

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CALIFORNIA

BOARD OF NEIGHBORHOOD
COMMISSIONERS

JOY ATKINSON
President

ELI LIPMEN
Vice President

SUSAN AVAKIAN-KOROGHLYAN
LEONARD SHAFFER
DEBBIE WEHBE
MAGGIE DARETT-QUIROZ
RAY REGALADO

TELEPHONE: (213) 978-1551



ERIC GARCETTI
MAYOR

NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCILS
EMPOWER LA
Department of
NEIGHBORHOOD EMPOWERMENT

20TH FLOOR, CITY HALL
200 NORTH SPRING STREET
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

TELEPHONE: (213) 978-1551
TOLL-FREE: 3-1-1
FAX: (213) 978-1751
E-MAIL: EmpowerLA@lacity.org

GRAYCE LIU
GENERAL MANAGER

www.EmpowerLA.org

**BOARD OF NEIGHBORHOOD COMMISSIONERS
NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
FUNDING EQUITY WORK GROUP
PARKING PASS INCLUDED IN LAST PAGE
SPECIAL MEETING AGENDA
Tuesday, July 31, 2018 6:30 PM**

**LOCATION: CONTROLLER'S CONFERENCE ROOM
City Hall 200 North Main Street, Room 351
Los Angeles, CA 90012**

The public is requested to fill out a "Speaker Card" to address the Work Group on any agenda item before the Work Group takes an action on an item. The amount of time for each agenda item is to be determined by the Chair at each meeting. Speakers shall limit their comments to matters relevant to the item on the agenda. The Chair may rule that the speaker is out of order if the comments are not germane to the item under consideration. If multiple speaker cards are submitted on one agenda item, preference will be granted to members of the public who have not spoken previously during the meeting, either during general public comment or on another agenda item.

A member of the public wishing to speak on more than one agenda item at a single meeting shall limit his or her remarks to a total of five (5) minutes per meeting. Comments by members of the public who have submitted multiple speaker cards and want to speak on all items for up to five minutes at one time. Members of the public who choose to speak on multiple agenda items will be given the opportunity to also speak during General Public Comments.

Comments from the public on other matters not appearing on the agenda that are within the Work Group's jurisdiction will be heard during the General Public Comment period. Public comment is limited to 15 minutes maximum. No individual speaker will be allowed more than 3 minutes, unless presiding officer of the Work Group decides differently.

BOARD OF NEIGHBORHOOD COMMISSIONERS
 NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL FUNDING EQUITY WORK GROUP
 SPECIAL MEETING AGENDA

MAY 17, 2018

Page 2 of 4

The agenda is posted for public review in Main Street Lobby of City Hall East at 200 North Main Street and at 20th Floor, City Hall, 200 North Spring Street, Los Angeles. As a covered entity under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Los Angeles does not discriminate on the basis of disability and upon request will provide reasonable accommodation to ensure equal access to its programs, services, and activities. The Agenda and Report(s) related to an agenda item will be available for review at www.Empowerla.org. Sign language interpreters, assisted listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability of services, please make your request at least 3 business days (72 hours) prior to the meeting by contacting the Department at (213) 978-1551.

SI REQUIERE SERVICIOS DE TRADUCCION, FAVOR DE NOTIFICAR A LA OFICINA 3 días de trabajo (72 horas) ANTES DEL EVENTO. SI NECESITA ASISTENCIA CON ESTA NOTIFICACION, POR FAVOR LLAME A NUESTRA OFICINA AL (213) 978-1551.

