



LOS ANGELES COUNTY
REGIONAL PARK AND
OPEN SPACE DISTRICT



Measure A Implementation

Los Angeles County Regional Park and Open Space District

Summary Meeting Notes
Steering Committee Meeting #7
January 25, 2018 9:30 am – 12:00 pm

Steering Committee Members in Attendance:

Manal Aboelata	Reyna Diaz	Yvette Lopez-Ledesma
Jean Armbruster	Hugo Enciso	Linda Lowry
Mark Baucum	Hugo Garcia	Sandra McNeil
Jane Beesley	Karen Ginsberg	Delia Morales
Alina Bokde	Michael Hughes	Sussy Nemer
Scott Chan	Bill Jones	Stefan Popescu
Maria Chong-Castillo	John Johns	Barbara Romero
Cheryl Davis	Kim Lamorie	Bruce Saito
Reuben R. De Leon	Amy Lethbridge	Keri Smith

Alternate Members in Attendance: Sylvia Arredondo, Onnig Bulanikian, Omar Gomez, Nicole Jones, Clement Lau, Cara Meyer, Tamika Butler

1. Comment Summary: *Public Comment*

- No context if at beginning to capture what transpired at meeting
- If at end, all in before 12. Best at 11:15/11:30
- Keep all at once

Straw Vote: When to solicit public comment

Unanimous 11:30, then return to any outstanding items

AGENDA ITEM: COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS

1. Comment Summary: *Acquisition of Parks in Non-Urban Areas*

- Time sensitive, move engagement until after purchase, public interest can drive up price of land
- Timing of input sensitive to nuances in acquisition once site is secured
- Need flexibility, parcels can be away from people eliciting different engagement
- Need exceptions/compromises to 36 months engagement timeframe, possibly more for open-space, or bypass engagement
- All recreation spaces should require community engagement
- Applicant needs to make argument for exceptions on a case-by-case basis
- Geographically based adaptations to framework
- Now typically through supervisorial districts
- Proactive, transparent plan, could be generic, to inform public of acquisition
- How to protect from inverse condemnation?

Response Summary:

- a. Three potential solutions to address these concerns:
 - i. If consistent with some type of master plan that received public input, this would count as participatory or concurrent engagement
 - ii. Inclusion on a board or agency meeting agenda would count as concurrent engagement
 - iii. Potential to look into limited action to allow exceptions to move forward
- b. These solutions will be investigated and a revision to the document will be made as needed to address the concerns

2. Comment Summary: *Language Accessibility*

- a. Language translation requirements are not strong enough
- b. Federal regulations aren't appropriate in L.A. , as the standard is too broad for individual communities
- c. Look at Seattle/King Co. to synthesize best practices

Response Summary:

- a. For competitive grants, additional language outreach will receive additional points
- b. Will more clearly articulate what language requirements must be met. Will look at requirements of used for PNA and Seattle/King County.
- c. Will work to set an objective numerical floor, so that it can be clearly evaluated.
- d. Revisions will be made to the document and shared with the Steering Committee.

3. Comment Summary: *Meeting Content*

- a. Not about how many people we reach, but what we do with their feedback
- b. Need to have some type of guide or requirement about what the meeting will cover and what kinds of questions engagement will cover
- c. Meeting shouldn't focus on whether or not a park is wanted, but what kind of park and how it will be used
- d. Should be a requirement to balance expert knowledge and community desires
- e. Agency needs to know limitations on what is possible for the project and be honest with residents
- f. Need to clarify what meeting content covers, not just definition of the type of meeting
- g. Could use TAP to raise the bar for engagement. Provide training and information to enhance understanding

Response Summary:

- a. Will look at further defining meeting content, ensuring that best practices are used in planning meeting content and facilitating meetings
- b. Need to keep requirements for content flexible enough to cover many different types of projects and meetings
- c. Will emphasize use of TAP to provide training on best practices for engagement
- d. Revisions will be made to document and shared with the Steering Committee

AGENDA ITEM: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

1. Comment: *Eligibility*

- a. Accessing professional services for enrollees is unclear – who is eligible?

Response Summary:

- a. There are two Selective and/or Competitive categories that all enrollees are eligible to apply for, although not all enrollees will receive these services:

- a. Professional Services – Selective and Competitive
- b. Planning and Design - Competitive
- b. All enrollees will have access to resource toolkits, directory (mentors and professionals), training and educations, and ongoing support from RPOSD.

2. Comment: *Initial Contact & Mentorship*

- a. Need a more flexible system to achieve goal of maximum participation in High/Very High Need Study Areas, especially because at the beginning of the process all needs may not be known
- b. Needs to be available at any point in process, not just beginning
- c. Need personal contact between RPOSD and especially High/Very High Need Study Areas especially in beginning
- d. Explore barriers to accessing TAP and make clear that TAP is available to those that experience barriers
- e. Need case manager, beyond volunteer support, that sticks with applicant through entire process
- f. More development needed for volunteer role, it's hard to imagine that a volunteer will be able to provide all the help that a High/Very High Need Study Area will need
- g. Broaden who can be a mentor, no need to limit it to RPOSD recipients. It's also very important that mentors are trained and know what is expected of them.

