

HWP ANNEX
COMMENTS RECEIVED AFTER CHARETTE
(Comment period: 5/20/06 thru 7/11/06)

1. HABITAT PROTECTION

- Protect wildlife corridor
- Protect native plants
- Protect existing oak woodland-remove fence and restore,
- Protect riparian habitat-improve drainage to create more habitat
- Remove non-native trees & plants
- Restore/create habitat in disturbed areas
- Habitat protection should be #1 priority

2. WATER RESOURCES – including groundwater, drainage, flood control, watershed management

- Protect and manage water resources as part of larger watershed and floodplain should be #1 priority
- Concern about maintaining water quality adjacent to equestrian facilities
- Improve drainage
- Design drainage corridors to sustain natural habitat

3. RECREATION-equestrian, trails and others

- Maintain existing equestrian programs and uses
- Provide public equestrian events – shows, demonstrations, lessons, etc.
- Integrate into existing HWP and reconsider HWP plan to include annex uses
- Emphasize/enhance as hub for equestrian and pedestrian trails including connection to Rim of the Valley and throughout the Arroyo
- No overnight use
- Site should be for ‘peaceful renewal and enrichment, an aesthetic haven”
- Site shouldn’t be dominated by one user group-minimize exclusive use
- Consider best use for the most users- public land should serve public use
- Provide diverse recreational opportunities
- Retain all existing types of uses
- Provide self-guided interpretive trail at rear of nature center
- Provide interpretative trail through oak woodland (remove fence and expand east)

4. PROGRAMS - NATURAL HISTORY, CULTURAL RESOURCES

- Develop learning center - focus on programs, not facilities
- Include history of equestrian uses of the Arroyo
- Emphasize watershed education

- Create HWP Watershed center to serve as nucleus for watershed management and education, provide opportunities for partnership with other agencies/organizations
- Program and volunteer involvement opportunities for all ages are 'endless', collaboration with community partners of all disciplines: including art, science, nature, equestrian, horticulture, etc.
- Create Children's Forest similar to Forest Service program
- Emphasize youth/student involvement
- Name of center should reflect equestrian uses of area, not just watershed
- 'Horsemanship 101' is feasible – should provide opportunities for those who can't pay
- Current physical/financial/ administrative structure of RBR is not able to provide public programs
- Create native plant nursery:
 - Provide opportunities for education
 - Provide volunteer opportunities and community participation
 - Produce native plants for local reforestation and restoration projects

5. SECURITY

- Keep fencing to a minimum
- Elimination of fencing could create liability issues for equestrian facilities
- Provide 24 hour access, no park closure
- Low level/glare free lighting

6. LEASE AGREEMENTS

- Tenants need to 'give back' to the City and the public
- Tenants need a plan to protect water resources and native habitat
- Tenants need to demonstrate sustainable management practices
- Tenants should have long-term lease
- Subsidizing equestrian facilities is in the public interest with these considerations:
 - Reduce/reconfigure area and increase capacity
 - Public benefit needs to compensate for subsidized rent
 - Actual costs of land use must be considered
- Oak woodland should be public, not included in lease
- Separate lease agreements for each tenant
- TSC provide more scholarships/ public programs
- MACH 1 should continue with own lease agreement and improved facilities –
- MACH 1 is willing and able to make improvements to their space
- Address individual ownership rights of RBR stalls
- Equestrians don't realize their privileged position, they have 'sweetheart' deal
- Continue RBR as primary lessee w/ subleases to TSC and MACH 1- allows for one lead /decision making entity.