1. Introduction (5 minutes)
2. Call to Order and Roll call (1 minute)

1	Brian Allen	Chair	Region 2
2	Tony Wilkinson	Vice Chair	Region 1
3	Terrence Gomes	Secretary	Region 11
4	Melanie Labrecque	Minutes Taker	Region 12

5	John DiGregorio	Region 1
6	Garry Fordyce	Region 2
7	Harvey Goldberg	Region 3
8	Corinne Ho	Region 3
9	Arthur Wypchlak	Region 4
10	VACANT	Region 4
11	Emily Kantrim	Region 5
12	Brad Kane	Region 5
13	James Hornik	Region 6
14	Laura Rudison	Region 6

15	Mark Mauceri	Region 7
16	Darcy Harris	Region 7
17	Jamie Tijerina	Region 8
18	Lynda Valencia	Region 8
19	Everett Banks	Region 9
20	Bridgette Kidd	Region 9
21	Wendell Greer	Region 10
22	Kathy Guyton	Region 10
23	Doug Fitzsimmons	Region 11
24	Khixaan Obioma-Sakhu	Region 12

3. Discussion with Neighborhood Council representatives on any Neighborhood Council Resolution or Community Impact Statement filed with the City Clerk which relates to any agenda item listed or being considered on this agenda for the Neighborhood Council Funding Equity Work Group.
4. General Public Comment – Comments from the public on non-agenda items with the Working Group’s subject matter jurisdiction. This agenda item will last a total of 15 minutes and no individual speaker will be allowed more than three minutes. (15 minutes)

5. Discussion and possible action to approve the Meeting Minutes of the Board of Neighborhood Commissioners Special Meeting of the NC Funding Equity Work Group on 04/11/18.
6. Discussion and possible action to approve the Meeting Minutes of the Board of Neighborhood Commissioners Special Meeting of the NC Funding Equity Work Group on 04/23/18.
7. Discussion and possible action to approve the Meeting Minutes of the Board of Neighborhood Commissioners Special Meeting of the NC Funding Equity Work Group on 05/17/18.
8. Discussion and possible action to approve a final report to the Board of Neighborhood Commissioners with recommendations on the methodology of the distribution of funds to the Neighborhood Council system. [NCFEWG Final Report DRAFT 06.30.18](#)
9. Discussion and possible action to appoint members of the NC Funding Equity Work Group to present the approved final report to the Board of Neighborhood Commissioners.
10. Work Group Business - Comment from Members on subject matters within the Work Group's jurisdiction. (15 minutes)
 - a. Comment on Member's own activities/brief announcements.
 - b. Brief response to statements made or questions posed by persons exercising their general public comment rights/ask staff questions for clarification.
11. Adjourn

Future Neighborhood Council Funding Equity Work Group Meetings
(INFORMATION ONLY) (*Please note: The items listed below are tentative and may be subject to change.* You are encouraged to visit the City's website at www.lacity.org to view Work Group agendas and subscribe through the City's Early Notification System Subscription page to receive the Work Group's agendas via email.)

FINALIZATION OF BOARD ACTION:

Per City Charter Section 245, the Board's determination shall become final at the expiration of the next five meeting days of the Council during which the City Council has convened in regular session, unless the City Council acts within that timeframe by a two-thirds vote to bring the action before them or to waive review of the action.

EXHAUSTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES:

If you challenge these agenda items in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing or in written correspondence on these matters delivered to this agency at or prior to the public hearing. California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.6 governs the time in which a party may seek judicial review of this determination. Under that provision, a petitioner may seek judicial review of any decision of the City pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.5 only if the petition for Writ of Mandate pursuant to that section is filed no later than the 90th day following the date on which the City's decision became final.

RECONSIDERATION:

The Work Group may make a MOTION TO RECONSIDER and alter its action taken on any item listed on this agenda at any time during this meeting, or make a MOTION TO RECONSIDER at its next regular meeting as indicated below:

If the Work Group moves and approves a Motion for Reconsideration at the *initial* meeting wherein an action was taken, then the underlying item may be reconsidered at that time.

If the Work Group moves and approves a Motion for Reconsideration at *the next regular meeting* then consideration of the item may *only* occur at this regularly scheduled meeting if the item for consideration has been placed on that meeting's agenda. If the underlying item for reconsideration has not been placed on the agenda for that next regular meeting, then it shall be considered at a subsequent meeting pursuant to the Ralph M. Brown Act.

