BOARD REPORT **NO.** 25-214

DATE December 18, 2025 C.D. ALL

BOARD OF RECREATION AND PARK COMMISSIONERS

SUBJECT: PARK NEEDS ASSESSMENT – ADOPTION OF THE 2025 CITYWIDE PARK NEEDS ASSESSMENT – STATUTORY EXEMPTION FROM THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) PURSUANT TO ARTICLE 18, SECTION 15262 [A PROJECT INVOLVING ONLY FEASIBILITY OR PLANNING STUDIES FOR POSSIBLE FUTURE ACTIONS WHICH THE AGENCY, BOARD, OR COMMISSION HAS NOT APPROVED, ADOPTED, OR FUNDED DOES NOT REQUIRE THE PREPARATION OF AN EIR OR NEGATIVE DECLARATION BUT DOES REQUIRE CONSIDERATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS] OF CALIFORNIA CEQA GUIDELINES AS WELL AS ARTICLE II, SECTION 2(d) OF CITY CEQA GUIDELINES

B. Aguirre		M. Rudnick	
B. Jones		for * C. Santo Domingo	DF
C. Stoneham		N. Williams	

General Manager

Approved Disapproved Withdrawn

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Approve and adopt the proposed Park Needs Assessment (PNA), which is included herein as Attachment 1 and summarized in this Report;

2. Direct the Department of Recreation and Parks (RAP) staff to utilize the Implementation Section of the PNA to inform future decision making regarding capital improvements, programming, and operations;

3. Direct RAP staff to include findings regarding compliance with the PNA in all future reports submitted to the Board of Recreation and Parks Commissioners (Board);

4. Direct RAP staff to create Intradepartmental Implementation Guides for PNA compliance for each RAP section of and report back to the Board with a status update before July 1, 2026;

5. Direct the Board Secretary to transmit this Report forthwith to the City Clerk;

6. Request the City Council to direct the Department of City Planning be directed to update the Public Recreation Plan to include the new park classifications established in the PNA;

7. Request the City Attorney to prepare and transmit to the City Council an ordinance amending the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Section 12.33.E.3 to update the spending radii to include with the new park classifications if the Public Recreation Plan is updated per Recommendation No. 6;

8. Determine that the proposed Board action is statutorily exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Article 18, Section 15262 [A project involving only feasibility or planning studies for possible future actions which the agency, board, or commission has not approved, adopted, or funded does not require the preparation of an EIR or Negative Declaration but does require consideration of environmental factors] of California CEQA Guidelines as well as Article II, Section 2(d), of City CEQA Guidelines, and direct staff to file a Notice of Exemption (NOE) with the Los Angeles County Clerk and the Governor's Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation;

9. Authorize RAP's Chief Accounting Employee to prepare a check to the Los Angeles County Clerk in the amount of $75.00 for the purpose of filing an NOE; and,

10. Authorize RAP staff to make technical corrections as necessary to carry out the intent of this Report.

BACKGROUND

On August 2, 2024, RAP issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) for a comprehensive Park Needs Assessment (PNA) in order to evaluate the present recreational needs of Angelenos, identify gaps in level of service, develop recommendations for funding strategies, and create a decision-making framework for future park planning and operations.

On December 19, 2024, the Board of Recreation and Park Commissioners (Board) awarded the contract for the preparation of the PNA to Olin Partnership, LTD (Report 24-269). The Notice to Proceed (NTP) was issued on January 6, 2025, initiating work on the PNA. The term of the contract was 12 months, with a total cost of $3,950,273.26.

PNA PROCESS AND FINDINGS:

The PNA included 4 phases in its preparation:
1. Grounding
2. Evaluation
3. Draft
4. Final

Along with extensive collaboration with RAP staff, the PNA team facilitated regular meetings and input with the Technical Advisory Committee and the Steering Committee. The Technical Advisory Committee, which met 3 times, primarily consisted of representatives from other City Departments and County and State parks counterparts to provide technical expertise about similar ongoing planning efforts related to parks or aspects that could impact parks. The Steering Committee met a total of 7 times and was comprised of park and nature advocates, non-profit partners, health

experts, Los Angeles Deputy Mayors, and a member of the Los Angeles Native American Indian Commission.

The PNA also engaged the public through in-person and virtual community meetings, pop-up events, workshops, and surveys, with materials available in multiple languages (English, Spanish, Mandarin, Korean, and Armenian).

Engagement occurred in three phases:

- Phase I – Grounding (Feb–Apr 2025): Focused on raising awareness of the PNA and assessing the current state of parks. Outreach included digital campaigns, printed materials, and in-person activities. Over 5,000 Angelenos participated in surveys (short, long, or statistically valid).
- Phase II – Evaluation (Apr–Aug 2025): Shared findings from Phase I and collected community reactions and priorities for future improvements. Input was gathered through community meetings, technical advisory sessions, steering committee meetings and an additional survey.
- Phase III – Refinement (Sep–Nov 2025): Aimed at collecting feedback on the Draft PNA. This input, gathered through both in-person and online channels, will shape the Final PNA to be completed by the end of 2025.

The PNA engagement efforts included:

- 4,600+ online survey responses
- 1,000+ statistically valid survey responses
- 450+ community meeting attendees
- 10 City Council briefings
- 17 interest group meetings
- 11 pop-up events citywide
- 12 community partner organizations
- 3 youth workshops/events

Overall, over 100,000 Angelenos participated in direct engagement or online outreach throughout the PNA process.

SUMMARY OF FINAL PNA

Section I: Context

The Overview Section highlights important data points discovered and collected throughout the PNA process. The Planning Context summarizes the importance of recreation and parks the mental and physical health of Angelenos, support development, offer economic opportunities, and build resilient communities as well as details the literature review that informed the PNA.

The Engagement chapter summarizes the extensive community outreach and engagement events and strategies utilized during the development of the PNA. The findings from the Engagement chapter reveal that less than half of respondents think parks and recreation centers are in excellent or good condition. Additionally, the most important facilities are unprogrammed green space, natural areas/wildlife habitats, multi-use trails, swimming pools, exercise equipment,

and walking tracks and gyms. The most important programs are fitness/wellness programs, special events/festivals, nature experiences/environmental education, and arts and crafts classes.

Section II: Recreation and Parks Today

This section focuses on the history, evolution, and current state of the Department of Recreation and Parks. Historically, Los Angeles's park system has experienced periods of expansion, but the park acreage per capita ratio continues to decline as more people move to the City. RAP manages 489 parks over 16,000 acres, thousands of park amenities, and special facilities such as the Griffith Observatory, Cabrillo Marine Aquarium, and the Greek Theatre. RAP is supported by 1,711 full-time and 5,000 part-time employees.

The current budget ($359 million) is constrained by over one third (40%) being reimbursed to the City's General Fund to pay for staff benefits and utilities. The City invests less in parks per capita ($92) than peer cities in the United States. This limits park quality, programs, and access for all Angelenos. Ultimately, RAP will face generational funding challenges due to the City's projected $1 billion budget deficit in FY 2026 and the expiration of Proposition K in 2026.

Section III: Community Needs

The PNA benchmarked Los Angeles against the following peer cities: San Diego, San Francisco, Dallas, Chicago, New York, and Washington D.C. The benchmarking exercise revealed that the City generally has fewer recreation amenities and spends less public money on its park system. This allowed the PNA to set both realistic and ambitious targets that will better serve Angelenos' needs.

The "Universe of Sites" is a product of the PNA that is based on community, agency, and stakeholder feedback as well as best practices to determine where RAP should prioritize investment over the coming decades. The "Universe of Sites" includes all 489 existing parks and 36 prospective park sites that focus on the top 25% of residents lacking in either park access or park acreage and are also either disadvantaged or vulnerable communities.

The Regional Snapshots reveal that needs vary across the City. The East/Central region faces issues related to people experiencing homelessness, street vending, and safety. The South region has similar issues with high use, maintenance, and amenity availability, particularly in communities that have experienced decades of disinvestment. The North region has acres of parkland, but issues on connectivity, accessibility, and park proximity. The West region has a variety of parks and benefits from nearby state parks, but is concerned with people experiencing homelessness occupying limited park space, maintenance, and safety.

Section IV: Guidelines

The Capital Life Cycle is a systematic process designed for RAP to assess when park facilities should be maintained, refreshed, repurposed or replaced through all phases of their lifespan (acquisition, vision planning, design, construction, operation, and evaluation). The Site Planning guidelines provide a clear roadmap for designing new parks, refreshing existing sites, and informing the development of framework plans, periodic evaluations, and new park design.

The City's Public Recreation Plan currently has only 3 park classifications: Neighborhood, Community, and Regional. The PNA recommends a new Park Classification system with a total of 20 classifications. The new Park Classifications help clarify how existing parks function and provide guidelines for future facility planning. The Ongoing Engagement guidelines aim to create a more inclusive process for reflecting the diverse needs of neighborhoods through various feedback mechanisms to promote community ownership and increase equity in access and outcomes. Lastly, since there are no uniform level of service standards for parks or recreational amenities in the United States, the PNA introduces new Level of Service standards to address how many amenities are needed in the City.

Section V: Implementation

Over the past 25 years, RAP's operations and maintenance budget has not kept up with inflation or the growth of the park system. An estimated $15 billion in one-time capital spending required for new projects and to catch up on deferred maintenance projects. Annually, RAP would need $558 million to cover staffing, operations, and General Fund reimbursements, requiring a 60% increase in its operating budget to restore staffing and align with peer cities. The PNA recommends that RAP explore a series of funding strategies:

RAP-Led Funding Strategies

- Increase earned-revenue generation
- Expand Partnerships with non-profits and build a conservancy model
- Leverage State and Federal funding sources

Funding Strategies Requiring Partnership

- Increase the Charter Mandated allocation of the property tax revenue to RAP
- Evaluate property tax assessments
- Evaluate sales taxes
- Evaluate City bonds option: general obligation and revenue bonds

The Action Plan chapter establishes the PNA as the central reference point for decision-making, focusing on the highest priority sites identified through the Site Prioritization process. Early actions include RAP creating branch-specific implementation toolkits, continuing community engagement, and securing sustainable funding sources for RAP. The PNA highlights that a multifaceted approach is necessary in order to address the significant needs identified in the final document.

ADOPTION OF THE PNA

Upon approval by the Board, the PNA will serve as a foundational document to guide future decisions related to park planning, programming, capital investment, and community engagement. RAP staff will reference the findings and priorities identified in the PNA to align projects with demonstrated community needs. The PNA will also inform applications for grant funding, interagency collaboration, and long-term strategic planning. The final PNA, including maps, priorities, and data tools, will be hosted on the PNA website open to the public. All future engagement efforts will follow the recommended practices outlined in the report.

Project Evaluation and Prioritization:
RAP staff will use the Site Level Decision Framework to evaluate proposed park projects. Projects should align with the following PNA site planning and design principles:

- The project is located at a top-ranked site based on the site prioritization criteria.
- It addresses citywide or regional priorities identified through engagement.
- It adds or improves amenities typical for the park's classification.
- It contributes to meeting level-of-service standards across the city.
- It improves site design based on the classification-specific site planning guidelines.
- The surrounding community has been meaningfully engaged in project development.

Systematic Use of Tools:
Each park project will be evaluated using the PNA's tools, including:

- Site Prioritization Rankings – to identify areas of highest need.
- Park Classifications & Typical Amenities – to guide what is appropriate at each site.
- Site Planning Guidelines – to ensure well-designed, accessible, and functional parks.
- Level-of-Service Standards – to balance geographic equity across the system.
- Regional Profiles – to account for differing needs and priorities by area.

Updating the PNA:
Every **5 years**, RAP staff will publish a public Status Report tracking:

- Completed and planned projects
- Dollars spent, allocated, and needed
- Progress in meeting level-of-service targets
- Qualitative outcomes (e.g., community engagement success, workforce development, equity progress)

Every **10 years**, RAP staff will engage a consultant to:

- Reassess and update the Universe of Sites
- Re-run prioritization using updated datasets (e.g., CalEnviroScreen, park condition data)
- Conduct a new statistically valid survey and analyze park visitation data
- Determine whether a new full PNA is needed by 2045 in preparation for 2050

Building on the PNA:
The following is a framework for how RAP can continue to advance the strategies of the PNA beyond the early actions.

- Develop a Parks Master Plan, building upon key foundational efforts: this Park Needs Assessment (PNA), a Facility Assessment, and a Capital Improvement Plan (CIP).
- The Facility Assessment should fully deploy RAP's asset management system, include dedicated staff to conduct assessments, and establish a regular schedule to evaluate all park assets—not just the 16 currently required by the County.
- Develop a Capital Improvement Plan that operates on a three-year cycle and encompasses projects that have secured funding and RAP resources.
- Both the Facility Assessment and the CIP should be completed by the time of the first five-year status report on the PNA, ensuring that the groundwork is in place to begin development of the Parks Master Plan.

Institutionalization and Staffing:
RAP staff is advised to hire dedicated full-time staff to oversee PNA implementation and coordinate progress tracking, reporting, and public updates.

Action Plan:
The PNA action plan directs RAP staff to utilize the strategies and priorities in the PNA to develop RAP branch-specific implementation toolkits to inform future decision making regarding capital improvements, programming, and operations. Below is the list of RAP branches tasked with developing new operational procedural guidelines:

- **Public Relations**: follow Chapter 12 "Ongoing Engagement" to create an actionable implementation plan for the Department's future engagement opportunities. This includes a guide for accessing translation services.
- **Human Resources**: follow Chapter 14 "Cost and Funding: Additional Staff Needs" to create an implementation plan for prioritized staff hiring for positions identified in the PNA, whenever and wherever feasible.
- **Recreation**: follow Chapter 3 "Engagement" survey results, Chapter 8 "Site Prioritization", and the "Guidelines" section (Ch. 9-12) of the PNA to create an implementation plan that identifies and evaluates the need for new/existing recreation programming based on PNA prioritization criteria and key performance indicator(s).
- **Maintenance**: Follow the "Guidelines" section (Ch. 9-12) to create an implementation plan that includes schedules for regular assessments, best operational practices identified, and a regular evaluation of the deployment of the PNA prioritization criteria.
- **Construction**: Follow the "Guidelines" section (Ch. 9-12) to create an implementation plan that includes schedules for regular assessments, best operational practices identified, regular evaluation of buildings, and a regular evaluation of the deployment of the PNA prioritization criteria.
- **Planning**: Follow Chapter 8 "Site Prioritization", and the "Guidelines" section (Ch. 9-12) of the PNA to create an implementation plan for parcel acquisition and facility project planning based on the PNA prioritization criteria.
- **Executive Management**: Follow Chapter 5 "RAP by the Numbers" and Chapter 14 "Cost and Funding" to create an implementation plan for using the PNA to inform other City Departments of RAP priorities and future budget proposals; as well as future requests to the City Council for funding assessments that align with RAP Priorities, identifying which funding strategy recommendation(s) (Chapter 14) to deploy, and reevaluating the authorities within and outside of RAP's jurisdiction and recommend pathways for RAP reorganization.
- **Partnerships**: Follow Chapter 8 "Site Prioritization", "Guidelines" section (Ch. 9-12), and Chapter 14 "Cost and Funding: Funding Strategy Recommendations" to create an implementation plan that identifies applicable partnerships within the City based on the PNA prioritization criteria.
- **Concessions**: Follow Chapter 8 "Site Prioritization", "Guidelines" section (Ch. 9-12), and Chapter 14 "Cost and Funding: Funding Strategy Recommendations" to create an implementation plan that identifies funding strategies and locations for future concessions based on the PNA prioritization criteria.

New PNA Board Report Section:
Upon approval of this Report, RAP staff will be directed to include a new section in all future board reports that detail how that report's recommendations comply with the provisions of the PNA. The new section shall include Park Rank, Site Prioritization Tier, Park Classification, compliance with the Site Level Decision Framework and/or applicable chapter of the PNA. See below an example of the new section:

Approval of this Board Report advances RAP's Park Needs Assessment by:
Park Name: MacArthur Park
Overall Park Ranking: 95
Prioritization Tier #: 2
Park Classification: Large Community Park
Intradepartmental Implementation Guide Compliance: (TBD - As directed per Recommendation 4 of this Report)

Updating the City's Public Recreation Plan:
Upon approval of this Report, RAP requests that the City Council direct the Department of City Planning to update the City's Public Recreation Plan in order to adopt the new Park Classifications set forth in the PNA as well as update any Zoning Code sections that would be impacted by changes made to the Public Recreation Plan.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

The proposed Board action consists of the adoption of RAP's Park Needs Assessment (PNA). The nature of the PNA is analytical and procedural. The document evaluates RAP's current financial situation and estimates the financial and human resources needed to improve RAP's services to reach a set of benchmarks, while identifying options to fund such needs. However, it does not identify which specific projects would be needed to meet those benchmarks and does not indicate which specific funding mechanisms RAP will implement. The document identifies areas of the city where the needs for new parks is more intense and lays out procedures RAP divisions will follow when acquiring new parks or planning for park improvements, but does not identify specific areas or sites that should be acquired or improved. The PNA also establishes a new park classification, more granular of the current, that takes into account the environmental resources present in each park and lays out a process of continuous update that would lead RAP to better understand how Los Angeles park needs evolve and adapt to the changing social, economic and environmental conditions of the city.

The document does not approve, fund or adopt specific projects and, although it has binding effect on RAP's internal processes to fund, acquire and plan for projects, does not have any binding effect on specific projects in specific areas of the City.

Section 15262 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines provides a statutory exemption for planning studies for possible future actions which the lead agency has not yet approved, adopted, or funded and includes environmental factors.

Based on these facts, RAP staff recommends that the Board determine that the proposed Board action is statutorily exempt from the provisions of CEQA pursuant to Article 18, Section 15262 of California CEQA Guidelines and Article II, Section 2(d) of the City CEQA Guidelines. Staff will file a Notice of Exemption (NOE) with the Los Angeles County Clerk and the Governor's Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation upon the Board's approval

FISCAL IMPACT

The potential Fiscal Impact to the RAP's General Fund is currently unknown.

This Report was prepared by Jeremy Silva, City Planning Associate, Planning, Maintenance and Construction Branch.

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

1) Attachment 1 - Park Needs Assessment Final Draft

PARK NEEDS ASSESSMENT

CITY OF LOS ANGELES

December 2025

LAND ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The City of Los Angeles recognizes that we occupy land originally and still inhabited and cared for by the Kizh, Tongva, Tataviam, and Chumash Peoples. We honor and pay respect to their elders and descendants—past, present, and emerging—as they continue their stewardship of these lands and waters. We acknowledge that settler colonization resulted in land seizure, disease, subjugation, slavery, relocation, broken promises, genocide, multigenerational trauma, disruption of cultural practices, trade, and tribal relations. This acknowledgment demonstrates our responsibility and commitment to truth, healing, and reconciliation and to elevating the stories, culture, and community of the original inhabitants of the City of Los Angeles. We are grateful to have the opportunity to live and work on these ancestral lands. We also honor the self-attestation of current mission-based Tribes confirming their connection to the ancestral lands on which we live and work today:

Gabrieleno San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians led by the Gabrieleno Tongva Tribal Council
Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians - Kizh Nation
Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians
Northern Chumash Tribal Council

PREPARED FOR:
LOS ANGELES DEPARTMENT OF RECREATION AND PARKS

PREPARED BY:

OLIN

THE ROBERT GROUP | KOUNKUEY DESIGN INITIATIVE | AGENCY: ARTIFACT | ESTOLANO ADVISORS
BETTER WORLD GROUP | GEOSYNTEC CONSULTANTS | HR&A ADVISORS | WEST OF WEST | GREENINFO NETWORK
LANDAU DESIGN + TECHNOLOGY | DHARAM CONSULTING | CALVADA SURVEYING | ETC INSTITUTE



Figure 1. O'Melveny Park, located in the Santa Susana Mountains, is one of the largest parks in the City of Los Angeles and features many great places to picnic and hike. Source: Calvada Surveying, Inc, 2025.

Dear Angelenos,

Every day, our parks serve as the stage for the rich tapestry of life in Los Angeles. From serene natural escapes to bustling urban oases and from the mountains to the beach, LA's parks truly have a little bit of everything.

Over the past year, we have heard from Angelenos from all corners of the city how passionate they are about their parks. More than just green spaces, they are vital community hubs where people come together and connect with nature. Having grown up in Los Angeles, I have a deep connection to the Department of Recreation and Parks, where I began my career almost 30 years ago as a part-time employee and have served ever since. I'm incredibly excited to share this citywide Park Needs Assessment (PNA), which is designed to set our city on a clear path to making recreation and parks even better over the next 20 years.

What makes this PNA truly special is the collaborative spirit that shaped it. This assessment uniquely incorporates both rigorous analytics and the lived realities of our residents, ensuring that our plans are not just data-driven but also deeply reflective of what our communities truly need and desire.

I am incredibly optimistic about the future of recreation and parks in Los Angeles, and I look forward to building that future together with all of you.

Sincerely,

Jimmy Kim

JIMMY KIM
GENERAL MANAGER
LA RECREATION AND PARKS



Figure 2. Parks are a foundational part of life for Angelenos of all ages. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

CITY OF LOS ANGELES

Karen Bass, Mayor

Jacqueline Hamilton, Deputy Mayor for Neighborhood Services

Randall Winston, Deputy Mayor of Infrastructure

Karren Lane, Deputy Mayor of Community Safety

Robert Clark, Deputy Mayor of Public Safety

Nancy Sutley, Deputy Mayor for Energy and Sustainability

Dr. Etsemaye Agonafer, Deputy Mayor of Homelessness and Community Health

CITY COUNCIL

Eunisses Hernandez, Councilmember District 1

Adrin Nazarian, Councilmember District 2

Bob Blumenfield, Councilmember District 3

Nithya Raman, Councilmember District 4

Katy Yaroslavsky, Councilmember District 5

Imelda Padilla, Councilmember District 6

Monica Rodriguez, Councilmember District 7

Marqueece Harris-Dawson, Councilmember District 8

Curren D. Price, Jr., Councilmember District 9

Heather Hutt, Councilmember District 10

Traci Park, Councilmember District 11

John Lee, Councilmember District 12

Hugo Soto-Martínez, Councilmember District 13

Ysabel J. Jurado, Councilmember District 14

Tim McOsker, Councilmember District 15

BOARD OF RECREATION AND PARK COMMISSIONERS

Renata Simril, President

Luis Sanchez, Vice President

Marie Lloyd, Commissioner

Benny Tran, Commissioner

Tafarai Bayne, Commissioner

DEPARTMENT OF RECREATION AND PARKS

Jimmy Kim, General Manager

Matthew Rudnick, Executive Officer

Cathie Santo Domingo, Assistant General Manager

Brenda Aguirre, Assistant General Manager

Chinyere Stoneham, Assistant General Manager

Noel Williams, Chief Financial Officer

Darryl Ford, Superintendent of Planning, Project Manager

Meghan Luera, Senior Management Analyst II

Jeremy Silva, City Planning Associate

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP)

Helen Olivares

Adriana Rubalcava

Tino Reynoso

Rebecca Lobos

City of Los Angeles Sanitation and Environment (LASAN)

Barbara Romero

Susie Santilena

City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering (BOE)

Steven Fierce

Ohaji Abdallah

University of Southern California (USC)

Cindy Olnick

Esther Marguiles

United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)

Trevor Snyder

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro)

Heather Repenning

Isabelle Garvanne

Los Angeles County Parks and Recreation

Sean Woods

Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority (MRCA)

Brian Baldauf

Fernando Gomez

Streets LA

Ana Tabuena-Ruddy

City of Los Angeles Civil + Human Rights and Equity Department

Monet Bagneris-Tolbert

California State Parks

Sedrick Mitchell

Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD)

Krisztina Tokes

Isela Lopez

Jennifer Natividad

City of Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD)

Billy Brockway

City of Los Angeles Department on Disability (DOD)

Alison Everett

Matan Koch

City of Los Angeles City Planning

Delia Arriaga

City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT)

Jesus Serrano

City of Los Angeles Department of Neighborhood Empowerment

Thomas Soong

Office of Forest Management

Clarissa Boyajian

Office of the Chief Legislative Analyst

Xochitl Ramirez

Office of the City Administrative Officer

Anne Johnson

Maria Gutierrez

Mindy Pothongsunun

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

STEERING COMMITTEE

Board of Recreation and Park Commissioners Representative

Marie Lloyd

California Conservation Corps

Duane Wilson

Nikki Morales

Community Partners

Yvette-Lopez Ledesma

Deputy Mayor

Jacqueline Hamilton

Randall Winston

Karren Lane

Friends of the Los Angeles River

Candice Dickens-Russell

Individual Expert

Deborah Cohen

Los Angeles Alliance for a New Economy (LAANE)

Lauren Ahkiam

Stephany Calvillo

Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation

Sean Woods

Sheela Mathai

Los Angeles Neighborhood Initiative

Veronica Hahni

Aleigh Lewis

Los Angeles Neighborhood Land Trust

Tori Kjer

Los Angeles Parks Foundation

Amber Martinez

Lindsey Kozberg

Los Angeles Waterkeeper

Bruce Reznik

Mayor's Office

Geoff Thompson

Estefany Garcia

Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority (MRCA)

Brian Baldauf

Native American Indian Commission Representative

Rich Toyon

Prevention Institute

Francisco Romero

Rob Baird

Resources Legacy Fund

Alfredo Gonzalez

The Nature Conservancy

Kelsey Jessup

Trust for Public Land

Guillermo Rodriguez

Sarah Friedman

University of Southern California (USC)

Vanessa Carter Fahnestock

We are deeply grateful to the Steering Committee members who generously took time out of their busy schedules to share their insights with us through meetings, interviews, and collaborations.



Figure 3. The Steering Committee receives an update on PNA progress on May 20, 2025. Source: OLIN, 2025.

CONSULTANT TEAM

OLIN

Planning, Landscape Architecture, Urban Design, Engagement

Jessica M. Henson, Project Director

Andrew Dobshinsky, Associate-in-Charge and Parks Planner

Sarah Swanseen, Project Coordinator; Senior Landscape Architect and Planner

Max Dickson, Senior Planner

Joanna Karaman, Ecological Systems Specialist

Selina Cheah

Kate Lawler

Darian Ehya

Derek Lazo

Evangeline Sheridan

Zitong Huang

Jiewen Hu

Priyanjali Sinha

Rachita Saxena

Farzana Rahman

Miranda Ayres

Kristen Juen

Hanrui Fu

AGENCY ARTIFACT

Landscape Architecture and Engagement

Christopher Torres, Founding Principal

Viraj Chauhan

Emilio Uranga

Melanie Buffa

THE ROBERT GROUP

Community Engagement

Christine Robert

Isaiah Ford

Christina Monzer

Mary Alice Williams

DaYoung Lee

Brock Morgan

KOUNKUEY DESIGN INITIATIVE

Landscape Architecture and Engagement

Chelina Odbert, Founding Principal

Lauren Elachi

Eric Riley

Leslie Dinkin

Nora Healy

ESTOLANO ADVISORS

Strategy, Equity, and Facilitation

Cecilia Estolano

Thomson Dryjanski

Sasha Ragland

DHARAM CONSULTING

Cost Estimation

Steve Kelly

Allan Duncan

Andrew Jonsson

Rey Sasuman

BETTER WORLD GROUP

Strategy and Coalition Building

Shona Calzada Ganguly

Kimberly Guo

HR&A ADVISORS

Economic Analysis and Strategy

Connie Chung

Jill Schmidt Bengochea

Lauren Kim

GREENINFO NETWORK

Park Data and Prioritization

Dan Rademacher

Jon Christensen

Jayita Bhojwani

Amanda Kochanek

Data Visualization and User Needs

Maria del Carmen Lamadrid

Tom Allnutt

Andrew Nham

WEST OF WEST ARCHITECTURE + DESIGN

Architecture

Jai Kumaran

Jonathan Rieke

Jess Smith

Angela Lufkin

LANDAU DESIGN + TECHNOLOGY

Digital Engagement and Animation

Chris Landau

Gina Rattanakone

Yaoze Yu

Sabrina Rattanakone

Timothy Day

GEOSYNTEC CONSULTANTS

Water Resources and Civil Engineering

Mark Hanna

Daniel Lee

Stephanie Zinn

Haley Bauer

CALVADA SURVEYING, INC.

Professional Land Surveying, LiDAR & Photogrammetry, and UAS – Unmanned Aerial Systems (Drone) Imagery

Armando DuPont

Saul Melgarejo Jr.

Daniel Oswaldo Gonzalez

ETC INSTITUTE

Statistically Valid Surveying

Chris Tatham

Jason Morado

Ryan Murray

COMMUNITY PARTNERS

Friends of the LA River

Heart of Los Angeles

Homeless Health Care Los Angeles

Koreatown Youth + Community Center (KYCC)

LA Compost

Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition (BikeLA)

Los Angeles Walks

Nature for All

Northeast Neighborhood Outreach (NENO)

Pacoima Beautiful

Tia Chucha's Centro Cultural and Bookstore

TreePeople

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OVERVIEW



The **Overview** offers a high-level summary of the PNA's objectives and the overarching vision for parks across Los Angeles.

17 A Vision for LA Parks

20 Key Takeaways

34 How to read the PNA

SECTION I: CONTEXT



Section I: Context sets the stage for the PNA and summarizes the community engagement process that informed priorities throughout the report.

45 PLANNING CONTEXT

46 The Value of Recreation and Parks

52 Park and Recreation Trends

54 Previous Planning

62 Population projections

65 ENGAGEMENT

66 Engagement Timeline

68 Engagement Across The City

70 Engagement By The Numbers

72 Meetings and Outreach

80 What We Heard

100 Public Draft PNA

SECTION II: RECREATION AND PARKS TODAY



Section II: Recreation and Parks Today lays out an overview of RAP, including its historical development, current system, and budget structure.

107 HISTORY

108 City of Los Angeles Recreation and Parks Story

116 Recreation & Parks System Growth

119 RAP BY THE NUMBERS

120 The Park System

122 Existing Classifications

135 CURRENT BUDGET AND FINANCE

136 Financial Snapshot

146 Staffing Snapshot

APPENDIX

See PNA Appendix document for additional detail and resources.

SECTION III: COMMUNITY NEEDS



Section III: Community Needs situates LA's park system in the context of peer cities and identifies areas of need with site prioritization and regional snapshots.

155 BENCHMARKING

156 Peer City Benchmarking

158 Recreation and Park Amenity Benchmarking

160 Financial Benchmarking

165 SITE PRIORITIZATION

166 Universe of Sites

172 Prioritization

183 REGIONAL SNAPSHOTS

184 East/Central

190 South

196 North

202 West

SECTION IV: GUIDELINES



Section IV: Guidelines provides a framework and tools for planning the future of the park system, including park classifications, site planning strategies, and level of service standards.

212 Capital Life Cycle

215 ONGOING ENGAGEMENT

216 Engagement Guidelines

227 SITE PLANNING

228 Site Planning Guidelines

245 PARK CLASSIFICATIONS

246 Proposed Classifications

295 LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS

296 Level of Service Standards

300 Summary of How the Guidelines Relate to the Capital Life Cycle

SECTION V: IMPLEMENTATION



Section V: Implementation outlines a path to realize the PNA vision through cost and funding strategies and an action plan to help guide decision making in the future.

307 COST AND FUNDING

308 Planning-Level Cost Assumptions and Estimates

310 Types of Cost, Assumptions, and Approach

314 Cost Totals

316 Additional Staff Needs

320 Funding Strategy Recommendations

333 ACTION PLAN

334 How Do We Get There?

336 Steps forward

346 Updating the PNA

348 Building on the PNA

RESOURCES

356 Universe of Sites

366 Sources

374 Table of Figures



Figure 4. Youths play at the Class Parks Summer Kickoff Picnic. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.

PARK NEEDS ASSESSMENT
OVERVIEW

As critical infrastructure in our communities, parks are a foundational part of life in Los Angeles. The 2025 City of Los Angeles Park Needs Assessment (PNA) is a roadmap to better meet Angelenos' park needs in the coming decades. It brings together deep community engagement, innovation in data collection and mapping, and the lived realities of communities around the City.

The PNA highlights the wealth of amenities and experiences available to residents across more than 16,000 acres of public parkland and the breadth of benefits residents receive from these vast resources everyday. At the same time, the PNA demonstrates opportunity areas to expand and enhance these resources to historically underserved communities, such as families with low income, those from marginalized racial or ethnic groups, and those with disabilities, improving equitable access to amenities, including staffing and funding.



Figure 5. The CicLAvia Heart of LA event engaged users of MacArthur Park. Source: Calvada Surveying, Inc., 2025.



A VISION FOR LA PARKS

LA'S PARKS HELP US THRIVE EVERY DAY BY PROVIDING SPACES TO PLAY, LEARN, AND CONNECT IN NATURE.

Parks are for all Angelenos.

They connect us to nature, to the mountains and the ocean, to each other. They are places to escape the heat, attend festivals, see coast live oak trees, eat carne asada, and paddle in swan boats with family and friends. They are our front and backyards, the places we instinctively gravitate to. They knit the very fabric of our city together and make it feel like home.

From a young age, playgrounds transform into the backdrops for endless imaginative adventures, and open fields provide the perfect setting for impromptu soccer games with friends. The laughter, the friendly competition, the sheer joy of running freely are experiences not just about physical activity but about building friendships, learning teamwork, and fostering creativity that are foundational to social and emotional development for children of all cultures, abilities, and socioeconomic statuses.

As we get older, parks evolve with us. Impromptu games give way to tournaments and our imaginations run wild with what to grow in community garden plots. Nature becomes our sanctuary. These experiences nurture our bodies and build community. The ability to disconnect from screens and pressures allow us to clear our heads, gain perspective, and promote calm and clarity. Parks become vital outlets for mental well-being—spaces for both quiet introspection and fostering a greater sense of community.

For over two centuries, LA's parks have been indispensable pillars in our communities. As our City changes and grows, and our society becomes more aware of the diversity of perspectives, experiences, needs, and abilities within our community, our parks will evolve so that they continue to enrich our lives and help us thrive.

THROUGH THESE SHARED SPACES, PARKS ENRICH OUR LIVES AND HELP US THRIVE.




Figure 6. People fly kites at Angels Gate Park. Source: Connie Chung/HR&A, 2025.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

LA'S PARK SYSTEM HAS FALLEN TO 90TH OUT OF THE 100 LARGEST CITIES' PARK SYSTEMS IN THE COUNTRY.

The PNA identifies strategies to maintain, improve, and expand LA's diverse network of parks, facilities, and programs.



~500
PARK SITES

16,000+
ACRES


6,700+
EMPLOYEES



RAP WILL USE THE PNA AS A GUIDE TO MAKE EQUITABLE, EFFECTIVE, AND LASTING IMPROVEMENTS ACROSS THE PARK SYSTEM OVER THE NEXT 20 YEARS.

RAP'S BUDGET HAS NOT KEPT PACE WITH INFLATION, EVEN AS PARK ACREAGE AND THE DEPARTMENT'S OBLIGATION TO REIMBURSE THE GENERAL FUND FOR STAFF BENEFITS AND UTILITIES HAS GROWN. ADDITIONALLY, SOME CRITICAL FUNDING SOURCES WILL EXPIRE IN THE NEXT FEW YEARS.

The PNA identifies a need for $15 billion in one-time capital spending to catch up on deferred maintenance and to meet level of service goals.



The PNA identifies a need for $558 million annually to cover staffing, operations, and General Fund reimbursements. The current budget is approximately $350 million, more than half of the need.

ANNUAL OPERATING NEEDS

(IN 2025 DOLLARS WITHOUT ESCALATION)

$558M



EXPENSES

~$62M

+



STAFF INCREASES TO MEET STAFFING GAP

~$295M

+




GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENT

$201M

RAP AND THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES WILL PURSUE A VARIETY OF STRATEGIES TO INCREASE FUNDING FOR PARKS.

SINCE 2008, RAP'S FULL-TIME STAFF HAS DECREASED BY OVER 25%.


The PNA identifies specific staffing needs for native habitat management and ecologists, accessibility managers, park rangers, and park ambassadors.



RAP WILL WORK TO OVERCOME RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION DIFFICULTIES DUE TO LIMITED RESOURCES AND LOWER WAGES COMPARED TO OTHER DEPARTMENTS.

GIVEN CURRENT FUNDING CHALLENGES, PRIORITIZATION AND DECISION-MAKING TOOLS ARE CRITICAL TO BE ABLE TO SAY "THESE SITES AND NEIGHBORHOODS NEED ATTENTION FIRST."

The PNA prioritizes existing and prospective park sites across the City using indicators of park need, park pressure, and facility condition as well as social and environmental equity, resilience, and alignment with other City and County initiatives.



RAP WILL USE THE PNA'S PRIORITIZED LIST OF 518 PARK SITES AND NEW PARK PRIORITY AREAS TO BE PROACTIVE IN DECISION-MAKING ABOUT WHERE TO INVEST FIRST.

MOST ANGELENOS AGREE THAT PARKS, TRAILS, RECREATION FACILITIES, AND PROGRAMS PROVIDE A WIDE RANGE OF BENEFITS.

The PNA pulls together resident sentiments and research documenting the benefits recreation and parks provide in improving health and wellness, supporting childhood development, offering economic opportunity, and helping build strong, resilient communities.








RAP WILL USE THESE FINDINGS AND RESEARCH IN MARKETING AND COMMUNICATIONS AS WELL AS TO SECURE ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR RECREATION AND PARKS.

LESS THAN HALF OF ANGELENOS FEEL THAT THERE ARE ENOUGH PARKS AND/OR RECREATION CENTERS WITHIN WALKING DISTANCE OF THEIR HOME.

The PNA was shaped by the participation of thousands of Angelenos in surveys, in-person meetings, workshops, and events.



4,600+
Online Survey Responses




1,000+
Statistically Valid Survey Responses



1,200+
Community Meeting Attendees



25+
Pop-Ups Around the City



12
Council District Briefings



17
Interest Group Meetings



100+
Community Partner Events




3
Youth Workshops and Events

RAP WILL USE THE PNA'S GUIDELINES FOR ONGOING ENGAGEMENT TO HELP PARKS REFLECT THE DIVERSE NEEDS AND PRIORITIES OF LOS ANGELES' MANY NEIGHBORHOODS.

THERE ARE DIFFERENT NEEDS AND PRESSURES IN DIFFERENT PARTS OF THE CITY, FROM DISPARITIES IN PARK ACCESS AND RECREATIONAL RESOURCES TO DIFFERENCES IN COMMUNITY PRIORITIES.

The PNA documents different issues and preferences in four geographic regions of the City.



NORTH

Characterized by historic suburban, low-density development and vast landscapes, the North region includes some of RAP's largest and most popular recreation areas and faces challenges around access and interconnectivity.

EAST/CENTRAL

Home to some of the most diverse and densest neighborhoods in the City, the East/Central region faces challenges of high park pressure, low park acreage, and displacement and green gentrification.

WEST

Known for its coastal proximity and lower density, the West region's diverse range of park and recreation facilities, from beaches to mountain trails, face increased wildfire risk as well as overall challenges of maintenance and safety.


SOUTH

Encompassing one of the City's most historically significant and culturally rich communities, the South region's historic disinvestment underlies challenges with safety, underfunded programming and staffing, and environmental burdens.

RAP WILL USE THE REGIONAL SNAPSHOTS TO TAILOR ITS ACTIONS TO THE NEEDS IN DIFFERENT PARTS OF THE CITY.

WHILE LA'S PARK SYSTEM CONTINUES TO EXPAND, THE CITY CURRENTLY HAS JUST 4.2 PARK ACRES PER THOUSAND RESIDENTS—THE LOWEST RATIO SINCE THE 1870S—AND GENERALLY OFFERS FAR FEWER AMENITIES PER CAPITA THAN ITS PEERS.


The PNA guides how many amenities are needed through newly-developed benchmarks, called level of service standards.



RAP WILL USE THE LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS TO GUIDE DECISIONS ABOUT WHAT ADDITIONAL AMENITIES ARE NEEDED.

RAP'S ANNUAL ASSESSMENT OF RECREATION AMENITIES DOES NOT CURRENTLY TAKE INTO ACCOUNT SITE DESIGN AND FUNCTION.

The PNA's site planning guidelines help establish consistent principles for design, connectivity, sustainability, and access.



DESIGN

- ☑ SYSTEM-WIDE DESIGN LANGUAGE
- ☑ DESIGN VOCABULARY
- ☑ COHESIVE SITE LAYOUT
- ☑ PARK CORE
- ☑ INDOOR-OUTDOOR CONNECTIONS
- ☑ NATIVE PLANTING VARIETY
- ☑ PARK USER EQUITY
- ☑ CULTURAL/HISTORIC FEATURES
- ☑ WATER CONSERVATION
- ☑ FIRE RISK REDUCTION

CONTEXT

- PSU ☑ PARK SUPPORTIVE USES
- ☑ BUILDING FRONTAGE
- ☑ COUNTY / REGIONAL PARKS PROPERTY
- ☑ PUBLIC PROPERTY/INSTITUTIONAL
- ☑ STREETSCAPE ENHANCEMENTS

CONNECTIVITY

- ☑ STREET GRID CONNECTIVITY
- ☑ SEAMLESS PUBLIC SPACE
- ☑ TRAIL MODE SEPARATION
- ☑ LOOP TRAIL
- ☑ INTERNAL WALKING TRAIL
- ☑ TRAIL CONNECTION
- ☑ SAFE ROUTES / PASSAGES

WAYFINDING

- ☑ GATEWAYS (PRIMARY/SECONDARY)
- ☑ PATH HIERARCHY
- ☑ UNIVERSAL WAYFINDING SIGNAGE

TYPICAL AMENITIES

UNIVERSAL ELEMENTS IN ALL ZONES

Seating, Shade, Identity Features, Low Impact Development BMPs, Lighting

IU INTENSIVE USE

Outdoor Event Space, Group Picnic Area, Restroom, Dog Park, Community Garden

PG PROGRAMMABLE GATHERING

Park Shelter, Tiered Seating

RE RECREATION

Fitness / Exercise Equipment, Creative Play Attraction, Playground, Rectangular Field, Diamond Field, Basketball Court, Tennis / Pickleball Court, Volleyball Court, Water Play, Pool

CU CASUAL USE

Individual Picnic Area, Casual Use Space, Internal Walking Trail, Shade Structure

NA NATURAL

Stormwater Management, Natural Space, Unique Landscape Feature

INFRASTRUCTURE

Bike Parking, Transit Stop, Shared Parking, On-Site Parking, Safe Crossings, Comfort Facility, Maintenance Facility, Pickup/ Dropoff, Regional Water Partnerships

RAP WILL USE THE PNA'S SITE PLANNING GUIDELINES TO ENSURE THAT PARKS ACROSS LOS ANGELES ARE NOT ONLY FUNCTIONAL AND BEAUTIFUL BUT ALSO ALIGNED WITH COMMUNITY EXPECTATIONS.

PRIOR TO THE PNA, ALL OF THE CITY'S PARKS WERE CATEGORIZED INTO ONLY THREE CLASSIFICATIONS.

The PNA includes new park classifications to expand the vocabulary we use to refer to the various types of parks in the city.

PROPOSED CLASSIFICATIONS

- Mini Park
- Neighborhood Park
- Large Neighborhood Park
- Neighborhood Nature Park
- Community Park
- Large Community Park
- Community Nature Park
- Regional Park
- Regional Nature Park
- Historic Landmark Site
- Greenway
- Linear Park
- Canyon Park
- Community School Park
- School Pool
- Beach
- Mountain Camp
- Single Purpose Site
- Golf Course
- New Park Priority Area

RAP WILL USE THE CLASSIFICATIONS TO CLARIFY HOW EXISTING PARKS FUNCTION AND SET EXPECTATIONS ABOUT HOW FUTURE PARKS CAN MEET RESIDENTS' NEEDS.


AS THE CITY CONTINUES TO GROW AND CHANGE, IT WILL REQUIRE SUSTAINED INVESTMENT TO MAINTAIN, IMPROVE, AND EXPAND ITS DIVERSE NETWORK OF PARKS, FACILITIES, AND PROGRAMS.

The PNA provides both long-term guidance and day-to-day tools for managing the city's recreation and parks system.

IDENTIFY PROJECT APPROACH




SECURE SUSTAINABLE FUNDING FOR RECREATION AND PARKS



FOCUS ON THE HIGHEST PRIORITY SITES




SEEK TO ADDRESS RESIDENTS' TOP CITYWIDE PRIORITIES FOR AMENITIES AND PROGRAMS



CONSIDER CITYWIDE NEEDS BASED ON LEVEL OF SERVICE

300 in 2025 ▲ 432 by 2050

ACCOUNT FOR DIFFERENT PRIORITIES IN DIFFERENT PARTS OF THE CITY



USE THE SITE PLANNING GUIDELINES TO EVALUATE AND IMPROVE FORM AND FUNCTION



CONSULT THE CLASSIFICATIONS TO IDENTIFY TYPICAL AMENITIES AND APPLICABLE GUIDELINES



CONTINUE TO MEANINGFULLY ENGAGE WITH RESIDENTS



RAP WILL IMPLEMENT THE PNA AND UPDATE IT ON A RECURRING BASIS.

HOW TO READ THE PNA

The PNA had four phases and public engagement was important at each step of the process. The resulting needs assessment is based on community feedback and brings together several key elements:

WHERE

- A **"Universe of Sites"** includes existing sites and areas in need of future parks. The PNA has completed a rigorous update to the park data layers to define boundaries of existing parks. In addition, potential areas for future parks are defined using an innovative tool called "PerSquareMile." This tool allows examination of areas that do not have enough park access.
- **Sites are prioritized** based on criteria from community engagement, Steering Committee guidance, and best practices.

WHAT

- **A set of needed elements or features is compiled** based on national trends for parks and recreation, benchmark comparisons to other peer cities, and the types of elements people prioritize in surveys conducted for the PNA.

HOW

- **Costs for prioritized elements, features, land, staffing, design, and other financial projections are determined** by capital cost estimates, maintenance estimates, regulatory requirements, and other budget realities over a 25-year projected timeline.
- **Potential ideas for funding are explored** based on the needs identified.

In summary, the "Universe of Sites" exercise defines where to spend money, the "Elements" defines what to spend money on, and the Costs define the budget gap and funding opportunities.

In combination, these factors will provide a decision making framework that provides a direct line of sight from community needs and priorities to RAP spending and projects. These factors are tied to and demonstrated through explorations of the lived realities in different neighborhoods in the City.

Ultimately, the costs and desires of park users will add up to a number bigger than the City can afford under current funding mechanisms.

The problems of our park system require more robust strategies. Some neighborhoods in Los Angeles lack adequate park space. Other parts of the City face barriers to accessing existing parks. There is a significant need for additional recreational facilities, space, and cultural amenities. Hundreds of acres of parks are needed in the densest areas of the City and some areas that are densifying rapidly, such as the San Fernando Valley, will soon require more park acreage. Billions of dollars are needed for land acquisition, additional staffing, operations and maintenance, and upgrades in accessibility, and amenities.



Figure 7. People paddle swan boats at Echo Park lake. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.

The Park Needs Assessment (PNA) considers traditional park needs and community feedback, and categorizes those needs and costs. It is important to balance incremental steps toward the vision that Angelenos have for parks with generational opportunities and bold visions at the scale of the City to meet the needs outlined in the PNA.

One of the most basic ways to meet the needs of Angelenos is to coordinate partnerships with schools, colleges, and universities to create shared use agreements that allow usage of facilities for more hours during the week. Additionally, increasing lighting at parks with recreation fields can increase the hours of play, especially in winter months.

Beyond these existing facilities, it becomes necessary to consider other large land uses as part of our public park system. The planning efforts along the Los Angeles River, which identified over 2,300 acres of potential public land in the river right of way, is one example of bold initiatives that can create additional park amenities in the City of Los Angeles. Efforts to depave or reuse large asphalt parking lots or bridge over roadways with parks are the types of grand strategies that must be taken seriously. Meeting the needs of downtown Los Angeles, East Los Angeles, and other dense areas of the city will require finding utility right of ways, roadways, and landscapes over structure to meet the growing population's needs in the coming decades. Even if these strategies seem expensive, small-scale efforts cannot meet current challenges, and the opportunity costs of inaction outweigh large investments.

RAP's budget has not kept pace with inflation over the past 25 years, even as the city has added over 1,000 acres of parkland—meaning that the current budget is not able to cover basic park needs. This is why prioritization and decision making tools are critical to be able to say "spend money on this element first at this place."

Meeting even the most basic requests of Angelenos for better operations and maintenance and safety in their parks will require a tremendous infusion of additional funding. With the City budget currently in deficit and dropping, gone are the days when it could be relied upon to meet these needs. Los Angeles needs creative strategies that go beyond those typically considered in other major American cities to meet the scale of the issues affecting its parks.

HOW TO FIND YOUR SPECIFIC PARK!

PNA SHORTCUTS FOR THOSE INTERESTED IN A SPECIFIC PARK.

The PNA is organized and designed to be a tool for understanding and advancing park equity and investment. Users can first locate their park or prospective park site of interest in the Universe of Sites table found in Chapter 14: Action Plan. From there, readers can refer back to earlier chapters to explore how that site scores in terms of prioritization, what classification it falls under, and which guidelines apply for its future planning, design, and development. Chapter 8: Regional Snapshots offers additional context for where the site sits within the City.

Start here to find your park or park site in the Universe of Sites table!

FIRST PRIORITY


Rank	Title	Size (Acres)	PNA Classification	Region	Composite Score
24	105th Street Pocket Park	0.11	Mini Park	South	
1	11th Avenue Park	0.21	Mini Park	South	
5	97th Street Pocket Park	0.13	Mini Park	South	
11	Arts District Park	0.51	Mini Park	Cen/East	
13	LAR Greenway - Mason to Vanalden	6.22	Greenway	North	
20	Leo Politi Elementary School (CSP)	2.02	Community School Park	Cen/East	
12	Little Green Acres Park	0.23	Mini Park	South	
25	Ord And Yale Street Park	0.60	Mini Park	Cen/East	
10	PerSquareMile - Downtown	3.00	New Park Priority Area	Cen/East	
15	PerSquareMile - East Vermont Square	3.00	New Park Priority Area	South	
19	PerSquareMile - Exposition Park	3.00	New Park Priority Area	South	
14	PerSquareMile - N Hist South Central	3.00	New Park Priority Area	South	
23	PerSquareMile - North Hollywood	3.00	New Park Priority Area	North	
22	PerSquareMile - Pico-Union	3.00	New Park Priority Area	Cen/East	
6	PerSquareMile - University Park North	3.00	New Park Priority Area	Cen/East	
17	PerSquareMile - Van Nuys - Valley Glen	3.00	New Park Priority Area	North	
7	PerSquareMile - Westlake	3.00	New Park Priority Area	Cen/East	
9	PerSquareMile - Westlake-Koreatown	3.00	New Park Priority Area	Cen/East	
21	Rolland Curtis Park	0.09	Mini Park	South	
2	Saint James Park	0.90	Mini Park	Cen/East	
3	San Julian Park	0.29	Mini Park	Cen/East	
16	Sixth Street Viaduct Park	12.52	Community Park	Cen/East	
4	South Victoria Avenue Park	0.26	Mini Park	South	
8	Valencia Triangle	0.06	Mini Park	Cen/East	
18	Vermont Miracle Park	0.22	Mini Park	South	

SECOND PRIORITY

45	111th Place Pocket Park	0.09	Mini Park	South	
80	1st And Broadway Civic Center Park	1.96	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	
132	4206 S Main St Maintenance Yard	0.48	Single Purpose Site	South	
119	49th Street Pocket Park	0.19	Mini Park	South	
97	61st Street Pocket Park	0.12	Mini Park	South	

Figure 8. **Each park or park site is listed in the Table of Sites, which lets readers know how it is prioritized, its classification, and its region.**
Source: OLIN, 2025.


LEARN HOW THE PARK WAS PRIORITIZED




LEARN ABOUT THE PARK'S CLASSIFICATION



LEARN WHAT GUIDELINES APPLY



LEARN ABOUT REGIONAL NEEDS AND INITIATIVES



PRIORITIZATION

See how parks and park sites are scored based on need, equity, access, and other criteria to understand which sites rise to the top.

See how a site ranked in the Resources section on 354 and it's full score in all prioritization criteria in the PNA Appendix.

The Prioritization chapter starts on 165.

CLASSIFICATIONS

Learn how each park and park site is classified by size, type, and function to help provide guidelines to meet current and future needs.

The Classification chapter starts on 245.

GUIDELINES

Find best practices for site planning, amenities, and level of service standards for different park classifications.

The Site Planning Guidelines chapter starts on 227.

REGIONAL SNAPSHOTS

Explore and understand community needs and challenges unique to each region in the City.


The Regional Snapshots chapter starts on 183.


PARK PIXELS: VISUALIZING PARK DATA

To address the challenge of visualizing over 500 parks and park facilities across the City, a 'park pixel' method was developed for the PNA to depict each park in a simplified format. In this approach, each park is represented as a pixel in its approximate location.

The pixel size corresponds to park acreage: parks under 100 acres are shown as 1x1 pixels, parks between 100 and 999 acres as 2x2 pixels, and parks over 1,000 acres as 3x3 pixels. This abstraction helps make complex data more accessible and enables a clearer visualization of the full park system at a citywide scale, particularly when mapping site prioritization (see Figure 13 as an example). The pixel map also allows viewers and users of the PNA to understand how parks compare in terms of size and relative need, allowing patterns and gaps to emerge more legibly.


1x1 pixel =
Under 100 acres






Example:
St. James Park


2x2 pixel =
100+ acres





Example:
Elysian Park

3x3 pixel =
1,000+ acres





Example:
Griffith Park

Figure 9. **Saint James Park is a park under 100 acres and represented by a 1x1 pixel.** Source: Viraj Chauhan/Agency: Artifact, 2025.
Figure 10. **Elysian Park is between 100 and 1,000 acres and is represented by a 2x2 pixel.** Source: Nora Healy/Kounkuey Design Initiative, 2025.
Figure 11. **Griffith Park is over 1,000 acres and is represented by a 3x3 pixel.** Source: Mary Alice William/The Robert Group, 2025.




Figure 12. The map above depicts parks represented as park pixels and arranged by their respective regions in the City. Source: OLIN, 2025.




Figure 13. The map on the left shows Park Condition Assessment data visualized by park, while the map on the right shows the same data visualized by park pixel. Source: OLIN, 2025.

Figure 14. The ribbon cutting at the re-opening of Inell Woods Park. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025.
Figure 15. People play soccer at Rancho Cienega Park. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.
Figure 16. Children play on the playground at Porter Ridge playground. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.
Figure 17. Hikers climb a trail in Runyon Canyon. Source: Alex Millauer/Shutterstock, 2017.
Figure 18. A bench provides a place to rest along a path at North Atwater Park. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.











01



Figure 19. **Youths playing football at the Class Parks Summer Kickoff Picnic.** Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.

SECTION I:
CONTEXT

Welcome to the Park Needs Assessment! The Planning Context chapter situates this effort within the broader context of regional and local plans and underscores the vital role that parks and recreation play in supporting healthy, vibrant cities. The Engagement chapter summarizes the robust community input gathered through surveys, workshops, engagement meetings, and other outreach efforts, which helped shape the plan's priorities and reflect the diverse recreation and park needs of Angelenos.



Figure 20. This view over Historic Saint James Park in South LA shows the park's walking path and area of native planting. Source: Agency: Artifact, 2025.



PLANNING CONTEXT

This chapter provides an overview of relevant work that has informed the analyses and proposals of the PNA. The Park Needs Assessment is grounded in national research on the essential role parks play in our everyday lives—from improving health and wellness to providing economic opportunities to building stronger communities. It also acknowledges and builds on the planning efforts by RAP and other local entities that are setting the course for a more environmentally sustainable and culturally sensitive Los Angeles.

THE VALUE OF RECREATION AND PARKS

Recreation and parks are essential.

The following research, much of which has been compiled by the National Recreation and Park Association, backs up what people intuitively know—that recreation and parks are critical resources that help ensure residents' and cities' well-being.

HEALTH AND WELLNESS

PEOPLE WHO LIVE NEAR PARKS ARE BOTH PHYSICALLY AND MENTALLY HEALTHIER THAN THOSE WHO DO NOT.

Access to indoor and/or outdoor recreation facilities and frequency of park visitation correlate with greater physical activity.[1]

People who use parks and open spaces are three times more likely to achieve recommended levels of physical activity than non-users.[2]

Greenspace exposure corresponds with improved physical health, including decreases in stress, blood pressure, heart rate, and risk of chronic disease (cancer, diabetes, cardiovascular heart disease).[3,4]

Eighty-six percent of adults in the U.S. have had a healthcare provider recommend methods for improving physical or mental health that do not involve medication.[5]

Nearly 60 percent of adults in the U.S. have had their healthcare provider recommend moving their body daily.[6]

Playgrounds designed with features for both adults and children could support physical activity by increasing visitation frequency and duration.[7]

People who live near parks are more likely to use active transportation options such as walking, biking, and running than those who do not live near parks.[8]

Children with access to parks and facilities have shown decreased prevalence of obesity compared to children without access.[9]

Time spent in nature positively impacts mental health by increasing cognitive performance and well-being and alleviating illnesses such as depression, attention deficit disorders, and Alzheimer's disease.[10]

Children lacking parks are more likely to be physically inactive, have excessive screen time (greater than or equal to 4 hours daily), obtain inadequate sleep, and be obese, overweight, or diagnosed with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD).[11]

Inadequate physical activity leads to greater aggregate health care expenditures. Annual healthcare costs are significantly lower for adults who maintain moderate or high physical activity levels and adults who increase physical activity levels in early adulthood (in comparison to adults who were consistently inactive from adolescence into middle age).[12,13]



Figure 21. Players participate in youth soccer practice at Boyle Heights Recreation Center in East LA.
Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks.

ACCESS TO PARKS AND OTHER PUBLIC OPEN SPACE PROMOTES GREATER MENTAL WELL-BEING.

Access to parks and greenspace exposure correlates with reductions in stress and reduced symptoms of depression as well as improved attention and mood.[14]

Mental health is significantly related to residential distance from parks. People living more than 0.6 miles away from a green space have nearly 50% higher odds of experiencing stress than those living fewer than 0.2 miles from a green space.[15]

Physician-diagnosed depression is 33% higher in the residential areas with the fewest green spaces compared to the neighborhoods with the most.[16]

In order to find joy, a plurality of U.S. adults in big cities wish they spent more time outdoors.[17]

Parks promote positive mental health by providing access to nature and encouraging recreational and sporting activity.[18]

PEOPLE WITH ACCESS TO PARKS AND GREEN SPACES LIVE LONGER, HEALTHIER LIVES.

Parks provide opportunities for physical activity and connecting with the outdoors. The resulting impacts are better mental health, improved physical health, and increased physical activity.[19]

Greenspace exposure in urban environments corresponds with lower mortality.[20,21]

Outdoor green environments enable physical distancing that reduces the risk of airborne viral infections (e.g., COVID-19) and increases resilience to global climate change.[22]

RECREATIONAL PROGRAMS AND EVENTS CONTRIBUTE TO OVERALL LEVELS OF PHYSICAL ACTIVITY.

Most park and recreation agencies offer in-person (five in six agencies) and virtual (nearly three in four agencies) fitness and exercise programs.[23]

In Los Angeles, park use and physical activity have been shown to be directly attributable to the number of scheduled organized activities.[24]

ACCESS TO ARTS AND CULTURAL RESOURCES IN PARKS HAS A POSITIVE IMPACT ON A NEIGHBORHOOD'S HEALTH, SCHOOL OUTCOMES, AND CRIME RATE.

The presence of arts and cultural resources in neighborhoods has been correlated with a decrease child abuse and neglect, a decrease obesity, a decrease serious crime rates, and an increase children's math and reading exam scores.[25]

Low- and moderate-income neighborhoods, which tend to have relatively few cultural resources, show the strongest connection between culture and social well-being.[26]

CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT

PARKS AND RECREATION AGENCIES ARE LEADING PROVIDERS OF CHILDCARE AND OUT-OF-SCHOOL TIME PROGRAMMING.

Park and recreation agencies deliver out-of-school time programs to children of all ages.[27]

Eighty-five percent of U.S. adults say it is important for their local park and recreation agency to offer before- and after-school childcare and summer camps for youth.[28]

PARKS AND RECREATION AGENCIES ARE LEADERS IN YOUTH SPORTS, PROVIDING OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN OF ALL SKILLS AND ABILITIES TO PLAY AND INTRODUCING KIDS TO A WIDE VARIETY OF SPORTS ACTIVITIES.

Availability of nearby parks correlates with higher participation in active sports.[29]

Ninety-eight percent of U.S. adults agree that it is important to provide youth with equitable access to sports opportunities.

Seventy-eight percent of U.S. adults believe that it is important that youth sports providers offer all children and young adults opportunities to learn about and play sports regardless of their skill or ability to pay.[30]

PARKS AND RECREATION TEACH KIDS ABOUT ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY, PROVIDE BETTER COGNITIVE AND EMOTIONAL STIMULATION, AND PROMOTE CREATIVITY AND IMAGINATION.

Youth who spend more time in nature tend to place a higher value on nature and have greater pro-environmental attitudes and behaviors.[31,32]

Ninety-four percent of U.S. adults agree that it is important for children and young adults to learn about the environment and ways they can help be good environmental stewards.[33]

CHILDREN WHO SPEND A SIGNIFICANT AMOUNT OF TIME IN NATURE ALSO EXPERIENCE BETTER EMOTIONAL STABILITY AND IMPROVED MENTAL HEALTH.

Self-reported time in nature correlates with overall positive youth development as exhibited in competence, connection, confidence, character, and caring.[34]

The positive effects of nature exposure for children include improved cognitive functioning (including increased concentration, greater attention capacities and higher academic performance), better motor coordination, reduced stress levels, increased social interaction with adults and other children, and improved social skills.[35]

Nature play is an important component of the development of resilience in early childhood.[36,37]

Participating in outdoor recreation bolsters adolescent resilience to stressors such as the COVID-19 pandemic and improves overall adolescent mental health.[38]

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

LOCAL PARK AND RECREATION AGENCIES' EXPENDITURES SUPPORT ECONOMIC ACTIVITY AND JOB CREATION.

Local parks and recreation agencies in the United States generated more than $200 billion in economic activity and supported more than 1.1 million jobs in 2021.[39] In California alone, local parks and recreation agencies generated more than $20 billion in economic activity and supported more than 105,000 jobs that same year.[40]

The outdoor recreation economy, which includes local parks and recreation, accounted for $373.3 billion of 2020 U.S. Gross Domestic Product, or 1.8% of the U.S. economy.[41]

The more than 10,000 local park and recreation agencies across the United States employ more than 175,000 full-time and hundreds of thousands of part-time and seasonal park and recreation professionals.[42]



Figure 22. The City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks opens a Community School Park with the goal of increasing access to parks across communities in LA. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks

Systematic review shows economic benefits exceed the cost for park, trail, and greenway infrastructure interventions to increase physical activity and use.[43]

EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYEES ARE MORE LIKELY TO LOCATE NEAR HIGH-QUALITY PARKS AND RECREATION AMENITIES.

Nearly 62% of corporate executives indicate that quality-of-life is an important factor when they consider making plans to expand facilities or relocate.[44]

Investments in improving a community's quality of life can create a virtuous cycle: high-quality places attract workers and employers, which in turn attract more investments and jobs.[45]

Research and development facilities, technology companies, and corporate headquarters are more likely to prioritize quality-of-life and cultural amenities when making site-location decisions.[46]

PARKS AND RECREATION BOOST HOME VALUES AND PROPERTY TAX BASES.

Among U.S. adults, 86% say that proximity to parks and recreation facilities is an important factor in deciding where to live.[47]

A review of 33 studies suggests a home value premium of 8 to 10% for properties adjacent to a passive park.[48]

PARKS AND RECREATION ARE LEADING SOURCES OF FIRST JOBS FOR YOUTH AND YOUNG ADULTS.

Ninety-six percent of U.S. adults agree there are important benefits that teenagers and young adults gain from their first jobs and volunteer opportunities.[49]

Ninety percent of U.S. adults want their local park and recreation agency to provide job and volunteer opportunities for youth and young adults.[50]



Figure 23. This community resources fair included senior services and job placement at South park Recreation Center in South LA.
Source: City of Los Angeles, Department of Recreation and Parks.

STRONG COMMUNITIES

PARKS AND RECREATION COUNTER SOCIAL ISOLATION BY CONNECTING PEOPLE WITH NATURE AND EACH OTHER.

The top reason people cite for using parks and recreation facilities is to be with family or friends.[51]

Eighty-eight percent of U.S. adults agree that parks and recreation provide good opportunities to interact with nature and the outdoors.[52]

Ninety-one percent of U.S. adults seek park-centered entertainment and social events that allow them to mix and mingle with others.[53]

Fifty-three percent of U.S. adults in big cities have had at least one positive conversation in a park with somebody of a different social or economic background.[54]

Walking, park prescriptions, community gardening, and farmers' market vouchers may promote nature contact, strengthen social structures, and improve longer term mental and physical health by activating intrapersonal, interpersonal, and environmental processes.[55]

High-quality parks and built environment features help to foster positive social interactions and increase social capital within historically marginalized communities.[56]

THE U.S. PUBLIC STRONGLY SUPPORTS PARKS AND RECREATION'S MISSION AND FUNDING.

In the U.S., more than 276 million people visited a local park or recreation facility at least once during the past year.[57]

Ninety-one percent of U.S. adults say that parks and recreation are an important local government service.[58]

Eighty-one percent of U.S. adults want parks and recreation to ensure inclusivity through policies and practices. Inclusive practices and policies are those that take into account people of all mental and physical abilities, as well as ethnic, religious, racial, cultural or socio-economic backgrounds, or orientations.[59]

U.S. ADULTS WANT THEIR POLITICAL LEADERS TO FULLY FUND PARKS AND RECREATION.

Seventy-two percent of U.S. adults are more likely to vote for politicians (e.g., mayor, county executive, or council member) who make park and recreation funding a priority. This preference is robust across ages, income levels, and political affiliation.[60]

Nearly 90% of U.S. adults agree that it is important for local, state, and federal governments to fund local park and recreation agencies sufficiently in order to ensure every member of the community has equitable access to amenities, infrastructure, and programming.[61]

Sixty-six percent of U.S. adults say that they support their local government dedicating revenues, taxes, and levies that specifically target park and recreation operations or expansion projects.[62]

RESILIENT COMMUNITIES

PARKS AND RECREATION AGENCIES ARE ON THE FOREFRONT OF THEIR COMMUNITIES' EMERGENCY RESPONSE.

Seventy-seven percent of adults in the U.S. agree that their park and recreation agency should invest in preparing for, weathering, or recovering quickly from natural disasters.[63]

Forty percent of park and recreation agencies offer disaster and emergency relief.[64]

Three in five park and recreation agencies provided essential, emergency services in response to the COVID-19 pandemic in October 2020, including:[65]

- supporting food to vulnerable youth, older adults, and families
- opening agency facilities to serve as virtual learning centers
- providing facilities to serve as vaccination and testing centers
- transforming recreation centers to serve as emergency shelters

CLIMATE-READY PARKS PROVIDE PROVEN, COST EFFECTIVE, AND SUSTAINABLE ENVIRONMENTAL SOLUTIONS.

Parks lower ground temperatures with tree canopy, clean water, reduce flooding, and contribute to healthier air.[66]

Trees and vegetation in parks help reduce air pollution directly by removing pollutants and reducing air temperature.[67]

Urban parks can improve the environment, enhance stormwater management, reduce traffic noise, and increase biodiversity.[68]

THE U.S. PUBLIC WANTS PARKS AND RECREATION TO PROTECT NATURAL RESOURCES AND MITIGATE THE IMPACT OF CLIMATE CHANGE.

Ninety-three percent of U.S. adults agree that it is critical that their local government develops local parks, trails, and greenspaces near bodies of water for the purpose of protecting natural resources in their community.[69]

Eighty-six percent of U.S. adults support their local park and recreation agency's environmental initiatives, including wildlife conservation, educating the public on environmental issues, natural resource management, mitigating the impacts from climate change, nurturing pollinator habitats, and managing land for flood mitigation.[70]

Eighty-nine percent of U.S. adults want their local park and recreation agency to reduce the impact of extreme temperatures through the planting of trees and other vegetation.[71]

PARK AND RECREATION TRENDS

Recreation is constantly evolving. In 2024, Recreation Trends Magazine identified 25 of the biggest trends in parks and recreation in the past 25 years.[72] This is a condensed summary of that retrospective.

GENERAL TRENDS

Cost Recovery, or Running Like a Business: Park and recreation departments are increasingly looking to generate revenue through fees and partnerships to subsidize operations.

The Rise of Data: Major studies and data resources, like TPL's ParkScore, have emerged to help benchmark operations, fine-tune resource allocation, and gain funding support.

Technology Changes Everything: Technological advances, including management software, online facility reservations, and widespread Wi-Fi access, have transformed how facilities operate and how people interact with them.

Conservation & Sustainability: Driven by climate concerns, conservation and sustainability efforts have become essential, influencing facility design, construction, and operation through resource conservation, eco-friendly practices, and formal standards like LEED certification.

Diversity & Inclusion: A commitment to diversity and inclusion drives decisions to provide equitable access and engagement in recreation for all people, influencing accessibility of facilities and programs.

