

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Cornelia Seiffert · om>
Sent: Sunday, September 6, 2026 11:45 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Pasadena Equestrian Center

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [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 (PAB). For more information about the PAB view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

Good day,

I see that the lease for the Pasadena Equestrian Center between the City and Rose Bowl Riders is on the agenda for a closed session on Tuesday, Sept. 8th. Below is my correspondence for the record:

Good morning,

I see that the Pasadena Equestrian Center is on the agenda for a closed session next Tuesday.

While there has been recent public comment supporting continuation of the City's relationship with Rose Bowl Riders (RBR) and Myrtle Hill Farm, I want to ensure that the City is also aware that serious and ongoing concerns remain regarding the governance and operation of the organization(s) currently operating on this publicly owned property.

Approximately 20 horses that were previously boarded at the Equestrian Center have now been moved off the property. Many former boarders and stakeholders have attributed their departures to significant recent changes in the structure and operation of the approximately 80-year-old club, including changes they consider inconsistent with responsible nonprofit governance and the historic character of the organization.

These developments follow concerns that I and others have repeatedly brought to the City's attention over a period of years. I remain concerned that the City's limited intervention or oversight, despite notice of these issues, may create unnecessary legal and public-policy risks for the City.

I would appreciate answers to the following:

1. **RFP:** When does the City anticipate issuing a new Request for Proposals for operation of the Pasadena Equestrian Center following cancellation of the previous RFPs?
2. **Public access and membership:** Records obtained from the City indicate that the City has previously provided direction to RBR concerning access to an arena on the publicly owned property. Given that involvement, what oversight does the City exercise to ensure that access to the property and opportunities offered there are administered fairly and consistently with the public purposes underlying the City's relationship with RBR?

I am a Pasadena taxpayer and former RBR member who left the organization voluntarily and later reapplied for membership. I have been informed that communications I made to City representatives concerning RBR—including requests for governmental review and redress—were discussed by an RBR board member during a closed session meeting in connection with the decision not to approve my membership application.

If accurate, this raises serious questions for me about whether a private organization operating on City property may penalize an individual for communicating concerns to public officials, and what significance the City's involvement with and oversight of RBR may have in that analysis. I have filed a civil-rights complaint and am consulting counsel regarding these issues.

09/8/2026
Item 3

3. **Stakeholder correspondence:** A letter signed by numerous concerned stakeholders was previously sent to City officials regarding these matters. To my knowledge, none of the recipients has acknowledged or substantively responded to that correspondence. Will the City please confirm that the letter was received and advise whether these concerns are being reviewed?

Given that the Pasadena Equestrian Center is now appearing on the City's closed-session agenda, I respectfully ask that these concerns be considered as part of the City's evaluation of its relationship with the organizations currently operating at the property.

Thank you for your attention to these matters. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely,

Cornelia Seiffert, LCSW (CA #104102)
PATH International Certified Therapeutic Horseback Riding Instructor

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Maura Thorpe
Sent: Monday, September 7, 2026 12:18 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Comment CITY COUNCIL SPECIAL MEETING Sept. 8 re Item #3 re 4750 Oak Grove Park lease
Attachments: 2026.08.11 letter to City Atty Bagneris re RBR vote to strip assets.pdf

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [redacted] [...n 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 (PAB). For more information about the PAB view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

I am attaching a copy of the letter I sent to City Attorney Bagneris on August 11, 2026.

In summary, I wrote to City Attorney Bagneris as a member and former board member of Rose Bowl Riders, Inc. to inform her that Rose Bowl Riders' Board of Directors, the Board is run by friends and family of Myrtle Hills Farms, is stripping non-profit Rose Bowl Riders of its assets, operations and lease with the City and **publishes this action as "driven" by the City's requirements**. The stripping of Rose Bowl Rider's assets appears to be a defacto dissolution of Rose Bowl Riders. The Board intends to transfer Rose Bowl Riders assets and operations to an entity controlled by Myrtle Hills Farms and/or its friends and family and to cut ties with Rose Bowl Riders. To do this in the name of the City is deceptive and misleading. And to implement a defacto dissolution of the non profit with less than the required 2/3 vote of the membership would not be legal.

I believe the City should be aware of the information the Board has published to its members (see attached) and would like to know if this stripping of assets and operations is driven by the City.

Rose Bowl Riders is an 80-year heritage Pasadena institution, and it needs the City's protection. The recent actions of the Board have forced most of the non-Myrtle Hills members to move their horses, some out of safety and retaliation concerns. I would like to see the City intervene to deny the transfer of the lease to a new entity and to require the Board to work with all its members to attain fair representation of all its members and resolve some of the serious issues, especially the issues that involve children's safety and quality standard of care of the horses.

Sincerely,
Maura Thorpe

09/8/2026
Item 3



Outlook

Fwd: Pasadena Lessee-Rose Bowl Riders-assets being stripped using the City to justify

From Maura Thorpe

Date Tue 8/11/2026 1:26 PM

To mbagneris@cityofpasadena.net <mbagneris@cityofpasadena.net>

 3 attachments (525 KB)

Notice of Upcoming Membership Vote and Resolution.pdf; Questions and answers for members following 7-21-26 mtg.pdf; Material Terms and Governance Summary @ 7-30-26.pdf;

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Maura Thorpe

Date: August 11, 2026 at 1:22:42 PM PDT

To: mbagneris@ci.pasadena.ca.us

Subject: Pasadena Lessee-Rose Bowl Riders-assets being stripped using the City to justify

Dear City Attorney Bagneris,

I am writing to you as a member and former board member of Rose Bowl Riders, Inc., a California nonprofit, (Rose Bowl Riders leases City property at Hahamonga Park) to apprise you of a very serious situation in which **the City of Pasadena is being used by the Board of Directors of Rose Bowl Riders to justify stripping Rose Bowl Riders of its assets, operations and lease with the City.** I suspect that the information the Rose Bowl Riders' Board of Directors is publishing to its members about the City's role in driving this action is misleading and deceptive. The vote on this action is scheduled for August 18.

Rose Bowl is a heritage California nonprofit public benefit IRC 501(c)(7) started in 1946 and operating at property leased from the City of Pasadena in Hahamonga Park. Rose Bowl Riders' stated purpose in its bylaws is to operate an equestrian facility. Rose Bowl Riders' assets include significant operating, cash, equipment, tools, water, truck, tractor, utility vehicles, maintenance, equipment, stalls, tack, bars, storage structures, and other equipment necessary to operate the equestrian facility.

The Rose Bowl Riders' Board of Directors is seeking to permanently transfer the City's

lease and all of the assets and operations of Rose Bowl Riders out of Rose Bowl Riders and into a complicated entity structure (involving a new non profit and two LLCs) in which Rose Bowl Riders and its members would have no governing authority, oversight, or operational control over its former assets, lease and facility operations. The lease, the assets, and operations would be forever lost to Rose Bowl Riders. This is tantamount to a dissolution of Rose Bowl Riders. This is being done in the name of the City. **The Board directly states that this proposal is driven by the City.**

The Board of Rose Bowl Riders has scheduled a vote on August 18 for approval of this action by the members. **Not only is the Board of Directors seeking to do this before obtaining permission from the City to transfer the lease, but it is doing so by publishing to the members that it is necessary as driven by the City's expectations, objectives, and in alignment with the City's vision.** I understand that certain individuals at Rose Bowl Riders have been in discussions with individuals on behalf of the City, but I think it is deceptive for the Board of Directors to state that permanently transferring assets out of the heritage nonprofit is driven by the City's requirements.

I have attached the documents that the Board of Directors published to the membership to sway the voting members. As you will see, the numerous references to the City's expectations, vision, objectives, and requirements, misleads the membership into believing that the transfer of assets is driven by the City. The Board uses the City as an excuse to justify stripping Rose Bowl riders of these assets.

Here is a summary of the references in the documents sent to the Rose Bowl Riders members stating that this transfer of assets is driven by the city: [my comments are in brackets]. The documents are attached.

NOTICE OF SPECIAL MEETING: the new entities into which the board will transfer Rose Bowl Riders' assets "will carry out the charitable, educational, and public-serving activities **outlined in the City's vision** for the Pasadena Equestrian Center."

"The membership is being asked to vote on this now so that Rose Bowl Riders is ready for... **the possibility of a third RFP.**"

[I do not believe there is any third RFP under consideration at this time so this is just a misleading tactic.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

I. **"Beyond the City's expectations,** the Board believes these organizational improvements **are necessary...**"

I.1. "The Board determined that **the City envisions** the Pasadena Equestrian Center..."

"In addition to **better aligning with the City's vision,**..."

I.2. "During the RFP process, the Board recognized that **the City's goals and operational requirements** for the Pasadena Equestrian Center..."

I.3. **"The timing of this proposal was initially driven by the City's request for proposal process.** As part of that process, **the City advised that clarification of the**

proposed operating structure was needed before moving forward toward a final operations agreement. **The Board determined that it would facilitate negotiations with the City if the new 501(c)(3) nonprofit were formed** as well, and the related agreements necessary to establish the proposed operation structure were completed, including the Joint Venture."

I."4. Is this being driven by the city?

"The proposal is the result of both the City's evolving expectations for the Pasadena equestrian center, and the legal and financial recommendations provided to the Board..."

II.1 The joint venture with between RBR equine operations, LLC and Myrtle Hill Farm LLC is "intended to coordinate the day-to-day operation of the Pasadena equestrian center **under the City contract.**"

II.4 "[Rose Bowl Riders] ... **will not** manage the day today operations, or **provide oversight** of any of the other entities." [the clear intention is to cut ties with Rose Bowl Riders.]

III. 1. "The proposal will transfer operational responsibilities, assets, and liabilities not dissolve Rose Bowl Riders.... [Because the stated purpose in the bylaws of Rose Bowl riders is to operate an equestrian facility, stripping Rose Bowl riders of its assets and operations is tantamount to a dissolution.]

III.2. The assets expected to transfer include: operating cash associated with the equestrian operations; contracts, border, agreements, and operational records; equipment, tools, water, truck, tractors, utility vehicles, maintenance, equipment, supplies; employee, relationships, and operational obligations; and Rose Bowl riders owned improvements, including stalls, corrals, tack, bars, storage structures, portable, fencing, dressage court, mounting blocks, grandstands, picnic tables, clubhouse, and other improvements owned by Rose Bowl riders. This list is not exhaustive.

The operational obligations and liabilities expected to transfer include: employee, wages, and payroll obligations; workers, compensation, and employment, compliance; utilities, trash, removal, manure, removal, and grounds, maintenance; clubhouse, maintenance; insurance required for facility operations – general liability, auto, property, sexual molestation; lease obligations and operating responsibilities; vendor agreement, and operational contract contracts.

[As you can see, this transfer strips Rose Bowl Riders of all its hard assets as well as its ability to "operate an equestrian facility". The justification for this is the City's expectations, vision, goals and operational requirements.]

MATERIAL TERMS AND SUMMARY OF GOVERNANCE

[As you will see, the new business structure is very complicated but results in the new entities (into which Rose Bowl Riders' assets and operations are transferred) will be self-governing, meaning that they appoint their own directors and have no oversight by Rose Bowl Riders. Rose Bowl Riders will be cut off . The initial directors that they have

appointed are the same directors that are putting together this transaction which strips, Rose Bowl riders of its assets. And all are friends and family and clients of Myrtle Hill Farm.]

I have attached the following documents which were sent to the members on August 1, 2026:

Notice of special meeting August 18 2026
Questions and Answers
Material Terms and Summary of Governance

I write to you to ask whether the statements made by the Board of Directors - that the proposal to transfer the operations, assets and liabilities of Rose Bowl Riders to a new entity in conjunction with a joint venture with two for profit LLC's - is driven by the City in any way? Has the City advised Rose Bowl Riders of this new entity structure? Did the City communicate to Rose Bowl Riders that this transfer of assets and entity restructuring is necessary for the City's expectations, vision, goals, or operating requirements? Is this transfer of assets and entity restructuring necessary for the City's expectations, vision, goals, or operating requirements?

Thank you for your time.

If you would like to contact me, you may reach me via this email or cell phone:(213) 247-7270.

Sincerely,
Maura Thorpe

Sent from my iPad

Upcoming Membership Vote – Asset Transfer to Community Benefit Organization

The vote to authorize the transfer of certain operations, assets and liabilities from Rose Bowl Riders, Inc to the new 501c3 is has been rescheduled from July 30 to August 18, 2026.

This notice is being given at least 15 days before the meeting, as required by the bylaws. The special meeting of the membership will be held in person on August 18, 2026, at 7:00 p.m. in the Clubhouse at 4750 Oak Grove Dr. in Hahamongna Watershed Park, Pasadena, CA. Members may vote in person, by proxy, or by written or electronic ballot as described in the enclosed materials. Only the business described in this notice will be conducted at the meeting. The record date for determining the members entitled to notice of, and to vote at, the meeting is June 30, 2026. A quorum of twenty percent (20%) of the voting membership must be present in person or by proxy, and the transfer will be approved if a majority of the members voting (a quorum being established) vote in favor.

The members will vote on the resolution to authorize the transfer of certain operations, assets and liabilities from the Rose Bowl Riders 501(c)(7) social club to the Rose Bowl Riders Community Benefit Organization, a 501(c)(3) nonprofit public benefit corporation. The resolution authorizes the Board to implement the transfer and execute the legal documents necessary to complete the transfer in an orderly manner. *The resolution is attached to this notice.*

Rose Bowl Riders, Inc. (the 501(c)(7) social club) will not be dissolved. It will continue to exist as a membership-based social club, while the Community Benefit Organization and the Joint Venture will carry out the charitable, educational, and public-serving activities outlined in the City's vision for the Pasadena Equestrian Center.

The membership is being asked to vote on this now so that RBR is ready for the future – the negotiation of a long-term lease or the possibility of a third RFP.

Included with this notice

- Resolution to transfer certain operations, assets and liabilities of Rose Bowl Riders (501c7) to Rose Bowl Riders Community Benefit Organization (501c3)
- Questions and answers given at the July 21, 2026, informational meeting
- Questions and answers received at the conclusion of the informational meeting
- The broad terms of the transfer and a summary of how the new entities are governed

RESOLUTION OF THE MEMBERS OF ROSE BOWL RIDERS, INC.

