



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 #13
May 31, 2018 9:30 am – 12:00 pm

Steering Committee Members in Attendance:

Hugo Enciso	John Jones	Sussy Nemer
Belinda Faustinos	Nicole Jones	Bonnie Nikola
Esther Feldman	Amy Lethbridge	Stefan Popescu
Hugo Garcia	Yvette Lopez-Ledesma	Barbara Romero
Karen Ginsberg	Linda Lowry	Bruce Saito
Michael Hughes	Sandra McNeil	Keri Smith
Bill Jones	Delia Morales	Stephanie Stone

Alternate Members in Attendance: Manal Aboelata, Greg Alaniz, Jean Armbruster, Alina Bokde
Tamika Butler, Onnig Bulanikian, Scott Chan, Maria Chong-Castillo, Reyna Diaz

AGENDA ITEM: Revised Draft Displacement Avoidance Strategy

1. General Comment Summary

- How will the effectiveness of the displacement strategy be tracked?
- Very forward-thinking policy that could serve as a model
- Language should be sharpened. Forming a taskforce isn't the strongest recommendation here, it's that the BOS take action related to displacement and use of funds from Measure A and other measures.
- This should not be limited to Measure A funding
- Risk of park development contributing to displacement can be reduced if there are parks everywhere in the County.
- There should be a partnership between housing developers and park developers to tackle the issue of displacement.

Response Summary:

- The effectiveness of the displacement strategy can be tracked through the metrics RPOSD will be tracking and sharing this data with others.
- The steering committee should ask the board to establish a task force and provide additional funding.
- The steering committee recognizes that there are a variety of factors that contribute to displacement. Parks are not the only source of displacement and this needs to be addressed countywide.

2. Comment Summary: Goal 5

- How can funding sources address displacement?
- Businesses should be included in Goal 5, Policy 1.

- c. Clarify that the funding sources in Goal 5, Policy 2 are not solely attributed to local and state funding by adding "Identifying adequate funding from a variety of sources"

Response Summary:

- a. We are supporting countywide efforts that includes other agencies and leaders
 - b. Add health, schools, local jurisdictions and businesses in Goal 5, Policy 1.
 - c. Include "identify funding from a variety of sources" at the end of Goal 5, Policy 2. Add "rate and type" of property sales to Goal 5, Policy 6.
- 3. Comment Summary: Recommendation to BOS**
- d. SC recognizes displacement as an issue, parks are one part of the issue, but not the only source.
 - e. Displacement needs to be addressed countywide.
 - f. BOS should adequately fund displacement avoidance efforts with funds from a variety of sources

Response Summary:

- g. These points will be added to the proceedings.

AGENDA ITEM: Grant Administration and Project Delivery

1. Comment Summary: Grant Application Process

- a. It would be helpful to send out ongoing updates on funding opportunities. Sending notifications on updates of the grants 6 months in advance is not frequent enough.

Response Summary:

- a. Updates on grant opportunities will be provided through digital platforms such as the RPOSD website, social media and email blasts. Competitive grant calendar, which goes out through 2030 will also be on RPOSD's website

2. Comment Summary: Eligible Costs

- a. How was the 30% design threshold determined for soft costs?
- b. For Category 1 and 2 funding, at what point can you charge against a grant?
- c. Cost allocation rates are not used effectively by non-profit organizations and Technical Assistance needs to aid these non-profit organizations with this concern.
- d. The grant evaluation committee should include community service specialist. There should be an understanding of what communities need on a broad spectrum and how these grants can best serve the community.

Response Summary:

- a. The 30% design threshold is based on industry standards in the design field.
- b. A contract must be fully executed before reimbursable work can be done.
- c. Education on cost allocation rates can be added as a TAP topic for resource toolkits, training and ongoing assistance.
- d. Specific types of experts will be considered for each evaluation panel and this particular suggestion will be reviewed by RPOSD.

3. Comment Summary: Contract Amendments

- a. Site visit notifications should be extended from 2-days to 5-10 days

Response Summary:

- a. Noted.

4. Comment Summary: Good Standing

- a. Setting five year time limit on M&S funding will push agencies to use these funds.
- b. A 60 day turn-around by RPOSD is not long enough to rectify Good Standing issues. Can both grantee and RPOSD ensure efficient turnarounds?

