



**Parks and Natural Resources Division
Department of Public Works**

DATE: SEPTEMBER 29, 2009

TO: HAHAMONGNA WATERSHED PARK ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**FROM: KATHLEEN WOODS, PARKS & NATURAL RESOURCES DIVISION
ADMINISTRATOR**

**SUBJECT: UPDATE AND CONSIDERATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE
HAHAMONGNA WATERSHED PARK (HWP) MASTER PLAN
ADDENDUM FOR THE HAHAMONGNA ANNEX**

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Hahamongna Watershed Park Advisory Committee (HWPAC) reaffirm their support for the adoption of the Initial Study and the Hahamongna Watershed Park Master Plan Addendum for the Hahamongna Annex in light of the staff's most recent recommended modifications to these documents and based on the update provided below.

UPDATES

The following is an update on the project since the HWPAC's May 12, 2009 meeting.

Staff made edits to the Draft Master Plan Addendum and the Draft Initial Study in response to the HWPAC recommendations (1), (2), (3), (5), (6) listed below. Edits included addressing the community input provided, most notably regarding; 1) the analysis of the park access roadway extension; 2) the width of the recreational trail greenway was better defined in consideration of public safety; 3) the removal of references to a parking structure in the CEQA addendum; 4) clarification on the PD-16 zoning within the Annex, which the proposed project is consistent with; and 5) the clarification that night time recreational lighting is inconsistent with the Arroyo Seco Master Plans. All edits made to these documents since the May 12, 2009 HWPAC meeting were indicated in **red**. The Draft Master Plan Addendum was last revised on June 2, 2009. One minor edit was made to Exhibits 3-2 and 3-3 which consisted of shortening an internal access route within the horse boarding area of the Equestrian Center. The Initial Study was also last revised on June 2, 2009 and indicates a revised date of June 2009. In addition, the title of the CEQA document was changed to avoid

confusion with the Master Plan Addendum, which was also a suggestion expressed at the HWPAC meeting.

HAHAMONGNA WATERSHED PARK ADVISORY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

On May 19, 2009, the Hahamongna Watershed Park Advisory Committee (HWPAC) recommended their support to the City Council for the adoption of the Hahamongna Watershed Park Master Plan Addendum for the Hahamongna Annex. The HWPAC voted to not take action on the CEQA document. The following recommendations were also made by the HWPAC:

- 1) Items in the CEQA documents (including the reference to the 1200 space parking structure and the roadway) should be deleted or noted as no longer relevant;
- 2) The trailway/bikeway should be designed according to the concept presented (Sections AA and BB) and limited to a maximum width of approximately 30 ft.;
- 3) A map showing the zoning of the Annex (including the PD-16 designation) should be included in the Master Plan Addendum;
- 4) Partnership proposals, including management of the Environmental Education Center should be brought before the HWPAC for review and comment;
- 5) Issues related to the gate(s) should be removed from the Master Plan; and
- 6) Any proposal for a master CUP should be brought before the HWPAC in advance of the CUP hearing, for review and comment by the HWPAC.

The following environmental review information was provided in the staff reports to each of the below named city commissions:

The Initial Study analyzes the potential environmental impacts of the proposed Hahamongna Watershed Park Master Plan Addendum for the Hahamongna Annex. The Initial Study has been prepared to meet all of the substantive and procedural requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act, the State CEQA Guidelines and the City of Pasadena's Environmental Guidelines.

CEQA allows for limited environmental review of subsequent projects following a Master EIR. A Master EIR for the entire Arroyo Seco Master Plan was certified by the City in 2003. Accordingly, the Initial Study evaluates the potential environmental impacts of the proposed HMP Addendum and compares those impacts to the impacts evaluated in the Arroyo Seco Master EIR. The Initial Study utilizes the framework of CEQA Guidelines § 15162 to determine whether a subsequent or supplemental environmental document is required, by analyzing the following:

1. Determine whether the proposed HMP Addendum activities may cause any additional significant effects which were not analyzed in the Arroyo Seco Master EIR;
2. Determine whether the "Limitations on the Use of a Master EIR" have been exceeded; and
3. Identify the mitigation measures from the Master EIR that are applicable to the HMP Addendum.