Authorizing the Transfer of Assets and Operations to Rose Bowl Riders Community Benefit Organization

ROSE BOWL RIDERS

Informational meeting July 21, 2026

Questions and answers submitted prior to and at the conclusion of the meeting.

Rose Bowl Riders members submitted questions prior to the meeting. These are the answers to those questions.

The meeting was called to order at 6:35 p.m.

Angela Lowell, President, Heather Kodama, Vice President, presided over the meeting with guest, attorney Jim Robertson from Hahn & Hahn, LLP present.

Good evening, everyone. Thanks so much for being here.

It's really nice to see such a great turnout tonight. I think the fact that so many of you came says something important—we all care about Rose Bowl Riders and where we're headed. We may not all see every issue the same way, but I think we all want what's best for this club.

The reason we're here tonight is pretty simple. We want to share information, answer as many of your questions as we can, and make sure everyone has the information they need before the membership votes.

First, I want to thank everyone who submitted questions ahead of time. We received several, and many covered the same topics, so we've grouped them together to help keep things moving.

I'm also very pleased to introduce **Jim Robertson from Hahn & Hahn**, who has been advising the Board throughout this process. He's here tonight to help explain the legal and governance aspects of the proposal and to help answer many of the questions we've received.

I also want to acknowledge what's probably the biggest question in the room. Since we announced this meeting, the City closed the current RFP. We know that's raised a lot of questions, and we're going to talk about that tonight. We just ask that you let us walk through the whole picture before deciding what that means.

If something comes to mind during the presentation, please jot it down on the index card you received when you came in. We'll start with the questions submitted ahead of time, and if time allows, we'll move on to additional written questions.

Tonight's presentation will conclude at 7:30. If we don't get to every question, we'll answer the remaining ones afterward in an email to the membership. And finally, I ask just one favor.

Let's assume the best of one another tonight. Let's keep an open mind, treat each other with kindness and respect, and let the meeting follow the format we've outlined. That will give us the best chance to answer as many questions as possible and make the most of our time together.

Thanks again for coming.

Let's get started.

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

I. WHY IS THIS CHANGE NECESSARY?

The Board believes the proposed organizational structure is in the best interests of Rose Bowl Riders because it better positions the organization to meet both its long-term mission and the evolving operational requirements of the Pasadena Equestrian Center.

The City's Request for Proposals (RFP) does not require the operator to become a 501(c)(3), nor does it prohibit a 501(c)(7). However, the RFP repeatedly describes the Pasadena Equestrian Center as a public-serving community resource. It requires the operator to provide public access, educational programming, community events, scholarships, internships, and measurable public benefit, while operating a facility that is accessible and open to the general public. These requirements are significantly broader than the traditional purpose of a social club.

Beyond the City's expectations, the Board believes these organizational improvements are necessary regardless of the outcome of any particular operating agreement. Like many organizations that have existed for decades, Rose Bowl Riders has grown considerably. With that growth comes increased responsibilities related to governance, financial management, insurance, employment compliance, and risk management.

The Board also believes the organization must continue evolving to remain financially sustainable. While boarding income remains an essential part of Rose Bowl Riders' operations, a diversified revenue model is necessary to support long-term maintenance, capital improvements, educational programming, insurance, and future growth.

1. Why is Rose Bowl Riders creating a new 501(c)(3)?

After evaluating the City's Request for Proposal (RFP), the Board determined that the City envisions the Pasadena Equestrian Center operating as a public-serving community resource with expanded public programming and access.

To better position Rose Bowl Riders for the future, the Board retained Hahn & Hahn LLP to evaluate the most appropriate organizational structure. Based upon that professional guidance, the Board concluded that creating a charitable 501(c)(3), together with an organizational structure that appropriately separates charitable and commercial activities, would provide the strongest long-term framework for continuing equestrian operations. In addition to better aligning with the City's vision, a 501(c)(3) is eligible to seek charitable grants and accept tax-deductible donations, creating additional opportunities to support

educational programming, community outreach, facility improvements, and the long-term sustainability of the Pasadena Equestrian Center.

The Board also considered whether the existing **Rose Bowl Riders Charitable Organization (RBRCO)** could fulfill this role. Based upon the Board's understanding of the City's expectations through the RFP process, the Board concluded that a public-serving nonprofit organization would be better suited to the proposed operations role than a membership organization. Because RBRCO is a membership organization, the Board determined that creating a new 501(c)(3) was the most appropriate structure to meet those objectives. RBRCO will continue to exist, and current Rose Bowl Riders members will continue to be members of RBRCO.

2. Why can't RBR simply remain a 501(c)(7) social club?

A 501(c)(7) social club is designed primarily to serve its members. During the RFP process, the Board recognized that the City's goals and operational requirements for the Pasadena Equestrian Center are evolving toward a broader public-serving model. In addition, the Board identified operational challenges associated with insurance requirements and operating a public-serving equestrian facility through the existing 501(c)(7) structure.

3. Why is this change being proposed now?

The timing of this proposal was initially driven by the City's Request for Proposal (RFP) process. As part of that process, the City advised that clarification of the proposed operating structure was needed before moving forward toward a final operations agreement. The Board determined that it would facilitate negotiations with the City if the new 501(c)(3) nonprofit were formed as well and the related agreements necessary to establish the proposed operations structure were completed, including the Joint Venture.

4. Is this being driven by the City?

The proposal is the result of both the City's evolving expectations for the Pasadena Equestrian Center and the legal and financial recommendations provided to the Board by Hahn & Hahn LLP and the counseling CPA.

II. WHY THE PROPOSED STRUCTURE?

1. What is the purpose of each of the new organizations?

Please explain the purpose of each of the following entities:

Each organization was created to serve a separate legal and operational purpose.

- **Rose Bowl Riders Community Benefit Organization (501(c)(3))** is the charitable nonprofit that supports public programming, education, fundraising, grants, and community outreach.
- **RBR Equine Operations LLC** is a taxable entity owned by the 501(c)(3). It is intended to conduct commercial operations in a manner consistent with nonprofit and tax law.

- **Rose Bowl Riders & Myrtle Hill Farm, LLC** is the Joint Venture between RBR Equine Operations LLC and Myrtle Hill Farm LLC. It is intended to coordinate the day-to-day operation of the Pasadena Equestrian Center under the City contract.

2. Which entity will hold the agreement with the City?

The current plan is for the agreement with the City to be held by **Rose Bowl Riders & Myrtle Hill Farm, LLC (Joint Venture)**. Final terms will depend on the City's ultimate approval and contract documentation.

3. How does the Rose Bowl Riders 501(c)(7) fit into the proposed structure?

Under the proposed structure, Rose Bowl Riders 501(c)(7) would continue as the membership social club, supporting member activities, volunteerism, and the traditions of the organization.

Operational responsibilities for the Pasadena Equestrian Center would be carried out through the new organizational structure.

4. What oversight will the 501(c)(7) have over the new organizations?

The proposed 501(c)(3), its taxable operating subsidiary, and the Joint Venture are separate legal organizations with their own governance structures.

The 501(c)(7) will continue as the membership social club and will not manage the day-to-day operations or provide oversight of any of the other entities.

III.-WHAT IS BEING VOTED ON?

1. What exactly are members voting on?

Members are being asked to consider authorizing the transfer of operations, assets and related liabilities necessary for the continued operation of the Pasadena Equestrian Center. The proposal will transfer operational responsibilities, assets and liabilities – not dissolve the Rose Bowl Riders 501(c)(7) organization.

2. What does "transfer of operations" mean?

The Board believes that assets used in the day-to-day operation of the facility should be owned and managed by the entity responsible for operating, maintaining, insuring, and replacing those assets. Aligning operational assets with operational responsibility promotes greater financial accountability, clearer governance, and more effective risk management.

The assets expected to transfer include:

- Operating cash associated with equestrian operations.
- Contracts, boarder agreements, and operational records.
- Equipment, tools, water truck, tractors, utility vehicles, maintenance equipment, and supplies.
- Employee relationships and operational obligations.

- Rose Bowl Riders-owned improvements, including stalls, corrals, tack barns, storage structures, portable fencing, dressage court, mounting blocks, grandstands, picnic tables, Clubhouse and other improvements owned by Rose Bowl Riders.
(Illustrative and not exhaustive.)

Operational obligations and liabilities expected to transfer include, among other things:

- Employee wages and payroll obligations.
- Workers' compensation and employment compliance.
- Utilities, trash removal, manure removal, and grounds maintenance.
- Clubhouse maintenance
- Insurance required for facility operations – general liability, auto, property, sexual molestation
- Lease obligations and operating responsibilities.
- Vendor agreements and operational contracts.
(Illustrative and not exhaustive.)

IV DOES THIS CHANGE THE CLUB?

1. Is Rose Bowl Riders dissolving?

No.

The proposal is **not** a dissolution of Rose Bowl Riders 501(c)(7). Under California law, dissolution is the legal process of ending a corporation's existence by winding up its affairs, satisfying liabilities, distributing assets, filing dissolution documents, and terminating the corporation.

The membership is **not** being asked to dissolve Rose Bowl Riders.

Instead, the proposal authorizes the transfer of operational assets and obligations to an affiliated charitable organization so that Rose Bowl Riders may continue as a membership-based social club while its former operational responsibilities for the Pasadena Equestrian Center are carried out through the new organizational structure.

2. Will the social club continue?

Yes.

Rose Bowl Riders will continue as a California nonprofit mutual benefit corporation organized to serve its members and preserve the traditions and history of the organization.

The Club will continue to:

- Maintain memberships.
- Elect directors.
- Conduct meetings.
- Sponsor social activities and member events.
- Encourage volunteerism.
- Promote horsemanship and equestrian fellowship.
- Preserve the traditions and identity of Rose Bowl Riders.

Rose Bowl Riders will continue as a membership organization with its traditions, community, and social activities, its own corporate identity, bylaws, membership, Board of Directors, and social mission.

V GOVERNANCE

1. Under what authority may the Board enter into the Joint Venture and create the proposed organizational structure?

Members have asked what authority allows the Board to establish these organizations and enter into a Joint Venture before the membership vote.

Rose Bowl Riders has authority under **California Corporations Code Section 7140(i)** to assume obligations, enter into contracts, and incur liabilities. Under **Section 7140(j)**, it has the authority to: "Participate with others in any partnership, joint venture, or other association, transaction, or arrangement of any kind whether or not such participation involves sharing or delegation of control with or to others." And under **Section 7210**, the Board has the authority to conduct the activities of Rose Bowl Riders and to exercise all its corporate powers.

The membership is **not** being asked to approve the creation of the organizations themselves. Rather, the membership will be asked to vote on the proposed transfer of designated operational assets and related liabilities from the 501(c)(7) to the new 501(c)(3). The Board believes this proposal allows Rose Bowl Riders to return to its traditional role as the membership social club while the 501(c)(3) and Joint Venture focus on operating the Pasadena Equestrian Center for the benefit of the broader community.

2. Who authorized the use of the Rose Bowl Riders name for the newly formed organizations?

The names of the proposed organizations were selected by the Board during meetings with legal counsel.

Bonnie Hedrick, in her capacity as RBR Board Secretary, submitted the formation documents to the State of California.

Bonnie Hedrick and Greg Hedrick were designated as the **Agents for Service of Process** for certain entities. This is a statutory filing requirement and does **not** confer ownership, governing authority, or operational control.

3. Who will govern the new organizations?

Each organization will have its own governing structure consistent with California nonprofit and corporate law. The 501(c)(3) will appoint and oversee the management of its wholly owned taxable subsidiary, RBR Equine Ops, which in turn will serve as the manager of the Joint Venture. The Board intends for the CBO to be governed by individuals committed to supporting the charitable and educational mission of the Pasadena Equestrian Center. The

Board will continue working with Hahn & Hahn to ensure appropriate oversight and governance responsibilities are clearly defined.

4. Will members still have a voice?

The proposal is intended to preserve **Rose Bowl Riders 501(c)(7) as the membership organization**. The proposal does not terminate existing memberships in Rose Bowl Riders. Membership rights would continue under the bylaws of the 501(c)(7).

The proposed 501(c)(3) and Joint Venture are separate entities that will focus on public programming, fundraising, grants, and operating the Pasadena Equestrian Center.- They will be governed by their own Boards of Directors, as is typical for charitable nonprofits and the LLC. RBR's members will continue to govern the **social club** (the 501(c)(7)) but will **not** govern the CBO, the operating subsidiary RBR Equine Ops, or the joint venture.

The Board believes this structure allows the 501(c)(7) to continue serving Rose Bowl Riders' membership social-club needs, and supporting its members through social activities, volunteer opportunities, and other member-focused programs, while the 501(c)(3) and the Joint Venture focus on public programming, education, fundraising, and the operation of the Pasadena Equestrian Center.

VI MYRTLE HILL FARM

1. Why partner with Myrtle Hill Farm?

This is a fair question, particularly given the financial issues that previously existed between Rose Bowl Riders and Myrtle Hill Farm. It is important to understand both the history and the City's objectives. Many of the operational terms for moving forward with Myrtle Hill Farm were negotiated by the previous Board of Directors. Likewise, the previous Board established the framework for resolving the outstanding arrears owed to Rose Bowl Riders.

The current Board did not simply accept those agreements as they existed. Instead, it built upon the previous Board's work by strengthening the agreements, adding additional contractual protections and accountability measures, and incorporating those provisions into the Joint Venture structure. The Board's objective was to better protect Rose Bowl Riders' interests while ensuring Myrtle Hill Farm remained accountable for its obligations as the organizations moved forward together.

At the same time, the Board evaluated what would best satisfy the City's requirements for the Pasadena Equestrian Center. During discussions with City representatives, it became clear that the City's vision extends well beyond simply providing riding lessons. Pasadena is seeking an operator that can demonstrate meaningful public benefit through community engagement, educational programming, volunteer opportunities, youth activities, and expanded public access to equestrian programs.

Myrtle Hill Farm is already equipped to provide the professional equestrian operations necessary to meet those goals. Specifically, Myrtle Hill Farm:

- Operates a large, established lesson program at the Pasadena Equestrian Center.
- Employ professional trainers and staff rather than relying primarily on volunteers.
- Is prepared to obtain and maintain the insurance required by the City.
- Has the horses, equipment, personnel, and infrastructure necessary to immediately provide public riding lessons and educational programming.
- Has the operational capacity to expand programs that serve both the public and Rose Bowl Riders members.

