

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
Southern California Association of Governments 818 West Seventh Street, 12 th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90017-3435 Jeffrey M. Smith, Senior Planner	SCAG-1	11 page letter submitted that provides SCAG initial review and comments; main comments include DRAFT MEIR does not provide a discussion of the relationship between proposed Project to applicable regional plans as required by Section 15125 [d] of CEQA; FINAL MEIR should address the relationships to SCAG's Regional Comprehensive Plan utilizing specific staff comments included in letter; SCAG is also looking for the City to identify any inconsistency between SCAG's plans and the City (referring to SCAG policy numbers). Other SCAG comments include: 1 – MEIR should include project phasing or timing schedule 2 – MEIR should include discussion on Transportation Control Measures 3 – MEIR should include discussion on demand management of Air Quality 4 – MEIR does not include discussion of the subject of public expenditures for infrastructure and facilities, MEIR should include it 5 – MEIR does not include discussion on watershed management, MEIR should discuss this 6 – MEIR does not include discussion on recycling waterwaste for useful purposes
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Priya Finnemore, Project Manager Regulatory Branch, Los Angeles District 213-452-3287 Priya.Finnemore@spl01.usace.army.mil	USArmy-1	Specific comments on Nationwide Permit Program (NWP), including clarification to language included in MEIR
County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Watershed Management Division – LA River Section Dan Sharp 626-458-4345 dsharp@ladpw.org	CoLAPW-1	5/28/02 request for extension of comment period
County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works PO Box 1460 Alhambra, CA 91802 Massie Munroe 626-458-4359	CoLAPW-2	9/12/02 letter provides comments for the following categories: 1 – Environmental Programs 2 – Flood maintenance 3 – Geotechnical and Materials Engineering 4 – Land Development (Grading & Drainage) 5 – Land Development (Transportation Planning) 6 – Programs Development

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
		7 – Traffic & Lighting 8 – Water Resources 9 – Watershed Management (More specific comments are included in letter)
County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County 1955 Workman Mill Road Whittier, CA 90601-1400 Ruth I. Frazen, Engineering Technician Planning and Property Management Section 562-699-7411, x 2717	CoLASant-1	Letter indicating that all information concerning Districts' facilities and sewerage service contained in the document is currently complete and accurate
State of California Governor's Office of Planning & Research State Clearinghouse 1400 Tenth Street Sacramento, CA 95812-3044 Scott Morgan, Project Analyst 916-445-0613	ST-1	Letter indicating review period has been extended
State of California Governor's Office of Planning & Research State Clearinghouse 1400 Tenth Street Sacramento, CA 95812-3044 Scott Morgan, Project Analyst 916-445-0613	ST-2	6/5/02 letter indicating that Draft MEIR was distributed to various agencies for review
State of California Governor's Office of Planning & Research State Clearinghouse 1400 Tenth Street Sacramento, CA 95812-3044 Scott Morgan, Project Analyst 916-445-0613	ST-3 ST-4	Letters indicating review period has been extended
State of California Governor's Office of Planning & Research	ST-5	No state agencies submitted comments by review period closing date; complied with State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents pursuant

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
State Clearinghouse 1400 Tenth Street Sacramento, CA 95812-3044 Terry Roberts, Director 916-445-0613		to CEQA
State of California Department of Transportation District 7, Regional Planning IGR-CEQA Branch 120 S. Spring Street Los Angeles, CA 90012 Stephen Buswell, IGR/CEQA Branch Chief Transportation Planning Office, District 7	CalTrans-1	6/11/02 letter indicating no comment at this time
Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy State of California – The Resources Agency 570 West Avenue Twenty-Six, Suite 100 Los Angeles, CA 90065 323-221-8900 x 117 Cara McLane	SMMC-1	15 page letter that includes numerous comments including the following: 1 – proposed parking structure need is not explained; not enough detail to assess its environmental impacts 2 – ASMP doe not provide enough information on the Arroyo Seco itself, plan does not address stream restoration and thus is inadequate 3 – Significant discussion on ASMP and its components (by area) regarding habitat restoration, Oak Woodland restoration, request for exotic animal inventory, description of native habitat communities (fish), grading plans, restoration in the Lower Arroyo; regarding Rose Bowl Use Plan – additional events and the resulting aggregate impacts must be quantified and mitigated; supports contents of Design Guidelines; 4 – Significant discussion on MEIR and its components including aesthetics, air quality, biological resources (sensitive plant and animal species and wetlands), hydrology and water quality, and recreation
Jet Propulsion Laboratory California Institute of Technology 4800 Oak Grove Drive Pasadena, CA 91109 Bruce Fisher Manager, Facilities Division	JPL-1	Letter received includes comments from Facilities Division only – concerned about increased traffic on Oak Grove Drive and Windsor Avenue, and inclusion of parking structure; JPL's preference is the parking structure be located in the northern Arroyo east of the JPL bridge; also concerned with West Rim and Perimeter Trail and coordination with JPL; concerned about North Bridge crossing for perimeter trail; will work with City to plan the relocation of existing overhead power and communication

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
818-354-0701		lines
Rose Bowl Operating Company 1001 Rose Bowl Drive Pasadena, CA 91103 Patrick Green President 626-577-3101	RB-1	Letter submitted raises concern of possible inconsistency between factual statements in the DEIR and current and past use of the Rose Bowl regarding number of events; clarification regarding baseline situation pertaining to major events at the Rose Bowl and whether remaining analysis in the DEIR of potential environmental impacts associated with the Rose Bowl Use Plan is based on that baseline; questions regarding noise and traffic analysis and types of events
Christine McLeod Public Affairs Region Manager Southern California Edison	SCE-1	SCE's primary concerns are focused upon proposed relocation and/or undergrounding of SCE facilities with Hahamongna; since City's plan are not specifically developed, SCE's comments are general in nature – 1 – concerned with plans for proposed watershed management and water storage proposals and its adverse impact on SCE facilities 2 – concerned with facility access 3 – concerned with relocation impacts 4 – project specific environmental impacts need to be addressed in the future 5 – has some regulatory concerns
Marcus Renner Urban & Environmental Poly Institute Occidental College 1600 Campus Rd Los Angeles, CA 90041 323-259-2991	ED-1	1 – EIR has not adequately evaluated the habitat restoration plans within ASMP 2 – EIR has not adequately taken into account the historical record in evaluating the impacts of the ASMP 3 – EIR gives very little consideration to opportunities that exist for restoration beyond the areas currently classified as ruderal vegetation (more specific comments are listed within the letter)
Karen Evans Assistant Field Supervisor United State Department of Interior Fish & Wildlife Office 2730 Loker Avenue West Carlsbad, CA 92008 760-431-9440	USDI-1	Provides the following general comments (see letter for specifics): 1 – Permit required from US Army Corps of Engineers under section 404 of the Clean Water Act (related to Arroyo Toad) 2 – Every effort should be made to avoid further impacts to arroyo toad critical habitat through project alterations 3 – MEIR does not clearly state that the habitat conversion from southern willow scrub to open water in the conservation pool is considered an impact to a sensitive habitat type 4 – Recommends that disc golf stay in its present location and area be rehabilitated (restoration should be large contiguous patches rather than small ones) 5 – Proposed project should avoid impacts to sage scrub communities

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
		6 – Federally endangered plants – Nevin’s barberry and Palmer’s mariposa lily should be avoided 7 – Recommended that proposed East & West lakes be reduced to one and recreational field activities consolidated into one or two main areas 8 – Discourage stocking of ponds with non-native species 9 - Any proposed lights should be directed away from native habitats or restoration areas 10 – Impacts to biological resources related to bicycle path need to be included in MEIR
Robert Stanley Director, Community Development Department City of La Canada Flintridge 1327 Foothill Blvd La Canada Flintridge, CA 91011 818-790-8880	LCF-1	Primary concerns revolve around the relocation of parking and the concomitant traffic issues – specifically no discussion or analysis to indicate that parking structure is needed in connection with any recreational park uses now or in the future; the use of the parking structure for Rose Bowl events is a possibility, but additional use is not analyzed or discussed in MEIR, but contemplated by Travel Demand Management Strategy for CAMP (more specific issues/comments in letter)
Altadena Equestrian Resources 3613 Skylane Drive Altadena, CA 91001 Tracy Sullivan, President	NP-1	1 – Demands justification for overall shift in structural additions and impact from affluent and white area of Lower Arroyo to predominantly minority area of Hahamongna 2 – Justification and impact of the location of refuse storage adjacent to Altadena is not properly addressed 3 – MEIR does not address impact on accessibility that mountain bikes would cause not liability by pack riders or impacts on surrounding area 4 – MEIR does not address increase beyond current capacity of use of trailhead to Angles National Forest
Spirit of the Sage Council 30 North Raymond Avenue, Suite 303 Pasadena, CA 91103 Leeona Klippstein, President	NP-2	Requests the “no project” alternative, states City is legally required to conserve critical habitat under ESA. Project description in MEIR is inaccurate and misleading (specific examples are cited)
West Pasadena Residents Association PO Box 50252 Pasadena, CA 91115	NP-3	Public records request for responses; requests additional review time; more community meetings; Commission needs to explain disparity between recreation and preservation; explanation of why concrete flood control channel removal is not included; explaining financing plans for project; address lack of maintenance and policing considerations; reconcile negative or minimal impact statements in EIR on

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
		cultural and aesthetic issues in view of significant proposed changes; include a survey to document and determine significance of historical/cultural resources; assessment of tree population; consider adopting certain elements which are not controversial
West Pasadena Residents Association PO Box 50252 Pasadena, CA 91115 Richard Davis, Board Member	NP-4	Letter outlines concerns with bicycle path in Lower Arroyo
West Pasadena Residents Association PO Box 50252 Pasadena, CA 91115 Joan Hearst, Secretary	NP-5	Request for extension of public review period
West Pasadena Residents Association PO Box 50252 Pasadena, CA 91115 Vince Farhat, President	NP-6	Arroyo should be preserved and restored
West Pasadena Residents Association PO Box 50252 Pasadena, CA 91115 Richard Davis, Board Member & Chair of Arroyo ad hoc Committee	NP-7	Questions raised include: 1 – Why does LAMP and MEIR not provide an alternative for eliminating bicycle path? 2 – When will a revised Master Plan and MEIR which includes their alternative be issued for public comment? 3 – Why no public notice and opportunity for public comment on elements raised by community at June 25 “hearing” contained in the ASMP and MEIR that are additions to original draft Master Plan approved by City Council in 1997? Also summary of public comments taken by WPRA included
West Pasadena Residents Association PO Box 50252 Pasadena, CA 91115 Vince Farhat, President	NP-8	Letter updating staff on WPRA’s review of documents
Singer Park Neighborhood Association PO Box 50245 Pasadena, CA 91115 Andrew Ewing, President	NP-9 NP-9a	Letter NP-9 includes the following: 1- Flood Control channel removal should be considered 2- Restoration of historic paths and boulder walls 3- Bicycles should not be permitted in Lower Arroyo 4- Addition of restrooms, fountains and bridges should be removed as projects

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
		5- No additional parking lots or road widening 6- Archer area should be fenced 7- Increased security needs to be consider Letter NP-9a includes: 1 – Wants process for Design Review to be changed 2 - Questions need for signage, bridges, gates, road widenings, restrooms, paved bike paths and parking lots 3 – Wants Design Commission to review all changes in Arroyo
Pasadena Casting Club PO Box 6 Pasadena, CA 91102 Kip Gomez, President	NP-10	Fully supports the goals of LAMP and improvements proposed
League of Women Voters Pasadena Area 1353 North Hill Avenue Pasadena, CA 91104 Robbie Davis, President	NP-11	Requests extension of public review period
Ad hoc Committee of Neighborhood & Homeowners Associations 570 South Arroyo Boulevard Pasadena, CA 91105 Joan Hearst, Chair, Pro-Tem	NP-12	Submitted a list of 44 questions at community meeting on July 16, 2002
Equestrian Trails Inc., Corral 2 Attn: Elizabeth A. Bour 1132 Wellington Ave. Pasadena, CA 91103 626-792-2934	NP-13	Letter raises questions/concerns about the following projects/issues: 1 – Oak Grove Dr Improvements (Westside) 2 – New 1,200 space JPL parking structure 3 – West Arroyo inner park access 4 – Equestrian refuse disposal area 5 – Bicycle route 6 – Westside multi-use trail for bicyclists and hikers 7 – Negative Declaration for MWD land lease as well as numerous other issues
West Pasadena Residents Association PO Box 50252	NP-14	Letter requesting Parks and Recreation Commission pass a resolution on the following:

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
Pasadena, CA 91115 Richard Davis, Board of Directors		1 – Proposed bicycle path for Lower Arroyo be dropped from further consideration 2 – That neither City Council or City staff take further action on consummating a lease with MWD for property in Hahamongna until MEIR is certified.
Altadena Foothill Conservancy Nancy L.C. Steele President Nsteele@altadenafoothills.org 626-791-8458 PO Box 3 Altadena, Ca 91003	NP-15	Following comments submitted: 1 – Concerned that distribution of ASMP and MEIR has been inadequate 2 – Air quality section provides inadequate analysis and mitigation measures. 3 – Issues and concerns raised regarding biological resources 4 – Water quality impact analysis for Hahamongna is inadequate 5 – MEIR should recognize that Arroyo users are not from Pasadena exclusively and Arroyo is a regional resource, as such wider notification system beyond signage is needed
North East Trees Eileen Takata Arroyo Seco Watershed Coordinator Claire Robinson Executive Director 570 West Avenue 26, Suite 200 Los Angeles, CA 90065 323-441-8634	NP-16	North East Trees and Verna Jigour Associates submitted a lengthy, technical letter identifying their concerns and issues for both the ASMP and the ASMEIR. The comments are within the framework of supporting the restoration of the Arroyo Seco from a concrete flood control channel to a multiple-benefit living stream. Their study “integrates issues of stream restoration with habitat restoration, recreation and open space, water supply and water quality.
Daniel S. Cooper Director of Bird Conservation Audubon California C/o The Audubon Center 6042 Monte Vista St. Los Angeles, CA 90042 323-254-0252	NP-17	Concerned with Arroyo Seco, as its management affects wildlife downstream (specifically Audubon California’s management of Debs Park). Issues raised in letter include: 1 – Channel Removal 2 – Constructed Lakes & Streams 3 – Camel Hump Modification 4 – Grading/Excavating Hahamongna Basin 5 – Movement Corridors 6 – Eastside Park Entrance
Richard Davis West Pasadena Resident’s Association PO Box 50252 Pasadena, CA 91115	NP-18	Submitted letter that emphasizes points outlined in the response submitted by Coalition for the Protection of the Arroyo (CPAS); main issues identified include: 1 – ASMP and ASMEIR focus on physical infrastructure, instead of restoration, protection, preservation and maintenance of Arroyo Seco 2 – MEIR should not be certified and that ASMP be revised to reflect “desires of the

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
		<p>community and to emphasize preservation and restoration”</p> <p>3 – No consideration for Watershed Management Plan for Hahamongna</p> <p>4 – No consideration for impacts and mitigation for inclusion of NFL team or increasing events to 25 at the Rose Bowl</p> <p>5 – No consideration for removal of concrete flood control channel, restoration of streambed or alternative for restoration of natural steam bed in lieu of proposed extension of the BFI low flow stream into the Memorial Grove area</p> <p>6 – Lack of alternatives to proposed parking structure</p> <p>7 – No sources of funding for maintenance of various projects</p> <p>8 – No provisions are made for policing for proposed bicycle paths, picnic area, trails (nor are safety issues with bicycle paths addressed)</p>
<p>Emina Darakjy President East Arroyo Residents Association 1044 Prospect Blvd Pasadena, CA 91103 626-792-0586</p>	<p>NP-19</p>	<p>Letter identifies the following issues/concerns:</p> <p>1 – “Plan” does not conform to Objective 9 of the General Plan to “preserve and acquire open space”</p> <p>2 – Plan does not consider the Arroyo Seco Watershed and means to protect and enhance the water supply for Pasadena (doesn’t address streambed restoration)</p> <p>3 – MEIR doesn’t address impacts of increased usage of Rose Bowl (i.e. NFL, etc.)</p> <p>4 – Building 75’ and 90’ poles around golf course seems to be in violation of Design Guidelines</p> <p>5 – MEIR doesn’t address impact of additional parking on Area H, and field should be restored</p> <p>6 – EIR does not address impacts of a 50,000 sq ft minimum for Design Review; nor does it address visual blight from additional signs, kiosks, lights, etc.</p>
<p>Norman Parker President Linda Vista Annandale Association PO Box 94364 Pasadena, CA 91109 626-795-1065</p>	<p>NP-20</p>	<p>Cover letter submitted references 2 attachments submitted by Coalition for the Protection of the Arroyo Seco (attachments “reflect or expand on CPAS submittals). Issues from Attachment A:</p> <p>1 – Can City propose projects involving other independent agencies?</p> <p>2 – Does CEQA and MEIR process provide a formal mechanism to address issues omitted by city staff from the ASMP?</p> <p>3 – Additional analysis required – reference flood control channel</p> <p>4 – Evaluation of management and maintenance programs of CAMP needed, can’t review and comment on cumulative impacts, mitigation or plan alternatives without them</p>

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
		<p>5 – Request for “financial studies or certain existing situations such as a study of costs and revenue relating to use of public parkland by organized activities from outside Pasadena – do events consume space or time such that Pasadena’s own youth are crowded out?”</p> <p>6 – Wants installation of pedestrian pathways along Salvia Canyon Rd, Seco St from Linda Vista to West Dr and Seco St from Rosemont to Lincoln</p> <p>7 – Wants removal of poles and netting along golf course – “community” believes that proper notice was not given</p> <p>8 – Wants inclusion of Rosemont Pavilion visual improvements by painting and landscaping as recommended by CAMP Advisory Committee</p> <p>9 – Wants concepts of Watershed Study included</p> <p>10 – Deferred maintenance ignored throughout CAMP</p> <p>Issues from Attachment B (Regarding Rose Bowl Use Plan): vague and broad, not enough to evaluate; doesn’t include description of existing environment; MEIR does not evaluate inconsistencies between project and General Plan and other approved plans; doesn’t identify significant environmental impacts; doesn’t include analysis of significant cumulative impacts; does examine if project will lead to economic or population growth that could affect environment; does not explain potentially significant impacts that cannot be mitigated; does not explain reasons that possible significant environmental impacts were found to be insignificant; does not describe reasonable range of alternatives to project; doesn’t examine all significant irreversible environmental changes that would occur if project is implemented</p>
Peggy Stewart President La Casita Foundation PO Box 51075 Pasadena, CA 91105	NP-21	Letter submitted includes clarifications to language and raises the following issues/concerns: 1 – Acknowledgement of deterioration of east slope of the Arroyo adjacent to La Casita 2 – MEIR is deficient because it does not assess irreversible effects on aesthetics or cultural resources by the construction of picnic areas, widen trails, bicycle paths, and new roads and bridges 3 – MEIR is deficient because it doesn’t assess the possibility and effects of removing concrete stream channel despite Watershed study Master Plan comments: 4 – Excellent idea to define boundaries of Garden at La Casita