The Initial Study analyzed the uses and projects proposed in the HMP Addendum, as well as additional facts and concerns raised by the public, and concludes:

1. The proposed HMP Addendum would NOT result in any additional significant effects or the need for new additional mitigation measures or alternatives that are not already discussed in the Arroyo Seco Master EIR. Therefore, the proposed HMP Addendum will not cause any additional significant effects which were not analyzed in the Arroyo Seco Master EIR pursuant to Public Resources Code (PRC) § 21157.1 and State CEQA Guidelines § 15177.
2. As required by CEQA, all feasible and appropriate mitigation measures and alternatives set forth in the Arroyo Seco Master EIR have been applied, verbatim as adopted by Council on April 14, 2003, to the project or otherwise made conditions of approval of the project.
3. No substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the Arroyo Seco Master EIR was certified and there is no new available information which was not known and could not have been known at the time the Arroyo Seco Master EIR was certified.

Accordingly, pursuant to Public Resources Code Sections 21157.1, 21157.6 and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15179, no further environmental analysis is required.

PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

At their meeting of on July 8, 2009, the Commission considered a staff recommendation that the Commission support the City Council's adoption of the initial study and Master Plan Addendum for the Hahamongna Annex. After public comment and discussion, the Commission continued discussion for the purpose of conducting a site visit on September 9, 2009. At their meeting of September 9, 2009, the Planning Commission agreed with staff's recommendation on the draft Master Plan Addendum and the Initial Study, with the following exceptions/conditions:

1. Modify the Recreational Trail Greenway to reflect a bikeway, not more than 10 feet in width, and delete the proposed pedestrian/equestrian trail;
2. Consider updating the Arroyo Seco Public Lands ordinance to include the Hahamongna Annex (See Attachment D);
3. Provide further project-level environmental review of the "projects of concern" as set forth in the August 3, 2009 letter from counsel for the Friends of the Hahamongna if and when those projects become reasonably foreseeable construction projects; (See Attachment A) and
4. Further address the PD-16 issue, including the consideration of a zone change to the subject PD-16 parcel within the Annex.

DESIGN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

At their meeting on July 13, 2009, the Design Commission considered a staff recommendation that the Commission support the City Council's adoption of the Master Plan Addendum for the Hahamongna Annex. After public comment and discussion, the Commission continued discussion for the purpose of conducting a site visit on September

9, 2009. At their meeting on September 14, 2009 the Design Commission agreed with staff's recommendation on the draft Master Plan Addendum with the following exceptions/conditions:

1. Include a combination of trail solutions one and two, as suggest by the Friends of Hahamongna (FOH) (See Attachment C);
2. Consider incorporating a landscape barrier along the bikeway to improve the aesthetics along the northern edge of the bikeway; and
3. Support for consideration of the use of "granular stone" on the bikeway surface, at the project level, and as described by Friends of Hahamongna in the "Trails for the 21st Century".

It should be noted that this meeting was staff's first viewing of the possible trail solutions suggested by FOH. After further review, staff provides the following comments on solutions one and two:

- ♦ These trail solutions are considered stub connector trails and do not provide a thru-trail route around the perimeter of the Annex, therefore would not replace the existing trail along the northern border of the equestrian area.
- ♦ Staff finds no exception to solution one and would not be supportive of solution two.

TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMISSION

At their meeting of September 3, 2009, the Transportation Advisory Commission agreed with staff's recommendation on the draft Master Plan Addendum and the Initial Study, with the following exceptions/conditions:

1. That the bikeway/trail be designed in a manner that does not lend itself to becoming a road.

The following is a further update on the project:

1. Staff met with Friends of Hahamongna (FOH) on July 24, 2009 to discuss the proposed Recreational Trail Greenway and the alternative alignment suggested by FOH at the commission meetings in July.
 - a. Purpose of the meeting was to discuss the proposed bike path and equestrian trail and to attempt to reach a consensus on a preferred alignment for these. Staff also understood the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the alternate easterly alignment suggested by FOH at the July Design and Planning Commission meetings and for staff to view the other various alternatives prepared by FOH and referred to at these commission meetings, however, there were no new alternatives presented by FOH.
 - b. Staff made FOH aware that after doing further research, the alternate easterly alignment suggested by FOH would not be possible due to its violation to the terms of a 2004 Settlement Agreement between the City and the Spirit of the Sage Council, in which Spirit of the Sage received concessions from the City to protect the integrity of HWP area. In general terms, this Settlement agreement does not allow the introduction of new

recreational uses that were not part of the adoption of the Arroyo Seco Master Plans within the areas designated by the Settlement Agreement as Natural Open Space; in other words, the City cannot place a bike trail in the HWP area.

- c. FOH asked for their alternatives to be included in the Draft Master Plan Addendum document; staff cannot do so because their alternative violated the above mentioned settlement agreement. In addition, their proposal would conflict with the adopted HWP master plan to narrow the existing road through the Annex and would directly and negatively impact adopted HWP master plan to restore habitat along that road.
 - d. Staff asked FOH to provide a list of other concerns they had, in priority order so that staff could address these.
 - e. Staff made it clear that resources were not available to layout and flag the alternative alignment for the 9/9/09 site visit, but agreed to indicate the location of the alternative alignment during the site visit by referencing the existing unpaved westerly perimeter trail.
 - f. All agreed to meet again, prior to the scheduled 9/9/09 site visit for the purpose of presenting detailed mapped alternatives that addressed FOH's alignment concerns for the bike path and the trail.
2. The City received a letter from FOH on August 3, 2009, summarizing the meeting of July 24th and their list of concerns. (See Attachment A)
- a. Some concerns listed will be addressed either as edits staff will make to the draft Master Plan Addendum document and/or the IS or where appropriate. However, it is important to note that many of the concerns FOH raises are not appropriate to address in the Addendum since they are items that need to be addressed as part of the upcoming lease negotiations with the future HWP Annex tenants, and only when those tenants are represented. It is also important to note that those leases must go through appropriate environmental review before they are approved by the City, so any environmental concerns FOH may have with those leases may be raised at that time.
 - b. The following was staff's response to some of FOH's concerns and included in the staff reports to the Planning and Design Commission:
 - Proposed 30 foot corridor – Staff will edit all documents to remove any reference to “a corridor” of any width. Instead, the bikeway and the equestrian trail will be described, including the recommended design width for each. The environmental document will be revised in consideration of this.
 - PD 16 Designation – The PD -16 designation does not limit or preclude any use proposed in the Master Plan addendum and therefore, does not require any changes at this time.
 - Surplus Land Act – The City acquired the Annex land from MWD pursuant to the “Surplus Land Statute” (Cal Govt Code s. 54220-54232). That statute allows public agencies to sell surplus land to be used for specific purposes, among which is “parks and recreation” purposes, or “open space” purposes. The purchase and sale agreement also specifically states in Section 9.2: “Covenant

Regarding Use of the Property. Purchaser covenants and agrees that it will use the Property as required under the Surplus Land Statute.” Exhibit B to the purchase and sale agreement reserves a “Permanent Open-Space Easement for park and recreational purposes or open-space purposes . . .” over the property in favor of MWD. The City is legally bound to abide by these terms of the purchase and sale agreement, and nothing in the Master Plan Addendum conflicts with these restrictions.

- Overflow Parking – The JPL east lot and the equestrian picnic area were purposely not included in the parking areas for the Annex because they were not within what was considered a reasonable walking distance from the primary Annex use areas. The distance considered “reasonable” were parking areas within 2800 ft. or ½ mile of the proposed Environmental Education Center (EEC) within the Annex. The northern portion of the JPL east lot is 4100 ft. from the EEC and the equestrian picnic area is 3800 ft. from the EEC. However, these lots could be specified for use under the current recommendation in the draft HPW Master Plan Addendum for the Annex, where an Annex reservation applicant would need to demonstrate a parking plan to use these lots as off-site Annex parking.