AQUATIC TRENDS

Diversification of Design & Offerings: Aquatic facilities have moved away from traditional rectangular pools toward diverse designs, including zero-depth entries and water slides, alongside more diverse programming like water-based fitness classes.

Aquatic Safety Advances: Aquatic safety has advanced through improved lifeguard training, better indoor ventilation systems, and nationally mandated anti-entrapment measures.

Secondary Disinfection: Secondary disinfection has become necessary to combat chlorine-resistant pathogens, particularly in high-risk aquatic areas like splash play facilities.

Aquatic Accessibility: In 2010, ADA Standards for Accessible Design started to require that newly constructed or altered pools include accessible entry methods, such as pool lifts or sloped entries.

Splash Play: Zero-depth interactive fountain areas, or splash play, have become a booming trend in parks, with designs focused on inclusive experiences.

PARK & PLAYGROUND TRENDS

Inclusive Play: Playground design has progressed from mere ADA accessibility to genuine inclusive play, ensuring children of all abilities can play alongside one another on the same equipment, addressing a broad range of physical and developmental needs.

Playground Safety & Perceived Risk: Playground innovation balances greater perceived risk (e.g., higher towers) with stringent safety maintenance, relying on adherence to established standards, professional certification, and improved surfacing materials.

Screen Time Competition: Parks are increasingly having to compete with youth screen time, employing elaborate, adventurous playgrounds and specialized facilities (like skate parks) to boost play value and encourage outdoor activity.

Dog Parks: Dog parks have become a rapidly expanding community trend, now included in over a quarter of facilities surveyed, featuring increasingly sophisticated designs with amenities like agility equipment and size-separated areas for safer play.

Trails & Active Transportation: The successful development of multiuse trails, including the conversion of former rail corridors, provides alternative transportation routes, connects people to nature, and offers significant community health and economic benefits.



Figure 24. Patton Street Pocket Park is an example of a mini park with community amenities such as a playground and fitness zone.
Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks

Outdoor Fitness: Parks are increasingly incorporating outdoor fitness areas and equipment, offering a key solution to address public health issues.

Waterfront Reclamation & Development: Waterfront reclamation and development have transformed former industrial sites into public gathering places, creating vibrant communities with varied active and passive recreational amenities like riverwalks and on-water features.

RECREATION, SPORTS & FITNESS

Recreation & Wellness Centers: Larger community recreation and wellness centers have boomed, integrating a diverse array of advanced amenities, fitness options, and sports courts for multiple generations.

Active Aging: The aging, physically active Baby Boomer population has necessitated adjustments to programming and amenities to support active wellness regimens in retirement, leading to the development of dedicated centers for the 50+ demographic.

The X Games Effect & Youth Sports Diversification: While traditional sports once dominated school and community sports programs, today people of all ages have a wider array of sports programs, including lacrosse, rugby, pickleball, ultimate frisbee and more, leading to higher overall participation.

Surface Evolution: Sports surfaces have evolved significantly, moving beyond traditional materials to adopt improved synthetic court materials, fitness surfaces, and synthetic turf systems that offer better safety and playability as well as easier maintenance.

Lighting & Scoreboard Updates: LED technology has transformed sports facilities by providing longer-lasting lighting that minimizes light spill and modernized scoreboards and videoboards that enhance the spectator experience and allow for advertising revenue generation.

Changing Room Changes: Modern designs for locker rooms are more aesthetically pleasing, with a focus on inclusion achieved through improved fixtures, lighting, and the introduction of family or private changing and showering spaces.

Fitness Programming & Equipment Diversifies: Fitness equipment has advanced with sophisticated technology and integration (e.g., cross-trainers and integrated entertainment), while programming has diversified to include popular group exercise and virtual workouts that extend reach.

Integration of Fitness & Health Care: Addressing public health issues like obesity and aging, the integration of fitness and health care is highlighted by the "Exercise is Medicine" initiative, which standardizes physical activity assessment and promotion within clinical care.

PREVIOUS PLANNING

Key Reports

A foundational aspect of planning in a complex context like the City of Los Angeles is understanding the constellation of related planning efforts occurring at local, state, and federal levels. Parks and park programming relate closely to many of the most critical topics affecting Southern California today from water to biodiversity to climate issues to housing. Given this intersection of topics, the following literature review outlines planning efforts that are important to understand related to the PNA.

Documents identified as Key Documents are summarized below with their importance to the PNA outlined.

2009 CITY OF LA PARK NEEDS ASSESSMENT





Figure 25. The 2009 City of LA Park Needs Assessment included evaluation of support for park improvements. Source: Citywide Community Needs Assessment, Page 26, 2009.

Title: Citywide Community Needs Assessment
Date: 2009
Prepared By: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks
Summary: The 2009 Citywide Community Needs Assessment is the most recent needs assessment completed by the City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. The assessment included community input and a survey, demographic and trends analysis, recreation and sports trends, facility and program assessments, a community values model framework, a prioritized needs assessment, and a service area analysis. The survey findings can be compared to current trends and data to understand change over time within communities. The survey information and prioritization rankings are divided into seven geographic areas around the city as well as by age group. This is a helpful framework to consider community needs. The 2009 assessment did not lead to significant funding.

2018 PARKS CONDITION ASSESSMENT REPORT



City of Los Angeles
Department of Recreation and Parks
HOLLENBECK PARK

Address: 415 S. St. Louis Street
Los Angeles, CA 90033
Council District: 14
Maintenance Region: Metro
Property Acquired: 1892
Operated By: Recreation and Parks
Park Acreage: 18.30

Major Recreational Features:
Barbecue pits, children's play area, picnic tables, lake, bridge

Facility Improvements

Recently Completed Improvements:
- Demolition of existing asphalt path. Installation new concrete mow strip, new path of travel and temporary fencing along work area.
- Install new path of travel and fractured rock along lake's edge to support shoreline.
- Install new concrete mow strip along back edge of rock. Install new asphalt to new path of travel.

Expenditure:
- $364,475 – Quimby
- $371,325 – Quimby
- $368,585 – Quimby

Figure 26. This page showing Hollenbeck Park Condition Assessment is an example of the assessment performed for each park. Source: Parks Condition Assessment Report, City of LA RAP, Page 939, 2018.

Title: Parks Condition Assessment Report
Date: 2018
Prepared By: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks: Planning, Maintenance and Construction Branch
Summary: The 2018 Parks Condition Assessment Report summarizes the site condition and recommended improvements for parks owned by the Department of Recreation and Parks. This includes information about each site's history, recreational features, and information about buildings and facilities within the parks. This report includes information on the parks and sub-parks within RAP's system. This report contains a summary of the main findings, including the number of facilities to be replaced including, 20 of the 184 recreation centers, 12 of the 60 pools, and one of the senior centers. The assessment estimates that to complete all projects within the report, would cost $2.1 billion dollars. The report notes possible funding sources for these projects as: Proposition 68, Measure A, Community Development Block Grant (CBDG), Proposition K, Quimby funds, public-private partnerships, and other grants.

CITY OF LOS ANGELES GENERAL PLAN




Figure 27. This diagram recognizes gaps in open space in the long range development patterns of the City. Source: City of Los Angeles General Plan, City of LA DRP, Page 40, 2001.

Title: The City of Los Angeles General Plan
Date: August 2001 (Framework Element)
Prepared By: City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, Department of Recreation and Parks, et. al.
Summary: The City of Los Angeles General Plan puts forth policy goals and objectives to inform land use decisions and planning. It is composed of 11 citywide elements that cover different aspects of the urban environment, including open space, public facilities, land use (which is further broken down in 35 community plans), and conservation. These citywide elements are organized by the Framework Element, which sets an overall strategy for long-term growth and acts as a guide for future updates. The Framework recognizes a deficiency of open space in the City and the difficulty in acquiring large, contiguous tracts of land to create new regional, community, and neighborhood parks. It also acknowledges that park acquisition is limited due to existing patterns of development and a lack of funding, while communities that experience little or no development have limited resources but are often areas with the greatest open space need. The Framework calls for updated park standards to reflect changing population and urban form dynamics.

CITY OF LOS ANGELES GENERAL PLAN: OPEN SPACE ELEMENT



Figure 28. The City of LA General plan recognizes the benefits of open spaces such as the Hollywood Reservoir. Source: City of Los Angeles General Plan, Open Space Element, City of LA DRP, Page 26, 1973. Photo Credit: Ed. Rondot.

Title: Open Space Element
Date: June 1973
Prepared By: City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning
Summary: This plan is a framework and guide for preserving and managing the City's open spaces. It defines "open space" as public or private land free of structures, buildings and/or natural in character, while "open space use" covers four main areas: preservation of natural resources, managed protection of natural resources, outdoor recreation, and public health and safety. "Desirable open space" is defined as land with characteristics that should be protected. The Plan outlines five goals:

1. Preserve and conserve open space for recreation, environment, health, and safety
2. Conserve unique natural features, scenic areas and cultural and historical monuments
3. Develop an open space system that provides identity, form, and a visual framework
4. Conserve and preserve environmental resources
5. Provide access to open space lands

Various policy recommendations and implementation programs target each goal. For example subdivision and zoning regulations on privately owned open space lands and desirable open space to establish access standards and consider natural hazards.

CITY OF LOS ANGELES GENERAL PLAN: PUBLIC FACILITIES ELEMENT



Figure 29. The Public Recreation Plan guides the development and management of neighborhood and community recreation sites. Source: Public Recreation Plan, Cover Image, 1968.

Title: Public Recreation Plan
Date: 1968, 2016
Prepared By: City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, Department of Recreation and Parks
Summary: The Public Facilities Element (1968) is a part of the General Plan, covering cultural and historical monuments, City-owned power transmission rights-of-way (ROW) development, major equestrian and hiking trails, public libraries, public recreation, and public schools. The Public Recreation Plan, prepared by the City's Department of City Planning and Department of Recreation and Parks, guides the development and management of neighborhood and community recreation sites, emphasizing priority on underserved areas of the City. The plan describes specific objectives, including developing and locating public facilities in areas that provide greatest benefit to the greatest number of people at least cost and least environmental impact as well as a guide of priorities for acquisition and development of public recreation facilities. Local and community recreation standards are set in the plan alongside policy recommendations for service levels.

In 2016, there was a proposed and approved amendment to the Public Recreation Plan. The amendment modernized the definitions for neighborhood, community, and regional recreational sites and included updated guidelines. The new guidelines modified recommended service area distances and recommended new service levels for each of the three recreational sites and facilities.

QUIMBY ACT/ZONE CHANGE FEE/PARK IMPACT FEE



Figure 31. The Quimby Act intends to alleviate and mitigate development park pressure. Source: Aerial image of Seoul International Park and surrounding urban landscape. Google Earth Pro Version 7.3.6.10201, Date of imagery: November 20 2023.

Title: Quimby Act Provisions to the Subdivision Map Act (California Government Code, § 66410:66499)
Date: 1971, 2017
Summary: The Quimby Act was first adopted in 1971, which required developers to dedicate land or pay an in-lieu fee as a condition of subdivision map approval. In 1985, the Zone Change Fee (aka Finn Fee) was also adopted which applied the same fee schedule to multi-unit housing developments that were increasing residential density. The underlying principle of the Act posits that new development brings in additional residents, placing more strain on the existing park system. The fees and/or land dedication collected via the Quimby Act intends to alleviate and mitigate this park pressure. RAP is permitted to use Quimby and Park Fees only for park capital improvements; these include land acquisition, design/construction of park and recreational improvements, and park rehabilitation projects. It does not include park operations, maintenance, materials and supplies, or equipment.

Beginning in January 2017, the current park fee ordinance dictates that new dwelling units must dedicate land or pay a fee in-lieu ('Park Fee') for developing park and recreational facilities. A land dedication must be located on-site or within a certain radius from the project site depending on the park classification (neighborhood park: within a 2 mile radius; community park: within a 5 mile radius; regional park: within a 10 mile radius).

2016 LOS ANGELES COUNTY PARK NEEDS ASSESSMENT




Figure 30. The 2016 Los Angeles County Park Needs Assessment included evaluation of park metrics such as amount of parkland and availability of park amenities. Source: Citywide Community Needs Assessment, LA County DRP, Page 11, 2016.

Title: Los Angeles County Parks & Recreation Needs Assessment
Date: 2016
Prepared By: LA County Department of Parks and Recreation
Summary: In 2016, the County of Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) underwent a countywide Park Needs Assessment to inventory and identify needed parks and recreational facilities in cities and unincorporated areas. The assessment emphasized community priorities as well as deferred maintenance projects, using five key metrics to determine park need and priorities: park land available, park access, park condition, park infrastructure, and park pressure (acres of park). The PNA led to the creation of a countywide dataset on parks and recreation facilities, which provides a regional understanding of where park need is highest and where funding may be leveraged for park and open space projects where they are needed the most. The County updated the PNA in 2022 with PNA+.

2022 LOS ANGELES COUNTY PNA+




Figure 32. The PNA+ identified areas for environmental restoration among other county-wide analyses. Source: 2022 LAC PNA+, LA County DPR, Page 3-6.

Title: Los Angeles County Parks and Recreation Needs Assessment Plus (PNA+)
Date: 2022
Prepared By: LA County Department of Parks and Recreation
Summary: Adopted by the Board of Supervisors in 2022, the PNA+ builds on the 2016 LA County PNA and is led by LA County Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR). The updated report focuses on environmental conservation and restoration, regional recreation, and rural recreation. The report also serves as the County's 30x30 plan, which sets a goal of conserving 30 percent of lands and coastal waters by 2030. Priority areas were identified as those with most environmental benefits, such as habitat connectivity, as well as areas that have the most environmental burdens, like hazardous waste. The PNA+ focuses on most vulnerable residents who live in park-and-tree-poor urban and rural areas and have limited access to local and regional parks or facilities. The PNA+ also includes an updated database on regional park and open space access, trails, beaches and lakes, and local parks in rural areas. Based on the findings, the report outlines funding priorities and coordination opportunities for DPR as well as recommendations for capacity building and increased access to parks and recreation facilities. This City of LA PNA is consistent with the goals and priorities of the LA County PNA, prioritizing habitat connectivity and environmental burden on communities in future park investment.

LA COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION STRATEGIC PLAN




Figure 33. The Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation administers a vast network of open spaces and recreation facilities. Source: The County of Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation Strategic Plan, LA County DRP, Page 16-17, 2023.

Title: The County of Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation Strategic Plan
Date: March 2023
Prepared By: LA County Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR)
Summary: Released in 2023, the Department's Strategic Plan describes LA County DPR's action plan for providing services to residents and stewarding existing and future parkland. The document identifies six goals to guide the agency's work over the next five years. These include:

1. Promote play and well-being of youth, families, and seniors
2. Strengthen programs, experiences, and engagement in the community
3. Increase park equity and access to park space
4. Invest in staff and volunteers
5. Provide stewardship of public lands, natural resources, and urban forestry
6. Advance organizational excellence

Each goal includes strategies to achieve DPR's vision. For example, to improve the park experience and increase equity, DPR highlights strategies such as expanding revenue generation, prioritizing park safety, and increasing park amenities in high and very-high need communities. Throughout the plan, LA County DPR codifies its commitment to uplifting historically marginalized communities and increasing park equity countywide.

OURLA2040 OPEN SPACE WORKING GROUP SUMMARY



Figure 35. Large urban open spaces allow for public access to parks. Source: Aerial image of O'Melveny Park, Calvada Surveying, Inc, 2025.

Title: OurLA2040 Open Space Working Group Summary
Date: September 2017
Prepared By: Los Angeles Department of City Planning
Summary: In 2017, the City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning convened subject matter experts for an Open Space Working Group to develop key goals and policies for the Open Space Element of the 2020 General Plan, also known as OurLA2040. While the update to the element has yet to take place, there are key trends that were identified for open space and land use in Los Angeles. The working group focused on four topics: parks and recreation, wildlands, waterways and beaches, and connections. Drawing on their technical expertise and community feedback, the working group identified challenges, opportunities, and policy recommendations within each topic, with several themes spanning across all four topics. The key "cross-cutting" themes were:

1. Create a network of interconnected urban open spaces and green infrastructure
2. Capitalize on opportunities to repurpose existing land for parks
3. Strategically invest in improving equity and access to parks
4. Promote citizen education, involvement, and stewardship
5. Identify opportunities for climate-smart open space investments that deliver multiple environmental benefits

PLAN FOR A HEALTHY LOS ANGELES




Figure 34. The Plan for a Healthy Los Angeles supported physical activity as an integral facet of healthy living. The plan advocated for public, private, and non-profit partners, including LAUSD, to bring health and wellness programming to LA youth. Source: Plan for a Healthy LA, LADCP, 2021. LAUSD Beyond the Bell, Page 67.

Title: Plan for a Healthy Los Angeles: A Health, Wellness, and Equity Element of the General Plan
Date: November 2021
Prepared By: Los Angeles Department of City Planning
Summary: Released in 2021, the Health, Wellness, and Equity Element of the Los Angeles General Plan provides goals, strategies, and high-level policies to achieve better health outcomes for residents in the City of Los Angeles. This document uplifts beneficial health policies in the General Plan and, where gaps exist, provides recommendations for additional health policies. The plan outlines a holistic vision towards achieving better health outcomes for Angelenos, with portions of the plan detailing how parks and open space can achieve improved health outcomes. The plan includes a chapter, titled Bountiful Parks and Open Spaces, that describes specific objectives and strategies the City should pursue to improve and increase park access for residents. For example, the chapter emphasizes the need to adequately fund park development in low-income communities and identifies funding strategies to achieve this goal, such as leveraging transit development funds or developing public-private partnerships. The chapter also uplifts existing exercise opportunities that the City can promote to increase health outcomes in Los Angeles.

EQUITY, INFRASTRUCTURE, AND PARK-SPECIFIC MASTER PLANS

In addition to the Key Reports summarized above, several regional and national planning documents play pivotal roles in understanding the intersection of equity and infrastructure with the future of our parks system. Local park-specific planning efforts are instrumental in bringing forward park needs and community objectives for some of RAP's largest parks.



SEPULVEDA DAM BASIN MASTER PLAN AND ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, 2011

Prepared By: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Summary: Identifies land use classifications and multiple resource management topics for the Sepulveda Basin. The USACE is updating the Master Plan during 2025.



HANDBOOK FOR GENDER-INCLUSIVE URBAN PLANNING AND DESIGN, 2020

Prepared By: International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank and KDI
Summary: The handbook presents the economic and social case for gender inclusion in urban planning and design and provides guidelines on how to implement gender inclusive design of public spaces and parks.




SEPULVEDA BASIN VISION PLAN, 2024

Prepared By: City of LA Dept. of Public Works Bureau of Engineering and Department of Recreation and Parks
Summary: The plan proposes 48 distinct projects across a 25-year horizon for land within the Sepulveda Basin. Projects emphasize climate resiliency and access for both neighboring communities and the region-at-large. Objectives aim to balance recreational, ecological, cultural, and resiliency functions.




COEXISTENCE IN PUBLIC SPACE, 2021

Prepared By: SPUR (San Francisco Bay Area Planning and Urban Research Association)
Summary: This document provides useful tactics and approaches for engaging issues of the unhoused community in public spaces and the best ways to organize engagement that fosters productive conversations towards the betterment of public space for users.



A VISION FOR GRIFFITH PARK, 2013

Prepared By: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks
Summary: Building off the 1978 Master Plan, this Vision Plan aims to preserve the urban wilderness identity of Griffith Park and its biodiversity while enhancing the existing programmatic uses of the park.



RECYCLED WATER MASTER PLAN, 2012

Prepared By: City of LA Dept. of Water and Power and LA County Public Works, LASAN and LABOE
Summary: Strategies to maximize implementation potential of expanded recycled water use to help secure a more sustainable water supply for the City. Important to LA's parks is the inclusion of new recycled supplies to meet non-potable demands.



STORMWATER CAPTURE MASTER PLAN, 2015

Prepared By: City of LA Dept. of Water and Power
Summary: The master plan investigates the use of stormwater as a supply for the City of LA including both groundwater recharge and direct use. It creates a funding mechanism for projects that either capture and augment the City's groundwater aquifers or directly use water through site-specific storage and distribution.



LA RIVER MASTER PLAN, 2022

Prepared By: LA County Public Works
Summary: The master plan includes community-based goals, design guidelines, and equity-focused strategies for multi-benefit projects for the 51 miles of the LA River. It includes areas within and around several City of LA Parks as Planned Project sites.




LASAN BIODIVERSITY INDEX BASELINE REPORT, 2022

Prepared By: City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, Bureau of Sanitation and Environment
Summary: The report uses 25 metrics to assess the City's progress towards a no-net loss biodiversity target. This creates scores for the existing biodiversity of parks to track goals moving forward.



CITY OF LOS ANGELES LA RIVER REVITALIZATION MASTER PLAN, 2007

Prepared By: City of LA Dept. of Public Works Bureau of Engineering
Summary: The master plan identifies a number of improvements that relate to LA River adjacent park spaces and an interconnected system of green streets and walking loops.



ENHANCED WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLANS

Prepared By: Various[73]
Summary: The City of LA exists within several watersheds, including the Upper LA River, Santa Monica Bay, Ballona Creek, Dominguez Channel, and Marina del Rey watersheds. Several Watershed Management plans are relevant for park compliance across RAP's system.

POPULATION PROJECTIONS

Projected Population Density Growth 2019–2050

Between 2019 and 2050, the population in Los Angeles is expected to grow. According to the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) population projections, areas such as Council District 14 are expected to experience the most significant increases in population density over the next 25 years. CD 14 includes the neighborhoods of Downtown, Boyle Heights, and Lincoln Heights. Growth is also anticipated in CD 5, 10, and 13, which encompasses neighborhoods like Mid-City and Hollywood. These projections suggest that park needs and pressure will likely be higher in these areas of the City as the rising concentration of residents will heighten the demand for accessible open space and recreational amenities.




Figure 36. This map shows projected population density growth from 2019 to 2050 within the City of LA. Source: City Boundary and Parks: City of LA Data Portal, 2025. Roads: US Census Bureau, 2025., LA River: National Hydrography Database, 2025. Projected population density: SCAG Connect SoCal 2024.



LOS ANGELES
eles County
LEGEND
City of LA Boundary
City of LA Parks
LA River
LA County
Major Road/Highway
Minor Road
POPULATION GROWTH DENSITY 2019 - 2050
(PEOPLE PER SQUARE MILE)
≤ -2,000
-2,000–0
0–2,000
2,000–4,000
4,000–6,000
6,000–8,000
8,000–12,000
12,000–16,000
16,000–20,000
20,000–30,000
30,000–60,000
≥ 60,000



Figure 37. Council Member Monica Rodriguez gives opening remarks for a PNA Community Meeting at Lake View Terrace.
Source: The Robert Group, 2025.

ENGAGEMENT

Community engagement was foundational to the development of the Parks Needs Assessment (PNA). The engagement process raised awareness of the role the Department of Recreation and Parks plays in the City, collected input on needs and opportunities that reflect the diverse cultures and communities of Los Angeles, and elevated the voices of communities that have been traditionally excluded from planning and design conversations. Over 100,000 Angelenos participated in the development of the PNA through direct engagement events and online outreach throughout the project.

Engagement for the PNA sought to meet people where they are, focusing on events and popups at community events across the City, providing venues for in-person open houses and worksessions, hosting virtual meetings and events, and working with 12 community partner organizations that have established community ties to engage their networks. Across various phases of engagement, space was created for meaningful conversations that reflect the diverse needs of LA. Despite a political climate in summer 2025 that made some residents uncomfortable attending in-person meetings, the PNA Consultant Team and community partners were able to reach these communities through virtual and hybrid workshops, meetings, and equity-focused sessions. These challenges during the PNA further demonstrated that oftentimes the most marginalized communities need parks the most.




Figure 38. The PNA project timeline included three phases and many different types of outreach. Source: OLIN, 2025.


ENGAGEMENT TIMELINE

Outreach and engagement was structured into three phases that aligned with the phases of the PNA's development.

PHASE I: ASSESS UNDERSTANDING

February–April 2025

The goal of Phase I engagement was to increase residents' awareness of the PNA, the Department of Recreation and Parks (RAP), and the city's park system. Digital, analog, and in-person outreach and engagement encouraged widespread participation from community members and key groups. Over 5,000 Angelenos completed a survey that assessed park needs and opportunities across the City.



3
DRAFT PNA
REFINING FINDINGS INTO A DRAFT PNA

4
FINAL PNA
SHARING THE FINAL PNA

PHASE II: UNDERSTANDING PRIORITIES

April–August 2025

The goal of Phase II engagement was to share findings from the Phase I survey as well as from technical analyses of RAP's finances and facility conditions. A Phase II survey asked community members for their reactions to Phase I survey findings and their priorities for park improvements. This information was crucial in the formation of the Draft PNA document.

PHASE III: SHARING ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

September–November 2025

The goal of Phase III engagement was to get feedback on the Draft PNA. Public comments were received via email, the PNA website, PDF mark-up, and online and virtual events. Community comments were key in finalizing the PNA. During the PNA development process, the political climate made some residents uncomfortable attending in-person meetings. This included some individuals from communities in the LA region most lacking in park resources who engaged with PNA Community Partner Organizations in their communities. This underscored the importance of virtual engagement meetings with the public and virtual equity sessions with advocacy groups.

ENGAGEMENT ACROSS THE CITY

Community feedback from across LA was foundational to the Park Needs Assessment. Residents stopped by information tables at community events, attended community workshops and equity sessions, and shared thoughts at park community open house meetings.

In addition, thousands of community members participated digitally in virtual meetings and by taking online surveys.

PHASE 1 COMMUNITY OPEN HOUSES

1. Ramona Hall
2. Wilmington Rec Center
3. Algin Sutton Rec Center
4. Victory Vineland Rec Center
5. Tarzana Rec Center
6. Westchester Rec Center
7. Lincoln Park Senior Center

POP-UPS, INTEREST GROUPS, YOUTH EVENTS: PH 1

1. Tarzana Earth Day
2. CicLAvia: Koreatown
3. SEACA Youth Workshop
4. LA Maker Faire
5. LASAN Earth Day
6. Foundations & Funders Round Table

PHASE 3 COMMUNITY OPEN HOUSES AND POP-UPS

1. Bellevue Rec Center
2. Westwood Rec Center
3. Hispanic Heritage Month Movie, Felicia Mahood
4. Fiesta Party, North Hollywood RC
5. ShineLA, North Hollywood RC
6. Park Pop-Up Rancho Cienega
7. LA Congress of Neighborhoods
8. CicLAvia South Central

PHASE 2 COMMUNITY OPEN HOUSES

1. JT Harvard Rec Center
2. Lakeview Terrace RC
3. Lafayette Rec Center
4. South Park Rec Center
5. Evergreen Rec Center
6. Peck Park Rec Center
7. Friendship Auditorium
8. Sepulveda Rec Center
9. Alpine Rec Center
10. Granada Hills Rec Center

POP-UPS, YOUTH EVENTS, WALKSHOPS: PHASE 2

1. National Night Out/Sun Valley
2. Salute to Recreation
3. Lotus Festival
4. Lincoln Heights RC
5. Walkshop: Fern Dell
6. Walkshop: Venice Beach
7. Walkshop: Debs Park
8. LANI Forum
9. 7th Annual Beautification Conference
10. Golf Advisory Committee
11. Equine Advisory Committee
12. CicLAvia Culver Meets Venice*
13. CicLAmini Pico/Union*


LEGEND

- City of LA Boundary
- LA River
- LA County
- Major Road/Highway
- In-Person Equity Sessions
- Community Partner Outreach and Events

Indicates CicLAvia event staffed by a CPP

Figure 39. This map shows the location of the in-person engagement events held across the City this year for the PNA. Source: City Boundary and Parks: City of LA Data Portal, 2025. Roads: US Census Bureau, 2025., LA River: National Hydrography Database, 2025.

N 0 2 4 miles


+30 Virtual Meetings
8 Equity Sessions Held at EXPO Center


ENGAGEMENT BY THE NUMBERS



4600+
Online Survey Responses




1200+
Attendees across Engagement Meetings



1000+
Statistically Valid Survey Responses



25+
Pop-Ups Around the City



12
Council District Briefings



17
Interest Group Meetings



100+
Community Partner Events



3
Youth Workshops and Events

THROUGHOUT ALL THREE PHASES OF ENGAGEMENT, OVER 72 EVENTS WERE HELD. ADDITIONALLY, THOUSANDS OF ANGELENOS ENGAGED ONLINE!



Figure 40. A sensory engagement board at youth events and pop-ups, like pictured here at LASAN Earth Day, encouraged participants to draw what they love most about parks. Source: The Robert Group, 2025.



Figure 41. Community members converse about pickleball at the community meeting at Ramona Hall. Source: OLIN, 2025.

MEETINGS AND OUTREACH

IN-PERSON COMMUNITY OPEN HOUSE MEETINGS

In-person open house meetings followed an interactive format designed to encourage active involvement. After an introductory presentation, participants explored stations with informational and interactive boards. Informational boards provided participants with greater detail about the project. Interactive boards provided participants with opportunities to express their opinions and preferences. RAP staff and consultants were available to answer participants' questions.

IN-PERSON OPEN HOUSES PROVIDE A FORUM FOR RESIDENTS TO GIVE DIRECT FEEDBACK AND BE IN DIALOG WITH THE PROJECT TEAM.

VIRTUAL COMMUNITY OPEN-HOUSE MEETINGS AND WEBINARS

Virtual open houses provided a way for those unable to attend the in-person open houses to hear the same presentation from any location. Following the presentation, a moderated Q+A session gave participants the opportunity to ask questions and engage with the project content.

Additional deep-dive webinars during the Draft PNA phase provided community members a format to learn more detailed informations about the PNA and ask the Project Team questions. These virtual open houses and webinars were made available on the PNA website and YouTube Channel.



Figure 42. Residents explore informational boards in a Phase 2 community meeting at Lafayette Recreation Center. Source: OLIN, 2025.

ENGAGEMENT MATERIALS

Materials provided at the meetings included informational and engagement project boards, project fact sheets, sticky notes, comment cards, and contact information. A large city map allowed participants to indicate where they live and parks they frequently use. Materials were available in English, Spanish, Mandarin, Korean, and Armenian.








Figure 43. Materials were made available at community meetings including informational boards, flyers, and activity books gave participants a variety of ways to engage with information about the PNA. Source: OLIN, 2025.



Figure 44. **A youth advocacy workshop was held at Alpine Recreation Center in Chinatown with the Southeast Asian Community Alliance.** Source: OLIN, 2025.






Figure 45. **Youth activity and education materials were provided at meetings and for download on the project website.** Source: OLIN, 2025.

YOUTH-FOCUSED OUTREACH

A youth advocacy workshop with the South East Asian Community Alliance at Alpine Recreation Center and several youth-centered pop-ups, including the LA Maker Faire and the YMCA Youth Recreation Day, allowed LA's youngest park users (and future park stewards) and their parents to have their voices heard.

Outside of the youth-focused events, an educational activity book, "draw your dream park" activity sheet, and youth survey were available at in-person meetings, at pop-ups, and on the PNA website to explain the PNA process accessibly and gather aspirations for the future of LA parks.



Figure 46. The YMCA Healthy Day for Kids event included a sensory board for children to draw what they love most about parks. Source: OLIN, 2025.



Figure 47. A walkshop in Venice Beach brought information about the PNA to community members out in the parks. Source: OLIN, 2025.

POP-UPS AND WALKSHOPS

To engage a broader spectrum of Los Angeles residents, PNA team members set up information booths and tables at events occurring throughout the city, connecting with individuals in familiar and comfortable settings. These pop-ups led to spontaneous, meaningful interactions with families, seniors, students, and professionals who might not have known or had the time or ability to attend the PNA open houses.

Walkshop events held at Griffith Park, Venice Beach, and Earnest E. Debs Regional Park facilitated inclusive and representative feedback from park users in real time.




Figure 48. Equity sessions focused on communities with specialized relationships to parks. Source: Kounkuey Design Initiative.

EQUITY SESSIONS

The PNA equity sessions focused on communities, issues, and groups often neglected in large planning processes. The sessions were organized around four critical lenses: Critical Social Services addressing people who use parks to access service providers like people experiencing homelessness, Parks in Place focusing on residents and vendors who access parks for economic benefit and the impacts of parks on gentrification and displacement, Access for All focusing on access and disability in parks, and the Public Stage which focused on arts and culture in parks.

In 16 equity sessions, the team met with over 30 organizations from around the City to address each of the topics, discussing their intersections and creating recommendations for the PNA guidelines. These meetings centered the lived experiences of participants to help shape more inclusive, equitable public spaces in the future. Attendees directly helped to shape components within the PNA Guidelines (Section IV).

Groups involved in the Equity Sessions throughout the year include:

- Access LA
- Angel City Sports
- AARP
- Butterfli
- City of LA Department of Cultural Affairs (DCA)
- Clockshop
- Community Power Collective (CPC)
- Disability Rights California (DRC)
- DTLA Alliance
- DTLA Mobility for All
- FASTLink DTLA
- Friend of the LA River (FoLAR)
- Homeless Health Care Los Angeles (HHCLA)
- Inclusive Action for the City (IAC)
- Infinite Flow Dance
- Koreatown Youth and Community Center (KYCC)
- LA City Department on Disability (LADOD)
- LA Commons
- LA River Arts (LARA)
- LA Walks
- Move LA
- The Music Center
- Nature for All
- Northeast Neighborhood Outreach
- PACE
- Prevention Institute
- Proyecto Pastoral
- Rancho de Los Amigos
- Refresh Mobility
- Safe Place for Youth (SPY)
- Self Help Graphics (SHG)
- Strategic Actions for a Just Economy (SAJE)
- Tia Chucha's Centro Cultural & Bookstore

ANALOG & DIGITAL RESOURCES

SOCIAL MEDIA

RAP and PNA-specific Instagram, Facebook, LinkedIn and YouTube accounts were used to keep residents informed and engaged. Posts included images, videos, and information about the survey and community meetings, and served as a call to action for community members interested in sharing feedback about city parks.

PRINT OUTS AND ANALOG INFORMATION


Flyers, mailers, QR codes, lawn signs, banners, and posters were distributed to recreation centers and local businesses near community meetings. These materials contained information about community meetings and the overall project. The flyer was available in double-sided English and Spanish, Mandarin, Armenian, and Korean.


PROJECT WEBSITE

The PNA website (needs.parks.lacity.gov) served as an engagement hub with project information and digital surveys, continually updated throughout the PNA's development. Now that the PNA is complete, the website has turned into an interactive version of the final PNA itself.




Figure 49. Flyers, banners, and QR codes were made available in multiple languages. Source: OLIN, 2025.












Figure 50. Other forms of engagement include videos, social media, and a project website. Source: OLIN, 2025.

COMMUNITY PARTNER PROGRAM




Figure 51. Twelve community partner organizations were part of the PNA process to extend outreach. Source: OLIN, 2025.

To reach an even larger audience, 12 community partner organizations with existing networks were tasked with reaching out to their constituents to engage them in the PNA process. These groups attended events and shared information on how to provide input at over 100 events and outreach efforts throughout the year. The community partner organizations for the PNA included:

- Friends of the LA River
- Heart of Los Angeles
- Homeless Health Care Los Angeles
- Koreatown Youth + Community Center (KYCC)
- LA Compost
- Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition
- Los Angeles Walks
- Nature for All
- Northeast Neighborhood Outreach (NENO)
- Pacoima Beautiful
- Tia Chucha's Centro Cultural and Bookstore
- TreePeople

COMMUNITY PARTNER GROUPS EXTENDED OUTREACH TO INCREASE AWARENESS AND RESOURCES FOR THE PARK NEEDS ASSESSMENT.

AGENCY, NON-PROFIT, AND COMMUNITY ADVOCATE COORDINATION




Figure 52. Draft priorities were presented to the Steering Committee. Source: OLIN, 2025.



Figure 53. Steering Committee members discussed the relative importance of different priorities. Source: Mark Hanna/Geosyntec, 2025.



Figure 54. The Technical Advisory Committee met at key milestones. Source: OLIN, 2025.

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

City and County agencies, local technical and institutional leadership, as well as elected officials' staff, were invited to participate in a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) that met at three key milestones to provide technical feedback on the Park Needs Assessment. A full list of Technical Advisory Committee members is provided in the acknowledgments at the beginning of this document.

STEERING COMMITTEE

The PNA Steering Committee was composed of a cross section of park advocates, interest groups, and leadership from the City and RAP. This group met at seven key milestones to review findings and give direction to analyses and recommendations. A full list of Steering Committee members is provided in the acknowledgments at the beginning of this document.

NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL REPORTS

Neighborhood councils across Los Angeles were invited to submit short reports on local park conditions and priorities as part of the PNA outreach effort. Reports were requested to focus on each council or neighborhood's significant challenges and opportunities to provide insight into their lived reality. This outreach aimed to gather geographically specific insights to inform the PNA, as well as provide information to Council Districts, decision makers, and RAP. Twelve neighborhood councils submitted reports which can be found on the PNA website.



Figure 55. Community members listen to a presentation at Lincoln Park during Phase 1 engagement. Source: OLIN, 2025.

WHAT WE HEARD

Throughout the year, the PNA engagement process brought together community members from around the City in conversation about current issues and future aspirations for LA parks. Feedback was gathered through conversation, via notes and letters, and through digital engagement such as online surveys, emails, and comments.

What we heard in meetings and via surveying methods is summarized on the following pages.

TRADITIONAL IN-PERSON AND VIRTUAL COMMUNITY MEETINGS

At community meetings, residents often shared the issues most pressing in their day-to-day experiences in parks and at recreation facilities. Concerns about operations, maintenance, lack of park space, and City finances were among the most frequent comments received.

Some community members expressed concern about environmental health and long term access to open space given increased pressure for housing and densification.

Many community members also expressed safety concerns,including parks with inadequate lighting, fire risk, and a lack of upkeep in current park facilities. Many other individuals came to advocate for increasing park spaces across the City. For additional takeaways from engagement events across areas of the City, see Chapter 8: Regional Snapshots.

TRIBAL BRIEFINGS AND LISTENING SESSIONS

Tribal briefings throughout the process helped raise awareness of the project with tribal leaders in the region. At the Tribal listening session, participants advocated for increased representation and designation of cultural spaces for Indigenous communities in LA parks, potentially through focused contracting with Native artists on interpretive displays at parks and cultural sites. Another area of focus during these conversations was on workforce development within RAP and the City for Indigenous people. It was noted that in ongoing planning and engagement, specific engagement with Tribes can help to close gaps that can occur in traditional engagement and sampling.

INTEREST GROUP MEETINGS

Participants in Interest Group Meetings during the PNA represented neighborhood councils, park advisory boards, and community based organizations. Concerns over park pressure, accessibility, maintenance, and safety were top concerns expressed in these meetings. Many who attended the interest group meetings throughout the process advocated for increasing native species across RAP parks as well as supporting long-term ecologically regenerative land management practices. This feedback helped to inform the Site Planning guidelines in Chapter 10.

EQUITY SESSIONS

Participants in the PNA Equity Sessions spanned community advocacy groups, agencies, non-profits, and arts organizations. These conversations were diverse, with perspectives on parks as foundational infrastructure for LA residents.

The feedback from these groups recounted past experiences collaborating with RAP as a department, and helped to identify actionable areas for improvement. These conversations were foundational to the formation of the PNA Guidelines (Section IV).

THROUGHOUT ALL THREE PHASES OF ENGAGEMENT, OVER 72 EVENTS WERE HELD AND OVER 100,000 ANGELENOS PARTICIPATED THROUGH DIRECT ENGAGEMENT OR ONLINE OUTREACH!





Figure 56. Community members find their favorite park on the PNA engagement map at a community meeting held at Lafayette Recreation Center.
Source: OLIN, 2025.

PUBLIC SURVEY TAKEAWAYS AND STATISTICS


In addition to community meeting discussions and feedback, surveys were used to gather both quantitative and qualitative community input on the current state of local parks and recreation facilities, as well as to identify opportunities for improvement and expansion. Questions solicited opinions about the conditions of parks and recreation centers, how people access parks, barriers to access, and the services and benefits provided by RAP's programs and facilities.

OVER 5,600 SURVEYS WERE COMPLETED ACROSS THE STATISTICALLY VALID SURVEY, THE SHORT ONLINE SURVEY, AND THE LONG ONLINE SURVEY.

Surveys were mailed to a random sample of households in the city to get a statistically valid representation of Angelenos' opinions, and an open survey was available on the PNA website. The open survey had short and long versions tailored to the amount of time people had available.

Over 5,600 surveys were completed across the statistically valid survey, the short online survey, and the long online survey.

How to Read the Survey Takeaways



EACH TICK MARK REPRESENTS A DIFFERENT REGION. THE PERCENTAGE SHOWN SHOULD BE COMPARED TO THE STATISTIC SHOWN IN THE MIDDLE OF THE PIE CHART.

Which households agree?

Respondents from households with XXX and households with XXX are more likely to agree...

Which households are less likely to agree?

Respondents from households over XXX are less likely to agree...

CALLOUTS SHOW HOUSEHOLD TYPES WHOSE RESPONSES DIFFERED FROM THE OVERALL RESULTS BY AT LEAST 3.1%.

Cross-tab information has a higher margin of error due to a smaller number of respondents.

CROSS-TABULAR INFORMATION

- Region
- Household Type
- Race/Ethnicity
- Annual Household Income
- Years in City
- Council District

PARK ACCESS


Access and Availability
Less than half of respondents feel that there are enough parks and/or recreation centers within walking distance of their home. The majority of respondents typically drive or walk to parks and recreation centers, while less than a quarter bike or take transit. Most respondents have visited a City of LA park within the past year, while only about half have visited a City of LA recreation center.

LESS THAN HALF OF RESPONDENTS FEEL THAT THERE ARE ENOUGH PARKS AND/OR RECREATION CENTERS WITHIN WALKING DISTANCE OF THEIR HOME.

DO YOU FEEL THERE ARE ENOUGH PARKS AND/OR RECREATION CENTERS WITHIN WALKING DISTANCE OF YOUR HOME?


STATISTICALLY VALID SURVEY

990 Total Respondents




ONLINE SURVEY

4,097 Total Respondents



IN-PERSON ENGAGEMENT

52 Total Respondents



Which households agree?

Respondents from households with older children aged 10–19 (50%) and households over age 55 and without children (50%) are more likely to agree there are sufficient parks and recreation centers within walking distance.

Which households are less likely to agree?

Respondents from households making $10K–$40K annually (39%) are less likely to agree that there are enough parks and recreation centers within walking distance.

CONDITIONS: PARKS

Overall Condition


Respondents to the statistically valid survey were more positive about the physical condition of parks than respondents to the online survey and in-person meeting participants. Nearly two thirds of statistically valid survey respondents think parks are in excellent or good condition, compared with 40% for the online survey and 10% for in-person meeting participants.

LESS THAN 40% OF RESPONDENTS THINK PARKS ARE IN EXCELLENT OR GOOD CONDITION.

HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE PHYSICAL CONDITION OF LOS ANGELES PARKS?


STATISTICALLY VALID SURVEY

932 Total Respondents



ONLINE SURVEY

4,104 Total Respondents



IN-PERSON ENGAGEMENT

53 Total Respondents



Which households agree?

Respondents from households who have lived in the City for 11–20 years (74%) agree that parks are in excellent or good condition.

Which households are less likely to agree?

Respondents from households who have lived in LA for more than 31 years (61%), households with older children aged 10 - 19 (61%), and households making more than $150K annually (59%) are less likely to agree that parks are in excellent or good condition.

CONDITIONS: RECREATION CENTERS

Overall Condition


Respondents to the statistically valid survey were more positive than those who responded online or in-person about the physical condition of recreation centers. While nearly two-thirds of statistically valid survey respondents think recreation centers are in excellent or good condition, only 37% of online respondents and 24% of in-person respondents agree.

LESS THAN HALF OF RESPONDENTS THINK RECREATION CENTERS ARE IN EXCELLENT OR GOOD CONDITION.

HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE PHYSICAL CONDITION OF LOS ANGELES RECREATION CENTERS?


STATISTICALLY VALID SURVEY

518 Total Respondents



ONLINE SURVEY

4,011 Total Respondents



IN-PERSON ENGAGEMENT

41 Total Respondents



Which households agree?

Respondents from households who have lived in the City for less than 10 years (72%) agree that recreation centers are in excellent or good condition.

Which households are less likely to agree?

Respondents from households with young children aged under 10 (51%) and households making more than $150K annually (48%) are less likely to agree that recreation centers are in excellent or good condition.

PARK PARTICIPATION


Participation
About one in four statistically valid survey respondents participated in a recreation program in the past year. Of those who participated, over 75% rated the quality of the recreation programs as excellent or good. And over 75% of respondents agree that recreation of park facilities are available when they want to use them.

OF THOSE THAT PARTICIPATE IN A RECREATION PROGRAM, OVER 75% RATED THE QUALITY OF RECREATION PROGRAMS AS EXCELLENT OR GOOD.

HOW WOULD YOU RATE OVERALL QUALITY OF ALL RECREATION PROGRAMS YOUR HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS HAVE PARTICIPATED?

STATISTICALLY VALID SURVEY

1,008 Total Respondents



PARK VISITATION


Visitation varies between parks and recreation centers. The majority of respondents have visited a park in the last year, while only half of respondents have visited a recreation center in the same time frame.

MOST RESPONDENTS HAVE VISITED A CITY OF LA PARK IN THE PAST YEAR, WHILE ONLY ABOUT HALF HAVE VISITED A CITY OF LA RECREATION CENTER.

HAVE YOU VISITED ANY PARKS AND RECREATION CENTERS OFFERED BY CITY RECREATION & PARKS IN PAST 12 MONTHS?

PARKS

1,008 Total Respondents



Which households agree?


Respondents from households with young children under 10 are more likely to have visited a park in the last year (97%).

Which households are less likely to agree?

Respondents from households making under $10K annually are less likely to have visited a park in the last year (13%).

RECREATION CENTERS

1,008 Total Respondents



Which households agree?

Respondents from households with young children aged under 10 (67%) and older children aged 10–19 (65%) are more likely to have visited a recreation center in the last year.

Which households are less likely to agree?

Respondents from Asian households (42%) and households who have lived in the City for less than 5 years (40%) are less likely to have visited a recreation center in the last year.

PARK AVAILABILITY

Availability
Respondents to the statistically valid survey generally agree that parks or recreation facilities are available when they want to use them, with more than three quarters of respondents strongly agreeing or agreeing.

MORE THAN 3/4 OF RESPONDENTS AGREE THAT RECREATION OR PARK FACILITIES ARE AVAILABLE WHEN THEY WANT TO USE THEM.

PLEASE RATE YOUR LEVEL OF AGREEMENT WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT: RECREATION OR PARKS FACILITIES ARE ALWAYS AVAILABLE WHEN I WANT TO USE THEM.




Figure 57. **Bar chart illustrating the various ways people travel to parks and recreation centers.** Source: OLIN, 2025.

Which households agree?

Respondents from households with young children under 10 are more likely to have visited a park in the last year (97%).

Which households are less likely to agree?

Respondents from households making under $10K annually are less likely to have visited a park in the last year (13%).

THE MAJORITY OF RESPONDENTS TYPICALLY DRIVE OR WALK TO PARKS AND RECREATION CENTERS.

BARRIERS TO VISITING PARKS

Barriers


The top barrier to visiting parks for respondents is people experiencing homelessness, with a little under half of respondents ranking it as their top reason. Other top barriers that prevent respondents from visiting parks include distance from residences, lack of information on where to go or what is offered at parks and recreation facilities, and lack of maintenance.

PEOPLE EXPERIENCING HOMELESSNESS IS THE MOST COMMON REASON RESPONDENTS DO NOT VISIT.

PLEASE CHECK ALL THE REASONS THAT PREVENT YOU OR MEMBERS OF YOUR HOUSEHOLD FROM VISITING PARKS AND RECREATION CENTERS MORE OFTEN.

5,330 Total Responses

IN-PERSON ENGAGEMENT



MOST IMPORTANT OUTDOOR FACILITIES


WHICH FOUR OF THE OUTDOOR FACILITIES LISTED BELOW ARE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU AND THE MEMBERS OF YOUR HOUSEHOLD?

3,725 Total Responses

UNPROGRAMMED GREEN SPACES, NATURAL AREAS, AND MULTI-USE TRAILS (PAVED AND NON-PAVED) ARE THE MOST IMPORTANT OUTDOOR FACILITIES TO RESPONDENTS.

ONLINE SURVEY

IN-PERSON ENGAGEMENT




MOST IMPORTANT INDOOR FACILITIES

WHICH FOUR OF THE INDOOR FACILITIES LISTED BELOW ARE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU AND THE MEMBERS OF YOUR HOUSEHOLD?

3,224 Total Responses

SWIMMING POOLS, EXERCISE AND FITNESS EQUIPMENT, AND WALKING TRACKS ARE THE MOST IMPORTANT INDOOR FACILITIES TO RESPONDENTS.




MOST IMPORTANT PROGRAMS

WHICH FOUR OF THE PROGRAMS LISTED BELOW ARE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU AND THE MEMBERS OF YOUR HOUSEHOLD?

3,008 Total Responses

FITNESS, FESTIVALS, NATURE EXPERIENCES, AND ARTS AND CRAFTS CLASSES ARE THE MOST IMPORTANT PROGRAMS TO RESPONDENTS.



TOP FOUR MOST IMPORTANT INDOOR/OUTDOOR FACILITIES AND PROGRAMS

THE MOST IMPORTANT OUTDOOR FACILITIES:	THE MOST IMPORTANT INDOOR FACILITIES:	THE MOST IMPORTANT PROGRAMS:
1. UNPROGRAMMED GREEN SPACES 2. NATURAL AREAS AND WILDLIFE HABITATS 3. PAVED, MULTI-USE TRAILS (WALKING, JOGGING, BIKING) 4. NON-PAVED, MULTI-USE TRAILS (WALKING, JOGGING, BIKING)	1. SWIMMING POOL 2. EXERCISE AND FITNESS EQUIPMENT 3. WALKING/JOGGING TRACK 4. WEIGHT ROOMS/GYMS	1. FITNESS/WELLNESS PROGRAMS 2. SPECIAL EVENTS/ FESTIVALS 3. NATURE EXPERIENCES OR ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION 4. ARTS AND CRAFTS CLASSES

Important Facilities and Programs
The four most important outdoor facilities to respondents were:

- Unprogrammed green space,
- Natural areas and wildlife habitats,
- Paved, multi-use trails,
- Non-paved, multi-use trails

The four most important indoor facilities to respondents were

- Swimming pools,
- Exercise equipment,
- Walking/jogging tracks,
- Weight rooms/gyms

The four most important programs to respondents were:

- Fitness/wellness programs
- Special events/festivals
- Nature experiences/environmental education
- Arts and crafts classes

The results for outdoor facilities, indoor facilities, and programs were also broken down by region. While there were some differences and variation, there was a lot of overlap and alignment on unprogrammed green space, trails, indoor walking tracks, indoor pools, and events/festivals.


BENEFITS OF PARKS

Benefits

Overall, respondents agree that there is a wide range of benefits that parks and recreation facilities provide. There was widespread agreement that parks provide benefits to physical health and fitness, mental health and stress reduction, quality of life, and preservation of open space and the environment.

MOST RESPONDENTS AGREE THAT PARKS, TRAILS, RECREATION FACILITIES, AND PROGRAMS PROVIDE A WIDE RANGE OF BENEFITS.

THE FOLLOWING ARE SOME BENEFITS PARKS, TRAILS, RECREATION FACILITIES, AND PROGRAMS PROVIDE. FOR EACH BENEFIT, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR LEVEL OF AGREEMENT.



SAFETY & BELONGING


Safety and Belonging
More than three in four online survey respondents feel safe or feel that they belong at least one park or recreation facility.

MORE THAN 3/4 OF ONLINE RESPONDENTS FEEL SAFE AND/OR FEEL LIKE THEY BELONG IN AT LEAST ONE PARK OR RECREATION FACILITY.

ONLINE SURVEY

1,687 Total Respondents


IS THERE AT LEAST ONE PARK OR RECREATION FACILITY IN LOS ANGELES WHERE YOU FEEL SAFE?



ONLINE SURVEY

1,642 Total Respondents

IS THERE AT LEAST ONE PARK OR RECREATION FACILITY IN LOS ANGELES WHERE YOU FEEL LIKE YOU BELONG?




FINANCIAL SUPPORT

Support for Additional Funding
Most respondents agreed that parks, trails, recreation facilities, and programs provide a wide range of benefits, with agreement ranging from 81% to 97%.

More than half of respondents are supportive of a bond, tax, or levy to fund parks and recreation facilities. In-person meeting attendees were most supportive, at 70%, followed by 63% of online respondents, and 58% of statistically valid survey respondents. While in-person and online respondents had a lower opinion of the conditions of parks and recreation centers, they were also more willing to provide financial support.

CLOSE TO 2/3 OF RESPONDENTS ARE SUPPORTIVE OF A BOND, TAX, OR LEVY TO FUND PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES.



HOW SUPPORTIVE ARE YOU OF A BOND OR SOME INCREASE IN TAXES OR LEVIES TO FUND THE TYPES OF PARKS AND RECREATION CENTERS THAT ARE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU AND YOUR HOUSEHOLD?

Which households agree?

Respondents from households with young children aged under 10 (62%) and households who have lived in the City for less than 5 years (70%) are more likely to support funding for parks and recreation facilities.

Which households are less likely to agree?

Respondents from households over the age of 55 and without children (50%), and households who have lived in the City for 6–10 years (50%) and more than 31 years (51%) are less supportive of funding parks and recreation facilities.

WHAT ANGELENOS SAID...

WHAT DOES LOS ANGELES NEED TO IMPROVE UPON WITH PARKS AND RECREATION IN THE FUTURE?

"A LOT MORE TREES AND SHADE IN EXISTING PARKS. MORE PARKS IN DENSE AREAS. MORE WALKING/HIKING PATHS."

"DOWNTOWN LA LACKS GREENSPACE. SOUTH OF GRAND PARK DESPITE BEING DOTTED WITH EMPTY LOTS AND UNDERUSED OR ABANDONED COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES. MUCH MORE COULD BE DONE HERE TO CREATE SMALL PARK SPACE."

"SOLVE THE QUALITY DISPARITY! WHY CAN'T EVERY PARK HAVE THAT GRIFFITH PARK 'FEEL' NO MATTER THE ACREAGE"

"PUTTING MORE PARK LANDS IN AREAS IN DOWNTOWN WHERE PEOPLE LIVE. FEW LIVE NEAR THE LARGEST PARK. WE NEED TO BUILD PLACES MORE THOUGHTFULLY"

"EQUITY IN FUNDING"

"PROVIDE MORE OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE COMMUNITY TO GET INVOLVED AND SPACE FOR OPEN DIALOGUE"

WHAT DOES LOS ANGELES DO WELL IN PARKS AND RECREATION?

"GOOD TRAILS! HIKING AND NICE LARGE CHUNKS OF AREAS TO EXPLORE"

"STAFF ARE ALMOST ALWAYS AMAZING AND ARE THERE TO HELP KIDS AND HAVE FUN!"

" NEW PARKS LIKE THE ONE NEAR CHINATOWN ARE WELL-MAINTAINED. HIKING TRAILS ARE MORE PLENTIFUL THAN I EXPECTED."

"THERE IS A NICE VARIETY AND SOME LARGE TRACKS OF LAND DEVOTED TO PARKS."

"THEY ARE EVERYWHERE! PAN PACIFIC IS A CROWN JEWEL - THE GROUNDS HAVE BECOME MORE BEAUTIFUL WITH TIME AND I LOVE AND APPRECIATE THE SUMMER CAMP FOR KIDS."

"DIVERSITY, EQUITY AND INCLUSION. MY LOCAL PARK IS A WELCOMING PLACE"

WHAT PROGRAMS WOULD ENCOURAGE YOU TO USE PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES MORE?

"SENIOR FITNESS, COMMUNITY ADVISORY BOARDS FOR EACH FACILITY."

"MORE SHADED PLAYGROUNDS. ORGANIZED RECREATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR YOUNGER CHILDREN (18MONTHS - 3 YEARS)"

ADULT SPORT LEAGUES

"PROGRAMS OF NETWORKING AND COMMUNITY GET TO KNOW EACH OTHER EVENT"

"MORE NATURE AREAS WITH TREES AND TRAILS INSTEAD OF JUST CUT GRASS"

"MORE INTERGENERATIONAL PROGRAMMING + MORE TREES TO ENCOURAGE PRIVATE RELAXATION - MEDITATION GARDEN"

"URBAN GARDENS TO ADDRESS LOCAL FOOD ACCESS"

HOW WOULD YOU MAKE YOUR FAVORITE PARK MORE WELCOMING?

"PROVIDE PROGRAMING FOR AT RISK YOUTH"

"MONTHLY OUTREACHES FOR HOMELESS WITH PORTABLE SHOWERS"

"SHADE STRUCTURES, COOL SURFACES, CONVERTING VACANT LOTS TO POCKET PARKS"

"MORE NATIVE PLANTS, BIOSWALES, SHADE TREES"

"MORE SENIOR PROGRAMS"

"MORE OUTREACH TO CHILDREN + FAMILIES, TRAINED COACHES WITH QUALIFICATIONS"



Figure 58. Community members listening to a presentation at Bellevue Recreation Center during Public Draft PNA, engagement.
Source: OLIN, 2025.

PUBLIC DRAFT PNA

A Draft PNA was made available to the public on September 2, 2025, and remained open for review until October 15, 2025.

The public had 45 days to review and comment. The full Draft PNA was available on the project website, and a PDF was also available for download. Comments were received through a comment form on every page of the website, a hosted version of the PDF document, public meetings, listening sessions, agency and nonprofit meetings, hand written and typed letters, phone calls, and emails. In addition the Project Team continued small group meetings with the Steering Committee, interested groups, and equity-focused groups where aspects of the Draft PNA were discussed. During the community meetings, virtual community meeting, and virtual deep dive sessions in September 2025, questions were asked and answered in real-time by RAP and the Consultant Team.

Many of the comments highlighted and praised the ambition of the PNA and recognized the budgetary challenges faced by RAP.

Commenters appreciated the opportunity to participate in the PNA engagement process and encouraged the continuation of these efforts in the realization of projects, the development of partnerships, and the ongoing review of parks in the City.

Many commenters noted the lack of park space and amenities in several communities around the City and the desire for a more equitable distribution of park space.

Other commenters advocated for more consistent enforcement of regulations and improved maintenance.

There is concern regarding operations and maintenance of the system and funding for implementation. Comments noted the interrelationship of the park system to community equity, workforce opportunities, and other economic factors with a particular concern for how to assist and reduce the number of persons experiencing homelessness within the parks.

Comments were reviewed and informed changes incorporated into this Final PNA.

COMMENTS TAGGED BY THEME




Figure 59. This bar chart illustrates the most common themes within comments during the Draft PNA Review. Some comments included more than one theme. Source: OLIN, 2025.

Park Needs Assessment Total Comments and Sources and Themes

During the Draft PNA review period the following number of comments were received and meetings and conversations facilitated:

- 216 Comments on the website
- 94 Comments on the online PDF
- 15 Letters
- 249 Emails
- 22 Community Meetings, Listening Sessions, Youth Engagement, Deep Dives, Virtual Interest Group Meetings, Equity Sessions, and Popups.

THE PUBLIC HAD 45 DAYS TO REVIEW AND COMMENT ON THE DRAFT PNA

Comments were categorized into the following themes:

- Operations & Maintenance
- New Parks
- Enforcement of Regulations
- Budget Concerns
- Facilities & Amenities
- Programming & Activities
- PNA Methodology
- Ecology
- Site-/Region-Specific Comments
- Engagement
- Equity
- Partnerships
- Citywide Issues
- General Organization
- General Edits: Graphics and Typos

SUMMARY: CONTEXT

Do you want to revisit the key points of this section of the PNA? Check out these key summary points!

PNA OVERVIEW

- LA's parks help us thrive everyday by providing spaces to play, learn, and connect in nature.
- The 2025 City of Los Angeles Park Needs Assessment (PNA) brings together deep community engagement, innovation in data collection and mapping, and the lived realities of communities around the City.
- The PNA will guide future investment in park infrastructure and amenities that is reflective of the diverse cultures and communities of the City and projected population growth.
- The PNA defines the WHERE, WHAT, and HOW for future parks investment:
  - WHERE: a prioritized "Universe of Sites" made up of all existing parks and New Park Priority Areas
  - WHAT: the amenities that are needed based on benchmarking and engagement
  - HOW: costs and funding sources
- The City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks has one of the most diverse and varied park systems in the country.
- LA Parks have fallen to 90th out of the 100 largest park systems in the country.
- RAP's service and labor budget has not kept pace with inflation over the past 25 years, even as the city has added over 1,000 acres of parkland.
- RAP has a growing obligation to reimburse the General Fund for staff benefits and utilities. In addition, Proposition K funding will expire in 2026 and PlayLA funding will expire in 2028.
- Since 2008, RAP's full-time staff has decreased by over 25%.
- Given current funding challenges, prioritization and decision-making tools are critical to be able to say "these sites and neighborhoods need attention first."
- While LA's park system continues to grow, park acres per capita are the lowest since the 1860s and the City generally has far fewer amenities per capita than its peers.
- As the city continues to grow and change, it will require sustained investment to maintain, improve, and expand its diverse network of parks, facilities, and programs



Figure 61. A child slides down a slide at the Inell Woods Park ribbon cutting. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.

PLANNING CONTEXT

- Recreation and parks are essential. They help improve health and wellness, support childhood development, offer economic opportunity, and help build strong, resilient communities.
- The PNA builds on a constellation of related local, state, and federal planning efforts.
- Recreation is constantly evolving and trends across aquatics, parks & playgrounds, recreation, and sports will be critical to track into the future.

ENGAGEMENT

- Thousands of Angelenos participated in the development of the PNA through surveys, in-person meetings, workshops, and events.
- What we heard:
  - Less than half of respondents feel that there are enough parks and/or recreation centers within walking distance of their home.
  - The majority of respondents typically drive or walk to parks and recreation centers.
  - Less than 40% of respondents think parks are in excellent or good condition.
  - Less than half of respondents think recreation centers are in excellent or good condition.
  - Close to 2/3 of respondents are supportive of a bond, tax, or levy to fund parks and recreation facilities.
- The most important outdoor facilities:
  - Unprogrammed green space
  - Natural areas and wildlife habitats
  - Paved, multi-use trails
  - Non-paved, multi-use trails



Figure 62. People skate at the Pershing Square ice rink. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.

- The most important indoor facilities:
  - Swimming pools
  - Exercise equipment
  - Walking/jogging tracks
  - Weight rooms/gyms
- The most important programs:
  - Fitness/wellness programs
  - Special events/festivals
  - Nature experiences/environmental education
  - Arts and crafts classes
- The Draft PNA was available for comment within a 45 day comment window.
  - Comments received were organized by theme, with the most frequent themes being Facilities and Amenities, Operations and Maintenance, and Site-/Regional-Specific Comments.
  - Comments informed this Final PNA.

02



Figure 63. Picnic tables at Drum Barracks park complement other seating and a playground. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.

SECTION II:

RECREATION AND PARKS TODAY

This section provides a snapshot of the current state of the City's park system and the Department of Recreation and Parks (RAP). The History of the Park System chapter traces the evolution of recreation and parks in Los Angeles, providing context for present-day conditions. The RAP by the Numbers chapter presents an overview of the department's current amenities, programs, staffing, and organizational structure. The final chapter in this section, Current Budget and Finance, details how RAP is funded, how resources are allocated, and fiscal challenges and opportunities it faces. Together, these chapters ground the PNA in an understanding of how the park system has developed, how it operates today, and the financial resources that support it — now and into the future.



Figure 64. The Women's Playground Outing in 1936 took place in Griffith Park. Source: Los Angeles Times Photographic Collection. UCLA Library Digital Collections.

HISTORY

The evolution of Los Angeles' recreation and parks system reflects the City's broader social and urban transformation, shaped by waves of migration, exponential population growth, and shifting political and economic forces that have redefined public space and access over time. Understanding the history of the recreation and parks system in Los Angeles helps contextualize current conditions and provides an opportunity to look to the future to create a stronger system.

Los Angeles was initially envisioned as a garden city, prioritizing private open spaces and bungalows. This contrasted with the denser development model found in cities in the Northeast and Midwest of the United States. As a result, the development of public parks in Los Angeles has not always matched the City's rapidly expanding population.[74] More recently, there has been a rapid densification and increase in the number of residents over the past fifteen years in the downtown area, with a slower trend of expansion in the San Fernando Valley.[75] Findings from the Trust for Public Land show that Los Angeles has a relatively high abundance of large natural areas, but scores significantly low for amenities and overall equity and access.[77] Today, there is a collective effort to evaluate and reimagine how the parks system can better serve its residents in the future.

The following research is compiled primarily from the Municipal Parks, Recreation, and Leisure, 1886-1978 survey from the Los Angeles Citywide Historic Context Statement, the 100 Years of Recreation and Parks report published by the Recreation and Parks Department in 1988, and news articles and historic photographs from the Los Angeles Times and the Los Angeles Public Library.



Figure 65. In 1900, only sparse development could be seen around Griffith Park. Source: Los Angeles Public Library Photo Collection.

CITY OF LOS ANGELES RECREATION AND PARKS STORY

LAND STEWARDSHIP (PRE-1781)

Los Angeles, known as "Tovangar" in the Tongva language, has been the home of Indigenous people such as the Tongva, or Gabrielino, Fernandeño Tataviam, and the Chumash for over 10,000 years.[77]



Figure 66. The San Gabriel mountains frame the background of the Mission San Gabriel Arcangel. Source: Autry Museum; P.26923.

Indigenous groups have cared for and continue to shape the land that makes up the present day city of Los Angeles and its surrounding areas, extending from the Santa Monica Mountains to the Channel Islands.[78] Present-day downtown Los Angeles was primarily inhabited by the Tongva and their settlements were both independent and interconnected. In the 18th century, Spanish settlers established missions throughout California to spread Catholicism and strengthen allegiance to Spain, and many Indigenous communities were enslaved at these missions.[79]

MANY PRESENT-DAY PARK SITES ARE RELATED TO HISTORIC VILLAGE SITES OR SACRED SITES OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES.

Indigenous knowledge and present day research reveals that many present-day park sites are related to historic village sites or sacred sites of Indigenous Peoples. Spanish baptismal records collected by the

Early California Cultural Atlas project suggest that there were around 100 Tongva villages spread across Los Angeles at the time of the missions.[80] Griffith Park was the former home of the Tongva and there are at least three known settlement sites within the park: near Fern Dell, west of Travel Town near Universal City, and close to the Feliz adobe and ranger station.[81] In addition, Yaanga, believed to be one of the largest Tongva settlements, was located west of the Los Angeles River in the path of what is today Route 101, in close proximity to Elysian Park.[82] The park is part of a belt of hilly land that was formerly covered with indigenous coast live oaks and California black walnut trees and provided sustenance and a reliable food source for the Tongva.[83]

In the San Fernando Valley, many park sites have ties to historic locations of Fenandeño Tataviam sites, such as Sepulveda Basin, which is near the site of the historic village Siutcanga. The name Siutcanga means "the Place of the Oaks," and was established near a freshwater spring along the basin.[84] Present-day Sepulveda Basin recreation areas were part of the fishing, hunting, and gathering grounds of the inhabitants of Siutcanga.[85] The living descendants of the many Indigenous communities of Los Angeles continue to engage with the land through contemporary spiritual practices and climate activism.[86]

THE EARLY YEARS (1781 – 1885)

The City of Los Angeles was established by a group of settlers under Spanish colonial rule as a farming community in 1781.[87] Under Anglo-American rule, which began in 1848, the City inherited two Spanish-style open plazas that structured public life: Plaza Park and Central Park (present-day Pershing Square).[88] These plazas were organized with formal lawns and fruit trees with eventual additions such as fountains and walkways as the surrounding neighborhoods developed more residential and commercial uses.[89] As the City's population grew, it gradually began to acquire parcels of land to meet the needs of the residents for park purposes such as Eastlake Park (present-day Lincoln Park) which was acquired in 1874.[90]




Figure 68. Plaza Park was one of two original Spanish-style open plazas that existed when Los Angeles was established. Source: Library of Congress, Geography and Map Division



Figure 67. Central Park (now Pershing Square) was the other original Spanish-style open plaza that existed when Los Angeles was established. Source: Los Angeles Times Photographic Collection. UCLA Library Digital Collections.



Figure 69. Marian Skouras and Velda Martin canoe by lotus flowers on Echo Park Lake, Los Angeles, 1935. Source: Los Angeles Times Photographic Collection. UCLA Library Digital Collections.

FROM PLEASURE GROUNDS TO PLAYGROUNDS (1886 – 1930)

As a result of growing land acquisitions, the City Council established the Parks Department in 1889.[91] The largest park that came under their jurisdiction at the time was Elysian Park, which had already been acquired in 1886 and became the City's first official park.[92] A fifteen year period of expansion followed with the establishment of major parks such as Westlake (present-day MacArthur Park), Echo Park, Hollenbeck Park, Sunset Park (present-day Lafayette Park), and Griffith Park.[93] These parks were primarily developed as pleasure gardens, which was in line with prevailing notions of nineteenth century romanticism and reflected the idea that there was innate goodness in a natural setting.[94]

Parks from this perspective were spaces of passive recreation and aesthetic beauty. Some parks also served as sites of water storage for the City's zanja water distribution system prior to their integration with the municipal water system in 1904.[95]

PLEASURE GARDENS REFLECTED THE IDEA THAT THERE WAS INNATE GOODNESS IN NATURAL SETTINGS.