However, the City indicated it was looking for more than a private lesson business. A private operator alone does not provide the broader community engagement and public-serving mission the City identified as important.

Rose Bowl Riders, as a 501c3, brings that essential public benefit. Through its educational programs, community events, equestrian advocacy, and decades of service to the Pasadena community, Rose Bowl Riders CBO will provide the public outreach and community engagement component that complements Myrtle Hill Farm's professional operations.

2. What protections exist against private benefit?

The Board has worked with Hahn & Hahn to develop a structure intended to comply with IRS requirements governing nonprofit and corporate organizations. Compensation, services, and contractual relationships are intended to be conducted on arm's length terms consistent with applicable law and documented through formal agreements.

VII FINANCIAL QUESTIONS –

All corporations and independent contractors who operate onsite are required to carry separate insurances – general commercial liability and/or equine liability, workers' compensation where applicable, sexual abuse and molestation coverage (new requirement), auto and property insurance plus waivers of subrogation to protect the City. RBR is currently covered as a boarding facility without the proper coverage to provide public riding lessons, public benefit activities or the public access envisioned by the City. Partnering in a joint venture with MHF will reduce the insurance costs down to one comprehensive policy that covers all the activity on the property.

1. Will membership dues become tax deductible?

No.

Membership dues paid to the 501(c)(7) generally remain membership dues and are not charitable contributions.

2. Will donations become tax deductible?

Once the IRS has approved the tax exemption of the 501(c)(3), qualified charitable donations made to the 501(c)(3), and otherwise meeting applicable requirements, may be tax deductible.

3. Will lesson fees become tax deductible?

No.

Lesson fees are payments for services rather than charitable contributions.

4. Will grants benefit the organization?

One advantage of a 501(c)(3) is expanded eligibility for grants and charitable fundraising to support educational programming, facility improvements, and community outreach.

VIII ASSETS

1. Who owns Rose Bowl Riders' assets-the corporation or the membership?

Rose Bowl Riders, Inc. owns the organization's assets and is responsible for its liabilities. Membership dues, boarding fees, event proceeds, and other revenues support the operation of the organization, including employee wages, insurance, maintenance, equipment, leasehold obligations, infrastructure, and facility improvements.

While members support the organization through their participation and financial contributions, the assets themselves are owned by the nonprofit corporation rather than by individual members.

2. Who owns member-purchased equipment?

Equipment purchased by Rose Bowl Riders has historically been owned by the corporation rather than individual members. Any transfer of operational assets would occur only as authorized by the membership and in accordance with applicable law.

3. Will the Joint Venture or Myrtle Hill Farm own Rose Bowl Riders' assets?

How are private benefit concerns addressed?

The proposal asks the membership to authorize the transfer of designated operational assets and related liabilities from the 501(c)(7) to the new 501(c)(3).

The proposed Joint Venture would **not** own these assets.

Myrtle Hill Farm LLC would **not** own these assets.

The assets would be owned by the new 501(c)(3), while contractual relationships among the entities would be governed by formal agreements reviewed by legal counsel. The proposed structure has been designed with guidance from Hahn & Hahn LLP to address applicable nonprofit governance and IRS private benefit requirements.

4. Does transferring operational assets dissolve Rose Bowl Riders?

Members have asked whether:

- transferring substantially all operational assets, or
- transferring responsibility for operating the Pasadena Equestrian Center

constitutes a dissolution of Rose Bowl Riders.

No.

The proposal is not a dissolution of Rose Bowl Riders.

The proposal is intended to allow the 501(c)(7) to continue as the membership social club while transferring the operations, assets and liabilities to the new 501(c)(3).

5. What is each organization contributing to the proposed structure?

Under the proposed structure:

- **Rose Bowl Riders (501(c)(7))** would transfer designated operational assets and related liabilities to the new 501(c)(3), subject to membership approval.
- **Myrtle Hill Farm LLC** contributes its operational management experience, equestrian instruction, and day-to-day expertise in operating the Pasadena Equestrian Center.

Together, these contributions are intended to support the continued operation of the facility under the proposed organizational structure.

6. What assets will remain with Rose Bowl Riders?

The following are expected to remain with Rose Bowl Riders 501(c)(7):

- The corporation itself.
- Membership records.
- The bylaws.
- Existing governance responsibilities.
- Social activities and member functions.
- Funds reserved for continuing Club operations, insurance and social functions.

IX LEGAL COMPLIANCE

1. Why did the Board retain nonprofit legal counsel?

Because the proposed organizational transition involves nonprofit law, IRS regulations, corporate governance, and contractual relationships with the City, the Board retained Hahn & Hahn LLP and counseling CPA to provide specialized legal guidance throughout the process.

2. How are conflicts of interest addressed?

The Board complies with all applicable nonprofit governance standards and conflict-of-interest requirements. Hahn & Hahn has reviewed the proposed governance structure and determined that it complies with these requirements.

With respect to MHF, Board members who take lessons or lease horses are customers engaged in a consumer relationship and do not have an expectation of pecuniary gain. The same is true for Board members who board horses at RBR. Their boarding arrangements are consumer transactions governed by standard boarding agreements and do not create an expectation of pecuniary gain.

X.-CITY OF PASADENA

1. Why does the City prefer this structure?

The City has expressed a desire for the Pasadena Equestrian Center to operate as a public-serving community resource with expanded access, educational programming, and long-term sustainability.

During the RFP process, the Board understood that the City was seeking a structure focused on public access, community programming, and long-term sustainability. The proposed organizational structure was developed to better align with those goals while preserving the Rose Bowl Riders community.

2. Will the City continue regulating the facility?

Board Response

Yes.

The City will continue to establish operational requirements through its lease or operations agreement, including matters such as occupancy, parking, public access, and facility standards.

XI COMMUNITY IMPACT

1. Will the barn become overcrowded?

The proposal does not change the City's authority over occupancy limits, parking, safety requirements, or operational standards. The Board intends to continue operating within all applicable City requirements.

2. What stays the same?

The Board's goal is to preserve the things members value most:

- Our equestrian community
- Responsible horsemanship
- Volunteerism
- Friendships and traditions
- Our commitment to connecting people with horses and the outdoors
- Our desire to continue operating the Pasadena Equestrian Center

XII REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION AND DOCUMENTATION

1. Member have requested additional information and access to documents related to the proposed organizational transition, including:

- Draft agreements and operations documents
- Financial projections
- Conflict-of-interest disclosures
- Legal opinions from independent legal counsel
- Board resolutions or meeting minutes related to the proposed organizational structure

- Organizational documents, business filings, and related agreements
- Existing agreements between Rose Bowl Riders and Myrtle Hill Farm
- A copy of the Request for Proposal (RFP) submitted to the City of Pasadena

The Board understands that members are interested in reviewing additional information regarding the proposed organizational transition.

Rose Bowl Riders members have inspection rights under California law with respect to certain corporate records of Rose Bowl Riders, Inc. Those records generally include:

- Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws.
- Minutes and records that are available for inspection under applicable California law.
- Certain accounting books and records of the corporation.
- Membership records, subject to applicable legal requirements and limitations.
- Certain records for purposes reasonably related to a member's interests as a member, as provided by California law.

Not all requested documents are subject to inspection. Documents that may be protected from disclosure include:

- Attorney-client communications.
- Attorney work product.
- Draft agreements and negotiation materials.
- Documents belonging to separate legal entities.
- Confidential personnel records.
- Documents subject to contractual or legal confidentiality obligations.

This information in this document is intended to provide members with the information reasonably necessary to make an informed decision while complying with its legal obligations regarding confidentiality and privileged communications.

Additional questions received at the meeting:

1. Current contract with City of Pasadena and lease renewal

The existing contract with City of Pasadena was last amended on June 12, 2023 for a six-month term from July 1, 2023-December 31, 2023. RBR has been on a month-to-month tenancy since January 2024. This is the third time RBR has been on a month-to-month lease with City of Pasadena. The lease may be terminated by either party on 30 days' written notice. It is the Board's intention to work with the City on a new or updated lease following the vote to transfer assets and liabilities. It is in RBR's best interest to seek an amended or new lease with City of Pasadena so we are not on a month-to-month tenancy.

2. Who gets the assets if the RFP is awarded to someone else?

Assuming the City of Pasadena does not enter into a new or amended lease with RBR and terminates RBR's current month-to-month lease, the terms of the current lease state, "All structures or other improvements existing on the property as of the date of this amendment or placed on the Property with the consent of Lessor shall be the personal property of Lessee and shall be removed by Lessee by the last day of the Lease; provided further, Lessor may dispose of any property not so removed." RBR *owns and may remove* its improvements and equipment by the last day. Structures and improvements placed on the property by MWD or the City or with the City's consent are RBR's personal property — so the permanent improvements, including the clubhouse and barn, belong to RBR.

**3. Does the City need to give permission to transfer the lease and has that happened?
Does the transfer of assets and liabilities violate the current lease?**

RBR's current lease prohibits assigning or subleasing any part of the property without the City's consent. The City may allow RBR to enter operating agreements with trainers and other users, but only at the City's discretion and subject to the City's right to require pre-approval and to terminate such arrangements. The transfer of RBR's own assets and liabilities - which are the personal property of the corporation - is not by itself an assignment or sublease of the property. Because the intent is to move the lease away from the 501c7 social club (membership organization) the lease itself will need to be assigned to, or a new lease entered by, the new operating entity (the joint venture). That step is an assignment or new lease that requires the City's discretionary consent, which has not yet been sought. For strategic reasons, the Board intends to complete the member vote first, since the City will likely want the transfer approved before discussing the lease.

The members should understand that once RBR's assets are officially and completely transferred and held by the new charitable corporation, they are dedicated to charitable purposes and cannot be returned to RBR or its members.

4. RBR members should be able to review the bylaws of the new organizations.

The new 501(c)(3) and the two LLCs are separate organizations with their own boards and governing documents. RBR members do not elect the managers or directors of the new entities nor have the same inspection rights RBR members have in RBR's own records. Even so, because RBR members are being asked to authorize the transfer, the material terms of the transfer and a plain-language summary of how the new entities are governed, while reserving privileged, confidential, and draft materials is included with this information.

5. Will the membership receive a full written copy of the proposed bylaws and transfer agreement to review before the vote.

See answer to question 4 above.

6. How will the City be involved going forward?

City of Pasadena continues to be the landlord with all the rights they currently have over the property per the current lease. Their role on the property does not change on its own; because the operating entity will change, a new lease or an assignment of the existing lease to the new entity — which requires the City's consent — is a necessary step, not an optional one.

7. If the City blocks the lease transfer, what is the backup plan to prevent the club from being evicted?

Rose Bowl Riders has been on a month-to-month tenancy with City of Pasadena since January 2024. The City can evict RBR at any time on 30-days' written notice. If the City does not wish to renew the lease or transfer it to the Joint Venture, the status of RBR remains the same – the club continues on a month-to-month lease. The member vote *authorizes* the transfer, but the Board will not *complete* the transfer until the City has agreed to a new lease or an assignment. If the City is unwilling to do so, the Board can pause or restructure the transfer so the club keeps its current tenancy while alternatives are explored. The Board's goal remains to move the club off the insecurity of month-to-month by negotiating a longer-term or updated lease, and to time the asset and lease transfer to align with those discussions with the City.

8. Who will have oversight of boarding, horse care, use of tack rooms, etc.?

Once the transfer is approved and the Board determines the timing of implementation, the intent is for the Joint Venture will assume management of the operations of the facility, including horse boarding and related horse care services with the 501c3 maintaining overall control.

9. Will boarders be able to hire insured professionals for services such as bodywork, outside trainers, etc?

Boarders will continue to be able to hire their preferred veterinarians, horse chiropractors and farriers. Outside trainers will need to be approved by the Joint Venture based upon City restrictions, insurance requirements, size of program, ability to perform public benefit services for Pasadena and proper vetting to confirm experience and suitability.

10. How are the lawyers getting paid?

For the Joint Venture, Hahn & Hahn was engaged to form the joint-venture entity and to represent that entity in preparing its operating agreement. Although the firm has represented Rose Bowl Riders on other matters, for this engagement, the firm represents the joint-venture entity itself — not Rose Bowl Riders and not Myrtle Hill Farm. Rose Bowl Riders CBO (through RBR Equine Operations) and Myrtle Hill Farm are the prospective equity holders in the joint venture, and as a business matter they are sharing the cost of forming that entity and preparing its operating agreement; sharing that cost does not make either of them the firm's client on the current matter. Rose Bowl Riders is separately responsible for the legal costs of the new 501(c)(3) and RBR Equine Operations, LLC. The cost-sharing arrangement with Myrtle Hill Farm was reviewed under the Board's conflict-of-

interest process. To date, no funds have been expended by RBR to form the entities with the IRS or State of California.

11. Does the State have to approve the transfer of assets?

Generally, no. Under California nonprofit law, a transfer of assets from Rose Bowl Riders to the new 501c3 charitable corporation requires only internal approval — the Board and, for a transfer of substantially all assets, the membership. There is no general requirement to obtain approval from the California Attorney General or the Secretary of State for this kind of transfer. Only if any of RBR's assets are held in charitable trust, must RBR give the California Attorney General at least 20 days' written notice before transferring those assets. "Held in charitable trust" refers to the legal arrangement where assets or property are managed by a third party, known as the trustee, for the benefit of another party or group, known as the beneficiary. RBR does not hold any assets in charitable trust.

