



DRAFT 2450 LA Park Needs Assessment

Meeting Date: Aug 19, 2025
Meeting Time: 10am-12pm PST
Meeting Location: In-Person; EXPO Center
3980 Bill Robertson Ln, Los Angeles, CA 90037
Subject: LA Park Needs Assessment - Steering Committee Meeting #5

Project Team Attendees:

City of Los Angeles, RAP

- Jimmy Kim
- Matthew Rudnick
- Brenda Aguirre
- Ryan Carpio
- Cathie Santo Domingo
- Chinyere Stoneham
- Darryl Ford
- Meghan Luera
- Jeremy Silva

OLIN

- Jessica Henson
- Andrew Dobshinsky
- Sarah Swanseen

The Robert Group

- Christina Monzer

KDI

- Eric Riley
- Leslie Dinkin
- Nora Healy

Agency: Artifact

- Melanie Buffa

Estolano Advisors

- Cecilia Estolano
- Thomson Dryjanski

Better World Group

- Kimberly Guo

GreenInfo Network

- Dan Rademacher
- María Lamadrid

UCLA/Luskin

- Jon Christensen

West of West

- Angela Lufkin

HR&A

- Jill Bengochea

Steering Committee Member/Organization	Committee Member		Present
	First Name	Last Name	
Trust for Public Land	Sarah	Friedman	X
Resources Legacy Fund	Alfredo	Gonzalez	
The Nature Conservancy	Kelsey	Jessup	
LA Neighborhood Land Trust	Tori	Kjer	
LA County Department of Parks and Recreation	Sheela	Mathai	X
Community Partners	Yvette	Lopez-Ledesma	X
University of Southern California	Vanessa	Carter Fahnestock	

LA Waterkeeper	Bruce	Reznik	X
Los Angeles Alliance for a New Economy	Lauren	Ahkiam	
Prevention Institute	Francisco	Romero	X
Friends of the LA River	Candice	Dickens-Russell	
Office of the Deputy Mayor of Infrastructure, City of LA	Geoff	Thompson	X
Deputy Mayor for Neighborhood Services, City of LA	Jacqueline	Hamilton	X
Deputy Mayor of Community Safety	Karren	Lane	
Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority	Brian	Baldauf	X
Individual Expert	Deborah	Cohen	X
Los Angeles Neighborhood Initiative	Veronica	Hahni	
Los Angeles Parks Foundation	Lindsey	Kozberg	X
California Conservation Corps	Duane	Wilson	X
City of LA Recreation and Parks Commission Representative	Marie	Lloyd	X
Los Angeles City/ County Native American Indian Commission Chair	Rich	Toyon	X

Alternates and Other Attendees Organization	Name		Present
	First Name	Last Name	
Los Angeles Alliance for a New Economy	Stephany	Calvillo	X
Los Angeles Neighborhood Initiative (Alternate)	Aleigh	Lewis	X
Prevention Institute (Alternate)	Rob	Baird	
California Conservation Corps (Alternate)	Nikki	Morales	X
LA Waterkeeper (Alternate)	Maggie	Gardner	
Office of the Mayor	Estefany	Garcia	X
Trust for Public Land (Alternate)	Lee	Clauss	
Trust for Public Land (Alternate)	Nola	Talmage	

Meeting Objectives

- 1) Share Project updates including schedule status, guidelines, classifications, budget and cost estimates.
- 2) Walk through the draft PNA and facilitate discussion.

AGENDA

Time	Agenda Items	Notes
10:00-10:05	1. Welcome	Cecilia Estolano (EA) called the meeting to order.
10:05-10:15	2. General Updates and Schedule Status	Jessica Henson (OLIN) presented a quick update on the project status and schedule. The PNA is near the end of the "Draft PNA" stage and the Consultant Team and RAP are preparing to share a Draft PNA with the public on September 2nd.
10:15-10:25	3. Draft PNA Walk Through and Discussion	Jessica walked through the Draft PNA report contents and gave a high level summary of each chapter. The Draft PNA is organized into 5 sections; Context, Recreation and Parks Today, Community Needs, Guidelines, and Implementation. Within these 5 sections there are 15 total chapters. The back of the book contains resources including the universe of sites scoring and list of engagement meetings from throughout the process.
10:25-10:40	4. Guidelines and Classifications	Andrew Dobshinsky (OLIN) presented the PNA's proposed Park Classification system. This includes reclassifying the three groups that RAP currently has into a total of 19 classifications. Updating these classifications will help the Department to more efficiently plan and manage their park and recreation assets across the City through the PNA's definition of common elements within each of the classifications. Deborah Cohen asked if there are specific items within the PNA guidelines that emphasize the value of social interaction within parks. Tori Kjer (LANLT) noted that there are a lot of continuing needs for consideration of park design. She emphasized the need for flexibility. Andrew clarified that the guidelines are stating typical conditions and that there is flexibility noted within the guidelines. Multi-benefit use and "micro-use" could be further emphasized within the PNA. Andrew also noted that ongoing engagement will be key Rich Toyon (LACC NAIC) asked for additional information about the benchmarking exercise. What were the cities and what were the criteria being compared? - Andrew noted that peer cities were selected to include regional peers, aspirational peers, and comparable cities. - The types of things being compared included budget, staff, philanthropic support etc. Brian Baldauf (MRCA) noted that there is a value in the reclassification. He asked about how linear parks and greenways are desired and how they can be emphasized in the PNA since there are a lot of opportunities within the City. Geoff Thomson (Mayors Office of Infrastructure) asked for clarification about the level of service basis. Andrew clarified that LOS in the PNA indicates the number of something needed per resident.