In parallel, parks like Griffith reflected the concept of the 'wilderness park,' a prevalent idea at the time that sought to recreate a sense of wilderness within the urban environment."[96]

This period was followed by a rise of municipal parks and playgrounds between 1904 and 1931, which were products of the Progressive Era reforms of the early 1900s.[97] Both these park typologies pushed back on the concept of the passive pleasure ground.

WILDERNESS PARKS SOUGHT TO RECREATE A SENSE OF WILDERNESS WITHIN THE URBAN ENVIRONMENT.

The municipal park was conceived to be an accessible setting for residents to engage in activities, containing sporting facilities such as ball fields, tennis courts, as well as structures for educational and cultural use. Concurrently, the playground emerged as a concept and was seen as a beneficial setting for children's upbringing in underresourced neighborhoods.[98] Playgrounds were physically separated from parks and governed by a Playground Commission which was established in 1904 and supported by upper and middle-class women's organizations.[99] Family camps as a municipal recreation service were also established in 1913 and became popular programs which were replicated by other cities like San Diego and Sacramento.[100]

MUNICIPAL PARKS WERE CONCEIVED TO BE AN ACCESSIBLE SETTING FOR RESIDENTS TO ENGAGE IN ACTIVITIES.

The creation of a Department of Parks and a Department of Playgrounds and Recreation (formerly the Playground Commission) as a result of a new charter in 1925 was a turning point in the development of the City's parks system.[101] George Hjelte was appointed the first general manager of the Department of Playgrounds and Recreation in 1926 and continued in the role until 1962, playing a significant role in the evolution of the parks system. The concept of playgrounds expanded in the mid-1920s to include adult programming and recreation.[102] The swimming pool, or plunge, as it was popularly referred to, was a key facility that characterized this shift. The plunge at the Griffith Park Playground was one of the largest swimming pools of the time and was opened to the public in 1927.[103] In addition to swimming pools, municipal beaches were also constructed, and in 1928 the City used dredged sand to create Cabrillo Beach.



Figure 72. Women pose for a photo at Griffith Park Playground. Source: Los Angeles Times Photographic Collection. UCLA Library Digital Collections.



Figure 71. Bathers enjoy the swimming pool in Griffith Park. Source: Los Angeles Times Photographic Collection. UCLA Library Digital Collections.



Figure 70. Children splash in a fountain in Echo Park. Source: Los Angeles Times Photographic Collection. UCLA Library Digital Collections.

RECREATION DURING THE GREAT DEPRESSION & SECOND WORLD WAR (1930 – 1945)

The Great Depression resulted in a reduction in budget for parks operations and employee salaries. As a response to the economic crisis, the federal Works Progress Administration (WPA) established in 1933 allowed the City to hire unemployed workers for government programs. The City benefited from this program and was able to expand park maintenance and recreation programs.[104] The concept of the recreational facility was growing in popularity among planners and landscape architects at this time and the Olmsted Brothers and Harland Bartholomew Associates proposed two types: the neighborhood center and the regional or district center.[105] The neighborhood centers were envisioned as everyday recreational use spaces for all age groups; whereas, the regional centers would focus on athletic contests.

TWO TYPES OF RECREATIONAL FACILITIES WERE PROPOSED: THE NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER AND THE REGIONAL OR DISTRICT CENTER.

While their ideas were not fully realized due to economic constraints, elements were incorporated into WPA projects such as the Rancho Cienega Playground (present-day Rancho Cienega Park).[106] Further, during the Second World War, parks and playgrounds were designated as places of refuge during an emergency, and recreation directors were involved in mobilizing volunteers in the Civil Defense Corps.[107]



Figure 73. A day laborer dumps rocks from a wheelbarrow in Griffith Park, Los Angeles, 1933. Source: Los Angeles Times Photographic Collection. UCLA Library Digital Collections.

POSTWAR RESPONSES & REORGANIZATION (1945 – 1978)

An improving economic climate and rapid population growth after the Second World War led to a reorganization of the parks system marked by the unification of the City's separate park and playground bureaus into a single Department of Recreation and Parks (RAP).[108] A bond of over $12.5 million was approved in 1947, which allowed for the expansion of park facilities. The concept of the recreational facility was fully realized and it was viewed as an essential public service that residents were entitled to. The bath house and club house were the two most common building types found in these early postwar recreation centers.[109] The City was interested in recreation as a means to combat "juvenile delinquency" and to develop "among Los Angeles' more than 2,000,000 citizens stronger community and family ties."[110]

Late postwar recreational facilities in Los Angeles were characterized by a change in leadership, with William Frederickson Jr. taking over from Hjelte, and an increased budget. In 1957, a $39.5 million bond issue was approved, which was the largest bond issue ever voted by any city in the US until then for recreation.[111] The rapid growth of parkways and highways in this time period limited public access and reduced opportunities for green corridors.[112] The subsequent increase in automobile usage resulted in parking requirements being added to recreational facilities and a return to more traditional park styles was seen such as Chatsworth Park (present-day Chatsworth Park North).[113] There was also an expansion in postwar municipal golf courses, which were self-financing entities and relied on fees from players.[114] The postwar years were thus characterized by economic growth and infrastructural expansion.



Figure 74. The Elysian Valley reservoir and Dodger Stadium can be seen within Elysian Park, 1987. Source: Los Angeles Times Photographic Collection. UCLA Library Digital Collections.

CHALLENGES & EXPANSION (1970 – 2000)

Following the period of postwar expansion, the City's parks system declined, mirroring a nationwide trend. Hjelte's retirement further symbolized the end of postwar optimism in the parks system.[115] The movement of the middle class to the suburbs led to the rise of lower funded inner city parks and there were concerns of increasing violence and vandalism in the parks. In response, park rangers were granted limited peace officer status in 1989.[116] This period of decline was also marked by economic constraints since the City was dependent on local property tax.[117] Despite these challenges, several important milestones were achieved in this period, which included the adoption of the Quimby and dwelling unit construction tax that expanded funds for the development of additional parks and the development of the first and only adopted Griffith Park master plan.[118]

Following 1975, under James Hadaway's direction, the parks system continued to oscillate between periods of growth and setbacks. The Department rolled out the vision statement "We Make L.A. a Better Place", which was reflected in their expanded scope that included supporting cultural and social programs such as the "Just Say No" initiative to combat youth drug use and new facilities for residents with disabilities.[119] [120] In 1996, Proposition K (Prop K), a 30-year funding initiative that prioritizes park development in underserved areas, was passed to help ensure that communities with limited access to green space received new recreational opportunities.[121]

THE MOVEMENT OF THE MIDDLE CLASS TO THE SUBURBS LED TO THE RISE OF LOWER FUNDED INNER CITY PARKS.



RECENT DEVELOPMENTS (2000 – PRESENT)

Since the 1970s, there has been a greater focus on equity, sustainability, and community engagement in RAP initiatives. Prop K has funded projects like the revitalization of MacArthur Park and the creation of Community School Parks, where school facilities are open to the public after hours.[122]

SINCE THE 1970S, THERE HAS BEEN A GREATER FOCUS ON EQUITY, SUSTAINABILITY, AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT IN RAP INITIATIVES.

In 2008, the City began requiring certain departments, including the Department of Recreation and Parks, to pay reimbursements to the City's General Fund for employee benefits, the Department of Water and Power for utilities, and the Bureau of Sanitation for refuse costs. These reimbursements have diminished RAP's ability to meet and increase vital maintenance and recreational programming needs.[123]

Since the inception of these Department contributions in FY '08-09, over $960M has been diverted away from RAP's core operations.[124]

In 2009, RAP conducted a Citywide Community Needs Assessment that provided a framework for long range planning initiatives but did not result in significant new funding. In 2018, RAP completed a Parks Condition Assessment that determined there was over $2B in unmet construction and maintenance needs.[125] With the need for additional resources growing — and Proposition K, a 1996 voter-approved measure providing $25 million annually for recreation and parks through property taxes, set to expire in 2026 — the City developed a replacement funding measure.[126] In November 2022, the Los Angeles City Council placed Proposition SP on the ballot, which aimed to generate approximately $227 million annually through parcel taxes.[127] However, this measure failed, which is attributed primarily to the lack of a clear, detailed plan for fund allocation.

The system today still faces ongoing issues with deferred maintenance, and reduced staff numbers have made it difficult for RAP to achieve many goals in the 2000s. Nonetheless, since 2000, the park system has expanded by over 1,100 acres, including acquisitions such as South East Valley Skate Park,



Figure 75. Hikers look out over Los Angeles from Griffith Park. Source: Emilio Uranga., Agency: Artifact.

Ascot Hills Park, and parks along the Los Angeles River, like Aliso Creek Confluence Park.

The current Park Needs Assessment is the City's first significant effort to strengthen the parks system since the 2009 Citywide Community Needs Assessment, reflecting the City's initiative to meet the current and future recreational needs of the residents.


THE CURRENT PARK NEEDS ASSESSMENT IS THE CITY'S FIRST INITIATIVE TO STRENGTHEN THE PARKS SYSTEM SINCE 2009.



Figure 76. People kick around soccer balls and walk through MacArthur Park. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks .

RECREATION & PARKS SYSTEM GROWTH

THIS TIMELINE TRACKS SIGNIFICANT EVENTS IN THE GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES RECREATION AND PARKS SYSTEM FROM 1770 TO PRESENT DAY.




Griffith Park, 1900


Westlake Park, 1912


Lincoln Park, 1939




Westlake Park, 1934

Figure 77. Recreation and parks in Los Angeles have evolved as the City has changed over time. Source: See the Table of Figures for a full list of sources.



MUNICIPAL PARK PLAYGROUNDS | RECREATIONAL FACILITIES | OPEN SPACE SYSTEMS | CONTEMPORARY PARKS

1900 1910 1920 1930 1940 **1950** 1960 1970 1980 1990 **2000** 2010 2020 2030

1904 / PLAYGROUND COMMISSION established

MUNICIPAL WATER SYSTEM
Parks connected to MWS for irrigation

1925 / DEPT OF PLAYGROUNDS & RECREATION established

1926 / GEORGE HJELTE
appointed General Manager

1947 / A unified DEPARTMENT OF RECREATION & PARKS established

MAY BOND approved

1962 / WILLIAM FREDERICKSON JR.

2009 / CITYWIDE COMMUNITY NEEDS ASSESSMENT

2025 / PNA

2021 / 100 ACRE PARTNERSHIP


Elysian Park, 1937


Cleanup at Elysian Park, 1967


Griffith Park, 1987


Los Angeles State Historic Park, 2005



Figure 78. The playground at Highland Recreation Center provides a variety of features to engage children..
Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.



RAP BY THE NUMBERS

The Department of Recreation and Parks stewards Los Angeles' park system, providing green space to support residents' mental and physical health, playgrounds and programs for residents to play, and gathering spaces for families and friends. Further, RAP delivers essential citywide services, including violence intervention programs like Summer Night Lights; childcare through programs, recreation, and summer camps; and emergency management services, such as operating shelters during crises and cooling centers during heat waves.

THE PARK SYSTEM

The City of Los Angeles park system encompasses more than 16,000 acres of land at around 500 park sites. In addition to parks owned, operated, or managed by the City, other entities such as the federal, state, and county governments as well as land conservancies and non-profits manage, own, and operate parks within City boundaries. All of these parks together are important to the well being of Angelenos.



Figure 79. A walking trail winds past a shaded picnic area at Oro Vista Park in the Valley. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.

THIS ASSESSMENT IS FOCUSED ON PARKS THAT ARE OWNED, OPERATED, OR MANAGED BY THE CITY OF LA DEPARTMENT OF RECREATION AND PARKS (RAP).





Figure 80. RAP's parks range in size from tenths to thousands of acres. Source: OLIN with Park Outlines from the City of LA Data Portal, 2025.

RAP PARKS ORGANIZED BY SIZE



EXISTING CLASSIFICATIONS

The City currently divides all parks in Los Angeles into one of three park classifications.

NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS

Neighborhood parks provide space and facilities for outdoor and indoor recreational activities. They are intended to serve residents of all ages in the immediate neighborhood and are generally smaller, ranging 1–5 acres in size.



Figure 83. The playground at Westside Neighborhood Park has a wildlife theme. Source: Calvada Surveying, Inc., 2025.

COMMUNITY PARKS

Community parks are designed to serve residents of all ages in several surrounding neighborhoods. Community park facilities serve a much wider interest range than those of neighborhood parks and are larger in size, ranging 15–20 acres.



Figure 82. Sycamore Grove Park's playground for children sits right next to an outdoor gym for adults. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks, Accessed 2025.

REGIONAL PARKS

Regional parks provide facilities typically found in neighborhood and community parks as well as offering specialized recreation facilities such as lakes, golf courses, wilderness areas, and museums. Regional parks serve residents living throughout the entire city of Los Angeles and are generally over 50 acres in size.




Figure 81. Griffith Observatory is perched on a promontory with sweeping views. Source: Calvada Surveying, Inc, 2025.



Figure 84. Korean-inspired sculptures mark the entrance of Angels Gate Park, a regional park in the city's existing park classifications. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks, Accessed 2025.

NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS

1 - 5 Acres
e.g. Westside Neighborhood Park

COMMUNITY PARKS

15 - 20 Acres
e.g. Sycamore Grove Park

REGIONAL PARKS

50+ Acres
e.g. Griffith Park

With so few classifications, the current system includes vastly different parks in each category. For example, neighborhood parks include both the 105th St Pocket Park, which is under a quarter of an acre, and Bee Canyon Park, a park over 20 acres. The regional park classification includes Little Landers Park (1.1 acres), Stoney Point Park (29 acres), and Venice Beach (161 acres)—three parks with very different sizes, contexts, and uses. The new system of classifications defined in the PNA more accurately reflects the broad range of sizes, amenities, design, usage, and programming that exist in LA's recreation and parks facilities today. Additionally, as parts of Los Angeles continue to see increased density, new types of parks and recreation facilities will be needed.

THE EXPANDED CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM IN CHAPTER 12 ON PAGE 245 IS MEANT TO HELP SET MUTUAL EXPECTATIONS AMONG THE CITY, RESIDENTS, PARTNER ORGANIZATIONS, AND DEVELOPERS ABOUT HOW DIFFERENT PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES LOOK AND FUNCTION.




Figure 85. People enjoy the lawn at Holmby Park. Source: Viraj Chauhan/Agency: Artifact.



Figure 86. Children on the swings at Pan Pacific Park. Source: Connie Chung/HR&A.



Figure 87. The Sepulveda Basin Wildlife Refuge is home to a variety of avian and aquatic species. Source: Emilio Uranga/Agency: Artifact



Figure 88. Comfort facilities like a water fountain and garbage receptacle line the walking path at St. James Park. Source: Viraj Chauahan/Agency: Artifact.



Figure 89. Rail lines and trains attract visitors to the Travel Town Museum. Source: Mary Alice Williams/The Robert Group.



Figure 90. Mature trees provide shade at Laurel and Hardy Park. Source: Emilio Uranga/Agency: Artifact.



Figure 91. The Korean Friendship Bell is an iconic structure within Angels Gate Park. Source: Connie Chung/ HR&A.




Figure 92. People ride bikes at Augustus F. Hawkins Nature Park. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.



Figure 93. Both trees and manmade structures provide shade over playground equipment at Hoover Recreation Center. Source: Viraj Chauahan/Agency: Artifact.



Figure 94. The lake is a major attraction in Echo Park. Source: Sarah Swanseen/OLIN.

PARK AMENITIES

Across the park system, there are thousands of park amenities, including active and passive areas, recreation facilities, habitat or natural areas, trees, and iconic structures like the Griffith Observatory or the Greek Theatre. Since the system is so vast, it can be difficult to encapsulate the extent of features.

In 2024, RAP completed an assessment of about 34 types of recreational amenities at 355 sites. RAP completes this assessment annually.

These amenities are rated as good, fair, or poor and help provide a detailed understanding of a park or facility's current condition. These annual condition scores help inform RAP's decision-making processes regarding maintenance, repairs, and future investments.



Figure 95. People playing soccer at Pan Pacific Park in West LA.
Source: OLIN, 2025.

RAP BY THE NUMBERS

16,000+
ACRES OF PARKLAND

487
PARKS

92
MILES OF TRAILS

1,711 **FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES**

&

5,000 **PART-TIME EMPLOYEES**

29 Skate Parks	12 Golf Courses
185 Recreation & Senior Centers	156 Outdoor Fitness Areas
398 Playgrounds	277.5 Tennis Courts
59 Swimming Pools	13 Splash Pads
53 Museums	14 Dog Parks



304 Diamond Fields	39 Amphitheaters	19 Community Gardens	646 Parking Lots
692 Basketball Hoops	223 Picnic Shelters	18 Concession Stands	51.5 Pickleball Courts
156 Fitness Zones	10 Bandshells	44 Equestrian Rings	3 Roller Hockey Rinks
1,618 Bathrooms	175 Volleyball Courts	3 Disc Golf Courses	1 Nature Center
92 Gymnasiums	199 Multipurpose Fields	109 Rectangular Fields	9 Childcare Buildings

REGIONS

To provide a more nuanced analysis of park needs grounded in the lived realities of Angelenos, the PNA divides the City into four geographic regions: East/Central, South, West, and North. This framework acknowledges that there are different needs and pressures in each region, from disparities in park access and recreational resources to differences in community priorities.

By incorporating a view of the distinct issues and opportunities in each region, the PNA can help RAP tailor its actions to the needs in different parts of the City. Chapter 8 provides a more detailed overview of each region, including survey results, demographic snapshots, and feedback from residents.

REGION	COUNCIL DISTRICTS
NORTH Characterized by historic suburban, low-density development and vast landscapes, the North region includes some of RAP's largest and most popular recreation areas and faces challenges around access and interconnectivity.	2 3 4 6 7 12
SOUTH Encompassing one of the City's most historically significant and culturally rich communities, the South region's historic disinvestment underlies challenges with safety, underfunded programming and staffing, and environmental burdens.	8 9 10 15
WEST Known for its coastal proximity and lower density, the West region's diverse range of park and recreation facilities, from beaches to mountain trails, face increased wildfire risk as well as overall challenges of maintenance and safety.	5 11
EAST/CENTRAL Home to some of the most diverse and densest neighborhoods in the City, the East/Central region faces challenges of high park pressure, low park acreage, and displacement and green gentrification.	1 13 14




Figure 96. To provide a more nuanced analysis of park needs grounded in the lived realities of Angelenos, the PNA divides the City into four geographic regions: East/Central, South, West, and North. Source: City Boundary, Council District Boundaries, and Parks: City of LA Data Portal, 2025. Roads: US Census Bureau, 2025., LA River: National Hydrography Database, 2025.




Figure 97. The Department of Recreation and Parks is an independent charter department headed by a citizen commission.
Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks, FY 2024-25 Org Chart, June 2024.

DEPARTMENT ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

The Department of Recreation and Parks (RAP) is a City Charter created independent department under the control and management of a five member citizen board of commissioners (Board of Recreation and Park Commissioners). The Board of Recreation and Park Commissioners serve on a voluntary basis. Each Board Member is appointed by the Mayor for a five-year term, subject to approval by the City Council. The Board has two committees that are composed of two Board members, the Commission Task Force on Facility Repair and Maintenance and the Commission Task Force on Concession.

RAP is semi-proprietary, like the Library, meaning the department is responsible for some of its own collection, spending, and support. As outlined in the City Charter, RAP has a dedicated stream of revenue, receiving 0.0325% of assessed value of all property, but is eligible to get additional money from the City Council. Elected officials play a key oversight and policymaking role for RAP. In addition to representing community interests and adopting policies that guide planning and programming, RAP's annual operating budget is proposed by the Mayor of LA and adopted by the City Council. Any funding allocated by Charter Mandate or that RAP generates directly is controlled, appropriated, and expended by the RAP Board of Commissioners.




Figure 98. The Department of Recreation and Parks has a General Manager and Executive Officer who oversee various divisions, all reporting to the Board of Recreation and Park Commissioners. Source: City of Los Angeles, Organization of the City of Los Angeles, July 2021.

RAP'S AUTHORITY FROM THE CITY CHARTER AND ADMINISTRATIVE CODE

In addition to controlling its own funds, the Board of Recreation and Park Commissioners creates necessary staffing positions and authorizes RAP to carry out the powers and duties imposed by the City Charter, like the control and management of all recreation and park sites, establishment of policies, execution of contracts and agreements, and acquisition of property.

Figure 99 and Figure 100 highlight what RAP has the authority to control from the City Charter and administrative code and what falls outside of their authority. Generally, what RAP has authority to do requires Board approval.





Figure 99. RAP's authority from the City Charter and Administrative Code on parks and recreation facilities.




WHILE RAP HAS THE AUTHORITY TO MANAGE ITS BUDGET AND MUCH OF WHAT HAPPENS ON RECREATION AND PARK SITES, SOME AUTHORITY FOR RECREATION AND PARKS IS VESTED IN OTHER ENTITIES.

Figure 100. RAP's authority from the City Charter and Administrative Code on budget, revenue, and staffing.



Figure 101. RAP staff participate at an outdoor event. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025.



CURRENT BUDGET AND FINANCE

Funding for parks ensures that Angelenos have access to safe, welcoming, and well-maintained public spaces. Parks and recreation facilities play a vital role in supporting public health, environmental resilience, and social connection—and sustaining this system requires reliable and diverse funding sources. Los Angeles' parks receive funding from the City budget, voter-approved measures, grants, philanthropic partnerships, and earned revenue from programs and services. Together, these mechanisms support RAP's ability to operate hundreds of parks, deliver programs for people of all ages, perform daily maintenance, and implement long-term capital improvements.

This chapter provides an overview of RAP's current financial landscape based on interviews with RAP leadership and senior staff, as well as an in-depth analysis of budget, staffing, and operations data provided by the department. It explains RAP's financial and operating challenges, including structural funding gaps, rising maintenance costs, and growing service demands, and evaluates funding strategies that could strengthen the department's ability to maintain facilities, expand programming, and improve park access for all Angelenos.

By understanding the current budget and finance conditions, the PNA aims to identify opportunities to build a more resilient and equitable funding model for the City's recreation and parks system.

FINANCIAL SNAPSHOT

Like many major cities since the Great Recession, Los Angeles struggles with chronic underfunding of park maintenance.

This limits the City's ability to steward existing parks and facilities and fully realize the potential of these critical public spaces. Interviews with RAP staff, a review of RAP budget documents, and benchmarking against peer cities revealed that:

- **RAP's operating budget is constrained by General Fund reimbursements.** More than one-third (40%) of RAP's operating budget in FY 2025-2026 is allocated to the General Fund to pay for staff benefits, utilities, and refuse collection. This growing and significant amount limits the funds available for RAP to operate and maintain parks.
- **RAP's operating budget has increased more slowly than the City budget overall.** While the City's operating budget grew by 68% between FY 2009 and FY 2023, RAP's operating budget grew by half as much (35%) over the same period, after accounting for General Fund reimbursements.
- **RAP manages a growing park system with a shrinking workforce, straining its ability to maintain facilities, offer programs, and care for parks and open spaces.** Full-time staffing decreased by 28% and part-time staffing decreased by 9% between FY 2008 and FY 2025, while park space acreage and facilities have increased.
- **The City of Los Angeles invests less in parks per capita than peer cities, limiting park quality, programs, and access.** At $92, LA's per-capita park investment is lower than that of all other benchmarked cities.

To help ensure the accessibility, safety, and quality of Los Angeles parks, the City must explore sustainable and equitable funding solutions to address RAP's budget challenges. New, dedicated funding streams for RAP could include voter-approved sales or property taxes, municipal bonds, or partnerships with nonprofits and conservancies. Additionally, RAP can leverage funds from aligned initiatives like Measure W to help close funding gaps. Ensuring adequate investment in LA's parks is critical not just for parks and green space, but also supports public health, environmental resilience and economic vitality throughout the City.[128]



Figure 102. RAP staff and volunteers plant a tree.
Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.



Figure 103. The playground at the Buena Vista Meadow Picnic area sits at the base of hills in Elysian Park. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.


CHARTER-MANDATED FUNDING

RAP is one of only two city departments—the other being the Library Department—for which the City of Los Angeles Charter explicitly provides financial support. Beginning in 1925, the charter required an appropriation of 7¢ per $100 in assessed value for the Department of Parks and 4¢ per $100 in assessed value for the Department of Playgrounds and Recreation.[129] In 1937, the Department of Playgrounds and Recreation's appropriation was increased to 6¢ per $100 in assessed value.[130] A 1947 charter amendment merged the two departments into a new Department of Recreation and Parks, which was allocated 13¢ per $100 in assessed value—equal to the combined allocations of the two separate departments.[131]

In 1978, the passage of Proposition 3 changed the property assessment ratio from 25% of total property value.[132,133] In response, the City Charter was amended to adjust RAP's appropriation by an equal amount to maintain its prior level of funding, which equated to 3.25¢ per $100 in the newly assessed value.[134] This was codified in the 1999 version of the City Charter approved by LA voters.[135]

LA'S RECREATION FACILITIES AND PARKS HAVE RECEIVED CHARTER-MANDATED FUNDING SINCE 1925. WHILE THE FORMULA HAS CHANGED, THE EFFECTIVE RATE HAS REMAINED THE SAME SINCE 1937.

ASSESSED PROPERTY VALUE



RAP'S ALLOCATION

3.25¢/$100



Figure 104. The City Charter mandates that 3.25 cents of every 100 dollars in assessed property value goes to RAP. Source: Chesebro, Ray L., Frederick von Schrader, and William H. Neal. Charter of the City of Los Angeles: Annotated, 1935 ed., Section 191 (p. 121). Los Angeles, CA: Parker, Stone & Baird Co., 1935. As adopted January 22, 1925, amended through January 9, 1935. With annotations for amendments on January 7, 1937, April 29, 1937, and May 14, 1937.

OPERATING BUDGET

In FY 2025–2026, RAP's operating budget totaled $359 million. RAP's operating budget is funded by three sources: $298 million from property tax revenue allocation required by City Charter, $60 million from earned revenue (revenue generated by RAP-operated programs such as pool passes), and $285,000 from specified funds (Figure 105).

Major expenses for RAP were organized into four categories: City General Fund reimbursements, administration, maintenance, and programming (Figure 106). Since FY 2009, RAP has been required to reimburse its staff benefits, utilities, and trash costs back to the City General Fund. In FY 2026, RAP allocated $145 million—equivalent to 40% of its total operating budget—toward mandatory reimbursements, including employee benefits ($112 million), utility costs to the Department of Water and Power ($31 million, captured in "Maintenance" below), and refuse collection services through the Bureau of Sanitation ($3 million, captured in "Maintenance" below). As costs continue to rise, these required reimbursements place increasing strain on RAP's financial resources, limiting its capacity to adequately maintain recreation and parks programming without proportional increases to operating revenue.

RAP is primarily a people-oriented department, with the majority of its budget allocated to personnel costs. Out of RAP's FY 2025 budget (less General Fund reimbursements), $184 million (83%) was dedicated to salaries and the remaining $39 million (17%) was allocated to operating expenses.




Figure 105. In the Mayor's proposed budget for FY 2026, RAP would not receive any funding from the General Fund and would rely on earned revenue and Charter-mandated appropriation, supplemented by select special funds.
Sources: RAP, Mayor's Budget FY 2026. In addition to General Fund reimbursements for staff benefits, RAP reimburses the City for utilities and trash services ($34M total, captured in Maintenance).



Figure 107. Department of Recreation and Parks coaches attend a summit at Dodger Stadium.
Sources: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.




Figure 106. More than a quarter of RAP's budget goes to a General Fund reimbursement. Of the rest, over 60% goes to maintenance and programming.
Sources: RAP, Mayor's Budget FY 2026. In addition to General Fund reimbursements for staff benefits, RAP reimburses the City for utilities and trash services ($34M total, captured in Maintenance).

RAP's OPERATING BUDGET OVER TIME




Figure 108. While RAP's operating budget has grown over time, much of that growth has gone to General Fund reimbursements. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.

RAP's OPERATING BUDGET (WITHOUT GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENT, UTILITIES, AND REFUSE) OVER TIME




Figure 109. With General Fund reimbursements removed, RAP's operating budget has not kept pace with inflation. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. RAP Operating Expenses include RAP Service Labor Expense and RAP Service Non-Labor Expense. RAP Operating Expenses do not include General Fund Reimbursements and Dedicated Non-RAP Service.

RAP'S OPERATING BUDGET COMPARISION (PERCENTAGE CHANGE FY 2009-FY 2023)




Figure 110. RAP's operating budget with General Fund reimbursements removed has lagged behind not only inflation but the City's operating budget and median rent. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks, ACS (2009, 2023), BLS CPI Inflation Calculator.

BUDGET CHANGES OVER TIME AND IMPLICATIONS

Over time, RAP's total budget has grown. RAP's annual operating budget increased from $166 million in FY 2009 to $359 million in FY 2026 (Figure 108). However, most of the incremental increase is allocated to General Fund reimbursements rather than directly supporting park maintenance and services. Since the inception of these reimbursements in FY 2009, approximately $1.35 billion has been diverted from RAP's core operations.[136]

RAP's discretionary operating expenses—those directly tied to service delivery—include RAP Service Labor Expenses and RAP Service Non-Labor Expenses (shown in blue and purple in Figure 108). The discretionary expense budget has increased by $50 million since FY 2009 to $213 million as of FY 2026, an increase of 30%. If adjusted for inflation, the FY 2009 discretionary operating budget would be equal to $252 million. However, when adjusted for inflation, RAP's budget has effectively shrunk, creating a $40 million funding gap between the department's FY 2026 operating budget and an inflation-adjusted FY 2009 budget (Figure 109). This limited growth further underscores the financial constraints limiting RAP's ability to maintain and enhance the City's recreation and parks facilities.

In addition to not keeping up with inflation, RAP's budget has not kept pace with broader economic trends. Excluding General Fund reimbursements, RAP's operating budget increased by only 35% between FY 2009 and FY 2023, falling behind the City's total operating budget, which grew by 68% over the same period (Figure 110). Further, full-time staff positions declined by 18% between FY 2009 and FY 2023. For both RAP staff and park visitors, this disparity is significant, as other key economic indicators, such as median rent in Los Angeles, have risen at a faster rate during this time.

Compared to other City departments of comparable size, RAP's operating budget has grown more slowly than most (Figure 111). Between FY 2009 and FY 2023, RAP's operating budget, excluding General Fund reimbursements, grew by 35%. Over the same period, other departments with annual operating budgets over $50 million grew by up to 131%, with the exception of General Services and Information Technology (these budgets shrank). The City's only other semi-proprietary department, the Library, experienced a 131% increase to its operating budget once adjusting for General Fund reimbursements over a similar period of FY 2010 to FY 2023 (data for FY 2009 was insufficient).




Figure 111. Compared to other City departments of comparable size, RAP's operating budget has grown more slowly than most. Analysis includes departments with citywide operations and operating budgets in FY2009 of $50 million or more. It does not include budgets limited to capital investments.. Source: City of Los Angeles Adopted Budgets (Fiscal Years 2009, 2010, 2023).

ADDITIONAL PARK FUNDS AND FUNDING

In addition to the operating budget, RAP is supplemented by additional funding sources for both capital and operations and maintenance (Figure 112). Looking ahead, RAP will face significant capital project funding challenges with the expiration of Proposition K in 2026 and PlayLA in 2028. Simultaneously, the City is projecting a $1 billion budget deficit in FY 2026, and reduced property tax assessments resulting from the fires in January 2025 will reduce RAP's City-Charter-mandated assessment revenue.

PROPOSITION K

Proposition K created a property tax assessment that has generated $25 million annually, of which $20.5 million is committed to capital projects and $4.5 million is dedicated to operations and maintenance. The assessment expires in 2026.

MEASURE A

Measure A created a property tax assessment whose revenue can be used for both capital projects as well as operations and maintenance. The County manages and administers Measure A funding on a reimbursement basis. However, reimbursements take multiple years for the County to process.

QUIMBY/PARK FEES

As part of the Quimby Act, RAP collects in-lieu fees or land dedications for parks from new residential developments. Quimby funds can only be used for capital improvements or land acquisition and must be committed within five years. In 2017, an updated ordinance was passed, which created an "Early Consultation" meeting process with the City's Planning Department. However, there are still difficulties with requiring developers to dedicate parkland. Currently, there is $200 million in uncommitted Quimby funds in the fund. Because of deferred maintenance throughout the park system as a result of a shrinking operating budget, Quimby funds are used on necessary health and safety repairs like roofs and HVAC systems. If maintenance was adequately funded, RAP could utilize Quimby funds for long-term capital improvements and large projects.

GRANTS

RAP receives funding from regional, State and Federal grants to support capital projects and, to a lesser extent, operations and maintenance. The department has completed acquisition and capital rehabilitation projects with grant funding from State programs such as Proposition 40 (California Clean Water, Clean Air, Safe Neighborhood Parks, and Coastal Protection Act of 2002), Proposition 12 (Safe Neighborhood Parks, Clean Water, Clean Air, and Coastal Protection Bond Act of 2000), and Proposition 68 (Parks and Water Bond of 2018). Operational support has also been provided through grants like one from CAL FIRE, which funded arboriculture education and outreach initiatives.

SOURCE	FY 2025 AMOUNT	TYPE	DESCRIPTION
Proposition K	$25 million (of which $4.5M goes to Prop K Maintenance Fund)	Capital, O&M	Property Tax Assessment - Expires in 2026
Measure A	Varies	Capital, O&M	Property Tax Assessment (Countywide)
Quimby/ Park Fees	$39.4M	Capital	Park Dedication In-Lieu Fee
Grants	Varies	Capital, O&M	Grants
Philanthropy and Friends Groups	Varies	Capital, O&M	Contributed Income
Play LA (expires 2028)	$30.5M	O&M	Grants

Figure 112. RAP's budget is supplemented by additional funding sources for both capital and operations and maintenance. Source: Department of Recreation and Parks, Interviews with RAP staff.

PHILANTHROPY & FRIENDS GROUPS

RAP's Partnership Section helps administer individual and organization donations to the city park system. RAP is supported by non-profits like the Los Angeles Parks Foundation. However, donations tend to be more prevalent in affluent areas of the City, and processing donation agreements demands more staff time and energy. The City has strict rules related to donor recognition which limits corporate sponsorships for signage.

PLAYLA

As part of hosting the Olympics in 2028, LA received a commitment of $160M in funds to support youth sports and recreation through PlayLA. Youth sports and recreation are heavily subsidized by PlayLA, which makes them accessible to low-income families throughout LA. PlayLA funding will expire in 2028.

LA'S BROADER FISCAL OUTLOOK

Lastly, compounded by wildfires, increased City liability expenses, and projected City budget shortfalls; the City is projecting a citywide operating deficit in FY 2026. This citywide context limits the potential for additional funds for RAP from the City and underscores the need for dedicated, long-term reliable funding for park capital and operations and maintenance.



Figure 113. A group of youth play soccer at Mar Vista Recreation Center in West LA.
Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.





Figure 114. PlayLA provides free and low-cost youth and adaptive sports programs across Los Angeles.
Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. PlayLA. Retrieved from https://www.laparks.org/play-la

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

Between 2001 and 2025, RAP invested approximately $1.2 billion in capital improvement projects across the City. Funding came from a diverse mix of sources—grants, non-grants, Quimby, and Proposition K (Prop K)—reflecting the complexity of RAP's capital project financing. This investment in capital projects supported a wide range of park developments, renovations, and new facility constructions. Capital improvements range from small projects like pool drain replacements and restroom restoration to larger projects like a recreation center expansion and Phase 1 of the Griffith Observatory.

A breakdown of capital funding sources shows that 18% of total spending originated from Quimby funds, another 19% came from non-grant funding sources, and grant funding made up 19% of the total. The largest share came from Prop K funds, which contributed 42% of the total. Within the Prop K funding allocation, approximately 32% is tied to active and future projects, which include grants, specified regional and local projects, and pre-development. The remaining 68% has already been expended on completed projects.




**Note: Non-grant and grant funding dollar amounts are from Fiscal Year 2003 onwards.*

Figure 115. Between 2001 and 2025, RAP spent approximately $1.2B on capital improvement projects.
Sources: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks: GASB34 Complete Capital Projects (2003-2024), Prop K Attach 1 - 2025-26 Two Yr Plan, QTS1_Quimby & Zone Change 2001-2025, QTS2_Park Fee Projects

FUNDING BY PARK

Between 2001 and 2025, over 70% of parks in the City received some form of capital funding, whether from grants, non-grants, Quimby, and Prop-K dollars. Overall, parks in North LA and South LA have received more capital funding at 37% and 29% respectively. Parks in West LA and Central/East LA received less funding in this time period, at 12% and 22% respectively.



Regional Breakdown of the 70% of Parks That Received Capital Funding





Figure 116. Over 70% of RAP parks have received capital funding between 2001 and 2025, with more investment in North and South LA.
Sources: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks: GASB34 Complete Capital Projects (2003-2024), Prop K Attach 1 - 2025-26 Two Yr Plan, QTS1_Quimby & Zone Change 2001-2025, QTS2_Park Fee Projects

TOTAL FUNDING PER ACRE

South LA and Central/East LA parks have received more capital funding per acre ($124,567/acre and $75,680/acre, respectively), compared to North LA and West LA parks ($4,650/acre and $16,621/acre respectively).



Capital Funding per Acre

SOUTH	NORTH	WEST	CENTRAL/EAST
$124,567 /acre	**$4,650** /acre	**$16,621** /acre	**$75,680** /acre
1,098 ACRES IN SOUTH	11,638 ACRES IN NORTH	1,800 ACRES IN WEST	1,586 ACRES IN CENTRAL/EAST

Figure 117. South LA and Central/East LA parks have received more capital funding per acre.
Sources: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks: GASB34 Complete Capital Projects (2003-2024), Prop K Attach 1 - 2025-26 Two Yr Plan, QTS1_Quimby & Zone Change 2001-2025, QTS2_Park Fee Projects

STAFFING SNAPSHOT

RAP has not recovered from staffing cuts during the Great Recession.

Between FY 2008 when RAP full-time staffing peaked and FY 2015 when it hit an all-time low, 750 full-time positions were eliminated from the department. Since FY 2015, only 153 positions have been restored as of FY 2025, meaning the majority of these positions were eliminated and never restored.[137]

Among all City departments, RAP is the largest employer of part-time employees. As full-time employment has decreased, RAP has increasingly relied on part-time staff to take on greater responsibilities. RAP's part-time staff budget has remained nearly constant over the past 15 years. Over the same period, the part-time personnel costs have increased per-employee. For context, in 2009, the minimum wage in California was $8 per hour.[138] In 2015, the City of Los Angeles adopted a $15 per hour minimum wage.[139] As of 2025, the minimum wage in the City of Los Angeles is $17.87 per hour. Hourly minimum wages effectively doubled between 2009 and 2015 although the RAP budget for part-time personnel has remained relatively constant. As a result, RAP can afford fewer hours of part-time work annually.

IMPACT OF STAFFING AND BUDGET CUTS ON OPERATIONS & MAINTENANCE

Interviews with RAP staff revealed the following challenges resulting from budget constraints.

- **RAP's operating resources are declining despite responsibilities growing.** RAP staff are being asked to do more with less, leading to staff burnout, deferred maintenance, and growing waitlists for programs. For example, recreation centers used to have staff on Sundays, but now do not as a result of a strained budget. Anecdotally, RAP staff discussed a decline in maintenance quality due to lower staffing and less frequent visits to service parks, as well as increased vandalism and property damage in parks and park facilities. Staff also shared that RAP switched from a system of dedicated gardener caretakers for each park to a system where staff visit parks on rotation within a district.
- **RAP faces recruitment and retention difficulties due to limited resources and lower wages compared to other departments.** RAP provides pathways into City services with part-time positions and established onboarding and training practices. Agencies like the Department of Water and Power and the Port of Los Angeles offer higher salaries and more overtime opportunities, making it difficult to retain staff after RAP trains skilled positions.
- **Deferred maintenance is increasing, resulting in greater long-term costs.** With a focus on essential tasks like litter removal, restroom cleaning, and landscaping, other necessary upkeep is often delayed, leading to more expensive repairs and increased City liability over time.
- **RAP is responsible for providing shelters during emergencies, creating additional and unpredictable workloads for staff.** As extreme events increase in intensity and frequency, this will be a growing role for RAP within the city.
- **Over the long term, during economic downturns, RAP staff positions have been eliminated more quickly and in larger numbers than they are recovered.** Vacant full-time positions continue to be eliminated in budgets year over year. Between FY 2024 and FY 2025, 207 vacant full-time positions were eliminated or discontinued, further straining RAP's operating needs.

RAP OPERATING BUDGET AND STAFFING OVER TIME





Figure 118. RAP's budget has grown steadily, but full-time staffing remains below pre-recession levels, revealing a persistent gap between funding and workforce. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.

FULL AND PART-TIME STAFF POSITIONS AUTHORIZED OVER TIME





Note: "Part-time staff" refers to the total number of part-time employees. These are not reported in full-time equivalents based on total hours worked in a calendar or fiscal year. This chart does not include staff funded by administrative allocations from special funds such as Quimby.

Figure 119. Full-time staffing decreased by 28% and part-time staffing decreased by 9% between FY 2008 and FY 2025.[140]
Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.

EFFECTS OF BUDGET CONSTRAINTS ON RAP SERVICES OVER THE PAST 25 YEARS

Over the last 25 years, the City has added over 1,000 acres of parkland. At the same time, many budget cuts have led to reduced services and reduced staff. In many ways, RAP is still recovering from the budget cuts of the Great Recession, which greatly reduced staffing and changed how staff benefits and utilities were paid. During the PNA, Angelenos noted that services have been reduced, and more staffing is needed to have safe, well-maintained, and active facilities. Additional funding for RAP can bring back services and add newly identified services.




Maintenance reduces staff on the Spray Crew who perform essential landscape maintenance like controlling insects, rodents, weeds, and managing vegetation in high-traffic areas.
Maintenance loses 133 more full-time positions from 2024. Focus is now on core maintenance functions.
Maintenance eliminates the Ball Diamond Crew.
Maintenance eliminates the Forestry Valley Region **Tree Crew**, straining resources and decreasing RAP's ability to respond to **tree-related emergencies**.
Maintenance reduces the Homeless Related Services Team and Water Audit / Smart Irrigation Crew, and **eliminates** all Light Equipment Operators.
Maintenance eliminates the Green Machine whose primary functions were to build and refurbish fields, water systems, and other major landscape projects.
Due to the immense amount of positions eliminated, **Maintenance now relies on Gardener Caretakers to perform more duties**, removing them from their regular tasks, resulting in poorly maintained parks.
Maintenance loses 73 full-time positions and **eliminates** the Court Referral Volunteer Program.
City Council adopts the Report of the Arts, Parks, Health, Aging and River Committee, directing RAP and the City Administrative Officer (CAO) to **conduct a study of the Park Ranger Program** with goals to increase staffing and support.
The Park Ranger Division now deploys just **18 rangers** mostly to regional parks.
PlayLA launches.
'13
'15
'16
'19
'20
'21
'23
'24
'25
Aquatics closes Fremont, Granada Hills, and Rustic Canyon Pools.
Aquatics closes Peck Pool.
Aquatics closes Costello, Griffith Park, and Verdugo Hills Pools.
Aquatics closes pools on Mondays and has reduced operating hours throughout the year.
The CLASS Parks Program sees a 68% reduction in its budget since 2000, but receives a grant for its Youth Internship Program.
Childcare full-time positions and expense funds are eliminated for all but four centers. RAP is instructed to transition the provision of childcare operations from the Department to non-City providers.
ARPA funds allow RAP to expand and renovate 10 **licensed childcare centers** and operations.
Griffith Observatory closes due to the Covid-19 pandemic.
Griffith Observatory resumes full six-day operations.
From 2007 to 2016, **Griffith Observatory loses 10 full-time staff**.
Griffith Observatory reopens for only 3 days a week due to limited staffing because of below-market salaries
Griffith Observatory begins to fund some positions from its **reserve capital replacement account**.

SUMMARY: RECREATION AND PARKS TODAY

Do you want to revisit the key points of this section of the PNA? Check out these key summary points!

HISTORY

- Los Angeles was initially envisioned as a garden city, prioritizing private open spaces and bungalows.
- As a result, the development of public parks in Los Angeles has not always matched the City's rapidly expanding population.
- There have been periods of large expansions of the system, notably in the 1890s, 1930s, and 1940s.
- While the park system continues to grow, Los Angeles' park acreage per capita is the lowest it has been since the 1860s.
- The current Park Needs Assessment is the City's first comprehensive initiative to strengthen the parks system since 2009.
- There were notable funding measures for parks in the City in 1996 and the County in 2016. The 1996 funding measure, Proposition K, will sunset in 2026.

RAP BY THE NUMBERS

- In addition to the 487 parks RAP manages on over 16,000 acres of land, it manages 92 miles of trails.
- RAP has 1,711 full-time employees and 5,000 part-time employees.
- Across the park system, there are thousands of park amenities, including active and passive areas, recreation facilities, habitat or natural areas, trees, and iconic structures like the Griffith Observatory or the Greek Theatre.
- The system is so vast it can be difficult to encapsulate the extent of features.
- During 2024, RAP completed an assessment of about 34 types of recreational amenities at 355 sites. RAP completes this assessment annually.
- To acknowledge the different needs and pressures in different parts of the city, the PNA divides the City into four geographic regions: East/Central, South, West, and North.
- The Department of Recreation and Parks is a City Charter semi-proprietary independent department under the control and management of a five member citizen board of commissioners (Board of Recreation and Park Commissioners).
- While RAP has authority to manage its budget and much of what happens on recreation and park sites, some authority for these sites is vested in other entities.

CURRENT BUDGET AND FINANCE

- RAP's $359 million operating budget is constrained by General Fund reimbursements. More than one third (40%) of RAP's operating budget in FY 2025-2026 is allocated to the General Fund to pay for staff benefits and utilities.
- RAP's operating budget has increased more slowly than the City budget overall. While the City's operating budget grew by 68% between FY 2009 and FY 2023, RAP's operating budget grew by half as much (35%) over the same period after accounting for General Fund reimbursements.
- RAP manages a growing park system with a shrinking workforce, straining its ability to maintain facilities, offer programs, and care for parks and open spaces. Full-time staffing decreased by 28% and part-time staffing decreased by 9% between FY 2008 and FY 2025, while park space acreage and facilities have increased.
- RAP has not recovered from staffing cuts during the Great Recession. Between FY 2008 when RAP full time staffing peaked and FY 2015 when it hit an all-time low, 750 full-time positions were eliminated from the department.
- Since FY 2015, only 153 positions have been restored as of FY 2025, meaning the majority of these positions were eliminated and never restored.
- Among all City departments, RAP is the largest employer of part-time employees. As full-time employment has decreased, RAP has increasingly relied on part-time staff to take on greater responsibilities.
- The City of Los Angeles invests less in parks per capita than peer cities, limiting park quality, programs, and access. At $92 per-capita park investment, LA's per-capita investment is lower than that of all other benchmarked cities.
- LA'S recreation facilities and parks have received charter-mandated funding since 1925. While the formula has changed, the effective rate (3.25¢ per $100 in assessed property value) has remained the same since 1937.
- In addition to the operating budget, RAP is supplemented by additional funding sources for both capital and operations and maintenance.
- Looking ahead, RAP will face significant funding challenges with the expiration of Proposition K in 2026 and PlayLA in 2028.
- Simultaneously, the City is projecting a $1 billion budget deficit in FY 2026 and reduced property tax assessments resulting from the fires in January 2025, which will reduce RAP's City-Charter mandated assessment revenue.
- Between 2001 and 2025, RAP invested approximately $1.2 billion in capital improvement projects across the City.



Figure 120. Swimmers float in tubes at the LA Aquatic Day. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.

03



Figure 121. Children participate in a PlayLA event. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.

SECTION III:
COMMUNITY NEEDS

This section identifies and explores the diverse recreation and park needs across Los Angeles. It begins with the Benchmarking chapter, which compares RAP's system, amenities, and budget to those of peer cities to provide context and highlight areas of difference. The Site Prioritization chapter introduces the Universe of Sites—a comprehensive inventory of all existing and potential sites—and outlines a methodology for evaluating and prioritizing sites for future investment. The section concludes with the Regional Snapshots chapter, which explores how park needs vary across different areas of the city: East/Central LA, West LA, South LA, and North LA. Together, these chapters provide a data-driven framework to help guide equitable investment in recreation and parks, ensuring that resources are directed where they are needed most and that all Angelenos have access to quality parks and recreation.



Figure 122. Visitors look out over Los Angeles from the Griffith Observatory. Source: OLIN, 2025.

BENCHMARKING

Understanding where Los Angeles stands relative to peer cities provided a foundation for setting realistic and ambitious new targets that will better serve residents' needs. Comparisons of recreation and park amenities, budget, staffing, and acreage identified where Los Angeles is exceeding or being exceeded by other regional and national cities that have similar demographic or economic characteristics, similar climate, and more highly ranked park systems.

San Francisco and San Diego were chosen as regional peers, offering insights into how other California cities manage and fund their park systems. Chicago, New York City, and Dallas provide comparability in terms of size, population, density, land use, and urban parkland challenges, while Washington, D.C. serves as an aspirational model due to its consistently high ranked park system.

PEER CITY BENCHMARKING



LOS ANGELES WAS BENCHMARKED AGAINST PEER CITIES IN CALIFORNIA; CITIES OF SIMILAR SIZE, POPULATION, DENSITY, LAND USE, AND URBAN PARKLAND CHALLENGES; AND CITIES WITH ASPIRATIONAL RECREATION AND PARK SYSTEMS.

Chicago
Large Population Peer City



Population	**2,672,258**
TPL 2025 ParkScore	**11**
Residents in 10-min Walk	**98%**

New York
Large Population Peer City



Population	**8,562,125**
TPL 2025 ParkScore	**13**
Residents in 10-min Walk	**99%**

Washington, D.C.
Aspirational Park System



Population	**691,893**
TPL 2025 ParkScore	**1**
Residents in 10-min Walk	**99%**

Dallas
Similar Density Peer City



Population	**1,313,550**
TPL 2025 ParkScore	**34**
Residents in 10-min Walk	**81%**

RECREATION AND PARK AMENITY BENCHMARKING

Los Angeles generally has fewer recreation amenities per person than its peers.

Population-based level of service (LOS) is a measure of how many park and recreation amenities a city has. It is typically expressed as a ratio of number of amenities to population, allowing comparison across cities of different sizes and across different time periods as populations change.

CURRENT LEVEL OF SERVICE

Los Angeles' current level of service is based on the inventory of RAP amenities. Amenities that have two, nonsimultaneous uses (e.g., pickleball courts overlaid on tennis courts) are counted as half an amenity for each use.

The level of service for peer cities is based on the Trust for Public Land's 2025 City Park Facts, which includes self-reported amenity counts for the 100 most populous cities in the country. The median of the peers' levels of service was used for comparison.

See Chapter 12: Level of Service Standards for the new level of service standards defined by the PNA.



Figure 123. Residents play basketball at Hoover Recreation Center. Source: OLIN, 2025.

Amenity	Total RAP Count	Metric	Level of Service							
			Los Angeles	Peer Median	San Francisco	San Diego	Dallas	Chicago	New York	Washington, D.C.
Basketball Hoops	692	1/10,000	**1.8**	**3.8**	3.9	3.5	4.1	3.6	3.4	6.6
Community Garden Sites	19	1/1,000	**0.0**	**0.0**	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Diamond Fields	304	1/10,000	**0.8**	**1.0**	0.7	0.5	1.0	2.6	0.9	1.2
Dog Parks	14	1/100,000	**0.4**	**2.0**	5.0	1.9	0.7	1.2	2.0	2.7
Pickleball Courts	51.5	1/20,000	**0.3**	**1.0**	1.2	0.2	1.1	1.0	0.1	1.2
Playgrounds	398	1/10,000	**1.0**	**1.9**	2.5	1.4	1.6	1.9	2.0	1.9
Rectangular Fields	109	1/10,000	**0.3**	**0.7**	0.4	0.1	1.2	1.1	0.5	0.9
Tennis Courts	277.5	1/20,000	**1.4**	**3.1**	4.5	2.1	4.1	2.2	1.6	6.4
Volleyball Courts	175	1/20,000	**0.9**	**0.2**	0.0	0.8	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.4
Swimming Pools	59	1/100,000	**1.5**	**1.4**	1.4	1.1	1.4	3.0	0.8	5.5
Splashpads	13	1/100,000	**0.3**	**3.5**	1.3	0.1	1.3	9.1	6.9	5.8
Bathrooms	1,618	1/10,000	**4.2**	**1.6**	3.8	1.8	1.0	1.3	0.9	2.8
Nature Trails (Miles)	92	1/100,000	**2.4**	**3.6**	5.9	20.2	2.4	3.6	3.7	0.6
Disc Golf Courses	3	1/100,000	**0.1**	**0.2**	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.1
Rec & Senior Centers	185	1/20,000	**1.0**	**0.9**	0.9	0.9	0.6	1.9	0.4	2.1
Skate Parks	29	1/100,000	**0.8**	**0.7**	0.8	0.9	0.1	0.2	0.5	0.9
Park Acreage	16,333	1/1,000	**4.2**	**9.9**	7.7	31.1	17.8	4.7	3.8	12.1

Figure 124. Los Angeles generally has far fewer recreation amenities per person than its peers. Sources: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks, TPL City Park Facts 2025.

FINANCIAL BENCHMARKING

Los Angeles spends less public money on its recreation and parks system per person than its peers.

Benchmarking RAP's budget and operations against the same peer park systems provides valuable insight into how Los Angeles' investment in parks compares to other major cities and highlights opportunities for improvement. By examining the operating budgets, capital funding amounts, and private funding models of similar park systems, we can better understand where RAP falls short and identify potential strategies to enhance funding, and in turn, staffing and service delivery.

	Los Angeles	San Francisco	San Diego	Dallas	Chicago	New York	Washington, D.C.
Annual Budget (2023)	**$355M**	$486M	$215M	$301M	$493M	$1B	$274M
% of City Budget (2023)	**3%**	4%	4%	7%	4%	1%	1%
Park System Area in Acres (2023)	**16,000**	4,000	42,000	21,000	9,000	30,000	9,000
Full-Time Staff per Acre	**0.10**	0.49	0.02	0.07	0.36	0.16	0.10
Per Capita Public Investment	**$92**	$583	$155	$232	$182	$137	$407

Figure 125. Los Angeles spends less public money on its recreation and parks system per person than its peers. Sources: American Community Survey, 2023. Respective City Budgets for O&M, 2023; TPL City Parks Facts for Capital, 2023. Note: Acreage is rounded to the nearest 1,000.

The adopted budgets for Fiscal Year 2023 were used as the basis for comparing operating budgets, as this was the most recent year for which American Community Survey data were available to standardize population figures. Additionally, the benchmarking section incorporates data from Trust for Public Land (TPL) City Park Facts (2023) to provide further insights into capital investment from other public agencies and park investments by private entities within peer cities. [141]

PUBLIC PER-CAPITA INVESTMENT

Public per-capita investment was calculated by looking at annual operating budgets (FY 2023) and capital costs from TPL data (2023). At $92 per capita, LA's per-capita investment is lower than all other benchmarked cities . By comparison, the benchmarked cities average $283 of per-capita public investment in parks.

FULL-TIME STAFF PER ACRE

RAP also has a lower full-time staff per acre compared to San Francisco, Chicago, and New York City (Figure 125). Compared to other cities, RAP staff already have a greater workload because LA parks operate at more consistent levels of visitation year-round and most RAP programming and maintenance are handled in-house.

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INVESTMENT

Compared to Los Angeles, most peer park systems receive significant supplemental funding from other public agencies or private sources, strengthening their ability to maintain and enhance park facilities. San Francisco's park system is supported by a robust network of state, regional, and national entities, such as the Presidio Trust and the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, which provide 20% of the funding and stewardship for parks and open space in the city. The New York City park system is augmented by private investment through prominent conservancies and value capture mechanisms. Dallas has a strong philanthropic culture of supporting parks as part of quality of life in the city. Without substantial philanthropic support or partnerships with other public agencies, the City of Los Angeles primarily relies on City funding mechanisms to sustain RAP and the park system.




Figure 126. Per-Capita Public Investment. Source: Respective City Budgets for O&M, 2023; TPL City Park Facts, 2023.




Figure 127. RAP's contributions make up a greater share of overall funding for recreation and parks in Los Angeles than the primary public agencies in San Francisco, New York, and Washington, D.C. contribute to their systems. Source: TPL City Park Facts, 2023.



Figure 128. People sit out on blankets and play roundnet at Silver Lake Meadows. Source: Emilio Uranga, 2025.



Figure 129. A circular path connects different parts of Ernest E. Debs Regional Park. Source: Calvada Surveying, Inc., 2025.

SITE PRIORITIZATION

In the coming decades, the extensive park system stewarded by the Department of Recreation and Parks (RAP) will continue to grow and change through capital improvement, operations and maintenance, investment in new parks, and expansion of existing parks.

To prioritize where RAP should invest first, a system of criteria was used to assess existing parks and areas for potential future parks. These criteria are based on community, agency, and stakeholder feedback as well as recreation and parks best practices. These criteria are indicators of need for park investment across the City and cover park and recreation topics like park pressure and amenity conditions but also social and environmental equity, resilience, and alignment with other City and County initiatives.

EXISTING RAP PARKS AND FACILITIES




Figure 130. Algin Sutton Recreation Center's pool is used for swimming laps. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks.



Figure 131. Open space amongst a grove of trees at Barnsdall Park. Source: Mary Alice Williams/The Robert Group, 2025.



Figure 132. La Tierra de la Culebra Park is an oasis of native plants in Highland Park. Source: Sarah Swanseen/OLIN, 2025.



Figure 133. The North Atwater bridge crosses the LA River at North Atwater Park. Source: Jessica Henson/OLIN, 2025.



Figure 134. An open lawn sits behind a playground at Holmby Park. Source: Viraj Chauhan/Agency: Artifact, 2025.



Figure 135. Comfort facilities at Hansen Dam include restrooms. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.


UNIVERSE OF SITES

Both existing park sites and priority areas for new parks were evaluated in the PNA site prioritization.

The context and challenges of the parks and facilities in the RAP system vary greatly across the City. Prioritizing future investments first requires having an up-to-date inventory of all the sites that RAP could potentially invest in–referred to within the PNA as the "Universe of Sites." The Universe of Sites includes RAP's existing parks as well as new park priority areas where RAP might invest in developing new parks so that both can be scored and prioritized side-by-side within the same system.

EXISTING RAP PARK SITES

RAP manages over 500 parks and sub parks within its system. For the purposes of the PNA site prioritization for future investment, camps outside of City boundaries (e.g., Camp Valcrest and Camp High Sierra) were excluded. Additionally, subparks (e.g., the Los Angeles Zoo and Botanic Gardens within Griffith Park) were not considered independently. With those exceptions and exclusions, 483 existing park sites were evaluated as a part of the Universe of Sites.



SHOWING PARKS AS "PARK PIXELS"

In site prioritization maps, each park in the "Universe of Sites" is assigned to one pixel

For more information about Park Pixels, see page 38.




Figure 136. The City of LA RAP owns and manages about 500 park sites across the City of LA. Source: City Boundary and Parks: City of LA Data Portal, 2025. Roads: US Census Bureau, 2025., LA River: National Hydrography Database, 2025.

PARK NEED WILL INCREASE OVER TIME

METRIC	2023	2050	INCREASE IN POPULATION 2023-2050	PERCENT CHANGE 2023-2050
Park Access	885,536	980,943	**95,407**	11%
DAC	300,062	334,279	**34,217**	11%
CES75+	360,619	389,228	**28,610**	8%
Park Supply	3,787,124	4,327,532	**540,408**	14%

Figure 137. Metrics that measure park access and park supply across the LA region show park need will increase from 2023 through 2050. Source: GreenInfoNetwork, OLIN, 2025 with data from the US Census 2023 ACS, Southern California Association of Governments 2050 Population Estimates, and CalEnviroScreen4.0.

NEW PARK PRIORITY AREAS

The PerSquareMile tool, developed by GreenInfo Network and the UCLA Institute of the Environment and Sustainability, was used to identify potential areas where RAP might invest in developing new parks.

The tool was created to understand access to parks and the outdoors at a granular level across California. It was designed to identify areas with the greatest number of people in need of nearby parks. By overlaying a one-square-mile grid that covers the City of Los Angeles with high-resolution population location data, the tool was used to pinpoint where residents have no or insufficient access to parks within a half-mile of their homes.

PERSQUAREMILE ANALYSIS

There are 602 PerSquareMile grid cells that overlap the City of Los Angeles. For the PNA, the PerSquareMile tool was used to assess two metrics:

Park access - the number of people without a park within a 10-minute walk of their homes

Park supply - the number of people with less than 3 park acres per thousand people within a 10-minute walk of their homes


There are over 880,000 people who lack park access and over 3.7 million people have low park supply in the City of LA. If we do nothing by 2050 an additional 100,000 people will lack park access and over 500,000 will be in areas with low park supply due to population growth.

IF WE DO NOTHING TO ADDRESS PARK ACCESS, BY 2050. 117,000 MORE PEOPLE WILL LIVE WITHOUT A PARK NEARBY!

The Steering Committee considered multiple scenarios to serve residents who lack park access or sufficient park supply. The chosen scenario addresses the top 25% of residents lacking in either the park access or park supply metrics and are also either in the top quartile of exposure based on their CalEnviroScreen4.0 (CES) or identified as a Disadvantaged Community (DAC). The analysis considered all parks, including those managed by RAP and those managed by other agencies. Through this process, 36 New Park Priority Areas were added to the Universe of Sites alongside the 482 existing parks.

PARK ACCESS

THE NUMBER OF PEOPLE WITHOUT A PARK WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK OF THEIR HOMES




TOP % OF GRID CELLS	PEOPLE SERVED	GRID COUNT
10%	86,437	7
25%	216,092	21
50%	432,185	58
75%	648,277	119
100%	864,370	346
Final New Park Priority Areas		

Figure 139. The PerSquareMile tool for the Park Needs Assessment identified "New Park Priority Areas" based on Park Access. Source: GreenInfoNetwork, OLIN, 2025.

PARK SUPPLY

THE FEWEST PARK ACRES PER THOUSAND PEOPLE



TOP % OF GRID CELLS	PEOPLE SERVED	GRID COUNT
10%	349,892	11
25%	874,730	35
50%	1,749,460	87
75%	2,624,190	160
100%	3,498,920	314
Final New Park Priority Areas		


Figure 138. The PerSquareMile tool for the Park Needs Assessment identified "New Park Priority Areas" based on Park Supply. Source: GreenInfoNetwork, OLIN, 2025.

WITHIN THE GRID CELLS

Each PerSquareMile grid cell has opportunities within it for additional parkland. These opportunities include entirely new parks, partnership or joint-use agreements with other entities, or adaptation of single-use infrastructure or remediated brownfields sites into multi-benefit sites. Within the 36 grid cells, there are over 170 K-12 school campuses and 509 other public parcels that could be potential sites for future parks and recreation spaces. Five of the 36 grid cells contain public parcels already zoned as "open space." Privately owned public spaces (POPS) could also be used to complement, not replace, new parks—particularly in dense neighborhoods with significant redevelopment pressures. The Downtown Los Angeles Community Plan, for example, addresses the role of POPS.


OUTSIDE OF THE GRID CELLS

Throughout the PNA process, neighborhood councils and community advocates have shared additional prospective park sites across the City. While the PNA has identified these 36 square-mile New Park Priority Areas to look at first to close gaps in access to and supply of parks, RAP will continue to consider other opportunities outside of these grid cells to expand and establish new parks where feasible across the City, subject to funding. To read more about how RAP will use the PerSquareMile and Site Prioritization in future development and decision making processes, see the Action Plan in Chapter 14.



SHOWING NEW PARK PRIORITY AREAS ALONGSIDE "PARK PIXELS"

In site prioritization maps, each New Park Priority Area in the "Universe of Sites" is shown as an "X" on top of the Park Pixels



NEW PARK PRIORITY AREAS

THIS MAP IDENTIFIES NEW PARK PRIORITY AREAS FOR ADDRESSING THE TOP 25% OF THE NEED FOR NEW PARKS ACCESS AND ADDITIONAL PARK ACREAGE (SUPPLY), AS PART OF THE UNIVERSE OF SITES FOR THE PNA.

THIS ANALYSIS ALSO TAKES INTO ACCOUNT THOSE WHO LIVE IN DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITY AREAS (DAC) AS WELL AS THOSE WHO LIVE IN HIGH EXPOSURE AREAS BASED ON CALENVIROSCREEN (CES75+).

LEGEND

- Priority Areas due to Lack of Park Proximity (10 Minute Walk)
- Priority Areas due to Lack of Park Supply (Less than 3 park acres per 1,000 residents)
- Priority Areas due to Lack of Both Park Proximity and Park Supply

Figure 140. Thirty-six New Park Priority Areas were added to the "Universe of Sites" using the PerSquareMile tool. These sites were selected to help address both Park Access and Park Supply.
Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025.

CRITERIA




Figure 141. Twenty-four criteria were used in the site prioritization analysis. Source: OLIN. 2025.

PRIORITIZATION

The "Universe of Sites" were prioritized based on 24 criteria.

These criteria are indicators of need for park investment across the City. Once each site was scored on the criteria, they were assigned a priority grouping (First Priority through Fifth Priority) and rank (from 1 through 518) for RAP to use when making decisions. Criteria scores, in conjunction with each site's classification, also help guide the use of the PNA's ongoing engagement and site planning guidelines.

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND WEIGHTING

The 24 criteria in the PNA prioritization framework acknowledge the role of parks as critical infrastructure not just for recreation but for addressing equity, resiliency, and other City and County priorities. Many criteria touch on several of these themes (See Figure 141).

The criteria do not equally indicate the level of need in a community. To account for this, each criterion was given a weight based on input from the PNA Steering Committee–high, medium, or low. In the overall prioritization, the high weight criteria counted 3 times as much as the low weight criteria, and the medium weight criteria counted twice as much as the low weight criteria.

A summary description for each of the 24 criteria is provided on the following pages. To learn more about the technical detail behind each criteria including scoring methodology, and to see a table with each site's criteria scores, see the PNA Appendix.

RAP will use both the overall priority score as well as each existing or New Park Priority Area's scores on specific criteria to plan for the future. Because conditions vary from site to site, the specific criteria scores can help RAP identify the most critical guidelines and recommendations to focus on at each site. For example, the tree species composition criterion, which measures the percentage of a site's tree canopy that is made up of native species, may lead RAP to focus on the guideline pertaining to native planting variety. See Section IV: Guidelines.

2

CRITERIA IN THE PNA PRIORITIZATION ARE FROM DATA SOURCES ACROSS DIFFERENT SCALES OF MEASUREMENT




Figure 142. The criteria used for Site Prioritization vary in scale from site-based data, data sampled within a given parks 10-minute Parkshed, by the Zip code or by the Council District. Source: OLIN. 2025.



Figure 143. As our City continues to grow, parks will experience increased pressure. Source: Shutterstock/fivetonine.



Figure 144. Many parks in LA are hard to reach without a car, reducing accessibility of existing park assets by the community. Source: Shutterstock/Chizhevskaya Ekaterina.



Figure 145. As our region faces more hot days and increased climate vulnerability, amenities like shade will be a critical asset within our parks. Source: Sepulveda Basin Vision Plan, 2024.

CRITERIA DESCRIPTIONS

HIGH WEIGHT CRITERIA

Park Pressure

The demand on the park based on the amount of people projected to live in the area by 2050.

Walk Network Connectivity

The percent of area around a park that cannot be walked to within 10 minutes.

Low Shade Cover

The lack of shade at or around the park.

Climate Vulnerability

The number of climate risk factors the park is vulnerable to.

Park Conditions Assessment

The physical condition of the park's amenities, based on RAP's yearly assessment.

Environmental, Social, and Health Equity

The number of safety concerns that residents have with parks by council district.

Perceived Park Safety

The number of safety concerns that residents have with parks by council district.

MEDIUM WEIGHT CRITERIA

Criminalization Burden

The need for more prevention-first criminal justice policies in communities around the park.

Capital Improvement Project History

The historic capital investment in this site per park acre.

Extreme Heat Risk

The risk of extreme heat impacting communities around the park.

Metro Corridors

The proximity of the park to a Metro station.

THE 24 CRITERIA IN THE PNA PRIORITIZATION FRAMEWORK ACKNOWLEDGE THE ROLE OF PARKS AS CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE NOT JUST FOR RECREATION BUT FOR ADDRESSING EQUITY, RESILIENCY, AND OTHER CITY AND COUNTY PRIORITIES.



Figure 146. **Native plant communities are important to the future of climate resilience and biodiversity within our parks system.** Source: OLIN, 2023.



Figure 147. **The presence of well maintained priority amenities help bring people out into the parks.** Source: City of LA Recreation and Parks.



Figure 148. **Community input is critical in prioritizing future investment. Survey results in each Council District directly informed the Prioritization through answering questions about park safety, conditions, walkability, and priority amenities.** Source: OLIN, 2025.

