



**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 #11  
April 5, 2018 9:30 am – 12:00 pm**

**Steering Committee Members in Attendance:**

Jean Armbruster	Belinda Faustinos	Yvette Lopez-Ledesma
Mark Baucum	Esther Feldman	Linda Lowry
Jane Beesley	Hugo Garcia	Sandra McNeill
Alina Bokde	Karen Ginsberg	Sussy Nemer
Tamika Butler	Bill Jones	Bonnie Nikolai
Scott Chan	John Johns	Dilia Ortega
Maria Chong-Castillo	Nicole Jones	Stefan Popescu
Reuben R. De Leon	Tori Kjer	Keri Smith
Reyna Diaz	Kim Lamorie	
Hugo Enciso	Amy Lethbridge	

**Alternate Members in Attendance:** Omar Gonzalez, Cara Meyer, Lilly Qi

**Topic: Funding Allocation Schedule Updates**

1. Due to pending litigation over Measure A, RPOSD is recommending that the BoS release annual allocations only, until the litigation is resolved. Any contracts for annual allocations will include a clause requiring repayment of the funds if RPOSD does not prevail in court.
2. No competitive grant rounds will be held until the litigation is resolved.
3. RPOSD will continue to assess and collect taxes during the appeal process.
4. **Questions**
  - a. What happens to annual allocation funds if an agency does not to use them during this period?
    - i. The funds will remain in the agency's account until the agency applies to use them. Any interest earned on these funds is returned to Measure A and redistributed according to the expenditure plan.
  - b. If there is a risk that money will have to be paid back after it has been used to do work, what incentive is there for cities to engage in contracts?
    - i. RPOSD recognizes that this is a risk that some agencies will not be willing to take. RPOSD is looking into various insurance options to mitigate the potential risk.
  - c. Is there information that can be shared with the COG?
    - i. We will create talking points to share with cities and get these to you as soon as we can
  - d. Please post FAQ on the website.
    - i. Information will be added to the website.
  - e. What is the benefit for the litigant?
    - i. To repeal the measure and not have to pay the tax.

**AGENDA ITEM: Competitive Grant Scoring Rubrics**

1. Consultant team worked with RPOSD staff to revise based on Steering Committee member comments, public comments, and additional work tying scoring to measure language.
2. Many terms are subjective. Urgent can refer to pending development, properties for sale that won't become available again, etc. It is up to the applicant to describe the urgency. In general, urgency indicates that if a project is not done now, the opportunity to do it later is severely diminished. Projects identified in the Parks Needs Assessment are timely but not necessarily urgent.
3. 30% is set aside for High and Very High Need Study Areas, but all scoring is independent of study area need.
4. There is a one-week timeframe to submit written comments on these criteria.

**1. Comment Summary: Natural Lands - Social Multi-Benefit**

- a. Issue of displacement cannot be addressed at all with only 3 points.
- b. Displacement criteria opens county to litigation. It is not in the measure language and shouldn't receive any points.
- c. Leave social multi-benefit criteria but take out anti-displacement
- d. As a policy issue, a study should be done on a countywide level about how capital investments affect displacement.
- e. All responsibility can't be put on Measure A, and issue will continue to be incorporated in future measures. Can't tackle it alone and can't ignore either.
- f. Not enough points or substance. Add more weight to anti-displacement scoring. Issues of equity should be addressed. However, better to keep it in as is than take it out completely.

**Response Summary:**

- a. Variety of viewpoints, look at places outside of scoring to address displacement as well.

**2. Comment Summary: Natural Lands - Environmental Multi-Benefit**

- a. Language doesn't reflect that areas of scoring are inherently linked together and not separable
- b. Categories pertaining to water, such as stormwater and water quality, should be looked at together, and all air elements looked at together as well.
- c. Should receive points for meeting regulatory requirements, and additional points for going above and beyond.
- d. Meeting regulatory requirements is required and shouldn't receive points.
- e. As worded now, no one is disadvantaged and not losing points for meeting requirements.
- f. Language that puts everything on the table creates more innovation in the future.
- g. 40 points for this category seems high.
- h. The whole grant category is about environmental benefits, so it should be scored high.

**Response Summary:**

- a. Overall consensus about grouping water subcriteria together and air subcriteria together within this category. Variety of viewpoints on regulatory requirements and number of points.

**3. Comment Summary: Level of Need & Leveraging of Funds**

- a. No points should be awarded for being in a High or Very High Need Study Area.
- b. Would be fair and points should be awarded for simply being in a High or Very High Need Study Area.
- c. Carve outs are not fair and should be avoided so that more money is available to everyone.
- d. Measure focused on level of need and it is important to emphasize this.
- e. 10 points for level of need is not enough. Too many category points are random. Look at programs and priorities and work backwards from there.
- f. Points to projects in High and Very High Need Study Areas is consistent with voter intent.

