

## McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

**From:** Andrew Salimian  
**Sent:** Monday, August 01, 2022 1:07 PM  
**To:** PublicComment-AutoResponse  
**Cc:** Sue Mossman; Susan Mossman  
**Subject:** RBOC 5-Year Strategic Initiatives

**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 Mayor and Members of the City Council,

Thank you again for taking time to discuss the Rose Bowl, an important asset and community treasure in Pasadena. I would like to reshare Pasadena Heritage's comments from the last hearing, copied below. We thank you for your dedication to the Rose Bowl.

Dear Mayor and Members of the City Council,

As you consider options to improve the economic viability of the Rose Bowl in the future, please give utmost consideration to the fact that the Rose Bowl is a National Historic Landmark and that the Central Arroyo, including the Rose Bowl, surrounding area, and Brookside Golf Course are listed together as a National Register Historic District.

We are particularly concerned about the option of changing the seating at the south end of the Stadium as that would certainly be a significant alteration to the landmark stadium. What other possibilities have been considered? Reworking a portion of the original golf course for a family golf center is probably achievable with mitigation. Reworking the Brookside Golf Club, or constructing a new structure there that is more attractive and has more amenities is also an option that would not impact the historic resources in the area as much, would seem to have good revenue-generating potential and would be much less costly.

In general, any possible change to the Rose Bowl or the Golf Course or other historic areas or features should be carefully evaluated in terms not only of their income-generating potential but also as to the impact on these valuable historic resources. We have asked that an historic preservation consultant be part of the team proposing and reviewing these strategies so that you would have the benefit of that analysis. If that has not yet happened, we urge you to ask the Rose Bowl leadership to have that evaluation done as soon as possible so we can all use that information as part of a comparison of options and their pros and cons.

Thank you for hearing our concerns and for protecting this crucial Pasadena treasure.

**Andrew Salimian**  
Preservation Director  
O: (626) 441-6333 x119  
C: (516) 662-6425  
[asalimian@pasadenaheritage.org](mailto:asalimian@pasadenaheritage.org)

**CORONAVIRUS POLICY:** Out of an abundance of caution, Pasadena Heritage staff may be working from home. I still have access to email, but you can additionally be reached on my personal cell.



**PASADENA  
HERITAGE**  
PRESERVATION | ADVOCACY | EDUCATION

08/1/2022  
Item 19

## McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

---

**From:** Jon Fuhrman  
**Sent:** Monday, August 01, 2022 1:04 PM  
**To:** PublicComment-AutoResponse  
**Subject:** Rose Bowl Funding options -- Agenda Item 19

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [redacted]. [Learn why this is important](#)

**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...](#)

Re: Public comment on financing options for the Rose Bowl – Pasadena Municipal Code Section 4.48.040

Dear Councilmembers:

Now that the Council is considering possible solutions to the impending financial shortfalls of the Rose Bowl, I would like once again to direct your attention to our Municipal Code Section 4.48.040.

That section essentially establishes a 5% admission tax for Rose Bowl events. However, it places a cap of \$0.50 on that tax.

We have adjusted the cap on that tax for inflation, so the cap is now about \$1.90. However, that means that for a \$300 Rose Bowl ticket, which I understand to be a typical price for the cheapest seats, the aggregate tax is \$1.90, instead of the \$15 that would be generated by a flat 5% tax, which is entirely in line with admission taxes levied by other localities.

Thus, for every Rose Bowl game, that cap on the admission tax is costing us at least \$1 million in lost revenue. If you include the routine season games, we're losing at least \$2 million a year in potential revenue due to that irrational cap on the admission tax. Adding in additional events, like the soccer game of last weekend, would likely generate close to \$3 million annually in additional revenue.

I urge you to consider eliminating the cap on the Rose Bowl Admission Tax, even if that move would require a ballot initiative. One of the key points is that the Admission Tax is paid by attendees at the Rose Bowl – by the users of the facility, rather than by Pasadena taxpayers as a whole, and the facility users are exactly the population that should be shouldering a larger share of the burden for supporting the Rose Bowl.

I understand that RBOC officials argue that teams currently contribute a capital facilities maintenance fee, which was supposedly designed to substitute for a larger admissions tax. There is no reason why the teams should not continue to pay this maintenance fee even as we remove the cap on the admissions tax.

Removing the cap on the admissions tax is one of the only ways to increase revenue that is not entirely speculative and could be implemented essentially immediately. Now that we are finally facing the oncoming fiscal abyss head-on, there seems no valid excuse for not including the repeal of the admissions tax cap as one of the options we should exercise.