LOW WEIGHT CRITERIA

Perceived Park Condition

The percentage of residents who think parks are in poor condition by council district.

Lack of Private Open Space

The lack of private open space near the park.

Biodiversity and Habitat Conservation

The presence, or absence, of a variety of plants and animals near the park.

Perceived Recreation Center Condition

The percentage of residents who think recreation centers are in poor condition by council district.

Perceived Walkability

Indicates if residents feel that they can walk to a park or recreation center from their home by council district.

Presence of Community Priority Amenities

The availability at this park of the top 5 amenities residents prioritized in this council district.

Park Visitation

The difference in number of visitors per acre at this park compared to the citywide average.

Tree Species Composition

Percentage of living nonnative trees in the park.

Infiltration and Recharge Opportunities

If the park is located in an area where groundwater recharge and infiltration are most feasible.

MyLA311 Requests

The number of MyLA311 requests per acre for this park.

Habitat Connectivity

The location of a park within a half mile of a habitat connectivity point.

Water Quality Priority

If the park is located in an area where improving water quality is a County priority.

LA County PNA

The site's park need according to the 2016 LA County Park Needs Assessment.

LEARN MORE ABOUT EACH CRITERION IN THE PNA APPENDIX




Figure 149. The 518 park and prospective park sites were ranked from First to Fifth Priority. Of those sites a third are ranked as First or Second Priority.
Source: OLIN, 2025.

OVERALL RESULTS

Using the above criteria, each of the 518 sites in the Universe of Sites were scored and sorted into one of five levels of priority.

Of the 518 sites, 173 (33%) are first or second priority–including 38 (22%) of the North sites, 64 (48%) of the East/Central sites, 71 (49%) of the South sites, and 1 (2%) site in West LA. A full list of sites with their priority ranking can be found in the PNA Resources.

RESULTS BY REGION AND CLASSIFICATION


Looking across the City of LA, sites of highest priority are clustered in East, Central, and South LA as well as portions of the southern and eastern San Fernando Valley (see Figure 152).

Looking at the sites by classification, mini parks and new park priority areas make up the majority of first and second priority sites. Many second priority sites were neighborhood parks.

TO SEE THE TOP THREE SITES WITHIN EACH OF THE 18 PNA CLASSIFICATIONS IN THE UNIVERSE OF SITES, SEE THE PNA APPENDIX

PRIORITIZATION RESULTS BY REGION


NORTH



TOP 5 SITES:

- Los Angeles River Greenway - Mason to Vanalden
- PerSquare Mile - Van Nuys - Valley Glen
- PerSquare Mile - North Hollywood
- PerSquare Mile - Van Nuys East
- Caballero Creek Confluence Park


CENTRAL/EAST



TOP 5 SITES:

- Saint James Park
- San Julian Park
- PerSquare Mile - University Park North
- PerSquare Mile - Westlake
- Valencia Triangle


SOUTH



TOP 5 SITES:

- 11th Avenue Park
- South Victoria Avenue Park
- 97th Street Pocket Park
- Little Green Acres Park
- PerSquare Mile - N Hist South Central

WEST




TOP 5 SITES:

- Culver-Slauson Park
- Isidore B Dockweiler State Beach
- Media Park
- Venice Beach
- Linnie Canal Park

Figure 150. When looking regionally, 22% or 38 of the North sites, 48% or 64 of the Central/East sites, 48% or 70 of the South sites, and 2% of 1 site in West LA are either first or second priority. Source: OLIN 2025.

PRIORITIZATION RESULTS BY CLASSIFICATION

MINI-PARK



TOP 5 SITES:

- 11th Avenue Park
- Saint James Park
- South Victoria Avenue Park
- 97th Street Pocket Park
- Valencia Triangle


NEW PARK PRIORITY AREAS



TOP 5 SITES:

- University Park North
- Westlake
- Westlake-Koreatown
- Downtown
- N Hist South Central


COMMUNITY PARK



TOP 5 SITES:

- Sixth Street Viaduct Park
- Pershing Square
- Hollenbeck Park
- Winnetka Recreation Center
- Sun Valley Park


NEIGHBORHOOD PARK



TOP 5 SITES:

- Caballero Creek Confluence Park
- Toberman Recreation Center
- Wabash Recreation Center
- Prospect Park
- Grand Hope Park

Figure 151. When looking at the classifications of the sites, mini parks and new park priority areas made up the majority of first and second priority sites. Neighborhood parks also had many second priority sites. Source: OLIN 2025.



SITE PRIORITIZATION RANKINGS

THE RANKINGS SHOW HIGH PRIORITY SITES CLUSTERED IN EAST, CENTRAL, AND SOUTH LA AS WELL AS THE SOUTHERN AND EASTERN SAN FERNANDO VALLEY.

LEGEND


- RAP Site
- New Park Priority Area
- First Priority
- Second Priority
- Third Priority
- Fourth Priority
- Fifth Priority

Figure 152. The site prioritization results show high priority sites clustered in the East, Central, and South LA. Also many sites within the Southern and Eastern San Fernando Valley are high priority sites. Source: OLIN, 2025.

FIRST PRIORITY SITES

THESE SITES REPRESENT THOSE THAT SCORED THE HIGHEST OUT OF ALL 518 IN THE PRIORITIZATION FRAMEWORK. THEY RANGE IN CLASSIFICATION, SIZE, AND REGION.

11TH AVENUE PARK




Classification: Mini Park

Region: South

Acres: 0.21

SAINT JAMES PARK




Classification: Mini Park

Region: Central/East

Acres: 0.9

SAN JULIAN PARK




Classification: Specialty Facility

Region: Central/East

Acres: 0.29

SOUTH VICTORIA AVENUE PARK




Classification: Mini Park

Region: South

Acres: 0.26

97TH STREET POCKET PARK




Classification: Mini Park

Region: South

Acres: 0.13

PERSQUAREMILE - UNIVERSITY PARK NORTH




Classification: New Park Priority Area

Region: Central/East

Acres: 3

PERSQUAREMILE - WESTLAKE




Classification: New Park Priority Area

Region: Central/East

Acres: 3

VALENCIA TRIANGLE




Classification: Mini Park

Region: Central/East

Acres: 0.06

Continued on the following pages...

PERSQUAREMILE - WESTLAKE-KOREATOWN




Classification: New Park Priority Area

Region: Central/East

Acres: 3

PERSQUAREMILE - DOWNTOWN



Classification: New Park Priority Area

Region: Central/East

Acres: 3

ARTS DISTRICT PARK



Classification: Mini Park

Region: Central/East

Acres: 0.51

LITTLE GREEN ACRES PARK




Classification: Specialty Facility

Region: South

Acres: 0.23

LAR GREENWAY - MASON TO VANALDEN




Classification: Greenway

Region: North

Acres: 6.22

PERSQUAREMILE - N HIST SOUTH CENTRAL




Classification: New Park Priority Area

Region: South

Acres: 3

PERSQUAREMILE - EAST VERMONT SQUARE




Classification: New Park Priority Area

Region: South

Acres: 3

SIXTH STREET VIADUCT PARK




Classification: Community Park

Region: Central/East

Acres: 12.52

PERSQUAREMILE - VAN NUYS - VALLEY GLEN



Classification: New Park Priority Area

Region: North

Acres: 3

VERMONT MIRACLE PARK




Classification: Mini Park

Region: South

Acres: 0.22

PERSQUAREMILE - EXPOSITION PARK




Classification: New Park Priority Area

Region: South

Acres: 3

LEO POLITI ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (CSP)



Classification: Community School Park

Region: Central/East

Acres: 2.02

ROLLAND CURTIS PARK




Classification: Mini Park

Region: South

Acres: 0.09

PERSQUAREMILE - PICO-UNION




Classification: New Park Priority Area

Region: Central/East

Acres: 3

PERSQUAREMILE - NORTH HOLLYWOOD




Classification: New Park Priority Area

Region: Valley

Acres: 3

105TH STREET POCKET PARK




Classification: Mini Park

Region: South

Acres: 0.11

ORD AND YALE STREET PARK



Classification: Mini Park


Region: Central/East

Acres: 0.6

SEE THE FULL LIST OF SITES BY PRIORITY IN THE PNA APPENDIX




Figure 153. A nature trail winds through Peck Park Community Center. Source: Jessica Henson/OLIN.



REGIONAL SNAPSHOTS

To help document how needs vary in different parts of Los Angeles, the Park Needs Assessment summarizes key parks, neighborhoods, Council Districts, as well as key issues and engagement findings within four geographic regions–West, North, South, and East/Central.



EAST/CENTRAL

East and Central Los Angeles are home to some of the densest and most diverse neighborhoods in the City, posing unique challenges and opportunities for parks. Westlake and East Hollywood—two of the densest neighborhoods in the City—have high levels of multi-family housing, a significant population of renters, and low park access. These communities also rank among the most diverse within the City, with over two-thirds of residents born in another country.

East and Central Los Angeles are also home to some of the most iconic—and most contested—City parks. Maintenance and service issues experienced at MacArthur Park, Echo Park, and Elysian Park are emblematic of the many roles that the parks in Los Angeles play. Homelessness, street vending, and safety are key challenges within these parks and neighborhoods.

EAST/CENTRAL LA NEIGHBORHOODS AND COUNCIL DISTRICTS

EAST AND CENTRAL LOS ANGELES, AS DEFINED WITHIN THIS REPORT, ENCOMPASSES CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT 1, CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT 13, AND CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT 14.

COUNCIL DISTRICT 1

- Glassell Park
- Highland Park
- Chinatown
- Mount Washington
- Echo Park
- Elysian Park
- Westlake
- Pico Union
- Angelino Heights
- Lincoln Heights
- MacArthur Park

COUNCIL DISTRICT 13

- Atwater Village
- East Hollywood
- Echo Park
- Elysian Valley
- Glassell Park
- Historic Filipinotown
- Hollywood, Larchmont Village
- Little Armenia
- Melrose Hill
- Rampart Village
- Ridgewood-Wilton
- Silver Lake
- Spaulding Square
- St. Andrews Square
- Sunset Square
- Thai Town
- Verdugo Village
- Virgil Village
- Western-Wilton, Westlake
- Wilshire Center
- Windsor Square

COUNCIL DISTRICT 14

- Downtown LA
- Boyle Heights
- El Sereno
- Lincoln Heights
- Highland Park
- Garvanza
- Monterey Hills
- Glassell Park
- Eagle Rock




Figure 154. East and Central Los Angeles, as defined within this report, encompasses City Council District 1, City Council District 13, and City Council District 14. Source: City Boundary, Council District Boundary, and Parks: City of LA Data Portal, 2025.

EAST/CENTRAL

ONGOING CITY INITIATIVES

In Council District 1, a particular focus is MacArthur Park, where initiatives include mobile overdose response teams, a peace ambassador program, and community clean teams that employ local community members in maintaining the park. Council District 13 is particularly focused on Echo Park, where a pilot street vending district is currently in development to assist in formalizing a self-governance structure for street vendors within the park.

In Council District 14, densification of neighborhoods like Boyle Heights is causing residents to be concerned about even greater pressure on existing parks and amenities. Council District 14 also contains Downtown LA (DTLA), where there is a lack of RAP recreation center facilities to serve such a dense population. These facilities, like gymnasiums, courts, and multipurpose fields, would offer free to low cost alternatives for residents. DTLA contains some existing Privately Owned Public Spaces (POPS). POPS, while important, pose access issues for low income residents, and forces residents to travel outside of their neighborhood to access RAP amenities. Privately owned public spaces (POPS) can be used to complement, not replace, new parks or recreation centers—particularly in dense neighborhoods with significant redevelopment pressures like DTLA.

SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES AND ENGAGEMENT FINDINGS

Increasing Need for Park Space + Access

Displacement and Green Gentrification Issues

Improved Maintenance, Safety, and Facilities

Downtown LA is home to Skid Row, changing the character of parks such as San Julian Park and Gladys Park, which serve as key meeting points for service providers and community members who are experiencing homelessness. Shade inequity is stark here, making parks even more important lifelines for residents. Additionally, the presence of POPS limits the availability of open and accessible assembly spaces for residents to host events, parades, and other large scale programming outside of private venues in DTLA. With several DTLA parks slated for redevelopment there are opportunities to add more active recreation and public venues for programming which will also increase perceptions of safety.

Displacement and green gentrification are of concern to community members, particularly in communities such as Boyle Heights where strong advocacy groups have tirelessly fought to maintain their communities in place. The LA River, and associated future development, cuts through many neighborhoods in East and Central Los Angeles, providing a key opportunity to increase park access in ways that benefit communities without leading to green gentrification.

Like residents in other parts of the City, community members within East and Central Los Angeles expressed concerns about maintenance, safety, availability of and access to restrooms, inadequate shade, and more diverse recreational opportunities. Community members also voiced the need for programs to serve neurodiverse individuals and seniors—which is of significance particularly in Westlake where many community members are over the age of 65. Other community members indicated that the understaffing at recreational facilities negatively impacts the availability of programming at parks, for example public art workshops at Elysian Valley Recreation Center.

Community members also expressed support for large regional parks in Central/East LA including Ernest E. Debs Regional Park which provides places to walk and hike with pets, family, and friends. Many advocated for these spaces to improve their operations and maintenance including removal of dead trees, caring for native species, removal of debris and trash, maintenance of trails following rain events, improved wayfinding and signage, and improvement of facilities.

In Boyle Heights, community members identified a need for a more equitable way to allocate park funding, since the current funding structure, primarily defined by Quimby requirements, is failing to prioritize investments that address the park needs of these park poor, but densifying neighborhoods.

Popular Parks in East/Central LA



Figure 155. The lake at Echo Park is a key feature. Source: OLIN, 2025.



Figure 156. The Frank Glass and Grace E. Simons Memorial Sculpture draws visitors to Elysian Park. 2025. Source: KDI, 2025.



Figure 157. A view of MacArthur Park has Downtown LA in the background. Source: vesperstock/Shutterstock




Figure 158. A person looks at The Wall: Las Memorias AIDS Monument at Lincoln Park. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025.

EAST/CENTRAL

144 City Parks

6,315 Acres of Parkland

760,946 Residents

270 Sports Fields and Courts


146 Playgrounds

56 Recreation & Community Centers

12 Pools & Splashpads

33% Average Canopy Coverage in Parks

DEMOGRAPHICS



Top 3 languages spoken:

Spanish, English, Korean

$70,094 Median HH income

$81,173 *Citywide*

151,357 Population with income below poverty level

624,523 *Citywide*

37.1 Median age

37.5 *Citywide*

What we heard..

"Putting more park lands in areas in downtown where people live."

"There is a nice variety and some large tracks of land devoted to parks. New parks like the one near Chinatown are well-maintained. Hiking trails are more plentiful than I expected."

"Staff are almost always amazing and are there to help kids and have fun!"

"Few live near the largest park. We need to build places more thoughtfully"

Current and Future Needs: Survey Results

Central/East region respondents feel similarly to the city as a whole about the physical conditions of City of LA parks but worse about recreation centers.

Parks




Rec Centers




Most Central/East region respondents have visited a City of LA park in the past year, while only about half have visited a City of LA recreation center.


Parks



Rec Centers




Walking Distance



Fewer than half of Central/East region respondents feel that there are enough parks and recreation centers within walking distance of their homes.

Bond Measure



About two-thirds of Central/East region respondents support a bond, levy, or tax to fund parks and recreation facilities.

Top 3 Most Important...

Outdoor Facilities

1. Unprogrammed green spaces
2. Natural areas & wildlife habitats
3. Non-paved, multi-use trails

Indoor Facilities

1. Swimming pool
2. Walking/jogging track
3. Exercise & fitness equipment

Programs

1. Special events/festivals
2. Arts & crafts classes
3. Fitness/wellness programs

Top barriers to visiting parks and recreation centers more often:

49%
People experiencing homelessness there

40%
Do not know where to go/what is offered

38%
Facilities are not well-maintained; Too far from our residence; Lack of public restrooms

33%
No visible patrolling presence

The PNA prioritized existing sites for future investment and identified New Park Priority Areas across the City. To see the breakdown of scores and the top sites in East/Central LA, see **Chapter 7: Site Prioritization.**



SOUTH

South Los Angeles is one of the City's most historically significant and culturally rich regions, encompassing a wide array of neighborhoods with deep community ties, vibrant local identity, and longstanding calls for equity in public services. Many of these neighborhoods—including Watts, Florence-Firestone, and South Park—have high proportions of Black and Latinx residents, a predominance of renters, and a growing youth population.

South LA contains some of the most active and heavily utilized parks in the City—such as Exposition Park and South Park. These spaces serve as critical infrastructure for recreation, culture, public gathering, and social services. At the same time, they face ongoing challenges related to safety, maintenance, and amenity availability, particularly in communities that have experienced decades of disinvestment. Concerns around environmental justice, public safety, and displacement are deeply intertwined with how parks are used and perceived in the area.

Key parks and recreation centers in South Los Angeles serve as vital hubs for culture, recreation, and community gathering. Exposition Park anchors the region with its museums, sports fields, and large-scale event spaces. Watts Towers Arts Center & Watts Towers Park stands as a cultural landmark and creative hub for the surrounding community. Leimert Park Plaza continues to be a celebrated space for Black arts, music, and public life. South Park Recreation Center provides dense urban neighborhoods with access to recreation facilities and athletic fields. Martin Luther King Jr. Recreation Center offers a large regional park featuring playgrounds, open space, and a public pool. Further south, Ken Malloy Harbor Regional Park provides vital access to nature, with walking trails, a wildlife refuge, and multi-use recreation areas.

SOUTH LA NEIGHBORHOODS AND COUNCIL DISTRICTS

SOUTH LOS ANGELES, AS DEFINED WITHIN THIS REPORT, ENCOMPASSES CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT 8, CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT 9, CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT 10, AND CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT 15.

COUNCIL DISTRICT 8

- West Adams
- Hyde Park
- Vermont Square
- Chesterfield Square

COUNCIL DISTRICT 9

- Historic South Central
- Florence
- Green Meadows
- South Park

COUNCIL DISTRICT 10

- Jefferson Park
- Harvard Heights
- Koreatown

COUNCIL DISTRICT 15

- Watts
- Wilmington
- San Pedro
- Harbor Gateway




Figure 159. South Los Angeles, as defined within this report, encompasses City Council District 8, City Council District 9, City Council District 10, and City Council District 15. Source: City Boundary, Council District Boundary, and Parks: City of LA Data Portal, 2025.

SOUTH

ONGOING CITY INITIATIVES

Across South Los Angeles, Council Districts 8, 9, 10, and 15 are advancing a range of initiatives centered on equity, safety, and cultural relevance in public spaces. Shared priorities include universal design, ADA compliance, and greater community involvement in capital improvement projects. There is broad support for climate-resilient design, shade infrastructure, and culturally relevant programming, alongside common concerns over permitting delays and the need for improved coordination between the City and community organizations.

In Council District 8, initiatives like Destination Crenshaw and community-led designs in Leimert Park and Hyde Park reflect a focus on cultural preservation and public art. Investments seek to add shade, sidewalks, and nearby affordable housing to support long-term community stability. There is also interest in workforce development connected to park improvements.

In Council District 9, there is a focus on safety, cleanliness, and youth engagement through efforts like the Clean & Safe South LA Program and upgrades to South Park and Green Meadows Recreation Center. Community members want basic amenities such as restrooms, drinking water, and shaded play areas, as well as community-centered safety approaches.

In Council District 10, there is an investment in park infrastructure across Jefferson Park and West Adams and focus on enhancing accessibility in aging facilities. There is a strong push to modernize permitting for events and ensure new projects reflect the diversity and needs of the community.

In Council District 15, the Watts Rising Collaborative promotes climate resilience and green job creation. Investments in Ken Malloy Harbor Regional Park and Wilmington Recreation Center aim to improve open space access and mitigate air quality issues. Residents prioritize clean, shaded, and well-maintained parks, along with improved access to trails and regional facilities.

SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES AND ENGAGEMENT FINDINGS

Overcrowding and Increasing Strain on Limited Parks

Heightened Environmental Burdens and Health Risks

Underfunded Programs, Staffing, Services, and Safety

Residents in South Los Angeles have expressed a growing concern around the impacts of rapid development and infill housing. Rising density is placing increasing demand and pressure on public infrastructure, including parks. Many parks serve multiple neighborhoods and are used heavily throughout the day, which leads to overcrowding, physical deterioration, and limited opportunities for passive or quiet recreation. This pressure is compounded by the fact that South LA has significantly less park acreage per resident than many other parts of the city.

Existing parks often lack the funding and staffing resources to serve the diverse needs of their communities. From after-school youth programs to senior fitness classes and family cultural events, the demand for inclusive programming far outweighs capacity. Residents have voiced frustration over barriers to park access for people with disabilities, insufficient vendor support for community events,

and outdated facilities that no longer meet the needs of local families. These gaps in resources and infrastructure limit parks' social, recreational, and economic potential.

Safety in public parks is a recurring concern. Reports of gang activity, drug use, and crime in and around park areas have led to reduced participation—especially for women, children, and elders. While some districts have begun deploying alternative safety approaches, such as community ambassadors or trained outreach staff, the lack of consistent, trusted presence in public space continues to be a barrier. Additionally, permitting processes for community-led programming are often seen as opaque, slow, or restrictive, further discouraging neighborhood activation.

Cultural inclusion and language access remain persistent challenges. South LA is home to a racially and linguistically diverse population—approximately 55–60% Latino, 25–30% Black, and 10–15% other ethnicities. Despite this, many programs lack multilingual staff or materials, and few events explicitly reflect local cultural traditions. This disconnect contributes to social exclusion, particularly for immigrant families and non-English-speaking elders. Residents have repeatedly called for programming that celebrates community identity, expands language access, and increases representation in decision-making.

Environmental and health burdens add another layer of urgency. The urban heat island effect is especially intense in South LA due to low tree canopy coverage, expanses of pavement, and proximity to industrial zones. Parks often lack shaded seating, green buffers, or splash pads to provide relief from the heat. Neighborhoods such as Wilmington, San Pedro, Florence, and South Central are further impacted by nearby freeways, oil extraction fields, and port activity—leading to elevated air and noise pollution. These conditions contribute to high rates of asthma, respiratory illness, and heat-related illness, disproportionately affecting children, elders, and those living in low-income housing without access to cooling infrastructure.

Popular Parks in South LA



Figure 160. The rose garden is an attraction at Exposition Park. Source: OLIN, 2025.



Figure 162. Walking paths run through Ken Malloy Harbor Regional Park. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025.



Figure 161. Palm trees line South Park. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025.



Figure 163. White Point Park Nature Reserve features open meadows overlooking the coast. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025.

SOUTH

136
City Parks

1,143
Acres of Parkland

1,029,060
Residents

338
Sports Fields and Courts


166
Playgrounds

59
Recreation & Community Centers

19
Pools & Splashpads

26%
Average Canopy Coverage in Parks

DEMOGRAPHICS



Top 3 languages spoken:

Spanish, English, Korean

$62,668 Median HH income — *$81,173 Citywide*

219,333 Population with income below poverty level — *624,523 Citywide*

35.3 Median age — *37.5 Citywide*

What we heard..

"Solve the quality disparity!

Why can't every park have that Griffith Park 'feel' no matter the acreage."

"...Los Angeles should focus on improving park maintenance, safety, and cleanliness—especially in underserved areas like Harbor City. Investing in updated equipment, better lighting, enhanced landscaping, and expanded programming for all age groups would make parks more attractive, increase usage, and boost neighborhood desirability."

"Rec teams for kids are great and accessible! We live 2 blocks from Queen Anne's and its very accessible and affordable."

Current and Future Needs: Survey Results

South region respondents feel worse than the city as a whole about the physical condition of City of LA parks, but more positive about recreation centers.

Parks




Rec Centers




Most South region respondents have visited a City of LA park in the past year, while only half have visited a City of LA recreation center.

Parks



Rec Centers




Walking Distance



Fewer than half of South region respondents feel that there are enough parks and recreation centers within walking distance of their homes.

Bond Measure



More than half of South region respondents support a bond, levy, or tax to fund parks and recreation facilities.

Top 3 Most Important...

Outdoor Facilities

1. Unprogrammed green spaces
2. Paved, multi-use trails
3. Swimming pool

Indoor Facilities

1. Swimming pool
2. Walking/jogging track
3. Exercise & fitness equipment

Programs

1. Fitness/wellness programs
2. Special events/festivals
3. Nature experiences or environmental education; Arts & crafts classes; Recreation

Top barriers to visiting parks and recreation centers more often:

43%
People experiencing homelessness there

39%
Too far from our residence

35%
Do not know where to go/what is offered

29%
Facilities are not well-maintained

The PNA prioritized existing sites for future investment and identified New Park Priority Areas across the City. To see the breakdown of scores and the top sites in South LA, see **Chapter 7: Site Prioritization.**

NORTH

North LA is a wide area ringed by the Santa Monica Mountains to the South, the Verdugo Mountains and San Gabriel Mountains to the East, the Simi Hills to the West, and the Santa Susana Mountains to the North.

The San Fernando Valley (Valley) makes up the majority of the North LA region. Though the Valley developed as a suburban, garden-home style fabric and generally maintains its low density, it is rapidly urbanizing as single-family homes are converted into multi-family developments. Even with some of the most expensive neighborhoods and enclaves, the Valley is generally considered more affordable than many other parts of the City with a slower pace and a rich sense of community.

North LA includes some of the City's largest and most popular recreation areas including the Hansen Dam Recreation Area, Runyon Canyon, and Griffith Park, as well as regional facilities such as the Sepulveda Basin Recreation Area. It also includes many well-loved neighborhood park spaces such as the North Hollywood Recreation Center, Reseda Park, and Limekiln Canyon Park.

Though North LA has many acres of parkland, there are issues around access to and interconnectivity of parks. Parks are quite far from some residents, leading to a need for better trails and enhanced streetscapes to connect parks and greenspaces. There is also a need for more accessible routes and facilities within parks. Additionally, safety, homelessness, access to amenities, wild fires, and habitat preservation are significant challenges faced by park spaces in North LA neighborhoods that have suffered from decades of disinvestment.

NORTH LA NEIGHBORHOODS AND COUNCIL DISTRICTS

NORTH LA, AS DEFINED WITHIN THIS REPORT, ENCOMPASSES CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, AND 12.

COUNCIL DISTRICT 2

- North Hollywood
- Studio City
- Sun Valley
- Valley Glen
- Valley Village
- Van Nuys

COUNCIL DISTRICT 3

- Canoga Park
- Reseda
- Tarzana
- Winnetka
- Woodland Hills

COUNCIL DISTRICT 4

- Encino
- Sherman Oaks
- Studio City
- Laurel Canyon
- Hollywood
- Hollywood Hills
- Los Feliz
- Griffith Park

COUNCIL DISTRICT 6

- Van Nuys
- Arleta
- Lake Balboa
- Sun Valley
- Panorama City
- North Hills
- Sepulveda Basin

COUNCIL DISTRICT 7

- Sylmar
- Mission Hills
- Pacoima
- Lake View Terrace
- Sunland-Tujunga
- North Hills
- Shadow Hills
- La Tuna Canyon

COUNCIL DISTRICT 12

- Chatsworth
- Granada Hills
- North Hills
- Northridge
- Porter Ranch
- Reseda
- West Hills




Figure 164. North LA, as defined within this report, encompasses City Council District 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, and 12. Source: City Boundary, Council District Boundary, and Parks: City of LA Data Portal, 2025..

NORTH

ONGOING CITY INITIATIVES

Council Districts in North LA have varied relationships to their infrastructure and parks.

In Council District 2, parks symbolize stability and are seen as providing critical social services, such as childcare, capacity for disaster response, as well as services for the unhoused community.

Council District 3 includes the future site of the Warner Center planned development. Community members have expressed concerns about park density and pressure in response to future densification and development.

In Council District 4, Griffith Park is undergoing renovations to roads and transit access. In the wake of recent regional fires, attention in Council District 4 is turning towards resiliency to fire risk and climate vulnerability in neighborhoods and parks. Council District 4 is also interested in expanding programs within their park spaces and understanding broader trends of amenities and usership for community members.

In Council District 6, there is a focus on prioritizing infrastructure including transit, street repairs, and energy-related infrastructure. This district includes the 1,500-acre Sepulveda Basin Recreation Area, which RAP leases from the US Army Corps of Engineers. A vision plan for the basin, completed in 2023 with support from Council Districts 4 and 6, outlines a cohesive, multi-benefit framework for the basin over the next 25 years. In anticipation of hosting several Olympic competitions in 2028, existing park spaces will be upgraded and new trails and facilities will be added.

Council Districts 7 and 12 include robust equestrian communities. In Council District 7, new and updated equestrian trails are being built with the goal of improving equestrian safety, and grants are funding the construction of new parks and playground upgrades.

SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES AND ENGAGEMENT FINDINGS

- Need for Increased Interconnectivity
- Parks are Resilience Infrastructure
- Valley Densification is Increasing Park Pressure

Community members in North LA have raised concerns about safety and maintenance in parks. Resilience is another key theme among North LA neighborhoods. During the COVID-19 pandemic, many parks in North LA were used as safe testing and vaccination locations.

During extreme heat advisories, many residents turn to aquatic facilities, water features like splash pads, and air conditioned recreation centers to cool off. Parks in this region are seen by residents as resilience assets that help keep them safe, stable, and healthy.

Rapid urbanization is also a concern in North LA. As areas that were historically made up of single family homes with private yards become more dense, the region's parks are facing increased pressure. This pressure is also shown in lack of access to parks with many areas in the San Fernando Valley lacking a park within 10 minute walk. Thirteen of the 36 New Park Priority Areas identified in this PNA are located in the North region.

Historically, most parks in the San Fernando Valley have been larger neighborhood or community parks. Community members recommended looking at using a greater variety of pocket parks to relieve park pressure in areas that may be facing increases in density.

Similarly to other regions, the North faces a lack of staffing. Community members voiced that a larger and more specialized range of staff from park rangers to ecologists would help meet operational and maintenance goals and help increase biodiversity and stewardship of natural areas.

Many communities also face challenges with ADA compliance and availability of shade, especially given the lack of the capital funds to cover general operations and maintenance issues. Parks in North LA also experience poor air quality and climate stresses due to adjacency to industrialized land uses.

Popular Parks in North LA




Figure 165. The Griffith Observatory is a major attraction at Griffith Park. Source: OLIN, 2025.



Figure 167. Visitors hike Runyon Canyon's many trails. Source: Agency: Artifact, 2025.



Figure 166. Hansen Dam features expansive terrain and native vegetation. Source: OLIN, 2025.



Figure 168. Comfort amenities are located throughout O'Melveny Park. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025.

NORTH

211 City Parks

14,192 Acres of Parkland

1,536,275 Residents

506 Sports Fields and Courts


176 Playgrounds

59 Recreation & Community Centers

24 Pools & Splashpads

31% Average Canopy Coverage in Parks

DEMOGRAPHICS



Top 3 languages spoken:

English, Spanish, Other Indo-European

$91,231 Median HH income

$81,173 *Citywide*

202,762 Population with income below poverty level

624,523 *Citywide*

39.3 Median age

37.5 *Citywide*

What we heard..

"...I also wish we could have parks that were meant to benefit people in the community rather than as a way to gentrify areas which ultimately displaces people instead of improving their access to parks."

"Support parks equally. If the parks in poorer neighborhoods had the same care and put into them as the more affluent parks, it would be a huge difference. Our poor parks are used, i just hate that I have to worry about my children's physical safety."

"...Making friends in the community is so important."

Favorite Memory: "Leading birdwalk with an arts group in the Sepulveda Basin Wildlife Area..."

Current and Future Needs: Survey Results

North region respondents feel worse than the city as a whole about the physical condition of City of LA parks and recreation centers.

Parks




Rec Centers




Most North region respondents visit a City of LA park at least once a month, while only a little more than half have visited a City of LA recreation center.

Parks



Rec Centers




Walking Distance



Fewer than half of North region respondents feel that there are enough parks and recreation centers within walking distance of their homes.

Bond Measure



A little over half of North region residents support a bond, levy, or tax to fund parks and recreation facilities.

Top 3 Most Important...

Outdoor Facilities

1. Unprogrammed Green Spaces
2. Natural Areas and Wildlife Habitats
3. Non-Paved, Multi-Use Trails

Indoor Facilities

1. Walking/Jogging Track
2. Exercise and Fitness Equipment
3. Swimming Pool

Programs

1. Special Events/Festivals
2. Fitness/Wellness Programs
3. Seniors (age 50 and over)

Top barriers to visiting parks and recreation centers more often:

50%
People experiencing homelessness there

33%
Too far from our residence

33%
Do not know where to go/what is offered

32%
Facilities are not well-maintained

The PNA prioritized existing sites for future investment and identified New Park Priority Areas across the City. To see the breakdown of scores and the top sites in North LA, see **Chapter 7: Site Prioritization.**

WEST

Though West Los Angeles includes some of LA's more economically affluent neighborhoods such as Century City, Pacific Palisades, and Hancock Park, it also includes students near UCLA in Westwood, the thriving Japanese community of Sawtelle, and the rich energy of Koreatown. West LA stretches to Western Ave on its eastern edge, north into the Santa Monica Mountains up to the Pacific Palisades, west to Will Rogers State Beach, and south to Dockweiler Beach, encompassing LAX.

West Los Angeles includes a wide variety of parks, from the recreational fields of Rancho Cienega Park and Cheviot Hills Park, to the popular Pan Pacific Park near the Grove, to the sands of Venice Beach. In addition to the variety of parks, West LA neighborhoods also benefit from their proximity to state parks, beaches, trails in the Santa Monica Mountains, Baldwin Hills, and the Ballona Wetlands, and parks in nearby Beverly Hills, Culver City, West Hollywood, and Santa Monica. After the 2025 Palisades wildfires, fire risk, resilience and recovery are priority concerns.

As in much of Los Angeles, communities in West LA are concerned about people experiencing homelessness occupying limited park space, maintenance and upkeep, and safety. In addition to those concerns, areas of West LA, such as Palms, Arlington Heights, West Adams, and Jefferson Park, expressed concern with park pressure when compared to the rest of the West region due to a higher population density and fewer immediate recreation and park resources.

WEST LA NEIGHBORHOODS AND COUNCIL DISTRICTS


WEST LOS ANGELES, AS DEFINED WITHIN THIS REPORT, ENCOMPASSES CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT 5 AND CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT 11.

COUNCIL DISTRICT 5

- Bel Air
- Beverly Crest
- Beverlywood
- Beverly Grove
- Carthay Circle
- Century City
- Cheviot Hill, Comstock Hills
- Encino
- Fairfax
- Hollywood
- Melrose
- Larchmont
- Oak Forest Canyon
- Palms
- Pico-Robertson
- Roscomare
- Westside Village
- Westwood
- Westwood Gardens

COUNCIL DISTRICT 11

- Brentwood
- Del Rey
- Mar Vista
- Marina del Rey
- Pacific Palisades
- Playa del Rey
- Playa Vista
- Venice
- West LA
- Westchester



LEGEND

- City of LA Boundary
- Region Boundary
- Council District Boundaries
- City of LA Parks
- City of LA Neighborhoods
- Major Road/Highway

Figure 169. West Los Angeles, as defined within this report, encompasses City Council District 5 and City Council District 11. Source: City Boundary, Council District Boundary, and Parks: City of LA Data Portal, 2025..

N

0 1.5 3 mile

WEST

ONGOING CITY INITIATIVES

As part of the ongoing "All About Parks!" initiative, Council District 5 received 1,200 responses to a park needs survey that was conducted within the district in 2024. The survey asked for broad feedback on barriers to park access as well as amenity usage and needs, and detailed feedback on up to 3 existing parks. Council District 5 plans to release this data publicly and is working to utilize the findings in conjunction with equity and Quimby considerations to develop their own prioritization of park improvements.

In the aftermath of the devastating Palisades Fire which occurred in January 2025, there is a heavy focus on recovery in Council District 11. This includes disaster response, impacts on the community, and rebuilding of community infrastructure and assets. Palisades Park Recreation Center was destroyed. The condition of other recreation and parks assets varies.

SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES AND ENGAGEMENT FINDINGS

More Parks Within Walking Distance

Accessibility

Cleanliness, Maintenance and Safety

As in other parts of Los Angeles, residents in West LA would like more neighborhood parks and, specifically, more parks within walking distance.

It was expressed that some neighborhoods in West LA, like Palms, Arlington Heights, West Adams, and Jefferson Park experience localized park pressure in their neighborhood due to a denser, lower income population with fewer immediate park resources and tree canopy cover when compared to other areas in the majority of West LA. It was noted that with future densification along transit corridors, these pressures are likely to increase and community members supported future park investment in areas accessible by transit.

Areas of West LA also have more fluidity with adjacent municipalities like Santa Monica, Culver City, and El Segundo which can positively and negatively impact park pressure. Due to this, community members in West LA have expressed that many people from outside their immediate neighborhoods travel to and utilize their parks and amenities adding to the park pressure of certain recreational facilities. In Palms it was noted that ownership and external municipal pressures impact availability of park space with one of the neighborhood's parks, Media Park, being operated by, maintained by, and largely serving the adjacent municipality of Culver City.

Parks in West LA are well used, but residents have expressed concerns about cleanliness, maintenance, and safety. They would like to see increased staffing to enhance maintenance, security, and interpretive opportunities, such as rangers providing native plant and ecosystem education. They would also like to see more investment in graffiti removal, sidewalk and trail repair, and bathroom cleanliness. Better lighting and repairs, as well as extended park hours would make parks feel more welcoming.

Seniors are well represented among park users and have advocated for expansion of senior centers and senior recreational programming. Accessibility is another concern for seniors and more broadly.

Popular Parks in West LA



Figure 170. Children play at the Cheviot Hills Recreation Center playground. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025.



Figure 173. People walk along the boardwalk at Venice Beach. Source: Pandora Pictures/Shutterstock



Figure 174. Pan Pacific Park features a distinctive recreation center. Source: OLIN, 2025.



Figure 171. Palm trees line Venice Beach. Source: Vlad Mikhailov/ Shutterstock



Figure 175. Mar Vista Recreation Center features outdoor exercise equipment. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025.



Figure 172. The hills of Santa Ynez Canyon Park offer hiking opportunities. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025.

WEST

71
City Parks

1,931
Acres of Parkland

513,946

286
Sports Fields and Courts


63
Playgrounds

24
Recreation & Community Centers

9
Pools & Splashpads

37%
Average Canopy Coverage in Parks

DEMOGRAPHICS



Top 3 languages spoken:

English, Spanish, Other Indo-European

$117,676
Median HH income

$81,173
Citywide

51,072
Population with income below poverty level

624,523
Citywide

39.4
Median age

37.5
Citywide

What we heard..

"A lot more trees and shade in existing parks. More parks in dense areas. More walking/hiking paths."

"Stoner Recreation Center -- this recreation center needs a major facelift, the facilities are old including the outdoor playground and the grass field area is poorly maintained."

"Diversity, equity and inclusion. My local park is a welcoming place"

Favorite memory: "Taking my children to folklórico classes to dance and build a community."

Current and Future Needs: Survey Results

West region respondents feel better than the city as a whole about the physical condition of City of LA parks and recreation centers.

Parks




Rec Centers




Most West region respondents visit a City of LA park at least monthly in the past year, while only half have visited a City of LA recreation center.

Parks



Rec Centers




Walking Distance



Fewer than half of West region respondents feel that there are enough parks and recreation centers within walking distance of their homes.

Bond Measure



Over 60% of West residents support a bond, levy, or tax to fund parks and recreation facilities.

Top 3 Most Important...

Outdoor Facilities

1. Unprogrammed Green Spaces
2. Natural Areas and Wildlife Habitats
3. Non-Paved, Multi-Use Trails

Indoor Facilities

1. Exercise and Fitness Equipment
2. Swimming Pool
3. Weight Rooms/Gyms

Programs

1. Fitness/Wellness Programs
2. Special Events/Festivals
3. Natural Experiences/Environmental Education

Top barriers to visiting parks and recreation centers more often:

48%
People experiencing homelessness there

39%
Do not know where to go/what is offered

39%
Too far from our residence

30%
Facilities are not well-maintained

The PNA prioritized existing sites for future investment and identified New Park Priority Areas across the City. To see the breakdown of scores and the top sites in West LA, see **Chapter 7: Site Prioritization.**

SUMMARY: COMMUNITY NEEDS

Do you want to revisit the key points of this section of the PNA? Check out these key summary points!

BENCHMARKING

- Understanding where Los Angeles stands relative to peer cities provided a foundation for setting realistic and ambitious new targets that will better serve residents' needs.
- Comparisons of park and recreation amenities, budget, staffing, and acreage identified where Los Angeles is exceeding or being exceeded by other regional and national cities that have similar demographic or economic characteristics, similar climate, and more highly ranked park systems.
- Los Angeles was benchmarked against:
  - San Francisco
  - San Diego
  - Dallas
  - Chicago
  - New York
  - Washington, D.C.
- Los Angeles generally has fewer recreation amenities per person and spends less public money on its recreation and parks system than its peers.

SITE PRIORITIZATION

- To determine where RAP should prioritize investment over the coming decades, a system of criteria based on community, agency, and stakeholder feedback as well as best practices were used to assess a "Universe of Sites."
- The Universe of Sites includes all 483 existing and 36 New Park Priority Areas.
- New Park Priority Areas were identified by the PerSquareMile tool developed by GreenInfo Network and the UCLA Institute of the Environment and Sustainability. The chosen sites contain the top 25% of residents lacking in either park access or park acreage and are also either disadvantaged or vulnerable communities.
- The criteria used to prioritize the Universe of Sites are indicators of need for park investment across the City and cover topics from park need, park pressure, and conditions of park facilities as well as factors in social and environmental equity, resilience, and alignment with other City and County initiatives.
- Each site was sorted into one of five levels of priority. Of the 518 sites:
  - 25 (5%) are first priority
  - 148 (29%) are second priority
  - 170 (33%) are third priority
  - 134 (26%) are fourth priority
  - 41 (8%) are fifth priority

- Ordered alphabetically, the 25 first priority sites are:
  - 105th Street Pocket Park
  - 11th Avenue Park
  - 97th Street Pocket Park
  - Arts District Park
  - LAR Greenway - Mason to Vanalden
  - Leo Politi Elementary School (CSP)
  - Little Green Acres Park
  - Ord and Yale Street Park
  - PerSquareMile - Downtown
  - PerSquareMile - East Vermont Square
  - PerSquareMile - Exposition Park
  - PerSquareMile - N Hist South Central
  - PerSquareMile - North Hollywood
  - PerSquareMile - Pico-Union
  - PerSquareMile - University Park North
  - PerSquareMile - Van Nuys - Valley Glen
  - PerSquareMile - Westlake
  - PerSquareMile - Westlake-Koreatown
  - Rolland Curtis Park
  - Saint James Park
  - San Julian Park
  - Sixth Street Viaduct Park
  - South Victoria Avenue Park
  - Valencia Triangle
  - Vermont Miracle Park

REGIONAL SNAPSHOTS

- Regional snapshots help document how needs vary in different parts of Los Angeles.
  - East and Central LA are home to some of the most iconic—and most contested—city parks. Maintenance and service issues experienced at MacArthur Park, Echo Park, and Elysian Park are emblematic of the many roles that the parks in Los Angeles play. Homelessness, street vending, and safety are key challenges within these parks and neighborhoods.
  - South LA contains some of the most active and heavily utilized parks in the City. While critical spaces for recreation, culture, public gathering, and social services, they face ongoing challenges related to safety, maintenance, and amenity availability, particularly in communities that have experienced decades of disinvestment.
  - Though North LA has many acres of parkland, there are issues around access to and interconnectivity of parks. Parks are quite far from some residents, leading to a need for better trails and enhanced streetscapes to connect parks and greenspaces. There is also a need for more accessible routes and facilities within parks.
  - West LA includes a wide variety of parks and benefits from proximity to state parks, beaches, regional trails, and facilities in nearby cities. With the recent Palisades wildfires, fire risk, resilience, and recovery are priority concerns. As in much of Los Angeles, communities in West LA are concerned about people experiencing homelessness occupying limited park space, maintenance, and safety.

04



Figure 176. Children participate in a PlayLA event. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.

SECTION IV:
GUIDELINES

In addition to identifying park needs in Los Angeles, the Park Needs Assessment defines key principles that should guide the implementation of projects and the ongoing operation of parks. This critically provides RAP staff and partners with a path to addressing the needs that have been identified.

The guidelines put forth here bring together countless hours of conversations with experts in accessibility, engagement, design, construction, sustainability, and operations from RAP and the community.

Each member of the RAP team and the public can refer to these guidelines to help create the park system Angelenos imagine. Guidelines are not a replacement for the expertise of competent and talented RAP staff, planners, designers, engineers, or engagement specialists, but they are important to help ensure a minimum level of quality in the park system.

CAPITAL LIFE CYCLE

The life cycle of a park does not stop at construction. Parks need to be periodically evaluated to ensure they stay relevant.

	Acquisition	Vision Planning	Design	Construction	Operation	Evaluation
Park Classifications	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
Site Planning Guidelines	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Engagement Guidelines	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Level of Service Standards	✓	✓			✓	✓

Figure 177. The PNA guidelines can be used at various stages of the capital life cycle. Source: OLIN, 2025.

Capital facilities, including parks and recreation facilities, have a life cycle. New parks and facilities are planned, built, and operated. Periodically, they must be evaluated to help ensure that they are still serving their intended purpose and to determine whether they need to be updated to better meet residents' changing needs. Over time, without thoughtful investment and improvement, facilities can become outdated, over- or underutilized, or costly to maintain. Mapping out a clear capital life cycle helps the Department of Recreation and Parks systematically assess when facilities should be maintained, renovated, repurposed, or replaced. This chapter explains how the capital life cycle ties to the PNA's guidelines and supports proactive stewardship of the City's recreation and parks system—ensuring that public assets remain safe, functional, and responsive to community priorities.

ACQUISITION

New parks are needed in the City. For some parks, their life cycle begins with acquisition from other government agencies or developers, private donations, or purchase. This process should be closely linked to ongoing consideration of park access and supply needs.

VISION PLANNING

The vision planning process solidifies the goals and physical armature for a park, based on community engagement to help ensure the site layout and facilities meet the park and recreation needs of the community.



Figure 180. **Operation | RAP maintenance staff are critical to the daily operations of the City's recreation and park facilities.** Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks, 2025.




Figure 179. **Design | The site plan for renovations at South Park show key improvements including turf upgrades, playgrounds, and recreational facilities.** Source: City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering, 2018.



Figure 178. **Acquisition | The City of LA purchased the 42-acre Taylor Yard site in 2017 and is working to develop it into a new park.** Source: City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering, accessed 2025.

DESIGN

Following a vision plan, the City develops construction drawings for needed onsite and offsite improvements. In addition to the development of park amenities, plantings, and structures, these improvements may include water delivery systems, utility infrastructure improvements, and stormwater enhancements.

CONSTRUCTION

The City secures a contractor or contractors needed to build the park through a traditional bid process. The City works with the contractor throughout the construction process to complete the project.

OPERATION

The City operates the park or facility with staff to support residents' ongoing use.

EVALUATION

Periodically, the City evaluates whether a park or facility is still serving its intended purpose and remains compliant with regulatory requirements. If not, improvements may be needed.



Figure 181. Families share input on desired events during a pop-up at Jackie Tatum Harvard Recreation Center.
Source: The Robert Group, 2025.



ONGOING ENGAGEMENT

Ongoing engagement helps parks reflect the diverse needs and priorities of Los Angeles' many neighborhoods. Meaningful engagement involves surveys, public meetings, advisory committees, neighborhood councils, workshops, focus groups, and pop-ups. Feedback from these engagements directly shapes park programming, amenities, and site planning for updated and new facilities. Public involvement should begin during planning, continue through construction, and extend beyond opening to make sure parks continue to serve their communities. Neighborhood groups including neighborhood councils can be great resources.



Figure 182. Community members at an engagement meeting in Granada Hills share ideas to help shape inclusive and equitable park planning. Source: Mark Hovater, 2025.

ENGAGEMENT GUIDELINES

Community engagement is vital to an equitable, inclusive, and sustainable park system.

An equity-driven, community-led approach will not just result in engagement findings that are more reflective of Los Angeles's diverse population, it will also lead to projects that offer multiple benefits, including:

- **Inclusive and accessible public spaces.** Engaging a broad range of community members—particularly those not traditionally included in park planning processes—allows for a diversity of expertise about park uses, safety, desired amenities, and many other elements. This on-the-ground knowledge from residents, alongside input from less-served community groups, can lead to parks that better serve local communities and all Angelenos alike, resulting in better system-wide alignment with community needs.
- **A sense of communal ownership.** People who participate in planning and designing their park are more likely to develop a sense of healthy ownership and pride, cultivating long-lasting stewardship relationships with their local public spaces. This connection can help improve park safety, maintenance, use, and sustainability, and leads to greater trust and transparency.
- **Leadership identification and cultivation.** Park planning and design processes offer a platform to cultivate community leaders. The result is an active group of residents with stronger ties to the site, facility, and staff which aid in fostering an overall sense of trust.
- **Equity in access and outcomes.** Historically, park planning and resources across Los Angeles have not always been equitable. Engagement, particularly in marginalized communities, needs to be a core element of planning processes from the beginning, with the aim to reduce disparities in access to quality green space and provide equitable distribution of resources.

From design to operations, meaningful community engagement for park projects should aim to create dynamic and inclusive processes where every Angeleno feels welcomed and heard. Engagement

at every scale should prioritize communities that have historically been underserved by public investment and underrepresented in park planning, budgeting, and decision-making processes. To make engagement processes more inclusive they should be developed and implemented in partnership with community members and community based organizations (CBOs), and adapted to reflect and be relevant to specific communities needs.

Metrics can be used not only to define the milestones necessary for a successfully completed project but also the strengths and challenges of the engagement process itself. Creating a plan to routinely collect and report out engagement data during the life cycle of a project not only builds in transparency and trust, but also creates a standard that parks can use to keep themselves accountable to internal and community goals. An inclusive planning and design process binds communities together to be life-long stewards of the recreation and park system.



Figure 183. An Engagement event at Jackie Tatum Harvard Recreation Center invites community voices on park priorities.
Source: The Robert Group, 2025.

HOW TO USE THE ENGAGEMENT GUIDELINES THROUGHOUT THE CAPITAL LIFE CYCLE

The following engagement guidelines are recommended for use when there is a significant capital improvement project (at a site or system wide scale) and in the long-term stewardship, operations, and programming of individual RAP sites. The overview below is followed by a more detailed description of how the engagement guidelines can be used for specific projects and in day-to-day operations. These guidelines are a starting point, and each engagement process should be considered and adapted to its community history and context accordingly.

ACQUISITION

Community engagement during the acquisition phase of a park project should keep residents adequately informed about the acquisition process, and guided by community input. This includes information on the location of the new facility, its classification (e.g., neighborhood park or neighborhood nature park), potential amenities, accessibility measures, and plans to thoughtfully integrate it into the existing community.

VISION PLANNING

Community-driven vision planning encourages and empowers residents to take an active role in shaping their environment and city. Whether planning for a new park or reimagining an existing one, engagement at this phase should involve multiple sessions for community members and key stakeholders to develop a robust and inclusive vision for a new project with RAP. The community's vision will set the course for a park that meets the needs and cultural contexts of its community. At this stage, RAP can begin building a base of community members to champion the new park site.

Continued on Next Page

DESIGN

Co-design engagement activities invite residents into the design process, giving people opportunities to make decisions about the park, including determining needs, prioritizing amenities, and creating site plans. Through that process, community members can develop a sense of ownership over a space they were directly involved in shaping.

CONSTRUCTION

Keeping residents and immediate neighbors informed and engaged during park and facility construction is vital to maintaining a strong base of residents committed to the park's success and sustainability. Communication during the construction phase is often sparse, yet providing updates and other vital information on the project's completion can avoid surprises and community distrust. RAP and its CBO partners should schedule semi-regular meetings with the community to update on progress and create opportunities (e.g. "community build days") to invite residents into the process, where possible.

OPERATION

RAP should create a transparent process for keeping residents informed of the ongoing operations and maintenance at sites, and provide opportunities for residents and CBO partners to actively shape programming where possible. For additional guidance see the Long-Term Stewardship, Operations, And Programming section below.

EVALUATION

In periodically evaluating parks and recreation facilities, an engagement process should help determine community metrics of a site's success that can supplement RAP's own metrics.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

PROJECT PRE-PLANNING

Identify the level of engagement a project needs.

The National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA) lists the following levels of engagement. Before developing a broader engagement strategy RAP should decide which level is appropriate for the planned capital improvement:

- **INFORM:** Is it to INFORM the community? A decision is made, and the community needs to be aware but does not have the ability to make changes to the decision.
- **CONSULT:** Is it to CONSULT the community? The community is asked to react to something specific and provide feedback that will shape the outcome.
- **INVOLVE:** Is it to INVOLVE the community? The community is asked to share their ideas that will help to shape the outcome.
- **COLLABORATE:** Is it to COLLABORATE with the community? Community members and the agency have a trusting relationship to work together to develop solutions that are best for their community.
- **SUPPORT:** Is it to SUPPORT the community? The agency provides community members with the tools needed to make decisions.

Incorporate meaningful engagement requirements in RFPs.

When contracting with consultants to conduct community engagement processes, RAP should establish that candidates have a clear understanding of the project, a history of leading successful and inclusive engagement processes, and a demonstrated understanding of the community impacted. Consider hiring local CBOs to help involve hard-to-reach communities.



Figure 184. Engaging young community members at Healthy Day for Kids helps build early connections and identify key stakeholders invested in neighborhood parks. Source: The Robert Group, 2025.

Identify key community stakeholders.

At the beginning of a project, RAP should connect with key community stakeholders and, if applicable, the existing and active Park Advisory Board (PAB). These stakeholders could be local CBOs, schools, religious organizations, the neighborhood council, and small businesses. Nearby stakeholders and the PAB should play a key role in the outreach efforts to tap into the existing networks of residents and community members already invested in the site and neighborhood.

Coordinate with related community planning efforts.

Connect to other RAP divisions, departments, and governmental agencies to understand if there are recent or ongoing projects in the area. If a community has been engaged multiple times about similar projects it can lead to distrust and fatigue. If possible, parallel processes should be coordinated to help lessen the time burden on community members.

COMMUNITY-DRIVEN PLANNING AND DESIGN PROCESS

Create an inclusive and targeted outreach strategy.

Define a geographic area for all outreach efforts, and identify the key populations, languages, and formal and informal cultural institutions within that boundary. An outreach strategy should also identify intermediate milestones and a goal for the total number of people to be engaged throughout the process. RAP should use existing user data and listserv to also guide outreach efforts wherever possible. Once established, conduct a multi-channel outreach campaign, including: door-knocking, digital and social media, and if resources are available local mailers and text messages. As part of the outreach campaign, one tactic to increase turnout includes forming a 'Street Team', a paid group of local youth or other interested residents to conduct outreach for the project. In addition, keep park bulletin boards updated with upcoming workshops and other events.

Create an open forum when announcing new capital projects to the community.

When a park site or facility is due to receive a new capital project or amenity improvement, provide multiple opportunities for the community to provide feedback. These should also be used as opportunities for celebration, highlighting the need the new site, amenity, or facility will fill.



Figure 185. A presentation kicked off an engagement meeting at Tarzana Recreation Center. Source: OLIN, 2025.

New parks and park improvements can also raise concerns about gentrification and displacement. Open forums provide space to discuss anti-displacement strategies and address concerns directly with community members. Early dialogue can help identify the potential impacts of a project and develop approaches that support the existing neighborhood in place.

Offer a spectrum of engagement opportunities.

Engagement should allow all community members, regardless of background, age, or ability, to share their expertise and shape the project. While the specific engagement strategy will be informed by the level of engagement required for the project, some core methods include:

- **Community Workshops:** A series of community meetings that includes presentations, activities, and facilitated discussions. Workshops serve as the key venue to provide in-depth information and equip residents with the necessary background to make informed decisions, co-design, and meaningfully shape the implementation process.
- **Mobile Engagement:** A pop-up "mini-workshop" at an existing event or community hub. Mobile engagement prioritizes quick prompts and ideation that can then be developed further in workshops. This is also intended to catch people's attention, spread the word about future engagement, and build the database of contacts for future outreach. Mobile engagement is best deployed at locations or events where people are already gathering, such as youth sporting events, community celebrations, or popular locations within the community to 'meet people where they already are.'
- **Focus Groups:** Convenings around a common topic. Focus groups provide an opportunity to ground truth desk research, foster buy-in,





Figure 186. A youth focus group at the SEACA workshop shares feedback to ground truth research and shape park planning around younger users' needs. Source: OLIN, 2025.



Figure 187. A bilingual engagement board in Granada Hills supports inclusive outreach and multilingual community input. Source: Mark Hovater, 2025.

and solicit feedback from specific groups at critical points in the project. These can either be centered around specific user groups such as recreation program participants, or around specific demographic groups such as younger park users or street vendors.

Consider community context.

Engagement strategies should consider the role a park plays and the way communities gather beyond park boundaries to increase participation and help ensure park design and programming better suit local needs.

Employ inclusive and accessible engagement tactics.

Consider the following strategies to create an inclusive and accessible outreach and engagement process for all residents:

- **Go beyond ADA standards:** Consider how engagement can go beyond meeting the baseline ADA requirements to be accessible, welcoming, and inclusive of the entire community. Materials should be accessible to those with disabilities, while still being graphically compelling for all potential participants.
- **Location:** When conducting in-person engagement, select a location that can be easily accessed by the target participants. Ensure multiple modes of inclusive transportation access including public transportation when considering sites. People of all abilities should feel welcomed and be able to attend the event with ease including access to bathrooms and water fountains.
- **Language justice:** When conducting engagement in communities where a significant portion of the population speaks a language other than English,

offer multilingual facilitation and materials, including experienced simultaneous interpretation services.

- **Plain language:** Use plain language that everyone can understand to explain capital improvements projects and bureaucratic mechanisms.
- **Provide childcare services:** Evening meetings and weekends are especially difficult for caregivers and working parents—providing access to childcare or childwatch can improve turnout.
- **Youth activities:** To appeal to parents, provide kids activities and food to encourage attendance. Offer a broad range of meeting times and locations for people to participate. Where possible, conduct specific youth workshops or have youth activities to allow children or younger adults the opportunity to shape future designs at their parks.
- **Food:** When offering meetings during lunch and dinner hours, providing food improves turnout and recognizes residents' time and commitment to the process.
- **Incentives:** Offer monetary incentives or gifts for residents and park users to participate in meetings and provide feedback.

Share decision-making power with the community.

When appropriate, incorporate co-design and shared decision making tools to bring residents into the decision making processes for their local parks. At the outset of any project, RAP should internally discuss and agree upon where community-input can have the most impact, and focus engagement around those decisions. During acquisition, community mapping exercises can help RAP understand where best to site a new park or facility. The Vision Planning phase is an opportunity for community members to help RAP shape the broad vision for their new amenity. During the design phase, shared decision making tools, like participatory budgeting, offer ways for residents to meaningfully engage with the capital improvement process by democratically selecting priority elements and amenities they'd like to see in the park or facility. Information about what can or cannot be shaped through the engagement process should be clearly defined for community members to help set expectations and build a stronger and more transparent relationship with residents.

Communities should have clear information about how park decisions are made and where funding is allocated.

Identify opportunities to uplift community history and stories.

Each park and each community has its own history and story to tell. When possible, use engagement processes to uncover and highlight hidden histories and stories of marginalized communities in parks, and integrate those stories into the amenities and design of the park space. This process could be undertaken through RAP or through partnerships with CBOs, engagement consultants, or local artists. Techniques include reviewing existing archival materials, collecting oral histories, mobile engagements, community archiving workshops, and temporary exhibitions.

IMPLEMENTATION

Conduct engagement meetings during the construction process.

Keep the community updated and engaged during the permitting and construction processes. Informing residents of delays, project changes, and updated project timelines will help maintain trust with the community and provide continuity between the engagement periods. Communication should also include tenant rights and anti-displacement resources. Updates should be provided at least quarterly.

Create opportunities for community co-build and planting.

Find appropriate opportunities for the community to be involved in the construction process of their new or updated park facility. Some ideas include community planting days, mural painting, or other co-build opportunities. This helps build residents' sense of ownership over their space.

Evaluate project success.

After a capital project is completed, RAP should organize a minimum of two feedback sessions to present evaluation metrics taken at the beginning of the engagement process and reflect with the community on the strengths and challenges of the entire process. Apply feedback to strengthen future engagement efforts.



Figure 188. Young residents take part in co-design and shared decision-making at the Tarzana Earth Day pop-up to help shape their local parks.
Source: The Robert Group, 2025.

LONG TERM STEWARDSHIP, OPERATIONS, AND PROGRAMMING

PARKS AMBASSADOR PROGRAM

Develop and implement a Parks Ambassador program.

Contract with local community-based organizations to pilot, and ultimately launch, a Park Ambassador program focused on high-need parks and parks without permanent staff. Park Ambassadors provide extra eyes and ears to support park users and staff. They help community members navigate the park and connect them with resources; report maintenance issues; and contribute to community stewardship within the park. Two potential areas of focus for the program are Youth Professional Development and a Promotores Model.

Youth Professional Development

The Park Ambassador program could be set up to foster the next generation of city staff and provide job training and opportunities for underserved young adults. Participants would develop transferable leadership and project management skills and explore career pathways in public service, environmental stewardship, and natural resources management. This program could operate in-house at RAP, via an external consultant, or be managed by entities such as the LA Parks Foundation or LA Conservation Corps.

Promotores model

The Park Ambassador Program coordinates or contracts with CBOs in (severely) disadvantaged communities to operate and staff the program. While the Park Ambassadors would share some common ground across the city, each neighborhood/CBO would have the ability to shape their program to respond to their community's needs. Across the system, Ambassadors would support park users, report maintenance issues, and foster environmental stewardship.

PARK ARTS STREAMLINED ACTIVITIES ALLOWED

Develop allowable arts events list and approvals.

Developing a working list of arts events that do not require permits to be held in designated park spaces would provide transparency and streamline operations. For example, small performances by pre-approved arts organizations without amplification or small interpretive drama without permanent structures should ideally be allowed in parks in a way that contributes to the use of space. This concept relates to cultural programming and creative placemaking in City parks. RAP and the RAP Board would review a list of arts organizations that apply to be on the "pre-approved" list for events on a recurring basis. Events would need to reserve space in advance through the reservation system at individual parks. The types of allowable activities would be limited and groups would lose privileges if one of the allowances was broken.

The goal would be to ensure that arts and culture initiatives are inclusive, community-responsive, and enhance the civic and environmental experience of the park system as well as making the distinctions between permitted and non permitted art events clear and making this information easily available to the public.

PROGRAMMING

Regularly assess RAP programming.

Periodically, assess the programs offered in the park. Engage residents around what programming they would like to see and ask them questions to inform the content, structure, and outcomes of the programming. Invest time in engaging historically and currently underrepresented community members in this process, and look for opportunities for park programming to reflect the unique culture of the local community. In-person or survey engagement beyond looking at program enrollment numbers is important, as there may be many reasons a program is or isn't being utilized.

Provide a clear mechanism for community-driven programming.

Publish and disseminate a permitting process for residents to host community-run programming in the park facility. The permitting process should be simple, clear, and low cost to reduce barriers and encourage use. The process should also take into account exemptions for spontaneous user-driven programming. Additional programming in parks beyond what RAP offers has the potential to further activate the space, increasing park usage and fostering a more culturally responsive park system.

Prioritize cross-beneficial programming.

A focus should be placed on programs that have benefits for several different types of park users. Cross-beneficial programming creates stacked benefits that increase social bonding, community education, and park activation.

Provide context-specific programming.

Parks and recreation facilities are located in diverse and dynamic communities, and programming should be culturally relevant to respond to each park's specific community context and needs. Parks also may have unique ecological assets that inform additional nature-based programming. Formally partnering with local CBOs, arts organizations, environmental organizations, and other local stakeholders can help to provide regular programming that celebrates local culture, honors existing rituals, and builds on other community events. Park bulletin boards and online calendars should be regularly updated with programming information to keep local residents informed about these community activities.

'FRIENDS' GROUPS AND PARK ADVISORY BOARDS

Support community stewardship.

Existing groups associated with the park including 'friends' groups and PABs should be incorporated on a regular basis into the park programming schedule. These groups should guide programming to meet specific community needs, support outreach and engagement efforts, and support staffing particular programs and events.



Figure 189. Community members gather for a Mother's Day celebration at Watts Senior Center. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025.

HIRING

Create local hiring opportunities.

Beyond places for recreation, parks and recreation facilities can also be places of employment for

community members. For positions that do not need commission approval, RAP should advertise job openings at community events and at recreation centers to prioritize the hiring of people from nearby communities. When possible, existing staff should be considered for promotions to new positions within the same park. This approach builds trust by preserving relationships between staff and the neighborhoods they serve.

Appoint staff community liaisons.

Some vulnerable groups that depend on parks, such as street vendors or individuals experiencing homelessness, would benefit from having RAP staff that serve as dedicated community liaisons to ensure continuity of communication. Having a specific point of contact for community members and advocacy groups alike can improve clarity of communication and can help minimize conflict within parks. In addition to first aid and CPR, these staff members should be trained in harm reduction and de-escalation techniques.

Appoint accessibility guides.

Certain groups would benefit from having dedicated RAP staff or volunteers help guide them through the park and its facilities. Some community members express interest in using park amenities but do not know how to operate them. Having RAP staff with lived experience with the community they are assisting would be key to greater community usage.



Figure 190. Venice Beach is a treasured regional destination operated by RAP..
Source: Calvada Surveying, Inc., 2025.



SITE PLANNING

Site planning guidelines provide a clear and consistent roadmap for designing new parks and recreation facilities, refreshing existing sites, and evaluating whether improvements are needed. These guidelines ensure that parks across Los Angeles are not only functional and beautiful but also aligned with community expectations. In a city as large, diverse, and dynamic as Los Angeles, thoughtful site planning is essential to creating parks that serve a wide range of community needs while maximizing the potential of each unique site. These guidelines help establish consistent principles for design, connectivity, sustainability, and access, so that every site—regardless of size or location—supports a vibrant, inclusive, and resilient public space network.

HOW TO USE THE SITE PLANNING GUIDELINES THROUGHOUT THE CAPITAL LIFE CYCLE

ACQUISITION

Use the guidelines as a checklist to understand how well a site can currently be accessed and the relationship a site has with surrounding uses, including other public spaces.

VISION PLANNING

Use the guidelines as a checklist for vision plan development. Pay particular attention to guidelines that address specific site-based needs.

DESIGN

Use the guidelines as a checklist for concept plan and design development. Pay particular attention to guidelines that address specific site-based needs.

CONSTRUCTION

Use the guidelines as a checklist for Park and Facility Construction. Pay particular attention to the guidelines that address future-use adaptability and communal gathering spaces.

OPERATION

Site planning guidelines do not apply at this phase since decisions about site planning and design are made in previous phases.

EVALUATION

Use the guidelines to periodically evaluate site conditions and determine whether the design holds up to the aspirations of the guidelines.

SITE PLANNING GUIDELINES

The following site planning guidelines are meant to ensure that park and recreation facility sites are well integrated into their surroundings and provide the best experiences for visitors. They address overall design, site context, access and connectivity, wayfinding, and various zones of use within the site. The guidelines are intended to inform:

- **the development of framework and site plans;**
- **the periodic evaluation of parks and recreation facilities to assess functionality and performance; and**
- **the design of refreshed or new parks.**

Following the list of site planning guidelines are diagrams showing how they apply to a prototypical park of each classification.



Figure 191. New parks like Jane & Bert Boeckman Park bring new experiences to the city. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025.

DESIGN

SYSTEM WIDE LANGUAGE

Use a consistent design language throughout the system, while maintaining flexibility.

Signage and wayfinding elements should be easy to read, graphics-based, and consistent from one park or recreation facility to another—especially for community, neighborhood, and mini parks. Regional parks provide opportunities for more unique design expressions. Having a consistent design language helps identify a park or recreation facility as being part of the Los Angeles recreation and parks system and helps users feel more comfortable visiting parks or recreation facilities they may be unfamiliar with. Consistency does not, however, preclude unique identity features.

DESIGN VOCABULARY

Ensure the vocabulary of design is appropriate for the scale and materials of the landscape and existing infrastructure.

Particularly on larger sites, landscape and architectural design elements should respond to the scale and aesthetic of their community context. For example, playgrounds, shelters, and rain gardens in regional parks should be sized differently than those in mini parks.

COHESIVE SITE LAYOUT

Consider the holistic design and layout of a space.

Facilities should move beyond just a collection of individual elements; they should be grouped to create spaces with complementary uses. Rather than a single tree, consider a grove of trees that frames a picnic space. Rather than a pavilion separate from a play area, consider how children and their caregivers might use the two together.

PARK CORE

Locate key park and recreation elements together, creating a hub of activity.

Particularly on larger sites, key elements should form a central hub for users—a nexus of activity. As a high traffic area, a park core should be accessible from primary and secondary pathways and its adjacent use zones should support community programming.

INDOOR-OUTDOOR CONNECTIONS

Consider recreation centers and parks as extensions of one another during capital improvements.