3. Staff further developed bikeway and trail alternative plans down to the “project level” details, as requested by FOH.

- a. Staff utilized existing topographic information in addition to extensive field measurements to develop the most accurate existing conditions site plan possible for a bikeway and trail alignment study, given the limited time frame to produce such a plan.
- b. Two alignment studies were prepared using differing design criteria:

Study A:

- Proposed a smaller footprint, therefore having the least impact to the existing use areas and facilities
- Would require more grading (though still not considered significant) and also would require several retaining walls, which would not exceed 3-4 ft. in height
- Proposed a paved bikeway of not greater than 10 ft. and a pedestrian trail of not greater than 6 ft.
- Would impact approximately 11 existing native trees and 23 non-native trees.

Study B:

- Aligned to protect the maximum number of existing native trees
- Would require a larger overall footprint and would slightly encroach into the existing use area.
- Would require less grading and therefore a reduced need for retaining walls
- Would provide a meandering alignment and accordingly, a more enjoyable user experience.

4. Staff met with FOH on August 27, 2009. This was the second meeting that the City held with FOH in order to better understand their concerns, and to narrow the program level analysis in the environmental document to a project level review solely to allay FOH's stated concern that the "corridor" would become a road.
 - a. Both alignment studies described above, were presented to FOH and an extensive discussion took place.
 - b. Staff presented information regarding the current site conditions being impacted by several current utility problems and explained that no matter what modifications occur as a result of the outcome with the bikeway and trail, these utility issues must be addressed to prevent the further environmental degradation of the Annex and the greater Arroyo. It was further explained that this work alone, will necessitate the need for some grading activity in this area of the Annex. The draft Master Plan Addendum and the IS describe these conditions and make recommendations to mitigate for any possible impacts; these explanations will be further edited to ensure clarity and a complete understanding of these important issues.
 - c. Based on FOH's comments, the City believed that all parties agreed that the preferred alternative to recommend and to present at the 9/9/09 site visit would be a variation of Study B, with the understanding that the large oak trees at the westerly entry to the equestrian area, should be protected.
5. Staff refined the alignment studies and prepared a "recommended alignment" resulting from the comments received from the August 27th meeting with FOH and presented it at the 9/9/09 site visit. A copy of the staff recommended alignment was provided to all at the beginning of the 9/9/09 site visit, and is also attached (See Attachment B). This recommended alignment would require the removal of two native trees and 29 non-native trees.

FINAL STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends making the following modifications to the subject documents as a result of comments received by the public to date, and the commissions referenced above:

1. Background information
 - a. Reflect the purchase of the Annex property under the Surplus Land Act in both documents.
2. Recreational Trail Greenway/Corridor
 - a. Remove any reference to a "Recreational Trail Greenway" or "a corridor" of any width in both documents. Instead, describe the addition of a bikeway along the northern edge of the public equestrian area and as generally shown in the bikeway alignment on Attachment B and as recommended by the Planning Commission. Describe the recreational intent of the proposed bikeway as well as some of its anticipated features such as enhanced planting to screen the land uses to the north and the addition of low retaining

