



November 1, 2021

Mayor Victor Gordo  
Pasadena City Council  
100 North Garfield Avenue  
Pasadena, CA 91109

RECEIVED  
2021 NOV - 1 AM 9: 55  
CITY CLERK  
CITY OF PASADENA

Dear Mayor Gordo and Pasadena City Council,

The Pasadena Center Operating Company enthusiastically supports the Rose Bowl Operating Company as they attempt to add music and soccer events to the Rose Bowl Stadium. Additional events bring in countless visitors which is wonderful for our City and local economy.

The Rose Bowl Stadium is an iconic landmark that is beloved across the nation and is an important piece of the City of Pasadena's legacy and worldwide appeal. It has served as a backdrop for a centennial of annual events, new year celebrations, global performances, and more. It is a place that has created memories for families across the nation and traditions that have been passed down for generations. It is important that the stadium continues its grand tradition of providing world class events so we can continue to attract visitors and provide lasting experiences.

The Rose Bowl as America's Stadium is a keystone of Pasadena that continues to bring global recognition to our wonderful city, thus we must come together to ensure that the Rose Bowl Stadium's legacy continues for years to come.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Michael Ross". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Michael" written in a larger, more prominent script than the last name "Ross".

Michael Ross  
CEO

**PASADENA CENTER OPERATING COMPANY**  
Convention Center | Civic Auditorium | Convention & Visitors Bureau | Ice Skating Center  
300 E. Green Street, Pasadena, CA 91101 | (626) 795-9311

11/01/2021  
Item 12

## Martinez, Ruben

---

**From:** Nina Chomsky  
**Sent:** Monday, November 01, 2021 10:13 AM  
**To:** PublicComment-AutoResponse  
**Subject:** Council Meeting 11/1/2021; Agenda Item 12.a.; Music Festivals -- Increase in Displacement Events.  
**Attachments:** Council Letter Re Increasing Music Festivals FINAL.pdf

**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...](#)

Please distribute the attached letter to the Council from the Linda Vista-Annandale Association concerning Agenda Item 12.a. for today's Council meeting, and post. Thank you.

Nina Chomsky, LVAA

11/01/2021  
Item 12

## Linda Vista-Annandale Association

October 31, 2021

Re: Council Meeting 11/1/2021; Agenda Item 12.a.; Music Festivals -- Increase in Displacement Events.

Mayor Gordo and Councilmembers,

The Board of Directors of the Linda Vista-Annandale Association (LVAA) has several significant concerns with this Agenda item concerning the proposed Music Festivals.

1. **Inadequate Public Review.** We are disappointed that the RBOC seeks approval for these matters with barely any time for the public to consider and analyze the proposal and its policy ramifications and neighborhood impacts.

On Wednesday, October 20, 2021, a Neighbors' Meeting was held to review and discuss matters of importance to the Rose Bowl neighbors. Nothing was said about any imminent plans to significantly expand the number of Music Festivals AND issue a significant Addendum under CEQA to the original Music Festival EIR (which Addendum is dated October 29, 2021 and consists of 24 pages) AND significantly increase the number of Displacement Events under the foundational Arroyo Seco Public Lands Ordinance requiring important Findings by the Council.

On Wednesday, October 27, 2021, we received Notice of a Special RBOC meeting at 8 AM on Friday, October 29, 2021, to: "temporarily" increase the number of Displacement Events relating to the Music Festivals to 19 from the current base number of 15; adopt the EIR Addendum; and make the required Arroyo Seco Public Lands Ordinance Findings.

It so happened that the LVAA Board had a scheduled Special Board meeting on Thursday, October 28, 2021, but we had inadequate Notice or time to fully review the Music Festival proposals including the Addendum and the proposed Findings prior to our Board meeting. At the meeting, concerns, among others, were expressed about this lack of time for public review; about what appears to be a "creep" toward permanent significant increases in the number of permitted Displacement Events under the Arroyo Seco Public Lands Ordinance without broad public discussion and with corresponding challenges in making the required Findings; and, without considering the need to consider a return to some level of full Neighborhood Protection for these Festivals which will bring in attendees who are not familiar with the neighborhoods surrounding and adjacent to the Rose Bowl.