- g. Cities could have need that isn't reflected in the Parks Needs Assessment data.
- h. Projects in high need areas should receive points and it's helpful to the process so that low-scoring projects aren't winning.

**Response Summary:**

- a. Variety of viewpoints regarding receiving points for being in High or Very High Need Study Area; consensus that points should be awarded for serving or benefiting these areas.
- b. Variety of viewpoints on the number of points to be awarded.

**4. Comment Summary: Level of Need & Leveraging of Funds**

- a. Leveraging of funds needs more points in all categories because it is very important.
- b. Leveraging of funds creates urgency without changing point allocations, although double-dipping of points could be an issue.
- c. Leveraging of funds can be challenging for cities that don't have a lot of resources and capacity

**Response Summary:**

- a. As written, subcriteria try to balance leveraging opportunities for those cities that don't have access to funds to leverage by giving points for Measure A funds being the first points in, and for using *Community-Based Park Investment* or *Neighborhood Parks, Healthy Communities and Urban Greening* program funds as leveraging.

**5. Comment Summary: Acquisition Only**

- a. Social multi-benefits can't be met as it is written, language needs some work
- b. Open up discussion to talk about content of subcriteria rather than submit these comments in writing only.

**Response Summary:**

- a. Will revisit language to ensure the subcriteria can be met

**6. Comment Summary: Recreation Access Program**

- a. Need to add points for social multi-benefit.
- b. Should also add points for regional benefits and community partnerships so small cities and cities in high need areas can pull together resources and get points. Small cities rely on each other out of necessity.
- c. Want to encourage partnership building.
- d. Transit and transportation partnerships should be lumped into program benefits. Creates a clear path to developing programs.

**Response Summary:**

- a. General consensus that social multi-benefits should receive points. Program benefits criteria are intended to address these benefits, will take a look at the language.

**7. Comment Summary: Youth & Veteran Job Training and Placement**

- a. Should be able to score points for social multi-benefit
- b. How does this apply to youth & veteran?
- c. If program has social benefits, such as diverting youth from gangs, it should get points.

**Response Summary:**

- a. General consensus that social multi-benefits should receive points. Program benefits criteria are intended to address these benefits, will take a look at the language.

**8. Comment Summary: Planning & Design Funds**

- a. Need to remember that this is part of technical assistance program for those who can't develop projects on their own.

- b. Environmental, social, and health multi-benefits should be included. All program benefits should be included too.
- c. Existing challenges category is not necessary, those receiving technical assistance will have existing challenges.
- d. People will need help over time and technical assistance is ongoing. Timeliness and urgency is irrelevant for technical assistance.
- e. Applicants won't be able to articulate the benefits because they won't know them yet, so those shouldn't be included.
- f. Timeliness and urgency should award leveraging. Local priorities can create urgency if there is a long waiting list for certain projects.
- g. Add points for community partnerships to fill in gaps in expertise.

**Response Summary:**

- a. Variety of viewpoints on how points should be modified.
- b. Likely that organization that wants technical assistance will have some ideas about what the project is and will be able to describe challenges without having to say exactly what the benefits will be.
- c. Documented long term desire for program could be part of timeliness and urgency

**AGENDA ITEM: Revised Community Engagement Requirements**

1. **Question:** Does social media require translation?
  - a. Yes, all outreach materials must comply with requirements.
2. **Comment Summary**
  - a. Scoring needs to be more concrete. Scoring elements don't reflect points for specific numbers of outreach methods or meetings.

**Response Summary:**

- a. Goal was to balance quantifiable and subjective so agencies aren't just checking the box of having held a meeting. Trying to encourage quality engagement, rather than just a certain number of meetings or methods.

**AGENDA ITEM: Revised Technical Assistance Program**

1. **Comment Summary**
  - a. Look at it as if the measure has a sunset clause – pressure to deliver projects now.
  - b. Look to Prop. 68 as an example of prioritizing getting projects done and benefits into the community now.

**Response Summary:**

- b. Need might diminish over time, ongoing need for evaluation is still included here.
- c. Money comes from Implementation, Operations, & Oversight funds, so spending funds on TAP does not take funds away from grant programs, with the exception of the Planning & Design funds.

**AGENDA ITEM: Public Comments**

1. **Damaris Hernandez, Best Start/First 5 East LA, Proyecto Pastoral/Promesa Boyle Heights/Inner City Struggle**
  - a. Parks committee working to get more green space and resources and work towards equity
  - b. In East L.A. we have many people and few parks
  - c. Have a document to share summarizing our community work and how to get in contact
2. **Mikaela Randolph, resident**
  - a. Concerning rubric for community engagement, there should be more points in Category 3 and 4
  - b. Points should also increase in acquisition-only

