/or patron and/or supporter of the Pasadena Ice Skating Center (PISC), I enthusiastically support funding to be spent on building a new ice skating rink in Pasadena. The beautiful City of Pasadena deserves to maintain the tradition of a city-based skating facility which provides both a recreational and professional skating venue for residents of all ages and neighboring patrons.

A new skating rink will attract many new skating opportunities and generate a sustainable, long-term income with \$12 million dollars in forecasted profit to the City. The project has a positive net present value in excess of \$2 million dollars. Now is the time for a new rink and the decision to move forward should be undisputed!

After decades of a long history of skating in Pasadena, this is a critical choice to maintain the livelihood of our community. Please help make the right choice – provide your support for funding the new Pasadena Skating Center.

Sincerely,

Demi Hutton
Name

320 E. Poppyfields Drive
Address

Altadena, CA 91001 CA 91001
City, State and Zip Code

District Number (Pasadena Residents)

8/03/2009
7.A.1.

MARSHA V. ROOD, FAICP
216 S. Madison Avenue, #302
Pasadena, CA 91101
July 31, 2009

The Honorable Mayor Bill Bogaard
Honorable Councilmembers
City of Pasadena City Council
100 N. Garfield Avenue
Pasadena, CA 91109

SUBJECT: Funding for Ice Skating Rink, East Pasadena, City of Pasadena

Dear Mayor Bogaard and Members of the City Council:

I am writing to express my deep concerns and opposition to allocating City funds for the proposed Ice Skating Rink in East Pasadena. Please consider these points as you deliberate on the proposed Ice Skating Rink in East Pasadena:

1. **MISUSE OF OPEN SPACE LAND:** The proposed location for the proposed ice skating rink is in the open space corridor adjacent to the Pasadena City College Education Extension facility on East Foothill Boulevard. The proposed project would block the green belt that many are counting on to expand the City of Pasadena's natural open space in East Pasadena for more appropriate uses such as a trail system along the eastern side of Pasadena linking the foothills above Pasadena to the beach cities on the south.
2. **WILDLIFE CORRIDOR:** This area's role as a wildlife corridor should be better understood and researched. It is expected that placing the Ice Skating Rink at this location would be detrimental to such a corridor.
3. **OPEN SPACE IS IMPORTANT TO THE CITY:** The use of this area as natural open space and not an ice skating rink would further Objective 9 of the Land Use Element of the Pasadena General Plan that states: *"Preserve and acquire open space in Pasadena in order to enhance the quality of Pasadena life."* Open space would not include an ice skating rink. State Law defines *"open space land"* as *"...any parcel or area of land or water that is essentially unimproved."*
4. **LITTLE LOCAL DEMAND FOR SKATING:** According to the 2005 City community survey, less than 5% of Pasadena skate; however, for example, about 23% use trails and open space. The development scope of the proposed project appears to be sized for a regional, rather than a local, ice skating facility.

5. **ICE SKATING RINK FUNDING BETTER USED FOR OTHER CITY PARKS, OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION NEEDS:** Aside from the inappropriate use of natural open space for this ice skating facility, spending approximately \$20 million in City funds for an Ice Skating Rink would not be the most cost/effective way in terms of use and location to meet the City's general recreation needs. Other and more pressing recreation and parks needs for the general population must receive priority. By way of example, more and more families and individuals live in the Central District than have in the City's history. Having smaller parks and other recreational facilities accessible by foot to nearby residents is becoming increasingly desirable and needed for recreation, community events and gatherings in the area. Central Park and Memorial Park do not serve the needs of residents living on the east side of the Central District. As Policy 106 of the Open Space Element of the General Plan states, *"Priorities in new facilities should go to those areas indicating the greatest need."*
6. **CITY AND STATE BUDGET CRISES:** In view of the current economic recession and budget crisis in California, more pressing City needs should and must command these resources for the near future. The City should carefully examine and weigh funds needed for such a facility in relationship to other City needs. In face of the current economic recession, these funds are needed not only to meet local public service needs but also the City's State-required contribution to the massive budget shortfall in the State of California's budget.
7. **ISOLATED LOCATION:** The location is isolated in terms of a walkable distance to retail and restaurant business, is not centrally located in the City, and is not very close to major transportation lines.
8. **FINANCIAL VIABILITY OF THE ICE SKATING RINK:** In addition to the capital cost investment, the City Council should consider the on-going economic viability of the facility, particularly whether or not the proposed facility can meet its on-going operation and maintenance costs. To build such a facility at public costs, and have it fail financially, would represent an enormous financial loss of City funds, associated opportunity costs, and sunk investment with few reuse options.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