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
		5 – More information on signage, kiosk etc is needed (reference previous attempts by Pasadena Garden Club) 6 – Opposed to introduction of bicycles
Patricia Locke Representative Concerned Citizens for Responsible Stewardship of the Arroyo Seco 306 Cherry Drive Pasadena, CA 91105 323-258-3784	NP-22	Letter submitted by group of residents stating that join CPAS in requesting that the City Council not certify the ASMP and MEIR and direct staff to prepare a phased ASMP and MEIR in line with public demands for river restoration
Susan Mossman Executive Director Pasadena Heritage 651 South St. John Ave Pasadena, CA 91105 626-441-6333	NP-23	Letter submitted includes the following: 1 – ASMP process should be reopened 2 – More attention should be given to preservation and restoration of natural environment and historic built environment 3 – New infrastructure should be kept to a minimum 4 – More information about the Rose Bowl and its future must be included 5 – Environmental review should be modified to reflect resulting changes in plan
Margaret Stewart President Arroyo Seco Foundation 539 East Villa St. #2 Pasadena, CA 91101 626-584-9902	NP-24	Lengthy document submitted that details specific concerns and issues; chief among the issues is MEIR treats Arroyo Seco not as a unique natural area, but a defined and designed park; MEIR fails to adequately protect water and natural resources and to consider more environmentally friendly alternatives such as stream restoration and a conservation plan which would stress protecting and restoring habitat and natural resources; supports comment of CPAS; asks City not to certify MEIR and submit the ASMP to “proper” public review
Ron Cyger President Pasadena Chapter National Audubon Society 1750 N. Altadena Dr. Pasadena, CA 91107 626-449-3625	NP-25	Letter submitted contains 26 broad issues and concerns, followed by a 22 page chart detailing specific issues, concerns, and questions on the MEIR and an 8 page chart on the ASMP. Synopsis of the 26 issues is as follows: 1 – What permits will City need to proceed with implementation? 2 – Concerned that Hahamongna Master Plan is very different than conceptually approved one 3 – Concern with City motives during comment period and not responding to public questions during CEQA meetings 4 – Illustrations are deceptive and picture basin as mostly filled with water

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
		5 – Will City make public more detailed descriptions of projects? 6 – Will MEIR Executive Summary be revised to include CEQA Section 15123 standards 7 – Will City revise plan to crate “shaded paths or blinds” which allow for observation with minimal human presence? 8 – Will City update LAMP since it was first approved 5 years ago and public sentiment has changed? 9 – Will City revise ASMP in light of ASF study findings? 10 – What projects in ASMP and MEIR have funding? 11 – Given new regional water quality standards, how does City plan to meet these standards with increased vehicular traffic in upper and lower Arroyo? 12 – What were the specific reasons the City dismissed the findings of Phillips Williams Study? Will City revise MEIR to include findings of study? 13 – What is the basis for City establishing a temporary lot on NE part of Hahamongna? Did the City establish a removal date? Public documents? 14 – Has/will City ask JPL to build their own structure on their own property? 15 – Will City move a number of proposed projects to NE corner of Hahamongna? 16 – Will City amend MEIR to include ground water responsibilities? 17 – What is the number of existing parking and proposed parking in Hahamongna? 18 – In what City or cities does JPL reside in? Does JPL have a parking master plan? 19 – Does the City have a budget or funding sources for ASMP? 20 – Table on page 3-20 – what categories are athletic fields, recreational activities, etc. classified on table? 21 – How does City define habitat in documents? 22 – What is the City’s intent for Hahamongna, especially related to developing revenue sources? 23 – What measures does City use to prevent groundwater contamination? 24 – Does City use reclaimed water or City water in relation to projects? What are plans during drought years? 25 – Will City amend Arroyo Seco Ordinance to include Hahamongna within lands covered by ordinance – and limit size and type of events held? 26 – With an increase in non-native bird species the impact of these species on native population must be addressed in MEIR.
Neil Kleinman	NP-26	Letter stating that CPAS raises many valid issues with respect to preservation and

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
Vice President Madison Heights Neighborhood Association Pasadena, CA 91106		natural environment, but approach appears to be insensitive to community's identified needs for greater access to Arroyo and increased recreational facilities.
Joan Hearst Representative Coalition for the Protection of the Arroyo Seco (CPAS) 570 S. Arroyo Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105 626-796-4057	NP-27	<p>Very lengthy document titled "Keep it Natural" submitted. Requests and recommendation outlined in cover letter include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 – Not certify MEIR 2 – Not adopt current ASMP 3 – Direct staff to rewrite ASMP, with following objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - write in a manner "readable and understandable" - present each element identically organized and consistently prepared - prepare all elements consist with CEQA - emphasize habitat enhancement, restoration and preservation using appropriate native materials - Focus on preserving historic character and environment - Limit objective in MEIR section 2.1 to incorporating Hahamongna Water Park into Arroyo Seco Public Lands Ordinance - Focus on third objective to achieve restoration/conservation or natural environment - Not include: "provide new revenue generating park facilities" - Set policy to guide preservation, conservation and recreation actives in Arroyo 4 – CPAS recommends that all projects proposed for deferred maintenance and improved safety be completed as quickly as possible <p>CPAS also indicates in document, that City does not address the following projects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 – Flood Control Channel Removal 2 – Bike Path in LAMP 3 – Hahamongna Parking Structure 4 – Soccer Fields 5 – Hahamongna Watershed Park Slip Lane 6 – Proposed MWD Property Lease
Tim Wesolowski 153 Grunnewald Ct. Santa Cruz, CA 95065	C-1	Against removing 9 holes at disc golf
Marian S. Sata	C-2	Don't allow bicycles to use Lower Arroyo trails (horses and bicycles don't mix)

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
Fnmsata@aol.com		
Mark Goldschmidt 2027 North Lake Avenue #1 Altadena, CA 91001	C-3	Questions and comments concern a proposed new entry and slip road to Hahamongna from Oak Grove Dr – MEIR does not address impact of construction or changes in traffic patterns
Mary Prickett 662 La Loma Road Pasadena, CA 91105	C-4	No bikes in Arroyo
Hugh Bowles Hahamongna Watchdog Group 1030 Shelly Street Altadena, CA 91001	C-5 C-5a	<p>Letter C-5 comments include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 – Did not receive notification of City’s intent to adopt a Neg Dec for the MWD lease 2 – For what purposes is the land being leased to the MWD? 3 – Request that City bring MWD project under HWP Park Plan 4 – Berkshire Dr. slip road should be brought under HWP Master Plan 5 – States 11-96, City stipulated to describe permissible events and projected capital improvements required to restore the area... <p>Letter C-5a contains numerous comments on the following topics:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 – Oak Grove Dr Improvements (Westside) 2 – New Park Entrance (Eastside) 3 – Realign Park Access Road 4 – Widen Johnson Field Road 5 – Pump-Back System 6 – Westside Spreading Basins 7 – Eastside Spreading Basins 8 – Flood Management 9 – West Lake 9a – Construct Parking Structure 10 – Renovate Johnson Field 11 – Habitat conservation 12 – City needs to provide capital outlay or capital improvement plan per CEQA 13 – City needs to provide a description of potential impacts of projects 14 – Feels project descriptions are inadequate (i.e. parking structure) 15 – Need to provide list of permits and approvals required 16 – Needs to provide more thorough Executive Summary for HWP plan

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
		17 – Proposition A funding 18 – Prior stipulation requirements 19 – “No discussion of cumulative impacts under CEQA” 20 – “No meaningful discussion of alternative projects under CEQA” 21 – NEPA requirements unmet
Gail Wilts GLWilts@aol.com	C-6	Does not want bicycles allowed in Lower Arroyo, which will interfere with horse riders
Dianne Domingo-Foraste 2256 Whittier Blvd. Los Angeles, CA 90023 323-268-8511	C-7	1 – Installation of bicycle trails will threaten safety of others 2 – Installation of public restrooms will lead to increased lewd activities by others 3 - Installation of parking lot and drive entrance will lead to safety issues
Jill Polsby Polsby@yahoo.com	C-8	Does not want to give away park land for La Canada High School driveway
Cheryl Auger 1211 Romney Way Pasadena, CA 91105	C-9	Letter raises questions regarding tree ordinance, including: 1 – Will City conduct survey of all native, specimen and landmark trees and revise ASMP and MEIR to protect trees? 2 – Will protection be expanded to include 5 trees requested by Councilman Madison? 3 – What provisions will be made in MEIR to prevent injury to trees? 4 – Will new UFAC commission monitor implementation of ASMP for compliance with tree ordinance?
Ramona Van Dyck	C-10	Against proposed parking lot and picnic tables at south end of Brookside Park adjacent to San Pascual stables.
T. Frank Cassidy 1267 Parkview Avenue Pasadena, CA 91103 626-796-7278	C-11 C-11a C-11b C-11c C-11d C-11e	Letters deal with the installation of 24 – 75’ and 90’ poles and netting erected near golf course – considers them to be an eyesore and wants them removed
Sharon D. Scull 1722 Putney Road Pasadena, CA 91103	C-12	Arroyo Seco should be preserved as wilderness area

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
626-578-1747 S.Scull@att.net		
Yvonne Castillo 413 Waldo Avenue, #108 Pasadena, CA 91101	C-13	Does not want bicycles allowed in Lower Arroyo; prevent the building of parking lots and public restrooms in Arroyo (drug users frequent these areas)
Michael Vogler 520 California Te Pasadena, CA 91105 626-796-1404	C-14	ASMP and MEIR do not address streambed restoration or consider watershed study
Robert H. Cooke 1050 Stoneridge Drive Pasadena, CA 91105	C-15	Letter protests the following: 1 – Bicycle trail in the Lower Arroyo 2 – New south entrance 3 – New pedestrian bridge
Cynthia Moussas 626-799-0092 Cmoussas@aol.com	C-16	Leave Arroyo Seco as wilderness
Bob Gutzman 737 La Loma Road Pasadena, CA 91105 213-613-3683 Bgutzman@cbre.com	C-17 C-26 (8-1-02 email)	Letter C-17 identifies the following issues: 1 – Inclusion of bicycle paths is flawed 2 – Remove of flood control channel needs to be considered 3 – New south entrance and picnic tables and parking doesn't make sense 4 – Improve signage requiring dogs on leash Letter C-26 - Concerned that EIR does not address streambed restoration and removal of concrete flood control channel
Diana Britt 280 Sequoia Drive Pasadena, CA 91105 626-440-9624 Dbritt@earthlink.net	C-18	1 – Opposes the widening of the existing main access road into Lower Arroyo at Norwood Dr and instead, encourages the City to clear the accumulation of silt from the northern edge of existing access road to improve access to the lot west of the Casting Pond. 2 – City should discuss with the City of South Pasadena the possible use of San Pascual parking lot in lieu of creating a new access road with parking lot 3 – City should consider an extension of the Arts bus route to improve access to Lower Arroyo 4 – City of Pasadena consider joint project with City of South Pasadena to install

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
		restrooms for use of the parking lot 5 – Any drinking fountains/horse troughs be adjacent to any restroom 6 – City to explain how it will patrol the area for safety and to ensure there is no inappropriate activity
Postcard dated 6-4-02 with no identifying information	C-19	Need “green space,” don’t cater to special interests, cater to those who interests maintain the park for pure recreational use. Arroyo is a City asset, not any one group’s asset
Suzanne Miller 1117 S. Orange Grove Blvd Pasadena	C-20	WPRA Postcard + comment regarding plants and the creation of a dry, dusty area where animals are unable to hide and live
B.J. Rack 3385 Trevall Road Pasadena, CA 91107	C-21	WPRA Postcard
Christine Madsen 515 W. California Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-22	WPRA Postcard
Ariel _____ 1235 Forest Avenue Pasadena, CA 91103	C-23	WPRA Postcard + off leashed dogs must be in a fenced area to protect horses and pedestrians
CBMM1881@aol.com	C-24	No bike trails, no picnic tables, no further development of Lower Arroyo, casting pond might need resurfacing
Joan Favre Jfavre@hotmail.com	C-25	Preserve open space in Lower Arroyo; can’t imagine a parking structure; 10’ bike path seems impossible without cutting into hillside
Janet Gordon 313 Arlington Drive Pasadena, CA 91105	C-27	1 – No bike path in Lower Arroyo 2 – Removal of concrete flood control and streambed restoration 3 – No additional parking or paving in Lower Arroyo 4 – Historical rock-lined paths and access stairs should be preserved and restored, and no additional access planned
Eileen Janice Takekoshi 1180 North Arroyo Boulevard Pasadena, CA 91103 626-356-7445	C-28	Contents of WPRA Postcard + comment about keeping natural setting being attacked by development
Richard Shivers	C-29	Opposed to plan, Arroyo should be returned to natural state as much as possible;

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
RichardShvrs@aol.com		remove concrete flood control structure; would like to know who conceived draft plan and who it is for?
Claire Brian 1150 South Arroyo Boulevard Pasadena Cbrian8587@earthlink.net	C-30	Do not allow "wheels" in the Lower Arroyo; do not pave pathways through the Arroyo
Gordon Treweek 1040 Armada Drive Pasadena, CA 91103	C-31	Strongly recommends the substantial reduction of asphalt parking in the Central Arroyo by at least 1,000 parking spaces to increase parkland; states even with reduction in parking contractual obligations to UCLA/RBOC can still be met
Sue Lafferty Slafferty@huntington.org	C-32	1 – Environmental impact of increased paving for bike paths is not adequately addressed in MEIR 2 – Why does bike path need paving? 3 – Concerned that 10' bike path would encourage high-speed cycling on racing bikes and the potential dangerous impacts that would result 4 – Will bike routes be used by pack riders? Feels there will be a significant negative impact on other recreational uses and this is not addressed in MEIR; high speeds and large numbers would have a significant impact on the normally quiet and peaceful natural setting – this is not addressed in MEIR
Patricia Crook 605 Evergreen Drive Pasadena, CA 91105	C-33	WPRA Postcard
Richard D. Shivers 1072 S. Orange Grove Pasadena, CA 91105	C-34	WPRA Postcard + personal statement regarding those supporting "destruction" of remaining natural environment in Arroyo Seco.
C.E.Foster 495 Orange Grove Circle Pasadena, CA 91105	C-35	WPRA Postcard + striking of last point regarding off-leash dogs; wants all dogs on leashes
R.B. Ricewasser 1549 Poppy Peak Drive Pasadena, CA 91105	C-36	WPRA Postcard + keep Arroyo as a natural open area for habitat by wildlife
Nancy _____ 474 Miles Street Pasadena, CA 91106	C-37	WPRA Postcard

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
Brenda _____ 615 S. Park Rose Monrovia, CA 91016	C-38	WPRA Postcard
Julia O'Grady Pollard 794 South Arroyo Blvd Pasadena, CA 91105	C-39	WPRA Postcard + archery range is allotted an "inordinate" amount of spaces, house should be removed; the paths the club has made are "ugly," how many Pasadena members belong to this "private club?"
John L. Thompson 4632 Viro Road La Canada, CA 91011 818-790-2906	C-40	1 – inadequate attention paid to aesthetic impact of parking structure in MEIR 2 – financial and traffic implications of parking structure need to be addressed 3 – apparent neglect of the concerns of the City of La Canada Flintridge with regards to parking structure 4 – concerned that plans for the three different areas of the Arroyo to not take into account each area's distinct nature
Hamilton Kelly 547 East Union Street Pasadena, CA 91101	C-41	WPRA Postcard
Patrick Fitzpatrick 1095 Busch Gardens Ct. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-42	WPRA Postcard
Paul Water 859 S. Orange Grove Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-43	WPRA Postcard
Edith Taylor 330 West California Blvd., #107 Pasadena, CA 91105	C-44	WPRA Postcard
Shari Thorece 728 Hillside Terrace Pasadena, CA 91105	C-45	WPRA Postcard
Madelaine & Morris Birnbaum 740 South Orange Grove Blvd. #4 Pasadena, CA 91105	C-46	WPRA Postcard + delete comment referencing off-leash dog activities
Doris K. Helton One South Orange Grove, #6 Pasadena, CA 91105	C-47	WPRA Postcard + please save Pasadena

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
Donald Cole 265 Linda Vista Avenue Pasadena, CA 91105	C-48	WPRA Postcard
Kenneth L. Colborn 670 S. Arroyo Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-49	WPRA Postcard
Richard Morris & Lisa Cliff 425 Juniper Pasadena, CA 91105	C-50	WPRA Postcard
Kenneth Misa 804 S. Orange Grove Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-51	WPRA Postcard + delete comment referencing off-leash dog activities
William Chavis 580 S. Arroyo Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-52	WPRA Postcard
Margaret Hinkley 1391 Capinero Drive Pasadena, CA 91105	C-53	WPRA Postcard
Carol Anne Ecorn 695 Arbar Street Pasadena, CA 91105	C-54	WPRA Postcard
P. Sutton 586 La Loma Road Pasadena, CA 91105	C-55	WPRA Postcard + comment "we need more areas not developed"
Norman & Cindy Dupon 242 S. Grand Avenue Pasadena, CA 91105	C-56	WPRA Postcard
Peter Schultz 333 Congress Place Pasadena, CA	C-57	WPRA Postcard
Sharon Stumpo 1280 Avenue 64 Pasadena, CA 91105	C-58	WPRA Postcard + comment "please no bike paths and no paved paths in Lower Arroyo – keep as natural as possible; do not widen roadways or expand parking facilities"

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
Inge Petersen 1356 Marianna Road Pasadena, CA 91105	C-59	WPRA Postcard
Morton Feingold 169 W. Glenarm St. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-60	WPRA Postcard
H. J. Mumper –Drumm 186 Annandale Road Pasadena, CA	C-61	WPRA Postcard + comment “if horse are allowed, some provision should be made for use by off-road bike riders,” also disagrees with statement “no bike path in Lower Arroyo”
Lee Salas 1450 Brixton Road Pasadena, CA 911050	C-62	WPRA Postcard
Viera Rigler 687 Bellefontaine St. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-63	WPRA Postcard
Guido Zemgals 1405 Capinero Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-64	WPRA Postcard + comment “removal of flood channel is the most important aspect”
Dudley Lang 960 Mesa Verde Road Pasadena, CA 91105	C-65	WPRA Postcard, but does not agree with that LAMP focuses too heavily on infrastructure development ...; LAMP must be maintained as natural, environmentally friendly setting; deleted comments referring to flood control channel, emphasis on restoration of historical trails and does not want off-leash dog activities; supports increase in paving, road widths and building of additional parking; also states “Arroyo is now a people place and should remain so.”
Karlene Goller 507 Bellefontaine St. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-66	WPRA Postcard
Wrenn 542 California Terrace Pasadena, CA 91105	C-67	WPRA Postcard
Dorothy Schully 570 Busch Place Pasadena, CA 91105	C-68	WPRA Postcard