		Marie Lloyd (RAP Commissioners) - Asked if the LOS take into account quality of service to which Andrew clarified that it does not. Lindsey Kozberg (LAPF) asked if the level of quality could be assessed to highlight areas of the City for prioritizing spending to raise quality of service. Andrew noted that the Prioritization included this type of differentiation of existing conditions within one of its criteria.
10:40-11:05	5. Budget Data and Cost Estimates	Jessica Henson presented the PNA analysis on Budget and Cost Estimation for the plan's proposals. Deputy Mayor Jacqueline Hamilton asked if expenses are included in the operating expenses amount. Jill Bengochea (HR&A) noted that a ratio of staff to expense amounts was applied to inform the estimate. DM Hamilton added that the Mayors office is in the process of finalizing a joint powers agreement with LAUSD which will ease the process of opening Community School Parks (CSPs). This was noted as a means to reduce the overall cost of acquisition required to raise acreage level of service through new park sites. She asked if the PNA can provide a list of CSPs to prioritize for areas that are the most park-poor. It was noted that a similar analysis to this had been recently completed by the Project team and that a later agenda item would provide information on this. Geoff Thomson noted that there was a rate payer action in 2008 which forced the City to repay the City's utilities costs. He asked if power generation and energy/water conservation factor into the future estimates. Jessica noted that even though water is being conserved, the price of water continues to increase. Power generation could be an option but it has not been modeled yet within the scope of the PNA cost estimate analyses. Tori Kjer asked, how have other Cities managed their parks? Do they also pay for utilities? Jill noted that we have looked at the role of private spending. Philanthropic cultures in other cities and conservancies. Funding structures can be difficult to compare as they are so different in structure. Many cities have started to pay for utilities. NYC primarily has funding from the general fund. SF has a charter mandated appropriation but their general fund is still the main contribution. Francisco Romero (Prevention Institute) - Comparison to other dept. and the City on the whole. - Can add this to the PNA - Matthew - portion going to public safety vs other depts Bruce Reznik - full cost accounting, what this gets you in terms of health savings and other co-benefits. Jessica noted that the benefits of parks are well documented in the PNA but in terms of the dollars saved there is not a full accounting. Tori noted that

		TPL has this type of accounting. CE noted that the City/County are doing this at the same time and that synergy is important. Lindsey (LAPF) noted that there is a shared cost and opportunity with other overlapping school districts. Jacklyn Hamilton stated that violence reduction, domestic violence, mental health are all factors that should be noted. These rarely have dollar amounts associated with them. Geoff Thompson asked about peer city comparisons for concessions and sponsorships asking how our fees compare to note if an increase would be warranted. - Jill noted that this is included at a high level in the funding sources listed in the PNA and Jessica added that sponsorships and fees have different levels of acceptability within communities and should be treated carefully. Yvette Ledesma-Lopez (Community Partners) asked what is the current charter mandate? The Consultant Team stated that it is 0.0325 per 100 dollars.
11:05-11:10	Break	
11:10-11:55	6. Prioritization Updates	Andrew (OLIN) presented an update to the Site Based Prioritization framework including updates to the criteria and final scores and rankings. Then Jon Christensen (GreenInfo Network/UCLA) presented findings of an analysis that looked at public parcels within each of the 36 proposed site grid-cells identified in the PNA Universe of Sites methodology. He shared that each of the grid cells contained at least one public school parcel and at least one other public parcel. Overall across the 36 grid-cells there were also several parcels that are owned by the City and zoned as open space. Jon closed by noting that this was a starting point for further exploration and ground-truthing. It was asked if the team had considered adjacencies. Dan Rademacher (GreenInfo Network) noted that the team has looked at this for the initial assessment into selection of the Grid cells but the current public parcel overlay considered only what is within the extents of the 36 square mile grids. It was clarified that no privately vacant land was assessed; just public. Lindsey Kozberg (LAPF) noted that it would be an important step in using this information to differentiate between different LAUSD charters. Sheela Mathai (LA County Parks and Rec) asked if this information would be hosted on the project website as .shp files or other formats for public and agency use. Jessica noted that the grid cells as prospective sites would be shown on the website however the level of detail of this overlay analysis,

		while being available for RAP and other Agency needs, may not be. This will be subject of a future discussion. Geoff Thompson noted that there are competing priorities for City-owned land and future land acquisition specifically for housing and homelessness. Tori Kjer noted that this is a typical response heard at the park advocacy level and that co-development should be considered whenever a housing project is taking precedence. Deputy Mayor Hamilton noted that it is important that these proposed sites be further ground truthed, adding that it could be possible many of them do not have much green space and already rely on public and park lands for their recreation and programming. She noted this is especially seen in South LA.
11:55-12:00p m	7. Next Steps	Jessica Henson closed the meeting by running through next steps for engagement and this group will reconvene on September 16 to discuss the draft PNA in more detail.

These Meeting Notes represent the Landscape Architect's summation of the proceedings of the meeting and are not a transcript. Unless the Landscape Architect receives written notice of any corrections, additions, or clarifications within ten (10) days of the issue, this report shall be considered factually correct and become part of the official project record.