Jonathan Fuhrman

Topic	Pasadena Center Operating Company	Rose Bowl Operating Company
<b>1. Legal Structure</b>	<p>Nonprofit public benefit corporation</p> <p>Operate Convention &amp; Visitors Bureau program through levies for Pasadena Tourism Improvement District (a tourism business improvement district)</p>	<p>Nonprofit public benefit corporation</p> <p>RBOC income excludible under Section 115(1) of the Internal Revenue Code and contributions to the RBOC are deductible under Section 170 of the Code</p> <p>Section 28 - A 501(c)(3) foundation may be established for charitable purposes</p> <p>Amendment 2 - Consent of use of "The Rose Bowl Foundation" for incorporation of the Foundation</p>
<b>2. Facilities</b>	<p>Civic Auditorium, conference building, exhibit hall and all other structures excluding the hotel</p>	<p>Rose Bowl Stadium, adjoining parking areas B, D, F, K, L and M and the Brookside Golf Course and Clubhouse</p> <p>Director of PRCS has discretion but shall make available Areas H, I, J and the Brookside Park Softball Diamonds 2 and 3 in support of events</p>
<b>3. Contracts</b>	<p>Section 2 – Contracts entered into in the name of City</p> <p>Section 4(p)(4) – Contracts must comply with Charter and Municipal Code</p>	<p>Section 3.2 – Contracts entered into on behalf of the City</p> <p>May procure materials, services, public utilities, supplies and equipment reasonably necessary</p> <p>Section 3.4.5 - Contracts must comply with Charter and Municipal Code</p>
<b>4. Responsibilities</b>	<p>Section 3 - Manage all facilities for the public purposes in which they were built</p> <p>Operate the parking garage and retain all revenue after expenses</p> <p>Maintain all facilities in good repair and working order</p> <p>Perform all custodial and janitorial service</p>	<p>Return economic and civic value to the City of Pasadena.</p> <p>Act as a liaison to the residents concerning the impact of stadium operations</p> <p>Section 5.4 - RBOC with control to manage operations in its sole discretion</p>
<b>5. Staffing</b>	<p>PCOC to prepare an Operating Memorandum (organizational chart and reporting relationships) and include it as part of the existing Policy and Procedure Manual, with a copy provided to the City</p> <p>PCOC may employ or contract for employees, legal counsel, consultants, accountants or other employees or contractors as necessary</p> <p>Section 4(g) - All salaries, fees, wages and compensation shall be reasonable</p>	<p>RBOC shall have in place as of July 1, 1996 its own personnel and staffing structure</p> <p>RBOC may employ or contract for employees, legal counsel, consultants, accountants or other employees or contractors as necessary</p>
<b>6. Joint Meeting</b>	<p>Annual joint PCOC/City joint meeting required to discuss goals and objectives, annual report including financial and building</p>	<p>Section 7.3.9 – Annual RBOC/City joint meeting (January or February) required to discuss regarding goals with specific measurement indicators, financial report</p>

	utilization, marketing plan, and five-year capital improvement program	and details utilization by type of function, marketing plans for the RBOC area with specific performance goals and objectives
<b>7. License</b>	PCOC may license, use or permit the use of all or any parts of the facilities	RBOC may license, use or permit the use of all or any parts of the facilities
<b>8. Indebtedness</b>	Section 4 – May not incur indebtedness without prior approval of the City Council	May not incur any indebtedness for any purpose which is secured by the revenues from activities within the RBOC Area  City shall not incur indebtedness based upon pledge of revenue generated by the RBOC
<b>9. Fees</b>	Section 5(a) – Compile a schedule of maximum and minimum rental fees, filed with the City for its approval; exceptions to the schedule may be made if it offers a significant marketing advantage and likely to produce a positive economic impact	Section 8.1 - Compile a schedule of maximum and minimum rental fees, adopted by resolution per Pasadena Municipal Code Section 3.32; exceptions to the schedule may be made if it offers a significant marketing advantage and likely to produce a positive economic impact
<b>10. Policies</b>	Section 5(b) – Maintain operating policies and procedures, submit as an informational item to the City, and modify at the request of City	Establish a series of reasonable operating policies and procedures (no requirement for City review or approval)
<b>11. Financial</b>	Section 6 – PCOC is responsible for accounting; financial audit to occur within 90 days following the end of the fiscal year  Section 7 – Submit annual financial statement to the City and pay net revenue, if any  City to provide funding for PCOC by making Transient Occupancy Tax available  City to provide bond financing capability should it be required for capital improvements	RBOC shall have its own accounting systems  Section 11.0 – Submit annual financial statement to the City and pay to the City portion of net revenue, if any
<b>12. Insurance</b>	PCOC shall maintain on its own or pay the City for automobile liability, general liability, and directors' and officers' liability coverage	RBOC shall procure and maintain public liability, property, earthquake, directors and officers, workers' compensation, riot and civil commotion insurance and surety bonds  Insurance must meet the requirements of August 1, 1990 Facility Lease
<b>13. Naming Rights</b>	PCOC may not sell naming rights or other advertising revenue without prior City Council approval	Section 29 - RBOC has the right to offer naming recognition for stadium features
<b>14. Legislation</b>	Section 2 – Operating Agreement not to be considered a restriction on any legislative authority of the City	City will not adopt any ordinance, resolution, etc. ordering or affecting RBOC area without first submitting to RBOC for report and recommendation

## McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

---

**From:** carl selkin  
**Sent:** Monday, August 01, 2022 3:52 PM  
**To:** PublicComment-AutoResponse  
**Subject:** RBOC item 19

**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...](#)

The needs of the residents of Pasadena need to take precedence as the City Council weighs options for the Rose Bowl operations. The fact is that as the Rose Bowl Operations eat away at the funds that our city needs for housing, especially the notoriously under-resourced need for affordable housing, the costs of the Rose Bowl are increasingly born by the workforce on which our city depends, workers who are forced out of housing or prevented from obtaining housing because of increasing rents as a result of housing scarcity. These residents are forced into longer and longer commutes until it no longer makes sense for them to work in Pasadena. The collapse in available labor is seen in the struggles of local business to find employees, especially at the lower wage levels.

Historic preservation is a valuable concept, but the costs of preservation should not be borne by those in the lower economic echelons. Family golfing centers are nice—but how many people would utilize such a center and where is the cost-benefit analysis that includes the impacts on the entire city and all residents, few of whom would benefit from such a project.

Rose Bowl beneficiaries—hotels, ticket buyers, leasers and tenants—need to support the venue and generate excess revenue for Pasadena's needs. We shouldn't be sinking more money to rescue a failed enterprise just because so much has already been sunk in it.

John Fuhrman and Sonja Berndt make valuable suggestions. But they remain inadequate to float the Rose Bowl to solvency.

Sent from Mail for Windows

08/1/2022  
Item 19