

Communication from Public

Name: Yael Pardess

Date Submitted: 06/24/2026 10:12 AM

Council File No: 26-0777

Comments for Public Posting: I am in full support of CD14 Ysabel Jurado resolution. I am attaching additional statements by CFAC (community Forest Advisory Committee) that was submitted in 2024 and are still pertinent to this case. for the record.

200 N. Spring Street
Room 361
Los Angeles, CA 90012-4801
cd2cfac@gmail.com



To: Mayor Karen Bass
City Council Members
RAP Commission
Jimmy Kim, RAP General Manager
Matthew Rudnick, RAP Sustainability Officer

September 13, 2024

RE: Proposed San Pascual Park transfer to South Pasadena

The Community Forest Advisory Committee is the City's commission to advise about urban forest matters, and in that capacity we are voicing our concern regarding the advisability and legality of removing a park that is in use by the community, and where the many trees provide a haven in nature for families and a home for birds and wildlife, this in a city that is considered deficient in park space for the number of residents.

For this reason we oppose Pasadena's Proposed Water Reuse Project's San Pascual proposal to put permanent infrastructure on Los Angeles parkland, which will become a water reclamation site primarily for a golf course that is in another city, South Pasadena. Ultimately this Los Angeles land would be turned over to that city. This does not fit the Code below:

Los Angeles City Charter Section 594

Control and Management of Recreation and Park Lands, Section (c)

Restrictions on Transfer of Dedicated Parks. **All lands heretofore or hereafter set apart or dedicated as a public park shall forever remain for the use of the public inviolate**” but the board may authorize use of the lands **for any park purpose**, and for:

.(a) **Management and Control.** The Department of Recreation and Parks shall operate, manage and control all property now or hereafter owned or controlled by the City for public recreation, including parks, and shall have power in the name of the City to acquire

and take by purchase, lease, condemnation, gift, in trust or otherwise, any and all property necessary or convenient for recreation, including park purposes.

(b) **Acquisition of Property.** No real property shall be acquired by the City for recreation sites, including parks, unless first approved by the Board of Recreation and Park Commissioners.

(c) **Restrictions on Transfer of Dedicated Parks.** All lands heretofore or hereafter set apart or dedicated as a public park shall forever remain for the use of the public inviolate; but the board may authorize use of the lands for any park purpose, and for:

(1) Easements or rights-of-way for any work, improvement or structure necessary and convenient for giving service to the City or its inhabitants in connection with any public utility owned by the City. Under similar circumstances, similar permission may be given to any private public utility holding a franchise, and limited to the life of the franchise. These easements or rights-of-way shall be subject to regulation by ordinance.

(2) Leases to the County of Los Angeles or the State of California or the United States for periods not to exceed 50 years, of sites in any public park for the erection and maintenance of public buildings consistent with public park purposes.

(3) Taking and disposal of molding sand, or other natural resources under terms as the board may prescribe and in a manner as to work no substantial impairment of public use and enjoyment of the premises.

(4) Opening, establishment and maintenance of streets or other public ways in and through the park lands controlled by the board.

(d) **Transfer to Purposes other than Recreation and Park Purposes.** No sites under the management and control of the department shall be devoted or transferred to any other purpose in whole or in part, except in compliance with **all** of the following:

(1) *Procedure.* Any transfer shall require a resolution of the board, approved by the Council by ordinance, incorporating the prescribed terms and conditions to be observed by the permittee. However, Council approval shall not be required for the granting of leases of property not immediately needed for the purposes of the department for a term **not to exceed three years.**

(2) *Restrictions on Transfer.* **No transfer shall be permitted if it would violate the provisions of subsection (c) of this section,** or in any case where the proposed use violates a specific trust or dedication upon which the property was acquired.

(3) *Requirement of Equivalent Property or Funds.* If property to be transferred to another use has been acquired from funds specifically provided for the Department of Recreation and Parks or its predecessors, the department shall be assigned the equivalent in property or funds as a condition of transfer of the property from its control, when required by the board.

(e) **Remaining Land Unsuitable for Park Use.** Where lands forming a portion of an existing public park have been removed from the jurisdiction of the board by reason of their dedication or use for public purposes incompatible with park use, the remaining lands, or any portion thereof, within the park shall not be subject to the provisions of subsection (c) of this section in the event that:

- (1) the board and Council find and determine that the remaining lands, or specific portion thereof, are unsuitable for further use as a public park; and**
- (2) lands of an area at least equal to the lands found to be unsuitable for further use as a public park are acquired in the same portion of the City and set apart or dedicated as a public park.**

Please note that AB 52 applies here as well, requiring public agencies to consult with tribes during the CEQA process, which hasn't happened. This is an historic area that has significance to indigenous tribes of LA as it contains ancient burial sites and sacred trees. No EIR was conducted that would have investigated these issues. The MND was not a Los Angeles document, but a City of Pasadena document, and furthermore it was written by Psomas, the construction company for the project. The City of Los Angeles will realize very few water benefits weighed against the number of trees, habitat and nature-based park use lost to this project.