PUBLIC ACCESS OF RECORDS:

"In compliance with Government Code Section 54957.5, non-exempt writings that are distributed to a majority or all of the Board of Neighborhood Commissioners in advance of their meetings, may be viewed at the office of the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment, located at City Hall, 20TH Floor, 200 North Spring Street, Los Angeles, California 90012, by clicking on the Department's Web site at <http://www.EmpowerLA.org> or at the Commission meeting. In addition, if you would like a copy of any record related to an item on the agenda, contact the Department at (213) 978-1551 or via e-mail: Commission@EmpowerLA.org.

Final Report from BONC Equity Funding Workgroup
Prepared June 30, 2018

By Brian Allen

Background & Directive:

Board of Neighborhood Councils Commissioner's (hereafter referred to as BONC) Equity Funding Workgroup (hereafter referred to as Workgroup) met eight (8) times over three (3) months. Stated purpose of this Workgroup was to attempt to formulate either a proposal or multiple proposals (options) that could improve the method of providing funds to the City of Los Angeles Neighborhood Councils (hereafter referred to as NCs). It should be further understood that the focus of this workgroup was to consider the method/s of delivery of funds but not the use or distribution of these funds by the NCs themselves. Further it was widely understood that a main consideration in establishment of this Workgroup was due to the conditions that arose after Subdivisions were implemented a few years back.

In the beginning there was no funding provided to the NCs. Over the 16 years of existence funds have been provided to the NC system in various amounts. NCs at one time were getting \$50,000 annually and with the recession of 2008 – 2009 funds were slashed. And eventually stabilized at an annual \$37,000 for a few years. Currently funds provided are at \$42,000 annually. The problem that surfaced recently is a perception of an unbalanced condition of needs vs. availability of funds.

Example:

Some NCs have large populations which can approach 100,000 individuals. In other cases, there are NCs that have less than 10,000 individuals. This brings up the question of equity based on the premise that to communicate with 100,000 individuals is costlier than to communicate with 10,000 individuals. With the current \$42,000 allotted each NC, those with small populations have enough funds to provide sound communication and community support for a wide variety of projects while those with large populations may not even be able to properly communicate with their population much less provide any other community support. Therefore, the question became, is that fair or even workable NC to NC.

Members of this Workgroup were selected by the BONC commissioners from a list of NC board members who had applied to be considered for appointment to this Workgroup. Los Angeles is broken down into twelve (12) NC regions and each region has an average of 8 plus NCs per region. In total there were 97 NCs while this workgroup was meeting. To be as all encompassing as possible BONC selected 2 NC board members from each region. By selecting by region, the Workgroup represented the overall NC system with a wide range of inclusion and diversity. Total potential membership to this Workgroup was 24. Over the eight meetings held the workgroup maintained an average of 19 members present at each meeting. For operational concerns the quorum was set at 11 and no meeting was ever in jeopardy of failing to meet quorum.

Due to the large membership of this Workgroup there were many concerns. Not all the concerns brought forward were focused on the distribution of funds to the NCs and those concerns will be addressed as additional concerns. These additional concerns, while in some ways may have an impact on funds available to be used, by the NCs, they are not directly related to initial funds distribution.

Each member of this Workgroup was asked and tasked with proposing ideas that could provide more efficiency and / or opportunities for NCs to preform their duties and responsibilities. Knowing there is no magic bullet it was quickly understood, that even in attempting to be as fair as possible, some NCs may not be able to justify receiving the same funding as they have been receiving.

Final Report from BONC Equity Funding Workgroup
Prepared June 30, 2018

By Brian Allen

Looking back, we can see that a standard of 20,000 stakeholders per NC was established as the initial minimum to certify an NC. In trying to provide some understanding for unique situations such as Geographic conditions to a community or the desire to recognize and support historic community environments a subdivision policy was implemented. With subdivisions came the result of approving NCs that were smaller than 20,000 stakeholders. A new challenge was identified, either to justify the current distribution of funds or to develop a more equitable method of distribution of funds. Large NCs immediately recognized they were disadvantaged compared to small NCs in regard to outreach ability.