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
Dudley O. Lee 300 Sequoia Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-69	WPRA Postcard
Marlohn Jenkins 66 N. Arroyo Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-70	WPRA Postcard (partial support) – delete comment regarding no bike paths in Lower Arroyo (wants non-paved bike path), dogs must be leashed, and no more increased building
Noble 521 S. Orange Grove Blvd. #110 Pasadena, CA 91105	C-71	WPRA Postcard + comment “please save our city ...”
Marjorie Van Mater 610 Westover Place Pasadena, CA 91105	C-72	WPRA Postcard
Richard Ocean 920 North Hudson Avenue Pasadena, CA 91104	C-73	WPRA Postcard + comment “preserve and protect, do not develop and neglect”
John Davidson 744 Rockwood Road Pasadena, CA 91105	C-74	WPRA Postcard + comment “restore Arroyo to original state ...; remove cement channel, absolutely no artificial construction”
Jean Chubb 121 Arlington Drive #2 Pasadena, CA 91105	C-75	WPRA Postcard + comment “area must be developed with a re-naturalization and environmental protection policy”
Carol Siegel 1049 La Loma Road Pasadena, CA 91105	C-76	WPRA Postcard + comment “please preserve our fabulous nature treasure”
Charlee Bailey 87 Columbia St Pasadena, CA	C-77	WPRA Postcard
Elizabeth Nord 1101 Linda Glen Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-78	WPRA Postcard
W. Chandler 1040 S. Orange Grove Blvd. #12 Pasadena, CA 91105	C-79	WPRA Postcard

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
J. Bowmer 480 S. Orange Grove Blvd. #8 Pasadena, CA 91105	C-80	WPRA Postcard
Mrs. V. Young 640 Busch Garden Ln. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-81	WPRA Postcard + delete reference to removal of concrete flood control channel & streambed restoration
Charlotte Acret 1135 S. Orange Grove Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-82	WPRA Postcard
John J. Bucklin 1230 S. Orange Grove Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-83	WPRA Postcard
Bill & Christy Rakow 418 S. Arroyo Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-84	WPRA Postcard
JoAnne & George Burr 234 Glenullen Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-85	WPRA Postcard + comment "Arroyo is now used by many for various activities – keep it that way"
Sharon D. Schull 1722 Putney Road Pasadena, CA	C-86	WPRA Postcard
Lorne Brown 1235 S. Orange Grove Blvd. #5 Pasadena, CA 91105	C-87	WPRA Postcard (supports part of the position); wants bike paths in the Arroyo; wants to remove part of the concrete flood channel; fine with some additional parking for those who do not live in immediate area; delete comment regarding no development of south entrance and comment regarding dogs off-leash
Linda Lasley 666 W. California Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-88	WPRA Postcard
June M. Colton 1210 Doremus Rd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-89	WPRA Postcard
Katherine Hall & Jane Meyer 701 S. Grand Avenue	C-90	WPRA Postcard

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
Pasadena, CA 91105		
William & Barbara Christopher 574 Bellefontaine St. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-91	WPRA Postcard + personal comment
Janice Raney - Pasadena, CA 91105	C-92	WPRA Postcard
Robert Bennett 660 S. Orange Grove Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-93	WPRA Postcard
Rebecca Palter 660 S. Orange Grove Blvd. #J Pasadena, CA 91105	C-94	WPRA Postcard
C.D. Burke 345 Linda Vista Ave. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-95	WPRA Postcard
P. Grant 13916 Marianna Rd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-96	WPRA Postcard
Janice Segall 96 Annandale Rd Pasadena, CA 91105	C-97	WPRA Postcard + comment "keep Lower Arroyo as natural as possible – can't recreate habitat as it once truly was, after its gone"
Warren & Lorda Procci 230 S. San Rafael Pasadena, CA 91105	C-98	WPRA Postcard
Richard & Carol King 60 E. Circulo Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-99	WPRA Postcard + comment "travesty of good planning and ... of nature to consider adding more concrete to the Arroyo"
Donald Watson 610 Tamarac Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-100	WPRA Postcard + comment "enough buildings in that area"
Janet Sporleder 1399 Cheviotdale	C-101	WPRA Postcard

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
Pasadena, CA 91105		
Anne Neville 1040 S. Orange Grove Blvd. #2 Pasadena, CA 91105	C-102	WPRA Postcard
Michael Erony PO Box 90548 Pasadena, CA 91109	C-103	WPRA Postcard
Mary Cavena 295 Sequoia Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-104	WPRA Postcard + comment "how can you consider putting a bicycle path in an area prohibited by City ordinance?"
Helene Hancock 677 W. California Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-105	WPRA Postcard + comment " Lower Arroyo must be kept natural habitat, this unique area must not have paved paths & cement channel should be removed as offered by interest shown by LA Dept of Public Works"
Marvel Bennetsen 111 S. Orange Grove Blvd. #304 Pasadena, CA 91105	C-106	WPRA Postcard
Donald Garrett 1308 N. Mentor Ave. Pasadena, CA 91104	C-107	WPRA Postcard
Katherine Gillespie 186 Sierra View Pasadena, CA 91105	C-108	WPRA Postcard
C. Haynes 71 Glen Summer Rd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-109	WPRA Postcard
Marlow & Herrad Marrs 929 S. San Rafael Ave. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-110	WPRA Postcard + comment "could the flood control channel be covered and planted with shrubs on top?"
Bonnie Dombrowski 617 S. Pasadena Ave. #3 Pasadena, CA 91105	C-111	WPRA Postcard + comment "we need to protect our valuable watershed and retain what little reparian corridors are left"
Ryan Thompson 56 Annandale Rd.	C-112	WPRA Postcard + comment "we moved to Pasadena because of its wonders like the Arroyo, please don't ruin it"

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
Pasadena, CA 91105		
Virginia Rowan 306 Arlington Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-113	WPRA Postcard
Gwynn T. DeYoung 64 Glensummer Rd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-114	WPRA Postcard + comment "I don't think the people that want to destroy our Arroyo live anywhere near it"
William _____ 150 Kenworthy Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-115	WPRA Postcard
Celeste Moore 650 W. California Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-116	WPRA Postcard, but deleted comments about no bike path in the Lower Arroyo and allowing some off-leash dog activities; + comment "a non-paved bike path would be ok"
Evelyn C. Miller 840 Burleigh Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-117	WPRA Postcard + comment "preserve the Arroyo & definitely dog activities"
B. Erdman 1179 Romney Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-118	WPRA Postcard
Sonia Trejo 445 Tamarac Dr. Pasadena, CA	C-119	WPRA Postcard
Harris Stater 676 La Loma Rd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-120	WPRA Postcard
Ralph & Linda Hubbard 320 Glen Summer Road Pasadena, CA 91105	C-121	WPRA Postcard + comment
Ruth Nilsen 1620 Pleasant Way Pasadena, CA 91105	C-122	WPRA Postcard + comment "let's keep our area like it use to be years ago."
Lee Cass 1235 S. Orange Grove Boulevard	C-123	WPRA Postcard

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
Pasadena, CA 91105		
D.R. Hinkley 1391 Capinero Drive Pasadena, CA 91105	C-124	WPRA Postcard + comment "consideration should be given to work around the flood control channel – perhaps landscaping and additional bridges would be less costly.
John Doyle 1049 Linda Glen Drive Pasadena, CA 91105	C-125	WPRA Postcard + comment
Paul McCollum 299 Patrician Way Pasadena, CA 91105	C-126	WPRA Postcard
Sarah Hicks 99 Annandale Road Pasadena, CA 91105	C-127	WPRA Postcard
Jim & Jane Ludlam 519 S. Orange Grove Boulevard Pasadena, CA 91105	C-128	WPRA Postcard + comment "support the West Altadena Residents Assoc."
Martin Truitt 80 N. Euclid, # 502 Pasadena, CA 91101	C-129	WPRA Postcard
Edward _____ 210 Sequoia Drive Pasadena, CA 91005	C-130	WPRA Postcard
Billie Spinat 407 Tamarac Drive Pasadena, CA 91005	C-131	WPRA Postcard + comment "provision for horse droppings should be included. Dog owners have to clean up.
Gary & Priscilla Hoecker 260 California Terrace Pasadena, CA 91105	C-132	WPRA Postcard + comment "any bike path would be devastating".
Mary Hinkley & Rick Button	C-133	WPRA Postcard + comment "no more hardscape – be returned to a natural state.
Bill & Marie Poulsen 1010 San Rafael Lane Pasadena, CA 91105	C-134	WPRA Postcard + comment "protect Pasadena's valuable resource"
Peter Boulson	C-135	WPRA Postcard

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
1051 Pine Oak Lane Pasadena, CA 91105		
H. Noll 530 S. Grand Avenue Pasadena, CA 91105	C-136	WPRA Postcard + comment – illegible comment
Barbara Wirick 1617 Pleasant Way Pasadena, CA 91105	C-137	WPRA Postcard
Elenn & Edward Kutch 322 W. Del Mar Boulevard Pasadena, CA 91105	C-138	WPRA Postcard
Jeff Stokes 630 S. Orange Grove #1 Pasadena, CA 91105	C-139	WPRA Postcard + comment “remove all of the concrete”
Normarie Waybourn 510 Tamarac Drive Pasadena, CA 91105	C-140	WPRA Postcard + comment “no 2000 space parking lot or soccer fields at Hahamongna”
Carl Phurby 50 East Green Street Pasadena, CA 91105	C-141	WPRA Postcard + comment “don’t do it or I’ll come and get you”
Dorothy Rogers 211 South Orange Boulevard #11 Pasadena, CA 91105	C-142	WPRA Postcard + comment “dogs should always be on leash”
Eugene & Elizabeth Bold____ 562 Bellefontaine Street Pasadena, CA 91105	C-143	WPRA Postcard
Don & Sally Kubly 215 La Verde Road Pasadena, CA 91105	C-144	WPRA Postcard
Vincent & June Tulling 565 Tamaric Drive Pasadena, CA 91105	C-145	WPRA Postcard + comment “no more traffic along the arroyo – leave it unspoiled.
Ada Gates	C-146	WPRA Postcard + comment “disturbed about disrupting natural habitat + personal

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
448 Laguna Road Pasadena, CA 91105		comment
William & Nancy McDonald 344 Bellafontaine Street Pasadena, CA 91105	C-147	WPRA Postcard
Curtis & Christine Heeslar 570 Bradford Street Pasadena, CA 91105	C-148	WPRA Postcard + comment "we support the above initiatives"
Scott Brown 1444 Poppy Peak Drive Pasadena, CA 91105	C-149	WPRA Postcard + comment "feels very strongly that this is the only option for preserving this treasure"
Rose _____ 1040 South Orange Grove #4 Pasadena, CA 91105	C-150	WPRA Postcard + comment "thanks. Keep it natural. What happened to slow growth?"
525 Arbor St. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-151	WPRA Postcard + comment "need Eco park"
Robert Kotz 1396 La Loma Rd Pasadena, CA 91105	C-152	WPRA Postcard + personal comment
Russell & Sarah White 154 S. Arroyo Blvd. Pasadena, CA	C-153	WPRA Postcard + comment "please leave the one beautiful area Pasadena has alone ... Pasadena is being overdeveloped"
1340 Doremus Rd Pasadena, CA 91105	C-154	WPRA Postcard
Il Goodwin 25 Annandale Rd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-155	WPRA Postcard + comment "the number of building permits issued lately is unbelievable - where are all the streets for the hundreds of add'l cars - San Rafael at Colorado is a mess already at 5-6pm"
David Wallerstein 667 W. California Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-156	WPRA Postcard + comment "we should be doing all we can to preserve wild places, not destroy them, this area already has more recreation than wilderness areas"
Zoe Rowe 206 W. California Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-157	WPRA Postcard

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
Martha Nuccio 334 S. Orange Grove Pasadena, CA 91105	C-158	WPRA Postcard
Margaret Allen 481 S. Orange Grove #2 Pasadena, CA 91105	C-159	WPRA Postcard
Janet Rose 657 Laguna Rd Pasadena, CA 91105	C-160	WPRA Postcard + comment "very idea of adding parking and a paved bike path and the like is more insanity in Pasadena planning – what Pasadena needs most is green space and trees"
Dorothy Winter 453 Orange Grove Blvd. #4 Pasadena, CA 91105	C-161	WPRA Postcard
Helen Posthuma 610 S. Orange Grove Blvd. #1 Pasadena, CA 91105	C-162	WPRA Postcard + comment "leave Lower Arroyo alone – no paths, etc."
F.D. Johnson Jr. 487 S. Grand Ave. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-163	WPRA Postcard
Helen Caird 1 S. Orange Grove Blvd. #12 Pasadena, CA 91105	C-164	WPRA Postcard
C. Lewis 561 Bellefontaine St. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-165	WPRA Postcard + comment "we must not allow this treasure to be ruined"
Jaquith Rhodes 691 S. Orange Grove Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-166	WPRA Postcard
Harriet Kirk 640 Westbridge Place Pasadena, CA 91105	C-167	WPRA Postcard
Daniel Halliday 365 Sequoia Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-168	WPRA Postcard

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
Robert Kilman 295 Anita Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-169	WPRA Postcard
Victor Ell 1175 La Loma Rd Pasadena, CA 91105	C-170	WPRA Postcard + comment " we need Lower Arroyo as is, please do not develop"
G.B. Cowles 1210 S. Arroyo Blvd. Pasadena, CA	C-171	WPRA Postcard + deleted portion of comment dealing with removal of concrete flood control channel and added comment "ground squirrels are seriously undermining rock walls especially at La Casita"
Alexander McGilvray 325 Arlington Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-172	WPRA Postcard
Michael Haynes 290 Redwood Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-173	WPRA Postcard + comment "one of a kind place in LA area, please don't destroy it with 'improvement'"
Betty F. Sheridan 1255 S. Orange Grove Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-174	WPRA Postcard
John W. H. Sleeter 1200 S. Orange Grove Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-175	WPRA Postcard
Sylvia & Bob Lewis 411 Garden Ter #5 Pasadena, CA 91105	C-176	WPRA Postcard
Kelly Logan 675 Busch Garden Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-177	WPRA Postcard + comment "believe we live in the Arroyo, I am not convinced that removing the flood control channel is a good idea"
Mimi & Tom Coombs 200 S. Grand Ave. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-178	WPRA Postcard
Rob Neithart Meithart@yahoo.com	C-179	Disagrees with WPRA on their views on the Lower Arroyo; as active user of recreational opportunities available in Arroyo, believes draft Master Plan is an outstanding piece of work; please don't let conservationists (many who don't use

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
		Arroyo) prevent City from making this an attractive, family-oriented recreation area”
Stan Thompson 626-441-1992 Sthompson@usfamily.net	C-180	Against paved bike paths, surfaced hiking trails, picnic tables and more parking in Lower Arroyo; recommends fixing archers cabin, allow area for dogs to run off leash; do not need or want any paving or road improvements”
Barbara Miller 355 S. Madison Avenue #206 Pasadena, CA 91101 626-793-8082	C-181	Biggest flaws in MEIR are under emphasis on natural conservation; too much infrastructure; cost; water conservation not addressed; creates fire hazard; mixing bikers with walkers/joggers/dogs/horses
Pamala Grayson 1220 S. Arroyo Blvd. Pasadena, CA Pamala@earthlink.net	C-182	1 – No bike path in Lower Arroyo 2 – Remove concrete channel “canal”
Sharon Sharth 601 South Hudson Avenue Pasadena, CA 91106 626-535-0140 Sharonsharth@earthlink.net	C-183	Leave Lower Arroyo as a natural preservation area and allow dogs off-leash to run free
Diana Raney 369 California Terrace Pasadena, CA 91105	C-184	WPRA Postcard + comment “please leave as it is...”
Lisa Morse 703 Bradford Pasadena, CA 91105	C-185	WPRA Postcard
Louisa G. Martineau 251 S. Orange Grove Blvd. #4 Pasadena, CA 91105	C-186	WPRA Postcard
Virginia Maltby 422 Avenue 64 Pasadena, CA 91105	C-187	WPRA Postcard + comment “Arroyo is last piece of nature left in Pasadena, can’t understand why one would want to change it”
Jan Stroud 6207 S. Pasadena Ave. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-188	WPRA Postcard + comment “bikes and walkers mix, bikes and horses, no; consider west side for off-leash dogs”
Kathleen McDonnell	C-189	WPRA Postcard + comment “I oppose any and all kind of development for our

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
1115 Virginia Rd San Marino, CA 91108		community”
Patricia and Robert Parrish 934 Glen Oaks Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-190	WPRA Postcard + comment “we don’t need any more concrete and buildings to attract people from outside Pasadena”
Teresa Bozem 40 W. Glenarm St. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-191	WPRA Postcard
Winn P. Dean 430A Orange Grove Circle Pasadena, CA 91105	C-192	WPRA Postcard + deleted comment suggesting some off-leash dog activities
Wayne Damore 106 Brocadero Place Pasadena, CA 91105	C-193	WPRA Postcard + deleted comment suggesting no bikes in the Lower Arroyo
Robert Summers 1131 Church St. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-194	WPRA Postcard + comment “please don’t pave over the whole City”
Nancy York 581 Bradford St. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-195	WPRA Postcard
C.J. Hansen 1815 Kaweah Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-196	WPRA Postcard
Elizabeth Baker 202 Palmetto Pasadena, CA 91105	C-197	WPRA Postcard
Bradford MacNeil 1343 Sonoma Dr. Altadena, CA 91001	C-198	WPRA Postcard
Mr. & Mrs. W.R. Russell 105 Columbia St Pasadena, CA 91105	C-199	WPRA Postcard
Judy & Kurt Liepman	C-200	WPRA Postcard + comment “please no paved trails” and deleted suggested comment

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
446 Anita Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105		of allowing off-leash dog activities
Sharon Wolcatt 1101 Nithsdale Rd Pasadena, CA 91105	C-201	WPRA Postcard
Janet Rouse 700 Arbor St. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-202	WPRA Postcard
Michael Murray III 530 W. California Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-203	WPRA Postcard
John & Lynne Casani 280 S. Orange Grove Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-204	WPRA Postcard
Tim Bulgarelli 1650 Pleasant Way Pasadena, CA 91105	C-205	WPRA Postcard
Dorothy Reed 77 Patrician Way Pasadena, CA 91105	C-206	WPRA Postcard + comment "leave as natural as it can be, no development is needed"
Kurt & Elsbeth Wittler 885 S. Orange Grove #18 Pasadena, CA 91105	C-207	WPRA Postcard
Anthony & Phyllis Abbate 1140 Poppy Peak Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-208	WPRA Postcard
Victoria Martin 66 Brocadero Place Pasadena, CA 91105	C-209	WPRA Postcard + comment " just leave it alone, rather destroy it with this 'master'"
Beth Hansen 480 Columbia Circle Pasadena, CA 91105	C-210	WPRA Postcard + comment " additional equestrian facilities"
Dana Hartfield	C-211	WPRA Postcard

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
516 La Loma Rd. Pasadena, CA 91105		
J.D. Simpson 667 S. Hudson Ave. Pasadena, CA 91106	C-212	WPRA Postcard
Carol & Harry Kirshner 390 Glenullen Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-213	WPRA Postcard + comment "please keep the nature beauty of area"
Aleta Hancock 330 W. California Blvd #208 Pasadena, CA 91105	C-214	WPRA Postcard
L.E. Cool 972 S. Orange Grove Blvd. #D Pasadena, CA 91105	C-215	WPRA Postcard
George de Cervantes 935 Laguna Rd Pasadena, CA 91105	C-216	WPRA Postcard
Jeff Stephens 380 S. Arroyo Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-217	WPRA Postcard
Barbara Dahn 480 California Terrace Pasadena, CA 91105	C-218	WPRA Postcard + comment "leave the Lower Arroyo as a natural area, no changes necessary"
Anne Alderson 936 S. Pasadena Ave. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-219	WPRA Postcard + comment "please don't ruin the most beautiful and peaceful spot in Pasadena"
Dorothy M. Haro 889 Grand View Ave. Sierra Madre, CA 91024	C-220	WPRA Postcard
670 Westbridge Pl. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-221	WPRA Postcard
Virginia Gladney 1110 Church St.	C-222	WPRA Postcard + comment "I would like the Arroyo to be a natural, environmentally friendly area..."