WHEREAS, Rose Bowl Riders, Inc. is a California nonprofit mutual benefit corporation described in Section 501(c)(7) of the Internal Revenue Code (“**RBR**”);

WHEREAS, Rose Bowl Riders Community Benefit Organization is a California nonprofit public benefit corporation organized for charitable and educational purposes, described in Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code (the “**CBO**”);

WHEREAS, the Board of Directors has determined that transferring RBR’s equestrian, educational, and community-serving operations and related assets to the CBO is in the best interests of RBR and advances its charitable and community-serving purposes, while RBR continues to exist and operate as a Section 501(c)(7) social club; and

WHEREAS, this transfer is submitted to the members for approval as required by the California Nonprofit Mutual Benefit Corporation Law and RBR’s bylaws;

NOW, THEREFORE, the members resolve as follows:

1. **Authorization of Transfer.** The members authorize the Board of Directors to transfer to the CBO the assets, contracts, rights, obligations, employees, funds, equipment, vehicles, supplies, and other property associated with RBR’s equestrian operations, educational programs, community programs, and related activities.
2. **Purpose.** The purpose of the transfer is to permit the CBO to operate and expand RBR’s charitable, educational, and community-serving activities, while RBR, Inc. continues to exist and operate as a Section 501(c)(7) social club.
3. **Board Discretion over Terms and Timing.** The Board of Directors is authorized, in its discretion, to determine the specific assets, contracts, and obligations to be transferred (and any to be retained by RBR), the consideration, if any, and the timing and manner of the transfer, and to carry out the transfer directly or through one or more entities affiliated with or controlled by the CBO.
4. **Consents; City Lease.** To the extent any element of the transfer requires the consent or approval of a third party or governmental authority — including any transfer of RBR’s lease with the City of Pasadena, which may be transferred only with the City’s consent — that element is subject to obtaining such consent, and the effectiveness of the remainder of the transfer is not conditioned on it.
5. **Further Authority.** The Board of Directors is authorized to negotiate, approve, execute, and deliver such agreements, assignments, employee-transition documents, and other instruments, and to take all such further actions, as the Board deems necessary or appropriate to implement the transactions authorized by this resolution.
6. **Ratification.** All actions previously taken by the Board of Directors and the officers of RBR in furtherance of the foregoing are ratified, confirmed, and approved.

Material Terms of the Proposed Transfer and Summary of Governance of the New Organizations

Enclosure to the Notice of Membership Meeting and Vote - for distribution to the Rose Bowl Riders membership
July 2026

Part 1 — Material Terms of the Transfer

1. What members are being asked to approve. The membership is being asked to authorize the transfer of certain operations, assets, and liabilities of The Rose Bowl Riders, Inc. (the existing 501(c)(7) social club, “RBR”) to Rose Bowl Riders Community Benefit Organization (the new 501(c)(3) nonprofit public benefit corporation, the “CBO”), and to authorize the Board to implement that transfer and sign the documents needed to complete it.

2. The existing club is not dissolving. RBR (the 501(c)(7)) will continue to exist as a membership-based social club. The charitable, educational, and public-serving activities at the Pasadena Equestrian Center will be carried out through the CBO and the related operating entities described in Part 2.

3. Assets to be transferred. The transfer will include

- Operating cash associated with equestrian operations.
- Contracts, boarder agreements, and operational records.
- Equipment, tools, water truck, tractors, utility vehicles, maintenance equipment, and supplies.
- Employee relationships and operational obligations.
- Rose Bowl Riders-owned improvements, including stalls, corrals, tack barns, storage structures, portable fencing, dressage court, mounting blocks, grandstands, picnic tables, Clubhouse, and other improvements owned by Rose Bowl Riders. *(Illustrative and not exhaustive.)*

RBR will retain

- The corporation itself.
- Membership records.
- The bylaws.
- Existing governance responsibilities.
- Social activities and member functions.
- Funds reserved for continuing Club operations, insurance and social functions.

4. Liabilities to be assumed. The Community Benefit Organization will assume ongoing operating obligations

- Employee wages and payroll obligations.
- Workers' compensation and employment compliance.
- Utilities, trash removal, manure removal, and grounds maintenance.
- Clubhouse maintenance
- Insurance required for facility operations – general liability, auto, property, sexual molestation

- Lease obligations and operating responsibilities.
- Vendor agreements and operational contracts.
(*Illustrative and not exhaustive.*)

5. Consideration and valuation. The assets are being transferred in furtherance of charitable purposes. No cash values have been assigned.

6. Relationship between the asset-holding entity and the operating entity. Because the charitable assets may be held by one entity (the CBO) and the facility operated by another (a joint venture or subsidiary), the entities will enter a written operations agreement governing the operator's use of the CBO's assets. That agreement will be on arm's length terms.

7. Timing. If the membership approves the transfer, the Board will implement it prior to or during any lease negotiations with City of Pasadena.

8. Approvals and safeguards.

- **Member vote.** Because this involves a transfer of a substantial amount of RBR's assets, California law requires approval by the Board and by the membership. This vote provides that member approval.
- **Conflicts of interest.** Because Myrtle Hill Farm participates in the operating joint venture, the transaction has been reviewed under the Board's conflict-of-interest process. Two board members are considered "interested directors" based on family and employment ties to Myrtle Hill Farm. The remaining six board members are "disinterested directors." Board members who take lessons or lease horses are customers – a consumer relationship, not an expectation of pecuniary gain, therefore not "interested" on that basis. The joint venture was approved unanimously by the six disinterested board members.
- **State notice.** No approval from the California Attorney General or Secretary of State is required for this kind of transfer, **except** that if any of RBR's assets are determined to be held in charitable trust, RBR must give the Attorney General at least 20 days' written notice before transferring those assets. "Held in charitable trust" refers to the legal arrangement where assets or property are managed by a third party, known as the trustee, for the benefit of another party or group, known as the beneficiary. RBR does not hold any assets in charitable trust.

9. What does not change for members.

Rose Bowl Riders will continue as a California nonprofit mutual benefit corporation organized to serve its members and preserve the traditions and history of the organization.

The Club will continue to:

- Maintain memberships.
- Elect directors.
- Conduct meetings.
- Sponsor social activities and member events.
- Encourage volunteerism.

- Promote horsemanship and equestrian fellowship.
- Preserve the traditions and identity of Rose Bowl Riders.

Rose Bowl Riders will continue as a membership organization with its traditions, community, and social activities. Rose Bowl Riders will continue to have its own corporate identity, bylaws, membership, Board of Directors, and social mission.

Part 2. How the New Organizations Are Governed

There are three new or affected organizations. In plain terms:

A. Rose Bowl Riders Community Benefit Organization (the “CBO”) - the 501(c)(3)

The CBO is a California nonprofit **public benefit** corporation, formed in April 2026, and intended to qualify as tax-exempt under Internal Revenue Code Section 501(c)(3). It is organized under California’s Nonprofit Public Benefit Corporation Law for public and charitable purposes and is governed by its board of directors under its articles of incorporation and bylaws.

- **Purpose:** the CBO’s stated specific purpose is to provide access to horses and riding opportunities to the greater Pasadena community. Its articles state that it is organized and operated exclusively for charitable purposes within the meaning of Section 501(c)(3).
- **No members.** The CBO is a **non-membership** public benefit corporation — it has no voting members. It is governed solely by its board of directors. This means that neither RBR’s members nor the public are voting members of the CBO, and they do not elect, nominate, or remove its directors; the board is self-governing.
- **Board of directors:** the CBO is managed by its board of directors. There will be a minimum of five board members, but no more than nine. Board members will serve for a term of three years with a maximum term of three, three-year terms. The initial board members, elected from the current RBR Board of Directors to serve on the CBO Board are Angela Lowell, Heather Kodama, Amy Molina, Laura Pangrazio and Eliza Jacobs.
- **Charitable asset lock:** the CBO’s articles irrevocably dedicate its property to its charitable purposes, and no part of its income or assets may ever benefit any director, officer, or private person. On dissolution, its remaining assets must be distributed to another 501(c)(3) organization — they cannot be returned to RBR or distributed to RBR’s members.
- **Governing documents:** the CBO’s Articles of Incorporation (filed with the California Secretary of State on April 29, 2026) and its bylaws are attached.

B. RBR Equine Operations, LLC - the operating subsidiary

RBR Equine Operations, LLC is a California limited liability company formed to conduct taxable operating activities in support of RBR’s exempt purposes while protecting RBR’s tax-exempt status.

- **Owner (member):** Rose Bowl Riders is the sole member and owns 100% of the company. The membership interest will be transferred to the CBO without dissolving the company, so that going forward the CBO would be its sole owner.

- **Management:** the company is manager-managed, and the CBO will be the manager. The member appoints the manager and may remove and replace the manager at any time, with or without cause.
- **Owner controls major decisions:** the manager runs day-to-day operations, but the member's written consent is required to admit another owner, to merge or convert the company, to sell substantially all of its assets, to dissolve it, or to amend its operating agreement.
- **Tax status:** while it has a single owner, the company is treated as a "disregarded entity" for federal income tax (its income is reported by its owner).
- **Exempt-status safeguards:** the company must operate so as not to jeopardize its owner's tax-exempt status — including keeping separate books, not using the owner's name or marks without written permission, and not entering major joint ventures, incurring significant debt, or granting liens outside the ordinary course without the owner's consent.

C. Rose Bowl Riders & Myrtle Hill Farm, LLC - the joint venture

This is the operating joint venture for the Pasadena Equestrian Center.

- **Owners (members):** RBR Equine Operations, LLC and Myrtle Hill Farm, LLC, are partners in the joint venture, each owning 50% of the company.
- **Manager:** RBR Equine Operations, LLC is the manager and runs day-to-day operations. The manager serves without compensation but is reimbursed for reasonable direct expenses and may be removed and replaced by the owners holding a majority of the interests.
- **Purpose:** to meet the City of Pasadena's requirements by providing governance and oversight of the Pasadena Equestrian Center, making capital improvements, managing community and member relations, providing public-benefit programming, facilitating public rentals, and overseeing day-to-day operations (including lessons, events, clinics, and a summer camp).
- **Major decisions need both owners' agreement:** although RBR Equine Operations manages the venture, a defined list of significant actions requires the consent of the owners holding **all** of the interests — for example, amending the articles, admitting new owners, incurring debt or granting liens, entering related-party agreements, buying or selling material assets, forming subsidiaries or further joint ventures, setting boarding rates, making capital improvements, amending the City contracts, and approving the annual budgets.
- **Voting:** decisions are normally made by written consent; where a vote is taken, a quorum is a majority of the interests and, except for the major decisions listed above, action is by majority of the interests.
- **Distributions:** cash is distributed to the owners in proportion to their ownership interests when the manager determines, with priority tax distributions to help owners pay taxes on their share of income.
- **Tax status:** the joint venture is treated as a **partnership** for tax purposes, so its income is reported by its owners.
- **Exempt-parent safeguards:** because one owner is ultimately connected to a tax-exempt organization, the venture must operate so as not to jeopardize that

organization's exempt status (separate books, no unauthorized use of names/marks, prompt notice of governmental inquiries).

- **Owners cannot walk away mid-term:** no owner may withdraw before the venture is dissolved, and interests may be transferred only as the operating agreement permits.

A note on member control

Members should understand that, after the transfer, RBR's members will continue to govern the **social club** (the 501(c)(7)) but will **not** govern the CBO, the operating subsidiary Equine Ops, or the joint venture. The CBO has no voting members, so RBR's members will not be members of the CBO and will not elect, nominate, or remove its directors - the CBO is directed by its own self-governing board. The transfer of the charitable assets to the CBO is intended to be permanent, and those assets, once held by the CBO, are dedicated to charitable purposes and cannot be returned to RBR or its members.

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Donna Guske
Sent: Monday, September 7, 2026 2:06 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Public Comment Re: Item #3 CITY COUNCIL CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATORS pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.8

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [n 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 (PAB). For more information about the PAB view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

Distinguished Members of the City of Pasadena Council

Victor M. Gordo, Mayor

Jessica Rivas, Vice Mayor, District 5

Tyron Hampton, District 1

Rick Cole, District 2

Justin Jones, District 3

Gene Masuda, District 4

Steve Madison, District 6

Jason Lyon, District 7

Matthew Hawkesworth, Interim City Manager

Michele Beal Bagneris, City Attorney,

The Pasadena Equestrian Center/Rose Bowl Riders located at 4750 Oak Grove Drive is on the agenda for the closed session Tuesday, September 8. While there has been recent public comment supporting continuation of the City's relationship with Rose Bowl Riders (RBR) and Myrtle Hill Farm, I want to ensure that the City is also aware that serious and ongoing concerns remain regarding the governance and operation of the organization(s) currently operating on this publicly owned property. Establishing price and payment gives the impression that the relationship will continue. According to city governance, doesn't an RFP need to be in place to establish the operator of city property? Please consider your actions in negotiating with Angela Lowell, president of Rose Bowl Riders 501 c(7). She is also president of the newly formed Rose Bowl Riders 501 c(3). Last month, the assets and operations were transferred from one to the other under her leadership. What is her stake in Rose Bowl Riders? She does not take lessons, nor does she board a horse on the property. She may tell you her daughter has had lessons. Her daughter lives in Germany and has for several years. She represents not just the conflict of interest the board of directors of RBR continues to ignore but also the clients of MHF who are far from disadvantaged.

Also, approximately 20 horses that were previously boarded at the Equestrian Center have moved off the property. Many former boarders and stakeholders have attributed their departures to significant recent changes in the structure and operation of the approximately 80-year-old club, including changes they consider inconsistent with responsible nonprofit governance and the historic character of the organization. About 10 of those horses were removed to Tom Sawyer Camp which has understood these recent changes and has offered relief for those impacted. I am concerned that the City's limited intervention or oversight, despite notice of these issues, may create unnecessary legal and public-policy risks for the City.

09/8/2026

Item 3

I would appreciate answers to the following:

1. **RFP:** When does the City anticipate issuing a new Request for Proposals for operation of the Pasadena Equestrian Center following cancellation of the previous RFPs? I understand the city must release an RFP to award operations of the facility to appropriate and qualified managers.

2. **Stakeholder correspondence:** A letter signed by numerous concerned stakeholders was previously sent to City officials regarding these matters. To my knowledge, none of the recipients has acknowledged or substantively responded to that correspondence. Will the City please confirm that the letter was received and advise whether these concerns are being reviewed?

Given that the Pasadena Equestrian Center is now appearing on the City's closed-session agenda, I respectfully ask that these concerns be considered as part of the City's evaluation of its relationship with the organizations currently operating at the property.

Thank you for your attention to these matters. I would appreciate a written response.

Sincerely,
Donna Guske

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Nancy Ly
Sent: Monday, September 7, 2026 9:24 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Please Preserve RBR/Myrtle Hill Farm — A Parent's Perspective

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [nly@pasadenacity.org](#) in 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 (PAB). For more information about the PAB view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

Dear Mayor Gordo and Members of the Pasadena City Council,

My daughter Ally has grown in ways at Rose Bowl Riders and Myrtle Hill Farm that I have not seen anywhere else.

