



**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 #2
May 25, 2017 9:30 am – 12:00 pm**

Steering Committee Members in Attendance:

Manal Aboelata	Hugo Garcia	Delia Morales
Greg Alaniz	Karen Ginsberg	Sussy Nemer
Jean Armbruster	Mark Glasscock	Bonnie Nikolai
Jean Beesley	Michael Hughes	Dilia Ortega
John Bwarie	John Johns	Ronda Perez
Scott Chan	Tori Kjer	Stefan Popescu
Maria Chong-Castillo	Kim Lamorie	Barbara Romero
Cheryl Davis	Clement Lau	Jeff Rubin
Reuben De Leon	Amy Lethbridge	Bruce Saito
Reyna Diaz	Linda Lowry	Keri Smith
Jay Duke	Norma Martinez	Brian Stiger
Hugo Enciso	Michael McCaa	Stephanie Stone
Belinda Faustinos	Sandra McNeill	Katy Young
Esther Feldman	Cara Meyer	

RPOSD Staff in Attendance: Rocio Diaz, Agie Jordan, Sara Keating, Arcy Navarette, Warren Ontiveros, Sok Tay, Ani Yeghiyan

PlaceWorks Staff in Attendance:

David Early, C.C. LaGrange, Jessica Wuyek

Agenda Item: Background Information

1. *Question:* When the inventory was done, did it include joint-use agreements with schools?
Response: It did not evaluate the details of any joint-use agreement because they tend to have complicated arrangements. Facilities available to the public through a joint-use agreement were included in the total park acreage and amenities matrix, when identified by the reporting agency.
2. *Question:* Can you talk more about the 2/3 weighting formula?
Response: The idea behind the 2/3 weighting formula is that areas that are more densely populated use their parks and amenities at a higher rate than less populous area and thus have higher maintenance and replacement rates.

Agenda Item: Future Steering Committee Meeting Topics and Schedule

1. *Question:* What specifically will be covered in the March 2018 meeting regarding equity?
Response: We will present a methodology memo that describes a researched approach to equity and how this project will ensure equitable distribution of funds with a way to track and report.
Comment: Because this item is crucial, I propose an earlier discussion, perhaps September.
Response: Yes, equity is the main item on the September agenda, and will be supported by the release of a park equity background memo this summer. The March meeting will formalize the discussions that take place over the course of multiple steering committee meetings into a methodology that details RPOSD's approach to equity in the administration of Measure A.
2. *Comment:* Let's also consider moving some of these steering committee meetings to other venues throughout the area, particularly in areas of high need.
Response: Many people come from Central Los Angeles so we would like to keep the location central. Holding the meetings in one consistent location also makes it easier for SC members to remember where they need to be and reduces confusion. If a number of people share this sentiment, email Jane Beesley or Warren Ontiveros and we will consider that option.
3. *Comment:* Maybe we could do weekend field visits to various sites.
4. *Question:* Are subcommittee meetings subject to Brown Act? If not, maybe we could hold those meetings around the County?
Response: We are not doing subcommittee meetings but if we were, they would be subject to the Brown Act.

Agenda Item: Overview of Granting Process

1. *Question:* Is technical assistance available to help teach agencies about durable materials and other solutions that meet their needs?
Response: Yes, that's exactly the type of thing that could be covered under technical support. We want people to be informed, so technical assistance would include providing education as well as administration assistance.
2. *Question:* Is the eligibility process recurring or one-time?
Response: We envision it as a recurring process, as several of the items suggested as required for eligibility will need to be updated over time. We have not determined how often eligibility would need to be updated.
Comment: There is always a year or two delay between eligibility and project implementation, I'd like to push for a more frequent process.
Comment: It sounds like a very extensive administrative process. We want to be careful what we require so that it doesn't prevent people from getting work done in the field. We should have a checklist of 5 things that they can easily check off to meet eligibility. If they have to renew every 2 years, it becomes an arduous task.
Response: Two things are being confused here. We don't want anyone to wait 2 years before they can begin projects – eligibility can be established at any time. We don't want a delay between eligibility and implementation. We want them to move through immediately. We want the eligibility to stay on record for a pre-determined amount of time.
Comment: It reads as though it's a one-time eligibility.
Response: There are things we will want updated regularly, like engagement. If study areas go more than 2 or 3 years without updating engagement to maintain eligible status, it may not serve the community well if the community voice isn't updated. A time cycle will be identified to determine how often we will require updated engagement and updated paperwork.