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
Pasadena, CA 91105		
Louis Beadle 1650 Poppy Peak Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-223	WPRA Postcard
P. Bedford 1489 Poppy Peak Pasadena, CA 91105	C-224	WPRA Postcard + comment "parking structure in Hahamongna maybe great for a busy weekend, but remainder of the week is saddening"
George & Isabel Armour 401 S. Orange Grove Blvd. #4 Pasadena, CA 91105	C-225	WPRA Postcard
Enrique Romero & Minerva Zermeno 485 Columbia Circle Pasadena, CA 91105	C-226	WPRA Postcard
Mary Coquillard 1330 Marianna Rd Pasadena, CA 91105	C-227	WPRA Postcard
Middleton-Wardle 664 Bellefontaine St. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-228	WPRA Postcard + comment "no development or gentrifying"
Mary Hayden 194 Sequoia Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-229	WPRA Postcard + comment "this area is a priceless gem that we must protect at all costs"
Kenneth Kemp 367 Cherry Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-230	WPRA Postcard + comment "...protect, not change it"
Jeff Anderson 100 Busch Garden Court Pasadena, CA 91105	C-231	WPRA Postcard
Marnie Lamm 1100 Avoca Ave. #3 Pasadena, CA 91105	C-232	WPRA Postcard + comment "please keep Lower Arroyo as natural as possible"
Barbara and Richard Ellis 636 West California Blvd.	C-233	WPRA Postcard + comment "please keep it a natural area, not another park ..."

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
Pasadena, CA 91105		
Eldon Teper 1000 S. Orange Grove #11 Pasadena, CA 91105	C-234	WPRA Postcard
Mary & Joe Kramer 245 Malcolm Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-235	WPRA Postcard + comment "we support 'no plan' and oppose development"
Janice Moya 330 W. California Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-236	WPRA Postcard + comment "do not pave over our natural beauties, the public appreciates the usage in keeping with the uniqueness of the Arroyo"
LoreAnn Sobieski 460 S. Arroyo Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-237	WPRA Postcard + comment " what remains of the Arroyo in its natural state should be preserved and restored at all costs"
A.M. Picchi 395 Elmwood Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-238	WPRA Postcard + comment "it is important to retain natural environment, not add pavement to a paved world"
Larry Young 176 California Terrace Pasadena, CA 91105	C-239	WPRA Postcard + comment "we must preserve natural green space"
Paul Paggi 1140 S. Pasadena Ave. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-240	WPRA Postcard + comment "please help save the Arroyo"
Carl Lo Cascio 200 Patrician Way Pasadena, CA 91105	C-241	WPRA Postcard
Mark & Jane Herzog 674 Bradford St. Pasadena, Ca 91105	C-242	WPRA Postcard
Quan & Alex Ngo 501 Linda Vista Ave. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-243	WPRA Postcard
Matthew Bryant 1742 E. Calveras St.	C-244	WPRA Postcard + comment "preserve the area"

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
Altadena, CA 91001		
Dorothy Jones 530 W. California Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-245	WPRA Postcard
Robert Kent 383 Glenullen Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-246	WPRA Postcard + deleted comment regarding removal of flood control channel + comment "no on this, too costly, how about a tax rebate if we have this much money"
Cydney McCurdy 648 Westminister Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-247	WPRA Postcard
Mark Mertens 1198 Romney Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-248	WPRA Postcard
Patricia Little 975 Burleigh Dr Pasadena, CA 91105	C-249	WPRA Postcard
Phillip Jordan 1010 Hillside Terrace Pasadena, CA 91105	C-250	WPRA Postcard
448 Glen Holly Dr. Pasadena, Ca 91105	C-251	WPRA Postcard + comment " no bikes in Arroyo, leave natural"
David Nelson 470 Columbia Circle Pasadena, Ca 91105	C-252	WPRA Postcard
Robert Zasa 315 Bellefontaine St. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-253	WPRA Postcard + comment "no bikes and only natural trails ... let's not overdevelop this natural asset, please help us preserve it, not create a park"
Kristin Leachman 540 W. California Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-254	WPRA Postcard + comment "please restore what little nature we have left"
Chris Schwarzenbach 370 California Terrace Pasadena, CA 91105	C-255	WPRA Postcard + comment "who or what is engineering this desecration?"

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
Kabess@earthlink.net		
Jeane C. Escherick 1147 La Loma Rd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-256	WPRA Postcard
Daniel Sheehan III 265 N. San Rafael Pasadena, CA 91105 626-792-4222	C-257	WPRA Postcard
Mary Barrie 5159 Crown Ave. La Canada, CA 91011	C-258	WPRA Postcard
Andrea & Geoff Bland 160 Sierra View Rd Pasadena, CA 91105	C-259	WPRA Postcard + comment "removal of concrete flood channel is of great importance and is vital to a successful Master Plan ..."
Stork 5159 Crown La Canada Flintridge, CA 91011	C-260	WPRA Postcard
T.D. Hoffman 312 W. California Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-261	WPRA Postcard
Chris & Priscilla Jenkins 390 S. Grand Ave. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-262	WPRA Postcard
Marion Moule 517 S. Orange Grove Blvd. #517 Pasadena, CA 91105	C-263	WPRA Postcard
Linda McCann 885 S. Orange Grove Blvd. #25 Pasadena, CA 91105	C-264	WPRA Postcard + comment "casting pond area is perfect for off-leash dogs"
Elizabeth Scott 1030 Stoneridge Dr Pasadena, CA 91105	C-265	WPRA Postcard
John & Patricia Locke	C-266	WPRA Postcard + deletion of comment suggesting the allowance of off-leash dog

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
306 Cherry Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105		activities + comment "it was our understanding that a consensus had agreed that a bike path was unsuitable – we feel duped again by the City; plan for Arroyo isn't desirable as well"
Jennifer O'Rafferty 968 D S. Orange Grove Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-267	WPRA Postcard
Bette Lingua 1300 La Loma Rd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-268	WPRA Postcard + comment "isn't the concrete flood control needed? – rethink on that issue"
Alan Uehara 1192 Romney Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-269	WPRA Postcard + comment "environmental protection & re-naturalization of the entire Arroyo..."
Mrs. William Bloomer 585 Bellefontaine St. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-270	WPRA Postcard
Marcia and Ed Nunnery 400 Sequoia Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-271	WPRA Postcard + comment "keep signage to a minimum"
Charlotte Hayden 267 West State St Pasadena, CA 91105	C-272	WPRA Postcard
Margaret _____ 870 Laguna Rd. Pasadena, CA	C-273	WPRA Postcard + comment "let's not change out natural for man-made – nature does a better job"
Patricia Crowe 300 S. Orange Grove Blvd. #4 Pasadena, CA 91105	C-274	WPRA Postcard + comment "save this undeveloped area as much as possible"
J. Patricia Wholy 166 S. Arroyo Blvd. Pasadena, Ca 91105	C-275	WPRA Postcard
K.H. Fritchey 701 W. Holly St. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-276	WPRA Postcard + comment "the flood control channel was put in for a reason, we need it to protect our homes, please keep it"

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
Victoria Miller 484 W. California Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-277	WPRA Postcard
Chris and Lois A. Madison 720 S. San Rafael Ave. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-278	WPRA Postcard
Joan P. Hearst 570 S. Arroyo Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-279	WPRA Postcard
Gloria Barrack 415 Anita Drive Pasadena, Ca 91105	C-280	WPRA Postcard
Susan Donaldson 200 Glen Summer Rd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-281	WPRA Postcard
Dalton 1191 S. Orange Grove Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-282	WPRA Postcard
Marta and Ted Wiersema 45 Glen Summer Pasadena, CA 91105	C-283	WPRA Postcard
Lynda Jenner Whaley 1616 S. Arroyo Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-284	WPRA Postcard + comment "please work with us to save this national treasure"
Harvey Lenkin 1112 Lagunita Rd Pasadena, CA 91105	C-285	WPRA Postcard
Cynthia Jordan 1034 Nithsdale Pasadena, CA 91105	C-286	WPRA Postcard
Paula _____ 124 Waverly Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-287	WPRA Postcard

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
Wendy Kuwata 340 Rosita Lane Pasadena, CA 91105	C-288	WPRA Postcard + personal comment
Mrs. Warren _____ 511 Orange Grove Circle Pasadena, CA 91105	C-289	WPRA Postcard
Paul Vert 286 West Bellevue Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-290	WPRA Postcard
Janet Hancock 1115 S. Orange Grove Blvd Pasadena, CA 91105	C-291	WPRA Postcard + comment "Arroyo should be left in the most natural state possible. We have too little nature left with the current over development of our City"
Jean Allen 333 W. California Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-292	WPRA Postcard
Pamala Grayson 1220 S. Arroyo Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-293	WPRA Postcard + comment "can't somebody remember the past? If there are people who can't appreciate nature, let them go further up the Arroyo"
Christina Gold 687 Arbor St. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-294	WPRA Postcard
Rodolfo Angeles 1705 La Loma Rd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-295	WPRA Postcard
Bert Barta 319 Markman Place Pasadena, CA 91105	C-296	WPRA Postcard
Cecil Withers 1170 Busch Garden Ct. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-297	WPRA Postcard
Marilyn Randolph 834 S. Orange Grove Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-298	WPRA Postcard

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
Susan Booth 1035 Nithsdale Rd Pasadena, CA 91105	C-299	WPRA Postcard
Virginia & James Heringer 245 San Miguel Rd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-300	WPRA Postcard + comment "make the Lower Arroyo more natural rather than less natural. There is plenty of "unnatural" park space in the middle Arroyo Rose Bowl area"
R.S. Quinn 795 San Rafael Terrace Pasadena, CA 91105	C-301	WPRA Postcard
Amnon & Fran Yariv 1000 S. San Rafael Ave. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-302	WPRA Postcard
Delores Pfister 1650 Kaweah Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-303	WPRA Postcard
Pamela Ludwig 428 Redwood Drive Pasadena, CA 91105	C-304	WPRA Postcard
Diana Collins-Hecht 248 S. San Rafael Ave. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-305	WPRA Postcard + comment "artists painting in the Arroyo support the WPRA & the "no plan" alternative
Judith Fong Bressier 1055 S. San Rafael Ave. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-306	WPRA Postcard
Anna Marie & Paul Nolte 285 Cherry Drive Pasadena, CA 91105	C-307	WPRA Postcard
A.M. Wray 453 S. Orange Grove Blvd #1 Pasadena, CA 91105	C-308	WPRA Postcard
John R. Mills 675 Westbridge Place Pasadena, CA 91105	C-309	WPRA Postcard

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
Mr. & Mrs. Henry Hancock 850 S. Arroyo Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-310	WPRA Postcard
Doris Barton 515 Covington Place Pasadena, CA 91105	C-311	WPRA Postcard + comment concerning removal of the channel – doubts water could be contained after a big storm without it
Stephen Early 5006 LoLeta Ave. Eagle Rock, CA 90041	C-312	WPRA Postcard + personal comment
Elena Phleger 1025 Hillside Terrace Pasadena, CA 91105	C-313	WPRA Postcard
Glenn Shock 335 Wigmal Drive Pasadena, CA 91105	C-314	WPRA Postcard
Terry MoVerry Monaga 419 Juniper Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-315	WPRA Postcard + comment “preserve the Arroyo, protect the animals, no infrastructure development, focus on habitat and naturalization”
Lorraine Supple 525 Covington Place Pasadena, CA 91105	C-316	WPRA Postcard + comment regarding acoustics in the area – too noisy
Jack Loos 160 Anita Drive Pasadena, CA 91105	C-317	WPRA Postcard
Maura Mackey 1211 Avoca Ave. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-318	WPRA Postcard
Christopher Link 150 S. Grand Ave Pasadena, CA 91105	C-319	WPRA Postcard
Jane R. Herrmann 375 Linda Vista Pasadena, CA 91105	C-320	WPRA Postcard + comment “ consider the original intent of the Arroyo as a sacred gift to the City as Open Space”

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
Norah Morley 648 S. Arroyo Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-321	WPRA Postcard
South Orange Grove Pasadena, CA 91105	C-322	WPRA Postcard + note disagreeing with removal of flood control channel and off-leash activities for dogs + comment " don't destroy any of the marvelous flood control we have in Pasadena"
Leslie Lange 5352 Aldama St Highland Park, CA 90042	C-323	WPRA Postcard + comment "build a fish ladder, stress the nature preserve concept"
John & Jill Doyle 1049 Linda Glen Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-324	WPRA Postcard + comment "keep this beautiful area ..."
Michael & Lorna Kahn 72 S. Greenwood Ave. Pasadena, CA 90017	C-325	WPRA Postcard + deletion of comments regarding removal of flood control channel and off-leash dog area + comment " no bike paths or surfaced trails in the Lower Arroyo"
Geraldine Lanza 540 Glen Holly Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-326	WPRA Postcard
Balderas 360 Sycamore Glen Pasadena, CA 91105	C-327	WPRA Postcard
John Lihani 2011 E. Mountain St. Pasadena, CA 91104	C-328	WPRA Postcard
James Odell 655 S. Orange Grove Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-329	WPRA Postcard
Ernest Lategr 473 S. Catalina Ave. Pasadena, CA 91106	C-330	WPRA Postcard + comment " keep Arroyo natural"
Stan Mc Clain 1305 Clubhouse Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-331	WPRA Postcard

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
Andy Yatrofsky 1614 Poppy Peak Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-332	WPRA Postcard + comment "keep as natural as possible"
Duplicate	C-333	
Audrey Gray 1495 Poppy Peak Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-334	WPRA Postcard + comment "please keep natural beauty .. no paving, no bike path"
Cavell Bean 720 S. Orange Grove Blvd. #5 Pasadena, CA 91105	C-335	WPRA Postcard
Gayleen Sharon 696 Burleigh Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-336	WPRA Postcard
Randall Duncan 160 S. Grand Ave. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-337	WPRA Postcard
Annette Guerrero 1056 Glen Oaks Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-338	WPRA Postcard
Edward & Nina Gomez 626 Bellefontaine St. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-339	WPRA Postcard
Blanche Sindelar 1232 Rock View St. Los Angeles, CA 91141	C-340	WPRA Postcard + comment " explore the impact upon cross county running teams the practice and compete at Lower Arroyo (sic)" + deletion of comment regarding off-leash dog activities
Don Combs 548 N. Orange Grove Blvd Pasadena, CA 91103	C-341	WPRA Postcard + comment "please don't take away the one area to get away from the City"
Bradford Boyd 1 S. Orange Grove #1 Pasadena, CA 91101	C-342	WPRA Postcard + comment "leave the channel"
H. William Happel 1234 Rock View St.	C-343	WPRA Postcard + comment " ...not a resident, but enjoy Arroyo, how can City take money it doesn't have for education and spend it paving a beautiful natural park"

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
Los Angeles, Ca		
Marrietta T. Kruells 835 W. Mariposa St. Altadena, CA 91001	C-344	1 – Will there be hours for this park and if so how will this be enforced? 2 – To what degree will perimeter fencing and gates be used to access the park? 3 – Will hours and fencing interfere with access to and from the national forest via the Gabrielino Tail on the East and the Cross Town Trail to the West? It is illegal to block access to the National Forest. 4 – Increasing public parking accessibility in the northern section of Hahamongna Park ...from 200 to 1200 spaces is more than this area can handle. What is parking for? 5 – Finally in assessing this natural area how do you fit athletic fields, parking structures, paved roads, lighting, fencing, etc in the context of a natural wildlife habitat?
Michael Vogler 520 California Terrace Pasadena, CA 91105	C-345	1 – The EIR & Master Plan fail to address the concepts of the streambed restoration and removal of the concrete flood control channel... 2 – ... City has not consulted with the very agency that maintains and operates the flood control channel ... which has expressed an interest in investigating the feasibility of the concrete removal ... 3 – Arroyo Seco Foundation and North East Trees have been working on feasibility study for Watershed Restoration ... and Corps of Engineers is now conducting its own “reconnaissance study” ... 4 – Urged to open dialog with people and agencies that are best equipped to help facilitate a practical and realistic solution for the restoration of the Lower Arroyo
Leonard Rusch South Pasadena, CDA Lrusch@wbcounsel.com	C-346	1 – Concerned that landscaping is tall, trails are made almost invisible, concerned with potential of increasing crime... doesn't think this has been adequately addressed in EIR. Final approval should include a mitigation measure that will provide for monitoring of crime statistics in plan area ... 2 – Bicycles should be allowed and equestrians should not be given exclusive rights to ban bicycles....
Romney Pearl O'Malley	C-347	1 – Would like place for dogs to run 2 – Natural habitat for birds and other wildlife should be left undisturbed
Vince Farhat 1030 Stoneridge Drive Pasadena, CA 91105	C-348	Letter submitted raises the following comments/questions: 1 – MEIR is inadequate as it relates to issues of water resources, habitat and watershed restoration

