



**Workshop Notes
Community Meeting
Hahamongna Watershed Park Annex
City of Pasadena**

Thursday, May 18, 2006

6:30-8:30 p.m.

Maranantha High School ~ Student Center

169 St. John Street

Pasadena, CA 91105

Desired Outcomes:

- 1) Share the input received through the planning process to date
- 2) Reach agreement regarding the draft planning framework
- 3) Obtain final input from public for the charrette event

1. Welcome and introductions

2. Background and history of Annex site and planning process

Rosa Laveaga (City of Pasadena, Public Works, Parks & Natural Resources) provided an overview of the project history and the planning process.

3. Presentation of input from open house and community workshops

Anne Dove (National Park Service, RTCA) provided an overview of the public forums to date and a summary of the input received through those forums.

4. Overview of draft planning framework

Following the presentation of input from the community meeting, Anne Dove provided an overview of how the planning framework evolved out of this input and how it connects to the Hahamongna Watershed Park Master Plan. Following that presentation, the community was invited to provide feedback on the planning framework (*Attachment A: Planning Framework Feedback*).

5. Overview of charrette process

A short presentation was made by Anne Dove providing an overview of the goals of the charrette and the agenda for the day. Following, the community was invited to provide any last, additional comments for the group of people who will be participating in the charrette (*Appendix B: Additional Comments*).

6. Summary of next steps in process/ Wrap-up

It was noted that the community will be invited to a charrette "open house" on Saturday to meet the people involved in the event and to view the work products. A formal meeting to present and solicit input and feedback on the charrette outputs will take place on June 15, 6:30-8:30 p.m., location to be determined.

Attachment A: Planning Framework Feedback

Vision Statement Comments

- Does not focus on vision; too many phrases
- Location is center of watershed; unique natural setting of water resources makes it special-focus on what makes this site unique and special
- Adapting facilities-the long term vision should be more general because long term facilities may be replaced-move this to the level of an objective-include “evaluate” and then determine what should be adapted vs. replaced
- Do not spend resources on existing Forest Service buildings
- More of an educational focus-maybe a separate goal
- Watershed center, trail hub, education center should be strongly emphasized
- The rustic, natural character much as it is today...this is not reflected. More emphasis on “model”, “showcase” could overshadow the intent of making this fit into the natural center, being more simple
- Need to make it more simple-we’re putting too much pressure on the Annex in this vision statement
- There’s a disconnect between public access programming and existing uses today. The intent doesn’t seem to make the leased areas completely accessible to the public, so be careful not to imply this
- The current fences in RBR’s area are there for insurance purposes
- Adapting existing facilities is important-reuse where appropriate
- Long term vs. short term use of buildings
- Want tenants to be onsite in perpetuity
- Point made about RBR not being exclusive
- Vision statement needs to be more visionary, especially the part about the public/private partnership aspects
- Visions statement regarding equestrians needs to be stronger
- 2 paragraph: take out 1st phrase-remove focus on adaptive
- The oak forest needs to be protected and not disturbed the way it is now-enhance this point
- Add protection to willows
- 1st paragraph: add “passive” to recreation and “function as a gateway to the Angeles National Forest, La Cañada, So. Pasadena, Central and Lower Arroyo....”
- Supports adapting existing facilities

Goal 1 Comments

- Add statement about protecting/preserving/enhance oak grove south of USFS area
- Need to integrate comment about preserving dark sky

Goal 2 Comments

- No comments

Goal 3 Comments

- Need to add something about protecting streams and wetlands
- Integrate storm water best management practices into the Annex site (the whole site, not just the equestrian facilities)

- Maximize ground water recharge-concern that it means introducing spreading basins onto the site

Goal 4 Comments

- Separate second bulleted objective, “Adapt and enhance the former USDA Forest Service facilities into an Interpretive Center” into two different bullets
- Remove “design children’s play areas to emphasize learning and connections to the natural environment”—it’s not relevant to the Annex site
- Change “maintain and enhance *historic* recreation uses” to “maintain and enhance *current* recreation uses”
- Make education a separate goal statement.
- Question whether the goals and objectives for the Annex should be integrated into the HWP Master Plan or if the Annex should have a separate framework, particularly since many objectives in the Master Plan do not apply and may conflict with the Annex
- Under “historic uses”, include trail use
- What will be interpreted at this center? Should include watershed/water resources
- There’s this “forcing” of the Annex to fit into the Master Plan. Don’t force it into the HWP master plan framework. Make it separate planning area.
- Things proposed in the Master Plan that could impact this site should be reconsidered
- Keep recreation in Goal 4 and education in Goal 5
- JPL clean-up impact to site
- Objective 5: youth programs “consistent with the area”
- Deliver “passive” recreation
- Need to define active vs. passive recreation
- Emphasize “outdoor” education (“education, including outdoor recreation”)

Goal 5 Comments

- No comments

Goal 6 Comments

- No fences-need to make site accessible for trail users and for wildlife movement. No limits on hours for trail uses (many use trails in evening/night)
- Specific objective: to minimize impacts on wildlife corridor (speaks to the fencing issue). Enhance wildlife corridors (speak to Goal 1)
- Take out goal 6. If there are no problems on the site, why does it need to be secured?
- Encourage mounted patrols
- Take out the “sewage infrastructure” statement
- Substitute “observe safety and security” instead of “provide”
- The “secure entrances and perimeter of HWP” conflicts with having trail/wildlife connectivity

Goal 7 Comments

- Do not use “mitigate”—better to say “address”. Education of users is important
- Eliminate objective 2 (provide adequate parking....)
- Security, parking...only needed if park is highly developed. Need to balance
- “Minimize environmental impacts when siting parking”

- Objective 4 is not appropriate for Annex site (“develop separate trail systems for bicycles, hikers and equestrians wherever possible”)—there isn’t enough room to have separated, redundant trail systems through Annex
- Promote trail etiquette-could use the right-of-way/”share the trail” signs for different users
- Trail hub
- Rewrite objective 4, “develop a plan for providing for safe multiple uses”

Appendix B: Additional Comments

- Point out to the people at the charrette that there was overwhelming desire by the people at the community meetings to keep the existing uses on site
- Concerned about effects of possible development of greater park (covered in Master Plan) on Annex
 - Fields: Require pesticides, herbicides and fertilizers that will impact groundwater in whole park
 - Night lighting (esp. for sports) would negate dark skies for enter basin
 - Sports may attract a “rowdy” element, litter, vandalism, a security issue
- Concern a disc golf pro shop/club house/pay-to-play and disc golf historic museum
- Concerns that the charrette participants will “do their own thing” and not address the community’s input
- Concern that Flintridge Riding Club and Altadena Crest Trail Restoration Working Group not directly participating in the charrette