Looking forward, Subdivisions continue. With the current Sub-Division policy there could, and most likely will, be more NCs established with less than 20,000 stakeholders. Odds are that that will only serve to expand the issue if it is not addressed now.

In the very first meeting of this Workgroup and continuing through many of the meetings the concept of Stakeholder was addressed. Based on the NC charter and Plan there is a directive to consider stakeholders to be not only residence but also individuals with an ongoing involvement in a community. While the concept is not questioned as valid per the directives to the NCs it was the decision of this Workgroup to disregard the technical definition of stakeholder, due to the complete inability to quantify the quantity of non-residence stakeholders. Therefore, the Workgroup settled on the concept of residence population for consistency in presentation. The Workgroup left the final counts for determining total stakeholders to the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment or its designated authority.

In the following pages of this report you will find a few assumptions, conclusions, and suggestions for which one or more of the members of this Workgroup have and did submit for consideration. It would have been nice if the workgroup would have chosen a single proposal but that was not to happen at this time. However, there is Workgroup majority consensus on a basic methodology. Though that methodology is simple, it will be presented in several ways based on different options. Very generally speaking the concept is to implement a Floor (equal minimum funding to all NCs) plus additional funding based on residential population, and a rollover of unspent funds at year end. Note, for clear understanding the concepts of floor, additional funding and rollover are not presented as options to funding but as a bundle that creates the total annual funding to an NC. To better understand the concept, we should first identify the total amount of funds to be provide to the NC system. Currently that is equal to \$42,000 per NC (at the time of this report there were 97 NCs) for a total of \$4,074,000. For easy calculation we will use a total of \$25,000 per NC as the floor (base). That would provide a total floor (base) funding of \$2,425,000 distributed leaving \$1,649,000 to be distributed. The balance of \$1,649,000 would be distributed to each NC based on the percentage their residence population is to the total cumulative residence population of all NCs. From this concept several proposals were presented and are forwarded with this report. While this formula is the basis for many of the proposals each proposal has its own additional considerations.

It should be noted that the Workgroup rejected the concept of providing distribution solely based on population due to the understanding that most if not all NCs regardless of population size have or may have similar administrative and operational cost. Likewise, the Workgroup also rejected the idea of keeping the funding as is for just the opposite reason that there are differences which may need to be addressed.

Over the course of eight (8) meetings the Workgroup heard from a variety of individuals affiliated with various NCs. Comments were provided that addressed issues like spending, support from DONE, subdivisions, training, amount of total funding, purpose, and intent of the NC System, to name a few. While the Workgroup stayed

**Final Report from BONC Equity Funding Workgroup
Prepared June 30, 2018**

By Brian Allen

focused on funding, many of the concerns outside direct funding effect the efficient use of the funding provided and should be addressed. Though this report does not focus on non-funding issues they are identified due to strong concerns members of the workgroup voiced. Subsequent to and unrelated to this Workgroup, Councilmen Ryu's recent motion, Council File 18-0467, is addressing some of these issues and concerns.

Proposals Submitted and Authorized to be presented by the Workgroup:

Proposals not Related to Direct Funds Distribution:

From Kathy Guyton –

Request EmpowerLA create a list of all benefits that Neighborhood Councils may receive by being affiliated with the city of Los Angeles. Example, some of the benefits may include, bulk mailing, Office Depot Discounts, copier leases, and any other arrangements or agreements the city may have that can be passed on to the Neighborhood Councils. By having this information available the NCs would be able to function at a higher level of efficiency and the environment between councils would be more equitable.