- c. There needs to be a plan to reinstate good standing for agencies and or organizations that lose good standing.
- d. The document should describe how it will set aside 30% of funding for High and Very High Need Study Areas.
- e. Good Standing should also be affected if a project was meant to serve High or Very High Needs Study Areas but is not doing so.
- f. Need to be able to learn lessons from projects that fail to do what they claimed they would do so that mistakes aren't repeated in the future. Especially if established "best practices" are followed and the project still doesn't perform as promised.
- g. Projects can fail to meet all their stated goals for a variety of reasons, some of which are beyond the control of the agency. For example, if a fire burns all around a new trailhead, not many people will want to hike the trail until the vegetation grows back. It doesn't seem fair to have agencies lose good standing in those cases.
- h. An applicant should not be allowed to get points for serving a High or Very High Need Study Area and then not have to prove that the project does actually serve High and Very High Need Study Areas. If a project that was supposed to serve High and Very High Need Study Areas is not serving residents of these areas, it's not ok to place the blame on the people that did not show up. We need to acknowledge that there are many barriers for low-income and people of color accessing these sites.
- i. If a project doesn't meet this goal, they need to be held accountable. Not necessarily lose good standing, but should have to take steps to remedy the issue. It's problematic.
- j. There is disagreement on this because you can't have it both ways – can't award points for claiming a project will do something and then not actually do it. The points become meaningless if there is no accountability.
- k. Evidence shows that proximity is what matters – it takes a lot of work to get people to a park that's far away, so serving High and Very High Need Study Areas is difficult.

Response Summary:

- a. Efficient turnaround to resolve issues is needed from both parties. By the time the notification of impending loss of good standing is issues, the RPOSD Program Manager will have been working with the grantee to resolve the issues – the notification should never be a surprise to the grantee. One solution could be to add an extension if the grantee can prove that progress is being made on the issues.
- b. Will add information about returning to good standing after loss of good standing.
- c. Yes, the process of ensuring that the 30% of funds are expended on projects located in High and Very High Need Study Area will be added to the document. The process will be that about 70% of funds will be awarded to the highest-scoring projects. If 30% of funds have not gone to projects in High and Very High Need Study Areas at that point, then funds will be awarded to the highest-scoring projects located in High and Very High Need Study Areas until the target is met.
- d. General agreement that projects that received points for serving or benefitting residents from High and Very High Need Study Areas should be evaluated to see if they are meeting this goal and if any lessons can be learned if they are not.
- e. Lack of agreement on status of good standing being affected by failing to serve residents of High and Very High Need Study Areas, lack of agreement on how these agencies could return to good standing if it is lost for this reason. Not certain if there should be penalties for an agency if their project did not perform the way they had anticipated.
- f. Awarding points to projects that serve High and Very High Need Study Areas remains contentious due to accountability issues once the project is built.

AGENDA ITEM: Next Steps for Measure A

1. General Comment Summary:

- a. What is the status of the litigation?
- b. Will there be an oversight committee? What will the committee be comprised of and how will it operate?
- c. Will there be an entitlement?

Response Summary:

- a. The county is preparing a brief that is due in June and then the court will set a date for the litigation.
- b. The Board of Supervisors will choose the committee. The purpose of the committee is to ensure that the Measure is implemented according to the law.
- c. An entitlement will not be provided. Total allocation sums will be published in July once final numbers are in.

AGENDA ITEM: Public Comment

1. Elizabeth Norman, City of Long Beach

- Goal 1, Policy 4: Do local municipality requirements need to be considered?
Response: Yes, all local requirements must be complied with.
- For M&S, if the project is completed by a nonprofit housing developer, who will maintain and operate the park?
Response: An M&S plan must be submitted as part of the grant application. Once a project is completed, either the city or non-profit organization implementing the park project can take control over maintenance. It is up to the city and nonprofit to make this determination prior to applying for the grant. The detail of who is responsible for M&S will be in the grant contract.

2. Francisco Romero, Promesa Boyle Heights

- Will the draft document be translated into Spanish? We have worked hard to translate everything for our community members so far.
Response: We will look into translating, but it will only be for the final document, not the draft version released to the Committee on the 14th.
- Why is the Board Letter coming out before the document is released?
Response: The Board letter is needed to keep funding moving forward on schedule. The Board Letter regarding the policies, procedures, and guidelines will not be submitted until the fall.