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
		2 – ASMP or MEIR doe not include a capital outlay or capital improvement program as required by CEQA 3 – List of permits and other approvals as required by CEQA not included 4 – Little or no discussion on secondary impacts 5 – References stipulation of Bowles v. Pasadena which calls for description of permissible events and projected capital improvements required to restore area which is now within the park boundaries to its natural state – has several questions 6 – Discussion of alternative projects and questions regarding why Philip Williams & Associates study is not discussed in MEIR - 10 + additional questions regarding specific project discussed in MEIR
Mickey Byrnes Ms_mick@msn.com 213-687-8963	C-349	“Concerned with danger and liability with horses and bikes mixing on paths; concrete flood channel echoes too much”
Alice Herald 1322 Annandale Terrace Pasadena, CA 91105 AliceHerald@hotmail.com	C-350 C-351	“Supports a natural river bed in Arroyo; bicycles don’t belong in Arroyo because they cause safety issues and are noisy”
Hugh Bowles Hugh.Bowles@uboc.com	C-352	“In list of related projects no mention is made of the CDC plans for redevelopment of the Rose Bowl motel area adjacent to Hahamongna, also hearing of plans to replace the school maintenance yards on Woodbury Avenue with Costco and new school administration buildings – projects will have to be completed through EIR process; cumulative impacts on traffic, noise must be assessed for both development of the Rose Bowl motel area, the school maintenance yards and the Arroyo Seco.”
Margaret Stewart 250 La Mirada Rd Pasadena, CA 91105	C-353	Comments addressed to Pasadena Utility Advisory Commission – 1 – Recreational Stream & ponds – EIR & MP should propose an educational program in Hahamongna using the real supply of water in a natural cycle/setting... 2 – Additional roadways and parking area – in a natural area and a water recharge area it is inappropriate to build roadways and parking areas that will inevitably invite dirty and polluting run off and emission particulate pollution 3 – Playing fields, new and refurbished - ... fertilizers and pollutants created by use of power mowers will add pollution to valuable water resources and already compromised air quality ...
Priscilla Benson	C-354	1 - Feels MEIR does not address the need for park maintenance and how the income

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
885 W. Mariposa St. Altadena, CA 91001 626-798-5110		for maintenance will be compromised by the proposed parking structure; 2 - feels changes will result in more vandalism and wonders how high level of maintenance will be achieved; what effect will building a parking structure have on funds currently available for park maintenance (assumes current JPL usage fee for parking lot is for park maintenance) 3 – concerned with parking garage security, says that MEIR does not address measures that will need to be taken to maintain the current level of security, costs or method of payment 4 – Concerned that parking structure may not be public enough in order to use bond proceeds to pay for construction; concerned with loss of jobs at JPL and public outcry resulting from paying for a parking structure vs. saving jobs at JPL 5 – MEIR is deficient in its evaluation of the Phillips, Williams and Associates study that used a more natural approach than what was evaluated in the MEIR
Gerry O'Malley	C-355	Likes Arroyo as is (for hiking and cycling and dog walking)
Patricia Adelman 727 No. Citrus Los Angeles, CA 90038	C-357	Comments stating opposition to: 1 – widening the main road and making a new one in the south 2 – surfaced paths 3 – any picnic tables
Marjorie Bedell-Laughlin 285 Arlington Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-358	WPRA Postcard
Cynthia Benton 635 Westbridge Place Pasadena, CA 91105	C-359	WPRA Postcard + comment “more security is needed – La Casita is consistently entered at night...”
Margaret Case 145 California Terrace Pasadena, CA 91105	C-360	WPRA Postcard
Mrs. Jack Samson 85 S. San Rafael Ave. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-361	WPRA Postcard + comment “most natural is what we need”
Elaine Klock 1966 Homewood Dr. Altadena, CA	C-362	WPRA Postcard + deletion of comment referencing off-leash dog activities, + comment “born and raised in Pasadena and appalled ... at congestive development”

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
John Lindsey 546 Avon Ave. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-363	WPRA Postcard + comment "don't turn Arroyo into concrete nightmare"
Kimmy Robertson 485 Glen Holly Dr Pasadena, CA 91105	C-364	WPRA Postcard + personal comment
Barbara & Richard Ealy 1080 Busch Garden Ct. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-365	WPRA Postcard + comment "important to preserve area"
Mr. & Mrs. E. Hannan 499 Lakeview Rd Pasadena, CA 91105	C-366	WPRA Postcard
Mr. & Mrs. Phil Henderson 720 S. Orange Grove #3 Pasadena, CA 91105	C-367	WPRA Postcard
Ruby Gardner 630 S. Marengo Ave. Pasadena, CA 91106	C-368	WPRA Postcard + personal comment
Cathy Caton 401 Pabecean Way Pasadena, CA 91105	C-369	WPRA Postcard
Mary Ann Eldridge 1225 Church St. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-370	WPRA Postcard
James Haddan 270 Arlington Dr Pasadena, CA 91105	C-371	WPRA Postcard + comment need traffic solutions for St. John and Pasadena Ave.
John Walker 5219 Lunsford Dr Los Angeles, CA 90041	C-372	WPRA Postcard + personal comment
Eleanor Miller 1306 Spruce Street South Pasadena, CA 91030	C-373	WPRA Postcard + agrees with no bike paths, no unnecessary buildings and restore Lower Arroyo + comment "whoever hacked the plants and bushes did so to the detriment to the wildlife in the Arroyo"

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
Marcia & Wayne Petersen 720 Norwood Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-374	WPRA Postcard
Tina Alietti 1619 Poppy Peak Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-375	WPRA Postcard + comment "please leave Arroyo as is, we don't want parking structures"
Susan Bertram 86 Grace Terrace Pasadena, CA 91105	C-376	WPRA Postcard
Marianne B. Hall 619 S. Grand Ave. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-377	WPRA Postcard
Carolyn Naber PO Box 50107 Pasadena, CA 91115	C-378	WPRA Postcard
Howard Everett 1000 Linda Vista Ave. Pasadena, CA 91103	C-379	WPRA Postcard + check 1 comment "to restore and maintain .. Lower Arroyo"
David & Angelica Clark 620 Burleigh Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-380	WPRA Postcard
Glenda Owens 70 West Mountain St. Pasadena, CA 91103	C-381	WPRA Postcard
Barbara Anglin 1230 Chateau Rd Pasadena, CA 91105	C-382	WPRA Postcard + comment "don't spend money on bad projects"
___ Red 415 S. Grand Ave. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-383	WPRA Postcard
D. McGee One South Orange Grove, #8 Pasadena, CA 91105	C-384	WPRA Postcard

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
Pat R _____ 395 Glenullen Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-385	WPRA Postcard
Geri _____ 1034 Pine Oak Lane Pasadena, CA 91105	C-386	WPRA Postcard + comment "Linda Vista residents oppose a "passive park" trail at a cost of \$350,000 near 500 Linda Vista Ave as proposed by Steve Madison"
Diamond 65 West Glenarm St Pasadena, CA 91105	C-387	WPRA Postcard + comment "very important to keep this undeveloped"
John Gee 272 Annandale Rd Pasadena, CA 91105	C-388	WPRA Postcard + deletion of comment dealing with removal of concrete flood control channel (too expensive in damage from a 100/200 year storm and too dangerous), wants minimal increase in parking, off-leash dog activities in a fenced, controlled area.
Judy Wilson 541 South Oak Knoll Ave. Pasadena, CA 91101	C-389	WPRA Postcard + comment "look at Tempe, Arizona, the Salt River had been channelized to a 284 acre lake using inflatable rubber dams, they can be deflated in 30 minutes in the event that it needs to be a flood control channel"
Kristina Bengtson PO Box 50716 Pasadena, CA 91115	C-390	WPRA Postcard + comment "emphatically supports preservation"
Eugenia Riordan Mule 411 Garden Terrace #1 Pasadena, CA 91105	C-391	WPRA Postcard
Jo Ann Turosvky 1550 Washburn Rd Pasadena, CA 91105	C-392	WPRA Postcard
R. Wayne McMillan 760 S. Laguna Rd Pasadena, CA 91105	C-393	WPRA Postcard
Michael _____ 654 Linda Vista Avenue Pasadena, CA 91105	C-394	WPRA Postcard + comment "please support efforts to enhance ... natural character.."
Carole DePaul 771 Panorama Pl	C-395	WPRA Postcard

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
Pasadena, CA 91105		
Shelly Lowe 262 S. San Rafael Ave. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-396	WPRA Postcard + comment " keep Arroyo natural – no bike paths take out cement ditch, etc."
David Withers 389 Linda Vista Ave. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-397	WPRA Postcard
Beatrice Simpson 2038 Milan Ave South Pasadena, CA 91030	C-398	WPRA Postcard + comment "agree with all except dogs ..."
George Corey 487 California Terrace Pasadena, CA 91105	C-399	WPRA Postcard
G. A. Silver 747 S. Orange Grove Blvd #2 Pasadena, CA 91105	C-400	WPRA Postcard + comment "enforce dog poop pick up by owners"
Ken & Kathy Grobecker 510 ____ Haven St. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-401	WPRA Postcard + deletion of comment dealing with off-leash dog activities and comment "adequate aesthetic and safety guideline are not established for Rose Bowl and recreational venues. No stadium lights in Rose Bowl parking lots"
Ann Mosser 885 S. Orange Grove Blvd Pasadena, CA 91105	C-402	WPRA Postcard
Marcy Springer 340 Glenullen Drive Pasadena, CA 91105	C-403	WPRA Postcard
Laura Needels 344 Tamarac Dr Pasadena, CA 91105	C-404	1 – strongly support adding a bike path to the western side of the Arroyo, encourage many forms of recreation 2 – do not support adding off-leash dog areas to Arroyo
Raymond Dashner 866 S. Arroyo Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-405	WPRA Postcard
Howard Rath 1040 Laguna Rd	C-406	WPRA Postcard

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
Pasadena, CA 91105		
Pamela Lansden 492 Hartwick St. Los Angeles, CA 90041	C-407	WPRA Postcard + comment "... who will pocket the cash one the Arroyo has been paved over ..."
Fay Ardon 381 Laun St Altadena, CA 91001	C-408	WPRA Postcard + comment "San Gabriel trails are bike infested..."
Fred Schwarzenback Leslie Prussia 472 Arlington Drive Pasadena, CA 91105	C-409	WPRA Postcard + comment "allow bikes to share equestrian trails and promote dog hygiene" + deletion of comment allowing some off-leash dog activities
Mark Bryan 601 S. Hudson Ave Pasadena, CA 91106	C-410	WPRA Postcard + comment "need off-leash dog area"
Sharon Bryan 601 S. Hudson Ave Pasadena, CA 91106	C-411	WPRA Postcard + comment "please pay attention to these needs..."
Allison Liddi-Brown 174 Annandale Rd Pasadena, CA 91105	C-412	WPRA Postcard + comment "...protect and restore..."
Wayne Br _____ 354 Kirby St Los Angeles, CA 90042	C-413	WPRA Postcard + comment "please leave Arroyo the way it is"
Michael & Joan Dooley 1188 Romney Dr Pasadena, CA 91105	C-414	WPRA Postcard + comment "please preserve and restore"
Joanne Woods 171 G. Grand Pasadena, CA 91105	C-415	WPRA Postcard
80 Grand Terrace Pasadena, CA 91105	C-416	WPRA Postcard + comment "...where else in L.A. is there space like this..."
Niels Frenzey	C-417	WPRA Postcard

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
2759 Effie St. Los Angeles, CA 90026		
T. Young 125 Brocadero Place Pasadena, CA	C-418	WPRA Postcard + comment "greater emphasis should be placed on nurturing native species"
Cardin Bradley 701 Bellefontaine St. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-419	WPRA Postcard
Gretchen Brickson 1130 Busch Garden Ct Pasadena, CA 91105	C-420	WPRA Postcard + comment "... No parking, bike paths, etc."
Patrick McGreal 4920 Hartwick St Los Angeles, CA 90041	C-421	WPRA Postcard + comment "do not build upon natural beauty, leave alone."
Fred Stankus 523 S. Fair Oaks Ave. Pasadena, CA 91105	C-422	WPRA Postcard + comment "Lower Arroyo's pristine setting is the last hope..."
Atehea Graham 235 Avenue 64 Pasadena, CA 91105	C-423	WPRA Postcard + comment "... been to workshops for 10 years, nothing seems to happen"
Julie Snoddy 565 Orange Grove Circle Pasadena, CA 91105	C-424	WPRA Postcard
Kittle Frantz 295 Cherry Dr Pasadena, CA 91105	C-425	WPRA Postcard + personal comment
Reed 1240 Clubhouse Dr Pasadena, CA 91105	C-426	WPRA Postcard
Robert Macklin 968 S. Orange Grove Blvd. Unit B Pasadena, CA 91105	C-427	WPRA Postcard + personal comment
John Babcock	C-428	WPRA Postcard

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
430 California Terr Pasadena, CA 91105		
C. Carrasco 802 S. Arroyo Blvd Pasadena, CA 91105	C-429	WPRA Postcard + comment "no additional signage..."
Pally Wheaton 365 W. California Blvd #3 Pasadena, CA 91105	C-430	WPRA Postcard + comment " a small percentage of Pasadena should remain natural..."
Pepi Feinblatt 1174 N. Hudson Ave Pasadena, CA 91104	C-431	WPRA Postcard + personal comment
Sally Wenzlau 1357 Westhaven Rd San Marino, CA 91105	C-432	WPRA Postcard
Erna Taylor-Stark & Lawrence Stark 627 Linda Vista Ave Pasadena, CA 91105	C-433	WPRA Postcard + comment "...leave Arroyo as is..."
George Lewis 420 Tamarac Dr Pasadena, CA 91105	C-434	WPRA Postcard + comment "preserve Arroyo"
Marilyn Polic 510 Linda Vista Ave Pasadena, CA 91105	C-435	WPRA Postcard
Gary Cowles 1210 S. Arroyo Blvd Pasadena, CA 91105 626-441-6737	C-436	1 - Concerned with controlling ground squirrel population that is destroying stone walls parallel to So. Arroyo Blvd 2 - Concerned with funding and future maintenance
Jon Fisher Glendale, CA Jong60@hotmail.com	C-437	1 - would like to see Arroyo remain as natural as possible
Madena Asbell Madenasbell@yahoo.com	C-438	1 - Acknowledges that lighting is necessary along bike paths 2 - Recognizes that it is impossible to enforce any restrictions for bikes or prohibit uses

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
		3 – increase human presence and noise generated from that congestion will disturb natural setting, does MEIR address the impact noise will have on the environment? 4 – Must consider the opinion of people who use Arroyo now, not those who will is plan is successful 5 – does not understand how plan can go forward in the face of opposition from the public; plan should be relocated or scrapped; Pasadena needs more parks, but Arroyo is not a park, but a natural preserve
Madena Asbell Madenasbell@yahoo.com	C-439	Concerned with off-leash dog area; understands that it was in an earlier draft of Master Plan, but removed, project provides nothing for dogs/owners; forcing dogs to east side will increase tensions between equestrians and dog owners and creates dangerous situation
Rosemary Carr 2371 Vista Laguna Terrace Pasadena, CA 91103 626-296-9016 CABIT@earthlink.net	C-440	Concerned with recent filming of television show – Alias – loud noises caused many problems for her family, City should care more about residents than revenue produced from filming industry
James Price 626 Busch Garden Drive Pasadena, CA 91105 Pingomingo@hotmail.com	C-441	1 – MEIR addresses Master Plan as proposed without consideration of future impacts (considers only the initial impact) and thus is of little value 2 – Does not address new fire hazards, increase in crime, noise problems, graffiti, damage to land and wildlife, etc. 3 – Bike path would change Lower Arroyo, bike path rules are unenforceable, inclusion of bike paths would have many ramifications 4 – MEIR does not mention that entire length of the bike path will have to be lit at enormous cost; what page does MEIR mention installation of miles of light poles, underground cables, police patrols, etc? 5 – Campgrounds are not appropriate for area, will cause disturbances causing neighborhoods to call the police and disturb the neighborhood and wildlife.
Thomas Juhasz 1105 Avoca Ave Pasadena, CA 91105 Taebotomi1@hotmail.com	C-442	1 - Arroyo should be restored to fullest ecological viability allowable by the present set of circumstances 2 - Destruction of natural habitat has lead to the disappearance of many different animal and plant species 3 - Removal of the concrete channel and habitat restoration would give many species the chance to survive

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
<p>Mary E. Barrie Edward T. Stork 5159 Crown Avenue La Canada, CA 91011 818-952-7928</p>	<p>C-443</p>	<p>4 - Recreational usage should be compatible to the restoration of the Arroyo</p> <p>Significant questions and comment raised regarding the following issues:</p> <p>1 – Parking structure in Hahamongna – are there typographical errors or is the project a major infrastructure expansion?</p> <p>2 – Parking structure in Hahamongna – many questions regarding the numbers, need, mitigation, access, traffic study, maintenance costs, impact on habitat, and alternatives</p> <p>3 – Parking lots throughout the Arroyo – many questions regarding why significant increase, use of spaces, parking requirements with the Rose Bowl, additional lighting impacts</p> <p>4 – Slip lane – questions regarding the slip lane in the Hahamongna</p> <p>5 – Paved bike path in the Hahamongna – questions regarding intent, regulations, etc.</p> <p>6 – Equestrian Refuse Disposal Area – questions regarding placement, proximity to major trail, questions regarding relevance with road on the MWD property</p> <p>7 – Failure of MEIR to address adequate projects planned on MWD property – questions regarding the Negative Declaration for the long-term lease between the City and MWD; concerns about segmenting out projects discussed for this area from the MEIR evaluation; concerned with cumulative impacts on a number of projects on the MWD property not being considered in MEIR</p> <p>8 – Areas of controversy – MEIR Executive Summary mentions “concern over cumulative water quality impacts from surface run-off, equestrian waste, the JPL superfund site...” and there is no mention of the negative effect on water quality caused by other waste (animal); section does not mention inclusion of more soccer fields in Hahamongna and public concern noted by author of letter</p> <p>9 – Playing fields in Hahamongna – concerned with lighting on playing fields and notes restrictions in the Design Guidelines, concerned that MEIR is not in conformance with Master Plan in this area; notes concerns about maintenance of soccer fields, pesticides on soccer fields</p> <p>10 – Error of Omission – MEIR does not include concepts discussed in Arroyo Seco Watershed Restoration Feasibility Study</p>
<p>Avril Adams Micheal Kelly 157 S. Fair Oaks Ave Pasadena, CA 91105</p>	<p>C-444</p>	<p>Keep Arroyo Seco as close to nature as possible</p>

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
Bill Joyce 2050 Meridian Ave Apt 5 South Pasadena, CA 91030 323-259-8480	C-445	1 – numerous questions regarding proposed parking in Hahamongna and related lighting 2 – comments regarding removal of concrete flood control channel 3 – Against bike path in the Lower Arroyo
Charles Avis 503 E. Claremont St. Pasadena, CA 91104	C-446	1 – comment on the measure aesthetic – 3 (lighting) 2 – comment on Section 4.2 – Alternative 2: Oak Grove Multi-Use Play Field (keep all 18 holes of disc golf as is)
Coralie Jupfer Vicki Gadbois John Martin Lathrop Rachel Casares C/o 133 San Miguel Road Pasadena, CA 91105	C-447	In agreement with CPAS, and do not want City Council to certify MEIR and adopt ASMP as written
Merril Greene 1054 Seco Street, #103 Pasadena, CA MSCGreene@aol.com	C-448	1 – Hold off on decisions regarding MEIR and Master Plan until issues regarding and NFL are determined 2 – Wants moratorium on additional commercial development in the Arroyo and end the domestication of an originally wild space
Enrique Jr. & Megan Hernandez 910 S. San Rafael Avenue Pasadena, CA 91105 626-441-1735	C-449	1 – Concur with comments of WPRA pertaining to Lower Arroyo and are in favor of removal of the flood control channel 2 – Vehemently opposed to “all weather” bike path to be constructed on western side of the flood control channel
Barbara Ellis 636 West California Blvd Pasadena, CA 91105 626-564-9107 barbarainamerica@hotmail.com	C-450	Wants Arroyo Seco left as is and restored to a more natural, wild area – no more parking, asphalted areas, bicycle paths, toilets and information boards
Mary Barrie 5159 Crown Ave. La Canada Flintridge, CA 91011 818-952-7928 Meb787@aol.com	C-451	Questions regarding new road on “MWD” property, which will allow public to access a JPL parking garage to be built on the westside of park (MEIR, page 2-19 is cited); specific questions are regarding access, questions regarding portions being located in La Canada Flintridge and will La Canada Flintridge permission and cooperation be necessary to build road; is there any portion of Hahamongna Watershed Park within the city limits of La Canada Flintridge?

