



**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 #5
October 19, 2017 9:30 am – 12:00 pm**

Steering Committee Members in Attendance:

Manal Aboelata	Jay Duke	Kim Lamorie
Greg Alaniz	Hugo Enciso	Amy Lethbridge
Jean Armbruster	Belinda Faustinos	Norma Martinez
Jane Beesley	Esther Feldman	Delia Morales
Alina Bokde	Hugo Garcia	Sussy Nemer
Maria Chong-Castillo	Karen Ginsberg	Stefan Popescu
Cheryl Davis	Mark Glassock	Bruce Saito
Reuben R. De Leon	John Jones	Teresa Villegas
Reyna Diaz	Tori Kjer	

Alternate Members in Attendance: Sylvia Arredondo, Nicole Jones, Clement Lau, Cara Meyer, Zachia Nazarai, Chanda Singh

AGENDA ITEM: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (TA)

1. **Comment Summary:** We need to see more about how someone would move through the TA program.
2. **Comment Summary:** More focus needs to be placed upon building organizational capacity. We should invest more funds in services that build capacity and not on consultant services which don't encourage agencies to learn. If an agency can't write a grant without significant assistance, they will not be able to administer the grant either – these skills need to be taught. We should clearly define benchmarks for how we can build organizational capacity and should invest funds in the beginning to ensure that agencies can get projects funded and built in their communities.
3. **Comment Summary:** The ultimate goal is strong multi-benefit projects and those projects need help with planning and design. More funds should be invested into planning & design.
4. **Comment Summary:** We need to challenge the notion of demand exceeding supply and build up elements where reach is described as limited. The amount of funds going to mentoring, strategic partnerships, and planning & design should be increased, with fewer funds going to application assistance.
5. **Comment Summary:** Don't choose a dollar amount that the TA program should cost, figure out how much need there is and make sure it is met.

Response Summary: The estimates presented are a best guess at how much TA is needed, although there is no way to gauge the need in a completely accurate way. The total dollar amount presented was not pre-determined. However, it is important to note that a balance must be struck between funds dedicated to TA and funds dedicated to building projects.

6. **Comment Summary:** Mentoring is very important to help build capacity but should not be volunteer-based because it is not reliable. A mentor should be able to support an applicant or project over the long term, since getting a project built takes many years.
Response Summary: Perhaps grant recipients could be required to give back by serving as a mentor. Or mentors could be paid by their employer and donate their time to RPOSD – for example, a successful city could allow an employee to spend a set number of work hours mentoring other agencies. Mentors should serve not to deliver TA but to help people determine which form of TA they need and where they can go to fulfill that need.
7. **Comment Summary:** TA should not be connected to Study Area need because even moderate or low need areas need assistance with capacity building.
8. **Comment Summary:** How much money will come from Prop A? Is the funding from Measure A sustainable over years? There needs to be long term investment and shouldn't rely on Prop A funds which are limited.
9. **Comment Summary:** There need to be guiding principles to inform the spending priorities of the TA program.
10. **Comment Summary:** The program needs to be analyzed annually to make sure funds are being spend appropriately.
11. **Comment Summary:** The TA program will not be successful if agencies are not aware of it.
12. **Comment Summary:** For planning and design funds, it is not helpful to predetermine how many of each plan type would be funded
Comment Response: Those are intended as hypotheticals to illustrate how many plans could be funded for that cost each year, not as a guideline of how many of each type would be funded.
13. **Comment Summary:** It may be useful to distinguish between different types of projects and the assistance they'll need, in order to better determine what kinds of TA are needed.

AGENDA ITEM: COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

1. **Comment Summary:** Projects using bonded funds will almost always be over \$500,000k and should require Approach A and B.
Response Summary: It is likely that A and B will have been done for the majority of bonded projects, but we do not want to require Approach A as it can be an insurmountable barrier in some jurisdictions. These are the minimum requirements and can be exceeded.
2. **Comment Summary:** We need to have a better understanding of what would qualify as Approach D, Participatory Engagement, and define some of the parameters surrounding this approach. Approach D should be required in more places. It is difficult to do but necessary if we want to do this right. Standrads defining what qualifies as Approach D are needed.
3. **Comment Summary:** Allowing community engagement that was conducted during the Parks Needs Assessment (PNA) or during the development of planning documents is not adequate because the engagement took place too far in the past and there is no way to critique the level of engagement that took place.
Comment Response: The level of engagement completed during the PNA varied widely and agencies that did an in depth process should not be punished by having to re-do the process. Community get tired of endless meetings without action.
Comment Response: It will be about 2 years since that outreach was conducted and priorities and communities change so engagement needs to be updated to ensure that current needs are addressed.
4. **Comment Summary:** Agencies may use a portion of their allocations or grant award for community engagement, but we need to find a way for the agencies to get those funds in advance since community engagement must be done prior to receiving the funds.
Comment Response: Yes, there should be a way to get an advance of allocation funds for use in community engagement.

5. **Comment Summary:** Add more participatory engagement requirements to the annual allocations. It is important to build parks that communities will actually use – only by using Approach D will we find out what the community actually wants in their parks.
6. **Comment Summary:** All engagement approaches need support conducting outreach, so they can ensure a good turnout and meaningful feedback. In addition to social media support, RPOSD should provide culturally sensitive print materials and translations. All outreach should be appropriate to the community – don't use Facebook posts if no community members are on the platform.
7. **Comment Summary:** Many other grants require that a project is consistent with other planning documents. Measure A should have this requirement too so that it's easier to leverage funds.
8. **Comment Summary:** How do the community engagement requirements interact with the TA program?
9. **Comment Summary:** The quality of engagement currently being done varies across the county. How can we even out the quality countywide? How can we help balance the need to get a project built with raising the bar for community engagement? Could we look at an agency's track record or evidence of community partnership?
Comment Response: Competitive grants will consider the quality of the engagement. We could consider indicators of community partnership in the evaluation of engagement efforts.
10. **Comment Summary:** for the middle bracket of allocations, the requirement should be Approach B and either C or D.

AGENDA ITEM: PUBLIC COMMENT

1. Is there a way for community based organizations to get funds to bring people to parks?
2. There needs to be more clarity on how technical assistance will fit in with Measure M and Measure H. Define specific outreach approaches. Let's hear more about how TA is frontloaded to High and Very High Need Areas and look at the long-term commitment for the program.

Meeting Adjourned.