[Marsha V. Rood]

MARSHA V. ROOD, FAICP

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

From: Edwina Travis Chin <etravischin@apmmusic.com>

To: Bogaard, Bill; Beck, Michael; Robinson, Jonathan (ITSD); McAustin, Margaret; Holden, Chris; Haderlein, Steve; Gordo, Victor; Stone, Rhonda; Tornek, Terry

Sent: Fri Jul 31 14:45:01 2009

Subject: Skating Rink

Dear Mayor Bogaard, City Manager Beck, and members of the City Council:

I have written previously to express my objection to the development of the Ice Skating Rink, but feel compelled to write again and bring up some additional points.

I grew up ice skating (and have the Girl Scout merit badge to show for it!) However, I still feel that financially this is the wrong time for the city to be investing in this project, and even more importantly, that this is the wrong location for the rink.

Having looked at a summary of the proposal for the rink, http://www.eewna.org/ice_rinks/ice-rink-development.html <http://www.eewna.org/ice_rinks/ice-rink-development.html> I have discovered that even in 2005, there were objections raised regarding the appropriateness of the rink at the currently proposed site, particularly as regards the placement of a large building and parking lot on land zoned as "Open Space".

Here is an excerpt from the end of the "Environmental Impact Process" section of the document (it is the last item in the document, and only accessed by a link, not displayed as part of the main document): I have highlighted those items which point out that this site is in conflict with the goals and policies of the city's Open Space Element, but the underlines are from the original document.

Please bear in mind that these are issues that were brought up in 2005 – I think all of us are much more aware of the importance of our environment and open space in 2009, and the update of the Open Space and Conservation Element that is currently being worked on would undoubtedly take the same (and probably even stronger) stand on this issue.

8/03/2009
7.A.1.

(excerpt)

Some general plan and municipal code items which seem to be in conflict with the project plan and its development process so far are:

General Plan Land Use Designation

* Objective 9 calls for preserving and acquiring open space in Pasadena in order to enhance the quality of Pasadena life.

Open Space Policies

* 102.0 The development of new park facilities should be undertaken only after thorough study justifying needs and potential usage.

* 104.0 Citizen participation shall play a major role in all phases of recreational open space planning from site selection to program development.

* 106.0 Priorities in new facilities should go to those areas indicating the greatest need.

* 200.2 Development of low-intensity, natural parks in City watershed areas with hiking, cycling, and equestrian trails.

* 200.3 Development of equestrian/bicycle trails along Southern California Edison right-of-way.

Cultural and Recreational Element

* Objective 1.4. A systematic assessment of recreational facility needs and preferences in recreational programming.

* Policy 201.0 The planning and delivery of recreational services is to be continuing process which takes into consideration the desires of the public concerning such services and which reviews and evaluates the success of, and continued need for, existing programs and the need for new programs.

State Code seems to be in conflict:

* 65560. (b) "Open-space land" is any parcel or area of land or water that is essentially unimproved

I'd also like to point out the following:

· In addition to the high water use, there is a huge energy cost associated with the cooling needed to maintain an ice skating rink, so that's an additional resource that will be impacted, and contributes to the city's overall carbon footprint.

· This presents an excellent opportunity for the city to practice "building recycling". I would hope that instead of the current proposed site, the rink could instead re-purpose an existing facility or site that would not require the loss of our limited open space.

· One of the arguments that the pro-rink people make is that the plans still allow for a hiking trail, which in their mind equates to the preservation of open space. However, open space serves not only human recreational needs, but also serves a very important function as wildlife corridors.

· In the case of wildlife, and particularly in encouraging diversity of wildlife, more acreage is always better, and a narrow belt serving as a hiking thoroughfare is not the same thing as a sizable open field (which is what we would lose with the construction of the rink.)

· I doubt that the presence of a recreational facility encompassing 58,000 square feet and 143 parking spaces (with the resulting pedestrian and auto traffic) will be conducive to a meaningful trail experience, and this proximity in combination with the narrowness of the trail will certainly diminish if not negate its usefulness as a wildlife corridor.