We would like to point out that the area across from the proposed site, there is a large flat seldom utilized parking lot that should be considered as an alternative site for this whole project. Using this barren lot, will save trees, animal habitats, air, water and money. It makes no sense to destroy an ecosystem in this era of global warming, when you have an easily excavatable area across the river.

We have heard the public comment at the RAP Commission offered by members of the nearby community who use this park and recommend that you put the health of the community first by preserving the trees and place in nature that this park is providing. This project is counter to the 30x30 State initiative to protect 30% of California's natural land and coastal waters by 2030. We feel it is within the mission of RAP to protect a small forest with trees that capture water naturally rather than bring in invasive equipment to remove trees and build hardscape.

We have been informed that RAP's approval is for some reason designated to take place after the construction of the proposed water re-use project. If this is the case, why would RAP allow construction on park land prior to giving approval? San Pascual Park is a natural habitat for wildlife that will be decimated if 82% of the trees are removed and construction is allowed in the middle of the park area. The wildlife does not just return after two years of heavy equipment taking over their home, coupled with installation of light polluting fixtures in the area.

Outreach did not go to many of the park users in Mt. Washington. What little outreach there was was mailed the day before Thanksgiving, and the comment period was designated between November 22nd and January 15th – the holiday season. The tribes were not consulted at all.

This summer many stakeholders made the effort to come in person to the RAP Commission to protest this project, and their comments are worth paying attention to. Presentations against this project were made in August at CFAC and also at the LA Neighborhood Council Sustainability Alliance Trees Committee. [▶ Trees Committee meeting, August 24, 2024](#)

Please realize that this project will make a further contribution to tree canopy loss, and any replacement or mitigation trees will take many years to achieve the full canopy of the mature trees that are removed, and the understory plant life may not return or be overtaken by invasive plants. We feel it is in the best interests of the residents of Los Angeles to preserve this home for nature enjoyed by families and not move forward with Pasadena's Proposed Water Reuse Project's San Pascual proposal that is not a park purpose and has no benefit or service to Angelenos. We do not see how this use of the park can be legally justified.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Joanne D'Antonio". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large, stylized 'D'.

Joanne D'Antonio, CFAC Chair
Letter voted at September 12, 2024 CFAC meeting

Communication from Public

Name: Yael Pardess

Date Submitted: 06/24/2026 10:15 AM

Council File No: 26-0777

Comments for Public Posting: I am Sending another attachment. I am in full support of CD14 Ysabel Jurado resolution. I am attaching additional statements by ASNC(Arroyo Seco Neighborhood Council) that was submitted in 2024 and are still pertinent to this case. for the record.

**ARROYO SECO
NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL**
PO BOX 42254, LOS ANGELES,
CA 90042
MESSAGE PHONE:
323-418-ASNC
<http://www.asnc.us>

GOVERNING BOARD
Lynda Valencia, PRESIDENT,
Valerie Harragin, 1st VICE-PRESIDENT
Lynnette Kampe, SECRETARY
Steven Austin, TREASURER
Teresa Bonsell, 2nd VICE PRESIDENT

c/o EmpowerLA - DONE
200 N. Spring St., Suite 2005
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Phone: (213) 978-1551
Fax: (213) 978-1751
Email: NCsupport@lacity.org
Website: www.empowerla.org

**CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CALIFORNIA**



**ARROYO SECO
NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL (ASNC)**

**ARROYO
SECO
NEIGHBORHOOD
COUNCIL**
www.asnc.us

Steve Austin	Montecito Heights
Luis Barrera	Montecito Heights
Jamie Crespo	Monterey Hills
Gloria Sierra	Monterey Hills
VACANT	Mt. Washington
Valerie Harragin	Mt. Washington
Lynnette Kampe	Mt. Washington
Natalie Seaman	Mt. Washington
Tom Mapp	Sycamore Grove
Roy Payan	At Large
Zachary Pitts	At Large
Ezra Pugh	At Large
Reed McNab	At Large
Teresa Bonsell	Community Interest
Lynda Valencia	Community Interest

September 23, 2024

Eunisses Hernandez, Chair Recreation & Parks Committee
Los Angeles City Council
Mayor Bass
LA Rec & Parks Commission

200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

RE: San Pascual Arroyo Seco Water Reuse Project

The Arroyo Seco Neighborhood Council (ASNC) voted at a Regular Board meeting held on September 23,, 2024, to unanimously oppose the Pasadena's Arroyo Seco Water Reuse Project.