Ally is a thoughtful, sensitive child who can sometimes be hesitant in new situations. Riding has given her a place where she has learned to be brave, independent, responsible, and confident. Watching her walk into the barn, work with an animal many times her size, and gradually learn that she is capable of handling difficult and unfamiliar things has been incredibly meaningful for our family.

What she is learning there goes far beyond horseback riding. She is learning patience, empathy, resilience, responsibility, and how to trust herself. Those lessons follow her home and into school. We have watched her confidence grow because she has a place where she is encouraged to stretch herself while still feeling supported and understood.

That is what makes Rose Bowl Riders and Myrtle Hill Farm so special. The instructors know these children as individuals. They teach them to care for the horses, respect the environment around them, work through challenges, and take pride in what they accomplish. For Ally, the barn has become a place where she feels capable and connected.

As a parent, I am deeply grateful that a resource like this exists here in our community. In an increasingly urban environment, it is extraordinarily rare for children to have regular access to horses, nature, mentorship, and this kind of hands-on responsibility. The Pasadena Equestrian Center offers something that cannot simply be replaced by another extracurricular activity or recreated somewhere else if it is lost.

I understand that the City must consider the financial and operational terms surrounding the property. I respectfully ask that, in doing so, you also give significant weight to the public value being created there every day. The benefit is not abstract. I see it in my own daughter.

Please do everything reasonably possible to preserve Rose Bowl Riders and Myrtle Hill Farm at the Pasadena Equestrian Center and allow this community to continue serving Pasadena-area children and families for years to come.

Thank you for your time, your consideration, and for recognizing the importance of preserving places that have such a lasting impact on children like Ally.

Warmly,

Nancy Ly
Ally's mom

09/8/2026
Item 3

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Tiffany Mat <
Sent: Monday, September 7, 2026 10:32 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [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 (PAB). For more information about the PAB view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

Dear Members of the Pasadena City Council,

My name is Tiffany, and I'm a member and rider at Rose Bowl Riders. I'm writing not as a form letter, but because this issue genuinely matters to me, and I'm asking you to support a long term lease for Rose Bowl Riders at the Pasadena Equestrian Center.

The Equestrian Center is one of those rare places left in a city like ours where a person can walk in, be around horses, and be part of something bigger than themselves. It's taught me patience, responsibility, and a kind of quiet confidence that's hard to find anywhere else. I know I'm not the only rider who feels this way. For a lot of us, this place isn't a hobby, it's grounding, it's community, and honestly, for some kids and families, it's one of the few affordable doors into a world that's usually reserved for people with a lot more money.

That's exactly why the lease situation worries me. Rose Bowl Riders has built something real here: a safe home for horses, a trusted place for families, and a program that's run itself responsibly. That uncertainty doesn't just threaten an organization, it threatens a place that people, myself included, genuinely depend on.

I'm asking the Council, directly and sincerely: please direct City staff to negotiate a meaningful long term lease with Rose Bowl Riders, and support their continued role running the Equestrian Center. This isn't just about protecting a facility. It's about protecting access for kids who might never otherwise sit on a horse, for families building memories together, and for a piece of Pasadena's history that's still very much alive.

Thank you for taking the time to read this, and for the work you do for our city. I hope you'll stand with Rose Bowl Riders on this.

Thank you
Tiffany

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Holly Inaba
Sent: Tuesday, September 8, 2026 7:50 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Myrtle Hill

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

[] 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 (PAB). For more information about the PAB view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

Please allow Myrtle Hill to stay at the Rose Bowl Rider facility. This place is amazing and has afforded my children to learn about and be around horses. It is imperative for the mental health and brings all of us joy.

Holly Inaba

Envoyé de mon iPhone

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Florence Kerns <[f.kerns@cityofpasadena.net](#)>
Sent: Tuesday, September 8, 2026 9:23 AM
To: Hampton, Tyron; Panossian, Koko; Hawkesworth, Matthew; PublicComment-AutoResponse; Gordo, Victor; DerBoghossian, Megheti; Barrios, Lisa; Sullivan, Noreen; Morales, Margo; Madison, Steve; Thyret, Pam; Moya, Jessica
Subject: Public Comment for Tonight's Session re: 4750 Oak Grove Drive Lease (Agenda Item 3)
Attachments: FINAL City Email.pdf

Some people who received this message don't often get email from

[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 (PAB). For more information about the PAB view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

Dear Members of the City Council:

I am writing as a member and, until very recently, a boarder of Rose Bowl Riders (RBR) to submit public comment ahead of tonight's session regarding the lease between the City and the RBR 501(c)(7) Board. Last month, a group of concerned current and former members, including myself, raised serious concerns regarding the status of the lease with the City.

Our August letter received no substantive response.

In early August 2026, a group of more than 50 current and former RBR members and boarders sent a detailed letter to City staff, including the City Attorney's office and the Mayor's office, raising specific concerns about the entity contracting with boarders, an undisclosed restructuring involving newly formed entities, potential lease-assignment issues, and conflicts of interest among current board members. The only response we received was a brief verbal statement from the City Attorney's office characterizing this as an "internal club matter" in which the City would not intervene. None of the specific questions we raised about lease compliance, entity authority, or required City consent to any transfer were substantively addressed verbally or in writing.

We do not believe this is an internal matter. RBR does not own the land it operates on; the City does. The facility has operated under a lease with the City since 1970, specifically on the condition that it serve the public benefit of Pasadena residents. What has since occurred is not an ordinary internal governance dispute, **it is the effective transfer of a public-benefit facility's operations and assets to new entities organized by insiders on RBR's own board**, without transparency to the membership or, as far as we can tell, adequate scrutiny by the City as landowner.

The consequences are now concrete, and directly relevant to tonight's discussion of the lease. Since the City declined to intervene, the RBR 501(c)(7) has, as far as we are aware, had its operations and assets stripped in favor of the newly formed entities. The questionable new Boarding Agreement has also been allowed to take effect. As a direct result, more than 20 horses (the vast majority of all privately boarded horses at the facility) have been forced to leave the property in a rushed, disruptive fashion in recent days. This is not a hypothetical harm from a governance dispute; it is the practical, immediate hollowing-out of a facility the City has leased for over 50 years to serve the public.

Our request to the Council tonight:

**09/8/2026
Item 3**

1. Before taking any action on the lease (whether a renewal, amendment, assignment, or consent to a change in operating entity) please confirm which entity the City currently recognizes as its tenant of record, and whether that entity retains the operations and assets the City understood it to have when the lease was granted.
2. Please ask City staff directly whether the City was informed of, or consented to, the transfer of RBR's operations and assets to the newly formed entities described in our August letter.
3. Please consider whether a facility that has just lost the vast majority of its private boarders in a matter of days is still fulfilling the public-benefit purpose the lease requires, and what the City's obligations are if it is not.

A copy of our August letter is attached. We are happy to provide additional supporting documentation and further information to any Councilmember or staff in advance of or following tonight's session.

This issue has been raised repeatedly over recent years. I respectfully ask that the City consider finally directly intervening in order to preserve public access to the Pasadena Equestrian Center and prevent it from being overtaken by private interests.

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

Respectfully,

Florence Kerns-Wilson

To: <mailto:jhernandez@cityofpasadena.net>; <mailto:rperez@cityofpasadena.net>;
<mailto:earroyo@cityofpasadena.net>; <mailto:kpanossian@cityofpasadena.net>;
mbagneris@cityofpasadena.net ; VDeLaCuba@cityofpasadena.net

CC'd:

Subject: **URGENT REQUEST** for City of Pasadena Review of Proposed Rose Bowl Riders Boarding Agreement (Response Requested before AUGUST 15th)

Attachments:

Exhibit A: Current RBR Boarding Agreement

Exhibit B: The Rose Bowl Riders, Inc Proposed Boarding Agreement

Exhibit C: RBR 2002-2023 Tenth Amendment

Exhibit D: Pasadena Area Horse Boarding Rates, August 2026

Exhibit E: Request for Special Meeting to Review New Agreement: RBR Board Response

Dear City of Pasadena Representatives:

We, the undersigned members and boarders of Rose Bowl Riders, respectfully request the City of Pasadena's immediate review of a newly proposed Equine Boarding Agreement distributed by the Rose Bowl Riders Board of Directors on August 1, 2026. Boarders have been directed to execute this agreement by **August 15, 2026** despite the existence of an active boarding agreement and despite significant unresolved questions regarding the authority, legality, and consistency of the proposed contract with the City's lease and the governance of Rose Bowl Riders.

Background: Rose Bowl Riders ("RBR") is a nonprofit organization operating a public equestrian facility on City-owned property. Myrtle Hill Farm LLC ("MHF") is a separate, private, for-profit business that operates the resident lesson and training program at the facility. Several of the issues described below concern the relationship between MHF, the current RBR Board, members and boarding members at RBR, and the operation of the facility.

Recent actions by the current RBR Board raise serious governance, lease-compliance, and conflict-of-interest concerns that directly implicate the City's interests in protecting public assets, maintaining transparent nonprofit governance, and preserving equitable public access to the historic equestrian facility.

Requested Immediate Action: Given the compressed deadline and the potential transfer of operational control and assets, we respectfully request that the City suspend enforcement or implementation of the proposed Boarding Agreement and any related changes in operations or asset transfers until the City has completed its review and provided guidance.

We respectfully request the City's legal guidance and clarification regarding the following issues:

Item 1: Identity and Authority of Contracting Entity

The proposed Boarding Agreement identifies the contracting party as "The Rose Bowl Riders, Inc. ("Stable")." However, members have been unable to determine which legal entity this refers to or whether it is the same entity that currently holds the City's lease. When members requested clarification from the current RBR Board, the Board described the contracting party only as "our social club," without identifying the legal entity or explaining its relationship to the City's lease.

Public records identify multiple similarly-named organizations, including:

- Rose Bowl Riders Community Benefit Organization
- RBR Equine Operations LLC
- Rose Bowl Riders & Myrtle Hill Farm, LLC
- Rose Bowl Riders, Inc.

Because members are being asked to enter into a legally binding agreement, we believe it is essential to know which entity is the actual contracting party and whether that entity possesses authority under the City's lease.

Accordingly, we respectfully request that the City confirm:

- (a) Which entity the City recognizes as the current holder of its lease with RBR;
- (b) Whether the City is aware of any recent organizational restructuring or changes in the entity operating the facility;
- (c) Whether the lease permits assignment or transfer of operation responsibilities or assets without City approval; and

(d) If so, whether any such approval has been sought or granted.

Item 2: Proposed Transfer of Assets and Operations

Public filings indicate that three new entities were formed within a three-week period during the Spring of 2026, including:

- **RBR Equine Operations LLC** (File No. B20260236228), filed May 18, 2026. Its principal and mailing address is 3535 Lincoln Ave, Altadena, CA 91001. Bonnie Hedrick is listed as its sole principal, registered agent, and organizer.
- **Rose Bowl Riders & Myrtle Hill Farm, LLC** (File No. B20260216380), filed May 18, 2026. Its principal address, 9725 Sunland Blvd, Sunland, CA 91040, and mailing address, PO Box 586, La Cañada, CA 91012, are the same addresses used by Myrtle Hill Farm LLC. Gregory J. Hedrick is listed as the agent for service of process, and Bonnie Hedrick is listed as the organizer and signed the filing herself.
- **Rose Bowl Riders Community Benefit Organization** (File No. B20260197302), filed April 29, 2026, as a California Non-Profit Public Benefit Corporation. Its principal address, 4750 Oak Grove Dr, Pasadena, CA 91103, and mailing address, PO Box 533, Pasadena, CA 91102, are the same address and PO Box currently used by RBR itself. Its listed officers are Angela Lowell (CEO), Bonnie Hedrick (Secretary), and Heather Kodama (CFO); Bonnie Hedrick is also listed as its registered agent.

Members understand that the current RBR Board intends to transfer RBR's operations and assets to one or more of these entities. If accurate, this raises important questions regarding whether City approval is required before any transfer of lease rights, operational responsibilities, or assets may occur. As a Nonprofit Public Benefit Corporation, any transfer of RBR's assets may also be subject to review by the California Attorney General's Registry of Charitable Trusts.

Given that the proposed restructuring could result in longstanding RBR assets and operations—built up over decades, in part with the City's support—being transferred to newly formed entities with overlapping leadership and family relationships, we believe the City has a direct interest in understanding the proposed structure and ensuring that any such transfer is consistent with the City's lease and approved before it occurs.

We respectfully request that the City advise whether it:

- (a) Has been informed of any proposed restructuring;
- (b) Has been asked to approve any transfer of the lease, operations, or assets to any of these three entities; and
- (c) Has approved any such transfer.

Item 3: Exclusive Trainer Restrictions

The proposed Boarding Agreement prohibits outside riding instructors entirely (see Exhibit B, Page 13, Item 13). This is a significant change in the terms governing boarder's use of the facility. This

prohibition is also inconsistent with statements made by the current RBR Board during its July 21, 2026 informational meeting, when members were told that additional trainers would be permitted.

More importantly, the proposed restriction appears inconsistent with the most recent lease between the City and RBR currently available to members, obtained through a public records request. That document states that outside trainers are limited to 20 hours per calendar year but does not prohibit them entirely (See Exhibit C, p. 22).

We respectfully request the City clarify whether:

- (a) The current lease, or any other agreement or directive issued by the City, has imposed any restrictions on properly insured independent riding instructors at the facility outside of MHF;
- (b) RBR has the authority under its lease or use agreement with the City to prohibit outside instructors entirely or grant exclusive instructional rights to a single trainer; and
- (c) If any such restrictions have been imposed or authorized since execution of the lease currently available to members, whether the City can identify the agreement or amendment under which those restrictions were approved.

Item 4: Allocation of Insurance Costs

The Board states that a significant portion of the recent boarding fee increases is attributable to new City-imposed insurance requirements, including general liability coverage and sexual abuse/molestation coverage. Members have not been provided any correspondence or documentation from the City establishing these insurance requirements.

We respectfully ask the City to clarify:

- (a) What insurance requirements, if any, has the City has communicated to RBR; and
- (b) Whether those requirements were directed toward RBR's operation generally or toward Myrtle Hill Farm' LLCs commercial lesson program specifically.

