



2450 LA Park Needs Assessment

Meeting Date: Nov 18, 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 #7

Project Team Attendees:

- City of Los Angeles, RAP
- Matthew Rudnick
 - Ryan Carpio
 - Cathie Santo Domingo
 - Chinyere Stoneham
 - Darryl Ford
 - Jennifer Perkins
 - Meghan Luera
 - Jeremy Silva

- OLIN
- Jessica Henson
 - Andrew Dobshinsky
 - Sarah Swanseen
 - Deedee Paiz

- The Robert Group
- Isaiah Ford

- KDI
- Eric Riley
 - Leslie Dinkin

- Agency: Artifact
- Chris Torres
- Estolano Advisors
- Thomson Dryjanski
 - Sasha Ragland
- Better World Group
- Shona Ganguly
- GreenInfo Network
- María Lamadrid
- UCLA/Luskin
- Jon Christensen
- HR&A
- Jill Bengochea

Steering Committee Member/Organization	Committee Member		Present
	First Name	Last Name	
Trust for Public Land	Guillermo	Rodriguez	No
Resources Legacy Fund	Alfredo	Gonzalez	No
The Nature Conservancy	Kelsey	Jessup	No
LA Neighborhood Land Trust	Tori	Kjer	Yes
LA County Department of Parks and Recreation	Sheela	Mathai	No
Community Partners	Yvette	Lopez-Ledesma	Yes
University of Southern California	Vanessa	Carter Fahnestock	Yes

LA Waterkeeper	Bruce	Reznik	Yes
Los Angeles Alliance for a New Economy	Lauren	Ahkiam	No
Prevention Institute	Francisco	Romero	No
Friends of the LA River	Candice	Dickens-Russell	Yes
Deputy Mayor of Infrastructure, City of LA	Randall	Winston	No
Deputy Mayor for Neighborhood Services, City of LA	Jacqueline	Hamilton	Yes
Deputy Mayor of Community Safety	Karren	Lane	No
Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority	Brian	Baldauf	Yes
Individual Expert	Deborah	Cohen	Yes
Los Angeles Neighborhood Initiative	Veronica	Hahni	Yes
Los Angeles Parks Foundation	Lindsey	Kozberg	Yes
Los Angeles Parks Foundation	Amber	Martinez	Yes
California Conservation Corps	Duane	Wilson	No
City of LA Recreation and Parks Commission Representative	Marie	Lloyd	Yes
Los Angeles City/ County Native American Indian Commission Chair	Rich	Toyon	Yes

Alternates and Other Attendees Organization	Name		Present
	First Name	Last Name	
Los Angeles Alliance for a New Economy	Stephany	Calvillo	No
Los Angeles Neighborhood Initiative (Alternate)	Aleigh	Lewis	No
Prevention Institute (Alternate)	Rob	Baird	No
California Conservation Corps (Alternate)	Nikki	Morales	Yes
LA Waterkeeper (Alternate)	Maggie	Gardner	No
Office of the Mayor	Estefany	Garcia	Yes
Office of the Mayor	Geoff	Thompson	Yes
Trust for Public Land (Alternate)	Lee	Clauss	No
Trust for Public Land (Alternate)	Nola	Talmage	No
Trust for Public Land (Alternate)	Sarah	Friedman	Yes

MEETING OBJECTIVES

- 1) Review the Final Needs Assessment Report.
- 2) Share project updates and next steps.

AGENDA

<i>Time</i>	Agenda Items	Notes
10:00 - 10:05	1. Welcome + Updates	<p>Thomson Dryjanski (Estolano Advisors) called the meeting to order and reviewed the agenda. Jessica Henson (OLIN) shared updates on the project process and schedule.</p> <p>The PNA Public comment period has ended and the Consultant Team has read and categorized the feedback and incorporated changes into a Final PNA and PNA Appendix in collaboration with RAP.</p>
10:05 - 10:35	2. Report on Public Comment	<p>Jessica Henson shared an overview of the Final PNA.</p> <p>The Final PNA has been split into a PNA and an Appendix document. The PNA still has 5 sections but now the Executive Summary has been changed into a more high level “Overview” section that highlights the main findings and recommendations of the report.</p> <p>Jessica reviewed the outcome of the PNA Public comment period including the volume of comments as well as common themes across the comment period.</p> <p>Themes included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Facilities & Amenities ● Operations & Maintenance ● Site-/Region-Specific Comments ● General Edits ● Citywide Issues ● Equity ● Engagement ● PNA Methodology ● Budget Concerns ● Partnerships ● Ecology ● Programming & Activities ● General Organization ● New Parks ● Enforcement of Regulations <p>Discussion and Questions</p> <p>Deputy Mayor Hamilton asked what kinds of methodological questions were asked during the public comment period. Jessica highlighted that several were clarifying questions and also noted that Steering Committee members such as the Trust for Public Land also submitted a letter about the broader methodology.</p>