Recreation centers and parks are not separate elements. Considering their adjacencies can lead to better indoor-outdoor connections spatially and programmatically. Architectural elements should be flexible in their connection between indoors and outdoors. Large communal porches, detached pavilions connected by large roofs, and shade structures attached to larger buildings are great strategies for integrating the park landscape and architecture. Rather than buildings being bastions within the park, they should welcome park users in and participate in the life of the park. Building exteriors should be considered as another type of "interior" or "room" and embrace the natural climate and landscape of Los Angeles.

NATIVE PLANTING VARIETY

Move beyond mown turf grass and include a variety of native plantings to create inviting spaces within parks.

Plantings should include native perennials, grasses, shrubs, and trees. This is an opportunity to strengthen Los Angeles's relationship with natural systems and to develop new approaches for City-owned and -managed parks. Planting variety will help the City adapt to climate change, sustain ecosystem services, expand biodiversity, invite educational programming opportunities, and provide for the recreational use and enjoyment for generations to come. Consider partnering with local native nurseries to provide plants and specialized training for park staff and community members on native plant care and maintenance.

Promote the planting, preservation, and maintenance of canopy trees.

Established canopy trees are not easily replaceable. They are long-term assets that provide lasting environmental, social, and health benefits. In addition to expanding a diverse urban forest across parks and trails, existing trees should be carefully protected and preserved during park improvements or new facility development to sustain and maximize the value of the city's urban canopy. The removal of non-native or dying trees should be carefully evaluated to ensure support of long-term ecological health and canopy resilience.

PARK USER EQUITY

Design spaces and experiences for all.

Spaces designed to include those with disabilities are accessible for all park users, and an accessible-first approach should be considered when improving or designing park elements. Design spaces to have ample seating, generous pathways, and varied experiences that are accessible and usable for all. Consider flexible and multi-use spaces that support park users, vendors, mobility hubs, community events, and changing neighborhood priorities. Focus on making primary experiences all-inclusive. Ensure that both universally accessible and non accessible areas have shade.

Design recreation areas to encourage use by multiple genders and age groups.

Use gender-equity best practices when designing recreational amenities by breaking up monolithic active recreation spaces to include seating and gathering spaces that can accommodate flexible uses, and consider striping fields for multiple sports.

CULTURAL & HISTORIC FEATURES

Preserve culturally and historically significant features.

Cultural and historic features, such as historic structures or routes, add interest and preserve experiences that are rare or unique. These features become destinations themselves and attract local and regional visitors. Parks and recreation facilities with culturally or historically significant features provide opportunities for interpretation and education.

WATER CONSERVATION

Promote water conservation in the design of landscape features and water-based amenities.

Follow the local water efficiency ordinance, and consider additional ways to conserve water at park facilities. Drought tolerant and native plantings can help reduce local water use. Track requirements of Assembly Bill 1572 to remove non-functional turf at park facilities. Water-based features, such as splash pads and pools, should continue to follow water-efficient practices and operate seasonally in the warmer months.

FIRE RISK REDUCTION

Incorporate fire risk reduction strategies in the design of parks and recreation facilities.

To protect park users, facilities, and surrounding communities while advancing the City's wildfire resilience goals, parks can layer both preemptive strategies to reduce anticipated fire risks and defensive strategies to reduce anticipated fire impacts. Preemptive strategies may include creating defensible space, maintaining vegetation management zones, and incorporating technology like cameras and sensors. Defensive strategies may include reducing ignition potential through the use of non-combustible materials, fire-resistant plant species, and adequate separation between structures and flammable vegetation.



Figure 192. RAP's new branding can be seen on a new RAP sign installed at Laurel Grove Park. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025.



Figure 193. Shaded playground and seating areas at Evergreen Recreation Center provide sun protection and accessible play equipment for community use. Source: María Lamadrid, 2025.

CONTEXT

PSU

PARK SUPPORTIVE USES

Ensure a mix of surrounding uses that support parks and recreation facilities.

A mix of residential, commercial, and civic uses expands the park user base, particularly at street intersections where people are traveling in multiple directions, and encourages activity through a longer part of the day. The number and mix of uses may vary by size, type, and location.

BUILDING FRONTAGE

Ensure that buildings adjacent to and across the street from parks and recreation facilities have frontages or entrances designed to face them.

Buildings with active ground floor uses that face parks and recreation facilities help frame the space and provide "eyes on the park." Such visibility from adjacent uses enhances the perception of safety. Building entrances adjacent to a park or recreation facility provide a built-in user-base. In addition, proximity to parks and recreation facilities is correlated with higher property values—benefiting property owners.

COUNTY AND REGIONAL PARK CONNECTIVITY

Connect to adjacent Los Angeles County and regional parks.

City parks and recreation facilities should be thought of as parts of a unified regional system along with County and regional parks. Clear connections between facilities help expand park and recreation access to all residents.

PUBLIC PROPERTY/INSTITUTIONAL

Connect to adjacent public properties or institutional facilities.

Facilities like schools, libraries, and museums offer community programming and information, resources, and recreation opportunities for residents that complement those of parks and recreation facilities.

STREETSCAPE ENHANCEMENTS

Surround parks and recreation facilities with enhanced streetscapes.

Streets surrounding parks and recreation facilities should be treated as extensions of those facilities. Trees, planters, rain gardens, lighting, and other features provide a visual cue to all street users that a park or recreation facility is nearby.



Figure 194. A loop trail at Runyon Canyon Park supports exploration, circulation, and wellness.
Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025.

CONNECTIVITY

STREET GRID CONNECTIVITY

Maintain physical and visual connections to the street grid.

Parks and recreation facilities should be thoughtfully integrated into the fabric of surrounding neighborhoods. They should be sited to minimize disruptions to the street grid, which is integral to a functional transportation network. Where streets do not continue through a park or recreation facility site, efforts should be made to maintain physical and visual connections, such as gateways, sight lines, or walking paths through the site in line with those streets.

SEAMLESS PUBLIC SPACE

Ensure seamless connections between parks and recreation facilities and other adjacent public spaces.

Residents do not typically perceive differences in ownership, but they do perceive differences in experiences and missing connections. Barriers and breaks in access limit attractiveness and viability. Regional ecosystems also do not observe jurisdictional boundaries and must be thought of as integrated, functional systems.

TRAIL MODE SEPARATION

Separate trails into paths for horses, cyclists, and pedestrians.

On larger sites, where space allows, separating trails for horses, cyclists, and pedestrians can enhance safety and reduce conflicts among users moving at different speeds. This separation also reinforces the sense that trail users are within a park or recreation environment. Differentiated trail materials can further support this approach; for example, a walking path might be surfaced with stone fines, while an adjacent bike trail could be paved with asphalt and an equestrian trail might use packed dirt or stone suited to horse hooves.

LOOP TRAIL

Provide a loop trail for people to explore, circulate, and recreate.

Loop trails provide opportunities for people to explore parts of a park or recreation facility site that they may not otherwise be aware of with confidence, knowing that they will end up where they started. When they are a specifically measured length, loop trails allow users to easily walk, jog, bike, or skate to a number of steps or miles they may be targeting for exercise and wellness.



Figure 195. An internal walking trail at Debs Park allow users to explore the park.
Source: Calvada Surveying, Inc., 2025.

INTERNAL WALKING TRAIL

Connect features in parks to each other using circulation.

Walking trails in parks allow users to explore the various features of a park and connect to adjacent uses. They also help keep users off of sensitive native vegetation or planted areas. Walking trails can offer different difficulty levels to accommodate a variety of age groups, exercise goals, and unique park experiences.

TRAIL CONNECTION

Maintain connections to the paved trail network.

Trail users are park and recreation facility users. Parks and recreation facilities can serve as trailheads, trail destinations, or locations to stop and rest along a trail. Parks and recreation facilities may also host critical trail links, leading to a more connected system.

SAFE ROUTES/PASSAGES

Create safe routes to parks and recreation facilities.

Critical to equitable access and connectivity is ensuring people have safe ways to get to parks and recreation facilities from home, schools, libraries, transit stops, and other destinations within their neighborhoods. Well-lit, well-paved sidewalks and trails, partnerships with community organizations and public agencies, and opportunities to overcome physical and perceived barriers should be prioritized.



Figure 196. The main gateway welcomes visitors to Pan Pacific Park. Source: OLIN, 2025.

WAYFINDING

GATEWAYS (PRIMARY AND SECONDARY)

Create gateway features at major entrances to parks and recreation facilities.

Gateway features clearly indicate major entrances and signal to visitors that they are welcome to enter. Architectural, landscape, art, and signage features may be used to indicate a gateway. The placement and design of gateway features can guide users to use specific routes through park and recreation facility sites.

PATH HIERARCHY

Ensure on-site paths have a clear hierarchy.

Establish a hierarchy of paths that offer a range of experiences for diverse users, access to destinations, and connections to surrounding circulation networks. Provide consistent widths and surface materials based on path hierarchy and user type.

UNIVERSAL WAYFINDING SIGNAGE

Ensure universal design for wayfinding systems.

Accessible and consistent wayfinding systems improve spatial orientation and reduce user anxiety. Wayfinding signage should be clear, concise, and accessible in order to address the diverse cognitive, physical, and sensory needs of park users. Signage should be at an appropriate height to ensure wheelchair users can interact with wayfinding elements. Consistent and clear symbols, fonts, typeface size, and high contrast colors create a cohesive visual language and enhance navigation. Signage should be abundant, including along trails, and should locate primary amenities such as bathrooms, monuments, trailheads, and comfort facilities.

Incorporate signage elements that can be used by those with visual impairments.

Wayfinding signage should include tactile elements, braille, and audible cues, use sans serif or other legible boldface font types, and use high-contrast colors.

Prioritize the use of pictograms in the communication of park policies.

Park policies guide appropriate park use across Los Angeles. Graphic pictograms communicate these policies more effectively than text-heavy signage, especially in Los Angeles' multilingual communities. Clear visual communication that is universally understandable helps park visitors quickly understand expectations and supports a welcoming environment.




Figure 197. Stormwater systems in parks may include above- and below-ground infrastructure. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025.

INFRASTRUCTURE

REGIONAL WATER PARTNERSHIPS

Identify opportunities for regional partnerships that can contribute to local sustainable water supplies, mitigate flood risk, and improve water quality.

Capturing stormwater and dry weather runoff at parks and recreation facilities may support multiple benefits including increasing local water supply, improving water quality in waterways, and mitigating flood risk.

As large open space areas in an urban landscape, parks offer opportunities to divert and capture stormwater and urban runoff. This may be achieved with infiltration facilities to recharge groundwater, capture and use facilities for a local source of water supply, and diversion to downstream regional water recycling systems. Local flooding may also be mitigated through diverting stormwater flows to parks. Additional funding may be available to implement stormwater capture systems at a regional scale through partnerships with other City agencies and the County.

BIKE PARKING

Provide adequate places for cyclists to secure their bikes.

Bike parking should be in visible and convenient places in parks and near recreation facilities. In order to make bike racks accessible, they should be installed within at least 50 feet of a facility's entrance. This ensures accessibility, safety, and security while reducing the potential for bikes getting locked to trees, signposts, handrails, fences, and other non-rack structures.

TRANSIT STOP

Connect parks and recreation facilities to transit.

As with trails, transit users are park and recreation facility users and vice versa. Gateways may relate directly to a bus stop or to a rideshare drop-off, providing a sense of place and spaces to welcome and send off visitors.

SHARED PARKING

Pursue shared parking strategies to eliminate or reduce on-site surface parking.

In high density areas land is limited and on-site parking further reduces park space. Rather than dedicating valuable space to parking, alternatives such as on-street parking or shared parking agreements may offer more efficient and context-sensitive solutions. This can be especially impactful when recreation and park facilities are adjacent to each other or other public facilities that offer parking options.

ON-SITE PARKING

When needed, integrate on-site parking with park and recreation facility site design.

On larger sites, like regional and community parks, on-site parking should be thoughtfully integrated with the site and natural elements. Green infrastructure elements and canopy trees should be included to help reduce the impact of parking on stormwater and urban heat island effects.

ACCESSIBLE PARKING AND DROP-OFF

Provide adequate spaces for accessible parking and drop-off.

Parks must have designated areas for parking and drop-off in accordance with ADA guidelines as well as accessible paths to park facilities from these areas. This ensures all users have safe and equitable access to all park amenities. For parks without on-site parking that have on-street parking on the park perimeter, on-street accessible parking must be provided. Parks that provide on-street loading zones on the park perimeter must provide accessible on-street loading zones.

SAFE CROSSINGS

Provide safe ways to cross streets that surround parks.

A welcoming park can feel inaccessible if bordered by dangerous, high traffic streets. Sidewalks and marked, safe crossings—whether at intersections or mid-block—encourage access and allow pedestrians, cyclists, horseback riders, and other users to feel comfortable that they are protected when accessing recreation and park facilities.

COMFORT FACILITIES

Provide amenities that support the use of parks and recreation facilities.

In order for parks and recreation facilities to function optimally, it is critical to include amenities such as restrooms, water fountains, waste receptacles, electricity, and Wi-Fi to support their use. These amenities should be open and maintained consistently, as well as designed to be durable and resist vandalism. Appropriate comfort facilities may vary by park or facility type.

Provide facilities that support park programming and community needs.

Parks host temporary art, vending, events, and programming that respond to the community and neighborhoods they serve. It is important to include any facilities that would support the diverse programming needs in current and future park development and ensure proper maintenance allows for the seamless use of these amenities by organizers.

MAINTENANCE FACILITIES

Consider areas for facilities that support maintenance needs.

On larger sites, like regional parks, it may be beneficial to store necessary equipment to make maintaining and caring for a park easier. These maintenance facilities may also serve as satellite storage areas to optimize maintenance of other nearby parks.



Figure 198. Water fountains are provided at Echo Park to support the use of nearby recreation facilities.
Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025.



Figure 199. The cherry grove with shade structure at Anthony C. Beilenson Park offers a comfortable setting and immersive ecological experience.
Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025.

ZONES

UNIVERSAL ELEMENTS

Ensure appropriate shade, seating, lighting and other universal elements throughout all zones.

Shade from trees or structures creates a more comfortable and safe environment. As Los Angeles faces more and more extreme heat days, shade coverage and other cooling methods in parks will need to evolve and expand. Trees reduce the impacts of urban heat island on hot days, while also sequestering carbon and helping to reduce soil erosion through their root systems. Shade structures should be used in places where trees are limited and where trees conflict with the particular park use.

Abundant and varied seating that allows people of all ages and abilities to comfortably inhabit public spaces should be a priority. Seating near recreational or programmed areas is important, particularly for older caregivers.

Identity features help tie a park or recreation facility to the neighborhood it is in, reflect a community's uniqueness, and become a signature for the facility. Public art, sculptures, decorative arches, or water fountains are examples of identity features that may attract users and serve as landmarks for meeting people or giving directions.

Follow local stormwater and flood control requirements for effective **on-site stormwater controls**. Low Impact Development (LID) Best Management Practices (BMPs) are required when 500 square feet or more of impervious surfaces within parks such as sidewalks, parking lots, and buildings are added or replaced. Additional flood mitigation controls may be required in certain locations.

Drainage, water quality, and flood management should be discussed early in the design process to improve local drainage and downstream water quality, as well as ease of access and maintenance. Considerations could include the footprint of required LID BMPs with overall park design, cost effective drainage design, and peak flood flow management features.

Lighting in parks should balance the need for safety with the protection of the natural nighttime environment. It should support visibility and a sense of security in active areas while minimizing light pollution and preserving opportunities for Angelenos to experience the night sky. Consistent with dark-sky principles, fixtures should be fully shielded, provide direct light only where needed, and use warm, low-intensity illumination to reduce glare and light trespass. Lighting should also be habitat-friendly, limiting disturbance to wildlife through the use of lower color temperatures and adaptive controls such as timers or motion sensors. Park lighting improvements should be coordinated with LA Lights to ensure alignment with citywide standards, energy efficiency goals, and environmental sustainability.

IU

INTENSIVE USE AREAS

Design spaces that can accommodate intensive use.

Parks and recreation facilities may attract large numbers of users due to the density of their surroundings, their integration into pedestrian and bicycle travel routes, and their use as event and gathering spaces. This high level of usage can impact the integrity of the space. Areas that are expected to be heavily used—for example, near entrances or gathering spaces—should be designed to accommodate that level of use, perhaps incorporating more hardscape areas or more resilient landscape plantings, but still be designed to feel comfortable even when large events are not occurring. Intensive use areas can also serve as a home for community gardens which can help bridge the gap between food deserts in urban areas as well as connect people to the natural environment by creating stewardship of the natural environment.

PG

PROGRAMMABLE GATHERING AREAS

Provide flexible open spaces that can be used as gathering spaces.

Parks and recreation facilities often serve as community gathering spaces, from small gatherings to large events. Areas should be designed to be flexible enough to accommodate these events while serving as space for informal play, picnicking, or other casual uses between events. These spaces may include both paved and soft surfaces and include amenities such as amphitheaters for performances. Infrastructure to support these gatherings, such as power and water hookups, Wi-Fi, and equipment storage for vendors and event holders may be needed.

RE

RECREATION AREAS

Provide areas and facilities that are specifically designed for recreation and are responsive to the needs of surrounding neighborhoods.

How parks and recreation facilities are used, and the degree to which they are used, depends on how well they respond to the needs of those who live near them. This may include both traditional courts and fields and unique facilities and spaces.

CU

CASUAL USE AREAS

Provide areas that are specifically designed for casual, impromptu use.

Just as important as programmed spaces are unprogrammed areas intentionally designed for people to enjoy a park or recreation facility without being displaced by programmed uses. Such casual use spaces may include areas for sitting (e.g., benches, walls, steps), picnicking, or playing a game of catch.

NA

NATURAL SYSTEM AREAS

Define areas that focus on the function and enhancement of natural systems.

Natural environments, including habitat areas, woodlands, wetlands, and stream corridors should be considered as predominant components of parks and recreation facilities rather than leftover spaces. Natural systems do not stop at site boundaries. In some neighborhoods, parks and recreation facilities are the closest opportunities to interact with natural spaces. Incorporating best stormwater management practices, enhancing existing ecosystems, providing habitat, and planting diverse landscapes can maximize the function of natural systems and enhance the user experience. Native, low-water-use or drought tolerant species establish climate-resilient and drought tolerant areas. Natural areas can also be effective at buffering parks from incompatible adjacent uses, such as highways.



Figure 200. Recreation areas promote active use through inclusive youth programming.
Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025.



Figure 201. A splash pad and pool provide opportunities for aquatic recreation outside the recreation center at Lincoln Park. Source: OLIN, 2025

ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS

PROGRAMMING

Align the use of built structures with a park's goals to enhance the user experience.

Programmed buildings and structures within parks should align with the overall goals of a park's vision plan and address the needs and desires of the local community. Community engagement—through surveys, public workshops, and collaboration with local organizations—can help ensure that design decisions reflect diverse voices and priorities.

Design structures for flexibility in programming.

Offering a wide range of programs within a park fosters a more inclusive environment that welcomes people from all backgrounds. It also encourages consistent use of the park throughout all seasons. Consider how structures can serve multiple functions or user groups and how they could adapt as community needs evolve over time. For example, park commissary kitchens could accommodate camp and afterschool programs and also be available to rent to vendors during non-program hours.

INTEGRATION WITH THE LANDSCAPE

Design architectural elements to reflect the unique character of the park and thoughtfully respond to context.

Design solutions should enhance the existing landscape while creating cohesive, welcoming environments that strengthen the sense of place. Structures introduced to park sites should blur the boundaries between interior and exterior environments. They should enhance the journey through the park, creating both pathways and destinations. Thoughtful use of site walls, extended roof coverage for shade, and clearly defined areas—whether programmed or unprogrammed—can be used as tools to accomplish this.

Aim to distribute architectural elements evenly across a park site.

To ensure the architectural elements integrate more seamlessly with the landscape, they should be thoughtfully distributed across the park. This approach prevents a single structure from dominating the site, and also allows for all corners of the park to be equally weighted in amenities.

Design architectural amenities to respect and preserve the beauty of the surrounding landscape.

When placing built structures within cherished landscapes such as parks, restraint is a valuable design principle. Thoughtful attention to scale, siting, and material finish allows architecture to complement and participate in the celebration of the landscape, rather than compete with it. All built structures should also integrate nature-based design solutions that are sensitive to surrounding ecosystems, for example, using patterned frit on glazing to prevent bird collisions and support habitat safety.

DESIGN EXCELLENCE

Design functional architectural elements that embody visual harmony, design clarity, and a high level of craftsmanship.

In all scales of the built environment, design excellence emerges through thoughtful and intentional work that honors and enriches the surrounding landscape, cultural context, and community. Such designs demonstrate originality in their treatment of form, materiality, and functional purpose. Additionally, high-quality construction and durable finishes help reinforce longevity, user comfort, and a refined sense of place.

Seek a variety of perspectives in selecting architectural designers.

Incorporating the work of various designers throughout the City encourages a variety of perspectives and innovative approaches that can also better reflect different neighborhood identities. This practice supports a continued commitment to rigorous design and contributes to the distinct character and quality of built work.

Craft design solutions that are both inventive in nature and capable of offering unexpected moments of joy.

Architectural elements within the park should be crafted with both beauty and authenticity, encouraging a sense of exploration and discovery for visitors. Even when serving a programmed function, park-based structures greatly benefit from embodying the attitude and intentionality of an artful site installation. These elements may present themselves through playful forms, tactile materials, or interactive features.

MATERIAL STRATEGIES

Select materials for constructing new and repairing existing structures to help ensure strength, resilience, and lasting quality.

Any built additions to a park serve as long-term investments in the environment and local community. As such, materials should be selected for their durability, ability to withstand wear over time, exposure to the elements, and potential natural disasters. These considerations contribute to a sense of security and permanence for nearby users and residents. Material selection should also prioritize environmental responsibility, including the use of products with low embodied carbon or considering salvaged and recycled building material when possible.

Use imaginative design solutions in the application of project materials.

Regardless of the perceived quality or cost of the materials selected for a project, their application should reflect creative thinking and innovation, contributing to both the visual appeal and performance of the overall design.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

Prioritize the environmental sustainability of built elements through low-impact design principles.

Given that architectural elements within parks and recreational areas are intended to complement and enhance the surrounding landscape, they should contribute meaningfully to both the natural environment and the visitor experience through the application of passive design strategies and established sustainable practices. Additionally, sustainability should be prioritized not only to minimize environmental impact, but also to protect the ecological integrity of park settings, reduce long-term maintenance costs, and create healthier, more resilient spaces for community use. Where feasible,design solutions—such as solar-powered lighting for pathways and pavilions, green roofs or living walls, natural ventilation in restrooms and shelters, optimized site orientation for shade and comfort, permeable paving, and rainwater harvesting for landscape irrigation—should be integrated early in the design process to maximize ecological performance, operational efficiency, and long-term community benefit.

Embed sustainability in both the construction phase and the final built form of architectural elements.

The construction of new architectural elements should also be guided by a commitment to environmental sustainability, including the implementation of a comprehensive construction waste management plan, the reuse of salvaged materials, the minimization of site disturbance, and the adoption of design/construction methods that support future adaptability and ease of disassembly. The architect, landscape architect, engineers, and construction team should closely collaborate to determine which sustainable practices will be most effective on each project. When possible, prioritize carbon neutral construction methods.

Support and advance the sustainability goals identified by the City of Los Angeles and the State of California.

New building structures within parks and recreational areas should demonstrate alignment with the sustainability objectives of the City of Los Angeles and the State of California, helping advance municipal and statewide environmental priorities. An example of this includes supporting the City's Green New Deal targets—such as reducing embodied carbon, enhancing energy efficiency, and expanding on-site renewable energy generation.

ACCESSIBILITY + EQUITY

Ensure architectural elements and structures provide equitable access for all visitors.

All architectural elements, regardless of scale or program type, must adhere to Federal and State standards for accessible design to help ensure equitable access and use of amenities. This compliance continues to promote a safe and inclusive environment within elements of the park. Furthermore, providing accessible built amenities facilitates opportunities for physical activity, community gathering and engagement, and connecting with nature—outcomes that are particularly vital for populations with limited access to alternative recreational resources.

Incorporate flexible programming within architectural elements to accommodate users of all genders, ages, and body types.

As with outdoor spaces, indoor programming—particularly recreational activities—must be flexible to better accommodate and welcome a broad, diverse range of users. Adaptable layouts, universally accessible features, and modular amenities can support a wide range of activities and evolving community needs, ensuring that all users feel welcome, comfortable, and empowered to participate.



Figure 202. The Juan Rodriguez Cabrillo Statue sits outside the Cabrillo Beach Bath House, which has a Mediterranean style that was popular in the 1930s. Source: Steve Cukrov / Shutterstock, 2021.



Figure 203. **The Echo Park Lake provides recreational benefits and wildlife habitat.** Source: Calvada Surveying, Inc., 2025.

PARK CLASSIFICATIONS

The City of Los Angeles has recreation and parks facilities of different sizes and uses. Together, these places form the active heart of the City's public space system, offering spaces for play, relaxation, cultural events, and connection with nature. From small parks tucked into neighborhood blocks to expansive open spaces, each type of park plays a distinct role in serving the diverse needs of Los Angeles' residents and communities. As the City grows and evolves, understanding the purpose and function of each type of park becomes increasingly important to ensure equitable access, appropriate amenities, and efficient management. The new park classification system in the PNA seeks to clarify how existing parks function and provides guidelines about future park and recreation facility typologies that may be necessary to meet the needs of current and future residents.

HOW TO USE THE PARK CLASSIFICATIONS THROUGHOUT THE CAPITAL LIFE CYCLE

ACQUISITION

Use the park classifications to understand what types of parks are appropriate for the size of the site being acquired, or conversely to understand the size of the site needed to accommodate a particular type of park.

VISION PLANNING

Use the park classifications as a checklist for vision plan development. Pay particular attention to amenities and guidelines that are appropriate for the park typology.

DESIGN

Use the park classifications as a checklist for concept plan and design development. Pay particular attention to amenities and guidelines that are appropriate for the park typology.

CONSTRUCTION

The park classifications do not apply to this phase since decisions about park amenities and design are made in previous phases.

OPERATION

Use the park classifications to guide how each park is managed, maintained, and programmed based on its type, size, and provided amenities.

EVALUATION

Use the park classifications to periodically evaluate the park to determine whether the site meets the spirit of the aspirations for its particular classification, or if the classification is incorrect.

PROPOSED CLASSIFICATIONS

The new park and recreation facility classification system in this PNA expands the existing classification system.

They clarify how existing parks and recreation facilities function and provide guidelines about future park and recreation facility typologies that Los Angeles expects to build in the future to meet the needs of current and future residents.


For each park and recreation facility classification, the following pages include a general description of the classification's:

- typical size range;
- typical length of visit;
- access provisions;
- list of appropriate amenities;
- applicable site planning guidelines.

The list of amenities is not meant to be prescriptive or exhaustive. The appropriate amenities for any individual park or recreation facility should be determined through a planning process that involves the community it is meant to serve. All parks and recreation facilities should be designed to serve all age segments and a diversity of users.

EXPANDED GUIDELINES FOR EACH CLASSIFICATION CAN BE FOUND IN THE APPENDIX: ADDITIONAL SITE PLANNING GUIDELINES.

PARKS BY CLASSIFICATION



LEGEND

- PNA Region Boundaries

NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS:

- Mini Park
- Neighborhood Park
- Large Neighborhood Park
- Neighborhood Nature Park

COMMUNITY PARKS:

- Community Park
- Large Community Park
- Community Nature Park

REGIONAL PARKS:

- Regional Park
- Regional Nature Park

LINEAR PARKS:

- Linear Park
- Canyon Park
- Greenway

SCHOOL-RELATED SITES:

- Community School Park
- School Pool

OTHER FACILITIES:

- Historic Landmark Site
- Beach
- Single Purpose Site

MINI PARK




Figure 204. Patton St Pocket Park is a mini park in the Echo Park neighborhood. Source: Lauren Elachi, 2025.

Mini parks are very small spaces, typically less than one acre in size, designed to provide walkable access to greenery and seating within dense neighborhoods. These parks often maximize their utility with features like benches and trees. Due to their limited size, mini parks tend to be more passive and simpler in their designs, offering places of respite.

TYPICAL SIZE (ACRES)

<1

TYPICAL LENGTH OF VISIT (HOURS)


0.25–1

TYPICAL ACCESS

Mini parks should be accessible by foot via local streets and sidewalks. They should be located away from busy roadways and noisy areas to support quiet neighborhood use.


TYPICAL AMENITIES

UNIVERSAL ELEMENTS IN ALL ZONES




IU INTENSIVE USE


PG PROGRAMMABLE GATHERING




RE RECREATION



CU CASUAL USE



NA NATURAL




INFRASTRUCTURE



TYPICAL ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS

SMALL ELEMENTS

(<1,000 SF)



MEDIUM ELEMENTS

(1,000 - 6,000 SF)

LARGE ELEMENTS

(>6,000 SF)

NEIGHBORHOOD PARK



Figure 205. Watts Serenity Park 's amenities were driven by community engagement. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025.

Neighborhood parks are designed to serve the recreational and social needs of residents living in their immediate vicinity. These parks typically offer basic amenities like play structures for children, benches, open grassy areas, and sports courts, providing convenient opportunities for passive recreation, relaxation, and informal community interaction.

TYPICAL SIZE (ACRES)

1–3

TYPICAL LENGTH OF VISIT (HOURS)

0.5–1.5

TYPICAL ACCESS

Neighborhood parks should be easily accessible by way of the city's sidewalks and local streets with no physical barriers or busy streets restricting access. Neighborhood parks should have street parking nearby.

TYPICAL AMENITIES

UNIVERSAL ELEMENTS IN ALL ZONES


Seating


Shade


Identity Features


Low Impact Development BMPs


Lighting

IU INTENSIVE USE

Outdoor Event Space

Group Picnic Area

Restroom

Dog Park


Community Garden

PG PROGRAMMABLE GATHERING


Park Shelter

Tiered Seating

RE RECREATION

Outdoor Fitness Equipment

Creative Play Attraction


Playground

Rectangular Field

Diamond Field


Basketball Court


Tennis / Pickleball Court


Volleyball Court


Water Play

Pool

CU CASUAL USE


Individual Picnic Area


Casual Use Space


Internal Walking Trail


Shade Structure

NA NATURAL


Stormwater Management


Natural Space

Unique Landscape Feature

INFRASTRUCTURE


Bike Parking

Transit Stop


Shared Parking

On-Site Parking


Safe Crossings


Comfort Facility

Maintenance Facility


Pickup/ Dropoff

Regional Water Partnerships

TYPICAL ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS

SMALL ELEMENTS

(<1,000 SF)

Memorial *(varies)*


Sculpture *(varies)*


Interpretive Display *(varies)*


Storage Container *160 sf*

Restroom Pavilion *400 sf*


Shade Structure *480 sf*


Mural *500 sf*


Folly/ Monument *600 sf*

Bandshell *800 sf*

Picnic Shelter *800 sf*

MEDIUM ELEMENTS

(1,000 - 6,000 SF)

Greenhouse *1,000 sf*

Concession Stand *1,000 sf*

Visitor Info. Center *4,000 sf*

Art Gallery *4,000 sf*

Nature Center *6,000 sf*

Amphitheater (outdoor) *6,000 sf*

LARGE ELEMENTS

(>6,000 SF)

Wildlife Center *7,000 sf*

Museum *8,000 sf*

Maintenance Facility *8,000 sf*

Childcare Center *10,000 sf*

Equestrian Center *12,000 sf*

Senior Center *12,000 sf*

Recreation Center *18,000 sf*

LARGE NEIGHBORHOOD PARK



Figure 206. Evergreen Recreation Center is a large neighborhood park in Boyle Heights. Source: María Lamadrid, 2025.

Large neighborhood parks are designed to serve a slightly broader group of residents than neighborhood parks. These parks typically offer basic amenities like play structures for children, benches, open grassy areas, sports courts, a field, and a loop trail, providing convenient opportunities for passive recreation, relaxation, and informal community interaction. They may also include unique landscape features.

TYPICAL SIZE (ACRES)

3–10

TYPICAL LENGTH OF VISIT (HOURS)


1–2

TYPICAL ACCESS

Large neighborhood parks should be accessible by sidewalks, the city's bicycle network, and major streets. While still connected to surrounding neighborhoods, they may also have on-site parking.


TYPICAL AMENITIES

UNIVERSAL ELEMENTS IN ALL ZONES



Seating | Shade | Identity Features | Low Impact Development BMPs | Lighting

IU INTENSIVE USE



Outdoor Event Space | Group Picnic Area | Restroom | Dog Park | **Community Garden**

PG PROGRAMMABLE GATHERING



Park Shelter | **Tiered Seating**

RE RECREATION



Fitness / Exercise Equipment | **Creative Play Attraction** | **Playground** | **Rectangular Field** | **Diamond Field**




Basketball Court | **Tennis / Pickleball Court** | **Volleyball Court** | **Water Play** | Pool

CU CASUAL USE



Individual Picnic Area | **Casual Use Space** | **Internal Walking Trail** | **Shade Structure**

NA NATURAL



Stormwater Management | **Natural Space** | **Unique Landscape Feature**

INFRASTRUCTURE



Bike Parking | Transit Stop | **Shared Parking** | **On-Site Parking** | **Safe Crossings**




Comfort Facility | Maintenance Facility | **Pickup/ Dropoff** | Regional Water Partnerships


TYPICAL ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS

SMALL ELEMENTS


(<1,000 SF)



Memorial *(varies)* | **Sculpture** *(varies)* | **Interpretive Display** *(varies)* | **Storage Container** *160 sf*



Restroom Pavilion *400 sf* | **Shade Structure** *480 sf* | **Mural** *500 sf* | **Folly/ Monument** *600 sf*




Bandshell *800 sf* | Picnic Shelter *800 sf*

MEDIUM ELEMENTS

(1,000 - 6,000 SF)



Greenhouse *1,000 sf* | **Concession Stand** *1,000 sf* | **Visitor Info. Center** *4,000 sf* | Art Gallery *4,000 sf*




Nature Center *6,000 sf* | **Amphitheater (outdoor)** *6,000 sf*

LARGE ELEMENTS

(>6,000 SF)

Wildlife Center *7,000 sf* | Museum *8,000 sf* | Maintenance Facility *8,000 sf* | Childcare Center *10,000 sf*



Equestrian Center *12,000 sf* | Senior Center *12,000 sf* | **Recreation Center** *18,000 sf*

NEIGHBORHOOD NATURE PARK



Figure 207. Moon Canyon Park provides access to nature with views of surrounding neighborhoods. Source: Leslie Dinkin, 2025.

Neighborhood nature parks are small, locally-focused spaces dedicated to preserving and showcasing natural features within a neighborhood. Unlike other neighborhood parks that may include more recreational amenities, their primary emphasis is on conserving unique ecosystems, biodiversity, and cultural landscapes. Neighborhood nature parks provide nearby residents with easy access to nature and serve as valuable ecological pockets within the urban fabric.

TYPICAL SIZE (ACRES)

<10

TYPICAL LENGTH OF VISIT (HOURS)

0.25–2

TYPICAL ACCESS

Neighborhood nature parks should be accessible by sidewalks, the bicycle network, and major streets. Like large neighborhood parks, they may have on-site parking while remaining easily reachable from nearby residential areas.

TYPICAL AMENITIES

UNIVERSAL ELEMENTS



Seating | Shade | Identity Features | Low Impact Development BMPs | Lighting

IU INTENSIVE USE

Outdoor Event Space | Group Picnic Area | Restroom | Dog Park | Community Garden

PG PROGRAMMABLE GATHERING



Park Shelter | Tiered Seating

RE RECREATION

Fitness / Exercise Equipment | Creative Play Attraction | Playground | Rectangular Field | Diamond Field

Basketball Court | Tennis / Pickleball Court | Volleyball Court | Water Play | Pool

CU CASUAL USE



Individual Picnic Area | Casual Use Space | Internal Walking Trail | Shade Structure

NA NATURAL



Stormwater Management | Natural Space | Unique Landscape Feature

INFRASTRUCTURE



Bike Parking | Transit Stop | Shared Parking | On-Site Parking | Safe Crossings



Comfort Facility | Maintenance Facility | Pickup/ Dropoff | Regional Water Partnerships

TYPICAL ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS

SMALL ELEMENTS

(<1,000 SF)



Memorial *(varies)* | Sculpture *(varies)* | Interpretive Display *(varies)* | Storage Container *160 sf*



Restroom Pavilion *400 sf* | Shade Structure *480 sf* | Mural *500 sf* | Folly/ Monument *600 sf*

Bandshell *800 sf* | Picnic Shelter *800 sf*

MEDIUM ELEMENTS

(1,000 - 6,000 SF)



Greenhouse *1,000 sf* | Concession Stand *1,000 sf* | Visitor Info. Center *4,000 sf* | Art Gallery *4,000 sf*

Nature Center *6,000 sf* | Amphitheater (outdoor) *6,000 sf*

LARGE ELEMENTS

(>6,000 SF)

Wildlife Center *7,000 sf* | Museum *8,000 sf* | Maintenance Facility *8,000 sf* | Childcare Center *10,000 sf*

Equestrian Center *12,000 sf* | Senior Center *12,000 sf* | Recreation Center *18,000 sf*

COMMUNITY PARK



Figure 208. Basketball and tennis courts are among the many amenities available at Leland Recreation Center. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025.

Community parks are designed to serve the recreational and social needs of residents from several neighborhoods. These parks typically offer a variety of amenities such as playgrounds, sports courts and fields, picnic areas, and walking paths, catering to diverse age groups and interests. They often serve as central gathering places, fostering social interaction and physical activity.

TYPICAL SIZE (ACRES)

10–20

TYPICAL LENGTH OF VISIT (HOURS)


1–2

TYPICAL ACCESS

Community parks should be accessible via the city's trail network, sidewalks, and major streets. Because they serve a broader area, these parks should provide on-site parking for visitors arriving from greater distances.


TYPICAL AMENITIES

UNIVERSAL ELEMENTS IN ALL ZONES



Seating | Shade | Identity Features | Low Impact Development BMPs | Lighting

IU INTENSIVE USE



Outdoor Event Space | Group Picnic Area | Restroom | Dog Park | Community Garden

PG PROGRAMMABLE GATHERING



Park Shelter | Tiered Seating

RE RECREATION



Fitness / Exercise Equipment | Creative Play Attraction | Playground | Rectangular Field | Diamond Field



Basketball Court | Tennis / Pickleball Court | Volleyball Court | Water Play | Pool

CU CASUAL USE



Individual Picnic Area | Casual Use Space | Internal Walking Trail | Shade Structure

NA NATURAL



Stormwater Management | Natural Space | Unique Landscape Feature

INFRASTRUCTURE



Bike Parking | Transit Stop | Shared Parking | On-Site Parking | Safe Crossings




Comfort Facility | Maintenance Facility | Pickup/ Dropoff | Regional Water Partnerships


TYPICAL ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS

SMALL ELEMENTS


(<1,000 SF)



Memorial *(varies)* | Sculpture *(varies)* | Interpretive Display *(varies)* | Storage Container *160 sf*




Restroom Pavilion *400 sf* | Shade Structure *480 sf* | Mural *500 sf* | Folly/ Monument *600 sf*




Bandshell *800 sf* | Picnic Shelter *800 sf*

MEDIUM ELEMENTS

(1,000 - 6,000 SF)




Greenhouse *1,000 sf* | Concession Stand *1,000 sf* | Visitor Info. Center *4,000 sf* | Art Gallery *4,000 sf*



Nature Center *6,000 sf* | Amphitheater (outdoor) *6,000 sf*

LARGE ELEMENTS

(>6,000 SF)



Wildlife Center *7,000 sf* | Museum *8,000 sf* | Maintenance Facility *8,000 sf* | Childcare Center *10,000 sf*



Equestrian Center *12,000 sf* | Senior Center *12,000 sf* | Recreation Center *18,000 sf*

LARGE COMMUNITY PARK



Figure 209. MacArthur Park is a beloved large community park. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025.

Large community parks are designed to serve the recreational and social needs of residents from several neighborhoods. These parks typically offer a variety of amenities such as playgrounds, sports courts, fields, picnic areas, and walking paths, catering to diverse age groups and interests. Due to their size, they may have a greater quantity of amenities than other community parks, and they may have separate trails for pedestrians and cyclists. They often serve as central gathering places, fostering social interaction, physical activity, and a sense of community pride.

TYPICAL SIZE (ACRES)

20–40

TYPICAL LENGTH OF VISIT (HOURS)

2–3

TYPICAL ACCESS

Large community parks should be accessed by the city's trail network, sidewalks, and major streets. Like smaller community parks, they should include on-site parking to support their wider service area.

TYPICAL AMENITIES

UNIVERSAL ELEMENTS IN ALL ZONES



Seating | Shade | Identity Features | Low Impact Development BMPs | Lighting

IU INTENSIVE USE



Outdoor Event Space | Group Picnic Area | Restroom | Dog Park | Community Garden

PG PROGRAMMABLE GATHERING



Park Shelter | Tiered Seating

RE RECREATION



Fitness / Exercise Equipment | Creative Play Attraction | Playground | Rectangular Field | Diamond Field



Basketball Court | Tennis / Pickleball Court | Volleyball Court | Water Play | Pool

CU CASUAL USE



Individual Picnic Area | Casual Use Space | Internal Walking Trail | Shade Structure

NA NATURAL



Stormwater Management | Natural Space | Unique Landscape Feature

INFRASTRUCTURE



Bike Parking | Transit Stop | Shared Parking | On-Site Parking | Safe Crossings



Comfort Facility | Maintenance Facility | Pickup/ Dropoff | Regional Water Partnerships

TYPICAL ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS

SMALL ELEMENTS

(<1,000 SF)



Memorial *(varies)* | Sculpture *(varies)* | Interpretive Display *(varies)* | Storage Container *160 sf*



Restroom Pavilion *400 sf* | Shade Structure *480 sf* | Mural *500 sf* | Folly/ Monument *600 sf*



Bandshell *800 sf* | Picnic Shelter *800 sf*

MEDIUM ELEMENTS

(1,000 - 6,000 SF)



Greenhouse *1,000 sf* | Concession Stand *1,000 sf* | Visitor Info. Center *4,000 sf* | Art Gallery *4,000 sf*



Nature Center *6,000 sf* | Amphitheater (outdoor) *6,000 sf*

LARGE ELEMENTS

(>6,000 SF)



Wildlife Center *7,000 sf* | Museum *8,000 sf* | Maintenance Facility *8,000 sf* | Childcare Center *10,000 sf*



Equestrian Center *12,000 sf* | Senior Center *12,000 sf* | Recreation Center *18,000 sf*

COMMUNITY NATURE PARK



Figure 210. Sullivan Canyon Park is well used by hikers. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025.

Community nature parks are dedicated to preserving and showcasing natural features, serving residents across several neighborhoods. Unlike other community parks that may include more recreational amenities, their primary emphasis is on conserving unique ecosystems, biodiversity, and cultural landscapes.

TYPICAL SIZE (ACRES)

10–40

TYPICAL LENGTH OF VISIT (HOURS)

1–3

TYPICAL ACCESS

Community nature parks should be accessible via trails, sidewalks, and major streets. These parks should provide on-site parking to accommodate users from farther distances.

TYPICAL AMENITIES

UNIVERSAL ELEMENTS



Seating | Shade | Identity Features | Low Impact Development BMPs | Lighting

IU INTENSIVE USE



Outdoor Event Space | Group Picnic Area | **Restroom** | Dog Park | Community Garden

PG PROGRAMMABLE GATHERING



Park Shelter | **Tiered Seating**

RE RECREATION

Fitness / Exercise Equipment | Creative Play Attraction | Playground | Rectangular Field | Diamond Field

Basketball Court | Tennis / Pickleball Court | Volleyball Court | Water Play | Pool

CU CASUAL USE



Individual Picnic Area | **Casual Use Space** | **Internal Walking Trail** | **Shade Structure**

NA NATURAL



Stormwater Management | **Natural Space** | Unique Landscape Feature

INFRASTRUCTURE



Bike Parking | **Transit Stop** | **Shared Parking** | **On-Site Parking** | **Safe Crossings**



Comfort Facility | Maintenance Facility | **Pickup/ Dropoff** | Regional Water Partnerships

TYPICAL ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS

SMALL ELEMENTS

(<1,000 SF)



Memorial *(varies)* | **Sculpture** *(varies)* | **Interpretive Display** *(varies)* | **Storage Container** *160 sf*



Restroom Pavilion *400 sf* | **Shade Structure** *480 sf* | Mural *500 sf* | Folly/ Monument *600 sf*

Bandshell *800 sf* | Picnic Shelter *800 sf*

MEDIUM ELEMENTS

(1,000 - 6,000 SF)



Greenhouse *1,000 sf* | Concession Stand *1,000 sf* | Visitor Info. Center *4,000 sf* | Art Gallery *4,000 sf*



Nature Center *6,000 sf* | Amphitheater (outdoor) *6,000 sf*

LARGE ELEMENTS

(>6,000 SF)



Wildlife Center *7,000 sf* | Museum *8,000 sf* | Maintenance Facility *8,000 sf* | Childcare Center *10,000 sf*

Equestrian Center *12,000 sf* | Senior Center *12,000 sf* | Recreation Center *18,000 sf*

REGIONAL PARK



Figure 211. Lincoln Park, originally East Los Angeles Park, is one of the oldest parks in Los Angeles. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025.

Regional Parks are large parks with recreational and nature-based features that draw residents from across the city for their larger scale and diverse offerings. These parks typically offer a wide range of activities such as extensive trail networks for hiking and biking as well as multiple picnic areas, multiple athletic fields, and a larger recreation center. Regional parks often preserve significant natural resources, wildlife habitats, or historical features.

TYPICAL SIZE (ACRES)

40+

TYPICAL LENGTH OF VISIT (HOURS)

1–4

TYPICAL ACCESS

Regional parks should be accessible through the city's trail network, sidewalks, and major streets. Designed for citywide and regional use, these parks should include on-site parking and connections to major transit routes where possible.

TYPICAL AMENITIES

UNIVERSAL ELEMENTS IN ALL ZONES



Seating | Shade | Identity Features | Low Impact Development BMPs | Lighting

IU INTENSIVE USE



Outdoor Event Space | Group Picnic Area | Restroom | Dog Park | Community Garden

PG PROGRAMMABLE GATHERING



Park Shelter | Tiered Seating

RE RECREATION



Fitness / Exercise Equipment | Creative Play Attraction | Playground | Rectangular Field | Diamond Field



Basketball Court | Tennis / Pickleball Court | Volleyball Court | Water Play | Pool

CU CASUAL USE



Individual Picnic Area | Casual Use Space | Internal Walking Trail | Shade Structure

NA NATURAL



Stormwater Management | Natural Space | Unique Landscape Feature

INFRASTRUCTURE



Bike Parking | Transit Stop | Shared Parking | On-Site Parking | Safe Crossings



Comfort Facility | Maintenance Facility | Pickup/ Dropoff | Regional Water Partnerships

TYPICAL ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS

SMALL ELEMENTS

(<1,000 SF)



Memorial *(varies)* | **Sculpture** *(varies)* | **Interpretive Display** *(varies)* | **Storage Container** *160 sf*



Restroom Pavilion *400 sf* | **Shade Structure** *480 sf* | **Mural** *500 sf* | **Folly/ Monument** *600 sf*



Bandshell *800 sf* | **Picnic Shelter** *800 sf*

MEDIUM ELEMENTS

(1,000 - 6,000 SF)



Greenhouse *1,000 sf* | **Concession Stand** *1,000 sf* | **Visitor Info. Center** *4,000 sf* | **Art Gallery** *4,000 sf*



Nature Center *6,000 sf* | **Amphitheater (outdoor)** *6,000 sf*

LARGE ELEMENTS

(>6,000 SF)



Wildlife Center *7,000 sf* | **Museum** *8,000 sf* | **Maintenance Facility** *8,000 sf* | **Childcare Center** *10,000 sf*



Equestrian Center *12,000 sf* | **Senior Center** *12,000 sf* | **Recreation Center** *18,000 sf*

REGIONAL NATURE PARK



Figure 212. White Point Park Nature Preserve blends ocean views, habitat, and coastal recreation. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025.

Regional nature parks are large protected areas recognized for their significant natural features, serving residents across the city. Unlike other regional parks that may include more recreational amenities, their primary emphasis is on conserving unique ecosystems, biodiversity, and cultural landscapes. These parks typically have extensive hiking trails and promote nature-based recreation and environmental education.

TYPICAL SIZE (ACRES)

40+

TYPICAL LENGTH OF VISIT (HOURS)

1–4

TYPICAL ACCESS

Regional nature parks should be accessible through trails, sidewalks, major streets, and public transit. Like other regional parks, they should include on-site parking and may have limited access points due to natural features.

TYPICAL AMENITIES

UNIVERSAL ELEMENTS



Seating | Shade | Identity Features | Low Impact Development BMPs | Lighting

IU INTENSIVE USE



Outdoor Event Space | Group Picnic Area | Restroom | Dog Park | Community Garden

PG PROGRAMMABLE GATHERING



Park Shelter | Tiered Seating

RE RECREATION

Fitness / Exercise Equipment | Creative Play Attraction | Playground | Rectangular Field | Diamond Field

Basketball Court | Tennis / Pickleball Court | Volleyball Court | Water Play | Pool

CU CASUAL USE



Individual Picnic Area | Casual Use Space | Internal Walking Trail | Shade Structure

NA NATURAL



Stormwater Management | Natural Space | Unique Landscape Feature

INFRASTRUCTURE



Bike Parking | Transit Stop | Shared Parking | On-Site Parking | Safe Crossings



Comfort Facility | Maintenance Facility | Pickup/ Dropoff | Regional Water Partnerships

TYPICAL ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS

SMALL ELEMENTS

(<1,000 SF)



Memorial *(varies)* | Sculpture *(varies)* | Interpretive Display *(varies)* | Storage Container *160 sf*



Restroom Pavilion *400 sf* | Shade Structure *480 sf* | Mural *500 sf* | Folly/ Monument *600 sf*

Bandshell *800 sf* | Picnic Shelter *800 sf*

MEDIUM ELEMENTS

(1,000 - 6,000 SF)



Greenhouse *1,000 sf* | Concession Stand *1,000 sf* | Visitor Info. Center *4,000 sf* | Art Gallery *4,000 sf*



Nature Center *6,000 sf* | Amphitheater (outdoor) *6,000 sf*

LARGE ELEMENTS

(>6,000 SF)



Wildlife Center *7,000 sf* | Museum *8,000 sf* | Maintenance Facility *8,000 sf* | Childcare Center *10,000 sf*



Equestrian Center *12,000 sf* | Senior Center *12,000 sf* | Recreation Center *18,000 sf*

HISTORIC LANDMARK SITE



Figure 213. Little Landers Park is a family-friendly historic site. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025.

Historic landmark sites are preserved for their significant historical, architectural, or cultural importance. Their connection to notable events, individuals, or periods in local history may feature historic structures, monuments, or landscapes. These sites promote the interpretation and public enjoyment of their unique heritage.

TYPICAL SIZE (ACRES)

Varies

TYPICAL LENGTH OF VISIT (HOURS)

1–3

TYPICAL ACCESS

Historic landmark sites should be accessible via sidewalks, local streets, and public transit. These sites should be well integrated into the urban environment with clear pedestrian connections and nearby street parking.

TYPICAL AMENITIES

UNIVERSAL ELEMENTS IN ALL ZONES



Seating | Shade | Identity Features | Low Impact Development BMPs | Lighting

IU INTENSIVE USE



Outdoor Event Space | Group Picnic Area | Restroom | Dog Park | Community Garden

PG PROGRAMMABLE GATHERING



Park Shelter | Tiered Seating

RE RECREATION



Fitness / Exercise Equipment | Creative Play Attraction | Playground | Rectangular Field | Diamond Field



Basketball Court | Tennis / Pickleball Court | Volleyball Court | Water Play | Pool

CU CASUAL USE



Individual Picnic Area | Casual Use Space | Internal Walking Trail | Shade Structure

NA NATURAL



Stormwater Management | Natural Space | Unique Landscape Feature

INFRASTRUCTURE



Bike Parking | Transit Stop | Shared Parking | On-Site Parking | Safe Crossings



Comfort Facility | Maintenance Facility | Pickup/ Dropoff | Regional Water Partnerships

TYPICAL ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS

SMALL ELEMENTS

(<1,000 SF)



Memorial *(varies)* | **Sculpture** *(varies)* | **Interpretive Display** *(varies)* | **Storage Container** *160 sf*



Restroom Pavilion *400 sf* | **Shade Structure** *480 sf* | **Mural** *500 sf* | **Folly/ Monument** *600 sf*



Bandshell *800 sf* | **Picnic Shelter** *800 sf*

MEDIUM ELEMENTS

(1,000 - 6,000 SF)



Greenhouse *1,000 sf* | **Concession Stand** *1,000 sf* | **Visitor Info. Center** *4,000 sf* | **Art Gallery** *4,000 sf*



Nature Center *6,000 sf* | **Amphitheater (outdoor)** *6,000 sf*

LARGE ELEMENTS

(>6,000 SF)



Wildlife Center *7,000 sf* | **Museum** *8,000 sf* | **Maintenance Facility** *8,000 sf* | **Childcare Center** *10,000 sf*

Equestrian Center *12,000 sf* | **Senior Center** *12,000 sf* | **Recreation Center** *18,000 sf*

GREENWAY



Figure 214. The Elysian Valley Bikeway is part of the larger LA River Greenway system. Source: Calvada Surveying, Inc, 2025.

Greenways are linear corridors often following natural features like rivers or old railway lines that are preserved for both recreation and environmental protection. These multi-purpose spaces provide pathways for walking, biking, and other non-motorized activities, connecting communities and offering access to nature. Greenways are also crucial for ecological health, serving as wildlife corridors and contributing to stormwater management and community greening efforts.

TYPICAL SIZE (ACRES)

Varies

TYPICAL LENGTH OF VISIT (HOURS)

0.5–1

TYPICAL ACCESS

Greenways should be accessible via the city's trail network, sidewalks, and bicycle routes. Designed for movement through natural and urban corridors, they should include multiple entrances and shared parking.

TYPICAL AMENITIES

UNIVERSAL ELEMENTS



Seating | Shade | Identity Features | Low Impact Development BMPs | Lighting

IU INTENSIVE USE

Outdoor Event Space | Group Picnic Area | Restroom | Dog Park | Community Garden

PG PROGRAMMABLE GATHERING

Park Shelter | Tiered Seating

RE RECREATION

Fitness / Exercise Equipment | Creative Play Attraction | Playground | Rectangular Field | Diamond Field

Basketball Court | Tennis / Pickleball Court | Volleyball Court | Water Play | Pool

CU CASUAL USE



Individual Picnic Area | Casual Use Space | Internal Walking Trail | Shade Structure

NA NATURAL



Stormwater Management | Natural Space | Unique Landscape Feature

INFRASTRUCTURE



Bike Parking | Transit Stop | Shared Parking | On-Site Parking | Safe Crossings



Comfort Facility | Maintenance Facility | Pickup/ Dropoff | Regional Water Partnerships

TYPICAL ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS

SMALL ELEMENTS

(<1,000 SF)



Memorial *(varies)* | **Sculpture** *(varies)* | **Interpretive Display** *(varies)* | Storage Container *160 sf*



Restroom Pavilion *400 sf* | **Shade Structure** *480 sf* | **Mural** *500 sf* | Folly/ Monument *600 sf*

Bandshell *800 sf* | Picnic Shelter *800 sf*

MEDIUM ELEMENTS

(1,000 - 6,000 SF)

Greenhouse *1,000 sf* | Concession Stand *1,000 sf* | Visitor Info. Center *4,000 sf* | Art Gallery *4,000 sf*

Nature Center *6,000 sf* | Amphitheater (outdoor) *6,000 sf*

LARGE ELEMENTS

(>6,000 SF)

Wildlife Center *7,000 sf* | Museum *8,000 sf* | Maintenance Facility *8,000 sf* | Childcare Center *10,000 sf*

Equestrian Center *12,000 sf* | Senior Center *12,000 sf* | Recreation Center *18,000 sf*

LINEAR PARK



Figure 215. Bandini Canyon Park is a quiet space for hiking, walking, and picnicking. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025.

Linear parks are characterized by their long, narrow shape, often following existing linear features like roads, former railway lines, rivers, or utility corridors. These parks serve as recreational pathways for activities such as walking, jogging, and cycling, effectively connecting different neighborhoods. If wide enough, they may include small casual use areas, community gardens, or playgrounds. Beyond recreation, linear parks enhance ecological connectivity, and can repurpose underutilized land into valuable community assets.

TYPICAL SIZE (ACRES)

<20

TYPICAL LENGTH OF VISIT (HOURS)

1–2

TYPICAL ACCESS

Linear parks should be accessible by sidewalks, local streets, and the trail network. With frequent entry points, they should connect seamlessly to surrounding neighborhoods. On-street parking may be available nearby.

TYPICAL AMENITIES

UNIVERSAL ELEMENTS



Seating | Shade | Identity Features | Low Impact Development BMPs | Lighting

IU INTENSIVE USE



Outdoor Event Space | Group Picnic Area | Restroom | Dog Park | **Community Garden**

PG PROGRAMMABLE GATHERING

Park Shelter | Tiered Seating

RE RECREATION



Fitness / Exercise Equipment | **Creative Play Attraction** | **Playground** | Rectangular Field | Diamond Field

Basketball Court | Tennis / Pickleball Court | Volleyball Court | Water Play | Pool

CU CASUAL USE



Individual Picnic Area | **Casual Use Space** | **Internal Walking Trail** | **Shade Structure**

NA NATURAL



Stormwater Management | **Natural Space** | Unique Landscape Feature

INFRASTRUCTURE



Bike Parking | Transit Stop | **Shared Parking** | On-Site Parking | **Safe Crossings**



Comfort Facility | Maintenance Facility | **Pickup/ Dropoff** | Regional Water Partnerships

TYPICAL ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS

SMALL ELEMENTS

(<1,000 SF)



Memorial *(varies)* | **Sculpture** *(varies)* | **Interpretive Display** *(varies)* | **Storage Container** *160 sf*



Restroom Pavilion *400 sf* | **Shade Structure** *480 sf* | **Mural** *500 sf* | Folly/ Monument *600 sf*

Bandshell *800 sf* | Picnic Shelter *800 sf*

MEDIUM ELEMENTS

(1,000 - 6,000 SF)

Greenhouse *1,000 sf* | Concession Stand *1,000 sf* | Visitor Info. Center *4,000 sf* | Art Gallery *4,000 sf*

Nature Center *6,000 sf* | Amphitheater (outdoor) *6,000 sf*

LARGE ELEMENTS

(>6,000 SF)

Wildlife Center *7,000 sf* | Museum *8,000 sf* | Maintenance Facility *8,000 sf* | Childcare Center *10,000 sf*

Equestrian Center *12,000 sf* | Senior Center *12,000 sf* | Recreation Center *18,000 sf*

CANYON PARK



Figure 216. Temescal Canyon Park has popular hiking trails with both ocean and canyon views. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025.

Canyon parks are protected areas specifically established to preserve and showcase a prominent canyon or gorge. These parks often feature significant geological formations, unique ecosystems, and opportunities for hiking. Their primary purpose is to allow public access and appreciation of the canyon's natural beauty while ensuring its ecological and geological integrity.

TYPICAL SIZE (ACRES)

20+

TYPICAL LENGTH OF VISIT (HOURS)

1–4

TYPICAL ACCESS

Canyon parks should be accessed via major streets and trail networks. Due to natural topography, they may have fewer access points and should provide on-site parking.

TYPICAL AMENITIES

UNIVERSAL ELEMENTS



Seating | Shade | Identity Features | Low Impact Development BMPs | Lighting

IU INTENSIVE USE



Outdoor Event Space | Group Picnic Area | Restroom | Dog Park | Community Garden

PG PROGRAMMABLE GATHERING

Park Shelter | Tiered Seating

RE RECREATION



Fitness / Exercise Equipment | Creative Play Attraction | Playground | Rectangular Field | Diamond Field

Basketball Court | Tennis / Pickleball Court | Volleyball Court | Water Play | Pool

CU CASUAL USE



Individual Picnic Area | Casual Use Space | Internal Walking Trail | Shade Structure

NA NATURAL



Stormwater Management | Natural Space | Unique Landscape Feature

INFRASTRUCTURE



Bike Parking | Transit Stop | Shared Parking | On-Site Parking | Safe Crossings



Comfort Facility | Maintenance Facility | Pickup/ Dropoff | Regional Water Partnerships

TYPICAL ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS

SMALL ELEMENTS

(<1,000 SF)



Memorial *(varies)* | **Sculpture** *(varies)* | **Interpretive Display** *(varies)* | **Storage Container** *160 sf*



Restroom Pavilion *400 sf* | **Shade Structure** *480 sf* | Mural *500 sf* | **Folly/ Monument** *600 sf*

Bandshell *800 sf* | Picnic Shelter *800 sf*

MEDIUM ELEMENTS

(1,000 - 6,000 SF)



Greenhouse *1,000 sf* | Concession Stand *1,000 sf* | **Visitor Info. Center** *4,000 sf* | Art Gallery *4,000 sf*



Nature Center *6,000 sf* | Amphitheater (outdoor) *6,000 sf*

LARGE ELEMENTS

(>6,000 SF)



Wildlife Center *7,000 sf* | Museum *8,000 sf* | Maintenance Facility *8,000 sf* | Childcare Center *10,000 sf*

Equestrian Center *12,000 sf* | Senior Center *12,000 sf* | Recreation Center *18,000 sf*

COMMUNITY SCHOOL PARK



Figure 217. The Camellia Avenue Elementary School (CSP) provides park access outside of school hours. Source: Image via Homes.com.

Community school parks are shared public spaces located on school campuses, designed to serve both the students during school hours and the broader community outside of those times. These parks typically feature amenities like playgrounds, sports courts, and green spaces that are accessible to the public, fostering recreation and social interaction for all ages. By maximizing the use of school grounds, they efficiently provide valuable open space and recreational opportunities within neighborhoods.

TYPICAL SIZE (ACRES)

Varies

TYPICAL LENGTH OF VISIT (HOURS)


0.5–1

TYPICAL ACCESS

Community school parks should be accessible via low-stress bicycle routes, sidewalks, and major streets. They should also be directly accessible from the adjacent school, allowing seamless movement between facilities.


TYPICAL AMENITIES

UNIVERSAL ELEMENTS



Seating | Shade | Identity Features | Low Impact Development BMPs | Lighting

IU INTENSIVE USE



Outdoor Event Space | Group Picnic Area | Restroom | Dog Park | **Community Garden**

PG PROGRAMMABLE GATHERING




Park Shelter | Tiered Seating

RE RECREATION



Fitness / Exercise Equipment | **Creative Play Attraction** | **Playground** | **Rectangular Field** | Diamond Field




Basketball Court | Tennis / Pickleball Court | Volleyball Court | Water Play | Pool

CU CASUAL USE



Individual Picnic Area | **Casual Use Space** | **Internal Walking Trail** | **Shade Structure**

NA NATURAL



Stormwater Management | **Natural Space** | Unique Landscape Feature

INFRASTRUCTURE



Bike Parking | Transit Stop | **Shared Parking** | On-Site Parking | **Safe Crossings**




Comfort Facility | Maintenance Facility | **Pickup/ Dropoff** | Regional Water Partnerships


TYPICAL ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS

SMALL ELEMENTS

(<1,000 SF)



Memorial *(varies)* | **Sculpture** *(varies)* | **Interpretive Display** *(varies)* | **Storage Container** *160 sf*




Restroom Pavilion *400 sf* | **Shade Structure** *480 sf* | **Mural** *500 sf* | **Folly/ Monument** *600 sf*

Bandshell *800 sf* | Picnic Shelter *800 sf*

MEDIUM ELEMENTS

(1,000 - 6,000 SF)



Greenhouse *1,000 sf* | Concession Stand *1,000 sf* | Visitor Info. Center *4,000 sf* | Art Gallery *4,000 sf*

Nature Center *6,000 sf* | Amphitheater (outdoor) *6,000 sf*

LARGE ELEMENTS

(>6,000 SF)

Wildlife Center *7,000 sf* | Museum *8,000 sf* | Maintenance Facility *8,000 sf* | Childcare Center *10,000 sf*

Equestrian Center *12,000 sf* | Senior Center *12,000 sf* | Recreation Center *18,000 sf*

SCHOOL POOL



Figure 218. The Venice High School Pool supports the school's strong athletics programs. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025.

School pools are swimming facilities located on the grounds of or adjacent to a school. They are primarily used for school swim teams and aquatic sports. Beyond school hours, some school pools may also be open to the public, serving as valuable community resources for swim lessons, open swim, and local events.

TYPICAL SIZE (ACRES)

Varies

TYPICAL LENGTH OF VISIT (HOURS)


1–2

TYPICAL ACCESS

School pools should be accessible by low-stress bicycle routes, sidewalks, and major streets. They should also provide direct access from the adjacent school and may share off-street parking with the school.

TYPICAL AMENITIES


UNIVERSAL ELEMENTS




IU INTENSIVE USE

PG PROGRAMMABLE GATHERING

RE RECREATION



CU CASUAL USE



NA NATURAL


INFRASTRUCTURE



TYPICAL ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS


SMALL ELEMENTS

(<1,000 SF)



MEDIUM ELEMENTS

(1,000 - 6,000 SF)



LARGE ELEMENTS

(>6,000 SF)

BEACH



Figure 219. Will Rogers State Beach combines opportunities for surfing and swimming with opportunities for volleyball and picnicking. Source: Shutterstock/fivetonine, 2022.

Beaches are stretches of the city's coastline that are accessible to the general public for recreational use. These areas are typically sandy and serve as popular destinations for swimming, sunbathing, and various beach activities, contributing significantly to quality of life and tourism.

TYPICAL SIZE (ACRES)

Varies

TYPICAL LENGTH OF VISIT (HOURS)

1–5

TYPICAL ACCESS

Beaches should be accessible via major streets, public transit, and the city's trail and bicycle networks. Given their regional draw, they should have multiple access points, on-site parking, and strong connections to adjacent coastal destinations.

TYPICAL AMENITIES

UNIVERSAL ELEMENTS IN ALL ZONES



Seating | **Shade** | **Identity Features** | **Low Impact Development BMPs** | Lighting

IU INTENSIVE USE



Outdoor Event Space | Group Picnic Area | **Restroom** | Dog Park | Community Garden

PG PROGRAMMABLE GATHERING

Park Shelter | Tiered Seating

RE RECREATION



Fitness / Exercise Equipment | Creative Play Attraction | Playground | Rectangular Field | Diamond Field

Basketball Court | Tennis / Pickleball Court | **Volleyball Court** | Water Play | Pool

CU CASUAL USE



Individual Picnic Area | Casual Use Space | Internal Walking Trail | **Shade Structure**

NA NATURAL



Stormwater Management | **Natural Space** | Unique Landscape Feature

INFRASTRUCTURE



Bike Parking | Transit Stop | **Shared Parking** | On-Site Parking | **Safe Crossings**



Comfort Facility | Maintenance Facility | **Pickup/ Dropoff** | Regional Water Partnerships

TYPICAL ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS

SMALL ELEMENTS

(<1,000 SF)



Memorial *(varies)* | Sculpture *(varies)* | **Interpretive Display** *(varies)* | Storage Container *160 sf*



Restroom Pavilion *400 sf* | **Shade Structure** *480 sf* | **Mural** *500 sf* | Folly/ Monument *600 sf*

Bandshell *800 sf* | Picnic Shelter *800 sf*

MEDIUM ELEMENTS

(1,000 - 6,000 SF)



Greenhouse *1,000 sf* | **Concession Stand** *1,000 sf* | Visitor Info. Center *4,000 sf* | Art Gallery *4,000 sf*

Nature Center *6,000 sf* | Amphitheater (outdoor) *6,000 sf*

LARGE ELEMENTS

(>6,000 SF)

Wildlife Center *7,000 sf* | Museum *8,000 sf* | Maintenance Facility *8,000 sf* | Childcare Center *10,000 sf*

Equestrian Center *12,000 sf* | Senior Center *12,000 sf* | Recreation Center *18,000 sf*

MOUNTAIN CAMP



Figure 220. Camp Seely was one of Los Angeles' first municipal recreation camps to offer residents an escape to the San Bernardino Mountains.
Source: Shutterstock, accessed 2025.

Mountain camps are sites outside the boundary of Los Angeles that provide opportunities for city residents to experience the mountains, particularly children, often as organized group events. They include individual and group tent camping sites or cabins, with limited shared amenities like fire pits, informal amphitheaters, and restrooms.

TYPICAL SIZE (ACRES)

Varies

TYPICAL LENGTH OF VISIT (HOURS)


Varies

TYPICAL ACCESS

Mountain camps should be accessed by major streets and highways. As regional facilities serving users from longer distances, they should include on-site parking.