Item 5: Boarding Fee Increases and Public Benefit

Boarders provide a substantial portion of RBR's revenue. The RBR Board has represented that Rose Bowl Riders provides a public benefit by offering affordable boarding and lesson opportunities to Pasadena residents. Fees have significantly increased in 2026 and are proposed to increase further under the proposed Boarding Agreement, producing rates well above comparable local facilities, and more in line with the rates at premium, luxury sport horse facilities (see Exhibit D). For many members, the cumulative increase is at least approximately 30-60% per month on top of previous rates.

These increases raise questions as to whether the operation of RBR continues to advance the public-benefit objectives described by the current RBR Board, particularly where the facility operates on City-owned property.

We respectfully ask the City to clarify:

- (a) Whether the current lease contains any provisions that limit boarding fee increases or otherwise regulate the fees charged by RBR; and
- (b) Whether the lease requires RBR to operate the facility in furtherance of a public benefit, including maintaining affordable public access, and if so, how the City evaluates compliance with those requirements.

Item 6: Conflict of Interest between MHF and RBR Entities

The proposed Boarding Agreement substantially limits outside trainers while simultaneously granting significant operational authority to individuals associated with Myrtle Hill Farm, the resident lesson program.

Public records show that Myrtle Hill Farm LLC ("MHF," California Secretary of State Entity No. 202464719341), a private training business based at 9725 Sunland Blvd, Sunland, CA, is co-managed by Gregory J. Hedrick and Katherine A. Ginzton. RBR's own website only identifies Katherine Ginzton as the operator of MHF. The current RBR Board has separately identified this same Katherine ("KT") Ginzton as RBR's new Interim Operations Manager — the person now responsible for day-to-day boarding operations and, by extension, administering the new rules that prohibit outside trainers and restrict jumping to lessons supervised by an approved trainer. Members also understand that Ms. Ginzton and Mr. Hedrick are both trainers at MHF and are married to one another, in addition to their co-management of the LLC.

Taken together, this means the person now managing daily operations at a city-owned public facility is both a business partner and spouse of the trainer whose business stands to benefit most from these new restrictions. Separately, and as discussed in Item 2, Bonnie Hedrick — who we understand to be Gregory Hedrick's mother — currently serves as Secretary of RBR's board, and public IRS filings for an entity called "Rose Bowl Riders Inc" (EIN 51-0136474) list a Bonnie Hedrick as that entity's Chief Executive Officer, a title inconsistent with members' understanding of her role.

We do not ask the City to reach conclusions regarding these relationships. However, because Rose Bowl Riders operates on City-owned property and serves an important public function, we believe these relationships warrant legal review to ensure that operational decisions affecting boarders are being made free from actual or perceived conflicts of interest and in accordance with the City's lease and applicable nonprofit governance standards and state and federal law.

Conclusion and Requested Review

Despite members/boarders' requests for clarification and a special meeting to address substantial changes to the proposed Boarding Agreement, the current RBR Board has indicated that it will not delay implementation or meaningfully address these issues before the new terms take effect. On August 6, 2026, the RBR Board notified members that the special meeting requested cannot occur until after September 1, 2026, and that the new agreement will nevertheless take effect September 1 (See Exhibit E). The Board further stated that any horse remaining at the facility after that date will be deemed to be boarded under the new rates, rules, and terms, whether or not the agreement has been signed.

We therefore respectfully request that the City take the following actions before the **August 15, 2026** deadline, the date on which boarders are required to either accept substantially revised terms, or remove their horses from the facility:

1. Place a temporary hold on any enforcement or implementation action of the proposed Boarding Agreement and its new rates, rules and restrictions pending the City's review; and
2. Review whether the proposed agreement and related actions are consistent with the City's lease, including (a) the identity and authority of the contracting entity, (b) whether any proposed transfers of lease rights, assets, or operations require City approval, and (c) whether any potential conflicts of interest or lease violations warrant further review.

Our goal is to ensure that changes to the operation and governance of a longstanding equestrian facility located on City property are consistent with the City's lease and applicable requirements. We believe resolving these issues before boarders are required to execute a substantially revised contract is in the best interests of the City, Rose Bowl Riders, and its members.

We appreciate your prompt attention to this matter and would be pleased to provide any additional documentation, including the Board's written responses, Secretary of State filings, IRS records, and other supporting materials useful to the City's review. We respectfully request a response at your earliest convenience and before **August 15, 2026**.

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

Respectfully,

The Undersigned Current Members and Boarders of Rose Bowl Riders,

/s/ Sofia Sotomayor (Wildfire Resilience Coordinator, RMC)

/s/ Samantha Sisk (Manager, Caltech/Pasadena)

Current Boarders, Family Membership

Both Former Board Members, Former MHF Clients

Pasadena Residents

/s/ Christian Koziol (Mounted Volunteer, Pasadena Police Department)

Current Boarder, Member
Former Board Member

/s/ Laurel Lange Richardson
Current Boarder, Member
Former President, Rose Bowl Riders, 2021-2023
Pasadena Community Police Academy Graduate, 2022

/s/ Donna Victoria Guske (Educator, Teacher)
Current Boarder, Family Membership
Former Board Member, Treasurer and Operations

/s/ Regina Colombo (Administrator, Caltech/Pasadena)
/s/ Alan Colombo (Retired)
Current Boarders, Family Membership
(Regina Columbo) Former Board Member

/s/ Kristyn Gonnerman
Current Boarder, Member
Former Board Member
Former MHF Client

/s/ Gari Merendino
Current Boarder, Member
Former Board Member
Pasadena Resident

/s/ Diane Filice
Current Boarder, Member
Pasadena Resident

/s/ Hope Beegle

Current Boarder, Member

/s/ Jodi Lakatos (HR, Pasadena Technology Company)

Current Boarder, Family Membership

Pasadena Resident

/s/ Nadine Douke

Current Boarder, Member

Pasadena Resident

/s/ Florence Kerns-Wilson

/s/ Anna Kerns-Wilson

/s/ Rigby Kerns-Wilson

Current Boarder, Family Membership

/s/ Jeni McKenna

/s/ Alex Finkel

Current Boarders, Family Membership

/s/ Lainie Baydian

Current Boarder, Member

/s/ Maura Thorpe

Current Boarder, Member

/s/ Taryn Simone

Current Boarder, Member

/s/ Phyllis Ginter

Current Boarder, Member

/s/ Mollie McGuire

Current Boarder, Member

/s/ Priscilla C Benson
Current Member, Former Boarder
Former Board Member, Secretary
Former MHF client

/s/ Jolie Beegle
Current Member, Former Border

/s/ Andrea Thorpe (Doctor)
Current Member

/s/ Barbara Lange
Current Member
Current MHF Client

/s/ Kayla Wilkinson (Registered Veterinary Technician)
Current Member

/s/ Krista Noel
Current Member, Current Lessee

/s/ Colette Shelton (PCC Student)
Current Member, Current Lessee
Former MHF client

/s/ Brandon Jones
Current Member
Contractor in Pasadena

/s/ Mary Timmer

Current Member
Pasadena Resident

/s/ Phoenix Mendoza
Current Member

/s/ Andrea Jarolim
Current Family Membership

The Undersigned Former Members, Boarders, and Other RBR Stakeholders,

/s/ Ariel Wisch-Schute
Former Boarder, Member (25 years)
Former Board Member (Dir. of Grounds, Stable Manager)

/s/ Ann Regan
Former Boarder, Member
Former Board Member

/s/ Craig Bergman
Former Boarder, Member
Former Board Member

/s/ Diane Bergman
Former Boarder, Member
Former Board Member

/s/ Francisco Miralles (Horse Trainer)
Former Member
Former Horse Trainer at RBR

/s/ Ashley Roberson
Former Boarder, Member
Former Barn Manager

/s/ James Hankin (Contractor)
Former Member
Former Board Member

/s/ Debby Dixler
Former Boarder, Member
Former MHF Client
Pasadena Resident

/s/ Abigail Jones (Fashion Editor)
Former Boarder, Member

/s/ Sarah Cannon
Former Boarder, Member

/s/ Lisa Grabow
Former Member
Former Board Member

/s/ Amelia Enzinger
Former Boarder, Member
Former MHF Client

1

/s/ Lisette Parker (Former Rose Parade Princess)
Former Boarder, Member

/s/ Sandy Pellegrin
Former Member (39 Years)
Former Board Member

/s/ Cornelia Seiffert, LCSW CA #104102 (Pasadena Resident, Business Owner)
PATH, Intl. Certified Therapeutic Riding Instructor
Former Boarder, Member

/s/ Joy Rittenhouse
Former Member
Former Chief Executive MACH-1
PATH, Intl. Certified Therapeutic Riding Instructor

/s/ Cric Dupuis
Former Member
Former Facility Manager MACH-1
PATH, Intl. Certified Therapeutic Riding Instructor

/s/ Ellen Williams
Former Member
Pasadena Resident

/s/ Pat Phillips
Former Member (40 years)

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Jeni McKenna
Sent: Tuesday, September 8, 2026 9:30 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Re: City council closed session 4750 oak grove
Attachments: FINAL City Email.pdf

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

[1] **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 (PAB). For more information about the PAB view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

Date: Tue, Sep 8, 2026 at 9:22 AM
Subject: Public Comment for Tonight's Session re: 4750 Oak Grove Drive

Dear Members of the City Council:

I am writing as a member and, until very recently, a boarder of Rose Bowl Riders (RBR) to submit public comment ahead of tonight's session regarding the lease between the City and the RBR 501(c)(7) Board. Last month, a group of concerned current and former members, including myself, raised serious concerns regarding the status of the lease with the City.

Our August letter received no substantive response. (It is included here below as a pdf)

In early August 2026, a group of more than 50 current and former RBR members and boarders sent a detailed letter to City staff, including the City Attorney's office and the Mayor's office, raising specific concerns about the entity contracting with boarders, an undisclosed restructuring involving newly formed entities, potential lease-assignment issues, and conflicts of interest among current board members. The only response we received was a brief verbal statement from the City Attorney's office characterizing this as an "internal club matter" in which the City would not intervene. None of the specific questions we raised about lease compliance, entity authority, or required City consent to any transfer were substantively addressed verbally or in writing.

We do not believe this is an internal matter. RBR does not own the land it operates on; the City does. The facility has operated under a lease with the City since 1970, specifically on the condition that it serve the public benefit of Pasadena residents. What has since occurred is not an ordinary internal governance dispute, **it is the effective transfer of a public-benefit facility's operations and assets to new entities organized by insiders on RBR's own board**, without transparency to the membership or, as far as we can tell, adequate scrutiny by the City as landowner.

The consequences are now concrete, and directly relevant to tonight's discussion of the lease. Since the City declined to intervene, the RBR 501(c)(7) has, as far as we are aware, had its operations and assets stripped in favor of the newly formed entities. The questionable new Boarding Agreement has also been allowed to take effect. As a direct result, more than 20 horses (the vast majority of all privately boarded horses at the facility) have been forced to leave the property in a rushed, disruptive fashion in recent days. This is not a hypothetical harm from a governance dispute; it is the practical, immediate hollowing-out of a facility the City has leased for over 50 years to serve the public.

Our request to the Council tonight:

1. Before taking any action on the lease (whether a renewal, amendment, assignment, or consent to a change in operating entity) please confirm which entity the City currently recognizes as its tenant of record, and whether that entity retains the operations and assets the City understood it to have when the lease was granted.
2. Please ask City staff directly whether the City was informed of, or consented to, the transfer of RBR's operations and assets to the newly formed entities described in our August letter.
3. Please consider whether a facility that has just lost the vast majority of its private boarders in a matter of days is still fulfilling the public-benefit purpose the lease requires, and what the City's obligations are if it is not.

A copy of our August letter is attached. We are happy to provide additional supporting documentation and further information to any Councilmember or staff in advance of or following tonight's session.

This issue has been raised repeatedly over recent years. I respectfully ask that the City consider finally directly intervening in order to preserve public access to the Pasadena Equestrian Center and prevent it from being overtaken by private interests.

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

Respectfully,

-Jeni Mckenna

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 8, 2026, at 9:26 AM.

-Jeni Mckenna

Sent from my iPhone

To: <mailto:jhernandez@cityofpasadena.net>; <mailto:rperez@cityofpasadena.net>;
<mailto:earroyo@cityofpasadena.net>; <mailto:kpanossian@cityofpasadena.net>;
mbagneris@cityofpasadena.net ; VDeLaCuba@cityofpasadena.net

CC'd:

[REDACTED]

Subject: **URGENT REQUEST** for City of Pasadena Review of Proposed Rose Bowl Riders Boarding Agreement (Response Requested before AUGUST 15th)

Attachments:

Exhibit A: Current RBR Boarding Agreement

Exhibit B: The Rose Bowl Riders, Inc Proposed Boarding Agreement

Exhibit C: RBR 2002-2023 Tenth Amendment

Exhibit D: Pasadena Area Horse Boarding Rates, August 2026

Exhibit E: Request for Special Meeting to Review New Agreement: RBR Board Response

Dear City of Pasadena Representatives:

We, the undersigned members and boarders of Rose Bowl Riders, respectfully request the City of Pasadena's immediate review of a newly proposed Equine Boarding Agreement distributed by the Rose Bowl Riders Board of Directors on August 1, 2026. Boarders have been directed to execute this agreement by **August 15, 2026** despite the existence of an active boarding agreement and despite significant unresolved questions regarding the authority, legality, and consistency of the proposed contract with the City's lease and the governance of Rose Bowl Riders.

Background: Rose Bowl Riders ("RBR") is a nonprofit organization operating a public equestrian facility on City-owned property. Myrtle Hill Farm LLC ("MHF") is a separate, private, for-profit business that operates the resident lesson and training program at the facility. Several of the issues described below concern the relationship between MHF, the current RBR Board, members and boarding members at RBR, and the operation of the facility.

Recent actions by the current RBR Board raise serious governance, lease-compliance, and conflict-of-interest concerns that directly implicate the City's interests in protecting public assets, maintaining transparent nonprofit governance, and preserving equitable public access to the historic equestrian facility.

Requested Immediate Action: Given the compressed deadline and the potential transfer of operational control and assets, we respectfully request that the City suspend enforcement or implementation of the proposed Boarding Agreement and any related changes in operations or asset transfers until the City has completed its review and provided guidance.