7. PLANNING PROCESS - COMMUNITY MEETINGS, CHARETTE

- Too much emphasis on reconfiguring equestrian areas and little emphasis on former Forest Service area
- Not enough public outreach for other park users, including disc golfers, in the planning process
- There is 'much anxiety and frustration' regarding the planning process
- Should form task force to develop plans for HWP watershed center
- Place chairs in circle during public meetings
- Have guest facilitators for public meetings
- Frustration that the number of people expressing opinions is not adequately recorded
- Should include outside professional consultants in the planning process- both for planning equestrian facilities and negotiating lease agreements
- Public input at Annex meetings is diluted and minimized
- Must consider highest and best public use
- Appreciation for time and effort of city staff and planning process:
 - Appreciation for being included in the charrette
 - Appreciation of city staff to meet and keep open communication with each tenant group
 - Appreciation for opportunity to provide comments
- Some outspoken stakeholders created an atmosphere of intimidation at charette and public meetings that prevented others from sharing their ideas
- Concern that individuals creating negative atmosphere don't necessarily represent all the points-of-view in their stakeholder group and that those with opposing views didn't feel they could publicly express their views for fear of backlash
- Concern that equestrian issues overshadowed other issues that affect Pasadena residents
- It doesn't seem that some key stakeholders want to work with the community and are not willing to make any changes
- Equestrians should not be cast as aggressors
- Goals and Objectives and Vision Statement:
 - Don't specifically recognize current tenants and programs, only general recreation and equestrian uses.
 - Goal 4 should specifically name current equestrian tenants and programs
 - Goal 4 should add "and the surrounding communities" to recognize regional use of the area.
 - Goal 4 should include "and other future equestrian programs"
 - One goal should be "keep horses on the property so that future generations can continue to enjoy equestrian recreation in the Arroyo Seco"

- Goal 1 should be: “ Keep Rose Bowl Riders, TSC and MACH 1 on the property”
- Long term lease for equestrian uses should be included as a goal
- Specifically state that RBR, TSC and MACH 1 currently contribute to “diverse recreation opportunities” indicated in Goal 4.
- Vision statement doesn’t adequately express strong equestrian presence
- Vision statement use of term “an equestrian facility” doesn’t protect current equestrian tenants
- Vision statement is good and identifies key facilities and focus
- Goals and objectives are good
- Eliminate the word ‘annex’
- Design goals, facilities and programs similar for all charette groups – could be combined into one set of goals
- Charettes:
 - Not all Charette participants were familiar with HWP history and existing equestrian uses
 - Would have liked more equestrian expertise on charette teams
 - Charette presentations were unclear, hard to follow
 - Charette process too rushed, not enough time to consider and understand all issues
 - Charette plans did not include management and programmatic recommendations, as directed
 - Presentation of charette plans showed insight and possibilities
- Charette group #3:
 - Very strong resistance to presenting a plan that would show reduced equestrian area
 - Majority of time spent on equestrian issues, not allowing time to discuss other issues
 - Strong personalities and loud voices intimidated others to speak/discuss other options
 - Paid consultants were not allowed opportunity to present information
 - Summary presented doesn’t reflect discussions/decisions of group

8. CIRCULATION/PARKING

- Keep parking, traffic, lighting, paving to a minimum
- Increase public transportation to maximize public access
- Address circulation within equestrian areas
- Remove TSC vans from site
- Parking should be around periphery, not in oak woodland areas
- Provide for turn-arounds and drop-off areas
- Need to retain TSC van parking to transport campers during the day
- If van parking is eliminated, need turn-around, drop-off areas to accommodate vehicles arriving and leaving at same time
- Provide another entrance on north side of property for equestrian use

- Keep horse trailers on property for emergencies

9. FACILITIES- BUILDINGS/PHYSICAL AMENITIES

- Reconfigure, relocate and/or reduce equestrian acreage:
 - Increase capacity in less space
 - Create more efficient and attractive facilities that blend with natural surroundings
 - Remove oak woodland from equestrian area - remove fence
 - Improve trail connections and access to park
 - Current equestrian facilities are random, unsightly, not best use of space
 - Relocate equestrian facilities to disturbed areas of site, above flood level
 - If equestrian areas are reconfigured, city should commit funds for changes
 - Protect natural areas and natural resources
- Retain and/or expand existing equestrian acreage:
 - Maintain equestrian facilities as is, utilize remaining areas of site to achieve goals and objectives
 - Need to retain TSC van parking to transport children throughout the day
 - Current size and configuration of horse stalls is good for the horses' well being
 - RBR must expand physically in order to provide community programs
 - City has opportunity for state of the art equestrian facility
 - Install water storage tank or truck for equestrian facilities
 - Retain MACH 1 with these improvements:
 - 120x140 arena
 - Separate entrance
 - 7 24 x 24 stalls
 - Hay & feed storage area
 - 10x12 office
 - 10x12 tack room
 - 6x6 ADA restroom
 - 4 ADA parking spaces
 - Retain RBR with these improvements:
 - 8 additional 24 x 24 stalls for community programs
 - 12 additional 24 x 24 stalls for additional boarders
 - Increase round pen to 75' diameter
 - Additional turn-out area to accommodate additional horses
 - Hay storage 12 x 36
 - Feed room 12 x 24