2. **Increase in Displacement Events: “Temporary” or Permanent?** Just how “temporary” or permanent was the 2017 increase in Displacement Events from 12 to 15? We believe that the original intent of the increase was to temporarily expand the number of Music Festival Displacement Events to enable the agreed upon large number of Music Festivals over a number of years, and, then the base number of Displacement Events under the Arroyo Seco Public Lands Ordinance would revert back to 12. In fact, the Arroyo Seco Public Lands Ordinance was amended to make the 15 number permanent under the assumption that the Music Festivals would occur as envisioned over an extended period of time. However, both the original contract with AEG and the 2020 revised contract with AEG were never fully implemented or realized. At some point, the 15 number for Music Festivals should have been publicly reviewed, and consideration given, based on the situation with the AEG contracts, whether or not the base number of Displacement Events should revert back to the original number in the Arroyo Seco Public Lands Ordinance, which is 12, and the Ordinance amended back to 12. This did not occur.

Now, you are asked to treat the 15 number as the permanent “ceiling” and increase the number of Displacement Events for AEG Music Festivals to a “temporary” 19 as indicated in the Staff Report to the RBOC. Is this new number of 19 intended as another permanent increase in the number of Displacement Events? Has this possibly permanent proposal received adequate public review and comment? When and how will this “temporary” number be terminated? Is eventual termination tied explicitly to the dates in this latest AEG contract for Music Festivals? What if this contract falls into inactivity just like the prior ones?

We request that the Council consider amending the base number of Displacement Events in the Arroyo Seco Public Lands Ordinance from 15 back to the original intended 12. As to this proposal, the temporary status of the Music Festival Displacement Events over the Ordinance base number of events should be fully provided for in the Council action, including defining what triggers the end of the “temporary” status of the Music Festival Displacement Events over the Ordinance base number.

Related to the number of permitted Rose Bowl (Recreational) Displacement Events is the question of what circumstances will cause the Council to be unable to make required Finding 3? What is the acceptable amount of disruption to passive Open Space and Recreational use of the Central Arroyo? What does the Recreation and Parks Commission think? The staff discussion in Finding 3 seems to say do not worry, we will take care of the disruption. Is this analysis sufficient?

3. **Significant, Major Changes Have Occurred to the Neighborhood Protection Plan Maintained and Implemented by the RBOC, and, Therefore, Required Finding 4 Possibly Cannot Be Made and the EIR Addendum May Be Inaccurate and Inadequate.**

Recently, the detailed and comprehensive successful (unwritten) Neighborhood Protection Plan for major events, carefully crafted and implemented over an extended period of time in cooperation and consultation with the neighborhoods surrounding the Central Arroyo, has been changed, reduced, and modified. The Plan has been significantly changed, reduced, and modified based on the Rose Bowl's assertions that it has insufficient money to fund the Plan, and due to labor shortages.

As to the LVAA neighborhood area, the Plan now consists primarily of distributing temporary signs throughout the LVAA neighborhood indicating No Event Parking. Luckily, this new Plan has been successful during the UCLA season so far because UCLA attendees typically are familiar with the Rose Bowl area and know not to intrude into the surrounding neighborhoods.

As to the Music Festivals (and the proposed Soccer Game) attended by people generally unfamiliar with the Rose Bowl and its surrounding and adjacent neighborhoods, it is not clear at all if such a changed Plan will be sufficient to provide adequate Neighborhood Protection. As to Finding 4, the staff's conclusory message is: No need for concern – there will be minimal disruption and impact. Considering the significant changes to the Neighborhood Protection Plan, this assertion appears insufficient and inadequate, and it is not clear that the Council can make Finding 4. Similarly, as to the EIR Addendum, the assertion that there have been no significant changed circumstances including to the surrounding area since the EIR simply is not true as to Neighborhood Protection and the Plan for such protection of all the surrounding and adjacent Rose Bowl impacted neighborhoods. Exactly how will the changed, reduced, and modified Plan be adapted and restored, improved, and expanded as necessary for the increased number of Music Festivals? Will the City and the RBOC wait for key issues and problems in the neighborhoods to occur prior to reacting? No answers have been available up to now and no CEQA enforceable mitigations provided.

Thank you for considering our comments and significant concerns with this proposal.

Sincerely,

*Nina Chomsky*

Nina Chomsky,

LVAA President; cc: LVAA Board of Directors