We respectfully request the City's legal guidance and clarification regarding the following issues:

Item 1: Identity and Authority of Contracting Entity

The proposed Boarding Agreement identifies the contracting party as "The Rose Bowl Riders, Inc. ("Stable")." However, members have been unable to determine which legal entity this refers to or whether it is the same entity that currently holds the City's lease. When members requested clarification from the current RBR Board, the Board described the contracting party only as "our social club," without identifying the legal entity or explaining its relationship to the City's lease.

Public records identify multiple similarly-named organizations, including:

- Rose Bowl Riders Community Benefit Organization
- RBR Equine Operations LLC
- Rose Bowl Riders & Myrtle Hill Farm, LLC
- Rose Bowl Riders, Inc.

Because members are being asked to enter into a legally binding agreement, we believe it is essential to know which entity is the actual contracting party and whether that entity possesses authority under the City's lease.

Accordingly, we respectfully request that the City confirm:

- (a) Which entity the City recognizes as the current holder of its lease with RBR;
- (b) Whether the City is aware of any recent organizational restructuring or changes in the entity operating the facility;
- (c) Whether the lease permits assignment or transfer of operation responsibilities or assets without City approval; and

(d) If so, whether any such approval has been sought or granted.

Item 2: Proposed Transfer of Assets and Operations

Public filings indicate that three new entities were formed within a three-week period during the Spring of 2026, including:

- **RBR Equine Operations LLC** (File No. B20260236228), filed May 18, 2026. Its principal and mailing address is 3535 Lincoln Ave, Altadena, CA 91001. Bonnie Hedrick is listed as its sole principal, registered agent, and organizer.
- **Rose Bowl Riders & Myrtle Hill Farm, LLC** (File No. B20260216380), filed May 18, 2026. Its principal address, 9725 Sunland Blvd, Sunland, CA 91040, and mailing address, PO Box 586, La Cañada, CA 91012, are the same addresses used by Myrtle Hill Farm LLC. Gregory J. Hedrick is listed as the agent for service of process, and Bonnie Hedrick is listed as the organizer and signed the filing herself.
- **Rose Bowl Riders Community Benefit Organization** (File No. B20260197302), filed April 29, 2026, as a California Non-Profit Public Benefit Corporation. Its principal address, 4750 Oak Grove Dr, Pasadena, CA 91103, and mailing address, PO Box 533, Pasadena, CA 91102, are the same address and PO Box currently used by RBR itself. Its listed officers are Angela Lowell (CEO), Bonnie Hedrick (Secretary), and Heather Kodama (CFO); Bonnie Hedrick is also listed as its registered agent.

Members understand that the current RBR Board intends to transfer RBR's operations and assets to one or more of these entities. If accurate, this raises important questions regarding whether City approval is required before any transfer of lease rights, operational responsibilities, or assets may occur. As a Nonprofit Public Benefit Corporation, any transfer of RBR's assets may also be subject to review by the California Attorney General's Registry of Charitable Trusts.

Given that the proposed restructuring could result in longstanding RBR assets and operations—built up over decades, in part with the City's support—being transferred to newly formed entities with overlapping leadership and family relationships, we believe the City has a direct interest in understanding the proposed structure and ensuring that any such transfer is consistent with the City's lease and approved before it occurs.

We respectfully request that the City advise whether it:

- (a) Has been informed of any proposed restructuring;
- (b) Has been asked to approve any transfer of the lease, operations, or assets to any of these three entities; and
- (c) Has approved any such transfer.

Item 3: Exclusive Trainer Restrictions

The proposed Boarding Agreement prohibits outside riding instructors entirely (see Exhibit B, Page 13, Item 13). This is a significant change in the terms governing boarder's use of the facility. This

prohibition is also inconsistent with statements made by the current RBR Board during its July 21, 2026 informational meeting, when members were told that additional trainers would be permitted.

More importantly, the proposed restriction appears inconsistent with the most recent lease between the City and RBR currently available to members, obtained through a public records request. That document states that outside trainers are limited to 20 hours per calendar year but does not prohibit them entirely (See Exhibit C, p. 22).

We respectfully request the City clarify whether:

- (a) The current lease, or any other agreement or directive issued by the City, has imposed any restrictions on properly insured independent riding instructors at the facility outside of MHF;
- (b) RBR has the authority under its lease or use agreement with the City to prohibit outside instructors entirely or grant exclusive instructional rights to a single trainer; and
- (c) If any such restrictions have been imposed or authorized since execution of the lease currently available to members, whether the City can identify the agreement or amendment under which those restrictions were approved.

Item 4: Allocation of Insurance Costs

The Board states that a significant portion of the recent boarding fee increases is attributable to new City-imposed insurance requirements, including general liability coverage and sexual abuse/molestation coverage. Members have not been provided any correspondence or documentation from the City establishing these insurance requirements.

We respectfully ask the City to clarify:

- (a) What insurance requirements, if any, has the City has communicated to RBR; and
- (b) Whether those requirements were directed toward RBR's operation generally or toward Myrtle Hill Farm' LLCs commercial lesson program specifically.

Item 5: Boarding Fee Increases and Public Benefit

Boarders provide a substantial portion of RBR's revenue. The RBR Board has represented that Rose Bowl Riders provides a public benefit by offering affordable boarding and lesson opportunities to Pasadena residents. Fees have significantly increased in 2026 and are proposed to increase further under the proposed Boarding Agreement, producing rates well above comparable local facilities, and more in line with the rates at premium, luxury sport horse facilities (see Exhibit D). For many members, the cumulative increase is at least approximately 30-60% per month on top of previous rates.

These increases raise questions as to whether the operation of RBR continues to advance the public-benefit objectives described by the current RBR Board, particularly where the facility operates on City-owned property.

We respectfully ask the City to clarify:

- (a) Whether the current lease contains any provisions that limit boarding fee increases or otherwise regulate the fees charged by RBR; and
- (b) Whether the lease requires RBR to operate the facility in furtherance of a public benefit, including maintaining affordable public access, and if so, how the City evaluates compliance with those requirements.

Item 6: Conflict of Interest between MHF and RBR Entities

The proposed Boarding Agreement substantially limits outside trainers while simultaneously granting significant operational authority to individuals associated with Myrtle Hill Farm, the resident lesson program.

Public records show that Myrtle Hill Farm LLC ("MHF," California Secretary of State Entity No. 202464719341), a private training business based at 9725 Sunland Blvd, Sunland, CA, is co-managed by Gregory J. Hedrick and Katherine A. Ginzton. RBR's own website only identifies Katherine Ginzton as the operator of MHF. The current RBR Board has separately identified this same Katherine ("KT") Ginzton as RBR's new Interim Operations Manager — the person now responsible for day-to-day boarding operations and, by extension, administering the new rules that prohibit outside trainers and restrict jumping to lessons supervised by an approved trainer. Members also understand that Ms. Ginzton and Mr. Hedrick are both trainers at MHF and are married to one another, in addition to their co-management of the LLC.

Taken together, this means the person now managing daily operations at a city-owned public facility is both a business partner and spouse of the trainer whose business stands to benefit most from these new restrictions. Separately, and as discussed in Item 2, Bonnie Hedrick — who we understand to be Gregory Hedrick's mother — currently serves as Secretary of RBR's board, and public IRS filings for an entity called "Rose Bowl Riders Inc" (EIN 51-0136474) list a Bonnie Hedrick as that entity's Chief Executive Officer, a title inconsistent with members' understanding of her role.

We do not ask the City to reach conclusions regarding these relationships. However, because Rose Bowl Riders operates on City-owned property and serves an important public function, we believe these relationships warrant legal review to ensure that operational decisions affecting boarders are being made free from actual or perceived conflicts of interest and in accordance with the City's lease and applicable nonprofit governance standards and state and federal law.

Conclusion and Requested Review

Despite members/boarders' requests for clarification and a special meeting to address substantial changes to the proposed Boarding Agreement, the current RBR Board has indicated that it will not delay implementation or meaningfully address these issues before the new terms take effect. On August 6, 2026, the RBR Board notified members that the special meeting requested cannot occur until after September 1, 2026, and that the new agreement will nevertheless take effect September 1 (See Exhibit E). The Board further stated that any horse remaining at the facility after that date will be deemed to be boarded under the new rates, rules, and terms, whether or not the agreement has been signed.

We therefore respectfully request that the City take the following actions before the **August 15, 2026** deadline, the date on which boarders are required to either accept substantially revised terms, or remove their horses from the facility:

1. Place a temporary hold on any enforcement or implementation action of the proposed Boarding Agreement and its new rates, rules and restrictions pending the City's review; and
2. Review whether the proposed agreement and related actions are consistent with the City's lease, including (a) the identity and authority of the contracting entity, (b) whether any proposed transfers of lease rights, assets, or operations require City approval, and (c) whether any potential conflicts of interest or lease violations warrant further review.

Our goal is to ensure that changes to the operation and governance of a longstanding equestrian facility located on City property are consistent with the City's lease and applicable requirements. We believe resolving these issues before boarders are required to execute a substantially revised contract is in the best interests of the City, Rose Bowl Riders, and its members.

We appreciate your prompt attention to this matter and would be pleased to provide any additional documentation, including the Board's written responses, Secretary of State filings, IRS records, and other supporting materials useful to the City's review. We respectfully request a response at your earliest convenience and before **August 15, 2026**.

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

Respectfully,

The Undersigned Current Members and Boarders of Rose Bowl Riders,

/s/ Sofia Sotomayor (Wildfire Resilience Coordinator, RMC)

/s/ Samantha Sisk (Manager, Caltech/Pasadena)

Current Boarders, Family Membership

Both Former Board Members, Former MHF Clients

Pasadena Residents

/s/ Christian Koziol (Mounted Volunteer, Pasadena Police Department)

Current Boarder, Member
Former Board Member

/s/ Laurel Lange Richardson
Current Boarder, Member
Former President, Rose Bowl Riders, 2021-2023
Pasadena Community Police Academy Graduate, 2022

/s/ Donna Victoria Guske (Educator, Teacher)
Current Boarder, Family Membership
Former Board Member, Treasurer and Operations

/s/ Regina Colombo (Administrator, Caltech/Pasadena)
/s/ Alan Colombo (Retired)
Current Boarders, Family Membership
(Regina Columbo) Former Board Member

/s/ Kristyn Gonnerman
Current Boarder, Member
Former Board Member
Former MHF Client

/s/ Gari Merendino
Current Boarder, Member
Former Board Member
Pasadena Resident

/s/ Diane Filice
Current Boarder, Member
Pasadena Resident

/s/ Hope Beegle

Current Boarder, Member

/s/ Jodi Lakatos (HR, Pasadena Technology Company)
Current Boarder, Family Membership
Pasadena Resident

/s/ Nadine Douke
Current Boarder, Member
Pasadena Resident

/s/ Florence Kerns-Wilson
/s/ Anna Kerns-Wilson
/s/ Rigby Kerns-Wilson
Current Boarder, Family Membership

/s/ Jeni McKenna
/s/ Alex Finkel
Current Boarders, Family Membership

/s/ Lainie Baydian
Current Boarder, Member

/s/ Maura Thorpe
Current Boarder, Member

/s/ Taryn Simone
Current Boarder, Member

/s/ Phyllis Ginter
Current Boarder, Member

/s/ Mollie McGuire
Current Boarder, Member

/s/ Priscilla C Benson
Current Member, Former Boarder
Former Board Member, Secretary
Former MHF client

/s/ Jolie Beegle
Current Member, Former Border

/s/ Andrea Thorpe (Doctor)
Current Member

/s/ Barbara Lange
Current Member
Current MHF Client

/s/ Kayla Wilkinson (Registered Veterinary Technician)
Current Member

/s/ Krista Noel
Current Member, Current Lessee

/s/ Colette Shelton (PCC Student)
Current Member, Current Lessee
Former MHF client

/s/ Brandon Jones
Current Member
Contractor in Pasadena

/s/ Mary Timmer

Current Member
Pasadena Resident

/s/ Phoenix Mendoza
Current Member

/s/ Andrea Jarolim
Current Family Membership

The Undersigned Former Members, Boarders, and Other RBR Stakeholders,

/s/ Ariel Wisch-Schute
Former Boarder, Member (25 years)
Former Board Member (Dir. of Grounds, Stable Manager)

/s/ Ann Regan
Former Boarder, Member
Former Board Member

/s/ Craig Bergman
Former Boarder, Member
Former Board Member

/s/ Diane Bergman
Former Boarder, Member
Former Board Member

/s/ Francisco Miralles (Horse Trainer)
Former Member
Former Horse Trainer at RBR

/s/ Ashley Roberson
Former Boarder, Member
Former Barn Manager

/s/ James Hankin (Contractor)
Former Member
Former Board Member

/s/ Debby Dixler
Former Boarder, Member
Former MHF Client
Pasadena Resident

/s/ Abigail Jones (Fashion Editor)
Former Boarder, Member

/s/ Sarah Cannon
Former Boarder, Member

/s/ Lisa Grabow
Former Member
Former Board Member

/s/ Amelia Enzinger
Former Boarder, Member
Former MHF Client

/s/ Lisette Parker (Former Rose Parade Princess)
Former Boarder, Member

/s/ Sandy Pellegrin
Former Member (39 Years)
Former Board Member

/s/ Cornelia Seiffert, LCSW CA #104102 (Pasadena Resident, Business Owner)
PATH, Intl. Certified Therapeutic Riding Instructor
Former Boarder, Member

/s/ Joy Rittenhouse
Former Member
Former Chief Executive MACH-1
PATH, Intl. Certified Therapeutic Riding Instructor

/s/ Cric Dupuis
Former Member
Former Facility Manager MACH-1
PATH, Intl. Certified Therapeutic Riding Instructor

/s/ Ellen Williams
Former Member
Pasadena Resident

/s/ Pat Phillips
Former Member (40 years)

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Andrea Bolan
Sent: Tuesday, September 8, 2026 12:55 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Long term lease needed for Rose Bowl Riders

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [n. 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 (PAB). For more information about the PAB view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

Dear Mayor and Members of the Pasadena City Council,

I am writing as a member of Rose Bowl Riders and mom to a rider, to urge the City Council to support an extended-term lease for Rose Bowl Riders at the Pasadena Equestrian Center and to continue Rose Bowl Riders as the Center's operator and manager.