· I have concerns as to whether funding the rink at this time is an economically viable business decision. Have the operators of the rink demonstrated that they can operate at a profit? If not, then how will the city recoup its investment in any reasonable period of time? (Or would the city be basically subsidizing this facility?)

· If providing "recreational opportunities" is the primary concern, then an amount of money that is substantially less than that earmarked for the rink could be better used to fund other more pressing and environmentally sensitive recreational opportunities that would serve a wider range of Pasadena residents (such as developing parks and open space in the Central District and completing rehabilitation of the Eaton Canyon corridor.)

I feel very strongly that funding for the rink needs to be postponed – this is not the right time from an economic standpoint to be spending this kind of money on such a narrow-focus project. Even more so, I feel that if a rink is to be built, a much more suitable location needs to be found that can meet the needs of the skaters and the general community without destroying one of our remaining natural assets. I am not opposed to having a skating rink, but in this instance, the wishes of a small percentage of our

community cannot take precedence over the long term benefits that Pasadena gains by keeping this site as undeveloped Open Space.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Edwina Travis-Chin

Member, Open Space and Conservation Element Advisory Committee

Alternate Member, General Plan Update Advisory Committee

Member, Open Space Now

1398 N. Sierra Bonita Ave.

Pasadena 91104

etravischin@apmmusic.com

Jomsky, Mark

From: Bogaard, Bill
Sent: Monday, August 03, 2009 4:29 PM
To: Jomsky, Mark
Subject: Fwd: skating rink--Opposed

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: <badmintonguy@runbox.com>
Date: August 3, 2009 2:56:19 PM PDT
To: bbogaard@cityofpasadena.net
Subject: Fwd: skating rink

----- Start Forwarded Message -----

Sent: Mon, 03 Aug 2009 14:16:33 -0700 (PDT)
From: <badmintonguy@runbox.com>
To: shaderlein@cityofpasadena.net
Subject: skating rink

Dear Mr Bogaard:

I am one of your constituents in East Pasadena. This e-mail is to urge you to prevent any city funds being used in any way to support the building or maintenance of an ice skating rink in Pasadena.

The neighbors and friends I have spoken to on this issue are about 90 per cent against using public funds for this purpose. Furthermore, there are some internet postings which back up this position.

Please do not be influenced by the vociferous minorities which are pushing their own selfish interests.

First, it is clear that the city cannot afford any expenditures at this time of recession, particularly when the State has cut back on our anticipated revenues.

If the city has \$22 million or thereabouts (or even a portion of same) to commit to

8/3/2009

08/03/2009
7.A.1

a skating rink, may I suggest that there are greater priorities here, including filling potholes and re-surfacing streets.

Second, a skating rink benefits only a small number of people at the expense of the tax-paying majority. It seems probable that a good percentage of rink users will not be Pasadena residents, and will simply be using our facilities while contributing nothing to our property taxes. Neither are non-residents available to vote for you at the next election or support your positions on major Pasadena issues.

Third, there are adequate skating facilities elsewhere in the area. A random internet check shows rinks in Burbank, Culver City, El Segundo, Lakewood, Ontario, Yorba Linda, Panorama City, Paramount, Valencia, and Van Nuys.

Any person serious about skating could drive to Burbank. I make that drive regularly in 20 minutes.

Fourth, we need to reduce traffic congestion in Pasadena. Any new rink will create a new center of congestion. Old town cannot handle existing traffic; and residential neighborhoods should not have to put up with new congestion, added noise, and greater danger. Ask the police chief about traffic problems.

Fifth, the city is already overbuilt, which is placing our resources, such as police, fire, and medical services under stress.

Sixth, we have been told to use much less water. I assume a new ice rink would be using the precious water supply, which is now rationed to homeowners, to make the ice. How many millions of gallons of water will it take to keep replacing the ice? How much scarce electricity to keep the building cool and the ice frozen?

Finally, I refer you to a significant analogy. Many years ago, the city of Pasadena evicted the Pasadena Badminton Club (which housed some international players) from the Pasadena Armory and promised to re-house the club. The re-housing never happened, and the club departed for a more friendly atmosphere in San Gabriel. Why should the ice rink be given more favorable treatment?

Very truly yours

ROBERT LEIGHTON

----- End Forwarded Message -----