From Emily Kantrim –

See Exhibit A attached to this report for full proposal. Following is a summary of the proposal's requests of DONE:

1. To provide more attention to big-picture issues in equity beyond population measures, concerns over ADA compliant space and cost, and assist with finding appropriate meeting spaces or relax boundary requirements.
2. Provide forums for NCs to share "best practices."
3. Assist NCs with acquiring access to the collective strengths of the city of Los Angeles
4. Assist NCs with social media campaigns which would enhance the ability to contact stakeholders when funding concerns may otherwise force NCs to choose a lesser but more expensive outreach method.
5. Help identify additional methods of outreach beyond Newsletters and Social Media.
6. Provide more opportunities for workgroups to address issues of equity in support of the NCs Charter of Communication.

From Mark Mauceri and Brad Kane –

See Exhibit H attached to this report for full proposal, discussion, and explanation. Following is a brief summary of the proposal:

Mark and Brad's Exhibit H requests a moratorium be placed on any new subdivisions until such time as the process has been more thoroughly vetted.

Proposals Directly Related to Funds Distribution:

From James Hornik –

See Exhibit B attached to this report for full proposal and discussion. Following is a brief summary of the proposal:

Proposal from James Hornik addresses the subject of unspent NC funds.

Option 1 – Suggests that each NCs unspent funds be rolled over into a separate fund that would be used the following year to cover specific items such as rent, storage costs, Interpretation services, elections, etc. A dollar limit of rollover can be established and any funds beyond that limit would return to the general fund.

Option 2 – Offers that all unspent funds would be collected and then redistributed to the NCs as a population bonus. There would be an NC population size threshold. Each NC exceeding that threshold would

Final Report from BONC Equity Funding Workgroup
Prepared June 30, 2018

By Brian Allen

share in the distribution by the percent their population, over threshold, is of the total NC wide population over threshold. There would be no limitation on the use of these funds. A dollar limit of rollover can be established and any funds beyond that limit would return to the general fund.

From Lyndia Valencia –

See Exhibit C attached to this report for full proposal. Following is a brief summary of the proposal:

Proposal from Lyndia Valencia concentrates on NC Subdivisions. She breaks down the funding levels by population after subdivision. For all other NCs the proposal relies on the concept of a floor (Equal Base Funding) plus population distribution of all remaining funds.

From Tony Wilkinson –

See Exhibit D attached to this report for full proposal and explanation. Following is a brief summary of the proposal:

Proposal from Tony Wilkinson offers that all pre-subdivision and pre-Hermon NCs receive a floor (Base Funding) of \$32,000 and the balance of funding to \$42,000 per NC be distributed on a percentage based on population. Further his proposal suggests that subdivisions including Hermon receive a base of \$16,000 plus their percentage of the balance of funding to \$42,000. Total Funding would be distributed on the concept of Base plus percent of population. See formula presented above.

From John DiGregorio –

See Exhibit E attached to this report for full proposal and discussion. Following is a brief summary of the proposal:

Proposal from John DiGregorio provides for a floor (Base funding) with additional funding based on percent of population. John's proposal provides for the base to be determined as a percentage of the total NC funds available and then distributed equally to all NCs. Balance of funds distributed by percent of population.

From Doug Fitzsimmons –

See Exhibit F attached to this report for full proposal and explanation. Following is a brief summary of the proposal:

Doug Fitzsimmons also proposed a base plus concept that uses a percentage calculation for determining the base funding. His recommendation is to choose one of three levels of base funding, 50%, 60%, and 75% of total NC funding (currently at \$4,074,000 annually for 97 NC) and distributed equally to each NC. Remaining funds be distributed by resident population. Additionally, he has proposed a rollover of either a percentage to be determined or \$10,000 per NC of any unspent funds. The rollover would not be cumulative and must be used in the following year.

From Mark Mauceri and Brad Kane –

See Exhibit G attached to this report for full proposal, discussion, and explanation. Following is a brief summary of the proposal:

Mark and Brad's proposal addresses issues of stakeholder definition, method of quantifying stakeholder volume, cost mitigation related to items like translation and meeting space, suggests that any base allocation of funds be guaranteed and equal amounts, funding by population should be verifiable, consideration of recycling (rollover) funds into the following year, consideration of any new funding model as to if there is need for some grandfathering conditions, and noting that performance incentives or penalties should not be a component of any new funding model among other concerns.