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
George R. Rossman 297 Sycamore Glen Pasadena, CA 91125 Grr@gps.caltech.edu	C-452	1 – MEIR does not consider Watershed Restoration Study 2 – MEIR does not address impacts associated with new bicycle path 3 – MEIR does not address all impacts associated with new parking structure 4 – The mitigation of geological hazards is discussed without saying what the hazards are 5 – MEIR does not address all impacts associated with new soccer fields 6 – MEIR does not address public art discussed in Master Plan
Diana Britt 280 Sequoia Drive Pasadena, CA 91105	C-453	1 – MEIR addresses a Master Plan that hasn't been approved by City Council 2 – LAMP does not address removal of concrete flood control channel; MEIR doesn't take into account a study by Berkeley students regarding the BFI project and therefore is inadequate 3 – LAMP does not adequately explain preservation projects, and MEIR mention of projects includes those that are damaging to area 4 – Regarding parking capacity – states that MEIR is defective because it analyzes a parking plan not approved by City Council; also MEIR has not considered "detrimental impacts" in its efforts to open up southern end of Lower Arroyo to more visitors 5 – LAMP and MEIR do not discuss where maintenance funds will come from for existing or new improvements; claims that guidelines for Lower Arroyo prohibit structures proposed 6 – MEIR does not address all impacts associated with bicycle path
Jennifer Lanski 376 Wallis St Pasadena, CA 91106	C-454	1 – Supports relocation of the back 9 holes of disc golf to provide for habitat restoration of the North Oak Grove area; but does not want complete elimination (MEIR section 4.2, Alternative 2) 2 – Strongly supports proposals 8.0 and 13.0 in Upper Arroyo that will create East and West lakes 3 – Supports efforts to removal flood control channel, and expansion of low flow stream restoration project 4 – Agrees with modification to Arroyo Land Ordinance that limits restoration planting to species indigenous to Arroyo 5 – Concerned with materials that will be used on trail beneath Parker-Mayberry Bridge and Colorado Street bridge – hopes pathway treatment is natural in character 6 – Concerned with improvements to trail systems and roads in the Lower Arroyo

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
		(opposes bicycle trail; concerned with widening trails to accommodate vehicles, which will lessen hillside; standards for widening trails seem excessive and unnecessary)
Cyril Musson 2721 N. Windsor Avenue Tom Liddell 2725 N. Windsor Avenue Altadena, CA 91001	C-455	1 – supports “No Plan” alternative 2 – wants preservation of Arroyo – concerned with water conservation, maintenance costs and security 3 – wants no increase in paving, road width or building any additional parking 4 – no soccer fields, picnic tables or play areas 5 – no development of interpretive areas with signage
Carolyn Naber PO Box 50107 Pasadena, CA 91115 626-795-7675 CRNaber@earthlink.net	C-456	Supports position of CPAS and does not want City Council to certify MEIR or adopt ASMP as written
Robert Wittry 244 Flower St. Pasadena, CA 91104 626-791-7974 wittry@datast.net	C-457	Concerned with true environmental impacts to MWD property –mentions lease agreement between City and MWD; no discussion of lease with Rose Bowl Riders – would like these issues addressed
Terry McVerry 419 Juniper Dr. Pasadena, CA 91105 323-254-2224 Terry.McVerry@lanterman.org	C-458	1 – Various terms used in the Master Plan need to be defined and complete descriptions of work need to be included 2 – Further explanation of “Enhance Bird Sanctuary” (LAMP 2.3.4.5) needs to be provided 3 – Plan needs to focus on preservation, not recreation 4 – Watershed Restoration Study needs to be considered; against certification of the “plan”
Lisa Nugent 5813 Buena Vista Terrace Los Angeles, CA 90042	C-459	WPRA comment card
Laura Garrett 711 S. Mentor Ave Pasadena, CA 91106 626-564-1890 purplecow@ips.net	C-460	Concerned with soccer fields displacing bird and animal habitat

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
Raymond Dashner 866 South Arroyo Blvd Pasadena, CA 91105 626-568-3808	C-461	1 – MEIR does not mention proposed survey by outside consultants to shore up eroded canyon wall adjacent to Casita (funded with Park A Park funds) 2 – MEIR does not reference removal of poison oak in Lower Arroyo 3 – Draft MEIR does not include description of flood control “ditch” – states plans are already underway by US Army Corps and County of Los Angeles
Robert Wittry 244 Flower St. Pasadena, CA 91104 626-791-7974 wittry@datast.net	C-462	Numerous comments (see letter for details), the following are highlights: 1 – CEQA process that City is following is flawed, just going through motions 2 – Concerns regarding volatile organic compounds in the soil 3 – Concerns with impacts to ground water and run off water 4 – Concerned with west-side and east side simulated stream 5 – Excessive road widening/additional asphalt not addressed in water quality and ground water issues 6 – Impacts resulting from new JPL parking structure are not addressed 7 – No analysis of cost impacts for proposed mitigation measures 8 – No discussion of economic impacts in either ASMP or MEIR 9 – Question regarding sighting of California Coastal Gnatcatcher 10 – Disruption of habitat due to additional roads, trails, etc, not addressed 11 – Public Art not addressed in aesthetic impact 12 – Police and Forest Service helicopters not referenced in MEIR section regarding noise 13 – Spill-light environmental issues not addressed in aesthetic, biological resources or any other section of MEIR 14 – Thorough analysis of bicycles not done in MEIR 15 – Soil erosion and flood event capacity of the dam not addressed in section 3.5 of MEIR 16 – Rare butterfly’s habitat will be impacted by picnic area in Lower Arroyo – why not addressed 17 – Does not address the lack of treatment of the storm drainage water 18 – Little stream restoration proposed for ASMP – why? 19 – States BFI project ends in the coming year – why is proposed lack of maintenance not addressed 20 – Why is restoration feasibility study not considered? 21 – If restoration is a future option, requiring a separate EIR, how come so much of proposed additional infrastructure would have to be removed in order to

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
		accommodate restoration? 22 – Why does City only have right to 25 cubic feet per second of water in Arroyo Seco area? 23 – Why are noise impacts of regular sediment removal not addressed? 24 – Why so little mention of Rose Bowl in cultural resources section? 25 – Where is canoeing area promised in early 1950's? 26 – Feels City did not adequate notify residents surround Arroyo Seco regarding ASMP or MEIR
Claire W. Bogaard Cwbogaard@earthlink.net	C-463	1 – Proposes permanent removal of parking on Area H and field left free for activities 2 – Area for archers should be fenced so that it is obvious for all
Ed & Joan Hearst 570 South Arroyo Blvd Pasadena, CA 91105 626-796-4057	C-464	1 – Trails and roads should not be widen, impact on habitat could not be mitigated 2 – Bicycles would damage habitat 3 – Parking structures have no place in this natural area 4 – Why are dogs prohibited against in Lower Arroyo?
Joe Feinblatt 1174 North Hudson Ave Pasadena, CA 91104	C-465	1 – Higher impact recreational uses have potential for impacting water quality 2 – Largest land use impact may come from transportation and facilities constructed to accommodate JPL and new sports facilities 3 – Proposals for additional parking to not conform to City's General Plan mandate for reduced dependence on automobiles 4 – Proposals for stream restoration may impact water management in Hahamongna
Jo A. Barker Ajo1961b@pacbell.net	C-466	Letter questions environmental evaluation process
Sylvia Vieyra O795842@yahoo.com	C-467	1 – Concerned that streambed restoration is not addressed 2 – Concerned that all-weather bike trail is included 3 – Master Plan focuses too much on infrastructure/active recreation facilities and not enough on preservation
Norm & Anna Arnheim 670 Westbridge Place Pasadena, CA 91105	C-468	More preservation of the Arroyo is needed
Marta Arriandiaga 366 Markham Pl Pasadena, CA 91105	C-469	WPRA comment card & comment "...opposition to bike path has been ignored"
Lenore Norwood	C-470	WPRA comment card

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
1127 S. Orange Grove Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91105		
Ellen Wilts 1431 Brixton Rd Pasadena, CA 91105	C-471	WPRA comment card, but disagrees with allowing dogs off-leash
Cathy McNassor 1515 Washburn Rd Pasadena, CA 91105 323-257-0057	C-472	Against bike path in Arroyo; should be as much restoration of natural streambed as possible
Jo A. Barker Ajo1961b@pacbell.net	C-473	Petition for administrative hearing on MEIR and ASMP issues
Priscilla Flynn Scilly@webtv.net	C-474	1 – Concerned that removal of flood control channel or watershed study are not considered 2 – Concerned with bike paths in Lower Arroyo, especially when not even allowed 3 – Lighting in bird sanctuary would cause birds to leave
Mary Barrie 5159 Crown Ave La Canada, CA 818-952-7928 meh787@aol.com	C-475	Concerned that MEIR describes a plan of development, very different from natural – cites concerns with number of parking spaces, use of parking, reasons for parking, light for parking, etc.
Phil Sotel Pksotel@worldnet.att.net	C-476	Poses 3 questions – 1 – does returning the Arroyo to nature expose houses on Busch Garden Pl to flooding and the City to liability? 2 – Does restoring the natural mean restoring breeding grounds for insects, in not, why not? 3 – Are we healthier if we catch west nile virus from a mosquito rather than on an airplane?
Jane Hermann 375 Linda Vista Ave Pasadena, CA 91105 JWH0301@aol.com	C-477	Says Arroyo is intended for open space use only
Hal Jericho 2126 Casa Grande St.	C-478 C-478a	Submitted MEIR document in the format of questions; letter requests written response to each question

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
Pasadena, CA 91104		
Erin Farnsworth 884 South Los Robles Ave Pasadena, CA 91106	C-479	WPRA comment card + comment "horses and their owners are running out of places to ride..."
Vince Farhat	PC-1	From June 25, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Need to preserve, restore and protect the Arroyo Seco. Arroyo Seco is worthy of national park protection. EIR conflicts with General Plan and should focus on restoration. Public comment period should be extended.
Mike Voglar	PC-2	From June 25, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Master Plan does not address streambed restoration. City has not consulted with Los Angeles County Flood Control District. Arroyo Seco Foundation and Northeast Trees have prepared a plan; should open dialogue to remove concrete and allow for streambed restoration.
Joan Hearst	PC-3	From June 25, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Arroyo Seco is one of the last natural areas in Pasadena. Master Plan and EIR need to comply with General Plan. The time period for public review should be extended thirty days; people aren't aware of project/document. Another public meeting should be held in July. Community does not want bike path in the Arroyo Seco.
Richard Davis	PC-4	From June 25, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Why no alternative with no bike path in the Lower Arroyo? EIR does not address "no-bike" path alternative. EIR doesn't address bike path adequately, i.e. safety and surface materials. Dogs are not adequately addressed in EIR. No adequate way to police bikes. In spite of signage, bikes use the Arroyo Seco. Cultural resources section doesn't address bikes, ditto for noise, effects of widening paths, and speeding. Biking should be encouraged as a mode (of transportation) to arrive at Lower Arroyo Seco.
Dorothy Lindsay	PC-5	From June 25, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Extend public comment period for another thirty days, and hold another comment meeting in July. Should include alternative with no bike path. Why doesn't EIR address removing flood control channel? Financing plans (for projects) should be disclosed. Policing/maintenance issues need to be addressed. (Need) to address environmentally superior alternative; (need) to address cultural resource in inventory; (need) to address trees.
Claire Bogaard	PC-6	From June 25, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Request additional time for (public comment period). The Master Plan should focus on natural environment in Lower Arroyo (from Singer Park Neighborhood Association).

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
Bruce Morrison	PC-7	From June 25, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Pleased to see remodeling of clubhouse.
Lauren Lutz	PC-8	From June 25, 2002 Public Comment meeting - No more development in Arroyo Seco; area should be kept as open space – preserve area; no changes.
Don Rogers	PC-9	From June 25, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Comments related to Hahamongna Watershed Park – keep as open space. How does City reconcile grading amount (considers significant) with statement that there are ...”no significant impacts” ... What type of plants will be used; concerned with mitigation alternatives, not feasible to implement. Concerned with (constructing) a parking structure in a natural area. Extend comment period.
Murrietta Krulz	PC-10	From June 25, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Concerned that after all these years, a “temporary” JPL parking lot still exists. Will there be hours of operation for the park? Will there be gates and fencing (to park and how to access)? Increasing parking is more than area can handle. Gabrielino Trail is already handling more than it can. Parking, playing fields, etc. inhibit natural area.
Elizabeth Bour	PC-11	From June 25, 2002 Public Comment meeting - References that parking structure will be used for Rose Bowl overfill – will this be analyzed? Parking references 1,700, should be 1,200 – is this a typo? Missing in document is the public access to parking structure uses roadway – what is the status of lease(s) with MWD? Bicycle route – will pavement be adequate for uphill riders?
Priscilla Flynn	PC-12	From June 25, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Assumptions throughout MEIR include bicycle trails, but they aren’t allowed. Alternative that majority approved (no bicycle trails) is left out. More parking in the Lower Arroyo doesn’t make sense.
David Czemanski	PC-13	From June 25, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Site for public meeting is not conducive fore public meeting – should be in library to encourage public interaction (and attendance). Other speakers (have stated they) want more natural environmental for Arroyo Seco. Plan is non-responsive to wishes of the community and interests of the public. City Manager and Director of Public Works are not responsive to City. Plan is heavily loaded with spending for infrastructure. Extend the public comment period.
Tim Brick	PC-14	From June 25, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Concerned if City was listening to years of public input. Problems with getting documents. Process (this meeting) only allows for comments, need opportunity for public discussion (not enough public

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
		comment). Stream restoration not included. (Plan) favors infrastructure over preservation. Extend deadline for public comment; have community meetings. Preserve and restore the Arroyo Seco.
Jacque Conroy	PC-15	From June 25, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Location for meeting is inappropriate. Creation of soccer fields will encourage vandalism in the area. Additional development will provide too much access to JPL.
Mary Barrie	PC-16	From June 25, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Parking access to JPL and (subsequent) MEIR analysis is inadequate. Will parking in the Hahamongna be used for Rose Bowl overflow? Additional cars create more problems for the area. Nothing in MEIR about access to parking lot and related safety issues. Relocating parking will cause impacts not discussed. Will there be a separate environmental document for improvements to MWD property?
Chuck Carroll	PC-17	From June 25, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Appreciates additional fields included in the plan. Area H is used by many schools and residents benefit from the multi-use of this green area. In meetings like this, the voice and concerns of children are often overlooked. This is not a case of either/or; both options can co-exist (preservation and including green space for fields).
Priscilla Benson	PC-18	From June 25, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Parking garage is more expensive to maintain than surface parking lots. Alternative - water feature should be pumped up to spreading grounds.
Dennis Crowley	PC-19	From June 25, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Lots of public input - everyone got 90% of what they wanted. Plan should include more non-motorized travel (in the Arroyo Seco). Get rid of flood control channel.
Anthony Henkels	PC-20	From June 25, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Mainly concerned with preservation and restoration of the facility for PRA, what will happen to club?
Deidre West	PC-21	From June 25, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Houses abutting Gabrielino Trail - plan should include more habitat restoration (only 13% increase). New parking (1,300) - why? Aesthetics - no view shed analysis, no photos or visual simulation. Moving electrical lines, where do they do, should be significant. Noise - only two measurements; threshold should be 3 dB, not 5dB. Amphitheater effect in Arroyo should be addressed. Altadena wasn't adequately addressed.
Polly Wheaton	PC-22	From June 25, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Need extension (suggests) two months (people are on vacation). Slopes at La Casita - no mention of fixing it. Bikes