With regard to the controversial and negative environmental action being undertaken by the Los Angeles Rec & Parks Commission and the Cities of Pasadena and South Pasadena against our marginalized communities of color.

This project was created by the cities of Pasadena and South Pasadena with the stated intent to capture and clean water from two sites in the San Rafael and San Pascual basins and return a far lesser quantity of water into the Arroyo Seco channel, depriving water for wildlife and reducing the watershed table for all other communities downstream in Council District 1 and the rest of Los Angeles, simply for the benefit of a few in a more affluent neighboring city and with no benefit to the City of Los Angeles.

The bulk of our concern encompasses the intended plans proposed by the City of South Pasadena and the eventual impact on San Pascual Park, a City of Los Angeles property under the auspice of the City of Los Angeles Rec & Parks and its surrounding marginalized low income communities of primarily Spanish speaking stakeholders.

Our initial concerns were raised when we found that part of the permanent infrastructure on the San Pascual site would be built on City of Los Angeles land. Local communities, such as residents in the San Pascual area and the Gabrieleno Kizh Nation (who have marked burials adjacent to the project and filed an AB52 Sacred Cultural and Burial Land Claim on this site) were never properly notified.

Both the City of South Pasadena and the LA City Rec & Parks Commission failed to properly notify nor consult any of the more than 67% of Spanish speaking residents nor outreach to the Gabrieleno Kizh Nation on this project.

The City of Pasadena claims to have sent letters to the local community at the end of 2023 despite many local residents saying that they did not receive any notification. Additionally, none of these letters were ever sent in Spanish – a violation of Title II of the Civil Rights Act.

We understand that a lease is being prepared by the LA City Rec & Parks Commission granting the City of South Pasadena use of Los Angeles parkland in perpetuity. Based on the documentation, the permanent lease of this land would be essentially giving it away to South Pasadena without any benefit to the residents of Los Angeles.

The plans include to remove 82% of the existing trees in the area (136 mature trees including 40 protected Oaks, Sycamores, and Elderberries), which will displace hundreds of wildlife and birds nesting there, decimate a local ecosystem and add to the Heat Island Effect. These trees are beneficial to all native animal species in Southern California. This forest currently reduces heat, noise, and pollution. If these trees are cut down as planned, their benefits will be lost, impacting the entire community area for decades to come. Replacement trees and flora will be fenced in around the water filtration pools, making them inaccessible. The plans will destroy the natural beauty of San Pascual Park for the benefit of the more affluent community of South Pasadena.

The Pasadena City Council has already approved a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND), which falsely states there was little to no environmental impact due to this project. In addition, this report claimed that their MND had no conflict with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), as put forth in their project plans, independent reports, and publicly shared information.

There is also concern that there is a conflict of interest because the MND was prepared by Psomas, the same company that has been contracted to build this project.

Additionally, the project claimed that its plans will recharge the local aquifer with the cleaned water before it is introduced back into the Arroyo Seco channel however; we understand that it fails to mention that the South Pasadena Golf Course will be redirecting at least twenty million gallons of this water annually for their use. This will have serious repercussions to the down-channel ecosystem, especially in drought years. This takes the water that should be a shared resource and uses it for an exclusive few in a more affluent neighboring community that is not a part of Los Angeles.

There are a number of issues with the project. This project benefits the cities of Pasadena and South Pasadena at Los Angeles' expense. A just and reasonable response to these issues would be an immediate engagement with our communities and independent land use experts. We are asking that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) be required and that the local community and the Gabrieleno Kizh Nation be consulted throughout the process as required under the California Assembly legislation, AB52. The California Department of Fish and Wildlife is the trustee agency has not been consulted in this process either. Their expertise must be included in an EIR for this project.

The final and most salient point is that the LA Rec & Parks Commission lacks the authority to unilaterally approve such a project without full LA City Council approval. Yet LA Rec & Parks Commission appears to be moving forward with this project, with plans to seek approval only after the project is completed. The LA Rec & Parks Commission must seek approval for any projects of such magnitude from the city council prior to commencing. If this property is surplus land as LA Rec & Parks Commission claims, then it must first be offered to other city entities or to indigenous lineal descendants.