**Final Report from BONC Equity Funding Workgroup
Prepared June 30, 2018**

By Brian Allen

From Darcy Harris –

See Exhibit I attached to this report for full proposal, discussion, and explanation. Following is a brief summary of the proposal:

Darcy's proposal uses the concept of a base plus population method but specifically recommends a 50% allocation of total NC system funds to be used as the calculation for base funding. She proposes to use resident population for the distribution of the balance of funding. Darcy also recommends the implementation of a rollover up to \$10,000 in unspent funds. Rollover funds are not to be cumulative.

From Brian Allen –

See Exhibit J attached to this report for full proposal, discussion, and explanation. Following is a brief summary of the proposal:

Brian Allen's proposal is the basis for which all other Floor (base funding) plus population proposals were derived. However, this proposal is different in that it identifies two additional components. Rollover is not proposed as a static amount, but it is proposed to be cumulative. While an annual specific amount has not been proposed this proposal uses a cumulative amount up to \$150,000. The limit can be any amount. The other condition included in this proposal is donations. Donations would help to reduce spending and thereby allow for other uses of funds that currently may require more funds than normal.

Pros and Cons of making a change to the method of distributing funding to Neighborhood Councils:

Pros:

1. Currently each NC receives the same annual funding of \$42,000. While the use of those funds is completely discretionary to each NC the ability to reach out to their community is not equal based on cost to achieve that communication. It is far less expensive to maintain communication with 10,000 stakeholders than it is with 90,000 stakeholders. This issue is addressed in different proposals in two ways. One way is to remove the cost of outreach communication by transferring it to DONE and the other is to provide more funding to larger NCs than smaller based on the number of stakeholders to reach out to.
2. All NCs struggle at the end of the year (the fourth (4th) quarter specifically) with spending their available funds. By adding items like roll over to enhance funding would provide for consistency that would allow for late year plans to continue into the following year as well as have a limiting factor on last minute spending.
3. Some of the other options recommended that would have beneficial impacts on many NS are:
 - a. DONE working on finding city property or working with LAUSD and GSD to establish arrangements to provide more cost effective rental space would improve the efficiency of use of the funds provided.
 - b. Providing the use of city discounts on supplies and services, based on the combined buying power of the city to the NCs would also increase the efficiency in the use of funds provided.
 - c. Transferring the translation and minute taking costs to DONE would lessen the drain on funds and improve the accuracy of maintaining minutes.
4. In most of the discussions there were over tones of problems that would and do affect the use of funds but none as great as the need for training. With training that provides for all members of NCs to be comfortable with their understanding of the authorities, responsibilities, and protocols of operation there

Final Report from BONC Equity Funding Workgroup
Prepared June 30, 2018

By Brian Allen

would be far better meetings but additionally a better use of funds. Where there is the most concern and divide, is in the way funds are distributed (Spent). Training on the proper use of funds, from how to why funds are used, would bring the boards closer to fulfilling the ultimate goals of communication with both the public as well as the City.

5. Addressing the issue of stakeholder definition could make the outreach component less costly and bring the NCs more in sync with each other. Much money is spent on elections that may not be necessary. Example, how many of the almost 200,000 employee stakeholders in the Downtown NC want to or do have any involvement in the actions of the downtown NC? The answer may be few. If this is true there could be a considerable cost shift to things like planning and land use for that NC.
6. By implementing Cumulative Roll Over would provide for considerable savings to total funding on an annual basis by almost eliminating year end frenzy spending while providing two additional benefits. With Cumulative Roll Over NCs would have the ability to produce larger events there by doing more aggressive outreach. Additionally, the benefit to the city would be to slow down the exposure of annual funding. With annual funding and roll over with a cap, let's say \$100,000, Funding would stop for any NC that hit the cap until funds are spent. There would be a considerable cash flow benefit as well as a hedge against economic downturns for the city as the city would be able to use these funds if the need were to arise. Depending on the cap and the NCs spending habits there could be 5 to 10 million dollars available at any one time. But the Funding annually would never exceed the level of \$42,000 per NC (or what ever the funding level would be in the future.

