



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 #12**  
**April 26, 2018 9:30 am – 12:00 pm**

**Steering Committee Members in Attendance:**

Greg Alaniz	Jay Duke	Tori Kjer
Jean Armbruster	Hugo Enciso	Kim Lamorie
Jane Beesley	Hugo Garcia	Yvette Lopez-Ledesma
Mark Baucum	Michael Hughes	Linda Lowry
Scott Chan	Lacey Johnson	Delia Morales
Cheryl Davis	Bill Jones	Sussy Nemer
Reuben R. De Leon	John Johns	Stefan Popescu
Reyna Diaz	Nicole Jones	

**Alternate Members in Attendance:** Sylvia Arredondo, Clement Lau, Lilly Qi

**AGENDA ITEM: Park Needs Assessment Updates**

**1. Comment Summary: Timing of Parks Needs Assessment Updates**

- a. What about every 5 years to create incentives for change as quickly as possible?
- b. 8-10 years is not long from a city standpoint when thinking of time it takes to get a project done, working with interest groups, community groups, and matching funds
- c. Bonded projects must be completed in a certain amount of time. i.e. three years. If a significant number of funds are bonded, it may make more sense to do update quickly
- d. Over 8-10 years the metrics that need to be analyzed will change, so the baseline should be flexible to add in additional questions and evaluation criteria to address current issues moving forward

**Response Summary**

- a. Need to balance time and resources required to complete PNA. Not anticipating that Park Need will shift that quickly due to time needed to implement projects. Updated map of Park Need will be created every two years.
- b. Update of PNA will include everything that was done in 2016: outreach to all communities, asking priorities, socioeconomic assessment, etc.
- c. Park inventory data will be updated every year
- d. Park Need Map will be revised every two years.
- e. At a minimum keep previous assessment but may add additional items

**2. Comment Summary: Accuracy of Assessment**

- a. In some Study Areas, the PNA wasn't conducted accurately, with parks unaccounted for.
- a. Needs assessment for certain areas is inaccurate because the boundaries are wrong.
- b. Need to identify and correct errors prior to updates

**Response Summary:**

- a. Yes, we recognize that there are potential inaccuracies in the PNA. The annual update of the park inventory data should help address parks that were not accounted for. Need map will be updated every two years, recalculation of need and metrics to determine official level of need (full assessment) will happen every 8-10 years.
- b. Not possible to create separate study areas for each community in L.A. Many include multiple communities and would not serve study to redraw boundaries. Drawn as representative as possible with population in mind. Keeping Study Area boundaries consistent over time will allow for comparisons of changing Need Level. However, splitting a Study Area is something that could be reviewed as part of the next update of the PNA.

**AGENDA ITEM: Displacement Avoidance Strategy**

**1. General Comment Summary**

- a. Building parks will exacerbate displacement. We can't address the displacement and gentrification problem unless we collaboratively work with housing agencies.
- b. This is a bigger issue that will require overall county coordination.
- c. Clarify Policy 2: 30% to High and Very High Need Areas vs. serving those areas
- d. What does it mean to be "publicly accessible"? How is this defined?
- e. Can developer be required to pay park fees or build park as part of development agreement?

**Response Summary:**

- a. 30% of funds are targeted for projects in High and Very High Need areas. Points are awarded in competitive grant scoring for projects serving High and Very High Need areas
- b. Publicly accessible means all people are allowed to go there, but there may still be issues of the space being hard to find or feeling unwelcoming.
- c. Nonprofit housing developers may be co-applicants for Measure A funds. They must partner with a public parks agency. Park may be on private land but must be publicly accessible. State law allows jurisdictions to require park fees of developers (Quimby Act).

**2. Comment Summary: Goal 1**

- a. Reword policies 1 and 2 to clarify intent.
- b. Policy 3 needs to say "non-profit" not just "affordable."
- c. Consider another policy for competitive grants to give points for partnering with nonprofit organizations that extend programs and services to parks, involve the community more, and find innovative ways to serve users.
- d. Don't force cities to work with nonprofits through a point opportunity mandate.