Comment: Each new project should automatically trigger a new community engagement process. There should be engagement for each specific project, regardless of timeline.

Comment: Agree with the previous comment. We don't want to give false expectations to the community. If we're going back out the community with new ideas, the community might get false hope. If they're doing engagement every X years but there is still a project in progress or stalled, it may hurt their confidence.

3. *Question:* To clarify, will there be outreach related to awareness of grant program eligibility and a separate process for specific projects?

Response: That is one possibility. There may not be a separate process for Categories 1 & 2, especially for those agencies receiving very small allocations.

4. *Comment:* We should sketch out RPOSD's expectations of the outreach process. We need to encourage support for future park funding. We need to have a strong outreach process associated with each project. I encourage you to consider that.

Comment: The whole process should be driven by public input. Period. Annual is too often. If you have the funding for the project, THEN you do engagement. Don't require engagement if we don't have money. You want the constituents to drive the projects.

Comment: It is critical for RPOSD to develop guidance about how outreach is done. Not just when but also, how it's done.

5. *Question:* For competitive grants, will there be any way to prioritize the high need areas in the grant process?

Response: We assume yes, and we'd love to hear your input. As we create the processes, some, if not all, categories will contain a scoring component that gives a bonus to higher need areas. We don't want to make it impossible for lower need areas to get funding but we do want higher need areas to get the funding they need.

6. *Comment:* Taking into consideration the bonding feature of the measure and the agencies that are getting less, bonding can be a way to get them more. However, they'll probably never get to the millions required of some of these projects.

Response: We haven't gotten those numbers yet. Bonding should produce something like 10-15 times the annual allocation.

7. *Comment:* I am proud of gold standard that is in place regarding equity. The reason it's important for outreach to be baked in is because a portion of that goes to high need areas and we won't move the equity needle if we don't build it in.

8. *Question:* Is it true that it's still hard for smaller cities to apply for eligibility and get in the queue? Is there a possibility for establishing a bench of non-profits to help and support cities early in the process?

Response: Yes, it's about ongoing engagement. Technical assistance needs to be defined and provided to agencies. Support from CBOs could encourage engagement. You are all here to provide input for what specifically we need to offer to agencies.

9. *Question:* The outreach for the Needs Assessment utilized contractors as CBOs for a small stipend. That model could work and support the need for CBOs to support cities. Will we talk more about engagement and technical assistance?

Comment: One place we're nudging up against is reconciling the Needs Assessment engagement piece back into the community organizations. It was a great process and helped pass the measure. We need to connect back into the communities, commissions, council members. Maybe there is a component built into the process where that type of engagement (commission and council) becomes a part of the structure and process. It could be a component of eligibility. When agencies and departments have staff changes, projects and efforts could be lost. Engaging the political leaders could foster stronger long-term involvement from local leadership and ensure that projects don't die due to administrative reasons.

Comment: It's not that cities don't want to do outreach, it's that they can't afford it. We need to spend time on the percentages. I prefer one discussion instead of brushing on 5 memos. If we don't do it collectively, we're not going to get to consensus. We need to spend time really digging into the allocations to make sure we can build. I would rather have less topics to review, I don't care about some of these topics. Send us emails on those things and dedicate more time to discussing allocations and engagement. What is eligible and what isn't.

10. *Comment:* Technical assistance is a key piece to this whole discussion. We need to talk a lot. We should break into small groups to talk just about technical assistance. There should be a flexible model of assistance. It's almost like mentoring. Cities may need help with administrative process down to materials. Cities and non-profits going after funding is very important. Maybe at next meeting we can spend a lot of time talking about it.

Response: One of the reasons for the summer memos is to bring everyone up to speed on where we are. We are considering all these components of equity.

11. *Question:* How will we consider collaboration across sectors?