Response Summary:

- a. The intent is that TAP is accessible at any point, the initial questionnaire is to assess initial need. Document will be revised to more clearly reflect this.
- b. Intent is that RPOSD will take an active role in figuring out what help is needed by High/Very High Need Study Areas and work to make sure the help is delivered. Document will be revised to more clearly reflect this.
- c. Intent was to include mentors with experience with RPOSD's policies and procedures, we can broaden this. Training of mentors is included in the TAP.

3. Comment: *Professional Services*

- a. Need to be aware of the legal implications of hiring consultants because agency is ultimately responsible for design and construction
- b. Estimated costs for construction administration are low and depends on the size of the project

Response Summary:

- a. Legal implications can be covered in a resource tool kit, or training. Intent is to include information on contracts and other legal issues in the TAP.
- b. We will go back and look at funding in this category

4. Comment: *Phased Program Timeline*

- a. Need for ongoing TA, even after 10 years. There is a lot of staff turnover and attrition, so there is a constant need to train and educate.
- b. Assumption that funding will decrease after 10 years may not be correct, many projects take 3-4 or even 10 years to complete and agencies may need TA for multiple projects.
- c. Also, projects that last many years have a need for continuity and documentation.
- d. Voters need built projects. Need defined evaluation period and plan, and 10 years is too long. The money should be spent on building projects.
- e. Yes, the evaluation is critical and 10 years should be a good amount of time to show if it is working. Make monitoring and evaluation requirements more explicit.
- f. Professional Services during the year 1-2 pilot would be beneficial, especially Community Engagement help as this is the period when many projects will be defined.

Response Summary:

- a. Will clarify in document that results of evaluation are unknown, remove assumption that need for TA will decrease then. Will emphasize importance of monitoring and evaluation.
- b. Monitoring and evaluation of TAP will be discussed in depth at March 15th meeting.
- c. Will look into feasibility of adding professional services during pilot phase of TAP.

5. Comment: *Effectiveness of TAP*

- a. How will agencies work with communities that don't have a support organization to push projects forward?
- b. What about TAP is fundamentally different from Prop. A to get to root causes of inequality? How do we make sure we are providing expertise and turning the ship?
- c. Necessary to bridge the gap of inequality, need to focus on safety and gang reduction – does TAP get there?
- d. TAP should address structural issue of parks-as-a-back-burner-issue in High/Very High Need Study Areas
- e. Evaluation should be more outcome-based and be evaluated through a success lens, what does success look like?

Response Summary:

- a. TAP is designed to be flexible and to provide training and education on best practices in all aspects of park planning and design, including community engagement.
- b. Can add documentation of how TAP is different from what has been done in the past. Can add additional potential topics for training and education and resource toolkits, such as best practices for gang reduction and public health. Can emphasize understanding needs of High/Very High Need Study Areas and how TAP can help those agencies and organizations.
- c. Evaluation of TAP elements can help determine effectiveness of TAP and can lead to changes in how it is offered and what is being offered.

AGENDA ITEM: PUBLIC COMMENT

1. Francisco Romero

- a. TA could really be a big factor in turning the ship
- b. Provide models: 6th St. Bridge project in Washington D.C. includes anti-displacement language
- c. Define youth component and expand on definition of intervention, what programs work
- d. Use asset mapping to look at which organizations are available to assist in each Study Area, this could be helpful to agencies

2. Chanda Singh

- a. Lacks big-picture assistance thinking and intersectionality
- b. Need to think about why High/Very High Need Study Areas are high need - systemic policies, race and social justice issues can't be ignored
- c. Would be helpful to frame why we have certain elements in the TAP and look at historical framework
- d. Would like to see evaluation assistance on specific park projects, finance, leveraging other sources
- e. RPOSD needs to work with council members to make sure staff can participate in trainings and workshops

AGENDA ITEM: POLICIES, PART I

1. Comment: *Initial Allocation of Variable Funds*

- a. No comments

Response Summary:

Does everyone agree with the policy and allocation recommendations as written? Yes, it looks like everyone does, so it will remain as written.

2. Comment: *BoS Annual Designated Projects Policy*

- a. Funds could be allocated based on proportion of need
- b. Prop. A funding going away, but this is how BoS uses those funds today. 2% is a nominal amount of funds in the big picture.

Response Summary:

- a. Does everyone agree with the policy as written? Yes, it looks like everyone does, so it will remain as written

3. Comment: *CPI Update Policy*

- a. No Comments

Response Summary:

- a. Does everyone agree with the policy as written? Yes, it looks like everyone does, so it will remain as written.

Meeting Adjourned.



Public Comment

Measure A Implementation Steering Committee Meeting #7

January 23, 2018 | 9:30am - 12:00pm

Hall of Administration

Room 140



Name: Chanda Singh

Address: 695 S. Vermont Ave, South Tower, Suite 1400, LA, CA

Organization/Affiliation (if any): LA Co. DPH

Email/Phone: csingh@ph.lacounty.gov



Public Comment

Measure A Implementation Steering Committee Meeting #7

January 23, 2018 | 9:30am - 12:00pm

Hall of Administration

Room 140



Name: FRANCISCO ROMERO

Address: 135 N. MISSION ROAD, LA, CA 90033

Organization/Affiliation (if any): PROMESA BOYLE HEIGHTS

Email/Phone: fromero@proyecto-pastoral.org