My daughter has struggled for years with anxiety, and post Covid, a lack of friends and supportive community. Three years ago we heard about Rose Bowl Riders. My daughter had never ridden a horse before then, we always thought that it was something we couldn't afford. Through RBR it made it all so much more accessible. The horses, the lessons and the community have profoundly affected her sense of confidence, positivity and belonging. Having access to this affordable and welcoming space is critical for her and for us as a family.

Having a steady yearly lease will add to the stability and trust that she will be able to keep riding and connecting with horses and this wonderful community will be here for the long run.

A long-term lease is not only about organizational stability. It is about preserving public access, supporting affordable programming for children and families like ours, protecting a historic Pasadena institution, and giving a proven community partner the opportunity to plan and invest responsibly.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter.

Andrea Bolan

Rose Bowl Rider member and mom of a teen rider who depends on this community and space.

09/8/2026
Item 3

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Anna Park ·
Sent: Tuesday, September 8, 2026 2:23 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Help us Preserve Rose Bowl Riders

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

[1] **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 (PAB). For more information about the PAB view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

Dear Members of the Pasadena City Council,

My name is Anna, and I'm a member of Rose Bowl Riders. I'm writing to ask that you move forward with a long-term lease for Rose Bowl Riders at the Pasadena Equestrian Center.

I joined RBR this summer. I discovered the facility organically during one of my many walks around the Hahamongna reservoir, scheduled an intro tour and prospective member meeting, took a few lessons, and decided to join. My experience has been entirely my own, without any influence or previous opinion of the organization.

Rose Bowl Riders has become an invaluable part of my life over these last few months. It's a genuine community that welcomes people from all walks of life, and the Myrtle Hill instructors are some of the most kind and patient people I've ever met. The positive impacts on my mental and emotional health are precious to me.

I'm deeply grateful to have found an equestrian community and facility that prioritizes financial accessibility, which is a crucial benefit to the wider Pasadena community and beyond. So many of us would otherwise have no access to the equestrian world, which is a world where money is so often the only open door.

As many others have called out, this is so much deeper than simply stabilizing a facility. It's about preserving a historic community that remains an irreplaceable safe place for families, children, and individuals. Please don't lose sight of the public benefit Rose Bowl Riders provides our communities every single day.

Thank you for your consideration and service. Please help us preserve Rose Bowl Riders with a long-term lease.

Best,
Anna

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Regina Colombo
Sent: Tuesday, September 8, 2026 3:15 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Public Comment re: Item 3 - CITY COUNCIL CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATORS pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.8

Some people who received this message don't often get email from

[learn why this is important](#)

[1] 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 (PAB). For more information about the PAB view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

Dear Mayor Gordo and Members of the City Council,

I am writing as a Pasadena stakeholder, Rose Bowl Riders (RBR) club member, former RBR Board Member, and recent horse boarder to urge the Council to investigate serious lease violations and profound governance failures before acting on tonight's RBR agenda item.

Shortly after joining RBR, I became aware of institutional issues during a public Board meeting that revealed significant budget problems, including poor accounting and unexplained deficits. Budget, safety, and transparency issues have been a recurring theme at public Board meetings, and over the years numerous Board members have abruptly resigned from the Board and/or the club entirely. I did not fully grasp the depth of this dysfunction until I joined the Board myself in February 2025. Closed-session meetings were fraught with rhetoric that frequently crossed into abusive territory. Anyone who disagreed with certain current Board officers was subject to being berated, insulted, and at times threatened. Most of these disputes centered on blatant conflicts of interest involving sitting Board members' ties to the independent contractor responsible for the riding lesson program. At one point, a club member — now a Board officer — engaged in deeply cruel behavior toward a Board member with whom they disagreed, which directly resulted in the resignation of two capable Board members. This ongoing discord sown by RBR's Board of Directors has rendered the club essentially ineffective at providing the public benefit expected by the City and deserved by Pasadena residents.

This context is but a small illustration of how the club reached its current crisis. Publicly available documents held by the City of Pasadena confirm that the City has been aware of the serious issues plaguing RBR for years.

In August, over 50 current and former members alerted City staff to an undisclosed corporate restructuring by Board insiders, potential unauthorized lease assignments, and severe conflicts of interest. The City Attorney's office dismissed this as an "internal club matter." I disagree. RBR does not own this land — the City of Pasadena does — and the lease has required a strict public benefit since 1970. This is no longer a simple internal governance dispute; it is the effective stripping of a public facility's operations and assets in favor of newly formed private entities. The real-world consequences are happening right now:

- **Stripped Operations:** RBR 501(c)(7) assets have been/will be transferred to new insider entities without membership transparency or City scrutiny.
- **Coercive Legal Waivers:** A new boarding agreement forces horse owners to waive their legal rights under California lien and remedy laws.
- **Mass Displacement:** Because of these predatory terms, approximately 20 horses — the vast majority of all privately boarded horses at the facility — have been forced off the property in a rushed, disruptive exodus over the last couple of weeks.

I urge you to halt any lease approvals, extensions, or modifications tonight until the City conducts a thorough, independent review of lease compliance, financial irregularities, and unauthorized asset transfers.

09/8/2026

Item 3

I also urge the Council to seriously consider options for operating the Pasadena Equestrian Center outside of RBR. Given the pattern of governance failures, financial opacity, and repeated harm to members documented here and in the City's own records, I do not believe RBR has demonstrated the capacity to responsibly manage a public equestrian facility going forward. The City should be willing to explore all alternatives that would better serve Pasadena residents and the public benefit this land was designated for — even if that means issuing a third Request for Proposals to identify an operator capable of meeting the City's standards for transparency, financial stewardship, and safety.

Sincerely,

Regina Colombo

Senior Assistant Administrator, Office of the Provost, Caltech

Pasadena Stakeholder & Former RBR Board Member

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Gari Merendino
Sent: Tuesday, September 8, 2026 3:50 PM
To: Regina Colombo
Cc: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Re: Public Comment re: Item 3 - CITY COUNCIL CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATORS pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.8

Some people who received this message don't often get email from

[Learn why this is important](#)

[1] **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 (PAB). For more information about the PAB view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

Excellent !!

On Tue, Sep 8, 2026 at 3:14 PM Regina Colombo <ginabroom@yahoo.com> wrote:

Dear Mayor Gordo and Members of the City Council,

I am writing as a Pasadena stakeholder, Rose Bowl Riders (RBR) club member, former RBR Board Member, and recent horse boarder to urge the Council to investigate serious lease violations and profound governance failures before acting on tonight's RBR agenda item.

Shortly after joining RBR, I became aware of institutional issues during a public Board meeting that revealed significant budget problems, including poor accounting and unexplained deficits. Budget, safety, and transparency issues have been a recurring theme at public Board meetings, and over the years numerous Board members have abruptly resigned from the Board and/or the club entirely. I did not fully grasp the depth of this dysfunction until I joined the Board myself in February 2025. Closed-session meetings were fraught with rhetoric that frequently crossed into abusive territory. Anyone who disagreed with certain current Board officers was subject to being berated, insulted, and at times threatened. Most of these disputes centered on blatant conflicts of interest involving sitting Board members' ties to the independent contractor responsible for the riding lesson program. At one point, a club member — now a Board officer — engaged in deeply cruel behavior toward a Board member with whom they disagreed, which directly resulted in the resignation of two capable Board members. This ongoing discord sown by RBR's Board of Directors has rendered the club essentially ineffective at providing the public benefit expected by the City and deserved by Pasadena residents.

This context is but a small illustration of how the club reached its current crisis. Publicly available documents held by the City of Pasadena confirm that the City has been aware of the serious issues plaguing RBR for years.

In August, over 50 current and former members alerted City staff to an undisclosed corporate restructuring by Board insiders, potential unauthorized lease assignments, and severe conflicts of interest. The City Attorney's office dismissed this as an "internal club matter." I disagree. RBR does not own this land — the City of Pasadena does — and the lease has required a strict public benefit since 1970. This is no longer a simple internal governance dispute; it is the effective stripping of a public facility's operations and assets in favor of newly formed private entities. The real-world consequences are happening right now:

- **Stripped Operations:** RBR 501(c)(7) assets have been/will be transferred to new insider entities without membership transparency or City scrutiny.
- **Coercive Legal Waivers:** A new boarding agreement forces horse owners to waive their legal rights under California lien and remedy laws.
- **Mass Displacement:** Because of these predatory terms, approximately 20 horses — the vast majority of all privately boarded horses at the facility — have been forced off the property in a rushed, disruptive exodus over the last couple of weeks.

9/8/2026

Item 3

I urge you to halt any lease approvals, extensions, or modifications tonight until the City conducts a thorough, independent review of lease compliance, financial irregularities, and unauthorized asset transfers.

I also urge the Council to seriously consider options for operating the Pasadena Equestrian Center outside of RBR. Given the pattern of governance failures, financial opacity, and repeated harm to members documented here and in the City's own records, I do not believe RBR has demonstrated the capacity to responsibly manage a public equestrian facility going forward. The City should be willing to explore all alternatives that would better serve Pasadena residents and the public benefit this land was designated for — even if that means issuing a third Request for Proposals to identify an operator capable of meeting the City's standards for transparency, financial stewardship, and safety.

Sincerely,

Regina Colombo

Senior Assistant Administrator, Office of the Provost, Caltech

Pasadena Stakeholder & Former RBR Board Member

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Alan Colombo
Sent: Tuesday, September 8, 2026 3:52 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Public Comment re: Item 3 - CITY COUNCIL CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATORS pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.8

Some people who received this message don't often get email from

[.rn 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 (PAB). For more information about the PAB view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

9/08/26

Dear Members of the City of Pasadena Council

Victor M. Gordo, Mayor

Jessica Rivas, Vice Mayor, District 5

Tyron Hampton, District 1

Rick Cole, District 2

Justin Jones, District 3

Gene Masuda, District 4

Steve Madison, District 6

Jason Lyon, District 7

Matthew Hawkesworth, Interim City Manager

Michele Beal Bagneris, City Attorney

I am writing to formally submit comments regarding the Pasadena Equestrian Center's inclusion on Tuesday's closed session.

The city should be wary of recent public comments supporting the relationship between the city, Rose Bowl Riders (RBR), Myrtle Hill Farm (MHF), and all of the recently constructed non-profit and LLC protected affiliates. These comments largely come from individuals who have little stake in the actual running of the facility; specifically, they are members only because they wish to take lessons in a training program monopolized by Myrtle Hill Farm at the facility. Support from those outside the boarding community does not negate the systemic failures occurring on the ground.

The reality is that approximately 20 horses (including our own) have left the property due to a collapse in responsible nonprofit governance and disregard for the 80-year historic character of the club along with the cancellation of a fairly negotiated boarder agreement and the issuing of an onerous contract that essentially requires boarders to sign legal rights away. These are not isolated complaints; they are a result of years of warning that the city has largely ignored because of the city's desire to not be involved in a club's inner mechanisms. By failing to provide meaningful oversight of this publicly owned property, the city is exposing itself to significant legal and public-policy risks.

I would like clear, written answers to the following:

1. After effectively cancelling the two previous Requests for Proposals (RFP), is the city improperly engaging in sole-source negotiations with one of the newly formed 501(c)(3)'s or LLC's or with the

9/8/2026
Item 3

original RBR 501(c)(7), from which all assets and operations have been transferred through a vote that possibly violates the club's own bylaws essentially stripping it of all input and control of the facility?

2. The city has previously intervened regarding public access to the arena on property. What oversight is currently in place to prevent the current operators from treating, as they do, in my opinion, a public asset as their own private property?
3. Numerous stakeholders previously sent a formal letter to city officials. They have not received a response. Please confirm receipt of said letter and provide a detailed explanation of how those concerns will be resolved.

The city is now in a position to re-evaluate its relationship with the organizations operating on the property. I strongly urge the city to prioritize accountability and public interest over the convenience of the current operators, as there are two highly respected, highly successful organizations, RideOn Therapeutic Horsemanship, and the historically successful Tom Sawyer Camp on the same property. Either of which, I believe, would provide safe, responsible governance and meaningful public benefit at the facility for which the city of Pasadena would be proud.

Sincerely,

Alan Colombo

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Taryn Simone
Sent: Tuesday, September 8, 2026 3:55 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Rose Bowl Riders

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

[1] 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 (PAB). For more information about the PAB view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

Dear City Council Members,

I am writing as a member and former boarder at Rose Bowl Riders to make a public comment regarding the status of the lease with the City of Pasadena, as I understand this item is on tonight's agenda.

I have been a member of RBR for 20 years. It has been a fantastic organization to be a member of and the organization long maintained a welcoming and affordable facility. When I first joined 20 years ago, several different types of trainers operated out of the facility and the membership seemed harmonious. All members could pursue their own equestrian interests freely on the property. For many years, I dreamed of moving my horses to the facility. Finally, last year, the stars aligned and I was able to move my horses there.

I am so heartbroken to say that I feel I watched Rose Bowl Riders unravel before my eyes in the last few months. Individuals associated with a single training operation on the property seem to have taken over the Board of Directors. In doing so, they pursue an agenda that seems aimed at the maximal gain for that entity with no regard for the general good of the membership, or indeed, the Pasadena equestrian community as a whole.

I was forced to move my horse because the current training operation monopolizing the facility was not able to meet his needs, and the current leadership, aligned with that operation, blanket prohibited any other trainers from operating at the facility, even with proper insurance. I am now stimulating the economy of San Dimas but would rather be in Pasadena and as well, support the Altadena community, as they make their way back. I have since learned that nearly all of the other private boarders have also been forced to move their horses out due to a new boarding agreement with extremely strict and questionable new rules as well as a sizable fee hike. Not long ago there was a long waitlist for the stalls at RBR, and now most of them stand empty because of the current leadership's actions. I am also the owner of one of the vacant stalls.

Seeing this organization and facility change from welcoming, fun, and affordable to exclusive and expensive aimed only at benefiting a select few is nothing short of heartbreaking to me. The City of Pasadena should know what has occurred at this facility that's intention is to serve the Pasadena community at large.

9/8/2026
Item 3

Thank you for your time and attention.

Respectfully,

Taryn Simone