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
		and horses do not mix. Should protect natural environment, not concrete.
Susan Hardman	PC-23	From June 25, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Extension should be given. EIR hasn't addressed noise levels from Johnson Field – will there be stadium seating?
Elizabeth Francis	PC-24	From June 25, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Workshops and meetings since 1998, (understood that) Master Plan was completed and ready for EIR, (now) new components (have been added) – bike paths, pavement, parking structures, etc. When will community be able to voice opinion? More community input in necessary.
Kirby Shanklin	PC-25	From June 25, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Executive Summary – ordinance designated Lower Arroyo as natural preservation area, why important? Public access to these kinds of meetings (needs improvement), only received notice yesterday.
Hugh Bowles	PC-26	From June 25, 2002 Public Comment meeting - People spent lots of time responding to DEIR (I.S.?), but no response in FEIR (DEIR?) Page 3.6, maximize water percolation, isn't community's goal. Spreading basins are useless for habitat. 1996 stipulation – Hahamongna Park Plan will describe how it will be restored. Plus, City said it would consult with CDFG & USFNS. City must commit to habitat restoration, alternatives to spreading grounds.
Frank Cassidy	PC-27	From July 16, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Poles, not in CAMP, should be; poles installed without public comment; safety should be considered, however, many people object. Should be removed and replaced with cantilevered netting to protect pedestrians (ex. Berkshire in LCF).
Jim Price	PC-28	From July 16, 2002 Public Comment meeting - EIR presumes things will be stay the same. Bike path will get ruts in the rain and then will need to be paved, then there will be rollerbladers, etc. Over time, use of park will increase
Norman Parker	PC-29	From July 16, 2002 Public Comment meeting - LVAA currently reviewing EIR. Interested in analysis of Arroyo Seco public lands ordinance, overall plan, flood control, additional extension
Joy Rittenhouse	PC-30	From July 16, 2002 Public Comment meeting - (Concerned with) road proposed through Rose Bowl Riders. MEIR doesn't address road, road will substantially affect MACH 1
Vince Farhat	PC-31	From July 16, 2002 Public Comment meeting - EIR is inadequate, no study of bikes off bike plan, not study of potential conflicts with watershed restoration, inadequate bio analysis
Joan Hearst	PC-32	From July 16, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Sign up to work on protecting the

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
		Arroyo Seco
Edward Stork	PC-33	From July 16, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Rose Bowl Riders – IS/ND for MWD will affect Rose Bowl Riders. Page 2-30 indicates that road through MWD land, road will affect environment; how is ND possible? What are proposed uses for MWD land?
Mike Vogler	PC-34	From July 16, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Lack of alternative to bike path in Lower Arroyo - why not? Safety hazard to pedestrians and animals, as well as erosion
Priscilla Benson	PC-35	From July 16, 2002 Public Comment meeting - JPL parking for 1,200, MEIR doesn't address cost and maintenance cost. Doesn't address noise issues. Parking – is it for Rose Bowl overflow?
Julie Miller	PC-36	From July 16, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Fire hazards are not addressed. Bring more people increases risk of fire. Graffiti increase. Policy goals for Arroyo Seco already exist, new projects destroy it
Frank Orlando	PC-37	From July 16, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Bike path – why exists if residents don't want it? Concerned that PVC pipe is still present in Arroyo Seco after 5 years (temp)
Sue Lafferty	PC-38	From July 16, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Concerned with road that will go through Rose Bowl Riders. Concerned with impact of a paved bike path, especially in natural areas, will encourage high speed riders because its paved (safety issues), will it be used by “pack” riders?
Yariv Amnon	PC-39	From July 16, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Concerned with mix of bike riders and hikers in Lower Arroyo (esp. speed from bike riders), primary concern is the safety of hikers. Concerned with incompatibility between restoration and new projects
Dorothy Lindsey	PC-40	From July 16, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Concerned that document refers to parkland. No mention of water conservation. Why no future impact for additional watering of soccer fields, etc
Elizabeth Bour	PC-41	From July 16, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Equestrian Refuge Area – proximity to parking structure – how do they reach dumpsters (how would large trucks access)? Refuge area does not seem to be addressed in MEIR
Mary Barrie	PC-42	From July 16, 2002 Public Comment meeting - MEIR does not adequately address road going through Hahamongna to parking structure. No discussion of safety issues related to road and its close proximity to many recreation uses. No mention of habitat destruction (trees lost, etc.). Is parking structure for Rose Bowl overflow?

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
Mark Goldschmidt	PC-43	From July 16, 2002 Public Comment meeting - New park entry into Hahamongna (slip road) – doesn't address construction impact; no traffic study; what are noise, aesthetic impacts? Safety concerns not addressed
Debbie Hemela	PC-44	From July 16, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Proximity of parking structure to JPL – security, who pays?
Tracy Sullivan	PC-45	From July 16, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Linking Eaton Canyon with Hahamongna – impacted trail head – influx of people isn't addressed. Currently is congested. Maintain integrity of Upper Arroyo infrastructure at trail heads. The trails are unique.
Thomas Lockhart	PC-46	From July 16, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Opposition to bike path – equestrian will be limited to east side. How is interface with Central Arroyo addressed? No options for pedestrian and equestrians. No evaluation of potential impacts to bio, urban pollution isn't addressed
Doug Lerner	PC-47	From July 16, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Roads serving parking structure aren't addressed. Slip lane. Bike access. Bring in front of audience
Barbara _____	PC-48	From July 16, 2002 Public Comment meeting - No new people to Pasadena. No bike path, parking structures, or other increased intensity
Hugh Bowles	PC-49	From July 16, 2002 Public Comment meeting - City agreed to describe permissible events in Hahamongna. Substantial cost to maintain. Increased intensity of use will lead to impacts – turf, spreading basins, city must provide environmental documents to public
Eileen Galagher	PC-50	From July 16, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Bike hazards vs. golf ball. Bring down those poles!
Robert Fuller	PC-51	From July 16, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Keep balance between preservation and new projects
Peggy Stewart	PC-52	From July 16, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Watershed Study by Arroyo Seco Foundation – considers it to be an effective alternative to plan proposed by City
Emina Darakjy	PC-53	From July 16, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Many have expressed concern with asphalt in Central Arroyo – current plan doesn't seem to reduce amount of asphalt; need to reduce number of parking spaces and increase cost to park to keep same amount of revenue. Remove poles or lower them. Reduce signage and lighting – if lost, you don't belong here
Dianne Domingo-Foraste	PC-54	From July 16, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Lower Arroyo – proposed parking lot

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
		near South Pasadena – even though natural surface, Pasadena should work with South Pasadena to eliminate the need for a new lot. New parking lot next to kids riding area is dangerous. Entrance to parking lot is very narrow and steep – potential for accidents. Public restrooms proposed – most closed, why open more, if they are to be closed
Cheryl Auger	PC-55	From July 16, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Inadequate MEIR – doesn't address the tree ordinance; goals of the plan and City are not congruent
Fran Yariv	PC-56	From July 16, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Off-leash activities should be accommodated
Susan Hardman	PC-57	From July 16, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Power lines – EIR doesn't address stringing them along Gabrielino Trail
Don Rogers	PC-58	From July 16, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Announcement regarding walkabouts
Ariel Wisch	PC-59	From July 16, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Drug dealing, dog attacks, run over by bicyclists and cars, stabbings – will security be increased? It should be. Off-leashed areas should be provided, but leash laws elsewhere should be enforced
George Rossman	PC-60	From July 16, 2002 Public Comment meeting - Public art – why? where? what? References to existing bike path – shouldn't be. How will geological hazards be mitigated – more concrete?
City of Pasadena Utility Advisory Commission	PC-61	From the August 21, 2002, Utility Advisory Commission Meeting (notes from staff) – 1. Flood control channel and the bike path are controversial elements that should be removed 2. What is the feasibility of adding plastic liners under the play fields to limit pesticides from leaching into the ground and the water supply? 3. Reclaimed water should be used for the lakes and for watering athletic fields. 4. The alternatives from the Phillip-Williams study should be study.
City of Pasadena Cultural Heritage Commission	PC-62	From the July 15, 2002, Cultural Heritage Commission Meeting (notes from staff minutes) – CHC recommends that the City Council certify the draft MEIR for the Arroyo Seco Master Plan with the understanding that staff will add mitigation measures for: 1) design review of any new projects in the Arroyo Seco shall be in accordance with Chapters 2.75, 2.80 and 17.92 of the Pasadena Municipal Code and 2) completion of a Cultural Landscape Report to address all the historic resources in the area within a year (if feasible) of adoption of the MEIR.

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
City of Pasadena Design Commission	PC-63	<p>From the August 26, 2002, continued to September 9, 2002, Design Commission Meeting (notes from staff minutes) – Action: Moved/seconded by Commissioners Lomako/Shulman to approve the staff recommendations with the following conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Acknowledge the purpose and intent of the Arroyo Seco Design Guidelines (Chapter 1). 2. Confirm the Draft MEIR’s finding of potentially significant unavoidable effects on aesthetics due to the proposed parking garage in the Hahamongna Watershed Park. 3. Design review shall be required for projects in the Arroyo Seco in accordance with Chapters 2.75, 2.80, 17.92 of the Pasadena Municipal Code. 4. Relate the Design Commission’s concerns in these three areas: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the non-inclusion of the removal/modification of the flood control channel, b. increase Rose Bowl uses, and c. the naturalization and restoration of the Arroyo
City of Pasadena Transportation Advisory Commission	PC-63	<p>From the June 21, 2002, Traffic Advisory Commission Meeting (notes from staff minutes) –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Plan includes too many infrastructure projects. For example, in the Lower Arroyo, parking lots, wider streets and a bike path are proposed. The plan should be more “wilderness” oriented. 2. The Plan and MEIR include references to bringing facilities up to industry standards – what are these standards? 3. On page 3.12-4 of the EIR, reference is made to Mountain Street accessing the Central Arroyo. What is Mountain Street’s lane configuration? How was it considered for traffic accessing the Central Arroyo and the Rose Bowl?
City of Pasadena Planning Commission Meeting	PC-64	<p>From the August 28, 2002, Planning Commission meeting, the following comments were noted (not attributed to specific speakers):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The discussion of potential aesthetic impacts in the EIR is inconsistent (see pages S-4, S-6, 3.1-11, and 5-1). 2. The EIR needs to address potential impacts of the 25 events proposed at the Rose Bowl, as well as improvements to the Rose Bowl to accommodate an NFL

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
		<p>team, more specifically.</p> <p>3. Why is the EIR being discussed prior to the Plan? There should be no plan for the Lower Arroyo – there is no need to widen the bridge, build the parking lot, or undertake other improvements proposed for the Lower Arroyo. Who will make changes to the Plan? How will comments on the Plan be addressed?</p> <p>4. There are several proposed improvements in particular that are controversial, including the bike path in the Lower Arroyo, the parking facilities (in the Lower Arroyo and Hahamongna), and the kiosks. How was it decided to include these components in the Plan?</p> <p>5. How will the City control speeds on the bike path, especially given the lax enforcement in the Park now?</p> <p>6. The Planning Commission should have a hearing to discuss the Plan.</p> <p>7. The Plan should be more in tune with Adam Schiff's Rim Plan, which focuses on open space. Pasadena should be concerned about increased population, loss of opens space, etc. The EIR should include an alternative from the Phillip Williams Study, which indicated that spreading basins are not the most appropriate option for the watershed. How do you build new habitat? The EIR should address the Arroyo Seco Watershed Feasibility Study. The EIR should consider the City's new Tree Ordinance.</p> <p>8. What is the urgency for completing the Plan?</p> <p>9. Has any money been designated for the bike path?</p> <p>10. Modern planning activities for the Arroyo could be described as having begun in 1985 with the first Strategic Plan, then the Hahamongna Operating Company, etc. Given its long history, emotions about the current Plan are mixed. The Plan is heavy on infrastructure, but it does represent some progress for planning the Arroyo. The Arroyo is Pasadena's Grand Canyon. The Watershed Feasibility Study focuses more on a conservation-oriented watershed-wide approach. Components of the Plan that are detrimental to water resources include the percolation ponds, which would be expanded into habitat for the Arroyo Toad. There is evidence that natural water flows through the Hahamongna Basin would result in greater recharge into the Raymond Basin (according to the Phillip Williams Study, up to ten times more). Although the BFI project was a good experiment, the Plan needs to examine removing the Channel and a watershed ecosystem that functions independently of human</p>

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
		<p>intervention. The Plan includes lined lakes, moving habitat, soccer fields, and other components that are detrimental to percolation. More traditional recreation areas (such as for bird watching, hiking, and learning about nature) are preferable.</p> <p>11. The MEIR and the Plan contradict each other in a number of places (for example, regarding parking in Hahamongna). The Traffic Study for the Plan indicates that the parking structure in Hahamongna may be used for Rose Bowl parking. Why is the proposed parking asphalt? Why does new parking need lighting facilities, if the park only will be used during the day?</p> <p>12. Preservation and restoration should be priorities for the Plan (including removal of the flood control channel). The Design Commission should review all projects in the Arroyo.</p> <p>13. The community needs more park space and watershed areas. The EIR doesn't address runoff and opportunities to trap and reuse that runoff. The EIR needs more alternatives. The Plan shouldn't include fake water bodies. Issues regarding air quality, noise, and light are not addressed adequately. Increased use of landscaping equipment and other two-stroke engines will result in increased air pollution in the Arroyo, which acts as a funnel, and will expose children to increased air pollution. ARTS buses should be used to transport people to and from the Arroyo. Increased paving shouldn't be proposed in the Lower Arroyo. The Plan discusses brush removal, but the EIR doesn't address what this brush is (i.e., is it endangered habitat?). The flood control channel should be removed.</p> <p>14. A Master Plan should be approved to end the current situation in which separate projects proceed in a piecemeal fashion (for example, Kids Space and the proposed slip lane). There are substantial discrepancies between the current Plan and earlier plans for the Arroyo, such as the new entrance and the bike path in the Lower Arroyo. The EIR should address removal of the flood control channel more aggressively.</p> <p>15. Stream restoration should be more emphasized in the Central Arroyo.</p> <p>16. Too much parking is proposed in the Lower Arroyo. Where will children go to collect toads, see owls, etc.?</p> <p>17. There are more opportunities to restore the watershed than are being proposed in the Plan. For example, storm water from surrounding urban areas could be</p>

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
		<p>addressed. Note that many activities that are considered active recreation (such as baseball) are less active than many activities that are considered passive recreation (such as hiking).</p> <p>18. The Plan ignores stream restoration. When will the EIR be fixed? How will the City approach the MWD lease agreement? Why does JPL's parking need to be in Hahamongna?</p> <p>19. The proposed project is a public works project. If the flood control channel is removed, then some of the projects included in the Plan will be affected.</p> <p>20. The proposed mitigation measures are not exhaustive. Additional mitigation that alters projects in the Plan should be included. Additional alternatives should be considered. The Master Plan should be revised (for example, by removing the parking structures).</p> <p>21. Removal of the flood control channel should be part of the Plan and considered in the EIR.</p> <p>22. Potential water impacts should be more fully addressed. Another alternative should be included that examines a case in which existing facilities are adequately maintained. Mitigation measure proposed for public services aren't feasible – the City doesn't adequately maintain existing facilities. The Plan includes too much infrastructure (such as additional bathrooms across from the Archery Range and signage). The 50,000 square-foot threshold for design review is inappropriate. The EIR doesn't adequately address 25 events in the Rose Bowl or its potential use by the NFL. Overall, the EIR does not adequately address impacts.</p> <p>23. The Plan and EIR should address removal of the flood control channel. The Rose Bowl should be more fully addressed. Another alternative should be included to conserve and restore the existing environment. The Arroyo should be restored.</p> <p>24. The Plan should be reevaluated, and then the EIR should be revised accordingly.</p> <p>25. The Planning Commission adopts the following motion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To recommend that staff re-examine and re-draft the Master Plan; and • To recommend that the MEIR not be certified, based on the determination that the MEIR does not adequately address the potential impacts because:

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It does not adequately address the potential impacts from additional major events at the Rose Bowl; ○ It does not adequately address the potential impacts to water quality and hydrology (including the Watershed Feasibility Study and potential removal of the flood control channel); ○ It fails to provide an effective alternative for consideration of the restoring/conserving of the existing character of the Arroyo Seco; and ○ The proposed threshold for Design Review does not provide an effective mitigation to the potential impacts to aesthetics.
Ray Dashner 8166 S. Arroyo Blvd. Pasadena 626-799-4547	PC-65	Comment given at August 28, 2002, Planning Commission Meeting: The “master plan” has to come first for approval.
Cheryl Auger 1211 Romney Way Pasadena 626-799-6465	PC-66	Comment given at August 28, 2002, Planning Commission Meeting: I urge the commission to ensure all plans and the EIR are reviewed, to ensure all environmental laws, ordinances and standards are followed and to assist the public in being represented.
Mary Barrie 5159 Crown La Canada 818-952-7928	PC-67	Comment given at August 28, 2002, Planning Commission Meeting: On Hahamongna parking issues
Jans Muntz 1560 E. California Blvd. Pasadena 626-795-0327	PC-68	Comment given at August 28, 2002, Planning Commission Meeting: PBF supports conservation and restoration of parkland and natural habitats, this would include the flood control channel.
Peggy Stewart 250 La Mirada Rd Pasadena 626-449-6148	PC-69	Comment given at August 28, 2002, Planning Commission Meeting: 1. Concerned about roadways in the Lower Arroyo 2. Playing fields and roadways in Hahamongna cause noise, air, light, water quality issues – naturalistic park, not a natural area
Pat Locke 306 Cherry Dr. Pasadena	PC-70	Comment given at August 28, 2002, Planning Commission Meeting: Concerns regarding Lower Arroyo

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
323-258-3784		
Sylvia Blackstone 1867 North Avenue 51 Pasadena 323-255-1983	PC-71	Comment given at August 28, 2002, Planning Commission Meeting: Negative effects of urban sprawl in news today – water supply, drought made worse as watershed (overall) loses capacity to infiltrate water. Should retrofit all infrastructure to increase capacity of Arroyo and watershed to capture water. Plan/EIR to address any loss of infiltration.
Robert Witty 244 Flower St Pasadena 626-791-7974	PC-72	Comment given at August 28, 2002, Planning Commission Meeting: Why does EIR and Plan not address Arroyo restoration as study recently? Why lease option on MWD property not addressed when road _____ through area is shown on master plan?
City of Pasadena Recreation and Parks Commission	PC-73	<p>From the August 6, 2002, Recreation and Parks Commission Meeting (notes from staff minutes) –</p> <p>Rosa Laveaga, Arroyo Seco Park Supervisor, gave a description of the process following the comment period, which is set to close August 30th. Ms. Laveaga indicated that a considerable number of comments have been received to date and that more comments are expected. She estimated that it will take at least two (2) months to respond, which based on the August 30th deadline, would be on or about November 1st. Subsequently, Staff will provide a recommendation to the Commission during public hearings in late November or early December. The Commission will then formulate a recommendation to the City Council. However, there would be no obligation to act on Staff's recommendation, as inquired by Chairman Hurley.</p> <p>Patsy Lane requested that Rosa Laveaga offer a recommendation with respect to an additional extension. Kathy Woods noted, however, that there may be a procedural problem since this is as an Information Item.</p> <p>The Commission discussed their right to take action on an Information Item, and it was concluded by Chairman Hurley that the Commission was entitled to suspend the rules in this situation.</p> <p>M/S/P approval for the Commission to take action on the Information Item</p>