ASNC urgently ask CD 1, the City Council, and the Mayor of Los Angeles to support our efforts to protect the San Pascual park land that residents in our community use daily and will cherish for years to come. Thank you for your time and consideration in supporting our stance to oppose this project in its current iteration.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important matter.

Sincerely,

Lynda Valencia

Lynda Valencia, President
Arroyo Seco Neighborhood Council

Communication from Public

Name: Gene Hightower

Date Submitted: 06/24/2026 12:57 PM

Council File No: 26-0777

Comments for Public Posting: I support Councilmember Jurado's Resolution opposing Pasadena/South Pasadena's Arroyo Seco Water Reuse Project.

Communication from Public

Name: Mandi Holmes

Date Submitted: 06/24/2026 01:37 PM

Council File No: 26-0777

Comments for Public Posting: Please support Councilmember Jurado's Resolution opposing Pasadena/South Pasadena's Arroyo Seco Water Reuse Project. I oppose the use of half an acre of San Pascual Parkland in perpetuity by this project.

Communication from Public

Name: Eli

Date Submitted: 06/24/2026 06:22 PM

Council File No: 26-0777

Comments for Public Posting: I am urging you to please protect San Pascual Park as an invaluable community resource for east Los Angeles. I have personally had my birthday party at this park for the last 3 years and gathered with friends to play frisbee, basketball, games, and more. I see people playing with their kids on the baseball field, training in the batting cages, shooting hoops, and so much more. Please consider all of these people who use and love this park. Where will they go? How will they get fresh air and exercise? Thank you.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 06/24/2026 06:29 PM

Council File No: 26-0777

Comments for Public Posting: To tear up this public park would be a grievous mistake, and I support Councilmember Jurado's resolution.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 06/24/2026 06:56 PM

Council File No: 26-0777

Comments for Public Posting: Please reconsider San Pascual Park and keep it as is. It is a beautiful staple in the neighborhood, provides shade and a place for families to gather. It has hosted countless birthdays and BBQ's. I would love to continue being able to spend family time there and celebrate more birthdays. Also provides a place for pets to play and go on a beautiful walk. In a time where tech is taking over, we need space in our neighborhoods to be able to escape in nature. A lot of parks lack restrooms, clean and safe park, shade, and San Pascual provides all of that and more. I would be heart broken if this park were to go. There's so much benefits of having this park where it is!

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 06/24/2026 06:57 PM

Council File No: 26-0777

Comments for Public Posting: save our trees! save our animals save our bugs! save our PARK!

Communication from Public

Name: D. Johnson

Date Submitted: 06/24/2026 06:58 PM

Council File No: 26-0777

Comments for Public Posting: I support City Councilwoman Ysabel Jurado's resolution opposing the Arroyo Seco Water Reuse Project (CF 26-0777). There has to be a better way to accomplish what is needed for public safety without sacrificing one of the rare jewels of open space remaining in the area.

Communication from Public

Name: Salomon Davila
Date Submitted: 06/24/2026 07:10 PM
Council File No: 26-0777
Comments for Public Posting: As a frequent cyclists to San Pascual Park, I support this resolution toSave San Pascual Park. Please do not implement the Arroyo Seco Water Reuse project to maintain the vitality of the park biodiversity.

Communication from Public

Name: Jeffrey Hernandez

Date Submitted: 06/24/2026 08:25 PM

Council File No: 26-0777

Comments for Public Posting: Please support Councilmember Jurado's Resolution opposing Pasadena/South Pasadena's Arroyo Seco Water Reuse Project. I oppose the use of half an acre of San Pascual Parkland in perpetuity by this project. I support the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation's request that there be full avoidance of this sacred site.

Communication from Public

Name: Suzanne Gero

Date Submitted: 06/24/2026 09:03 PM

Council File No: 26-0777

Comments for Public Posting: Please support Councilmember Jurado's Resolution opposing Pasadena/South Pasadena's Arroyo Seco Water Reuse Project. I oppose the use of half an acre of San Pascual Parkland in perpetuity by this project.