Cons:

1. Reducing the funding, without roll over, to NCs with less than 20,000 residents could limit those NCs from being able to provide a level of service to the community that it may currently provide. A more thoughtful and calculated approach to using the funds provided would have to be used.
2. NCs that are more limited in funding would not be able to engage in larger events as often or as quickly as those with larger availability of funds.
3. If the efficiencies that could be provided by the City and DONE are not provided, as discussed under the section Pros, item 3 above, the smaller NCs may be severely disadvantaged, depending on their operational spending.

Final Analysis and Recommendations of the BONC Equity Funding Workgroup:

While there were many recommendations that came out of this Workgroup each of them should be given equal consideration. It should be recognized that a few basic concepts were more discussed and ultimately agreed with. The first is that a Floor (base funding) should be used in any redesign of the funding method. Right behind that and in conjunction with the Floor concept is the rounding out of the initial funding by providing the balance of annual basic funding through a distribution of those funds based on population. For the Floor (base funding) no consensus as to a specific amount was agreed on however, the Workgroup did set a range of 50 to 75% of the total funds allotted to NCs with the balance distributed by the percent each NCs population is to the total population of all NCs.

Final Report from BONC Equity Funding Workgroup
Prepared June 30, 2018

By Brian Allen

In the first few meetings the Workgroup did agree that any use of population should be based on resident population due to the difficulty in accurately calculating the concept of stakeholder populations.

Early in the Workgroup meetings an agreement was made to accept rollover as a concept to recommend; however, there was no consensus as to how much of unspent funds to rollover or as to if the funds rolled over should be cumulative.

Even though proposals were agreed to be passed on that had concepts like donations and spending concerns, some of the specific options within the proposals did not receive independent consensus of the Workgroup.

There was strong agreement within the Workgroup to recommend other specific concerns. It was agreed that translation costs should be born by DONE. Meeting space cost was also a concern that the Workgroup strongly supported having DONE work with GSD and LAUSD in establishing options to help NCs locate and secure efficient meeting space.

Subdivisions were issues that were considered. The issue of subdivisions is what brought to light an inequality that required a review of the NC Funding method. Due to the perceived funding inequality, this Workgroup had consensus, in that they felt the subdivisions should be put on hold until they can be fully reviewed as to their impact, and value to the NC system.

As there was no single recommendation this summary, of majority agreements on the concepts and concerns presented to the Workgroup, could be a starting point to begin outreach efforts to the NC system. Much of what the Workgroup discussed is closely aligned with the work Councilmen Ryu has brought forward and may complement his CF 18-0467.

As a Co-Chair (and Acting Chair) of the BONC Equity Funding Workgroup I would be willing to work with the commission in presenting and explaining the work completed by the Workgroup, as I believe others in the Workgroup would too. The individual members of this Workgroup look forward to the next step in developing a final position on the equitable funding of the NC System

LOS ANGELES CITY HALL EAST
CONTROLLER'S CONFERENCE ROOM 351
200 NORTH MAIN STREET
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

DEPARTMENT OF
NEIGHBORHOOD EMPOWERMENT
AND THE BOARD OF NEIGHBORHOOD COMMISSIONERS

TUESDAY, JULY 31, 2018

NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL FUNDING EQUITY WORK GROUP

PARKING PASS

PLACE ON YOUR DASHBOARD

PLACE ON YOUR DASHBOARD

PARKING ENTRANCE IS ON LOS ANGELES STREET BETWEEN TEMPLE & 1ST STREET.

TAKE PARKING ELEVATOR TO 3RD FLOOR, THEN FOLLOW SIGNS TO CONTROLLER'S CONFERENCE ROOM 351.