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
		<p>related to the extension. Accordingly, the Commission requested that Staff make a recommendation to extend the public comment period on the MEIR through September 20, 2002.</p> <p>Richard Davis, on behalf of WPRA and as chair of the coalition committee, brought forth the following requests: 1) that the City identify a way to move forward with the repair of the Archery Clubhouse, 2) that the City remember that 'improvements' contained in the Master Plan, may be in conflict with the other plans relating to the watershed issue, etc., and 3) that a flow chart showing the CEQA process be developed and published on the City website. He believed that that there are conflicting understandings of the CEQA process and that the public needs additional information.</p> <p>Rosa Laveaga then referred the audience to the transcribed minutes, flow charts and summaries, which were included in the meeting packet. She stated that in order to provide a greater understanding for the public, additional information may need to be asked of the Planning Department.</p> <p>Commissioner Selinske believed it was equally important to clarify the steps and include different scenarios, for the Commission and public's understanding. As an example, he wondered how the process would be impacted if it was agreed that the project would amended. He suggested that a workshop on the process be held to adequately advise all parties regarding the environmental review process, but noted that associated timeframes may prevent such an activity.</p> <p>Kathy Woods confirmed that delaying the process would risk losing funds for the project. However, she agreed that the public's clear understanding of the project and the process is a priority.</p> <p>Don Rogers stated his belief that there are number areas of omission within the MEIR. He stated that there are bona fide legal issues related to MWD, which are not addressed in the MEIR.</p> <p>Chairman Hurley requested that Staff commit to another presentation at the next</p>

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
		<p>Recreation and Parks Commission meeting to provide further clarification as to the process steps and scenarios.</p> <p>Rosa Laveaga emphasized that this is a critical juncture and strongly recommended that Planning Staff and legal counsel be in attendance at that meeting.</p>
<p>City of Pasadena Recreation and Parks Commission</p>	<p>PC-74</p>	<p>From the September 10, 2002, Recreation and Parks Commission meeting, the following comments were noted (not attributed to specific speakers):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How will the Recreation and Parks Commission act on the EIR? 2. Can the City Council reject a project on the basis of an EIR? 3. Will additional opportunity to comment on the Plan be provided? 4. Can the Commission express its opinions about impacts? What will happen if the Commission feels that impacts potentially will be greater than discussed in the draft MEIR? 5. How has the Plan, as presented in the draft MEIR, been altered relative to the plans that were approved conceptually? Did preparation of the EIR result in this change? If so, how? 6. What is the definition of related projects according to CEQA? How and when are related projects defined? 7. The bike path proposed for the Lower Arroyo would be a disaster, resulting in 24-hour use of the Lower Arroyo, including nighttime lighting. It would be impossible to enforce rules on the bike path, including rules restricting hours of use. 8. WPRRA letter to Commission (read verbatim). 9. The project is not consistent with the General Plan, including General Plan polices related to open space and recreation. The EIR does not address long-term impacts adequately (for example, 67 percent of the mitigation measures are for construction). The EIR alternatives presented are inadequate (i.e., there are only five alternatives). 10. The City needs to start over with the EIR and the Master Plan. The EIR does not address JPL's groundwater contamination (see Section 3.7). The Plan does not address restoration potential in the Lower Arroyo. The proposed parking structure should not be in a natural area; instead, it should be on JPL's property since it is used for JPL employees.

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
		<p>11. This should be a public hearing, with transcripts available. I request an administrative hearing.</p> <p>12. The slip lane near La Canada High School has been helpful and has improved safety in the area. However, the proposed parking structure shouldn't be in a natural area. Furthermore, it will impact the Rose Bowl Riders.</p> <p>13. The draft MEIR is inadequate. The slip lane should not have been installed prior to certification of the MEIR and should have been addressed by the MEIR. Potential impacts from the proposed parking structure aren't adequately addressed (i.e., weekend access, use for Rose Bowl events, etc.). The roadway to the parking structure will impact the Rose Bowl Riders, which was not addressed in the MEIR. How will waste from the refuse storage area be removed? Won't activities to remove this waste result in impacts on the environment? Have these impacts been identified in the MEIR? How about the bike paths, the substantial paving proposed, and other components of the Plan?</p> <p>14. The Plan includes projects for which funds have been earmarked. One example is the bridge proposed near the Camel's back. Earmarking funds for projects prior to environmental clearance is inappropriate.</p> <p>15. No additional parking is necessary in the Arroyo. Concrete should be removed. The flood control channel should be removed, as was called for in previous planning efforts for the Arroyo. The Arroyo Seco Foundation/Northeast Trees' study should be included in the Plan.</p> <p>16. The City should consider the Arroyo Seco Restoration Study's recommendations. The Army Corps of Engineers currently is studying the feasibility of removing the flood control channel. Despite the criticism expressed, the City has done a good job during its planning process and should be commended. The Plan can be altered to incorporate many of the goals of the Restoration Study.</p> <p>17. A television program recently was filmed in Hahamongna Watershed Park, which caused great disturbance to the neighbors. The MEIR should restrict activities like filming in Hahamongna. Don't simulated explosions, like what was used for the television program, adversely affect wildlife?</p> <p>18. We should concentrate on restoring and maintaining what we have in the Arroyo, not installing new infrastructure. The Plan will displace the remaining animals in the Arroyo. The wilderness in the Arroyo is especially important for children, and should be preserved for future generations.</p>

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
		19. The Plan and the MEIR should analyze removal of the Channel. Although the City does not have enough park and open space to accommodate recreational needs, it is inappropriate for the Arroyo Seco to be used to accommodate citywide demand. The Upper Arroyo should be protected. If bikes aren't allowed in Griffith Park, why should they be allowed in the Arroyo? 20. No hardscape should be added to the Arroyo. Restoration should be emphasized. 21. The draft MEIR does not adequately analyze the 25 major events proposed for the Rose Bowl. Additional analysis should be provided. 22. It is wonderful to see so many citizens involved in the planning process. 23. Why hasn't the JPL Superfund site been addressed in the draft MEIR?
City of Pasadena Special Joint Meeting of the Hahamongna Watershed Park Advisory Committee and the Recreation and Parks Commission	PC-75	From the September 10, 2002, Joint Meeting of the Hahamongna Watershed Park Advisory Committee and Recreation and Parks Commission, the following public comments were noted: 1. Commissioner Hurley: Requests clarification as to the MEIR and how much authority is given to overriding the recommendations, Brian League, with the City Planning and Development Department clarifies that the MEIR is an information document. 2. Commissioner Joe Feinblatt: While reviewing comments from the MEIR and its affects on the plan, will there also be changes to the plan based on the plan and not to the MEIR. Are they considered on their own merit? Rosa indicates yes and confirms that is included within the process just outlined. 3. Commissioner Anita Fromholz inquiry - Rosa Laveaga clarifies that when plans went to Council was conceptual and now plans are much more detailed. Those details are within the realm of what was approved. She clarifies that there is an opportunity for the public to comment and recommendations will all come before the body. Public and written comment forums address the Master Plan as well. The comments received for the MP are being kept while comments to MEIR are being addressed. 4. Commissioner Fromholz is concerned that comments are being withheld because it is the "MEIR" comment period. Rosa confirms that all public comment hearings will be advertised so public can respond to the MP. 5. Commissioner Osen: Would like staff to address that if the Commission were to

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
		<p>feel that it was not only a problem with parking, aesthetics, etc. that pose a potential unavoidable impact. Could this “body” address this in some way? If there were more unavoidable impacts pointed out by the public, how is that handled? Brian League indicates the public needs to point that out before 9/16 (as a public comment) about the issue, and encourages the public as well as board members to make comments.</p> <p>6. Chairman Hurley, in follow-up to Rosa Laveaga’s comment about the plans being approved conceptually by City Council, he’d like to know what the driving force was for revision to plan. Rosa indicates that it was a need to define things better for the consultants preparation of the CEQA document; funding issues; staff recommendations; for example, descriptions, quantities, etc. that needed to be provided for the consultant to assess the impacts of the various projects.</p> <p>7. Chairman Hurley also inquires as to the threshold a project has to be in to be considered a related project. Brian League clarifies that projects need to be reasonable foreseeable at the time. For example, governmental projects; solid projects that are definable and measurable projects. They cannot be theoretical projects.</p> <p>8. Joe Fienblatt: Using the parking structure as an example, he indicates it is not described in the Plan, and would like to know how that is handled. Is it incorporated or revisited later? Brian League indicates that if the project doesn’t fit within the document, you move on to dealing with an existing project. If the project is to be done later, you will then move to have another study done, and so on.</p> <p>Comments from Public:</p> <p>9. <u>Jim Price, 695 Busch Garden Drive, Pasadena</u> He speaks as an individual in opposition to the Arroyo Seco Master Plan and MEIR. He has submitted comments in writing, but would like to reiterate some comments. He is opposed to the bike path and believes it would be disaster. He refers to the Central Arroyo and emphasizes that a bike path often includes scooters, bikers, pedestrians, etc. there is no enforceability; and it is in use 24-hours a day. He believes the proposed bike path would be the same. In addition, the thoroughfare is inviting to all night use, police are called in, crime is up, lights become required, etc. He’s confirmed this information with City Council and the Police Department. Moreover, his house would then be illuminated. He doesn’t</p>

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
		<p>want it to happen. He'd like the board to consider. This issue is not addressed in the MEIR. Finally, he notes that with respect to the bridge with non-motorized issues, etc., it doesn't work and references the beach as an example.</p> <p>10. <u>Richard Davis, 390 South Arroyo Boulevard, Pasadena.</u> Mr. Davis is speaking on behalf of the West Pasadena Residents Association, and reads a letter dated September 10, 2002, addressed to Parks and Recreation Commission, sign by Mr. Davis on behalf of the Board of Directors. The letter requests that the bicycle path be dropped from consideration and no longer be included in the deliberations on the adequacy of the MEIR (by way of signed Resolution). He refers to the history of the requested bicycle path and indicates that dropping this item would expedite the review of the comments to the MEIR, the requisite responses by City Staff and eliminate considerable future dissension on this matter. The letter further recommends that neither the City Council nor City Staff take any further action on consummating a lease with the MWD on the property in the Hahamongna Watershed Park until the MEIR is certified. The reasoning is that the proposed lease is not addressed in the MEIR, and the proposed lease could lead to significant environmental impacts that need to be addressed. It is recommended that the lease be pending until a thorough review of contemplated changes on the lease property and an environmental impact assessment is made, both which would be prudent and in a demonstration of good faith.</p> <p>11. <u>Dorothy Lindsey, 1430 Marianna Road, Pasadena.</u> Ms. Lindsey appears as an individual in opposition to the Arroyo Seco Draft Master EIR. She believes the MEIR has several fatal areas. She also indicates if the executive summary is reviewed with number of mitigations – 67% of measures relate only during construction – not after. She states the alternatives are inadequate – particular parking, and deferred maintenance is needed.</p> <p>12. <u>Robert Wittry, 244 Flower Street, Pasadena.</u> Mr. Wittry speaks as an individual and indicates the water issues are not adequately addressed in the MEIR. He believes there is a fatal plan and a new Master Plan will be needed. He refers to Paragraph 3.7.1 dealing with groundwater, which is stated as no impact. Mr. Wittry states it fails to mention contamination from JPL area from past use that is not completely mitigated. If ground water is put in, it is contaminated, and we're not allowed to take groundwater they're supposed to. The Plan does not</p>

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
		<p>address restoring water and natural water south of the dam. In addition, he is concerned about paving, stating there is no reason for a 6-story parking structure when it could go on JPL's project. Finally, he strongly reiterates that water issue must be addressed. If they're not addressed, the process needs to be started over.</p> <p>13. <u>Jo A Barker</u>. Ms. Barker speaks as an individual with general comments. She asks permission to address staff, and inquires if, at anytime of the administrative review process, whether or not there was an official "transcriptionist" in accordance with CEQA requirements. If not, the public comment period should be extended.</p> <p>14. <u>Randy Strapazon, 444 Georgian Road, La Canada</u>. Ms. Strapazon is speaking on behalf of La Canada Flintridge Trail Council. There is extreme concern over the parking structure. It will impact hiking trails; Rose Bowl Riders; will increase street traffic on Oak Grove; and will have an environmental impact, which are all seen as extremely negative. It will take part of the RB Riders, taking space from children. It is not appropriate due to natural area and animals placed there, noting the appeal is made to view Hahamongna as natural, beautiful and meditative. They would like the parking structure to be excluded from the Plan.</p> <p>15. <u>Elizabeth Bour, 1132 Wellington, Pasadena</u>. Ms. Bour did submit written comments, but speaks on behalf of Equestrian Trails, Inc. The greater concerns are with Oak Grove issues. She indicates the MEIR did not address it, and it happened anyway. She hopes that doesn't happen in the future. The MEIR is inadequate in mitigating measures and impacts are severely understated. The Mach I accreditation process is conditioned on location, and they are impacted greatly. They're concerned with trash disposal, track transport, etc. (negotiating curves, and aesthetics). In addition, the bicycle route, paving and grading are understated, and there is a conflict of use for the bike path. They'd like the MEIR to be reworked in the project descriptions.</p> <p>16. <u>Don Rogers, 8916 Jaylee Drive, San Gabriel</u>. Mr. Rogers is speaking on behalf of the Pasadena Audubon Society. He inquires as to whether or not there is a list of projects in the Plan, which are proposed by someone other than the public (City Staff or others), which have earmarked monies for them? For purpose of full disclosure, he'd like to know what projects the City has in mind.</p> <p>17. <u>Priscilla Flynn, 298 South Marengo Ave, Pasadena</u>. Ms. Flynn is a Pasadena native and speaks as an individual. She indicates that the Lower Arroyo is a</p>

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
		<p>natural preservation – not a park, stating that natural preservation seems to be the last that is considered. She is interested in the parking issue, as she doesn't believe that more parking is necessary. On the contrary, she recommends getting rid of more concrete. Ms. Flynn also remarks that the mitigation of flood channel was always previously included, but wasn't this time; that the EIR assumes that the bike path is allowed and existing but isn't; the flood channel is not mentioned. Finally, she doesn't believe the issues included in the watershed study by Northeast Trees & River Conservatory have been taken into account in this study.</p> <p>18. <u>Eileen Takata, 570 W. Avenue 26, Los Angeles.</u> Ms. Takata is from North East Trees and has been working with the Arroyo Seco Watershed Restoration Feasibility Study. They are submitting written comments, but they ask they City to consider recommendations from the watershed restoration study, copies of which are included on CD's that she distributed to the board. Restoration includes water quality, supplies, habitat, stream restoration, flood mitigation, recreation, etc. They would like this to be considered in future EIRs. They've also been working with LA County Public Works, indicates money has been given to corps for the benefit of the Arroyo Seco, and encourages partnering on the Master Plan. She's excited about it, commends the city on their efforts.</p> <p>19. <u>Elizabeth Francis, 884 W. La Canada Verde Road.</u> Ms. Francis is speaking as an individual in relation to a non-agenda item pertaining to film production of the show "Alias" in the Hahamongna Watershed Park. She states that to hold filming and production that includes propane, mortar, explosions, etc., and all equipment went through residential area, without notice to citizens. Ms. Francis states that the MEIR should have some sort of restriction as to what type of activities should go on in the Hahamongna Watershed Park. Furthermore, City didn't give notice as to the production. She recalls that windows were rattling during the production activities; citizens thought it was a terrorist attack; and natural wildlife was put at risk. The MEIR should address restrictions for the entire Arroyo.</p> <p>20. <u>Pat Locke, 306 Cherry Drive, Pasadena.</u> Ms. Locke is speaking as an individual and speaks to several oppositions. She understands that a bridge is to be widened or added to Lower Arroyo. She views Lower Arroyo as a wilderness park and treasure. Reference is made to a natural history magazine, containing</p>

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
		<p>article on young naturalists for 2002 with various studies done by children. She offers an example of the investigation of water pollution, and indicates that she'd like the Arroyo to offer the same types of natural environments, which will also benefit kids. Finally, she notes her agreement with the prior comments of Ms. Elizabeth Francis.</p> <p>21. <u>Peggy Stewart, 250 La Mirada Road, Pasadena.</u> Ms. Stewart is speaking on behalf of the Arroyo Seco Foundation with regard to the MEIR and alternative plans. She supports the remarks relating to the lack of consideration to the public comments to removal of concrete channel. She believes the Plan is trying to take on major recreational responsibility for the entire city, and states that what is not addressed is that the city is very under parked. It is not appropriate for the Arroyo Seco to take on those responsibilities for the entire City. Thus, the MEIR is lacking the alternative issue of the City getting more park space. Moreover, she'd like Upper Arroyo to be considered a true nature study center. Consultants suggestion protecting the habitats, but they're not addressed in EIR or plan. As to the bike path, she notes that the largest park, Griffith Park, doesn't allow bikes, so doesn't understand why there would be in the small park. The widths of paths don't speak of a natural park. In closing, she invites meeting attendees to view the degrading slope outside the meeting clubhouse, which is addressed, but not adequately.</p> <p>22. <u>Carol Soucek King, 60 El Circulo Drive, Pasadena.</u> Ms. Soucek King comments as a West Pasadena resident and concerned environmentalist. She and her husband think its criminal to add any hardscape to the park. They think every effort should be made to preserving, restoring, and getting rid of scars on existing areas, including on the water table. Ms. Soucek King strongly asks that no hardscape be added, as it will destroy more habitats.</p> <p>23. <u>Emina Darakjy, 1044 Prospect Blvd., Pasadena.</u> Ms. Darakjy is speaking on behalf of the East Arroyo Residents Association on the subject of the major impact on the Central Arroyo. Ms. Darakjy indicates that by having Rose Bowl taken out affects them a lot, as council has already approved more events. There's a possibility of NFL coming here, and she inquires as to how this can be mitigated – the Rose Bowl is Central Arroyo. It should be kept as something that impacts the City a lot. It is not addressed, and should be.</p> <p>24. <u>Commissions Response: Chair Selinske</u> encourages staff and the board to</p>

ARROYO SECO MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
COMMENT LOG MATRIX
Public Comments Received
As of December 9, 2002

COMMENTOR	CODE ASSIGNED	NATURE OF COMMENT
		<p>respond, but there is no comment at this time. Commissioner Fromholz clarifies that she's not ready to make comments, as she would prefer to put them in writing. However, as a resident, she thinks it is terrific to see the amount of interest taken, whether supportive or in opposition.</p> <p>25. Jody Gerstner asks why there no consideration or reference to remediation effort to Hahamongna area, as it will have an impact. Josh Hart indicates he believes its listed as a hazard.</p> <p>26. Chairman Hurley inquires whether or not it is possible that there would be governmental action required for an EIS, which Josh Hart responds that it is possible.</p>