Communication from Public

Name: Laura M

Date Submitted: 06/24/2026 09:37 PM

Council File No: 26-0777

Comments for Public Posting: Please Save San Pascual Park. Every neighborhood deserves a park, and San Pascual Park is ours. It's a place to daydream, the visit when times are tough and we feel anxious. A place to cool down on a hot day, to spend time with family and friends, to celebrate milestones and each new day on Earth. The lush greenery and wildlife it hosts are priceless. To wipe out this jewel of our neighborhood is to rob future generations of humans and wildlife of its magic. Do you really want to live with the fact that you aided and abetted in the removal of over 140 mature trees and bushes? Or that you enabled the removal of 175 Million gallons of water from the Arroyo Seco annually? Garvanza is a special community and if you help Save San Pascual Park, Garvanza will be forever grateful, for generations to come.

Communication from Public

Name: Tivoli Di Grazia
Date Submitted: 06/24/2026 10:37 PM
Council File No: 26-0777

Comments for Public Posting: Among many of the many hidden treasures Los Angeles has to offer are the natural areas and parks along the Arroyo Seco. Our city is not necessarily known for its nature; in fact, it is often derided as an urban planning disaster, with disjointed communities spanning miles of pavement only to be connected by car. Los Angeles gets a bad rap for being a city that isolates people from each other and nature, beholden to traffic patterns and long commutes. It takes experiences like a visit to San Pascual park, or any of the other lovely Arroyo parks, to dispel these types of misconceptions and open ones eyes to the small pieces of raw beauty we still have left within our city limits. This is a place where neighbors, families, wildlife, athletes, and even the DASH Highland Park Eagle Rock bus operator on break can gather together to enjoy a moment of respite accompanied by birdsong and the breeze passing through the riparian oaks and sycamores that also call it home. This space is a gift to anyone who frequents it, and as a neighbor I feel I am an especially lucky recipient. To jeopardize this public, accessible, community affirming space in anyway would be a massive mistake and would be a huge punch in the gut to our local wildlife. I am writing on behalf of the great blue heron, the coyote, the oak and sycamore trees, and my fellow Angelenos who all have the privilege of sharing San Pascual park together. I encourage anyone who would participate in its destruction to spend time here, and be moved by its many charms. Our planet is already under the ever pressing threat of climate change and it is everyday Angelenos who suffer the consequences. It is our duty to defend against harmful intervention whenever possible. We may not be able to save the world but it is not too late to save San Pascual Park.

Communication from Public

Name: Omar Macias

Date Submitted: 06/24/2026 02:51 PM

Council File No: 26-0777

Comments for Public Posting: Please support Council-member Jurado's Resolution opposing Pasadena/South Pasadena's Arroyo Seco Water Reuse Project. I oppose the use of half an acre of San Pascual Parkland in perpetuity by this project.

Communication from Public

Name: Amy Ludwig

Date Submitted: 06/24/2026 03:23 PM

Council File No: 26-0777

Comments for Public Posting: Please support Councilmember Jurado's Resolution opposing Pasadena/South Pasadena's Arroyo Seco Water Reuse Project. I oppose the use of half an acre of San Pascual Parkland in perpetuity by this project.

Communication from Public

Name: Rosa Rivas

Date Submitted: 06/24/2026 04:28 PM

Council File No: 26-0777

Comments for Public Posting: I support Councilmember Jurado's Resolution opposing Pasadena/South Pasadena's Arroyo Seco Water Reuse Project. I oppose the use of half an acre of San Pascual Parkland in perpetuity by this project. People in San Pascual are opposed to this project and don't want any of their land to be used for it.

Communication from Public

Name: Clara Solis

Date Submitted: 06/24/2026 04:43 PM

Council File No: 26-0777

Comments for Public Posting: I am 98 years old. This is a bad project. Don't let them take any of our San Pascual Park land. Our community likes our nature. Support Councilmember Jurado's Resolution. Let South Pasadena recycle their water for their golf course. There are better ways to clean the water. We passed Measure W for all the people not to give to only to the rich. This is my tax dollars being used. Say no to the Arroyo Seco Water Reuse project. Park land should stay park land.

Communication from Public

Name: Joaquin Alentin Hernandez Solis

Date Submitted: 06/24/2026 05:07 PM

Council File No: 26-0777

Comments for Public Posting: I support Councilmember Jurado's resolution. I oppose the Arroyo Seco Water Reuse Project. I have been using the east side of the park as long as I can remember. Wildlife needs a place where they can live that provides connectivity. I enjoy seeing rabbits, birds, fish, amphibians, reptiles and our insect friends on this side of San Pascual Park. There are better ways to clean the water. Support the Kizh Nation this is their land. The Little Hahamongva.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 06/24/2026 05:14 PM

Council File No: 26-0777

Comments for Public Posting: i object to this land/ water grab by/ for another city. i don't see a good reason to approve it. thank you ehud epstein - resident council district 14