TYPICAL AMENITIES

UNIVERSAL ELEMENTS IN ALL ZONES



Seating | Shade | Identity Features | Low Impact Development BMPs | Lighting

IU INTENSIVE USE



Outdoor Event Space | Group Picnic Area | Restroom | Dog Park | Community Garden

PG PROGRAMMABLE GATHERING



Park Shelter | Tiered Seating

RE RECREATION



Fitness / Exercise Equipment | Creative Play Attraction | Playground | Rectangular Field | Diamond Field

Basketball Court | Tennis / Pickleball Court | Volleyball Court | Water Play | Pool

CU CASUAL USE



Individual Picnic Area | Casual Use Space | Internal Walking Trail | Shade Structure

NA NATURAL



Stormwater Management | Natural Space | Unique Landscape Feature

INFRASTRUCTURE



Bike Parking | Transit Stop | Shared Parking | On-Site Parking | Safe Crossings




Comfort Facility | Maintenance Facility | Pickup/ Dropoff | Regional Water Partnerships


TYPICAL ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS

SMALL ELEMENTS


(<1,000 SF)



Memorial *(varies)* | Sculpture *(varies)* | Interpretive Display *(varies)* | Storage Container *160 sf*



Restroom Pavilion *400 sf* | Shade Structure *480 sf* | Mural *500 sf* | Folly/ Monument *600 sf*




Bandshell *800 sf* | Picnic Shelter *800 sf*

MEDIUM ELEMENTS

(1,000 - 6,000 SF)


Greenhouse *1,000 sf* | Concession Stand *1,000 sf* | Visitor Info. Center *4,000 sf* | Art Gallery *4,000 sf*




Nature Center *6,000 sf* | Amphitheater (outdoor) *6,000 sf*

LARGE ELEMENTS

(>6,000 SF)



Wildlife Center *7,000 sf* | Museum *8,000 sf* | Maintenance Facility *8,000 sf* | Childcare Center *10,000 sf*



Equestrian Center *12,000 sf* | Senior Center *12,000 sf* | Recreation Center *18,000 sf*

SINGLE PURPOSE SITE



Figure 221. El Sereno Senior Citizen Center offers fitness classes, arts and crafts, and educational opportunities for seniors. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025.

Single purpose sites are the locations of recreation centers or administrative buildings and have little or no outdoor space.

TYPICAL SIZE (ACRES)

Varies

TYPICAL LENGTH OF VISIT (HOURS)


Varies

TYPICAL ACCESS

Single purpose sites should be accessible via sidewalks and local streets. They should provide clearly defined public entryways, accessible pedestrian routes, and limited on-site or nearby street parking.

TYPICAL AMENITIES

UNIVERSAL ELEMENTS IN ALL ZONES



IU INTENSIVE USE

PG PROGRAMMABLE GATHERING

RE RECREATION

CU CASUAL USE

NA NATURAL

INFRASTRUCTURE




TYPICAL ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS

SMALL ELEMENTS

(<1,000 SF)

MEDIUM ELEMENTS

(1,000 - 6,000 SF)



LARGE ELEMENTS

(>6,000 SF)



GOLF COURSE



Figure 222. Penmar Golf Course is a public 9-hole course in Venice. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025.

Golf courses are unique outdoor spaces requiring dedicated facilities and maintenance. They can vary greatly in size and offer opportunities to preserve significant open space, support habitat, and offer recreational experiences.

TYPICAL SIZE (ACRES)

Varies

TYPICAL LENGTH OF VISIT (HOURS)


Varies

TYPICAL ACCESS

Access requirements vary by facility type and program, depending on their location, function, and user group.


TYPICAL AMENITIES

UNIVERSAL ELEMENTS IN ALL ZONES



Seating | **Shade** | **Identity Features** | **Low Impact Development BMPs** | Lighting

IU INTENSIVE USE



Outdoor Event Space | Group Picnic Area | **Restroom** | Dog Park | Community Garden

PG PROGRAMMABLE GATHERING

Park Shelter | Tiered Seating

RE RECREATION

Fitness / Exercise Equipment | Creative Play Attraction | Playground | Rectangular Field | Diamond Field

Basketball Court | Tennis / Pickleball Court | Volleyball Court | Water Play | Pool

CU CASUAL USE



Individual Picnic Area | Casual Use Space | **Internal Walking Trail** | Shade Structure

NA NATURAL



Stormwater Management | **Natural Space** | Unique Landscape Feature

INFRASTRUCTURE



Bike Parking | Transit Stop | **Shared Parking** | **On-Site Parking** | **Safe Crossings**




Comfort Facility | **Maintenance Facility** | **Pickup/ Dropoff** | Regional Water Partnerships

TYPICAL ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS

SMALL ELEMENTS

(<1,000 SF)

Memorial *(varies)* | Sculpture *(varies)* | Interpretive Display *(varies)* | Storage Container *160 sf*



Restroom Pavilion *400 sf* | Shade Structure *480 sf* | Mural *500 sf* | Folly/ Monument *600 sf*

Bandshell *800 sf* | Picnic Shelter *800 sf*

MEDIUM ELEMENTS

(1,000 - 6,000 SF)




Greenhouse *1,000 sf* | **Concession Stand** *1,000 sf* | Visitor Info. Center *4,000 sf* | Art Gallery *4,000 sf*

Nature Center *6,000 sf* | Amphitheater (outdoor) *6,000 sf*

LARGE ELEMENTS

(>6,000 SF)




Wildlife Center *7,000 sf* | Museum *8,000 sf* | **Maintenance Facility** *8,000 sf* | Childcare Center *10,000 sf*

Equestrian Center *12,000 sf* | Senior Center *12,000 sf* | Recreation Center *18,000 sf*

TYPICAL AMENITIES BY PARK CLASSIFICATION

	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park	Large Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Nature Park	Community Park	Large Community Park	Community Nature Park	Regional Park
typical size (acres)	<1	1-3	3-10	<10	10-20	20-40	10-40	40+
typical lengh of visit (hours)	0.25-1	0.5-1.5	1-2	0.25-2	1-2	2-3	1-3	1-4
UNIVERSAL ELEMENTS								
Seating	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Shade	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Identity Features	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Low Impact Development BMPs	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Lighting	☑	☑	☑	☐	☑	☑	☐	☑
INTENSIVE USE								
Outdoor Event Space	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☑
Group Picnic Area	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☑
Restroom	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☑	☑	☑
Dog Park	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☑	☐	☑
Community Garden	☐	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☐	☑
PROGRAMMABLE GATHERING								
Park Shelter	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Tiered Seating	☐	☐	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
RECREATION								
Outdoor Fitness/Exercise	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☑	☐	☑
Creative Play Attraction	☐	☐	☑	☐	☑	☑	☐	☑
Playground	☑	☑	☑	☐	☑	☑	☐	☑
Basketball Court	☐	☑	☑	☐	☑	☑	☐	☑
Tennis/Pickleball Court	☐	☑	☑	☐	☑	☑	☐	☑
Volleyball Court	☐	☑	☑	☐	☑	☑	☐	☑
Rectangular Field	☐	☐	☑	☐	☑	☑	☐	☑
Diamond Field	☐	☐	☑	☐	☑	☑	☐	☑
Pool	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☑
Water Play	☑	☑	☑	☐	☑	☑	☐	☑
CASUAL USE								
Individual Picnic/Sitting Area	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Casual Use Space	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Internal Walking Trail	☐	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Shade Structure	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
NATURAL SYSTEMS								
Stormwater Management	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Natural Space	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Unique Landscape Feature	☐	☐	☑	☐	☑	☑	☐	☑


Regional Nature Park
Historic Landmark Site
Green-way
Linear Park
Canyon Park
Com-munity School Park
School Pool
Beach
Mountain Camp
Single Purpose Site
Golf Course
40+
varies
varies
<20
20+
varies
varies
varies
varies
varies
varies
1-4
1-3
0.5-1
1-2
1-4
0.5-1
1-2
1-5
varies
varies
varies

ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS BY PARK CLASSIFICATION

	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park	Large Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Nature Park	Community Park	Large Community Park	Community Nature Park	Regional Park
SMALL ELEMENTS								
Memorial	☐	☐	☑	☐	☑	☑	☐	☑
Sculpture	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Interpretive Displays	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Storage Container	☐	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Restroom Pavilion	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☑	☑	☑
Shade Structure	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Mural	☑	☑	☑	☐	☑	☑	☐	☑
Folly / Monument	☐	☑	☑	☐	☑	☑	☐	☑
Bandshell	☐	☐	☑	☐	☑	☑	☐	☑
Picnic Shelter	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☑
MEDIUM ELEMENTS								
Greenhouse	☐	☐	☐	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Concession Stand	☐	☐	☑	☐	☑	☑	☐	☑
Visitor Information Center	☐	☐	☑	☐	☑	☐	☐	☑
Art Gallery	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑
Nature Center	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☑	☐
Amphitheater (Outdoor)	☐	☐	☑	☐	☑	☑	☐	☑
LARGE ELEMENTS								
Wildlife Center	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐
Museum	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑
Maintenance Facility	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑
Childcare Center	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☑	☐	☑
Equestrian Center	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑
Senior Center	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☑
Recreation Center	☐	☐	☑	☐	☑	☑	☐	☑

Regional Nature Park	Historic Landmark Site	Green-way	Linear Park	Canyon Park	Com-munity School Park	School Pool	Beach	Mountain Camp	Single Purpose Site	Golf Course
☐	☑	☑	☐	☑	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☐	☑	☑	☐	☐
☑	☑	☐	☑	☑	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☑	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☑	☐	☑
☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☐	☐
☐	☑	☑	☑	☐	☑	☑	☑	☐	☐	☐
☐	☑	☐	☐	☑	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐
☑	☑	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☑	☐	☐	☑
☑	☑	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐
☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☑	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐
☑	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☑
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐
☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☑	☐

DESIGN GUIDELINES BY PARK CLASSIFICATION

	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park	Large Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Nature Park	Community Park	Large Community Park	Community Nature Park	Regional Park
DESIGN								
System Wide Language	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Design Vocabulary	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Cohesive Site Layout	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Park Core	☐	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Indoor-Outdoor Connections	☐	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Native Planting Variety	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Park User Equity	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Cultural & Historic Features	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Water Conservation	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Fire Risk Reduction	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☑	☑
CONTEXT								
Park Supportive Uses	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☑	☐	☑
Building Frontage	☑	☑	☑	☐	☑	☑	☐	☑
County and Regional Park Connectivity	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑
Public Property/Institutional	☑	☑	☑	☐	☑	☑	☐	☑
Streetscape Enhancements	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
CONNECTIVITY								
Street Grid Connectivity	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Seamless Public Space	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Trail Mode Separation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☑
Loop Trail	☐	☐	☑	☐	☑	☑	☑	☑
Internal Walking Trail	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Trail Connection	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑
Safe Routes/Passages	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
WAYFINDING								
Gateways (Primary and Secondary)	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Path Hierarchy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☑	☐	☑
Universal Wayfinding Signage	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑

Regional Nature Park	Historic Landmark Site	Green-way	Linear Park	Canyon Park	Com-munity School Park	School Pool	Beach	Mountain Camp	Single Purpose Site	Golf Course
☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
☑	☐	☑	☑	☑	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☑
☐	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐
☐	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐
☐	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☐	☐	☐
☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑
☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑
☑	☐	☑	☑	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☐	☑	☑
☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑

DESIGN GUIDELINES BY PARK CLASSIFICATION

	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park	Large Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Nature Park	Community Park	Large Community Park	Community Nature Park	Regional Park
INFRASTRUCTURE								
Regional Water Partnerships	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑
Bike Parking	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Transit Stop	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☑	☑	☑
Shared Parking	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
On-Site Parking	☐	☐	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Accessible Parking and Drop-Off	☐	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Safe Crossings	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Comfort Facilities	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Maintenance Facilities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑
ZONES								
Universal Elements	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Intensive Use Areas	☐	☑	☑	☐	☑	☑	☑	☑
Programmable Gathering Areas	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Recreation Areas	☑	☑	☑	☐	☑	☑	☐	☑
Casual Use Areas	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Natural Areas	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS								
Programming	☐	☑	☑	☐	☑	☑	☑	☑
Integration with the Landscape	☐	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Design Excellence	☐	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Material Strategies	☐	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Environmental Sustainability	☐	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
Accessibility and Equity	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑

Regional Nature Park	Historic Landmark Site	Green-way	Linear Park	Canyon Park	Com-munity School Park	School Pool	Beach	Mountain Camp	Single Purpose Site	Golf Course
☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
☑	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☐	☑	☑
☑	☑	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☑
☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑
☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
☑	☑	☐	☑	☑	☑	☐	☑	☑	☐	☑
☑	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐
☐	☑	☐	☑	☑	☑	☑	☐	☑	☐	☑
☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☐	☑
☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☐	☑
☑	☑	☐	☐	☑	☑	☑	☐	☑	☑	☑
☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑
☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑



Figure 223. The playground complements the pool, courts, and fields at the WPA-era Sun Valley Park. Source: OLIN, 2025.



LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS

Level of service standards help guide decisions about how many recreational amenities are needed to serve Los Angeles' diverse and growing population. By establishing clear, population-based benchmarks, the City can proactively plan for the recreation and park needs of both current and future Angelenos, helping to ensure that every community has access to high-quality recreational opportunities. This chapter outlines level of service standards that will help guide the City's planning and investment strategies to 2050, providing a foundation for creating a more balanced, inclusive, and sustainable recreation and park system across Los Angeles.

LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS

The City of Los Angeles has a robust public space system that seeks to provide residents with convenient access to amenities and services.

No uniform level of service standards exist for parks or recreational amenities across the country. Population-based standards address how many amenities are needed, both now and in the future.

The PNA defines population-based standards by amenity. Using the level of service standards to increase access to recreational amenities could result in different types of actions:

- In areas where there is access to school district amenities but not to City-owned amenities, increased access could mean formalizing a partnership agreement to ensure that school district amenities—or new amenities on school properties—are always open and available to the public.
- In areas with large existing or planned infrastructure projects, increased access could mean partnering with other agencies on multi-benefit projects that include recreational amenities.
- In areas with a high population density that do not have access to school or City amenities, increased access could mean building new amenities in new or refreshed parks.
- In growing or redevelopment areas, where developers may provide new public spaces, increased access could mean working with developers during the development review process to provide needed amenities.
- In areas with access to multiple amenities in close proximity, increased access could mean repurposing an underused amenity.

The population-based standards provide a snapshot of the level of service provided by current recreation amenities and a road map for addressing the number of amenities in the future. The level of service standards can be used to help prioritize which actions will increase equitable access to recreational amenities for the most residents.

For this Park Needs Assessment, access considerations were incorporated into identifying the 36 New Park Priority Areas that are part of the Universe of Sites as described in Chapter 7: Site Prioritization.

POPULATION-BASED STANDARDS

On the following pages are the recommended level of service standards and future amenity counts to meet the median level of service of LA's peer cities by 2050.

To help set population-based level of service standards, the most common recreation amenities were looked at through four data points:

- Current level of service
- Level of service in peer cities
- Community priorities from the statistically valid survey
- National participation trends

Some data supports raising the current level of service. Other data supports maintaining or lowering the current level of service.

CURRENT LEVEL OF SERVICE

Population-based level of service is typically expressed as a ratio of number of amenities to population. The current level of service is based on counts of RAP's existing amenities from RAP's GIS database within City parks.

LEVEL OF SERVICE IN PEER CITIES

Level of service for peer cities is based on the Trust for Public Land's 2025 City Park Facts, which includes self-reported amenity counts for the 100 most populous cities in the country. The median of the peers' levels of service was used for comparison.

COMMUNITY SURVEY PRIORITIES

The PNA's statistically valid survey asked residents about their households' needs for various indoor and outdoor amenities and how important those amenities are to their households. Adding together the percentage of households with partially or unmet needs for each amenity with the percentage that said it was among the three most important amenities, the priority investment rating (PIR) indicates residents' relative priorities for investment.

NATIONAL PARTICIPATION TRENDS

National participation trends are based on the Sports and Fitness Industry Association's 2025 Topline Participation Report, which tracks rates of activity over time for Americans aged six and older across various recreational activities. Participation growth or decline on the following pages represents a weighted average of participation trends across activities that use a particular amenity. While the national trends for amenities are useful, it is important to keep in mind they include numbers from localities that may have very different demographics and climates from Los Angeles.

EXPANDED LEVEL OF SERVICE INFORMATION FOR EACH AMENITY CAN BE FOUND IN THE APPENDIX: LEVEL OF SERVICE DETAILS.

HOW TO USE THE LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS THROUGHOUT THE CAPITAL LIFE CYCLE

ACQUISITION

Use the level of service standards to understand what gaps in access to amenities could be reduced by potential new park sites.

VISION PLANNING

Use the population-based level of service standards to understand for a particular park which amenities should be maintained to continue access, which should be included to maintain or provide access, or which should be removed to reduce redundancies and create space for other experiences.

DESIGN

Level of service standards do not apply to this phase since decisions about which amenities to design are made in the acquisition and vision planning phases.

CONSTRUCTION

Level of service standards do not apply to this phase since decisions about which amenities to construct are made in the acquisition and vision planning phases.

OPERATION

Use the level of service standards to understand how changes to the availability of an amenity at one park—for example, when taken out of service for maintenance or due to disrepair—can impact the overall level of service in the city.

EVALUATION

Periodically evaluate site conditions against the level of service standards to determine if the park is helping to fill gaps in service.

LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS SUMMARY

Amenity	Total RAP Count	Metric	Current Level of Service (LOS)	Peer Median LOS	Priority Investment Rating	5-Year Change in Participation	Recommended LOS	# of Amenities by 2050
Basketball Hoops	692	1/10,000	**1.8**	**3.8**	**66**	**+28%**	3.8	1,625
Community Garden Sites	19	1/1,000	**0.0**	**0.0**	**127**	-	0.04	176
Diamond Fields	304	1/10,000	**0.8**	**1.0**	**59**	**+6%**	1.0	416
Dog Parks	14	1/100,000	**0.4**	**2.0**	**104**	-	2.0	85
Pickleball Courts	51.5	1/20,000	**0.3**	**1.0**	**78**	**+473%**	1.0	227
Playgrounds	398	1/10,000	**1.0**	**1.9**	**90**	-	1.9	828
Rectangular Fields	109	1/10,000	**0.3**	**0.7**	**65**	**+14%**	0.7	300
Tennis Courts	277.5	1/20,000	**1.4**	**3.1**	**78**	**+46%**	3.1	679
Volleyball Courts	175	1/20,000	**0.9**	**0.2**	**53**	**+4%**	0.2	49
Pools	59	1/100,000	**1.5**	**1.4**	**130**	**+6%**	1.4	62
Splashpads	13	1/100,000	**0.3**	**3.5**	**89**	-	3.5	153
Bathrooms	1,618	1/10,000	**4.2**	**1.6**	-	-	1.6	673
Nature Trails (Miles)	92	1/100,000	**2.4**	**3.6**	**154**	**+29%**	3.6	157
Disc Golf Courses	3	1/100,000	**0.1**	**0.2**	**51**	-	0.2	8
Rec & Senior Centers	185	1/20,000	**1.0**	**0.9**	-	-	0.9	202
Skate Parks	29	1/100,000	**0.8**	**0.7**	**55**	**+40%**	0.7	29
Park Acreage	16,333	1/1,000	**4.2**	**9.9**	-	-	9.9	42,704

Supports **raising** the current standard
Supports **maintaining** the current standard
Supports **lowering** the current standard
No information available

Figure 224. The PNA's level of service (LOS) standards address how many amenities are needed now and in the future.
Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks, TPL City Park Facts 2023, SFIA Topline Participation Report 2025.



Figure 225. Pickleball is one of the fastest growing sports nationwide. Source: Unai Huizi Photography / Shutterstock.

SUMMARY OF HOW THE GUIDELINES RELATE TO THE CAPITAL LIFE CYCLE

	Acquisition	Vision Planning	Design	Construction	Operation	Evaluation
Park Classifications	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
Site Planning Guidelines	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Engagement Guidelines	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Level of Service Standards	✓	✓			✓	✓



Figure 226. Runyon Canyon Park is among the most visited parks in the city. Source: HannaTor / Shutterstock.

SUMMARY: GUIDELINES

Do you want to revisit the key points of this section of the PNA? Check out these key summary points!

ONGOING ENGAGEMENT

- Ongoing engagement helps parks reflect the diverse needs and priorities of Los Angeles' many neighborhoods.
- Meaningful engagement involves surveys, public meetings, advisory committees, workshops, focus groups, and pop-ups. Feedback from this engagement directly shapes park programming, amenities, and site planning for updated and new facilities.
- The PNA's engagement guidelines aim to create more inclusive and accessible public spaces, foster a sense of ownership, identify and cultivate community leaders, and increase equity in access and outcomes.
- The guidelines cover engagement for project pre-planning, a community-driven planning and design process, and long-term stewardship, operations, and programming.

CAPITAL LIFE CYCLE

- Mapping out a clear capital life cycle helps RAP systematically assess when facilities should be maintained, renovated, repurposed, or replaced.
- The phases of the capital life cycle include acquisition, vision planning, design, construction, operation, and evaluation.

SITE PLANNING

- Site planning guidelines provide a clear and consistent roadmap for designing new parks and recreation facilities, refreshing existing sites, and evaluating whether improvements are needed.
- The guidelines are intended to inform:
  - The development of framework and site plans;
  - The periodic evaluation of parks and recreation facilities to assess functionality and performance;
  - The design of refreshed or new parks.
- The guidelines cover:
  - Overall design
  - Site context
  - Connectivity
  - Wayfinding
  - Infrastructure
  - Zones of park uses
  - Architectural elements

PARK CLASSIFICATIONS

- A new park classification seeks to clarify how existing parks function and provides guidelines about future park and recreation facility typologies that may be necessary to meet the needs of current and future residents.

- Each park and recreation facility classification includes a general description of its:
  - Typical size range;
  - Typical length of visit;
  - Access provisions;
  - List of appropriate amenities;
  - Applicable site planning guidelines,
  - Typical architectural elements.
- The new classifications are:
  - Mini Park
  - Neighborhood Park
  - Large Neighborhood Park
  - Neighborhood Nature Park
  - Community Park
  - Large Community Park
  - Community Nature Park
  - Regional Park
  - Regional Nature Park
  - Linear Park
  - Canyon Park
  - Greenway
  - Historic Landmark Site
  - Community School Park
  - School Pool
  - Beach
  - Single Purpose Site
  - Golf Course

LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS

- No uniform level of service standards exist for parks or recreational amenities across the country.
- The PNA defines population-based standards that address how many amenities are needed in the City, informed by:
  - Current level of service
  - Level of service in peer cities
  - Community priorities
  - National participation trends
- For each amenity, the recommended level of service leads to a projected quantity of that amenity needed by 2050, taking into account population growth projections.



Figure 227. Children playing at South Park Recreation Center during the Olympic Day of Sport. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.

05



Figure 228. Swimmers enjoy LA Aquatics Day at one of many pools across the city. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.

SECTION V:

IMPLEMENTATION

This section outlines the resources, strategies, and actions needed to bring the vision for recreation and parks in Los Angeles to life. As the City continues to grow and change, it will require increased and sustained investment to maintain, improve, and expand its diverse network of parks, facilities, and programs. The Cost and Funding chapter identifies the types of investments needed and explores available and potential funding sources to support this work. The Action Plan chapter then translates the plan's strategies into a clear roadmap for implementation. Together, these chapters provide a framework to guide the City in making equitable, effective, and lasting improvements across the park system.



Figure 229. Swan boats float on the lake in Echo Park. Source: Strike First/Shutterstock.

COST AND FUNDING

Los Angeles, a city defined by its vibrant communities and diverse landscapes, faces a critical challenge: ensuring its essential park system can meet the growing needs of its residents now and for generations to come. Investment in LA's park system has fallen since the Great Recession, leading to a funding crisis (See Chapter 5: Current Budget and Finance). A vital component of this Park Needs Assessment is laying out the financial investment required to maintain, enhance, and expand the City's parks and recreational amenities. Planning-level cost estimates for new facilities, maintenance, and staffing needs in addition to innovative funding strategies, are outlined as a roadmap to a resilient, equitable, and thriving Los Angeles park system.

PLANNING-LEVEL COST ASSUMPTIONS AND ESTIMATES

The PNA includes a rough order-of-magnitude estimate of the dollar amount needed to maintain, refresh, and build new parks and recreational amenities, facilities, and infrastructure across the City over the next 25 years as well as meet staffing and operational needs.

METHODOLOGY

The PNA's capital cost estimate is based on assumed costs for new parkland, construction of new amenities, replacement of existing amenities, repair of existing amenities, and maintenance of existing amenities. These assumed costs are based on:

- The costs of recently completed work by the City of Los Angeles
- The costs of recently completed work by local landscape architects, architects, and engineers
- The experience of cost estimators on similar park construction projects

Costs were developed for the over 30 amenities inventoried in RAP's annual Park Conditions Assessment, as well as other priority park facilities and landscapes that impact the overall quality and character of the parks system. The elements are categorized into:

- **Park Facilities**
    - Recreation Elements
    - Ecological Systems
    - Support Facilities
- **Architectural Elements**
- **Infrastructural Elements**
- **New Parkland**



Figure 230. The playground at Drum Barracks Park was assessed as 'fair' in the annual Park Conditions Assessment. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.



Figure 231. Swimmers enjoy the pool at the CLASS Parks Summer Kickoff Picnic. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.

There are costs associated with maintaining, completing a minor refresh of, completing a major refresh of, or adding each of these elements.

MAINTAIN

An amenity is in **good condition**, is fully functional, and does not need repairs. The amenity should be maintained to keep it in a good state of repair. Amenities in good condition encourage park use.

MAJOR REFRESH

An amenity is in **poor condition**, is largely or completely unusable, and requires major repairs to be functional. Amenities in poor condition discourage park use.

MINOR REFRESH

An amenity is in **fair condition** and is functional but needs minor or moderate repairs. Some elements of the amenity need to be refreshed. Amenities in fair condition can still be used, but may slightly discourage park use.

NEW FACILITY

A new facility must be built to meet a need in the overall system.



Figure 232. Engaging play elements at the Yosemite Recreation Center playground create a vibrant space for fun and exploration.. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.

TYPES OF COST, ASSUMPTIONS, AND APPROACH

CAPITAL ESTIMATES

Standardized costs were applied to the actual conditions of park amenities at each park site, as assessed by RAP, to arrive at project costs citywide through the year 2050. For amenities or elements that do not have a specific assessment, such as individual benches, current and future needs were estimated for the next 25 years. For new facilities, counts were based on the proposed level of service (LOS) standards for RAP. (See Chapter 12: Level of Service Standards) For example, if RAP wants to increase its LOS for basketball courts to match peer cities, the number of new courts needed to meet the new LOS standard was used. This was also true for the total acres of new parks. In the case of new parks, new amenity costs were applied to each of the 36 New Park Priority Areas identified using the "PerSquareMile" tool (See Chapter 7: Site Prioritization).

In addition to amenities, elements such as water and power support infrastructure, native habitat restoration or creation, and water bodies were considered in the cost estimate based on acreage or age of park.

The cost estimate also accounted for soft costs, such as design fees, for each of these projects as well. Soft costs for small projects are generally higher by percentage than large projects. This is due to the fact that regardless of the scale of the project, a certain level of project management and administrative work is required. For the purposes of this estimate, soft costs were averaged to 12%.

AMENITIES, HABITAT, AND SOFT COSTS WERE INCLUDED IN OVERALL COST CALCULATIONS.



Figure 233. Dogs socialize at the Whitnall Highway Park. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.

OVER THE PAST 25 YEARS, RAP'S OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE BUDGET HAS NOT KEPT UP WITH INFLATION OR GROWTH OF THE SYSTEM.

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE ESTIMATES

Staff salaries on the maintenance and construction teams constitute a significant portion of RAP's operations and maintenance costs. Currently, the Park Conditions Assessment, RAP staff, and community members all point to poor maintenance conditions in a high percentage of the City's parks. This is largely due to reduced numbers of operations and maintenance staff despite the ever-expanding scale of the park system. In a growing city like LA, the operations and maintenance budget of the park system also needs to grow year to year. Over the past 25 years, this budget has not kept up with inflation or the growth of the system (See Chapter 5: Current Budget and Finance).

PERSONNEL ESTIMATES

Future staffing needs and associated personnel costs were based on an average of three estimation methods.

1. **Increase Capacity to Provide A Higher Level of Service:** Increasing capacity and level of service by half (150%) to meet anticipated demand and elevate overall service delivery.
2. **Staffing Consistent to Prior Staffing Levels:** Returning staffing to RAP's prior, known peak in FY2008, a total budget increase of 30%. RAP has not returned to those pre-recession staffing levels. Restoring full-time employee counts to the FY2008 peak would require a 139% increase. Restoring part-time employee counts would require a 110% increase.
3. **Increase Capacity to Align to Peers:** Increasing staff per acre to align with peer systems (200%). Based on the average staff per acre against peer park systems, RAP would need to increase staff capacity by 200% to meet the service level of peers.

RAP COULD RESTORE STAFFING LEVELS, PROVIDE A HIGHER LEVEL OF SERVICE, AND ALIGN CAPACITY TO PEERS BY INCREASING ITS OPERATING BUDGET BY 74%.

EXPENSE ESTIMATES

Expense estimates assumed a salary-to-expense ratio of 20%, based on the historical average from RAP's FY2015–FY2025 budgets. General fund reimbursement estimates were based on a salary-to-reimbursement ratio of 68% based on the FY2025 budget.

Based on this approach, RAP would need to increase its operating budget by 60% to increase staff capacity to a level more consistent with prior service levels, desired service quality, and peers.



Figure 235. Volunteers plant trees at Stetson Ranch Park. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.

PERSONNEL AND EXPENSE ESTIMATE SUMMARY

Estimated Budgets	Full-Time Salaries	Part-Time Salaries	Misc. Salaries	Total Salary Budget	Expenses	Total Salary and Expense Cost	General Fund Reimburs-ement	Total Estimated Operating Costs	% Change from FY25
Existing FY2025	$126M	$54M	$4M	$184M	$39M	$223M	$125M	**$348M**	**0%**
1. Increase Capacity to Provide A Higher Level of Service	$190M	$82M	$5M	$276M	$58M	$335M	$188M	**$523M**	**50%**
2. Staffing Consistent to Prior Staffing Levels	$176M	$60M	$4M	$240M	$51M	$290M	$163M	**$454M**	**30%**
3. Increase Capacity to Align to Peers	$253M	$109M	$7M	$368M	$78M	$446M	$251M	**$696M**	**100%**
Average	**$206M**	**$83M**	**$6M**	**$295M**	**$62M**	**$357M**	**$201M**	**$558M**	**60%**

Figure 234. Personnel and Expense Estimates were based on level of service standards, prior staffing levels, and peer benchmarking. All costs are in 2025 dollars based on 2025 staff salaries and expenses. Source: HR&A Analysis of data provided by RAP and Trust for Public Land City Park Facts. Benchmarking peer cities rely on individual City Budgets from FY2023.

ESCALATION

One of the most important elements of long-range cost planning is considering escalation year to year, which may vary for capital projects and for operations. If underestimated, projects further into the future of the PNA time horizon will be underfunded. The rate of escalation depends largely on market conditions.

Capital Projects: While average years may be in the 4–5% range for capital projects, during the COVID-19 pandemic and in recent years escalation rates for capital construction costs rose very quickly at rates approaching 10–12%. Escalation forecasts for 2025–2026 in the LA market are 6–9%, driven in part by fire rebuild efforts and events-related development (World Cup, Superbowl, Olympics) before stabilizing for 2027–2029 in the 3–6% range.[142]

This projection equated to the following for the long-term PNA assumptions for capital costs:

- 2015–2024: Average of 5% escalation (accounts for Covid-peaks)
- 2025–2029: Estimate an average 6% escalation
- 2030–2050: Estimate an average 4% escalation
- Average Recommended 2025–2050 Escalation: 4.5%

Operations: The PNA assumed 3% annual escalation to project future operating costs based on inflation between 2015 and 2025 for goods according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics.



Figure 236. RAP makes path repairs at Pan Pacific Park. Source: OLIN, 2025.

COST TOTALS

The total budget takes into account facility conditions and deferred maintenance, desired new amenities, staffing needs, and operations and maintenance needs. Some costs recur annually, such as staffing. Other costs, such as new projects, are one-time costs that require ongoing operations and maintenance costs. The total budget can be broken down into one-time and annual costs. For new projects, completing them sooner will cost less as capital costs increase over time.

ONE TIME CAPITAL NEED
(IN 2025 DOLLARS WITHOUT ESCALATION)

$15B

Deferred Maintenance — ~$2.68B



Deferred Maintenance is maintenance that was not performed as scheduled or as needed and was put off to a future time, often due to a lack of funds or resources. In the PNA this includes minor refreshes, major refreshes, and replacement of existing facilities. Replacing a broken bench at a park or repaving an existing basketball court would be considered deferred maintenance if it had been delayed longer than when the maintenance should have been completed. Deferred maintenance costs go up as maintenance activities are further delayed, and sometimes facilities that were fixable at one point become impossible to repair and must be replaced by a completely new facility because maintenance has been deferred so long.

Level of Service Goals — ~$12.31B



New Facilities to Meet Peer City Levels — ~$3.83B

This cost covers the addition of new facilities—such as park facilities like pickleball courts, architectural elements, trails, and infrastructure elements—to bring Los Angeles' park system up to the median level of service among its peer cities.



New Park Acres to Meet Peer City Levels — ~$8.48B

This cost covers the addition of new park acres, including the 36 New Park Priority Areas and 26,000 additional acres, to bring Los Angeles' park system up to the median level of service among its peer cities.

With such large goals, it is helpful to further break these costs into various lenses to better explore funding measures or strategies and to prepare for department budgeting.

ADDITIONAL LENSES TO EXPLORE CAPITAL NEEDS	
Total for 36 New Park Priority Areas identified using the "Per Square Mile" tool at approximately 3 acres, including land acquisition.	**$1.3B***
Total needed to address the top 100 prioritized sites (based on a per acre average of the system cost)	**$695M**
Total needed to address the 25 first priority sites (based on a per acre average of the system cost)	**$50.9M**
Total needed to address the top 15 prioritized sites (based on a per acre average of the system cost)	**$25.1M**

**Note: If these new parks can be realized on land already owned by a public entity, land donated for parks, or as Community School Parks where land acquisition costs are not needed, this number would be around less than half of this total.*

Figure 237. There are multiple ways to break down the capital need estimate to understand the amount of money needed for various topics.
Source: OLIN, Dharam, 2025.

ANNUAL OPERATING NEEDS
(IN 2025 DOLLARS)

$558M

	EXISTING BUDGET FY2025	+	ADDITIONAL BUDGET NEEDS	=	ESTIMATED TOTAL BUDGET
Total for Staff Increases Year 1 to Meet Staffing Gap	$184M		~$111M		**~$295M**
Costs for future staffing needs and associated personnel costs, including full-time, part-time, and miscellaneous salaries to maintain and supplement current staffing.					
Total for Expenses Needed Year 1	$39M		~$23M		**~$62M**
The annual costs required for equipment, technology, and contracts to keep facilities running, parks clean, and programs operational.					
Total for General Fund Reimbursements *(2026)*	$125M		~$76M		**~$201M**
Reimbursement back to the City General Fund for expenses associated with City Employee Reimbursement System, Medicare, Employee Assistance, Civilian Flex programs, water, electricity, trash collection, and other related costs billed to the Department.					

This estimated addition of $209M annually would enable RAP to meet growing needs in staffing, operations and maintenance, and General Fund reimbursements for the Los Angeles park system, and is equivalent to 1.5% of the City of LA's Fiscal Year 2026 operating budget.

ESTIMATED ANNUAL OPERATING NEEDS WITH ESCALATION			
	2025 DOLLARS	2035 DOLLARS*	2050 DOLLARS*
TOTAL	**$558M**	**$749M**	**$1.17B**

**Note: Estimated total operating budget in 2035 and 2050 dollars is based on an annual inflation rate of 3%, consistent with inflation between 2015 and 2025.*

Figure 238. This table shows estimated annual operating needs with escalation included. Source: OLIN, HR&A, 2025.

ADDITIONAL STAFF NEEDS

Future park needs include staff needs and training needs. While the park system has grown since 2008, the number of staff at the Department of Recreation and Parks (RAP) has been reduced due to budget constraints.

There are several downsides to staff reductions. For example, current staff shortages and vacant positions make it nearly impossible to complete staff succession planning, meaning that RAP is frequently unable to look beyond the current year when thinking about staffing and training. This leads to a cycle of lost institutional knowledge. Staff reductions also often mean jobs either are not being done or someone who may not have been trained for a role is filling a role. Providing training opportunities for staff is key to help park staff meet the range of challenges they face in parks. For example, deescalation training is increasingly important for park staff, regardless of whether they are a ranger, program staff, or maintenance staff. Developing comprehensive strategies to address difficult issues at parks in a manner that is compassionate, trauma-informed, and balanced is key to ensure safe and equitable access for all park users, including children and families.

OVERALL RAP NEEDS MORE STAFF TO RESTORE THE LEVEL OF SERVICES ANGELENOS ASKED FOR DURING THE PNA.

Overall RAP needs more staff to restore the level of services Angelenos asked for during the PNA.



Figure 239. Department of Recreation and Parks maintenance staff. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.



Figure 240. Native habitat in North Atwater Park. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.

In addition to reaching a more sustainable full-time staff size overall, several specific staffing needs were identified in the assessment through conversations with RAP, other City agencies, the Steering Committee, the Technical Advisory Committee, equity session attendees, and community members.

Increasing staffing will increase jobs in Los Angeles and can provide opportunities for workforce development. City of LA jobs provide great opportunities for learning and growth, and can provide opportunities for internships that turn into life-long careers. An investment in park staff is an investment in a robust city economy.

MAINTENANCE - NATIVE HABITAT MANAGEMENT + ECOLOGISTS

Maintaining thriving native habitats across LA's park system will require dedicated staff and new methods for plant maintenance and procurement. Environmental supervisors, ecologists, and on-the-ground maintenance crews are needed for invasive species monitoring, protected species identification, plant replacement, and educational endeavors. RAP will also need to develop a pipeline for native plant materials through partnerships with native plant nurseries for contract growth of vegetation. Staff will be needed to manage all of these elements to meet the robust goals to plant significantly more native and climate ready species in parks.

SINCE 2008, STAFF NUMBERS AT RAP HAVE BEEN REDUCED DUE TO BUDGET CONSTRAINTS.

One strategy for expanding native habitat management staffing could be to leverage existing civil service positions established by the City of Los Angeles Personnel Department. The Environmental Specialist, Environmental Supervisor, and Environmental Affairs Officer positions are closest to the responsibilities of a RAP ecologist. Additionally, the Park Ranger position also may have duties related to ecological study. Required manual labor would be conducted by Gardener-Caretakers.

RAP currently has one ecologist on staff for Griffith Park who was hired in 2022. Initial steps to expand staff could include assigning a natural resource expert to each of RAP's management regions (West, Valley, Pacific, Metro, and Griffith). As each region varies in its total number of parks, total park acres, and specific local ecology maintenance needs, tailored maintenance strategies will need to be developed by these natural resource experts.



Figure 242. Youth participate in PlayLA Day. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.

Ideally a single, centrally-located supervisor would oversee the regionally-based staff. Staff from regions with fewer parks and natural ecosystems could help staff in districts with more and larger parks as needed.

Over the next two decades, staffing for the native habitat program should continue to grow, overseen by an Environmental Affairs Officer and supported by Environmental Supervisors that could manage multiple nearby regions. The specific number of staff needed for each region will depend on the management region's existing and new parks. The Griffith and Valley regions would likely need two to three Environmental Specialists, the Pacific and West regions, two, and the Metro region, one. Overall, the program could grow from six staff members up to a supervisory team of approximately 15 staff members in addition to on-the-ground maintenance crews.

ACCESSIBILITY

Accessible park infrastructure is a critical component to providing equitable access to parks. RAP is legally required to meet ADA and California standards for accessible design in any future park project, and to maintain compliance with these standards at existing parks. Having staff members dedicated to accessibility within RAP will help support the department's ADA compliance and help meet the department's aspiration for a more accessible park system across the City.

In addition to physical accessibility, dedicated program accessibility managers and communications accessibility experts are needed to address the accessibility of the department's programs and web, mobile, and analog communications.



Figure 241. The playground at Aidan's Place, Westwood Recreation Center is universally accessible. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.



Figure 244. The Department of Recreation and Parks' park rangers help keep parks safe. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.

RANGERS

Rangers perform a key role in City parks. They help community members navigate parks and keep parks safe. Approximately 30 of 70 ranger positions are empty today. In addition to filling empty positions, many more rangers are needed. Currently rangers are shared between large parks, and small parks rarely get ranger attention. Strategic, rotating patrols at smaller parks would be a welcome addition based on the feedback from Angelenos during the PNA.

PARK AMBASSADORS

Community members raised the need for park ambassadors multiple times. These ambassadors were envisioned to be residents hired at key parks from the immediate neighborhood to support park users and help direct people to services. Their familiar presence would help ensure that community members feel welcome in parks. Ambassadors could also assist other RAP staff with park functions such as maintenance if necessary. Given the requirement that civil service positions be approved through City Council, creative solutions may be needed to hire ambassadors from immediate neighborhoods. Residents cited the Metro Ambassadors program as a successful prototype. Given strong support for this potential program, recommendations and best practices for a pilot park ambassador program are outlined in Chapter 9: Ongoing Engagement.



Figure 243. Locally hired park ambassadors could support park users. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.

FUNDING STRATEGY RECOMMENDATIONS

The City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks relies on a combination of public funding sources for critical capital improvements and daily operations across more than 16,000 acres of parkland. As discussed in Chapter 5: Current Budget and Finance, RAP achieves this with an increasingly constrained budget. Some parts of the City have limited park space that is seeing increased pressure as a result of new development. Meanwhile, other parks receive high and growing numbers of visitors as major tourism destinations, requiring more frequent maintenance to keep up care and also accounted for in the PNA prioritization. More funding is needed—now and in the years to come.

Increasing RAP's operations and maintenance budget will enable the Department to continue to meet the needs of LA residents with flexibility to grow existing services, seed new programs, and adapt to changing needs. For example, with increasing operations and maintenance funding, RAP could increase park maintenance frequency (e.g. more frequent mowing and trash pickup), hire specialized positions and grow programs to enhance the park system (as described in the preceding section), and increase RAP employee wages. This will help retain staff and ensure a pipeline of committed future leaders, grow programs that connect residents to parks such as

Funding Strategy	Applicable Use	
	Capital	Operations and Maintenance
RAP-Led Funding Strategies		
Increase earned-revenue generation		X
Expand partnerships with non-profits and build a conservancy model	X	X
Leverage State and Federal funding sources	X	
Funding Strategies Requiring Partnership		
Increase the Charter mandated allocation of property tax revenue to RAP	X	X
Evaluate property tax assessments	X	X
Evaluate sales taxes	X	X
Evaluate City bond options: general obligation and revenue bonds	X	

Figure 245. Different funding strategies have different applicable uses. Source: HR&A, 2025.



Figure 246. Families ice skate at the Pershing Ice Rink opening. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.

Community School Parks and Park Rangers, and invest in infrastructure and technology for security, emergency management, and more. Further, since LA parks play a crucial role in the City's emergency management, a larger operating budget for RAP could strengthen the City's emergency preparedness such as expanding and reinforcing RAP facilities as cooling centers during extreme heat events.

This section describes strategies that the City of Los Angeles and RAP could use to increase funding for its park system, some of which build on existing assets and tools while others are newer approaches with limited examples. While RAP should remain attuned to state and federal funding sources, many of the following funding strategies are within the City's, and even RAP's, direct control. Strategies like building out an ecosystem of conservancies across the park system or evaluating opportunities to increase earned revenue take time to implement. The pursuit of additional funding, including the promising possibility of increasing revenue, should never compromise RAP's fundamental mission of providing accessible recreation programs to all Angelenos.

RAP-LED FUNDING STRATEGIES

INCREASE EARNED-REVENUE GENERATION

RAP can strengthen its financial sustainability by strategically reviewing and optimizing its existing revenue-generating programs, while remaining dedicated to the agency's fundamental mission of providing accessible recreation programs to all Angelenos. Affordability and earned revenue are not necessarily in conflict, and programs that produce revenue can help support new and exciting recreational opportunities that reflect community interests. Reassessing RAP's earned revenue could include conducting a market analysis that compares current fee structures, such as those for facility rentals, sports leagues, classes, or special events, with similar offerings provided by peer agencies and private providers in the region. If current rates are below those offered by peer institutions, particularly non-profit organizations with an interest in providing accessible services, there may be opportunities to adjust pricing while maintaining affordability and equitable access for residents.

RAP could also expand and diversify its revenue streams by collecting parking fees at new parks, improving and promoting concessions within the park system, or creating sponsorship opportunities for park maintenance or capital investment.



Figure 247. RAP maintains sports fields at North Hills Community Park. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.

PARKING

RAP could evaluate free and paid parking across the park system to identify locations for paid parking, particularly in high-traffic locations where free RAP managed parking sits adjacent to paid parking.

CONCESSIONS

In addition to reviewing pricing of existing concessions, RAP may consider new offerings. Creative examples of high demand concessions exist in urban park systems across the country. In Philadelphia each summer and fall, Parks on Tap attracts tens of thousands of residents to pop-up beer gardens across the city, generating vital revenue to support the city's parks and offering a fun way for residents to explore new parks. Run by FCM Hospitality in partnership with Philadelphia Parks & Recreation and Fairmount Park Conservancy, Parks on Tap offers local craft beer, food, and vibrant social space within the city's parks. The partnership allows Philadelphia Parks & Recreation to administer the program with limited staff effort. The program covers its own operating costs and generates thousands of dollars in revenue for the parks system. In the 2019 season alone, Parks on Tap generated $1.1 million in revenue. After covering program expenses, revenue supports trail improvements, tree plantings, signage, and free cultural events in parks with no direct investment from the city.[143]

SPONSORSHIP

RAP could also work to attract more sponsors, though this may require amending current sponsorship guidelines to attract higher value investment. Currently, RAP places strict limits on how sponsors can be acknowledged within parks. In particular, RAP limits the duration that signage providing donor acknowledgment can remain in a park to 1 year for every $25,000 in giving.[144] This means that even large scale donations are only acknowledged for a short time, which may disincentivize major gifts from those who would like to see permanent recognition for themselves or a loved one. Major park systems including those in New York City, Pittsburgh, and Minneapolis allow more permanent recognition of donations at a lower threshold, encouraging a greater deal of public-private partnership to support city parks. Additionally, tight rules around signage and branding disincentivize partners from sponsoring season-long free programming to activate a park, which does happen in other places, as with Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Alabama sponsoring regular free fitness classes in Railroad Park in Birmingham, AL.[145]

RAP CURRENTLY PLACES STRICT LIMITS ON HOW SPONSORS CAN BE ACKNOWLEDGED WITHIN PARKS.

ATTRACTING HIGHER VALUE SPONSORS MAY REQUIRE AMENDING CURRENT SPONSORSHIP GUIDELINES.

By investing in high-quality and in-demand programming, including outdoor fitness classes, nature camps, adaptive sports, and cultural events, RAP can continue to generate income while attracting broader community participation and supporting placemaking. Revenue gained through these efforts can be reinvested in park maintenance, staffing, and service enhancements, supporting long-term operational stability and improved park experiences. RAP is already engaged in this effort. From summer camps, to adult sports leagues, to venue rental permits, RAP is earning revenue to sustain the park system through exciting recreation amenities that communities love.

EXPAND PARTNERSHIPS WITH NON-PROFITS AND BUILD A CONSERVANCY OR 'FRIENDS' GROUP MODEL

Partnering with non-profits and growing a conservancy model can leverage philanthropic contributions to supplement public funding. These partnerships can provide targeted funding for specific parks, enhance programming, and introduce innovative stewardship models that improve park maintenance and community engagement. California has conservation organizations, such as the Mountains & Recreation Conservation Authority (MRCA) and the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy, that are dedicated to forming partnerships to acquire, protect, and research open lands across the state. Within Los Angeles, 'Friends' groups raise funds to advocate and organize volunteers on behalf of individual parks. The LA Parks Foundation raises funds for projects and programs throughout the LA park system with an annual operating budget of $2–3 million, majority of which is raised through private contributions. However, there is not a robust culture of private support for and stewardship of urban parks comparable to other major cities. Nationally, conservancies and friends groups are private organizations that fund capital improvements and regular maintenance in urban parks that have been effective at managing and funding major urban parks. These private entities can help reduce the financial burden on the city while fostering public-private collaboration to provide an increased level of programming and maintenance in some parks.

The level of involvement of a conservancy or friends group within a park system depends on the level of resources within the organization and the relationship they form with their park or park system entity. Friends groups and conservancies could be as small as a handful of motivated community members who organize quarterly planting and clean up days, or as large as a fully funded and well-resourced non-profit organization with a board of directors that facilitates regular maintenance of a park and capital improvements in conjunction with the public park agency. In these cases, a conservancy can serve as the primary steward of a park and allow the park agency to redistribute the funds and maintenance capacity that would have gone to the park to the rest of the park system. Regardless of size, since conservancies are volunteer or non-government partners, they are largely, if not entirely, insulated from public sector politics and changes, particularly annual budgets. Conservancies and friends groups rely on private sources for their budgets, including special assessments and philanthropy from foundations, corporations, and individuals. Budgets can vary widely, often impacted by the cultural significance of a park and the resources of the neighboring communities who use the park.

New York City is one city that has leveraged private philanthropy and public interest to expand the capacity of the park system through conservancies. As of 2022, in addition to hundreds of volunteer groups, New York City had 24 conservancies with formal contractual agreements to provide some scale of stewardship services to the parks they were affiliated with.[146] While two of these conservancies functioned citywide, most were park-specific, including the Central Park Conservancy, Prospect Park Alliance, Forest Park Trust, Friends of the High

PARTNERSHIPS CAN PROVIDE TARGETED FUNDING FOR SPECIFIC PARKS, ENHANCE PROGRAMMING, AND INTRODUCE INNOVATIVE STEWARDSHIP MODELS.



Figure 248. The LA Conservations Corps, Million Trees LA, and volunteers plant trees at Stetson Ranch Park after the 2008 wildfire. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.

Line, and others. In 2023, the five conservancies with the greatest revenue and expenses generated more than $220 million to operate and maintain five parks above and beyond NYC Parks' budget and role.[147] For example, Central Park Conservancy raises more than $100 million annually to maintain and operate Central Park, removing the City's burden to maintain one of New York's most iconic cultural assets.[148] The Conservancy has contracted with the City to provide all necessary maintenance needs, programming, and capital projects within the park and is funded entirely by private capital and volunteer support. Since its founding in 1980, Central Park Conservancy has invested more than $1 billion into Central Park.[149] While most conservancies are not as well-resourced as Central Park Conservancy and cannot take over all maintenance and capital needs of a park, a conservancy or friends group in almost any form can serve as an important long-term partner in park maintenance and an important way to generate care from the public for park assets.

A CONSERVANCY OR FRIENDS GROUP CAN SERVE AS AN IMPORTANT LONG-TERM PARTNER IN PARK MAINTENANCE.

Conservancies and friends groups are vital assets to a park system, but without an existing local model or culture of this type of support, it will take dedicated staff within RAP to work with interested community members to build the infrastructure for these organizations. Additionally, conservancies may receive community opposition if they are viewed as collecting private contributions to benefit only certain parks, say in wealthy, predominantly white communities, while other parks do not receive these additional resources, or if sponsored programming is geared towards wealthy donors rather than regular users. This makes it doubly important to have internal infrastructure to support motivated residents in establishing a friends group who may not have the funds, resources, or experience to independently do so, and to work with conservancies to ensure their contributions serve the full diversity of park users. This provides a better chance that communities across the city, no matter their socioeconomic status, have a chance to create non-government organizations to support their beloved neighborhood parks. In addition, RAP must be clear in messaging that conservancies relieve pressure on a parks system with limited funding by freeing up funds and maintenance resources for other parks rather than adding outside resources to an outsized share of public funds.

IT WILL TAKE DEDICATED STAFF WITHIN RAP TO WORK WITH EXCITED COMMUNITY MEMBERS TO BUILD THE INFRASTRUCTURE FOR CONSERVANCIES AND FRIENDS GROUPS.

LEVERAGE STATE AND FEDERAL FUNDING SOURCES

Tapping into state and federal funding, most often available for capital projects, can reduce pressure on the City to fund vital and expensive capital improvements through a parks budget that already struggles to support regular operational needs. State and federal grants often prioritize goals such as climate resilience, public health, and equity—all areas where RAP already has a strong impact. By aligning necessary capital projects under key state and federal priorities, RAP can secure additional resources to enhance facilities, expand access, and address underserved community needs. And despite a shifting climate around federal spending, California has a variety of state resources that remain active in supporting parks, open space, and recreation.

In California, Measure W and Proposition 4 are both key sources of capital that align with RAP's mission. Measure W, passed by Los Angeles County voters in 2018, created the Safe, Clean Water Program by establishing a parcel tax of 2.5 cents per square foot of impermeable surface on private properties to fund stormwater capture and water quality projects across the county.[150] The measure generates approximately $280 million annually to fund stormwater capture, water quality improvements, and local water supply projects, and prioritizes investments that support community benefits like green space, habitat restoration, and climate resilience.[151] These funding streams are well aligned with necessary green infrastructure projects within the Los Angeles park system.

RAP has a similar opportunity to embrace aligned goals with California Proposition 4. Approved by California voters in 2024, Proposition 4 led to the state issuing a $10 billion general obligation bond that funds climate resilience, water infrastructure, wildfire prevention, and environmental protection projects across the state. This includes $3.8 billion for safe drinking water, stormwater capture, drought preparedness, and flood control; $1.5 billion for wildfire prevention and forest health; and $1.2 billion for sea-level rise and coastal adaptation.[152] Importantly for RAP, it allocates over $1 billion to projects aimed at enhancing recreational opportunities, preserving and protecting open space, and reducing extreme heat through increased plantings and other interventions—all important areas of capital need for the LA park system.[153]

FEDERAL GRANTS OFTEN PRIORITIZE GOALS SUCH AS CLIMATE RESILIENCE, PUBLIC HEALTH, AND EQUITY—AREAS WHERE PARKS HAVE A STRONG IMPACT.



Figure 249. A ribbon cutting formally re-opens the Lincoln Heights Senior Center. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.

FUNDING STRATEGIES REQUIRING PARTNERSHIP

INCREASE THE CHARTER MANDATED ALLOCATION OF PROPERTY TAX REVENUE TO RAP

The property tax revenue allocated to RAP under the City Charter comprises the largest share of revenue to RAP's annual operating budget ($278 million out of $348 million in FY2025). The charter's current allocation rate for RAP is 0.0325% of the assessed value of all property in the city.[154] However, a charter amendment could increase this allocation.

In Los Angeles, property tax allocations to certain City agencies such as RAP and the Library Department are determined by fixed formulas in the City Charter which allocate a set percentage of assessed property tax revenue each year. These charter-based allocations are automatic and not subject to annual budget negotiations. Even as the State changed the property tax assessment ratio in the late 1970's, RAP's relative allocation in the City Charter remained constant.[155]

In 1978, Proposition 13 capped property taxes at 1% of a property's assessed value and limited annual increases in assessed value to 2% unless the property is sold or significantly improved.[156] Since many homes in Los Angeles are occupied by long-term owners, this means tax revenue—and therefore, RAP's allocation—has not kept pace with increases in market value, let alone the pressure from a growing population, a growing park system, and increasing labor costs. However, the City could work to amend the charter to increase RAP's annual funding allocation.

An increased charter-mandated allocation to RAP would increase tax revenue to operate and maintain Los Angeles' park system and help RAP better align revenue, albeit marginally, with rising inflation and housing values in the city. A proposed amendment would either need signatures from 15% of Los Angeles registered voters or support from two-thirds of the City Council to be put on the ballot for public approval. Once on the ballot, a simple majority of voters would be required to pass the measure.

AN INCREASE TO THE CITY'S CHARTER MANDATED ALLOCATION RATE WOULD INCREASE TAX REVENUE TO OPERATE AND MAINTAIN LOS ANGELES' PARK SYSTEM.

There is recent precedent for a charter amendment. In 2011, LA voters approved a City Charter amendment that increased the Los Angeles Public Library's guaranteed allocation from 0.0175% to 0.03% of assessed city property value.[157] Known as Measure L, this amendment was phased in over four years through fiscal year 2015, resulting in a roughly 70% increase in the library's budget and restoring six-day-a-week operations across branches.[158] RAP could work with the City or advocacy groups to propose an increased allocation from the City Charter to increase vital funds for park system operations.



Figure 250. Sherman Oaks East Valley Adult Center provides a range of services and programs for older adults. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.

EVALUATE A NEW PROPERTY TAX ASSESSMENT

A voter-approved special assessment on property taxes can provide a dedicated revenue stream for park improvements, new developments, and maintenance on affiliated capital projects. For the last 30 years, the City of Los Angeles has successfully leveraged Proposition K to allocate millions of dollars annually towards capital improvements within the city's parks. Proposition K was approved by Los Angeles registered voters in 1996 and created the "L.A. for Kids Program." It established a 30-year property assessment district to generate up to $25 million annually to fund capital development, acquisition, and improvement of parks and recreational facilities for youth across the city.[159] Assessments are based on a system of benefit points defined in the City Engineer's Report referenced in the referendum.[160] The vast majority of that funding, 82%, is reserved for parkland acquisition and capital projects.[161] A smaller share, 15%, is allocated to maintenance of completed Proposition K-funded projects, and 3% can be allocated to associated administrative costs. Proposition K is managed by the L.A. for Kids Steering Committee and administered by the Bureau of Engineering. It has funded both a set of pre-determined projects laid out in the original legislation as well as competitive grant cycles, with funding scheduled through fiscal year 2027. With Proposition K set to expire in the coming years, RAP faces the prospect of losing $25 million of annual funding that supports critical site improvements and new capital projects—a significant financial "cliff" if no other funding measure replaces it.

WITH PROPOSITION K SET TO EXPIRE IN FISCAL YEAR 26/27, THE CITY AND ADVOCATES MUST BUILD POLITICAL WILL TO PASS A SUCCESSOR.



Figure 251. Public infrastructure, like parks, can be funded through a Community Facilities District. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.

MELLO-ROOS COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT (CFD)

One strategy for establishing special property tax assessments in service of public infrastructure is through a Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD). A CFD is a special district established by a local government in California to finance public infrastructure and services such as schools, parks, streets, and emergency services. Authorized under the 1982 Mello-Roos Act, CFDs allow localities to levy a special tax on properties within a designated area after being approved by two-thirds of registered voters located within the District. Mello-Roos taxes are separate charges on property tax bills, often funding long-term bond repayments. CFDs are most useful at a small scale for defined infrastructure needs and not typically used for citywide needs.

EVALUATE SALES TAXES

Voter-approved sales taxes are a powerful tool for expanding a park agency's revenue base because they establish a dedicated, long-term funding stream that is less vulnerable to economic fluctuations or shifting political priorities. By securing a portion of local tax revenue, RAP could move beyond limited general fund allocations and gain greater financial stability to support capital improvements and operating costs such as staffing, maintenance, and programming. However, sales taxes are inherently regressive in that they impact the lowest income residents at the same rate as the wealthiest residents without any scale to distribute contributions by means. For that reason, sales taxes should be considered a tool, but not a primary tool, to diversify revenue for RAP.

Because they require voter approval, sales taxes are most successful when they have community buy-in and clear goals that prioritize underserved areas, sustainability, or other key issues. In Los Angeles, a ballot measure on special sales taxes can be brought to voters for approval either by a government body like the City Council or by the public. If a ballot measure is government-led, a two-thirds majority of registered voters is needed to pass the measure. If citizen-led, only a simple majority of voters is needed (50% + 1).

Measure A, passed by Los Angeles County voters in 2024, is a permanent half-cent sales tax that generates approximately $1 billion annually to fund homeless services, affordable housing, mental health care, rental assistance, and prevention programs.[162] It replaces Measure H, a 2017 voter-approved quarter-cent sales tax that raised about $355 million per year to support homeless services and was set to expire in 2027.[163,164] Measure A expands both the funding amount and scope, ensuring continued support for key programs with new accountability measures, including five-year performance goals and the ability to withhold funding from underperforming initiatives. A citizen-led initiative, Measure A was approved by 57.8% of voters.[165]

VOTER-APPROVED SALES TAXES ENCOURAGE COMMUNITY BUY-IN AND CAN BE STRUCTURED WITH CLEAR GOALS FOR PRIORITIZATION.




Figure 252. Runyon Canyon Park is an extremely popular park for many visiting Los Angeles. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.

TRANSIENT OCCUPANCY TAX (TOT)

Los Angeles' Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) is a special tax levied on guests of hotel or short-term rental accommodations for 30 days or less. The City currently levies a 14% rate, and unlike many local taxes, the TOT has no statutory cap. However, any rate increase must be approved by voters. Revenues generated by the TOT are a significant source of general municipal funding, supporting citywide services and quality-of-life investments.

Given the strong connection between high-quality parks and Los Angeles' tourism sector, including visitors' interest in open spaces, trails, and iconic urban parks; increasing the TOT rate could provide a reasonable revenue source to RAP. Los Angeles' parks not only serve residents, but are tourist destinations with broad appeal from Griffith Park to Venice Beach. Well-maintained parks contribute directly to visitor experience and neighborhood vitality, supporting Los Angeles' status as a national and global destination for tourists, industry conventions, and more.



Figure 253. Greenwood Square Park has play structures for multiple age segments. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.

EVALUATE CITY BOND OPTIONS

Issuing municipal bonds allows the City to secure large-scale financing upfront for capital projects, which can then be repaid over time through designated revenue sources. Bonds are an important avenue to finance a well-defined, clear slate of projects. Bonds are particularly useful for capital-intensive projects such as acquiring new parkland, major facility renovations, or climate resilience initiatives. Municipal bonds are primarily issued as either **general obligation (GO) bonds** or **revenue bonds**, each with distinct repayment sources and approval requirements. In Los Angeles, both types of bonds are used to finance public infrastructure, with GO bonds offering greater security and revenue bonds offering more flexibility for self-sustaining projects.

GO bonds are backed by the full faith and credit of the City, meaning they are repaid through general tax revenues, most often property taxes. Because they represent a claim on public tax dollars, GO bonds require a two-thirds majority approval by registered voters to enact. They are commonly used to fund projects that benefit the public broadly, such as schools, libraries, and, for RAP, parks and park infrastructure.

BONDS ARE PARTICULARLY USEFUL FOR CAPITAL-INTENSIVE PROJECTS SUCH AS ACQUIRING NEW PARKLAND, MAJOR FACILITY RENOVATIONS, OR CLIMATE RESILIENCE INITIATIVES.

Revenue bonds are repaid solely from the income generated by the project they finance. This might include tolls from a bridge, fees from a parking garage, or revenues from a water utility. In a park context, a revenue bond could be used to build improved parking infrastructure at a popular beach or recreation destination, or to build a ticketed amphitheater within a park. In both cases, the park amenity would need to generate revenue to repay the bond. Revenue bonds do not require voter approval because they are not backed by taxes, but they carry greater financial risk since repayment depends on the project's success.

RAP would not be the first cultural or recreation institution in LA to use bonds to fund necessary capital improvements. In 1998, Los Angeles voters approved Proposition CC, a GO bond measure that allocated $47.6 million to revitalize the L.A. Zoo's infrastructure and exhibits.[166] This financing, combined with additional funding through the Greater Los Angeles Zoo Association and other groups helped finance major capital investments including a new Animal Health Center, the Winnick Family Children's Zoo, the Children's Discovery Center, and more, bringing the total investment under the 1992 Los Angeles Zoo Master Plan to around $172 million. [167] This investment helped the L.A. Zoo improve both animal welfare and the visitor experience and maintain its presence as an important cultural and tourist destination for the region.

Between 2004 and 2007, the Los Angeles County Museum of Art (LACMA) issued a series of tax-exempt revenue bonds through the California Infrastructure and Economic Development Bank (Ibank) to fund major campus infrastructure improvements.[168] The 2004 A&B bonds financed the



Figure 254. Informational exhibits at White Point Park and Nature Preserve highlight the local landscape, cultural stories, and Indigenous history.
Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.

construction of a new museum building, upgrades to existing facilities including the Ahmanson Building, a new central heating and cooling plant, and improved walkways and landscaping. The 2004C bonds supported the demolition of an above-ground parking garage and construction of a two-level underground replacement. Finally, the 2007 bonds funded the design and construction of a new exhibition pavilion, expansion of education and gallery spaces, outdoor art installations, and the acquisition of five adjacent properties. These projects significantly modernized and expanded LACMA's physical campus.

ADDITIONAL FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES

Continuing to meet the demands on parks in LA and accommodating new parks will require a multi-pronged approach to funding capital investments and ongoing operations. In addition to the strategies described above, RAP should continue to seek and embrace funding and financing opportunities that can supplement existing and new strategies. As RAP adds staff for ecological services and maintenance in the coming years, additional grants and mechanisms to capture private investment may become available, such as carbon offsets or stormwater credits. To pursue these grants and other opportunities, RAP should continue to partner with local and regional sister agencies (e.g., LA Unified School District, LA Department of Water and Power, LA Sanitation Bureau, LA County Parks and Recreation, and LA County Public Works) to bolster coordination and apply for competitive grants such as those available through the California Climate Investments Urban Greening Program. Finally, new parks and major redevelopment of existing parks may also be eligible for financing tools that leverage anticipated value that will be created. RAP and its civic partners should continue to assess the potential of financing tools for major capital investments such as Enhanced Infrastructure Financing Districts (EIFDs).



Figure 255. Adults participate in an aquatic fitness class at Celes King II Pool. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.



Figure 256. People run and walk through Pan Pacific Park. Source: OLIN, 2025.

ACTION PLAN

Successful implementation of the vision, strategies, and priorities identified in this Park Needs Assessment requires balancing and addressing community aspirations, partner and agency goals, and the Department's mission and vision. This chapter translates these priorities into a clear set of steps to guide decision-making, resource allocation, and partnership development over time. It provides a roadmap for how the Department of Recreation and Parks can deliver more equitable, accessible, and high-quality parks and facilities across Los Angeles. By defining near-term actions, this chapter helps ensure that the City stays focused, adaptable, and accountable as it works to meet the evolving needs of all Angelenos.

HOW DO WE GET THERE?



Figure 257. People participate in LA Aquatics Day. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks, 2025.

THE PNA IS A ROADMAP

When making decisions or responding to the Los Angeles community or to elected or appointed officials, the PNA serves as a critical reference point. Because the assessment is an integral tool for the Department, it should also be central to training for existing and new employees.

The Park Needs Assessment sets forth an ambitious strategy for growing the park system in a way that is driven by community voices. The PNA is the product of rigorous community conversations, multiple surveys, in-depth analysis, and agency and partner visioning. Going forward, the City should use the PNA as a tool to assist in decision making as it relates to investment strategies and resource allocation to ensure barriers to participation are removed and create a more equitable system.


The PNA should serve as a unifying document that helps align the needs of the community with the priorities and actions of the City in order to continue to grow an inclusive, loved, and connected recreation and parks system.

RAP will use the strategies and priorities in the PNA as a framework for decision making.





Figure 258. RAP conducts training at EXPO Summer Day. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks, 2025.



STEPS FORWARD

The following steps build on the strategies and priorities identified in the Park Needs Assessment and serve as long-term guidance and day-to-day tools for managing the city's recreation and parks system. They include:

- **RAP'S OVERALL IMPLEMENTATION APPROACH**
- **EARLY ACTION SITES**
- **SITE LEVEL DECISION FRAMEWORK**




Figure 259. Technical Advisory Committee members discussing the PNA. Source: OLIN, 2025.

RAP'S OVERALL IMPLEMENTATION APPROACH


SECURE SUSTAINABLE FUNDING FOR RECREATION AND PARKS

SEE CHAPTER 13: COST AND FUNDING



PRIORITIZE CAPITAL INVESTMENTS, INCLUDING DEFERRED MAINTENANCE NEEDS, AS WELL AS STAFF INCREASES TO MEET STAFFING GAPS.

PROACTIVELY PURSUE PROJECTS



RAP SHOULD PROACTIVELY PURSUE AND LEAD PROJECTS. IN THIS APPROACH, IF THERE IS A SPECIAL FUNDING SOURCE THAT APPLIES ONLY TO A CERTAIN REGION, TYPE OF PARK, OR AMENITY, FIND THE HIGHEST RANKED SITES THAT MEET THE FUNDING SOURCE CRITERIA. IF NOT, FIND THE HIGHEST RANKED SITE OVERALL.

When RAP is presented with a potential project at a site:

If there is an identified funding source for the project, pursue if the project aligns with priorities of the PNA. Otherwise, pursue only if the project is a top ranked site.

EARLY ACTION SITES

FOCUS ON THE HIGHEST PRIORITY SITES

SEE CHAPTER 7: SITE PRIORITIZATION

First priority sites, arranged alphabetically:

105TH STREET POCKET PARK



Region: South

PNA Classification: Mini Park

11TH AVENUE PARK



Region: South

PNA Classification: Mini Park

97TH STREET POCKET PARK



Region: South

PNA Classification: Mini Park


ARTS DISTRICT PARK



Region: Central/East

PNA Classification: Mini Park

LAR GREENWAY - MASON TO VANALDEN



Region: North

PNA Classification: Greenway

LEO POLITI ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (CSP)



Region: Central/East

PNA Classification: Community School Park

LITTLE GREEN ACRES PARK



Region: South

PNA Classification: Specialty Facility


ORD AND YALE STREET PARK



Region: Central/East

PNA Classification: Mini Park


PERSQUAREMILE - DOWNTOWN



Region: Central/East

Classification: New Park Priority Area

PERSQUAREMILE - EAST VERMONT SQUARE




Region: South

Classification: New Park Priority Area

Existing parks and New Park Priority Areas were prioritized based on a system of community and data driven criteria.