- walls parallel to portions of the northern bikeway edge, to support the adjoining steep bank.
- b. Eliminate the existing/proposed trail route along the northern edge of the public equestrian area, and as shown on Attachment B and reflect only the bikeway, consistent with the Planning Commission recommendation.
 - c. Revise all graphics and site plans to reflect all described above.
3. Southern California Edison Easement
 - a. Revise appropriate text to reflect that the proposed plan is in keeping with the existing Edison easement.
 4. Zoning and Land Use
 - a. Revise appropriate text in both documents to further explain the PD-16 zone and offer a brief analysis of the effects of changing the zoning.
 - b. Revise the text in both documents describing the existing "Visitor Horse Stable" to an "Upper Barn", instead.
 - c. In the IS, correct the square footage construction improvements to the Main Office building and Equipment Garage from 7,000 sq. ft. to 7,500 sq.ft.
 - d. Remove the text in the IS that describes any proposed changes to the Jumping Arena.
 - e. Modify the text in the IS that describes an increase to the current 36 corrals in the horse boarding area to a maximum of 70 corrals. Clarify that this is not a firm recommendation of the plan, but an allowance for the tenant if this capacity is desired and that would be part of the future lease for the horse boarding area.
 - f. Text in the IS will be modified to reflect the Planning Commission recommendation for the proposed bikeway alignment and therefore serve as the basis of the environmental review. Environmental evaluation of a trail, whether previously recommended by staff or any suggested alternative trail alignment will be removed.
 - g. In the IS clarify that the only existing structure impacted by the proposed bikeway is the barn currently leased to MACH1 by Rose Bowl Riders. However, the evaluation of the impact to other existing structures within the equestrian area will remain since the possibility of their reconfiguration, according to the proposed plan, upcoming leases and Master Conditional Use Permit, does exist. As with all adopted projects of the Arroyo Seco Plans, subsequent environmental review will be provided once the details of a specific project are known and its implementation is eminent.
 5. Trees
 - a. Revise the text in the IS to reflect the total number of trees within the bikeway study area, which are 18 native trees and 32 non-native trees.
 - b. Text in the IS will be revised to reflect that the proposed bikeway alignment will require the removal of approximately 2 native trees.
 - c. The text in both documents will reflect that in keeping with habitat restoration goals for the Arroyo Seco, all non-native California trees within the Annex will be recommended for removal. This can occur in phases to ensure visual impacts are kept to a minimum.

6. Utilities

- a. Revise text and graphics in Addendum and IS to address the impacts resulting from the two existing non-functioning storm drains within the Annex site along with the recommendations for mitigation.
- b. Modify text and provide new graphic in Section 3 of the Addendum as well as in the IS that clarifies the utility work that will be, including resolving the problems associated with Storm Drain #3 and that will require the installation of new storm drain pipe and a new storm drain inlet structure.

7. Parking

- a. Revise appropriate text in both documents to reflect criteria staff used in determining the parking areas within the park that would provide parking spaces within a reasonable distance from the Annex (and as described earlier in this report).
- b. Revise Exhibit 2-7, Mobility, to include a footnote about parking Lot "L" not being available for park use and that it is solely utilized by JPL employees and accessed through a security gate on the JPL campus.

8. Proposed Land Uses & Anticipated Facilities

- a. Related to 2c above, the Master Plan Use Areas graphic in both documents will be revised to reflect the elimination of a defined "greenway corridor".
- b. A new trail section will be added to all graphics in both documents where proposed trails are illustrated. The new trail section will connect the proposed trails through the oak woodland at the southern end of the Annex to the Public Equestrian area, in accordance with the Planning Commission recommendation.
- c. The text in both documents will reflect the inclusion of a riding arena(s) in the description for the proposed Riding Arena & Equestrian Staging Area within the Equestrian Center.

Staff also recommends that a 45-day public review period of the documents begin as soon as possible after the 9/29/09 HWPAC meeting (on or about October 12th), as required by CEQA. The documents would incorporate all staff recommended modifications outlined above and be free of any red-lining. The project will be brought forward to the City Council at the close of the 45-day review period.

Prepared by:



Rosa Laveaga
Arroyo Seco Project Supervisor

Approved by:



Kathleen Woods
Administrator

Attachments:

- A. August 3, 2009 Letter from FOH
- B. Bikeway & Trail Alignment Study
- C. Trail Solutions by FOH
- D. Arroyo Seco Public Lands Ordinance
- E. Draft Hahamongna Watershed Park Master Plan Addendum for the Hahamongna Annex (Revised 6-2-09; Corrected Exhibits 3-2 and 3-3 incorporated on 6-26-09) (Available on city webpage at <http://www.cityofpasadena.net/publicworks/PNR/ArroyoSeco/annex.asp>)
- F. Draft Initial Study for the Hahamongna Watershed Park Master Plan Addendum for the Hahamongna Annex (June 2009) (Available on city webpage at <http://www.cityofpasadena.net/publicworks/PNR/ArroyoSeco/annex.asp>)
- G. Final Traffic Impact Study for the HWP Annex 3-25-09 (Available on city webpage at <http://www.cityofpasadena.net/publicworks/PNR/ArroyoSeco/annex.asp>)