**Response Summary:**

- a. Wording of policies can be fine-tuned.
- b. Policy 3 will be clarified to indicated that only nonprofit developers are eligible to apply.
- c. Can look into idea of partnering with nonprofit to increase programs and services at park.

**3. Comment Summary: Goal 2**

- a. Does Policy 1 violate the Brown Act? Are property acquisitions factored into outreach?
- a. Disclosure creates displacement challenges.
- b. Goal to minimize the direct impact on land values, but better nested under a countywide effort, not in a parks bubble

**Response Summary:**

- a. Brown Act has provisions to allow for sensitive negotiations. Decision-making body can make decisions in closed sessions and must report to public only when a decision is reached. Outreach requirements have been modified to limit requirements for acquisitions.

**4. Comment Summary: Goal 3**

- c. Can we add an additional goal to create a taskforce for anti-gentrification and anti-displacement? It would need to be a countywide task force to come up with countywide policy bringing together housing, parks, transportation, and public works. Taskforce could develop policies that communities can take and own, since many cities have need but no capacity to develop on their own policies.
- d. Displacement is statewide and we need statewide solutions also. There needs to be a discussion between city and community on what the city can do and how it can support residents.
- e. Policy #1 should include a requirement that cities talk about displacement with their communities, or should be required to have a taskforce to discuss displacement.
- f. This is a broad issue that Measure A can't solve alone. Housing subsidy programs are needed to avoid displacement.
- g. Look at data collection piece as bigger issue than just parks
- h. Look at collaborations with Metro, non-profits, housing developers
- i. Policies need teeth to be effective. We should promote a proactive integration of all agencies to discuss displacement.
- j. Need technical assistance for coordinating and leveraging funding in ways that reduce displacement.
- k. Park agencies are operating under charters with limited powers and can't necessarily advocate for housing needs but can take to the board of supervisors and push planning departments. Park agencies should definitely be involved in any working group though, as we have expertise to contribute. This committee should recommend to the board of supervisors that a committee/working group be established to address these issues countywide.
- l. Already opportunities that exist and there are lots of partners to address issues. Metro has many goals and programs to address issues outlined here that are funded and structured in a similar manner as parks.

**Response Summary:**

- a. Add to Policy #1 to encourage or require conversations about displacement. T. Kjer and J. Armbruster will form a sub-committee to look at this. Will take goals and policies and reorder and reorganize to see if there is anything else to be added. Will share at next meeting.
- b. Idea of creating a new goal or recommendation that the Board of Supervisors should convene a countywide task force on the issue and include RPOSD as a member of the taskforce along with other agencies that need to be part of the discussion and solution.
- c. Idea of an ongoing taskforce that could advise RPOSD on displacement issues and concerns in the immediate future.

**5. Comment Summary Goal 4:**

- a. No comments

**AGENDA ITEM: Policy Updates**

***Comment Summary: Bonding***

- a. Is there a threshold we need to meet to bond?

***Response Summary:***

- a. No prohibition on bonding amount, but bonds under 100 million don't get a good rate. RPOSD will work with cities who want to bond to organize together

***Comment Summary: General Grantmaking Policy***

- a. If 30% set aside for High and Very High Need areas could change over time, it needs to be clarified that any change would be linked to data collected as metrics

***Response Summary:***

- a. Noted.

**AGENDA ITEM: Public Comment**

1. ***Sissy Trinh, SEACA:*** This is a start. We do need a taskforce that will help cities succeed in building great parks and stabilizing neighborhoods at the same time. Enterprise has been partnering with Metro on this these issues for years, so we don't need to create something from scratch. Displacement affects everyone and can't be figured out in two weeks. Park agencies can always push on other departments to make sure displacement is being addressed. All the different efforts need to be aligned.

*Meeting Adjourned.*