Response: We see collaboration as a piece that we can support through technical assistance by funneling money to CBOs who implement outreach and other park projects.

12. *Comment:* Maybe we could bring together small groups during summer break months? Meetings could be optional, not mandatory. Interest?

Response: Everyone is interested, so we can do that.

13. *Comment:* Along with engagement process, I encourage you to explore looking at other items like M&S, public safety, and land tenure. These are vitally needed to make sure the project is a success.

14. *Question:* What happens to money that is collected in study areas that don't apply for or receive funding?

Response: Any interest accrued goes back into overall expenditure funds and is then distributed. We should treat it like a red flag if a city isn't using funds and then we can ask them why not and see if they can share it with another jurisdiction.

Agenda Item: Allocation Estimates

1. *Question:* Do you have a timeline for when cities will start receiving money?

Response: Funds will be available July 2018.

2. *Question:* Can you clarify Table 1—monies must be spent within each respective study area?

Response: In general yes, the money must be spent in the study area.

Question: But that is not the case for Table 2, correct?

Response: Correct

Agenda Item: Allocation Process

1. *Question:* I am concerned about sharing allocations between study areas of varying level of need. We can't allow high need areas to give away funds to low need areas.

Response: RPOSD will have to determine if the need is there and if it's appropriate. Any study area sharing funds with another must prove that sharing the funds will benefit their study area as well as the receiving study area.

Comment: We need to outline specific criteria for tracking requirements.

Comment: There are significant adjacency issues regarding level of need.

Comment: This loops back to eligibility. The process of sharing needs to be very transparent so that not only RPOSD can track it, but also communities can monitor.

2. *Comment:* Cities that have multiple study areas should be able to share funds within the city rather than keeping funds in each respective study area.
3. *Comment:* I'd like to take a look at how sharing can impact differences in race and ethnicity. This conversation is place-based. Let's review the Jennifer Wolch study to address racial inequities. We can't focus completely on geography, we need to consider race in addition to socio-economics.
4. *Comment:* We need think about sharing over time so we can build in flexibility that makes it easy to share funds over time so opportunities are maximized.
5. *Comment:* Should sharing of funds be allowed?
Response: All members are in agreement.

Agenda Item: Engagement Approach

1. *Question:* What languages will the website be available in? Will printed materials be available in different languages for those who don't have social media and internet?
Response: We will probably use the 5 languages identified in the Needs Assessment: Spanish, Chinese, Korean, Armenian, and English. If other languages are requested, we can explore that option.
2. *Question:* Will there be direct outreach to establish a list of eligible community-based organizations? Social media is good for general public but it doesn't work if it's not targeted. Who are these organizations that could receive training and funding?
Response: We will develop a list.
3. *Question:* Can you tell us about the Park Funding 101 meetings?
Response: There have been nine total meetings and one more pending in Antelope Valley. They were well attended. Agencies had great questions about the processes. People indicated interest in giving input on grant process. They also want to help beta test technology. Many of the questions that have come up here, the agencies asked.

Public Comment

1. *Question:* When will the grant amounts be set and discussed? What about project performance periods...will they be set in stone or extendable? If they are set, how long will that be? What about allocation grants? Regarding a list of non-profits, that came up in a grant meeting yesterday and LA County Department of Parks and Recreation thinks that's a great idea and would love a list of agencies.
Response: Allocations will flow to cities and study areas based on projects they come up with. There won't be minimum and maximum numbers. Competitive grants will be done in cycles specific to project types (swimming pools, landscaping, recreation centers, etc.). Those cycles might have numbers attached but it's not developed yet. Timeframes will be similar but will be developed based on the grant cycles/calendar.
2. *Question:* Regarding the eventual discussion of equity methodology. This is intended to further guidance on the distribution of funding?
Response: It is intended to document what we're doing regarding what we hope is an equitable approach to allocations and tracking measures to make sure we meet our goals. How we can get money into areas of high need.
3. *Question:* May we have access to a contact sheet of other steering committee members so we can network or does that violate the Brown Act?
Response: You can communicate but do not email more than half the group, do not send chain emails as these are considered serial meetings and violate the Brown Act.

Meeting Adjourned.