These sites represent those that scored the highest out of all 518 in the prioritization framework. They range in classification, size, and region.


PERSQUAREMILE - EXPOSITION PARK



Region: Central/East

Classification: New Park Priority Area

PERSQUAREMILE - N HIST SOUTH CENTRAL



Region: South

Classification: New Park Priority Area


PERSQUAREMILE - NORTH HOLLYWOOD



Region: North

Classification: New Park Priority Area


PERSQUAREMILE - PICO-UNION



Region: Central/East

Classification: New Park Priority Area


PERSQUAREMILE - UNIVERSITY PARK NORTH



Region: South

Classification: New Park Priority Area


PERSQUAREMILE - VAN NUYS - VALLEY GLEN



Region: Central/East

Classification: New Park Priority Area


PERSQUAREMILE - WESTLAKE



Region: Central/East

Classification: New Park Priority Area


PERSQUAREMILE - WESTLAKE-KOREATOWN



Region: Central/East

Classification: New Park Priority Area


ROLLAND CURTIS PARK



Region: South

PNA Classification: Mini Park

SAINT JAMES PARK



Region: Central/East

PNA Classification: Mini Park

SAN JULIAN PARK



Region: Central/East

PNA Classification: Specialty Facility


SIXTH STREET VIADUCT PARK



Region: South

PNA Classification: Neighborhood Park


SOUTH VICTORIA AVENUE PARK



Region: South

PNA Classification: Mini Park

VALENCIA TRIANGLE



Region: Central/East

PNA Classification: Mini Park

VERMONT MIRACLE PARK




Region: South

PNA Classification: Mini Park

SITE LEVEL DECISION FRAMEWORK


SEEK TO ADDRESS RESIDENTS' TOP CITYWIDE PRIORITIES FOR AMENITIES AND PROGRAMS

SEE CHAPTER 2: ENGAGEMENT




ACCOUNT FOR DIFFERENT PRIORITIES IN DIFFERENT PARTS OF THE CITY

SEE CHAPTER 8: REGIONAL SNAPSHOTS



CONTINUE TO MEANINGFULLY ENGAGE WITH RESIDENTS

SEE CHAPTER 9: ONGOING ENGAGEMENT




CONSULT THE CLASSIFICATIONS TO IDENTIFY TYPICAL AMENITIES AND APPLICABLE GUIDELINES

SEE CHAPTER 11: PARK CLASSIFICATIONS



USE THE SITE PLANNING GUIDELINES TO EVALUATE AND IMPROVE FORM, FUNCTION, AND REGULATORY COMPLIANCE

SEE CHAPTER 10: SITE PLANNING



CONSIDER SITE-SPECIFIC NEEDS IDENTIFIED BY THE PRIORITIZATION CRITERIA

See Addressing Site-Specific Needs at the end of Section IV.


CONSIDER CITYWIDE NEEDS BASED ON LEVEL OF SERVICE AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

SEE CHAPTER 12: LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS

300 In 2025 ▲ **432** by 2050


89 In 2025 ▼ **70** by 2050

SITE LEVEL DECISION FRAMEWORK



GUIDELINES			
ENGAGEMENT GUIDELINES **Is the site meeting community metrics of success that can supplement RAP's own metrics?**	**PARK CLASSIFICATIONS** **Does the site meet the spirit of the aspirations for its particular classification, or is the classification incorrect?**	**SITE PLANNING GUIDELINES** **Does the site's design hold up to the aspirations of the guidelines?**	**LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS** **Is the site helping to fill gaps in service?**
Yes	Yes, and the classification is correct	Yes, most/all are met	Yes
Yes	Yes, and the classification is correct	Yes, but some individual elements may need to be replaced	Yes, but some individual elements may need to be replaced
Some metrics are not being met	The classification is correct, but critical amenities are missing	Somewhat, but the design could use some tweaks	Somewhat, but there may be additional opportunities
TS OF THE SITE			
Many metrics are not being met	Many amenities are missing, or the classification is incorrect	Not well. The design needs to be rethought	There are unused amenities or spaces that could be repurposed
Not all	Yes, and the classification is correct	Yes, but some individual elements may need to be replaced	There is not enough space to meet needs
IPLEMENTARY SITE			

SITE LEVEL DECISION FRAMEWORK



COMMUNITY PRIORITIES

CITYWIDE PRIORITIES

Attempt to accommodate priority amenities and programs if not already available nearby.

REGIONAL PRIORITIES

Attempt to accommodate priority amenities and programs if not already available nearby.

GUIDELINES

ENGAGEMENT GUIDELINES

Community engagement during the acquisition phase of a park project should keep residents adequately informed about the acquisition process, and guided by community input.

PARK CLASSIFICATIONS

Use the park classifications to understand what types of parks are appropriate for the size of the site being acquired, or conversely to understand the size of the site needed to accommodate a particular type of park.

SITE PLANNING GUIDELINES

Use the guidelines as a checklist to understand how well a site can currently be accessed and the relationship a site has with surrounding uses, including other public spaces.

LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS

Use the level of service standards to understand what gaps in access to amenities could be reduced by potential new park sites.

ACQUISITION



Figure 260. Individuals work out at Pan Pacific Park. Source: OLIN, 2025.

UPDATING THE PNA

The following is a framework for how RAP should report progress toward fulfilling the needs and priorities identified in the PNA.

RAP should hire dedicated full-time staff responsible for steering and tracking the progress of PNA implementation.

EVERY 5 YEARS

Every five years, RAP should complete a public status report on progress toward fulfilling the needs identified in the PNA.

The status reports should include the number, location, and priority of sites that have received additional operations and maintenance or capital funding and total dollars spent, allocated, and requested. Reports should also include projections in funding shortages and progress in pursuing strategies to secure more sustainable funding. Qualitative descriptions should be included that describe progress on actions that may be less reflected by dollars spent, such as workforce development, the success of recreational and social service programs, collaboration with local Non-Governmental Organizations/Community-Based Organizations (NGOs/CBOs), and equity principles.

The following tasks should be completed by RAP staff for the five-year status report:

- Compile list of completed and planned projects, with dollars spent on, dollars allocated yet unspent on, and projected dollars needed to complete each project. Include hard and soft costs as well as operations and maintenance funding allocated annually compared to projected budget needs.
- Cross reference completed projects with the park prioritization list and report which priority tier level completed projects are within.
- Provide updates on progress toward equity metrics and goals, with specific attention to sites scoring a 1 on the Environmental, Social, and Health Equity criterion.
- Report on level of service improvements or losses in the full park system.




Figure 261. The timeline for updating the PNA includes 5- and 10-year milestones. Source: OLIN, 2025.

- Write a short qualitative description of each completed project, including successes in relation to community engagement, workforce development, or other items that may be less well understood based on the financial report.

EVERY 10 YEARS

Every ten years, RAP should engage a consultant to update the Universe of Sites and re-prioritize the Universe of Sites using:

- Datasets with regular update intervals *(example: CalEnviroScreen)*
- Parks conditions assessments
- Results from a new statistically valid survey
- Park visitation data

Where updated data are unavailable, existing datasets may be retained temporarily to ensure continuity and efficiency in analysis.

As the population projections used in the 2025 PNA are for 2050, by 2045 RAP should evaluate if an entirely new PNA is needed or if the current methodology is still valid. RAP should work toward the updated or new PNA by 2050. It is anticipated that the current methodology may still be valid but changes to the criteria may be needed to account for additional factors. All criteria should be updated in 2050.

In the event that population projections from the Southern California Association of Governments substantially change between now and 2045, RAP may want to consider a more substantial update sooner than 2045.




Figure 262. Hollenbeck Park became a hub of activity during the CicLAvia—Heart of LA event in October 2025. Source: Calvada Surveying, Inc., 2025.



Figure 263. MacArthur Park's playgrounds and soccer field are popular amenities. Source: Calvada Surveying, Inc., 2025.

BUILDING ON THE PNA

The following is a framework for how RAP can continue to advance the strategies of the PNA beyond the early actions.

DEVELOP A PARKS MASTER PLAN

RAP should develop a Parks Master Plan, building upon key foundational efforts: this PNA, a Facility Assessment, and a Capital Improvement Plan (CIP).

The Facility Assessment should fully deploy RAP's asset management system, include dedicated staff to conduct assessments, and establish a regular schedule to evaluate all park assets—not just the 16 currently required by the County.

The Capital Improvement Plan should operate on a three-year cycle and encompass projects that have secured funding and RAP resources.

Both the Facility Assessment and the CIP should be completed by the time of the first five-year status report on the PNA, ensuring that the groundwork is in place to begin development of the Parks Master Plan.



Figure 264. A volleyball tournament is held on the courts at Branford Recreation Center. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.

DEVELOP INTRADEPARTMENTAL IMPLEMENTATION GUIDES

RAP should develop implementation guides for specific branches of the department responsible for carrying out the PNA. These guides should reference relevant sections of the PNA to help guide staff in creating consistent and aligned operational procedures. The following serve as a starting point:

PUBLIC RELATIONS

Follow Chapter 9: Ongoing Engagement to create an actionable implementation guide for the Department's future engagement opportunities. This includes a guide for accessing translation services.

HUMAN RESOURCES

Follow Chapter 13: Cost and Funding (Additional Staff Needs) to create an implementation guide for prioritized staff hiring for positions identified in the PNA, whenever and wherever feasible.

RECREATION

Follow Chapter 2: Engagement survey results, Chapter 7: Site Prioritization, and the Guidelines section (Chapter 9–12) of the PNA to create an implementation guide that identifies and evaluates the need for new and existing recreation programming based on PNA prioritization criteria and key performance indicators.

MAINTENANCE

Follow the Guidelines section (Chapter 9–12) to create an implementation guide that includes schedules for regular assessments, best operational practices, and a regular evaluation of the deployment of the PNA prioritization criteria.

CONSTRUCTION

Follow the Guidelines section (Chapter 9–12) to create an implementation guide that includes schedules for regular assessments, best operational practices identified, regular evaluation of buildings, and a regular evaluation of the deployment of the PNA prioritization criteria.

PLANNING

Follow Chapter 7: Site Prioritization, and the Guidelines section (Chapter 9–12)of the PNA to create an implementation guide for parcel acquisition and facility project planning based on the PNA prioritization criteria.

EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT

Follow Chapter 4: RAP By the Numbers and Chapter 13: Cost and Funding to create an implementation guide for using the PNA to inform other City departments of RAP priorities and future budget proposals. Use these chapters to also inform future requests to the City Council for funding assessments that align with RAP Priorities, identifying which funding strategy recommendation(s) (Cost and Funding) to deploy, reevaluating RAP's authority and jurisdiction, and recommending pathways for RAP reorganization.

PARTNERSHIPS

Follow Chapter 7: Site Prioritization, the Guidelines section (Chapter 9–12), and Chapter 13: Cost and Funding to create an implementation guide that identifies applicable partnerships within the City based on the PNA prioritization criteria.

CONCESSIONS

Follow Chapter 7: Site Prioritization, Guidelines section (Chapter 9–12), and Chapter 13: Cost and Funding (Funding Strategy Recommendations) to create an implementation guide that identifies funding strategies and locations for future concessions based on the PNA prioritization criteria.

SUMMARY: IMPLEMENTATION

Do you want to revisit the key points of this section of the PNA? Check out these key summary points!



COSTS AND FUNDING

- The PNA includes a rough order-of-magnitude estimate of the dollar amount needed to maintain, refresh, and build new parks and recreational amenities, facilities, and infrastructure across the city over the next 25 years as well as meet staffing and operational needs.
- Over the past 25 years, RAP's operations and maintenance budget has not kept up with inflation or growth of the system.
- RAP could restore staffing levels, a higher level of service, and align capacity to peers by increasing its operating budget by 60%.
- RAP would need $15 billion in one-time capital spending for new projects and to catch up on deferred maintenance (in 2025 dollars).
- Annually, RAP would need $558 million to cover staffing, operations, and General Fund reimbursements.
- In addition to reaching a more sustainable full-time staff size, specific staffing needs were identified for native habitat management and ecologists, accessibility managers, park rangers, and park ambassadors.
- There are a variety of strategies that the City of Los Angeles and RAP could use to increase funding for its park system, some of which have not yet been tested.
- While RAP should remain attuned to state and federal funding sources, many of the funding strategies are within the City's, and even RAP's, direct control.
- The funding strategies explored in more detail are:
  - RAP-Led Funding Strategies
    - Increase earned-revenue generation,
    - Expand partnerships with non-profits and build a conservancy model, and
    - Leverage State and Federal funding sources.
  - Funding Strategies Requiring Partnership
    - Increase the Charter mandated allocation of property tax revenue to RAP,
    - Evaluate property tax assessments,
    - Evaluate sales taxes, and
    - Evaluate City bond options: general obligation and revenue bonds.

ACTION PLAN

- When making decisions or responding to the Los Angeles community or to elected or appointed officials, the PNA serves as a critical reference point.
- Steps Forward:
  - Secure sustainable funding for Recreation and Parks.
  - Proactively pursue projects.
  - Focus on the highest priority sites, based on the site prioritization.
  - Seek to address residents' top citywide priorities for amenities and programs. Account for different priorities in different parts of the City using the regional snapshots.
  - Continue to meaningfully engage with residents, following the ongoing engagement guidelines.
  - Consult the classifications to identify typical amenities and applicable guidelines.
  - Use the site planning guidelines to evaluate and improve form, function, and regulatory compliance.
  - Consider citywide needs based on level of service standards and regulatory requirements.
- Updating the PNA:
  - Every five years, RAP should complete a public status report on progress toward fulfilling the needs identified in the PNA.
  - Every ten years, RAP should engage a consultant to update the Universe of Sites and re-prioritize the Universe of Sites.
- Building on the PNA:
  - RAP should work to develop a Parks Master Plan building on the PNA, a Facility Assessment, and a Capital Improvement Plan (CIP).
  - RAP should develop intradepartmental implementation toolkits for specific Department branches responsible for carrying out the PNA.



Figure 266. KYCC members participating in the Stetson Ranch reforestation. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.



Figure 267. **Lincoln Park is a popular location for recreation and athletics.** Source: Calvada Surveying, Inc., 2025



ENDMATTER:
RESOURCES



UNIVERSE OF SITES (Organized alphabetically by priority tier)

FIRST PRIORITY

Rank	Title	Size (Acres)	PNA Classification	Region	Composite Score
24	105th Street Pocket Park	**0.11**	Mini Park	South	
1	11th Avenue Park	**0.21**	Mini Park	South	
5	97th Street Pocket Park	**0.13**	Mini Park	South	
11	Arts District Park	**0.51**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
13	LAR Greenway - Mason to Vanalden	**6.22**	Greenway	North	
20	Leo Politi Elementary School (CSP)	**2.02**	Community School Park	Cen/East	
12	Little Green Acres Park	**0.23**	Mini Park	South	
25	Ord And Yale Street Park	**0.60**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
10	PerSquareMile - Downtown	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	Cen/East	
15	PerSquareMile - East Vermont Square	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	South	
19	PerSquareMile - Exposition Park	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	South	
14	PerSquareMile - N Hist South Central	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	South	
23	PerSquareMile - North Hollywood	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	North	
22	PerSquareMile - Pico-Union	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	Cen/East	
6	PerSquareMile - University Park North	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	Cen/East	
17	PerSquareMile - Van Nuys - Valley Glen	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	North	
7	PerSquareMile - Westlake	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	Cen/East	
9	PerSquareMile - Westlake-Koreatown	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	Cen/East	
21	Rolland Curtis Park	**0.09**	Mini Park	South	
2	Saint James Park	**0.90**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
3	San Julian Park	**0.29**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
16	Sixth Street Viaduct Park	**12.52**	Community Park	Cen/East	
4	South Victoria Avenue Park	**0.26**	Mini Park	South	
8	Valencia Triangle	**0.06**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
18	Vermont Miracle Park	**0.22**	Mini Park	South	

SECOND PRIORITY

Rank	Title	Size (Acres)	PNA Classification	Region	Composite Score
45	111th Place Pocket Park	**0.09**	Mini Park	South	
80	1st And Broadway Civic Center Park	**1.96**	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	
132	4206 S Main St Maintenance Yard	**0.48**	Single Purpose Site	South	
119	49th Street Pocket Park	**0.19**	Mini Park	South	
97	61st Street Pocket Park	**0.12**	Mini Park	South	
74	6th & Gladys Street Park	**0.34**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
73	76th Street Pocket Park	**0.13**	Mini Park	South	
162	Algin Sutton Recreation Center	**16.46**	Community Park	South	
29	Aliso Triangle	**0.04**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
158	Alpine Recreation Center	**1.94**	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	
69	Alvarado Terrace Park	**0.91**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
84	Amistad Park	**0.14**	Mini Park	North	
65	Angeles Mesa Park	**0.15**	Mini Park	South	
110	Arroyo Rosa De Castilla	**0.73**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
120	Augustus F Hawkins Natural Park	**8.12**	Large Neighborhood Park	South	
112	Boyle Heights Sports Center	**8.51**	Large Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	
66	Brooklyn Heights Park	**0.20**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
28	Caballero Creek Confluence Park	**1.53**	Neighborhood Park	North	
70	Camellia Avenue Elem School (CSP)	**2.37**	Community School Park	North	
153	Canoga Park Senior Citizen Center	**0.77**	Single Purpose Site	North	
151	Carlton Way Park	**0.19**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
44	Central Avenue Jazz Park	**0.19**	Mini Park	South	
161	Central Recreation Center	**1.45**	Neighborhood Park	South	
114	Challengers Boys And Girls Club	**0.84**	Single Purpose Site	South	
88	Circle Park (5th Ave)	**0.17**	Mini Park	South	
72	Circle Park (S Gramercy Pl)	**0.17**	Mini Park	South	

SECOND PRIORITY

Rank	Title	Size (Acres)	PNA Classification	Region	Composite Score
104	City Hall Park	**1.71**	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	
169	Culver-Slauson Park	**3.27**	Large Neighborhood Park	West	
129	David M Gonzales Recreation Center	**6.80**	Large Neighborhood Park	North	
101	Denker Recreation Center	**2.81**	Neighborhood Park	South	
78	Dorothy J and Benjamin B Smith Park	**0.49**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
150	East Los Angeles Park	**0.32**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
61	Echo Park Community Center	**0.29**	Single Purpose Site	Cen/East	
170	Echo Park Deep Pool	**2.07**	Single Purpose Site	Cen/East	
77	El Pueblo de LA Historic Monument	**2.03**	Historic Landmark Site	Cen/East	
94	El Sereno Community Garden	**0.77**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
167	El Sereno Recreation Center	**13.94**	Community Park	Cen/East	
91	Elysian Park	**547.54**	Regional Park	Cen/East	
165	Ernest E Debs Regional Park	**318.62**	Regional Park	Cen/East	
157	Evergreen Recreation Center	**6.66**	Large Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	
64	EXPO Center	**6.65**	Regional Park	South	
124	Exposition Park Rose Garden	**10.39**	Historic Landmark Site	South	
79	Francis Avenue Community Garden	**0.15**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
163	Fred Roberts Recreation Center	**2.90**	Neighborhood Park	South	
36	Fremont High School Pool	**0.64**	School Pool	South	
128	Fulton Avenue Park	**0.40**	Mini Park	North	
144	Gage and Avalon Triangle Pocket Park	**0.26**	Mini Park	South	
58	Grand Hope Park	**2.00**	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	
49	Greenwood Square Park	**0.31**	Mini Park	North	
171	Grigsby Pocket Park	**0.28**	Mini Park	South	
142	Harbor View Memorial Park	**2.85**	Neighborhood Park	South	
86	Hartland Mini-Park	**0.07**	Mini Park	North	
172	Harvard Elementary School (CSP)	**1.22**	Community School Park	Cen/East	
37	Hazard Recreation Center	**24.99**	Large Community Park	Cen/East	
125	Hollenbeck Park	**18.30**	Community Park	Cen/East	
141	Hoover Pedestrian Mall	**2.16**	Greenway	South	
71	Hoover Recreation Center	**2.95**	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	
147	Hoover-Gage Park	**0.21**	Mini Park	South	
43	Hope and Peace Park	**0.57**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
145	Inell Woods Park	**0.27**	Mini Park	South	
90	Jacaranda Park	**5.35**	Linear Park	South	
155	Julian C Dixon Park	**0.96**	Mini Park	South	
121	Ken Malloy Harbor Regional Park	**290.87**	Regional Park	South	
107	Keswick Park	**0.36**	Mini Park	North	
92	Kittridge Mini-Park	**0.09**	Mini Park	North	
160	LAPD SWAT Officer R.D.Simmons Pk	**8.08**	Large Neighborhood Park	North	
156	LAR & Aliso Creek Confluence Park	**2.59**	Linear Park	North	
152	Latham Park	**0.19**	Mini Park	South	
111	Lincoln Park	**42.81**	Regional Park	Cen/East	
126	Loren Miller Recreation Center	**2.4**	Neighborhood Park	South	
103	Los Angeles Maritime Museum	**2.5**	Historic Landmark Site	South	
63	Lou Costello Jr Recreation Center	**3.46**	Large Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	
95	MacArthur Park	**29.90**	Large Community Park	Cen/East	
137	Madison West Park	**0.52**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
87	Marson Street Pocket Park	**0.29**	Mini Park	North	
139	Martin Luther King Jr Park	**6.53**	Large Neighborhood Park	South	
134	Mary McLeod Bethune Mid. Sch. (CSP)	**8.20**	Community School Park	South	
102	McKinley Avenue Park	**0.11**	Mini Park	South	
135	Monsignor Ramon Garcia Rec Center	**6.49**	Large Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	
122	Montecito Heights Recreation Center	**22.53**	Large Community Park	Cen/East	

SECOND PRIORITY

Rank	Title	Size (Acres)	PNA Classification	Region	Composite Score
75	Normandie Recreation Center	**3.27**	Large Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	
52	North San Fernando Park	**0.24**	Mini Park	North	
83	Obama Global Prep Academy (CSP)	**3.00**	Community School Park	South	
60	Orchard Ave Park	**0.14**	Mini Park	South	
106	Orthopedic Hospital UAP	**0.33**	Mini Park	South	
34	Parkview Photo Center	**0.96**	Single Purpose Site	Cen/East	
76	Parque Nativo Lopez	**0.72**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
82	Parthenia Park	**1.42**	Neighborhood Park	North	
68	Pecan Recreation Center	**4.28**	Large Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	
118	Pershing Square	**4.44**	Community Park	Cen/East	
39	PerSquareMile - Boyle Heights	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	Cen/East	
55	PerSquareMile - Central-Alameda	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	South	
59	PerSquareMile - Central-Alameda-N.	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	South	
41	PerSquareMile - E Hollywood-Ktown	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	Cen/East	
140	PerSquareMile - East Hollywood	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	Cen/East	
38	PerSquareMile - Florence	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	South	
100	PerSquareMile - Harvard Heights-Pico	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	South	
62	PerSquareMile - Harvard Park	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	South	
27	PerSquareMile - Historic South Central	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	South	
57	PerSquareMile - Koreatown	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	South	
98	PerSquareMile - North Hills	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	North	
136	PerSquareMile - Panorama City West	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	North	
89	PerSquareMile - Reseda	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	North	
53	PerSquareMile - South Panorama City	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	North	
46	PerSquareMile - South Park-Florence	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	South	
30	PerSquareMile - Sun Valley	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	North	
48	PerSquareMile - Tarzana-Encino	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	North	
32	PerSquareMile - Van Nuys Central	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	North	
26	PerSquareMile - Van Nuys East	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	North	
56	PerSquareMile - Van Nuys West	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	North	
131	PerSquareMile - Vermont Knolls	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	South	
31	PerSquareMile - Vermont-Slauson	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	South	
40	PerSquareMile - Vermont-South Park	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	South	
130	PerSquareMile - Windsor Square	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	Cen/East	
33	PerSquareMile - Winetka	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	North	
67	Pio Union Community Garden	**0.29**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
51	Prospect Park	**2.71**	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	
115	Ramona Elementary School (CSP)	**1.48**	Community School Park	Cen/East	
109	Reseda Park	**29.68**	Large Community Park	North	
105	Reseda Skate Facility	**2.28**	Single Purpose Site	North	
47	Richardson Family Park	**0.32**	Mini Park	South	
123	Roosevelt High School Pool	**1.49**	School Pool	Cen/East	
164	Ross Snyder Recreation Center	**11.34**	Community Park	South	
96	Ross Valencia Community Park	**0.30**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
166	Runnymede Park	**5.93**	Large Neighborhood Park	North	
50	Selma Park	**0.22**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
108	Senator Bill Greene Memorial Park	**0.47**	Mini Park	South	
149	Sepulveda Basin Recreation Area	**1542.46**	Regional Park	North	
117	South Broadway Pocket Park	**0.1**	Mini Park	South	
99	South Palos Verdes Street Park	**0.41**	Mini Park	South	
54	Spring Street Park	**0.80**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
113	State Street Recreation Center	**2.62**	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	
154	Strathern Park, West	**9.40**	Greenway	North	
133	Sun Valley Park	**17.26**	Community Park	North	

SECOND PRIORITY

Rank	Title	Size (Acres)	PNA Classification	Region	Composite Score
173	Telfair Park	**1.29**	Neighborhood Park	North	
35	Toberman Recreation Center	**2.74**	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	
116	Trinity Recreation Center	**2.06**	Neighborhood Park	South	
85	Van Nuys Multipurpose Center	**1.4**	Neighborhood Park	North	
146	Vanalden Park	**10.89**	Community Park	North	
168	Vermont Gage Park	**0.31**	Mini Park	South	
42	Wabash Recreation Center	**1.87**	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	
148	Wall Street Community Park	**0.10**	Mini Park	South	
159	Watts Senior Citizen Center	**1.30**	Neighborhood Park	South	
93	West Adam Heights Park	**0.09**	Mini Park	South	
81	Western And Gage Community Park	**0.15**	Mini Park	South	
138	Wilmington Athletic Complex	**18.87**	Community Park	South	
143	Wilmington Town Square	**0.48**	Mini Park	South	
127	Winnetka Recreation Center	**15.95**	Community Park	North	

THIRD PRIORITY

Rank	Title	Size (Acres)	PNA Classification	Region	Composite Score
204	109th Street Recreation Center	**3.17**	Large Neighborhood Park	South	
315	Albert Piantanida Intergen. Cntr	**2.66**	Neighborhood Park	North	
198	Allegheny Park	**1.05**	Neighborhood Park	North	
175	Anderson Memorial Senior Citizen Cntr	**1.62**	Neighborhood Park	South	
232	Andres + Maria Cardenas Rec Cntr	**0.70**	Neighborhood Park	North	
263	Arroyo Seco Park	**87.46**	Regional Park	Cen/East	
218	Ascot Hills Park	**92.44**	Regional Nature Park	Cen/East	
264	Baldwin Hills Recreation Center	**10.87**	Community Park	South	
174	Bandini Canyon Park	**4.97**	Linear Park	South	
253	Banning High School Pool	**0.52**	School Pool	South	
249	Barnsdall Park	**14.59**	Historic Landmark Site	Cen/East	
258	Bellaire Avenue Park	**0.14**	Mini Park	North	
310	Bellevue Recreation Center	**9.11**	Large Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	
306	Benny H Potter W. Adams Ave Mem Pk	**1.62**	Neighborhood Park	South	
261	Betty F Day Park	**0.12**	Mini Park	South	
223	Brand Park	**17.75**	Community Park	North	
180	Cabrillo Beach	**40.07**	Beach	South	
245	Campo De Cahuenga	**0.73**	Historic Landmark Site	North	
283	Carey Ranch Park	**23.80**	Large Community Park	North	
313	Carlin G Smith Recreation Center	**2.64**	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	
328	Charles F Lummis Home and Gardens	**1.75**	Historic Landmark Site	Cen/East	
327	Chatsworth Park South	**73.07**	Regional Nature Park	North	
184	Chesterfield Square Park	**1.89**	Neighborhood Park	South	
222	Chevy Chase Park	**2.44**	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	
269	Country Club Heritage Park	**0.08**	Mini Park	South	
193	Cypress Park Club House	**0.18**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
307	Cypress Recreation Center	**3.49**	Large Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	
196	De Garmo Park	**1.64**	Linear Park	North	
252	De Longpre Park	**1.4**	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	
200	Delano Recreation Center	**4.45**	Large Neighborhood Park	North	
242	Devonshire Arleta Park	**1.82**	Neighborhood Park	North	
243	Devonwood Park	**4.84**	Large Neighborhood Park	North	
248	Downey Recreation Center	**10.87**	Community Park	Cen/East	
236	Drew Street Park	**0.12**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
219	Drum Barracks Civil War Museum	**0.92**	Historic Landmark Site	South	
303	East Wilmington Greenbelt Comm Cntr	**0.85**	Mini Park	South	
212	East Wilmington Vest Pocket Park	**0.13**	Mini Park	South	

THIRD PRIORITY

Rank	Title	Size (Acres)	PNA Classification	Region	Composite Score
237	Echo Park	**28.41**	Regional Park	Cen/East	
230	El Dorado Avenue Park	**1.18**	Linear Park	North	
289	El Sereno Arroyo Playground	**2.35**	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	
190	El Sereno Senior Citizen Center	**0.91**	Single Purpose Site	Cen/East	
342	Elysian Valley Recreation Center	**1.99**	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	
251	Everett Park	**0.53**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
332	Fernangeles Recreation Center	**9.26**	Large Neighborhood Park	North	
266	Fox And Laurel Park	**0.28**	Mini Park	North	
246	Garden Grove Elementary School (CSP)	**3.00**	Community School Park	North	
284	Genesee Avenue Park	**0.75**	Mini Park	South	
192	Gilbert W Lindsay Recreation Center	**14.62**	Community Park	South	
268	Gladys Jean Wesson Park	**0.21**	Mini Park	South	
321	Glassell Park Rec Cen. and Youth Cen.	**12.69**	Community Park	Cen/East	
301	Glenhurst Park	**0.29**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
279	Greayer's Oak Park	**0.60**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
270	Green Meadows Recreation Center	**7.64**	Large Neighborhood Park	South	
265	Griffith Park	**4574.35**	Regional Park	North	
195	Hansen Dam Recreation Area	**1450**	Regional Park	North	
329	Harbor City Park	**11.1**	Community Park	South	
340	Harbor Highlands Park	**3.24**	Large Neighborhood Park	South	
240	Heritage Square	**4.16**	Historic Landmark Site	Cen/East	
275	Hollywood Recreation Center	**3.12**	Large Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	
288	Howard Finn Park	**3.66**	Large Neighborhood Park	North	
305	Hubert H Humphrey Memorial Park	**9.99**	Large Neighborhood Park	North	
181	Isidore B Dockweiler State Beach	**228.31**	Beach	West	
255	Jackie Tatum / Harvard Rec Center	**12.88**	Community Park	South	
229	Jaime Beth Slavin Park	**7.00**	Large Neighborhood Park	North	
176	James Slauson Recreation Center	**3.63**	Large Neighborhood Park	South	
250	Jim Gilliam Recreation Center	**17.63**	Community Park	South	
311	John Quimby Park	**3.82**	Large Neighborhood Park	North	
320	Kagel Canyon Park	**3.46**	Large Neighborhood Park	North	
322	La Mirada Park	**0.17**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
286	La Tierra de la Culebra	**0.56**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
241	Lacy Street Neighborhood Park	**0.37**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
207	Lafayette Recreation Center	**9.72**	Large Neighborhood Park	South	
205	Lanark Recreation Center	**19.20**	Community Park	North	
239	LAR Greenway - Brown's Creek	**3.66**	Greenway	North	
273	LAR Greenway - Coldwater to Whitsett	**2.30**	Greenway	North	
323	LAR Greenway - Sepulveda to Kester	**2.59**	Greenway	North	
213	LAR Greenway / Elysian Valley Bikeway	**4.82**	Greenway	Cen/East	
259	Larissa Parkway	**0.22**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
254	Las Palmas Senior Citizen Center	**1.14**	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	
206	Laurel and Hardy Park	**0.32**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
214	Leimert Plaza	**1.14**	Neighborhood Park	South	
331	Leland Recreation Center	**15.76**	Community Park	South	
290	Lemon Grove Recreation Center	**3.87**	Large Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	
271	Leslie N Shaw Park	**0.66**	Mini Park	South	
210	Lexington Avenue Pocket Park	**0.17**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
282	Limekiln Canyon Park	**95.78**	Canyon Park	North	
325	Lincoln Heights Recreation Center	**2.88**	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	
297	Lincoln Heights Youth Center	**0.74**	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	
304	Linnie Canal Park	**0.13**	Mini Park	West	
316	Little Landers Park	**1.14**	Historic Landmark Site	North	
278	Los Angeles Sister Cities Plaza	**0.33**	Mini Park	South	

THIRD PRIORITY

Rank	Title	Size (Acres)	PNA Classification	Region	Composite Score
312	Louise Park	**6.48**	Large Neighborhood Park	North	
300	Lummis Public Forest Park	**0.29**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
216	Madison Ave Park and Comm Garden	**0.56**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
309	Mascot Park	**0.19**	Mini Park	South	
203	Mecca Avenue Park	**0.18**	Mini Park	North	
274	Media Park	**1.00**	Neighborhood Park	West	
189	Mount Carmel Recreation Center	**3.41**	Large Neighborhood Park	South	
262	Mount Olympus Park	**8.91**	Neighborhood Nature Park	Cen/East	
224	Nevin Avenue Park	**0.26**	Mini Park	South	
215	North East Valley Multipurpose Center	**2**	Neighborhood Park	North	
324	North Hollywood Recreation Center	**55.60**	Regional Park	North	
225	North Weddington Recreation Center	**10.21**	Community Park	North	
317	Northridge Middle School (CSP)	**11.58**	Community School Park	North	
302	Old Mission Trail	**13.60**	Linear Park	North	
314	Open Magnet Charter School (CSP)	**2.80**	Community School Park	West	
318	Oro Vista Park	**8.23**	Large Neighborhood Park	North	
336	Pacific Region Headquarters	**2.62**	Single Purpose Site	South	
257	Panorama City Recreation Center	**6.00**	Large Neighborhood Park	North	
194	Patton St Pocket Park	**0.40**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
187	PerSquareMile - Arleta	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	North	
343	Pio Pico Library Pocket Park	**0.55**	Mini Park	South	
220	Pio Pico Middle School (CSP)	**3.54**	Community School Park	South	
201	Point Fermin Park	**39.13**	Community Park	South	
185	Ralph C Daniels Field Sports Center	**3.59**	Large Neighborhood Park	South	
256	Ritchie Valens Paxton Rec Center	**25.77**	Large Community Park	North	
235	Rockwood Community Park	**0.43**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
234	Roger W Jessup Park	**14.41**	Community Park	North	
272	Rose Hill Recreation Center	**2.26**	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	
267	Rosecrans Recreation Center	**10.55**	Community Park	South	
333	Runyon Canyon Park	**141.50**	Canyon Park	North	
179	Saint Andrews Recreation Center	**8.58**	Large Neighborhood Park	South	
326	San Juan Garage	**0.12**	Single Purpose Site	West	
285	San Pedro Plaza Park	**3.51**	Linear Park	South	
233	San Pedro Welcome Park	**0.40**	Mini Park	South	
226	SE Valley Roller & Skateboard Park	**2.20**	Single Purpose Site	North	
276	Seily Rodriguez Park	**0.34**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
337	Seoul International Park	**3.47**	Large Neighborhood Park	South	
292	Sepulveda Recreation Center	**10.59**	Community Park	North	
186	Shatto Recreation Center	**5.45**	Large Neighborhood Park	South	
221	Sheldon-Arleta Park	**45.16**	Regional Park	North	
291	Sherman Oaks Castle Park	**4.98**	Single Purpose Site	North	
227	South LA Wetlands Park	**9.01**	Large Neighborhood Park	South	
228	South Los Angeles Sports Activity Cntr	**1.00**	Single Purpose Site	South	
208	South Park Recreation Center	**18.25**	Community Park	South	
293	South Seas House Park	**1.03**	Historic Landmark Site	South	
335	South Weddington Park	**14.48**	Community Park	North	
183	Stetson Ranch Park	**28.31**	Large Community Park	North	
247	Stonehurst Recreation Center	**13.71**	Community Park	North	
209	Strathern Park - North	**12.74**	Community Park	North	
287	Sycamore Grove Park	**15.87**	Community Park	Cen/East	
280	Tarzana Recreation Center	**5.57**	Large Neighborhood Park	North	
244	Tiara Street Park	**1.56**	Neighborhood Park	North	
295	Tobias Avenue Park	**1.61**	Neighborhood Park	North	
338	Triangle Park	**0.09**	Mini Park	West	

THIRD PRIORITY

Rank	Title	Size (Acres)	PNA Classification	Region	Composite Score
277	Tujunga Greenbelt	**8.22**	Greenway	North	
330	Tujunga Infiltration Galleries	**47.37**	Regional Park	North	
238	Unidad Park	**0.32**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
182	Valley Plaza Park	**77.64**	Large Community Park	North	
199	Van Ness Recreation Center	**7.81**	Large Neighborhood Park	South	
202	Van Nuys Recreation Center	**3.90**	Large Neighborhood Park	North	
281	Venice Beach	**160.75**	Beach	West	
294	Verdugo Hills Pool	**0.75**	School Pool	North	
178	Vermont Square Park	**3.01**	Large Neighborhood Park	South	
191	Vernon Branch Library Pocket Park	**0.15**	Mini Park	South	
177	Victory-Vineland Recreation Center	**6.48**	Large Neighborhood Park	North	
298	Vineyard Recreation Center	**0.93**	Mini Park	South	
339	Vista Del Mar Park	**1.41**	Neighborhood Park	West	
341	Warner Ranch Park	**16.68**	Community Park	North	
231	Washington Irving Pocket Park	**0.13**	Mini Park	South	
319	Watts Cultural Crescent	**2.96**	Linear Park	South	
296	Watts Serenity Park	**1.12**	Neighborhood Park	South	
197	Watts Skate Park	**0.79**	Single Purpose Site	South	
188	West Lakeside Street Park	**6.16**	Large Neighborhood Park	North	
211	Westside Neighborhood Park	**3.98**	Linear Park	South	
217	White Point Park Nature Preserve	**95.00**	Regional Nature Park	South	
260	Whitnall Highway Park	**10.52**	Linear Park	North	
334	Will Rogers State Beach	**102.90**	Beach	West	
308	Woodbridge Park	**4.71**	Large Neighborhood Park	North	
299	Yucca Community Center	**0.97**	Mini Park	Cen/East	

FOURTH PRIORITY

459	Aliso Canyon Park	**60.45**	Canyon Park	North	
355	Alizondo Drive Park	**6.65**	Linear Park	North	
361	Alma Park	**2.26**	Neighborhood Park	South	
453	Amoroso Triangle	**0.03**	Mini Park	West	
358	Andres Pico Adobe Park	**2.20**	Historic Landmark Site	North	
363	Angels Gate Park	**70.44**	Regional Park	South	
413	Averill Park	**10.75**	Community Park	South	
357	Banning Park	**21.09**	Large Community Park	South	
414	Bee Canyon Park	**22.21**	Canyon Park	North	
386	Bell Canyon Park	**122.78**	Regional Nature Park	North	
447	Bill Rosendahl Del Rey Park	**4.82**	Large Neighborhood Park	West	
370	Branford Recreation Center	**13.38**	Community Park	North	
377	Bridewell Armory	**1.90**	Single Purpose Site	Cen/East	
366	Browns Creek Park	**51.99**	Canyon Park	North	
344	Budd Wiener Park	**0.79**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
410	Buena Vista Park	**8.71**	Large Neighborhood Park	North	
372	Caplow Property	**16.96**	Community Nature Park	North	
421	Carthay Circle Park	**0.97**	Greenway	West	
368	Chatsworth Oaks Park	**2.90**	Neighborhood Park	North	
371	Chatsworth Park North	**24.15**	Large Community Park	North	
391	Chatsworth Reservoir Site	**149.54**	Regional Park	North	
417	Cheviot Hills Recreation Center	**182.61**	Large Community Park	West	
375	Claude Pepper Senior Citizen Center	**0.40**	Single Purpose Site	South	
423	Cleland Avenue Bicentennial Park	**0.92**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
446	Cleveland High School Pool	**0.79**	School Pool	North	
415	Cohasset-Melba Park	**2.00**	Neighborhood Park	North	

FOURTH PRIORITY

Rank	Title	Size (Acres)	PNA Classification	Region	Composite Score
350	Corbin Canyon Park	**40.51**	Regional Nature Park	North	
369	Costanso Fire Station 84 Park	**0.36**	Mini Park	North	
477	Crescent Place Triangle	**0.02**	Mini Park	West	
430	Dearborn Park	**9.12**	Large Neighborhood Park	North	
471	Deervale-Stone Canyon Park	**79.40**	Regional Nature Park	North	
440	Del Rey Lagoon	**10.99**	Community Park	West	
382	Eagle Rock City Hall	**0.32**	Historic Landmark Site	Cen/East	
393	Eagle Rock Hillside Park	**27.58**	Community Nature Park	Cen/East	
463	Eagle Rock Historical Landmark	**2.17**	Historic Landmark Site	Cen/East	
466	Eagle Rock Recreation Center	**20.68**	Large Community Park	Cen/East	
408	East Wilmington Greenbelt Park	**3.96**	Linear Park	South	
445	Eddleston Park	**6.31**	Neighborhood Nature Park	North	
359	El Escorpion Park	**61.29**	Regional Nature Park	North	
406	Eleanor Green Roberts Aquatic Center	**0.75**	Single Purpose Site	South	
451	Fairfax Senior Citizen Center	**0.38**	Single Purpose Site	West	
379	Fallbrook Park	**0.30**	Mini Park	North	
352	Fehlhaber-Houk Park	**1.16**	Neighborhood Park	North	
399	Felicia Mahood Multipurpose Center	**0.82**	Single Purpose Site	West	
364	Franklin-Ivar Park	**0.93**	Mini Park	North	
405	Gaffey Street "Field of Dreams"	**17.95**	Community Park	South	
468	Garvanza Park	**5.59**	Large Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	
411	Granada Hills Recreation Center	**17.76**	Community Park	North	
428	Granada Hills Youth Recreation Center	**18.22**	Community Park	North	
354	Guardia Park	**3.08**	Large Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	
395	Haines Canyon Park	**52.38**	Regional Nature Park	North	
412	Harbor Gateway Park	**0.08**	Mini Park	South	
474	Harold A Henry Park	**1.60**	Neighborhood Park	West	
439	Highland Park Recreation Center	**5.41**	Large Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	
381	Highland Park Senior Citizen Center	**3.81**	Large Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	
457	Holleigh Bernson Memorial Park	**12.51**	Community Park	North	
396	Holmby Park	**8.52**	Large Neighborhood Park	West	
473	Irving Schacter Park	**0.31**	Mini Park	West	
441	Jane and Bert Boeckmann Park	**50.11**	Regional Park	North	
346	Jessie Owens Mini-Park	**1.64**	Neighborhood Park	North	
402	Juntos Family Park	**1.64**	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	
365	Knapp Ranch Park	**69.11**	Regional Park	North	
404	LA Center for Enriched Studies	**7.44**	School Pool	South	
455	La Tuna Canyon Park	**73.61**	Regional Nature Park	North	
397	Lake Street Park	**1.52**	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	
392	Lanark Shelby Mini-Park	**0.27**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
449	LAR Greenway - Laurel Canyon Gwy	**3.04**	Greenway	North	
424	LAR Greenway - Laurelgrove Ped Bridge	**0.03**	Greenway	North	
470	Laurel Canyon Mulholland Park	**1.71**	Neighborhood Park	North	
444	Laurel Canyon Park	**23.44**	Large Community Park	North	
426	Lookout Point Park	**1.39**	Neighborhood Park	South	
427	Mae Boyar Recreation Center	**2.23**	Neighborhood Park	North	
472	Marco Triangle	**0.03**	Mini Park	West	
351	Martin J Bogdanovich Recreation Cntr	**13.52**	Community Park	South	
347	Mason Recreation Center	**17.07**	Community Park	North	
362	McGroarty Park and Cultural Art Center	**16.89**	Historic Landmark Site	North	
420	Moon Canyon Park	**4.49**	Neighborhood Nature Park	Cen/East	
460	Moonshine Canyon Park	**25.88**	Canyon Park	North	
383	Norman O Houston Park	**9.50**	Large Neighborhood Park	South	
388	Normandale Recreation Center	**8.32**	Large Neighborhood Park	South	

FOURTH PRIORITY

Rank	Title	Size (Acres)	PNA Classification	Region	Composite Score
345	North Hills Community Park	**3.89**	Large Neighborhood Park	North	
418	Northridge Recreation Center	**24.02**	Large Community Park	North	
456	Nowita Triangle	**0.03**	Mini Park	West	
462	Oakridge Residence	**9.34**	Historic Landmark Site	North	
443	O'Melveny Park	**695.71**	Regional Nature Park	North	
454	Orcutt Ranch Horticultural Center	**24.10**	Historic Landmark Site	North	
467	Palisades Park (Pacific Palisades)	**26.43**	Community Nature Park	West	
403	Palisades Park (Porter Ranch)	**113.65**	Canyon Park	North	
448	Palisades-Asilomar Park	**1.44**	Greenway	West	
398	Peck Park	**74.52**	Regional Park	South	
400	Pilson Property	**14.59**	Community Nature Park	North	
416	Porter Ranch Park	**40.96**	Canyon Park	North	
458	Porter Ridge Park	**17.78**	Community Park	North	
452	Queen Anne Recreation Center	**5.23**	Large Neighborhood Park	South	
419	Ramona Hall Community Center	**1.43**	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	
348	Rancho Cienega Park	**28.97**	Large Community Park	South	
407	Reynier Park	**1.03**	Neighborhood Park	South	
373	Rio de Los Angeles State Park	**39.39**	Large Community Park	Cen/East	
378	Robert L Burns Park	**1.68**	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	
437	Roscoe-Valley Circle Park	**44.35**	Regional Nature Park	North	
436	Sean Brown Park	**5.97**	Large Neighborhood Park	North	
349	Serrania Avenue Park	**36.54**	Large Community Park	North	
409	Silver Lake Meadows Park	**3.45**	Large Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	
432	Silver Lake Recreation Center	**3.93**	Large Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	
387	Stoney Point Park	**29.06**	Community Nature Park	North	
425	Sunland Park	**14.32**	Community Park	North	
384	Sylmar Recreation Center	**19.78**	Community Park	North	
429	Temescal Canyon Park	**37.59**	Canyon Park	West	
433	Titmouse Park	**0.29**	Mini Park	West	
465	Tommy Lasorda's Field of Dreams	**1.80**	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	
476	Trask Triangle Park	**0.24**	Mini Park	West	
374	Valley Glen Community Park	**5.70**	Large Neighborhood Park	North	
464	Van Norman Lakes Reservoir	**10.90**	Community Park	North	
442	Van Nuys Sherman Oaks War Mem Park	**65.18**	Large Community Park	North	
422	Venice High School Pool	**1.47**	School Pool	West	
390	Venice Reservoir Site	**14.33**	Community Park	West	
353	Verdugo Mountain Park	**587.97**	Regional Nature Park	North	
389	Veterans' Barrington Park	**13.73**	Community Park	West	
367	Via Dolce Park	**0.14**	Mini Park	West	
450	Viking Park	**10.07**	Community Park	North	
385	Wattles Garden Park	**47.58**	Canyon Park	North	
461	West Hills Sport Center	**15.05**	Community Park	North	
401	Westminster Park	**2.24**	Neighborhood Park	West	
435	Westwood Gardens Park	**0.29**	Mini Park	West	
431	Westwood Recreation Center	**26.70**	Large Community Park	West	
376	Wilbur-Tampa Park	**7.29**	Large Neighborhood Park	North	
394	William S Hart Park - Dog Park	**0.83**	Mini Park	North	
356	Wilmington Recreation Center	**7.31**	Large Neighborhood Park	South	
434	Woodbine Park	**0.67**	Mini Park	West	
469	Woodland Hills Recreation Center	**18.76**	Community Park	North	
360	Woodside Triangle	**0.17**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
438	York Blvd Pocket Park	**0.29**	Mini Park	Cen/East	
380	Yosemite Recreation Center	**10.00**	Community Park	Cen/East	

FIFTH PRIORITY

Rank	Title	Size (Acres)	PNA Classification	Region	Composite Score
505	Barrington Recreation Center	**4.91**	Large Neighborhood Park	West	
506	Beverly Glen Park	**85.74**	Regional Nature Park	West	
497	Briarwood Park	**10.75**	Community Park	West	
490	Castle Peak Park	**3.09**	Large Neighborhood Park	North	
498	Club Circle Park	**0.30**	Mini Park	West	
517	Coldwater Canyon Park	**41.16**	Regional Park	North	
511	Crestwood Hills Recreation Center	**15.78**	Community Park	West	
518	De Neve Square Park	**0.61**	Mini Park	West	
502	El Paseo De Cahuenga Park	**1.29**	Neighborhood Park	North	
491	Encino Park	**5.27**	Large Neighborhood Park	North	
489	Gateway Triangle	**0.04**	Mini Park	West	
482	George Wolfberg Park at Potrero Canyn	**35.49**	Canyon Park	West	
504	Lazy J Ranch Park	**8.43**	Large Neighborhood Park	North	
480	Los Angeles High Memorial Park	**2.51**	Neighborhood Park	West	
507	Mandeville Canyon Park	**131.20**	Regional Nature Park	West	
495	Mar Vista Recreation Center	**18.51**	Community Park	West	
487	Marco Place Parkway	**0.03**	Mini Park	West	
484	Moorpark Park	**3.22**	Large Neighborhood Park	North	
496	Mulholland View Site No 16	**0.21**	Mini Park	North	
478	Oakwood Recreation Center	**3.63**	Large Neighborhood Park	West	
493	Palisades Recreation Center	**17.54**	Community Park	West	
485	Palms Recreation Center	**4.81**	Large Neighborhood Park	West	
512	Pan Pacific Park	**32.18**	Large Community Park	West	
514	Penmar Recreation Center	**64.71**	Community Park	West	
501	Poinsettia Recreation Center	**6.29**	Large Neighborhood Park	West	
481	Rena Park	**1.28**	Neighborhood Park	South	
494	Rinaldi Park	**0.08**	Mini Park	North	
516	Rivas Canyon Park	**25.76**	Community Nature Park	West	
492	Robertson Recreation Center	**1.24**	Neighborhood Park	West	
513	Rustic Canyon Park	**44.69**	Regional Nature Park	West	
510	Rustic Canyon Recreation Center	**8.95**	Large Neighborhood Park	West	
508	San Vicente Mountain Park	**31.45**	Community Nature Park	West	
499	Santa Ynez Canyon Park	**337.84**	Canyon Park	West	
503	Shadow Ranch Park	**12.03**	Community Park	North	
486	Steers Property	**21.35**	Community Nature Park	West	
483	Stoner Recreation Center	**8.66**	Large Neighborhood Park	West	
479	Studio City Recreation Center	**8.46**	Large Neighborhood Park	North	
515	Sullivan Canyon Park	**23.29**	Community Nature Park	West	
488	Taxco Trails Park	**2.45**	Neighborhood Park	North	
500	Venice of America Centennial Park	**0.89**	Mini Park	West	
509	Westchester Recreation Center	**23.58**	Large Community Park	West	

Acronyms

LAR - LA River
Cny - Canyon
Cntr - Center
CSP - Community School Park
Rec - Recreation

SOURCES

1. "Parks and Recreation Is Essential," National Recreation and Park Association, accessed June 25, 2025, https://www.nrpa.org/our-work/building-a-movement/parks-and-recreation-is-essential/.

2. Billie Giles-Corti, Melissa H Broomhall, Matthew Knuiman, Catherine Collins, Kate Douglas, Kevin Ng, et al., "Increasing Walking: How Important Is Distance to, Attractiveness, and Size of Public Open Space?" American Journal of Preventive Medicine 28.2 (2005): 169-176, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2004.10.018.

3. Caoimhe Twohig-Bennett and Andy Jones, "The Health Benefits of the Great Outdoors: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Greenspace Exposure and Health Outcomes," Environmental Research 166 (2018): 628-637, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2018.06.030.

4. Jean C. Bikomeye, Sima Namin, Chima Anyanwu, Caitlin S. Rublee, Jamie Ferschinger ,Ken Leinbach, et al. "Resilience and Equity in a Time of Crises: Investing in Public Urban Greenspace Is Now More Essential than Ever in the US and Beyond," International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health 18.16 (2021): 8420, https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18168420.

5. "Doctor Recommended," Park Pulse, National Recreation and Park Association, May 2025, https://www.nrpa.org/publications-research/park-pulse/doctor-recommended/.

6. "Doctor Recommended," Park Pulse, National Recreation and Park Association, May 2025, https://www.nrpa.org/publications-research/park-pulse/doctor-recommended/.

7. Deborah A. Cohen, Meghan Talarowski, Bing Han, Stephanie Williamson, Emily Galfond, Deborah R. Young, et al., "Playground Design: Contribution to Duration of Stay and Implications for Physical Activity," International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health 20.5 (2023): 4661, https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20054661.

8. National Recreation and Park Association, 2024 Engagement with Parks Report, https://www.nrpa.org/contentassets/257fe28053c6420786927fcffc2f9996/2024nrpaengagementreport.pdf.

9. Dayna S. Alexander, Larissa R. Brunner Huber, Crystal R. Piper, and Amanda E. Tanner, "The Association between Recreational Parks, Facilities and Childhood Obesity: A Cross-Sectional Study of the 2007 National Survey of Children's Health," Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health 67.5 (2013): 427-431, https://doi.org/10.1136/jech-2012-201301.

10. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. Urban Nature for Human Health and Well-Being: A Research Summary for Communicating the Health Benefits of Urban Trees and Green Space, February 2018, https://www.fs.usda.gov/sites/default/files/fs_media/fs_document/urbannatureforhumanhealthandwellbeing_508_01_30_18.pdf.

11. Aaron Reuben, George W. Rutherford, Jameze James, and Nooshin Razani, "Association of Neighborhood Parks with Child Health in the United States," Preventive Medicine, 141 (2020): 106265, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2020.106265.

12. Susan A. Carlson, Janet E. Fulton, Michael Pratt, Zhou Yang, and E. Kathleen Adams, "Inadequate Physical Activity and Health Care Expenditures in the United States," Progress in Cardiovascular Diseases 57.4 (2015): 315-323, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pcad.2014.08.002.

13. Diarmuid Coughlan, Pedro F. Saint-Maurice, Susan A. Carlson, Janet Fulton, and Charles E. Matthews, "Leisure Time Physical Activity throughout Adulthood Is Associated with Lower Medicare Costs: Evidence from the Linked NIH-AARP Diet and Health Study Cohort." BMJ Open Sport & Exercise Medicine 7.1 (2021): e001038, https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjsem-2021-001038.

14. Meredith A. Barrett, Daphne Miller, Howard and Frumkin, "Parks and Health: Aligning Incentives to Create Innovations in Chronic Disease Prevention." Preventing Chronic Disease 11 (2014): 130407, https://www.cdc.gov/pcd/issues/2014/13_0407.htm.

15. James F. Sallis and Chad Spoon, Making the Case for Designing Active Cities (Active Living Research, February 2015), https://activelivingresearch.org/sites/activelivingresearch.org/files/MakingTheCaseReport.pdf.

16. Roland Sturm and Deborah Cohen, "Proximity to Urban Parks and Mental Health," The Journal of Mental Health Policy and Economics 17.1 (2014): 19, https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4049158/.

17. Will Klein, "Public Attitudes Towards Public Parks And Other Outdoor Public Spaces," Trust for Public Land, Memorandum, May 21, 2025.

18. Lisa Wood, Paula Hooper, Sarah Foster, and Fiona Bull, "Public Green Spaces and Positive Mental Health–Investigating the Relationship between Access, Quantity and Types of Parks and Mental Wellbeing," Health & Place 48 (2017): 63-71, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2017.09.002.

19. David J. Nowak and Gordon M. Heisler, Air Quality Effects of Urban Trees and Parks, Research Series (National Recreation and Park Association, 2010): 1-44, https://www.nrpa.org/globalassets/research/nowak-heisler-summary.pdf.

20. Paul J. Villeneuve, Michael Jerrett, Jason G. Su, Richard T. Burnett, Hong Chen, Amanda J. Wheeler, et al., "A Cohort Study Relating Urban Green Space with Mortality in Ontario, Canada," Environmental Research 115 (2012): 51-58, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2012.03.003.

21. Terry Hartig, Thomas Astell-Burt, Zara Bergsten, Jan Amcoff, Richard Mitchell, and Xiaoqi Feng, "Associations between Greenspace and Mortality Vary Across Contexts of Community Change: A Longitudinal Ecological Study," Journal of Epidemiol Community Health 74.6 (2020): 534-540, https://doi.org/10.1136/jech-2019-213443.

22. Jean C. Bikomeye, Sima Namin, Chima Anyanwu, Caitlin S. Rublee, Jamie Ferschinger, Ken Leinbach, et al., "Resilience and Equity in a Time of Crises: Investing in Public Urban Greenspace Is Now More Essential than Ever in the US and Beyond," International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health 18.16 (2021): 8420, https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18168420.

23. National Recreation and Park Association. Parks and Recreation: Advancing Community Health and Well-Being (2021), https://www.nrpa.org/contentassets/df807077b2ee43f084810f5bb4a7bde1/2021healthwellness.pdf.

24. Deborah A. Cohen, Daniela Golinelli, Stephanie Williamson, Amber Sehgal, Terry Marsh, and Thomas L. McKenzie, "Effects of Park Improvements on Park Use and Physical Activity," American Journal of Preventive Medicine 37.6 (December 2009): 475–80, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2009.07.017.

25. Rachel Smith, "Increasing Art Access Through Parks and Recreation," National Recreation and Park Association, https://www.nrpa.org/parks-recreation-magazine/2023/may/increasing-art-access-through-parks-and-recreation/, published April 2023.

26. Rachel Smith, "Increasing Art Access Through Parks and Recreation," National Recreation and Park Association, https://www.nrpa.org/parks-recreation-magazine/2023/may/increasing-art-access-through-parks-and-recreation/, published April 2023.

27. National Recreation and Park Association, NRPA Agency Performance Review (2025), https://www.nrpa.org/globalassets/research/research-reports/2025-agency-performance-review-report.pdf.

28. National Recreation and Park Association, 2022 Engagement with Parks Report, https://www.nrpa.org/contentassets/257fe28053c6420786927fcffc2f9996/2022engagementreport.pdf.

29. National Recreation and Park Association, 2018 NRPA Out-of-School Time Report, https://prps.org/files/download/documents/out-of-school-time-survey-results-report-2018.pdf.

30. "No-Limits Youth Sports Opportunities," Park Pulse, National Recreation and Park Association, https://www.nrpa.org/publications-research/park-pulse/no-limits-youth-sports-opportunities/.

31. Edmond P. Bowers, Lincoln R. Larson, and Benjamin J. Parry, "Nature as an Ecological Asset for Positive Youth Development: Empirical Evidence From Rural Communities," Frontiers in Psychology 12 (2021): 2159, https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.688574.

32. Gary W. Evans, Siegmar Otto, and Florian G. Kaiser, "Childhood Origins of Young Adult Environmental Behavior," Psychological Science 29.5 (2018): 679-687, https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797617741894.

33. "Cultivating Environmental Stewardship," Park Pulse, National Recreation and Park Association, https://www.nrpa.org/publications-research/park-pulse/cultivating-environmental-stewardship/.

34. Nicole V. DeVille, Linda Powers Tomasso, Olivia P. Stoddard, Grete E. Wilt, Teresa H. Horton, Kathleen L. Wolf, et al., "Time Spent in Nature Is Associated with Increased Pro-Environmental Attitudes and Behaviors," International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health 18.14 (2021): 7498, https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18147498.

35. Susan Strife and Liam Downey, "Childhood Development and Access to Nature: A New Direction for Environmental Inequality Research," Organization & Environment 22.1 (2009): 99-122, https://doi.org/10.1177/1086026609333340.

36. Thomas Beery, "Exploring Access to Nature Play in Urban Parks: Resilience, Sustainability, and Early Childhood," Sustainability 12.12 (2020): 4894, https://doi.org/10.3390/su12124894.

37. Nooshin Razani, Kian Niknam, Nancy M. Wells, Doug Thompson, Nancy K. Hills, Gail Kennedy, et al., "Clinic and Park Partnerships for Childhood Resilience: A Prospective Study of Park Prescriptions," Health & Place 57 (2019): 179-185, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2019.04.008.

38. S. Brent Jackson, Kathryn T. Stevenson, Lincoln R. Larson, M. Nils Peterson, and Erin Seekamp, "Outdoor Activity Participation Improves Adolescents' Mental Health and Well-Being during the COVID-19 Pandemic." International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health 18.5 (March 3, 2021): 2506, https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18052506.

39. National Recreation and Park Association, The Economic Impact of Parks: An Examination of the Fiscal Effects of Operations and Capital Spending by Local Park and Recreation Agencies on the U.S. Economy, 2023, https://www.nrpa.org/contentassets/f568e0ca499743a08148e3593c860fc5/2023-economic-impact-report.pdf.

40. National Recreation and Park Association, The Economic Impact of Parks: An Examination of the Fiscal Effects of Operations and Capital Spending by Local Park and Recreation Agencies on the U.S. Economy, 2023, https://www.nrpa.org/contentassets/f568e0ca499743a08148e3593c860fc5/2023-economic-impact-report.pdf.

41. "Outdoor Recreation Satellite Account, U.S. and States, 2020," U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis, 2021, https://www.bea.gov/news/2021/outdoor-recreation-satellite-account-us-and-states-2020.

SOURCES

42. U.S. Census Bureau, "Local Government Employment and Payroll Data: U.S. and States: 2017 - 2024," Public Sector, PUB Public Sector Annual Surveys and Census of Governments, Table GS00EP03, 2025), accessed on June 25, 2025, https://data.census.gov/table/GOVSTIMESERIES.GS00EP03?q=gs00ep&g=010XX00US,$0400000&nkd=time~2024.

43. "Physical Activity: Park, Trail, and Greenway Infrastructure Interventions when Combined with Additional Interventions," Community Preventive Services Task Force, 2021, accessed on June 25, 2025, https://www.thecommunityguide.org/findings/physical-activity-park-trail-greenway-infrastructure-interventions-combined-additional-interventions.html.

44. Andy Greiner, "39th Annual Corporate & 21st Annual Consultants Surveys: What Business Leaders and Consultants Are Saying About Site Selection," Area Development, accessed on June 25, 2025, https://www.areadevelopment.com/Corporate-Consultants-Survey-Results/q1-2025/39th-annual-corporate-21st-annual-consultants-surveys-what-business-leaders-and-consultants-are-saying-about-site-selection.shtml.

45. The George Mason University Center for Regional Analysis, Promoting Parks and Recreation's Role in Economic Development, National Recreation and Park Association, May 2018, https://www.nrpa.org/link/fd2d6400bf634c45a91edfed15c8c443.aspx.

46. John L. Crompton and Sarah Nicholls, "Impact on Property Values of Distance to Parks and Open Spaces: An Update of U.S. Studies in the New Millennium," Journal of Leisure Research 51:2 (2020): 127-146, https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.2019.1637704.

47. National Recreation and Park Association, 2024 Engagement with Parks Report, https://www.nrpa.org/contentassets/257fe28053c6420786927fcffc2f9996/2024nrpaengagementreport.pdf.

48. John L. Crompton and Sarah Nicholls, "Impact on Property Values of Distance to Parks and Open Spaces: An Update of U.S. Studies in the New Millennium," Journal of Leisure Research 51:2 (2020): 127-146, https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.2019.1637704.

49. "The Important Benefits of a First Job," National Recreation and Park Association, published February 2022, https://www.nrpa.org/publications-research/park-pulse/the-important-benefits-of-a-first-job/.

50. "Parks and Recreation Is Essential," National Recreation and Park Association, accessed on June 25, 2025, https://www.nrpa.org/our-work/building-a-movement/parks-and-recreation-is-essential/.

51. National Recreation and Park Association, 2024 Engagement with Parks Report, https://www.nrpa.org/contentassets/257fe28053c6420786927fcffc2f9996/2024nrpaengagementreport.pdf.

52. National Recreation and Park Association, 2019 Engagement with Parks Report, https://www.nrpa.org/globalassets/engagement-survey-report-2019.pdf.

53. "Parks Come Alive at Night," Park Pulse, National Recreation and Park Association, September 2019, https://www.nrpa.org/publications-research/park-pulse/park-pulse-survey-parks-come-alive-at-night/.

54. Will Klein, "Public Attitudes Towards Public Parks And Other Outdoor Public Spaces," Trust for Public Land, Memorandum, May 21, 2025.

55. M. A. Leavell, J. A. Leiferman, M. Gascon, F. Braddick, J. C. Gonzalez, J. S. Litt, "Nature-Based Social Prescribing in Urban Settings to Improve Social Connectedness and Mental Well-Being: A Review," Current Environmental Health Reports 6.4 (2019): 297-308, https://doi.org/10.1007/s40572-019-00251-7.

56. "Parks and Recreation Is Essential," National Recreation and Park Association, accessed on June 25, 2025, https://www.nrpa.org/our-work/building-a-movement/parks-and-recreation-is-essential/.

57. National Recreation and Park Association, 2024 Engagement with Parks Report, https://www.nrpa.org/contentassets/257fe28053c6420786927fcffc2f9996/2024nrpaengagementreport.pdf.

58. National Recreation and Park Association, 2024 Engagement with Parks Report, https://www.nrpa.org/contentassets/257fe28053c6420786927fcffc2f9996/2024nrpaengagementreport.pdf.

59. "Inclusive Policies and Practices," Park Pulse, National Recreation and Park Association, June 2022, https://www.nrpa.org/publications-research/park-pulse/inclusive-policies-and-practices/.

60. National Recreation and Park Association, 2020 Engagement with Parks Report, https://www.nrpa.org/globalassets/2020-engagement-report.pdf.

61. "Parks and Recreation Is Essential," National Recreation and Park Association, accessed on June 25, 2025, https://www.nrpa.org/our-work/building-a-movement/parks-and-recreation-is-essential/.

62. "Strong Support for Park and Recreation Funding," Park Pulse, National Recreation and Park Association, October 2020, https://www.nrpa.org/publications-research/park-pulse/strong-support-for-park-and-recreation-funding/.

63. "Investing in Environmental Resiliency," Park Pulse, National Recreation and Park Association, April 2025, https://www.nrpa.org/publications-research/park-pulse/investing-in-environmental-resiliency/.

64. National Recreation and Park Association. Parks and Recreation: Advancing Community Health and Well-Being, 2021, https://www.nrpa.org/contentassets/df807077b2ee43f084810f5bb4a7bde1/2021healthwellness.pdf.

65. "Conservation Efforts at Any Age," Park Pulse, National Recreation and Park Association, April 2021, https://www.nrpa.org/publications-research/park-pulse/conservation-efforts-at-any-age/.

66. Barton Robison and Beth Jacob, Greener Parks for Health: Green Infrastructure as a Strategy for Improving Equity and Community Well-Being: Communications Toolkit, National Recreation and Park Association and Willamette Partnership, 2021, https://www.nrpa.org/contentassets/0aa1178a2d944cbc8cb6fbc5ce31b266/greener-parks-for-health-communications-toolkit-web.pdf.

67. David J. Nowak and Gordon M. Heisler, Air Quality Effects of Urban Trees and Parks, Research Series (National Recreation and Park Association, 2010): 1-44, https://www.nrpa.org/globalassets/research/nowak-heisler-summary.pdf.

68. Tiziano Tempesta, "Benefits and Costs of Urban Parks: A Review," Aestimum (2015): 127-143, https://doi.org/10.13128/Aestimum-17943.

69. "Parks Come Alive at Night," Park Pulse, National Recreation and Park Association, September 2019, https://www.nrpa.org/publications-research/park-pulse/park-pulse-survey-parks-come-alive-at-night/.

70. "Parks and Recreation Is Essential," National Recreation and Park Association, accessed on June 25, 2025, https://www.nrpa.org/our-work/building-a-movement/parks-and-recreation-is-essential/.

71. "Parks and Recreation Is Essential," National Recreation and Park Association, accessed on June 25, 2025, https://www.nrpa.org/our-work/building-a-movement/parks-and-recreation-is-essential/.

72. Emily Tipping, "25 Trends in 25 Years," Recreation Management, https://recmanagement.com/articles/154860/25-trends-25-years, published November 7, 2024.

73. Upper Los Angeles River Enhanced Watershed Management Group, Santa Monica Bay Enhanced Watershed Management Group, City of Los Angeles & Los Angeles County Flood Control, Ballona Creek Watershed Management Group, Dominguez Channel Watershed Management Area Group, Marina del Rey Enhanced Watershed Management Program Agencies.

74. "Citywide Community Needs Assessment" (City of Los Angeles, Department of Recreation and Parks, 2009), 1.

75. "Los Angeles Densest Urban Area: Revision of Census Bureau Data | Newgeography.Com," accessed April 23, 2025, https://www.newgeography.com/content/007739-los-angeles-densest-urban-area-revision-census-bureau-data.