- Tack rooms – one for every 8 horses 12 x 16
 - 15 permanent trailer spaces for emergencies
 - Retain 2 entrances
 - New water main/resolve water pressure problems
 - Connection to sewer system
 - Replace asphalt paving
 - Replace or renovate and enlarge clubhouse to include:
 - Education/community room
 - Kitchen
 - Storage closet
 - Courtyard & BBQ area
 - Children's play area
 - Improved ADA restroom
 - Office
- Develop native plant nursery
 - Locate adjacent to education center, or in area west of 'welder's shed', not in previous nursery area
- Charrette scenario 1;
 - Design change for MACH 1 would require re-accreditation, doesn't allow for required facilities
 - Change of MACH 1 is too close to JPL generators, too close to trail, too many disturbances, generally bad location
 - Inadequate parking and facilities for MACH 1
 - Doesn't consider terrain
 - Doesn't include tractor barn
 - Horses like to see each other, lining up stalls single file is not best option for their social behavior
 - Placing stables on east side may create problems with horse waste
 - Stables along east side may be workable
 - Compost could be relocated south of current Forest Service trash bins, not best use of space of flat area
 - Pedestrian through-way through equestrian area is not feasible- liability problems
 - Not enough room for jumping arena
 - Not enough room for event parking
 - Maintain 'enchanted forest' for equestrian use, open to public
 - Retain/refurbish existing buildings
- Charrette scenario #2
 - No indication of equestrian facilities, doesn't adhere to goals to provide equestrian facilities
 - Wildflower meadow is good
 - Consider historic value of trail to be removed
 - French drains are not necessary

- Not practical to only have one arena, need separate jumping arena
- Charrette scenario #3
 - Can't make sense of site plans
 - Unlabeled features
 - Equestrian areas too vague, no TSC or MACH 1
 - Lack of consideration of terrain
 - Alternative 3A is preferred plan
 - Most viable approach
 - Allows for expansion of 'forest' on west side
 - New building, solar powered, native material
 - Size of stalls, 12x12 is inhumane
 - Doesn't indicate if bike loop is dirt or paved
 - Relocation of 'historic' trail allows for new entrance to east parking lot and annex
 - Shared parking for equestrian events is good
 - Placing arenas below education center to provide visual experience for public is interesting idea
 - Stall design of plans 3B & 3C works best
 - 10,000 sq.ft. building is too large
- Support for integration of existing and proposed uses in scenarios #1 and #2,
- Support for layout of buildings in #1 and #2, even if existing buildings are replaced
- Establish small environmental education center
- Eliminate existing Forest Service buildings
- Build new education/interpretative center building:
 - One large watershed education center (10,000 sq ft)
 - Sustainable building specific to use
 - Multi-story to reduce footprint
 - Observation tower on roof as landmark and view point
 - Preserve more open space
 - Should be solar powered
 - Native material on façade, blend with natural surroundings
 - Include a flag pole
 - Large new building doesn't fit with community's interest in keeping area rustic and low-impact uses
 - 10,000 sq ft is too large
- Retain existing buildings to minimize cost –as indicated by the city when property was purchased
- Retaining existing buildings will expedite time to begin public use
- Reface existing building to blend more with natural environment – use stone and wood
- Create nature center with meeting rooms and auditorium

- Create educational center to include all disciplines - art, nature, science, Native Americans, etc., and attract all ages
- Create outdoor amphitheater at base of rock retaining wall east of existing garage
- Retain ranger's residence for park staff and management