		<p>Veronica Hahni asked how many comments related to bathrooms. Jessica noted that several people wanted better bathroom maintenance and some people wanted restrooms and parks so they can spend more time at them. Sarah Swanseen (OLIN) noted that 196 of 605 facilities and amenities comments mentioned bathrooms.</p>
<p>10:35 - 11:05</p>	<p>3. Final Park Needs Assessment Overview</p>	<p>Andrew Dobshinsky (OLIN) presented the primary changes made from the Draft to the Final PNA report.</p> <p>In summary, the report responded to feedback provided during the Draft Comment Period including;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● An “Overview” section that replaces the previous Executive Summary and is revised for clarity and impact ● Updates to the Site Prioritization including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Clarity of terminology for criteria ○ Additional detailed spreads moved to the appendix ○ A broader explanation of the PerSquareMile process and outcomes in the main report and more detail on each PSM grid in the appendix ○ New “laypersons” terms in the main document to substitute for the detailed descriptions ● Expanded language to further highlight site planning guidelines that were either not included or not detailed in the Draft PNA including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Lighting ○ Tree Canopy ○ Fire Risk Reduction ● Clarifications around the cost estimates ● Updated costs for the one-time capital need due to revised amenity counts ● Inclusion of escalation of operating needs over time ● Updated action plan section with improved site-level decision making framework and a new section about how departments can collaborate to build on the PNA.
<p>11:05 - 11:55</p>	<p>4. Priority Location Case Studies</p>	<p>Thomson shared draft progress on the high priority site case studies with the group. These included a draft for a high need existing RAP park as well as a high need PerSquareMile “New Park Priority Area.”</p> <p>Deputy Mayor Hamilton asked who the audience for these reports would be. Thomson clarified that these would be available for decision makers and advocates and Jessica noted these are not currently in the PNA report or the PNA Appendix. The Consultant Team is seeking input on whether the case studies are useful and who they are useful for. Yvette Ledesma Lopez (Community Partners) expressed support for the case studies for use by funders.</p> <p>Lindsey Kozberg (LAPF) noted that these case studies are helpful for operationalization of the PNA. She noted that this specifically helps highlight areas for potential future Community School Parks (CSPs). She added that shade and heat are examples of difficult</p>

		<p>criteria to isolate in the information currently available in the PNA because it is an aspect that is needed everywhere and combined with other issues and priorities in the site-prioritization. She asked if there is a benchmark that RAP is trying to hit?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Jessica noted that there is a County goal that could be used to evaluate parks that do not meet this goal.• Jon noted that heat and shade really is a citywide problem and the PNA prioritization helps identify intersections with other vulnerabilities. <p>Tori Kjer (LA Neighborhood Land Trust) noted that there is a Land Trust park within the University Park North PerSquareMile that was not included in the case study name Estrella Park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• She added that these case studies are a good summary but there is so much need that overlaps, for the folks who are actively implementing park building, these will not be as useful. <p>Assets and Asset Classes</p> <p>Geoff Thomson (Mayor's Office of Infrastructure) noted that the case studies have an overlap in methodology with the CIP process ongoing within the Mayor's Office of Infrastructure. In the CIP they are determining asset classes for maintenance within parks. They have asked RAP to provide these asset classes and he asked if the PNA takes this approach vs a site-based approach.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Jessica noted that there are 30 different amenity classes that are studied and costed by conditions across the system. They are not currently provided in the PNA as a ranked list but the information is built into the data. <p>Deborah Cohen noted that if specific amenities are going to be ranked in the PNA, the conditions as well as the usage and popularity should be included. She noted there is data regarding what amenities nationally are most popular and that prioritization toward improvements or additions should be based on what amenities are most popular.</p> <p>Darryl Ford (RAP) noted that the data included in the PNA provides new lenses within which to sort and prioritize opportunities. He noted that RAP has not had this information at the ready for making planning decisions in the past. He added that the case studies help to identify where small investments can go a long way.</p> <p>Thomson added that the case studies aim to help ground truth what improvements at high-need parks and their corresponding communities can help address needs identified by the PNA analysis.</p> <p>Jessica asked if the Case Studies could further highlight the Level of Service and Amenity need and opportunity as it relates to a site's need and community priorities.</p> <p>Community School Parks</p> <p>Jacqueline Hamilton noted that LAUSD high schools are off limits for future CSPs based on the Joint Use Agreement signed in</p>
--	--	--

		<p>August with LAUSD. She added that tree canopy as a city-wide issue can also be in conflict with other high need usage such as field sport use. How does this get balanced in future planning? Thomson noted that the Case Studies recommendations are focused on site feasibility and try to be pragmatic to reflect RAP's O&M realities.</p> <p>Shona Calzada Ganguly (Better World Group) noted that the case studies are helpful as a leave behind advocacy tool to identify the "ask" at a given site.</p> <p>Lindsey noted that it is very important to message that the use of CSPs should create park access for communities, rather than greening or amenity improvements using RAP funding; she emphasized that RAP's funding should not directly fund capital improvements at LAUSD sites. She highlighted past issues with denying public access to amenities built using Proposition K funding. Tori agreed with not directing future funds directly to LAUSD for capital improvement. Operations, utilities, janitorial staff, etc. are acceptable costs for RAP or foundations to provide funds for in the agreement, however; capital improvements should be a LAUSD contribution. Tori added that LAUSD is reluctant to accept Prop K funds due to long-term maintenance obligations (30 years).</p> <p>Deputy Mayor Hamilton noted that CSPs are a positive change within the City but recognized that they are not a total solution to the current issues faced by RAP and parks.</p> <p>Jon Christensen (UCLA) noted that CSPs provide opportunities to reduce access issues but only during weekends or evenings which can minimize the efficacy of the CSPs. Jon noted that since these parks are available, for example, 20% of the time, that perhaps it be considered a 20% solution in those neighborhoods.</p>
<p>11:55 - 12:00</p>	<p>5. Next Steps</p>	<p>Jessica Henson closed out the meeting by listing next steps for the PNA process. The team will be exporting the "Final" Final PNA early next week and aims to be agendaized on the 12/4/2025 RAP Board of Commissioners meeting agenda.</p> <p>She noted that the 12/4/2025 meeting will have a public comment period and SC members could attend to provide comment.</p> <p>Matthew Rudnick thanked the RAP Planning team as well as the Consultant Team and Steering Committee members for their participation and effort in producing the PNA report. He noted this will be a very useful tool to the department and sees the end of this process as the beginning of a lot of effort to improve parks across the City.</p>

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.