76. "Los Angeles, California," Trust for Public Land, accessed April 23, 2025, https://www.tpl.org/city/los-angeles-california.

77. "Gabrielino/Tongva Nation of the Greater Los Angeles Basin – NAHC Digital Atlas," accessed March 28, 2025, https://nahc.ca.gov/cp/tribal-atlas-pages/gabrielino-tongva-nation/.

78. Ibid.

79. "Indigenous Peoples of the LA River Basin – LA River Master Plan," accessed March 28, 2025, https://larivermasterplan.org/about/river-history/indigenous-peoples-of-the-la-river-basin/.

80. Sean Greene and Thomas Curwen, "Mapping the Tongva Villages of L.A.'s Past," www.latimes.com, May 9, 2019, https://www.latimes.com/projects/la-me-tongva-map/.

81. "Riots, Love Fests, Buried Secrets: Griffith Park's Hidden Histories," PBS SoCal, October 16, 2019, https://www.pbssocal.org/shows/lost-la/riots-love-fests-buried-secrets-griffith-parks-hidden-histories.

82. History of Elysian Park," Friends of Elysian Park, accessed April 15, 2025, https://www.elysianpark.org/the-park.

83. "The Origins of Elysian Park," PBS SoCal, June 28, 2013, https://www.pbssocal.org/shows/lost-la/from-worthless-land-to-semi-wild-paradise-the-origins-of-elysian-park.

84. "Sepulveda Basin Vision Plan" (City of Los Angeles, June 2024).

85. Ibid.

86. "Indigenous Peoples of the LA River Basin – LA River Master Plan."

87. "The History of Los Angeles | City of Los Angeles," accessed March 28, 2025, https://lacity.gov/government/history-los-angeles.

88. "Municipal Parks, Recreation, and Leisure, 1886-1978," Los Angeles Citywide Historic Context Statement (City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning, Office of Historic Resources, December 2017), 6.

89. Ibid.

SOURCES

90. "Lincoln Park Boaters - Los Angeles Public Library Photo Collection - Tessa: Photos and Digital Collections," accessed March 31, 2025, https://tessa2.lapl.org/digital/collection/photos/id/35993/rec/6.

91. "100 Years of Recreation and Parks" (Los Angeles: Los Angeles City: Recreation and Parks Department, 1988), 7.

92. Ibid.

93. "Municipal Parks, Recreation, and Leisure, 1886-1978," 8.

94. Galen Cranz, The Politics of Park Design: A History of Urban Parks in America (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1982), pp. 3-59.

95. "Municipal Parks, Recreation, and Leisure, 1886-1978," 9.

96. Ibid, 11.

97. Ibid.

98. Cranz, The Politics of Park Design, 62.

99. "Municipal Parks, Recreation, and Leisure, 1886-1978," 18.

100. "100 Years of Recreation and Parks," 11.

101. Ibid, 15.

102. "Municipal Parks, Recreation, and Leisure, 1886-1978," 22.

103. "Water Lures Many Weekly: Griffith Popular," Los Angeles Times, August 21, 1927.

104. "100 Years of Recreation and Parks," 19.

105. "Municipal Parks, Recreation, and Leisure, 1886-1978," 26.

106. Ibid, 28.

107. "100 Years of Recreation and Parks," 21.

108. Ibid, 31.

109. "City's Recreation Projects Started," Los Angeles Times, August 15, 1948.

110. Robert E.G. Harris, "Los Angeles Enjoying a Boom in Recreation," Los Angeles Times, April 5, 1950.

111. "100 Years of Recreation and Parks," 23.

112. Hise, Greg, William Deverell, and Laurie Olin. 2000. Eden by Design: The 1930 Olmsted-Bartholomew Plan for the Los Angeles Region. University of California Press.

113. "Municipal Parks, Recreation, and Leisure, 1886-1978," 38.

114. Ibid, 42.

115. Ibid, 43.

116. Ibid, 44.

117. "100 Years of Recreation and Parks," 23.

118. Ibid, 27.

119. Ibid, 29.

120. Ibid, 31.

121. "Overview | Bureau of Engineering," accessed April 7, 2025, https://engineering.lacity.gov/about-us/divisions/recreation-and-cultural-facilities/competitive-grants/overview.

122. "Community School Parks | City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks," accessed April 7, 2025, https://www.laparks.org/community-school-parks.

123. City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks, "Overview of the Adopted Fiscal Year 2023-2024 Department of Recreation and Parks Operating Budget,".

124. Ibid.

125. City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks Planning, Maintenance and Construction Branch, Parks Condition Assessment Report, 2018, 2.

126. "City of Los Angeles Proposition SP", accessed April 25, 2025, https://clkrep.lacity.org/election/Proposition_SP.pdf

127. Ibid

128. "The Power of Parks to Promote Health: A Special Report," Trust for Public Land. 24 May 2023.

129. Chesebro, Ray L., Frederick von Schrader, and William H. Neal. Charter of the City of Los Angeles: Annotated, 1935 ed., Sections 173 (p. 107) and 191 (p. 121). Los Angeles, CA: Parker, Stone & Baird Co., 1935. As adopted January 22, 1925, amended through January 9, 1935. With annotations for amendments on January 7, 1937, April 29, 1937, and May 14, 1937.

130. Chesebro, Ray L., Frederick von Schrader, and William H. Neal. Charter of the City of Los Angeles: Annotated, 1935 ed., Section 191 (p. 121). Los Angeles, CA: Parker, Stone & Baird Co., 1935. As adopted January 22, 1925, amended through January 9, 1935. With annotations for amendments on January 7, 1937, April 29, 1937, and May 14, 1937.

131. Chesebro, Ray L., William H. Neal, and Bourke Jones. Charter of the City of Los Angeles: Annotated, 1948 ed., Section 173 (p. 142). Los Angeles, CA: Parker & Company, 1948. Effective July 1, 1925, amended through June 16, 1947.

132. "Tax Computing: Yes on Prop. 3 ..." Los Angeles Times, October 31, 1979.

133. Bergholz, Richard. "Spending, Busing Curbs OKd." Los Angeles Times, November 7, 1979.

134. Hahn, James K. Charter of the City of Los Angeles: Annotated, 1990 ed., 7th Revision, Section 342.1. Los Angeles, CA: American Legal Publishing, 1997. Adopted January 25, 1925 with amendments to and including those approved in the primary and consolidated elections, April 8, 1997.

135. Official City of Los Angeles Charter. Section 593. Cincinnati, OH: American Legal Publishing, 1999. Current through legislation effective March 31, 2025.

136. "Overview of the Adopted Fiscal Year 2024-2025 Department of Recreation and Parks Operating Budget," City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.

137. Full-time positions refer to full-time authorized positions according to data provided by RAP.

138. "History of California Minimum Wage," State of California Department of Industrial Relations, 2025.

139. "LA City Council Votes To Raise Minimum Wage To $15 By 2020," National Public Radio, May 19, 2015, https://www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2015/05/19/408019128/la-city-council-votes-to-raise-minimum-wage-to-15-by-2020.

140. Part-time employees do not equate to full-time employees, but total number of part-time employees. This chart does not include staff funded by administrative allocations from special funds such as Quimby.

141. "2024 City Park Facts," Trust for Public Land, https://www.tpl.org/city-park-facts.

142. Dharam Consulting, "Los Angeles Construction Cost Note," May 2025, 6.

143. Tara Nurin, "With Permanent Pod Parks And Traveling Beer Gardens, Philadelphia Pioneers New Approaches To Placemaking," Forbes, October 4, 2019.

144. Board of Recreation and Park Commissioners, City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks, "Board Report No. 22-146" June 02, 2022.

145. "Exercise classes: Get Healthy on the Railroad. Sponsored by Blue Cross Blue Shield of Alabama," accessed July 23, 10125, https://railroadpark.org/programs/exercise-classes/.

146. NYC Parks, 2022

147. Annual reports and 990s of Brooklyn Bridge Park Corporation, Central Park, Friends of the High Line, Prospect Park Alliance, and Riverside Park Conservancy, 2023.

148. Central Park Conservancy, Annual Report, 2025.

149. "Central Park Conservancy Governance," accessed July 23, 2025, https://www.centralparknyc.org/governance.

150. Los Angeles County Public Works,"Safe Clean Water LA," accessed July 23, 2025, https://dpw.lacounty.gov/wp/safecleanwaterla/about/faq/.

SOURCES

151. Ibid.

152. San Francisco Bay Area Planning and Urban Research Association, "CA Prop 4 Climate Bond," accessed July 23 2024, https://www.spur.org/voter-guide/2024-11/ca-prop-4-climate-bond.

153. Ibid.

154. Los Angeles Charter and Administrative Code, " Sec. 593. Financial Support," accessed July 23, 2025, https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/los_angeles/latest/laac/0-0-0-2833.

155. Note: In 1979 California voters approved Proposition 3, which changed the assessment ratio used across the state to compute property taxes from 25% of market value to 100%. To account for this change and ensure the total allocation to agencies required in the charter would not quadruple in line with the new tax assessment ratio, the City Charter was amended to decrease the allocation share for RAP and other agencies to a quarter of what it had been, which in RAP's case changed the rate from 0.13% to 0.0325%. This meant that even though the technical calculation of assessed value changed, departments continued to receive the same effective share of property tax revenue they were guaranteed under the original formulas.

156. Ballotpedia, "California Proposition 13," accessed July 23, 2025, https://ballotpedia.org/California_Proposition_13,_Tax_Limitations_Initiative_(June_1978).

157. Los Angeles Office of the City Clerk, "Inter-departmental correspondence: Fiscal Impact Of Proposed Charter Amendment For Library Funding," November 16, 2010.

158. Brianna Lee. "Voters shape the LA city budget, too — here's how," LAist, May 13, 2025.

159. City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering, "About Us," accessed July 23, 2025, https://engineering.lacity.gov/about-us/divisions/recreation-and-cultural-facilities/about-us.

160. Engineer's Report for the City of Los Angeles, Landscape and Lighting District No. 96-1, 1996.

161. City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering, "Referendum Ordinance K Proposed Referendum Ordinance for City-Wide Parks, Recreation And Community Facilities Assessment," November 5, 1996.

162. County of Los Angeles Homeless Initiative, "The Facts About Measure A," November 14, 2024, https://homeless.lacounty.gov/news/the-facts-about-measure-a/.

163. Doug Smith, "Your guide to Measure A: Sales tax to fund homelessness programs," Los Angeles Times, October 3, 2024.

164. County of Los Angeles Homeless Initiative, "Measure H Year-One Report Card," August 30, 2018, https://homeless.lacounty.gov/news/measure-h-year-one-report-card/.

165. Los Angeles County Registrar,"LA County Election Results , General Election, November 5, 2024, https://results.lavote.gov/#year=2024&election=4324.

166. City of Los Angeles, "Special Election, Consolidated With California State General Election," November 3, 1998, https://ens.lacity.org/clk/elections/ND4469.htm.

167. City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering, "Los Angeles Zoo Bond & Capital Improvement Program," accessed July 23, 2025, https://engineering.lacity.gov/zoo.

168. California Infrastructure And Economic Development Bank (Ibank), Staff Report Executive Summary, 2020.

TABLE OF FIGURES

Figure 1. O'Melveny Park, located in the Santa Susana Mountains, is one of the largest parks in the City of Los Angeles and features many great places to picnic and hike. Source: Calvada Surveying, Inc, 2025. Found on Page 4

Figure 2. Parks are a foundational part of life for Angelenos of all ages. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 5

Figure 3. The Steering Committee receives an update on PNA progress on May 20, 2025. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 9

Figure 4. Youths play at the Class Parks Summer Kickoff Picnic. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 14

Figure 5. The CicLAvia Heart of LA event engaged users of MacArthur Park. Source: Calvada Surveying, Inc., 2025. Found on Page 16

Figure 6. People fly kites at Angels Gate Park. Source: Connie Chung/HR&A, 2025. Found on Page 19

Figure 7. People paddle swan boats at Echo Park lake. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 35

Figure 8. Each park or park site is listed in the Table of Sites, which lets readers know how it is prioritized, its classification, and its region. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 36

Figure 9. Saint James Park is a park under 100 acres and represented by a 1x1 pixel. Source: Viraj Chauhan/Agency: Artifact, 2025. Found on Page 38

Figure 10. Elysian Park is between 100 and 1,000 acres and is represented by a 2x2 pixel. Source: Nora Healy/Kounkuey Design Initiative, 2025. Found on Page 38

Figure 11. Griffith Park is over 1,000 acres and is represented by a 3x3 pixel. Source: Mary Alice William/The Robert Group, 2025. Found on Page 38

Figure 12. The map above depicts parks represented as park pixels and arranged by their respective regions in the City. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 39

Figure 13. The map on the left shows Park Condition Assessment data visualized by park, while the map on the right shows the same data visualized by park pixel. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 39

Figure 14. The ribbon cutting at the re-opening of Inell Woods Park. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025. Found on Page 40

Figure 15. People play soccer at Rancho Cienega Park. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 40

Figure 16. Children play on the playground at Porter Ridge playground. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 40

Figure 17. Hikers climb a trail in Runyon Canyon. Source: Alex Millauer/Shutterstock, 2017. Found on Page 40

Figure 18. A bench provides a place to rest along a path at North Atwater Park. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 40

Figure 19. Youths playing football at the Class Parks Summer Kickoff Picnic. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 42

Figure 20. This view over Historic Saint James Park in South LA shows the park's walking path and area of native planting. Source: Agency: Artifact, 2025. Found on Page 44

Figure 21. Players participate in youth soccer practice at Boyle Heights Recreation Center in East LA.
Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 47

Figure 22. The City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks opens a Community School Park with the goal of increasing access to parks across communities in LA. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks Found on Page 49

Figure 23. This community resources fair included senior services and job placement at South park Recreation Center in South LA. Source: City of Los Angeles, Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 50

Figure 24. Patton Street Pocket Park is an example of a mini park with community amenities such as a playground and fitness zone. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks Found on Page 53

Figure 25. The 2009 City of LA Park Needs Assessment included evaluation of support for park improvements. Source: Citywide Community Needs Assessment, Page 26, 2009. Found on Page 54

Figure 26. This page showing Hollenbeck Park Condition Assessment is an example of the assessment performed for each park. Source: Parks Condition Assessment Report, City of LA RAP, Page 939, 2018. Found on Page 55

Figure 27. This diagram recognizes gaps in open space in the long range development patterns of the City. Source: City of Los Angeles General Plan, City of LA DRP, Page 40, 2001. Found on Page 55

Figure 28. The City of LA General plan recognizes the benefits of open spaces such as the Hollywood Reservoir. Source: City of Los Angeles General Plan, Open Space Element, City of LA DRP, Page 26, 1973. Photo Credit: Ed. Rondot. Found on Page 56

Figure 29. The Public Recreation Plan guides the development and management of neighborhood and community recreation sites. Source: Public Recreation Plan, Cover Image, 1968. Found on Page 56

Figure 31. The Quimby Act intends to alleviate and mitigate development park pressure. Source: Aerial image of Seoul International Park and surrounding urban landscape. Google Earth Pro Version 7.3.6.10201, Date of imagery: November 20 2023. Found on Page 57

Figure 30. The 2016 Los Angeles County Park Needs Assessment included evaluation of park metrics such as amount of parkland and availability of park amenities. Source: Citywide Community Needs Assessment, LA County DRP, Page 11, 2016. Found on Page 57

Figure 32. The PNA+ identified areas for environmental restoration among other county-wide analyses. Source: 2022 LAC PNA+, LA County DPR, Page 3-6. Found on Page 58

TABLE OF FIGURES

Figure 33. The Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation administers a vast network of open spaces and recreation facilities. Source: The County of Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation Strategic Plan, LA County DRP, Page 16-17, 2023. Found on Page 58

Figure 35. Large urban open spaces allow for public access to parks. Source: Aerial image of O'Melveny Park, Calvada Surveying, Inc, 2025. Found on Page 59

Figure 34. The Plan for a Healthy Los Angeles supported physical activity as an integral facet of healthy living. The plan advocated for public, private, and non-profit partners, including LAUSD, to bring health and wellness programming to LA youth. Source: Plan for a Healthy LA, LADCP, 2021. LAUSD Beyond the Bell, Page 67. Found on Page 59

Figure 36. This map shows projected population density growth from 2019 to 2050 within the City of LA. Source: City Boundary and Parks: City of LA Data Portal, 2025. Roads: US Census Bureau, 2025., LA River: National Hydrography Database, 2025. Projected population density: SCAG Connect SoCal 2024. Found on Page 62

Figure 37. Council Member Monica Rodriguez gives opening remarks for a PNA Community Meeting at Lake View Terrace. Source: The Robert Group, 2025. Found on Page 64

Figure 38. The PNA project timeline included three phases and many different types of outreach. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 66

Figure 39. This map shows the location of the in-person engagement events held across the City this year for the PNA. Source: City Boundary and Parks: City of LA Data Portal, 2025. Roads: US Census Bureau, 2025., LA River: National Hydrography Database, 2025. Found on Page 68

Figure 40. A sensory engagement board at youth events and pop-ups, like pictured here at LASAN Earth Day, encouraged participants to draw what they love most about parks. Source: The Robert Group, 2025. Found on Page 71

Figure 41. Community members converse about pickleball at the community meeting at Ramona Hall. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 72

Figure 42. Residents explore informational boards in a Phase 2 community meeting at Lafayette Recreation Center. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 73

Figure 43. Materials were made available at community meetings including informational boards, flyers, and activity books gave participants a variety of ways to engage with information about the PNA. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 73

Figure 44. A youth advocacy workshop was held at Alpine Recreation Center in Chinatown with the Southeast Asian Community Alliance. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 74

Figure 45. Youth activity and education materials were provided at meetings and for download on the project website. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 74

Figure 46. The YMCA Healthy Day for Kids event included a sensory board for children to draw what they love most about parks. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 75

Figure 47. A walkshop in Venice Beach brought information about the PNA to community members out in the parks. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 75

Figure 48. Equity sessions focused on communities with specialized relationships to parks. Source: Kounkuey Design Initiative. Found on Page 76

Figure 50. Other forms of engagement include videos, social media, and a project website. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 77

Figure 49. Flyers, banners, and QR codes were made available in multiple languages. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 77

Figure 51. Twelve community partner organizations were part of the PNA process to extend outreach. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 78

Figure 52. Draft priorities were presented to the Steering Committee. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 79

Figure 53. Steering Committee members discussed the relative importance of different priorities. Source: Mark Hanna/ Geosyntec, 2025. Found on Page 79

Figure 54. The Technical Advisory Committee met at key milestones. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 79

Figure 55. Community members listen to a presentation at Lincoln Park during Phase 1 engagement. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 80

Figure 56. Community members find their favorite park on the PNA engagement map at a community meeting held at Lafayette Recreation Center. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 82

Figure 57. Bar chart illustrating the various ways people travel to parks and recreation centers. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 89

Figure 58. Community members listening to a presentation at Bellevue Recreation Center during Public Draft PNA, engagement.
Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 100

Figure 59. This bar chart illustrates the most common themes within comments during the Draft PNA Review. Some comments included more than one theme. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 101

Figure 60. Community members looking at the 'Where Are You From' map. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 102

Figure 61. A child slides down a slide at the Inell Woods Park ribbon cutting. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 102

Figure 62. People skate at the Pershing Square ice rink. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 103

Figure 63. Picnic tables at Drum Barracks park complement other seating and a playground. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 104

Figure 64. The Women's Playground Outing in 1936 took place in Griffith Park. Source: Los Angeles Times Photographic Collection. UCLA Library Digital Collections. Found on Page 106

Figure 65. In 1900, only sparse development could be seen around Griffith Park. Source: Los Angeles Public Library Photo Collection. Found on Page 108

TABLE OF FIGURES

Figure 66. The San Gabriel mountains frame the background of the Mission San Gabriel Arcangel. Source: Autry Museum; P.26923. Found on Page 108

Figure 67. Central Park (now Pershing Square) was the other original Spanish-style open plaza that existed when Los Angeles was established. Source: Los Angeles Times Photographic Collection. UCLA Library Digital Collections. Found on Page 109

Figure 68. Plaza Park was one of two original Spanish-style open plazas that existed when Los Angeles was established. Source: Library of Congress, Geography and Map Division Found on Page 109

Figure 69. Marian Skouras and Velda Martin canoe by lotus flowers on Echo Park Lake, Los Angeles, 1935. Source: Los Angeles Times Photographic Collection. UCLA Library Digital Collections. Found on Page 110

Figure 72. Women pose for a photo at Griffith Park Playground. Source: Los Angeles Times Photographic Collection. UCLA Library Digital Collections. Found on Page 111

Figure 71. Bathers enjoy the swimming pool in Griffith Park. Source: Los Angeles Times Photographic Collection. UCLA Library Digital Collections. Found on Page 111

Figure 70. Children splash in a fountain in Echo Park. Source: Los Angeles Times Photographic Collection. UCLA Library Digital Collections. Found on Page 111

Figure 73. A day laborer dumps rocks from a wheelbarrow in Griffith Park, Los Angeles, 1933. Source: Los Angeles Times Photographic Collection. UCLA Library Digital Collections. Found on Page 112

Figure 74. The Elysian Valley reservoir and Dodger Stadium can be seen within Elysian Park, 1987. Source: Los Angeles Times Photographic Collection. UCLA Library Digital Collections. Found on Page 113

Figure 75. Hikers look out over Los Angeles from Griffith Park. Source: Emilio Uranga., Agency: Artifact. Found on Page 115

Figure 76. People kick around soccer balls and walk through MacArthur Park. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks . Found on Page 115

Figure 77. Recreation and parks in Los Angeles have evolved as the City has changed over time. Source: See the Table of Figures for a full list of sources. Found on Page 116

Figure 78. The playground at Highland Recreation Center provides a variety of features to engage children.. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 118

Figure 79. A walking trail winds past a shaded picnic area at Oro Vista Park in the Valley. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 120

Figure 80. RAP's parks range in size from tenths to thousands of acres. Source: OLIN with Park Outlines from the City of LA Data Portal, 2025. Found on Page 120

Figure 83. The playground at Westside Neighborhood Park has a wildlife theme. Source: Calvada Surveying, Inc., 2025. Found on Page 122

Figure 82. Sycamore Grove Park's playground for children sits right next to an outdoor gym for adults. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks, Accessed 2025. Found on Page 122

Figure 81. Griffith Observatory is perched on a promontory with sweeping views. Source: Calvada Surveying, Inc, 2025. Found on Page 122

Figure 84. Korean-inspired sculptures mark the entrance of Angels Gate Park, a regional park in the city's existing park classifications. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks, Accessed 2025. Found on Page 123

Figure 85. People enjoy the lawn at Holmby Park. Source: Viraj Chauhan/Agency: Artifact. Found on Page 124

Figure 87. The Sepulveda Basin Wildlife Refuge is home to a variety of avian and aquatic species. Source: Emilio Uranga/ Agency: Artifact Found on Page 124

Figure 88. Comfort facilities like a water fountain and garbage receptacle line the walking path at St. James Park. Source: Viraj Chauahan/Agency: Artifact. Found on Page 124

Figure 86. Children on the swings at Pan Pacific Park. Source: Connie Chung/HR&A. Found on Page 124

Figure 89. Rail lines and trains attract visitors to the Travel Town Museum. Source: Mary Alice Williams/The Robert Group. Found on Page 124

Figure 90. Mature trees provide shade at Laurel and Hardy Park. Source: Emilio Uranga/Agency: Artifact. Found on Page 125

Figure 92. People ride bikes at Augustus F. Hawkins Nature Park. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 125

Figure 94. The lake is a major attraction in Echo Park. Source: Sarah Swanseen/OLIN. Found on Page 125

Figure 93. Both trees and manmade structures provide shade over playground equipment at Hoover Recreation Center. Source: Viraj Chauahan/Agency: Artifact. Found on Page 125

Figure 91. The Korean Friendship Bell is an iconic structure within Angels Gate Park. Source: Connie Chung/HR&A. Found on Page 125

Figure 95. People playing soccer at Pan Pacific Park in West LA. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 126

Figure 96. To provide a more nuanced analysis of park needs grounded in the lived realities of Angelenos, the PNA divides the City into four geographic regions: East/Central, South, West, and North. Source: City Boundary, Council District Boundaries, and Parks: City of LA Data Portal, 2025. Roads: US Census Bureau, 2025., LA River: National Hydrography Database, 2025. Found on Page 129

Figure 97. The Department of Recreation and Parks is an independent charter department headed by a citizen commission. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks, FY 2024-25 Org Chart, June 2024. Found on Page 130

Figure 98. The Department of Recreation and Parks has a General Manager and Executive Officer who oversee various divisions, all reporting to the Board of Recreation and Park Commissioners. Source: City of Los Angeles, Organization of the City of Los Angeles, July 2021. Found on Page 131

TABLE OF FIGURES

Figure 99. RAP's authority from the City Charter and Administrative Code on parks and recreation facilities. Found on Page 132

Figure 100. RAP's authority from the City Charter and Administrative Code on budget, revenue, and staffing. Found on Page 133

Figure 101. RAP staff participate at an outdoor event. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025. Found on Page 134

Figure 102. RAP staff and volunteers plant a tree. Found on Page 136

Figure 103. The playground at the Buena Vista Meadow Picnic area sits at the base of hills in Elysian Park. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 137

Figure 104. The City Charter mandates that 3.25 cents of every 100 dollars in assessed property value goes to RAP. Source: Chesebro, Ray L., Frederick von Schrader, and William H. Neal. Charter of the City of Los Angeles: Annotated, 1935 ed., Section 191 (p. 121). Los Angeles, CA: Parker, Stone & Baird Co., 1935. As adopted January 22, 1925, amended through January 9, 1935. With annotations for amendments on January 7, 1937, April 29, 1937, and May 14, 1937. Found on Page 137

Figure 105. In the Mayor's proposed budget for FY 2026, RAP would not receive any funding from the General Fund and would rely on earned revenue and Charter-mandated appropriation, supplemented by select special funds. Found on Page 138

Figure 107. Department of Recreation and Parks coaches attend a summit at Dodger Stadium. Found on Page 139

Figure 106. More than a quarter of RAP's budget goes to a General Fund reimbursement. Of the rest, over 60% goes to maintenance and programming. Found on Page 139

Figure 108. While RAP's operating budget has grown over time, much of that growth has gone to General Fund reimbursements. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 140

Figure 109. With General Fund reimbursements removed, RAP's operating budget has not kept pace with inflation. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. RAP Operating Expenses include RAP Service Labor Expense and RAP Service Non-Labor Expense. RAP Operating Expenses do not include General Fund Reimbursements and Dedicated Non-RAP Service. Found on Page 140

Figure 110. RAP's operating budget with General Fund reimbursements removed has lagged behind not only inflation but the City's operating budget and median rent. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks, ACS (2009, 2023), BLS CPI Inflation Calculator. Found on Page 140

Figure 111. Compared to other City departments of comparable size, RAP's operating budget has grown more slowly than most. Analysis includes departments with citywide operations and operating budgets in FY2009 of $50 million or more. It does not include budgets limited to capital investments.. Source: City of Los Angeles Adopted Budgets (Fiscal Years 2009, 2010, 2023). Found on Page 141

Figure 112. RAP's budget is supplemented by additional funding sources for both capital and operations and maintenance. Source: Department of Recreation and Parks, Interviews with RAP staff. Found on Page 142

Figure 113. A group of youth play soccer at Mar Vista Recreation Center in West LA. Found on Page 143

Figure 114. PlayLA provides free and low-cost youth and adaptive sports programs across Los Angeles. Found on Page 143

Figure 115. Between 2001 and 2025, RAP spent approximately $1.2B on capital improvement projects. Found on Page 144

Figure 116. Over 70% of RAP parks have received capital funding between 2001 and 2025, with more investment in North and South LA. Found on Page 145

Figure 117. South LA and Central/East LA parks have received more capital funding per acre. Found on Page 145

Figure 118. RAP's budget has grown steadily, but full-time staffing remains below pre-recession levels, revealing a persistent gap between funding and workforce. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 147

Figure 119. Full-time staffing decreased by 28% and part-time staffing decreased by 9% between FY 2008 and FY 2025.140 Found on Page 147

Figure 120. Swimmers float in tubes at the LA Aquatic Day. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 151

Figure 121. Children participate in a PlayLA event. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 152

Figure 122. Visitors look out over Los Angeles from the Griffith Observatory. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 154

Figure 123. Residents play basketball at Hoover Recreation Center. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 158

Figure 124. Los Angeles generally has far fewer recreation amenities per person than its peers. Sources: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks, TPL City Park Facts 2025. Found on Page 159

Figure 125. Los Angeles spends less public money on its recreation and parks system per person than its peers. Sources: American Community Survey, 2023. Respective City Budgets for O&M, 2023; TPL City Parks Facts for Capital, 2023. Note: Acreage is rounded to the nearest 1,000. Found on Page 160

Figure 126. Per-Capita Public Investment. Source: Respective City Budgets for O&M, 2023; TPL City Park Facts, 2023. Found on Page 161

Figure 127. RAP's contributions make up a greater share of overall funding for recreation and parks in Los Angeles than the primary public agencies in San Francisco, New York, and Washington, D.C. contribute to their systems. Source: TPL City Park Facts, 2023. Found on Page 162

Figure 128. People sit out on blankets and play roundnet at Silver Lake Meadows. Source: Emilio Uranga, 2025. Found on Page 163

Figure 129. A circular path connects different parts of Ernest E. Debs Regional Park. Source: Calvada Surveying, Inc., 2025. Found on Page 164

Figure 130. Algin Sutton Recreation Center's pool is used for swimming laps. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 166

TABLE OF FIGURES

Figure 133. The North Atwater bridge crosses the LA River at North Atwater Park. Source: Jessica Henson/OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 166

Figure 131. Open space amongst a grove of trees at Barnsdall Park. Source: Mary Alice Williams/The Robert Group, 2025. Found on Page 166

Figure 134. An open lawn sits behind a playground at Holmby Park. Source: Viraj Chauhan/Agency: Artifact, 2025. Found on Page 166

Figure 132. La Tierra de la Culebra Park is an oasis of native plants in Highland Park.Source: Sarah Swanseen/OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 166

Figure 135. Comfort facilities at Hansen Dam include restrooms. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 166

Figure 136. The City of LA RAP owns and manages about 500 park sites across the City of LA. Source: City Boundary and Parks: City of LA Data Portal, 2025. Roads: US Census Bureau, 2025., LA River: National Hydrography Database, 2025. Found on Page 167

Figure 137. Metrics that measure park access and park supply across the LA region show park need will increase from 2023 through 2050. Source: GreenInfoNetwork, OLIN, 2025 with data from the US Census 2023 ACS, Southern California Association of Governments 2050 Population Estimates, and CalEnviroScreen4.0. Found on Page 168

Figure 139. The PerSquareMile tool for the Park Needs Assessment identified "New Park Priority Areas" based on Park Access. Source: GreenInfoNetwork, OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 169

Figure 138. The PerSquareMile tool for the Park Needs Assessment identified "New Park Priority Areas" based on Park Supply. Source: GreenInfoNetwork, OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 169

Figure 140. Thirty-six New Park Priority Areas were added to the "Universe of Sites" using the PerSquareMile tool. These sites were selected to help address both Park Access and Park Supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 171

Figure 141. Twenty-four criteria were used in the site prioritization analysis. Source: OLIN. 2025. Found on Page 172

Figure 142. The criteria used for Site Prioritization vary in scale from site-based data, data sampled within a given parks 10-minute Parkshed, by the Zip code or by the Council District. Source: OLIN. 2025. Found on Page 173

Figure 143. As our City continues to grow, parks will experience increased pressure. Source: Shutterstock/fivetonine. Found on Page 174

Figure 144. Many parks in LA are hard to reach without a car, reducing accessibility of existing park assets by the community. Source: Shutterstock/Chizhevskaya Ekaterina. Found on Page 174

Figure 145. As our region faces more hot days and increased climate vulnerability, amenities like shade will be a critical asset within our parks. Source: Sepulveda Basin Vision Plan, 2024. Found on Page 174

Figure 146. Native plant communities are important to the future of climate resilience and biodiversity within our parks system. Source: OLIN, 2023. Found on Page 175

Figure 147. The presence of well maintained priority amenities help bring people out into the parks. Source: City of LA Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 175

Figure 148. Community input is critical in prioritizing future investment. Survey results in each Council District directly informed the Prioritization through answering questions about park safety, conditions, walkability, and priority amenities. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 175

Figure 149. The 518 park and prospective park sites were ranked from First to Fifth Priority. Of those sites a third are ranked as First or Second Priority. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 176

Figure 150. When looking regionally, 22% or 38 of the North sites, 48% or 64 of the Central/East sites, 48% or 70 of the South sites, and 2% of 1 site in West LA are either first or second priority. Source: OLIN 2025. Found on Page 177

Figure 151. When looking at the classifications of the sites, mini parks and new park priority areas made up the majority of first and second priority sites. Neighborhood parks also had many second priority sites. Source: OLIN 2025. Found on Page 177

Figure 152. The site prioritization results show high priority sites clustered in the East, Central, and South LA. Also many sites within the Southern and Eastern San Fernando Valley are high priority sites. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 178

Figure 153. A nature trail winds through Peck Park Community Center. Source: Jessica Henson/OLIN. Found on Page 182

Figure 154. East and Central Los Angeles, as defined within this report, encompasses City Council District 1, City Council District 13, and City Council District 14. Source: City Boundary, Council District Boundary, and Parks: City of LA Data Portal, 2025. Found on Page 185

Figure 155. The lake at Echo Park is a key feature. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 187

Figure 157. A view of MacArthur Park has Downtown LA in the background. Source: vesperstock/Shutterstock Found on Page 187

Figure 156. The Frank Glass and Grace E. Simons Memorial Sculpture draws visitors to Elysian Park. 2025. Source: KDI, 2025. Found on Page 187

Figure 158. A person looks at The Wall: Las Memorias AIDS Monument at Lincoln Park. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025. Found on Page 187

Figure 159. South Los Angeles, as defined within this report, encompasses City Council District 8, City Council District 9, City Council District 10, and City Council District 15. Source: City Boundary, Council District Boundary, and Parks: City of LA Data Portal, 2025. Found on Page 191

Figure 160. The rose garden is an attraction at Exposition Park. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 193

Figure 161. Palm trees line South Park. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025. Found on Page 193

TABLE OF FIGURES

Figure 162. Walking paths run through Ken Malloy Harbor Regional Park. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025. Found on Page 193

Figure 163. White Point Park Nature Reserve features open meadows overlooking the coast. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025. Found on Page 193

Figure 164. North LA, as defined within this report, encompasses City Council District 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, and 12. Source: City Boundary, Council District Boundary, and Parks: City of LA Data Portal, 2025.. Found on Page 197

Figure 165. The Griffith Observatory is a major attraction at Griffith Park. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 199

Figure 166. Hansen Dam features expansive terrain and native vegetation. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 199

Figure 167. Visitors hike Runyon Canyon's many trails. Source: Agency: Artifact, 2025. Found on Page 199

Figure 168. Comfort amenities are located throughout O'Melveny Park. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025. Found on Page 199

Figure 169. West Los Angeles, as defined within this report, encompasses City Council District 5 and City Council District 11. Source: City Boundary, Council District Boundary, and Parks: City of LA Data Portal, 2025.. Found on Page 203

Figure 170. Children play at the Cheviot Hills Recreation Center playground. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025. Found on Page 205

Figure 174. Pan Pacific Park features a distinctive recreation center. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 205

Figure 175. Mar Vista Recreation Center features outdoor exercise equipment. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025. Found on Page 205

Figure 173. People walk along the boardwalk at Venice Beach. Source: Pandora Pictures/Shutterstock Found on Page 205

Figure 171. Palm trees line Venice Beach. Source: Vlad Mikhailov/ Shutterstock Found on Page 205

Figure 172. The hills of Santa Ynez Canyon Park offer hiking opportunities. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025. Found on Page 205

Figure 176. Children participate in a PlayLA event. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 210

Figure 177. The PNA guidelines can be used at various stages of the capital life cycle. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 212

Figure 180. Operation | RAP maintenance staff are critical to the daily operations of the City's recreation and park facilities. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks, 2025. Found on Page 213

Figure 179. Design | The site plan for renovations at South Park show key improvements including turf upgrades, playgrounds, and recreational facilities. Source: City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering, 2018. Found on Page 213

Figure 178. Acquisition | The City of LA purchased the 42-acre Taylor Yard site in 2017 and is working to develop it into a new park. Source: City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering, accessed 2025. Found on Page 213

Figure 181. Families share input on desired events during a pop-up at Jackie Tatum Harvard Recreation Center. Found on Page 214

Figure 182. Community members at an engagement meeting in Granada Hills share ideas to help shape inclusive and equitable park planning. Source: Mark Hovater, 2025. Found on Page 216

Figure 183. An Engagement event at Jackie Tatum Harvard Recreation Center invites community voices on park priorities. Source: The Robert Group, 2025. Found on Page 217

Figure 184. Engaging young community members at Healthy Day for Kids helps build early connections and identify key stakeholders invested in neighborhood parks. Source: The Robert Group, 2025. Found on Page 219

Figure 185. A presentation kicked off an engagement meeting at Tarzana Recreation Center. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 220

Figure 186. A youth focus group at the SEACA workshop shares feedback to ground truth research and shape park planning around younger users' needs. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 221

Figure 187. A bilingual engagement board in Granada Hills supports inclusive outreach and multilingual community input. Found on Page 221

Figure 188. Young residents take part in co-design and shared decision-making at the Tarzana Earth Day pop-up to help shape their local parks. Found on Page 223

Figure 189. Community members gather for a Mother's Day celebration at Watts Senior Center. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025. Found on Page 225

Figure 190. Venice Beach is a treasured regional destination operated by RAP.. Found on Page 226

Figure 191. New parks like Jane & Bert Boeckman Park bring new experiences to the city. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025. Found on Page 228

Figure 192. RAP's new branding can be seen on a new RAP sign installed at Laurel Grove Park. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025. Found on Page 230

Figure 193. Shaded playground and seating areas at Evergreen Recreation Center provide sun protection and accessible play equipment for community use. Source: María Lamadrid, 2025. Found on Page 231

Figure 194. A loop trail at Runyon Canyon Park supports exploration, circulation, and wellness. Found on Page 232

Figure 195. An internal walking trail at Debs Park allow users to explore the park. Found on Page 233

Figure 196. The main gateway welcomes visitors to Pan Pacific Park. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 234

Figure 197. Stormwater systems in parks may include above- and below-ground infrastructure. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025. Found on Page 235

Figure 198. Water fountains are provided at Echo Park to support the use of nearby recreation facilities. Found on Page 236

TABLE OF FIGURES

Figure 199. The cherry grove with shade structure at Anthony C. Beilenson Park offers a comfortable setting and immersive ecological experience. Found on Page 237

Figure 200. Recreation areas promote active use through inclusive youth programming. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025. Found on Page 239

Figure 201. A splash pad and pool provide opportunities for aquatic recreation outside the recreation center at Lincoln Park. Source: OLIN, 2025 Found on Page 240

Figure 202. The Juan Rodriguez Cabrillo Statue sits outside the Cabrillo Beach Bath House, which has a Mediterranean style that was popular in the 1930s. Source: Steve Cukrov / Shutterstock, 2021. Found on Page 243

Figure 203. The Echo Park Lake provides recreational benefits and wildlife habitat. Source: Calvada Surveying, Inc., 2025. Found on Page 244

Figure 204. Patton St Pocket Park is a mini park in the Echo Park neighborhood. Source: Lauren Elachi, 2025. Found on Page 248

Figure 205. Watts Serenity Park 's amenities were driven by community engagement. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025. Found on Page 250

Figure 206. Evergreen Recreation Center is a large neighborhood park in Boyle Heights. Source: María Lamadrid, 2025. Found on Page 252

Figure 207. Moon Canyon Park provides access to nature with views of surrounding neighborhoods. Source: Leslie Dinkin, 2025. Found on Page 254

Figure 208. Basketball and tennis courts are among the many amenities available at Leland Recreation Center. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025. Found on Page 256

Figure 209. MacArthur Park is a beloved large community park. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025. Found on Page 258

Figure 210. Sullivan Canyon Park is well used by hikers. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025. Found on Page 260

Figure 211. Lincoln Park, originally East Los Angeles Park, is one of the oldest parks in Los Angeles. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025. Found on Page 262

Figure 212. White Point Park Nature Preserve blends ocean views, habitat, and coastal recreation. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025. Found on Page 264

Figure 213. Little Landers Park is a family-friendly historic site. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025. Found on Page 266

Figure 214. The Elysian Valley Bikeway is part of the larger LA River Greenway system. Source: Calvada Surveying, Inc, 2025. Found on Page 268

Figure 215. Bandini Canyon Park is a quiet space for hiking, walking, and picnicking. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025. Found on Page 270

Figure 216. Temescal Canyon Park has popular hiking trails with both ocean and canyon views. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025. Found on Page 272

Figure 217. The Camellia Avenue Elementary School (CSP) provides park access outside of school hours. Source: Image via Homes.com. Found on Page 274

Figure 218. The Venice High School Pool supports the school's strong athletics programs. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025. Found on Page 276

Figure 219. Will Rogers State Beach combines opportunities for surfing and swimming with opportunities for volleyball and picnicking. Source: Shutterstock/fivetonine, 2022. Found on Page 278

Figure 220. Camp Seely was one of Los Angeles' first municipal recreation camps to offer residents an escape to the San Bernardino Mountains. Source: Shutterstock, accessed 2025. Found on Page 280

Figure 221. El Sereno Senior Citizen Center offers fitness classes, arts and crafts, and educational opportunities for seniors. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025. Found on Page 282

Figure 222. Penmar Golf Course is a public 9-hole course in Venice. Source: City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks, accessed 2025. Found on Page 284

Figure 223. The playground complements the pool, courts, and fields at the WPA-era Sun Valley Park. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 294

Figure 224. The PNA's level of service (LOS) standards address how many amenities are needed now and in the future. Found on Page 298

Figure 225. Pickleball is one of the fastest growing sports nationwide. Source: Unai Huizi Photography / Shutterstock. Found on Page 299

Figure 226. Runyon Canyon Park is among the most visited parks in the city. Source: HannaTor / Shutterstock. Found on Page 301

Figure 227. Children playing at South Park Recreation Center during the Olympic Day of Sport. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 303

Figure 228. Swimmers enjoy LA Aquatics Day at one of many pools across the city. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 304

Figure 229. Swan boats float on the lake in Echo Park. Source: Strike First/Shutterstock. Found on Page 306

Figure 230. The playground at Drum Barracks Park was assessed as 'fair' in the annual Park Conditions Assessment. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 308

Figure 231. Swimmers enjoy the pool at the CLASS Parks Summer Kickoff Picnic. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 309

Figure 232. Engaging play elements at the Yosemite Recreation Center playground create a vibrant space for fun and exploration.. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 310

TABLE OF FIGURES

Figure 233. Dogs socialize at the Whitnall Highway Park. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 311

Figure 234. Personnel and Expense Estimates were based on level of service standards, prior staffing levels, and peer benchmarking. All costs are in 2025 dollars based on 2025 staff salaries and expenses. Source: HR&A Analysis of data provided by RAP and Trust for Public Land City Park Facts. Benchmarking peer cities rely on individual City Budgets from FY2023. Found on Page 312

Figure 235. Volunteers plant trees at Stetson Ranch Park. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 312

Figure 236. RAP makes path repairs at Pan Pacific Park. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 313

Figure 237. There are multiple ways to break down the capital need estimate to understand the amount of money needed for various topics. Source: OLIN, Dharam, 2025. Found on Page 314

Figure 238. This table shows estimated annual operating needs with escalation included. Source: OLIN, HR&A, 2025. Found on Page 315

Figure 239. Department of Recreation and Parks maintenance staff. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 316

Figure 240. Native habitat in North Atwater Park. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 317

Figure 242. Youth participate in PlayLA Day. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 318

Figure 241. The playground at Aidan's Place, Westwood Recreation Center is universally accessible. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 318

Figure 244. The Department of Recreation and Parks' park rangers help keep parks safe. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 319

Figure 243. Locally hired park ambassadors could support park users. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 319

Figure 245. Different funding strategies have different applicable uses. Source: HR&A, 2025. Found on Page 320

Figure 246. Families ice skate at the Pershing Ice Rink opening. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 321

Figure 247. RAP maintains sports fields at North Hills Community Park. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 322

Figure 248. The LA Conservations Corps, Million Trees LA, and volunteers plant trees at Stetson Ranch Park after the 2008 wildfire. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 324

Figure 249. A ribbon cutting formally re-opens the Lincoln Heights Senior Center. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 325

Figure 250. Sherman Oaks East Valley Adult Center provides a range of services and programs for older adults. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 326

Figure 251. Public infrastructure, like parks, can be funded through a Community Facilities District. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 327

Figure 252. Runyon Canyon Park is an extremely popular park for many visiting Los Angeles. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 328

Figure 253. Greenwood Square Park has play structures for multiple age segments. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 329

Figure 254. Informational exhibits at White Point Park and Nature Preserve highlight the local landscape, cultural stories, and Indigenous history. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 330

Figure 255. Adults participate in an aquatic fitness class at Celes King II Pool. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 331

Figure 256. People run and walk through Pan Pacific Park. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 332

Figure 257. People participate in LA Aquatics Day. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks, 2025. Found on Page 334

Figure 258. RAP conducts training at EXPO Summer Day. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks, 2025. Found on Page 335

Figure 259. Technical Advisory Committee members discussing the PNA. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 336

Figure 260. Individuals work out at Pan Pacific Park. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 346

Figure 261. The timeline for updating the PNA includes 5- and 10-year milestones. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found on Page 347

Figure 262. Hollenbeck Park became a hub of activity during the CicLAvia—Heart of LA event in October 2025. Source: Calvada Surveying, Inc., 2025. Found on Page 347

Figure 263. MacArthur Park's playgrounds and soccer field are popular amenities. Source: Calvada Surveying, Inc., 2025. Found on Page 348

Figure 264. A volleyball tournament is held on the courts at Branford Recreation Center. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 348

Figure 265. Aerial view of Lincoln Park. Source: Calvada Surveying, Inc., 2025 Found on Page 350

Figure 266. KYCC members participating in the Stetson Ranch reforestation. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found on Page 351

Figure 267. Lincoln Park is a popular location for recreation and athletics. Source: Calvada Surveying, Inc., 2025 Found on Page 352





PREPARED BY:

OLIN

THE ROBERT GROUP | KOUNKUEY DESIGN INITIATIVE | AGENCY: ARTIFACT | ESTOLANO ADVISORS
BETTER WORLD GROUP | GEOSYNTEC CONSULTANTS | HR&A ADVISORS | WEST OF WEST | GREENINFO NETWORK
LANDAU DESIGN + TECHNOLOGY | DHARAM CONSULTING | CALVADA SURVEYING | ETC INSTITUTE

APPENDIX

PARK NEEDS ASSESSMENT

CITY OF LOS ANGELES

December 2025

PREPARED FOR:
LOS ANGELES DEPARTMENT OF RECREATION AND PARKS

This document is an appendix to the 2025 LA Park Needs Assessment. Resources provided as a part of this document are meant to provide additional context to the findings of that report.

PREPARED BY:

OLIN

THE ROBERT GROUP | KOUNKUEY DESIGN INITIATIVE | AGENCY: ARTIFACT | ESTOLANO ADVISORS
BETTER WORLD GROUP | GEOSYNTEC CONSULTANTS | HR&A ADVISORS | WEST OF WEST | GREENINFO NETWORK
LANDAU DESIGN + TECHNOLOGY | DHARAM CONSULTING | CALVADA SURVEYING | ETC INSTITUTE

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

CITY OF LOS ANGELES

Karen Bass, Mayor

Jacqueline Hamilton, Deputy Mayor for Neighborhood Services

Randall Winston, Deputy Mayor of Infrastructure

Karren Lane, Deputy Mayor of Community Safety

Robert Clark, Deputy Mayor of Public Safety

Nancy Sutley, Deputy Mayor for Energy and Sustainability

Dr. Etsemaye Agonafer, Deputy Mayor of Homelessness and Community Health

CITY COUNCIL

Eunisses Hernandez, Councilmember District 1

Adrin Nazarian, Councilmember District 2

Bob Blumenfield, Councilmember District 3

Nithya Raman, Councilmember District 4

Katy Yaroslavsky, Councilmember District 5

Imelda Padilla, Councilmember District 6

Monica Rodriguez, Councilmember District 7

Marqueece Harris-Dawson, Councilmember District 8

Curren D. Price, Jr., Councilmember District 9

Heather Hutt, Councilmember District 10

Traci Park, Councilmember District 11

John Lee, Councilmember District 12

Hugo Soto-Martínez, Councilmember District 13

Ysabel J. Jurado, Councilmember District 14

Tim McOsker, Councilmember District 15

BOARD OF RECREATION AND PARK COMMISSIONERS

Renata Simril, President

Luis Sanchez, Vice President

Marie Lloyd, Commissioner

Benny Tran, Commissioner

Tafarai Bayne, Commissioner

DEPARTMENT OF RECREATION AND PARKS

Jimmy Kim, General Manager

Matthew Rudnick, Executive Officer

Cathie Santo Domingo, Assistant General Manager

Brenda Aguirre, Assistant General Manager

Chinyere Stoneham, Assistant General Manager

Noel Williams, Chief Financial Officer

Darryl Ford, Superintendent of Planning, Project Manager

Meghan Luera, Senior Management Analyst II

Jeremy Silva, City Planning Associate

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP)

Helen Olivares

Adriana Rubalcava

Tino Reynoso

Rebecca Lobos

City of Los Angeles Sanitation and Environment (LASAN)

Barbara Romero

Susie Santilena

City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering (BOE)

Steven Fierce

Ohaji Abdallah

University of Southern California (USC)

Cindy Olnick

Esther Marguiles

United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)

Trevor Snyder

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro)

Heather Repenning

Isabelle Garvanne

Los Angeles County Parks and Recreation

Sean Woods

Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority (MRCA)

Brian Baldauf

Fernando Gomez

Streets LA

Ana Tabuena-Ruddy

City of Los Angeles Civil + Human Rights and Equity Department

Monet Bagneris-Tolbert

California State Parks

Sedrick Mitchell

Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD)

Krisztina Tokes

Isela Lopez

Jennifer Natividad

City of Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD)

Billy Brockway

City of Los Angeles Department on Disability (DOD)

Alison Everett

Matan Koch

City of Los Angeles City Planning

Delia Arriaga

City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT)

Jesus Serrano

City of Los Angeles Department of Neighborhood Empowerment

Thomas Soong

Office of Forest Management

Clarissa Boyajian

Office of the Chief Legislative Analyst

Xochitl Ramirez

Office of the City Administrative Officer

Anne Johnson

Maria Gutierrez

Mindy Pothongsunun

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

STEERING COMMITTEE

Board of Recreation and Park Commissioners Representative

Marie Lloyd

California Conservation Corps

Duane Wilson

Nikki Morales

Community Partners

Yvette-Lopez Ledesma

Deputy Mayor

Jacqueline Hamilton

Randall Winston

Karren Lane

Friends of the Los Angeles River

Candice Dickens-Russell

Individual Expert

Deborah Cohen

Los Angeles Alliance for a New Economy (LAANE)

Lauren Ahkiam

Stephany Calvillo

Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation

Sean Woods

Sheela Mathai

Los Angeles Neighborhood Initiative

Veronica Hahni

Aleigh Lewis

Los Angeles Neighborhood Land Trust

Tori Kjer

Los Angeles Parks Foundation

Amber Martinez

Lindsey Kozberg

Los Angeles Waterkeeper

Bruce Reznik

Mayor's Office

Geoff Thompson

Estefany Garcia

Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority (MRCA)

Brian Baldauf

Native American Indian Commission Representative

Rich Toyon

Prevention Institute

Francisco Romero

Rob Baird

Resources Legacy Fund

Alfredo Gonzalez

The Nature Conservancy

Kelsey Jessup

Trust for Public Land

Guillermo Rodriguez

Sarah Friedman

University of Southern California (USC)

Vanessa Carter Fahnestock

We are deeply grateful to the Steering Committee members who generously took time out of their busy schedules to share their insights with us through meetings, interviews, and collaborations.



Figure 1. The Steering Committee receives an update on PNA progress on May 20, 2025. Source: OLIN, 2025.

CONSULTANT TEAM

OLIN

Planning, Landscape Architecture, Urban Design, Engagement

Jessica M. Henson, Project Director

Andrew Dobshinsky, Associate-in-Charge and Parks Planner

Sarah Swanseen, Project Coordinator; Senior Landscape Architect and Planner

Max Dickson, Senior Planner

Joanna Karaman, Ecological Systems Specialist

Selina Cheah

Kate Lawler

Darian Ehya

Derek Lazo

Evangeline Sheridan

Zitong Huang

Jiewen Hu

Priyanjali Sinha

Rachita Saxena

Farzana Rahman

Miranda Ayres

Kristen Juen

Hanrui Fu

AGENCY ARTIFACT

Landscape Architecture and Engagement

Christopher Torres, Founding Principal

Viraj Chauhan

Emilio Uranga

Melanie Buffa

THE ROBERT GROUP

Community Engagement

Christine Robert

Isaiah Ford

Christina Monzer

Mary Alice Williams

DaYoung Lee

Brock Morgan

KOUNKUEY DESIGN INITIATIVE

Landscape Architecture and Engagement

Chelina Odbert, Founding Principal

Lauren Elachi

Eric Riley

Leslie Dinkin

Nora Healy

ESTOLANO ADVISORS

Strategy, Equity, and Facilitation

Cecilia Estolano

Thomson Dryjanski

Sasha Ragland

DHARAM CONSULTING

Cost Estimation

Steve Kelly

Allan Duncan

Andrew Jonsson

Rey Sasuman

BETTER WORLD GROUP

Strategy and Coalition Building

Shona Calzada Ganguly

Kimberly Guo

HR&A ADVISORS

Economic Analysis and Strategy

Connie Chung

Jill Schmidt Bengochea

Lauren Kim

GREENINFO NETWORK

Park Data and Prioritization

Dan Rademacher

Jon Christensen

Jayita Bhojwani

Amanda Kochanek

Data Visualization and User Needs

Maria del Carmen Lamadrid

Tom Allnutt

Andrew Nham

WEST OF WEST ARCHITECTURE + DESIGN

Architecture

Jai Kumaran

Jonathan Rieke

Jess Smith

Angela Lufkin

LANDAU DESIGN + TECHNOLOGY

Digital Engagement and Animation

Chris Landau

Gina Rattanakone

Yaoze Yu

Sabrina Rattanakone

Timothy Day

GEOSYNTEC CONSULTANTS

Water Resources and Civil Engineering

Mark Hanna

Daniel Lee

Stephanie Zinn

Haley Bauer

CALVADA SURVEYING, INC.

Professional Land Surveying, LiDAR & Photogrammetry, and UAS – Unmanned Aerial Systems (Drone) Imagery

Armando DuPont

Saul Melgarejo Jr.

Daniel Oswaldo Gonzalez

ETC INSTITUTE

Statistically Valid Surveying

Chris Tatham

Jason Morado

Ryan Murray

COMMUNITY PARTNERS

Friends of the LA River

Heart of Los Angeles

Homeless Health Care Los Angeles

Koreatown Youth + Community Center (KYCC)

LA Compost

Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition (BikeLA)

Los Angeles Walks

Nature for All

Northeast Neighborhood Outreach (NENO)

Pacoima Beautiful

Tia Chucha's Centro Cultural and Bookstore

TreePeople

TABLE OF CONTENTS

13 Section I: Engagement

17 Section II: Site Prioritization Criteria Details

43 Section III: PerSquareMile Details

119 Section IV: Detailed Site Prioritization Scores

145 Section V: Council District Snapshots

207 Section VI: Parks by Classification

225 Section VII: Top three Sites by Classification

237 Section VIII: Additional Site Planning Guidelines

299 Section IX: Level of Service Details

324 Section X: Resources






Figure 2. Griffith Park has a beloved trail system crossing through the park. Source: City of LA Recreation and Parks, 2025.



Figure 3. Engagement meetingsin Phase 3 included food venders and informational boards out in the parks. Source: The Robert Group, 2025.


PARK NEEDS
REC & PARKS
ASSESSMENT
3 in a row
DID WE MISS ANYTH
123
130+
27
13
100+

ENGAGEMENT

ENGAGEMENT MEETINGS

Community feedback from across LA was foundational to the Park Needs Assessment.

Residents stopped by information tables at community events, attended community workshops and equity sessions, and shared thoughts at park community open house meetings. In addition, thousands of community members participated digitally in virtual meetings and by taking online surveys. A list of in-person engagement meetings organized by PNA engagement phase and meeting type is below.

PHASE 1 MEETINGS

Interest Group Meetings

2/20/2025	Funders and Foundations
2/28/2025	Broad Ranging Interest Groups

Traditional and Virtual Large Format Meetings

3/4/2025	Ramona Hall
3/5/2035	Wilmington RC
3/6/2035	Algin Sutton
3/8/2035	Victory Vineland
3/11/2025	Tarzana Rec Center
3/13/2025	Westchester RC
3/15/2025	Lincoln Park RC
3/18/2025	Virtual Open House

Tribal Conversations, Briefings and Workshops

3/10/2025	Tribal Briefing 1: Tongva
3/10/2025	Tribal Briefing 2: Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians
3/18/2025	Tribal Briefing 3: LA City/County Native American Indian Commission Briefing
3/24/2025	Tribal Briefing 4: Tongva Taraxat Paxaavxa Conservancy
3/27/2025	Tribal Briefing 5: Gabrielino-Shoshone
3/28/2025	Tribal Briefing 6: San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians Gabrieleno Tongva

Equity Sessions

3/14/2025	Equity Session 1: Access for All
3/20/2025	Equity Session 1: Parks in Place
3/21/2025	Equity Session 1: The Public Stage
3/27/2025	Equity Session 1: Critical Social Services

Pop-Ups and Youth Events

4/5/2025	Tarzana Earth Day Celebration
4/6/2025	CicLAvia: Ktown Meets Hollywood
4/13/2025	YMCA 2025 Healthy Kids Day
4/26/2025	Earth Day LA with LASAN

Council District Briefings

2/3/2025	CD 14 Briefing
2/10/2025	CD 15 Briefing
2/10/2025	CD 12 Briefing
2/10/2025	CD 5 Briefing
2/10/2025	CD 7 Briefing
2/11/2025	CD 2 Briefing
2/11/2025	CD 4 Briefing
2/11/2025	CD 11 Briefing
3/4/2025	CD 6 Briefing
3/17/2025	CD 1 Briefing

PHASE 2 MEETINGS

Interest Group Meetings

4/4/2025	Equipo Verde
4/5/2025	LA Neighborhood Council Commission
5/15/2025	2025 LANI Forum
5/21/2025	Broad Ranging Interest Group
5/22/2025	Foundations and Funders Roundtable #2
5/30/2025	Joining Us In Moving People to Play Briefing
6/25/2025	Homeless Healthcare LA Briefing
7/21/2025	Golf Advisory Committee
7/28/2025	Equestrian Advisory Committee

PHASE 2 MEETINGS

Traditional and Virtual Large Format Meetings

5/29/2025	JT Harvard
6/3/2025	Lake View Terrace RC
6/4/2025	Lafayette RC
6/5/2026	South Park RC
6/7/2025	Evergreen RC
6/10/2025	Peck Park RC
6/11/2025	Friendship Auditorium
6/18/2025	Sepulveda RC
6/21/2025	Pan Pacific Senior Activity Center
6/25/2025	Alpine RC
6/28/2025	Granada Hills RC
7/1/2025	Virtual

Tribal Conversations, Briefings and Workshops

7/15/2025	LA City/County Native American Indian Commission Briefing

Equity Sessions

4/8/2025	Phase 2A: Access for All
4/10/2025	Phase 2A: Parks in Place
4/24/2025	Phase 2A: Critical Social Services
4/30/2025	Phase 2A: The Public Stage
6/17/2025	Equity: General Session #1
6/18/2025	Equity: General Session #2
7/8/2025	Equity: Special Session #1
7/8/2025	Equity: Special Session #2

Pop-ups, Youth Events, and Walkshops

4/7/2025	SEACA Youth Workshop
4/12/2025	LA Maker Faire
5/16/2025	Salute to Recreation
6/14/2025	Walkshop #1: Venice
6/14/2025	Walkshop #2: Griffith
6/14/2025	Walkshop #3: Debs Park
7/13/2025	Lotus Festival
8/5/2025	National Night Out (Sun Valley)
8/23/2025	7th Annual Beautification Conference

PHASE 3 MEETINGS

Interest Group Meetings

8/28/2025	Broad Ranging Interest Group
8/28/2025	Foundations and Funders Roundtable #3

Council District Briefings

9/18/2025	All City of LA Council Districts: PNA Briefing

Traditional and Virtual Large Format Meetings

9/4/2025	Bellview RC
9/6/2025	Westwood RC
9/9/2025	Virtual Open House
9/10/2025	Deep Dive Webinar: Budget and Finance
9/11/2025	Deep Dive Webinar: Classifications, Guidelines, and Level of Service
9/18/2025	Deep Dive Webinar: Site Prioritization

Tribal Conversations, Briefings and Workshops

9/9/2025	LA City/County Native American Indian Commission Listening Session

Equity Sessions

9/9/2025	Equity Session 3: Northeast LA
9/10/2025	Equity Session 3: South LA
9/23/2025	Equity Session 3: Valley
9/24/2025	Equity 3.4 (Virtual)

Pop-Ups and Youth Engagement

9/14/2025	CicLAVia South Central
9/24/2025	Park Intercept - Felicia Mahood Movie Night
9/26/2025	Park Intercept - North Hollywood SC Fiesta
9/27/2025	Pop-up - LA Congress of Neighborhoods
9/27/2025	Pop Up - ShineLA
9/27/2025	School/Youth Advisory Council
10/9/2025	Pop Up - Rancho Cienega Recreation Center
10/12/2025	Pop Up - CicLAVia Heart of LA



Figure 4. A celebration marks opening day at Hope and Peace playground. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.




SITE PRIORITIZATION CRITERIA DETAILS

PARK PRESSURE

High-Weight Criteria

THE DEMAND ON THE PARK BASED ON THE AMOUNT OF PEOPLE PROJECTED TO LIVE IN THE AREA BY 2050.



Dataset and/or source
Walkshed from RAP Parks (RAP Access Points [2025] and LA County CAMS Road Segments)[1], and Projected 2050 Population (Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Connect SoCal 2024 Growth Projections)[2]

Description
Projected people per park-acre, using the number of people within a 10-minute walk of each site and the site's acreage. The number of people is based on 2050 population projections by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) at the Transportation Analysis Zone (TAZ) level. For New Park Priority Areas, 3 acres (the median size of a Community School Park) was used for this analysis.

Scale
Parkshed

Lowest Priority (0)
Lowest park pressure (lowest people per park acre)

Highest Priority (1)
Highest park pressure (highest people per park acre)


New Park Priority Areas Scoring Notes
People per imagined park acre (3 acres) within imagined parkshed from center point of square

Figure 5. PNA Criteria: Park Pressure. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: Walkshed from RAP Parks (RAP Access Points (2025) and LA County CAMS Road Segments), and Projected 2050 Population (Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Connect SoCal 2024 Growth Projections)

WALK NETWORK CONNECTIVITY

High-Weight Criteria

THE PERCENT OF AREA AROUND A PARK THAT CANNOT BE WALKED TO WITHIN 10 MINUTES.



Dataset and/or source
Walkshed from RAP Parks (RAP Access Points (2025) and LA County CAMS Road Segments)[3] and idealized walkshed (Half-mile buffer from the boundary of RAP parks).

Description
How much of the area within a half mile is also within a 10-minute walk of each park, measured as the amount of overlap between A) a walkshed drawn by measuring a half-mile distance along streets from RAP facility access points and B) the area within a half-mile straight line buffer around the RAP facility access points.

Scale
Parkshed

Lowest Priority (0)
Highest amount of overlap between measured walkshed and buffer

Highest Priority (1)
Lowest amount of overlap between measured walkshed and buffer

New Park Priority Area Scoring Notes
Median Score

Figure 6. PNA Criteria: Walk Network Connectivity. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: Walkshed from RAP Parks (RAP Access Points (2025) and LA County CAMS Road Segments) and idealized walkshed (Half-mile buffer from the boundary of RAP parks).

PARK CONDITIONS ASSESSMENT

High-Weight Criteria

THE PHYSICAL CONDITION OF THE PARK'S AMENITIES, BASED ON RAP'S YEARLY ASSESSMENT.

Dataset and/or source

Parks Conditions Assessment, City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks. 2024.

Description
Condition of park amenities, based on RAP's annual Park Conditions Assessment (PCA). The PCA rates the following amenities as being in good, fair, or poor condition. This data is reported annually to the LA County Department of Parks and Recreation for Measure A funding. During 2024, RAP completed an assessment of about 34 types of recreational amenities at 355 sites. RAP completes this assessment annually.

Scale
Site

Lowest Priority (0)
Best average reported condition

Highest Priority (1)
Worst average reported condition

New Park Priority Area Scoring Notes
Score of 0 (Same as park with no amenities)




Figure 7. PNA Criteria: Park Conditions Assessment. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: Parks Conditions Assessment, City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks. 2024.

ENVIRONMENTAL, SOCIAL, AND HEALTH EQUITY

High-Weight Criteria

THE NUMBER OF SAFETY CONCERNS THAT RESIDENTS HAVE WITH PARKS BY COUNCIL DISTRICT

Dataset and/or source
CalEnviroScreen 4.0[4], 2021, CoLA Equity Index (2024)[5], SB 535 Disadvantaged Communities.[6]

Description
Whether the site falls in a block group that meets at least one of the following thresholds: at or above the 75th percentile of CalEnviroScreen 4.0. the top 50% of the City of LA Equity Index score any SB 535 identified tract

Scale
Site

Lowest Priority (0)
Does not meet at least one of the above thresholds

Highest Priority (1)
Meets at least one of the above thresholds

New Park Priority Area Scoring Notes
Used square as site





Figure 8. PNA Criteria: Environmental, Social, and Health Equity. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: CalEnviroScreen 4.0, 2021, CoLA Equity Index (2024), SB 535 Disadvantaged Communities.

LOW SHADE COVER

High-Weight Criteria

THE LACK OF SHADE AT OR AROUND THE PARK.



Dataset and/or source
Walkshed from RAP Parks (RAP Access Points (2025) and LA County CAMS Road Segments), Tree Canopy Cover by Block Group (Tree People and Loyola Marymount University)[7], and Park Landcover (City of LA Bureau of Public Works - Forest Management, 2025).

Description
Availability of shade within each park and within a 10-minute walk of each park, based on land cover data.

Scale
Parkshed

Lowest Priority (0)
Highest canopy cover inside the park and within a 10-minute walk of the park

Highest Priority (1)
Lowest canopy cover inside the park and within a 10-minute walk of the park

New Park Priority Area Scoring Notes
Used square as site

Figure 9. PNA Criteria: Low Shade Cover. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: Walkshed from RAP Parks (RAP Access Points (2025) and LA County CAMS Road Segments), Tree Canopy Cover by Block Group (Tree People and Loyola Marymount University), and Park Landcover (City of LA Bureau of Public Works - Forest Management, 2025).

CLIMATE VULNERABILITY

High-Weight Criteria

THE NUMBER OF CLIMATE RISK FACTORS THE PARK IS VULNERABLE TO.

Dataset and/or source
LA County Chief Sustainability Office, LAC Climate Vulnerability Assessment.[8]

Description
Number of climate risk factors each site is vulnerable to, based on mid-century (2050) RCP85 projections from LA County for risk of fire, inland flooding, coastal flooding, drought, severe heat, and extreme precipitation.

Scale
Site

Lowest Priority (0)
Least number of climate risk factors

Highest Priority (1)
Greatest number of climate risk factors

New Park Priority Area Scoring Notes
Used square as parkshed




Figure 10. PNA Criteria: Climate Vulnerability. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: LA County Chief Sustainability Office, LAC Climate Vulnerability Assessment.

PERCEIVED PARK SAFETY

High-Weight Criteria

THE NUMBER OF SAFETY CONCERNS THAT RESIDENTS HAVE WITH PARKS BY COUNCIL DISTRICT.

Uses Statistically Valid Survey Results

Dataset and/or source
PNA Statistically Valid Survey Results, 2025.

Description
Residents' perception of safety, based on the number of safety-related responses to the question "Please check all the reasons that prevent you or members of your household from visiting parks and recreation centers more often."

Scale
Council District

Lowest Priority (0)
Lowest percentage of respondents indicating a safety concern

Highest Priority (1)
Highest percentage of respondents indicating a safety concern

New Park Priority Area Scoring Notes
Used square as site





Figure 11. PNA Criteria: Perceived Park Safety. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: PNA Statistically Valid Survey Results, 2025.

CRIMINALIZATION BURDEN

Medium-Weight Criteria

THE NEED FOR MORE PREVENTION-FIRST CRIMINAL JUSTICE POLICIES IN COMMUNITIES AROUND THE PARK.



Dataset and/or source
Justice Equity Need Index (JENI) Criminalization Risk (Catalyst California)[9]

Description
Presence of conditions by ZIP code where the criminal justice system has historically taken a detention-first, prevention-last approach, based on JENI's Criminalization Risk analysis, which measures: Mental Health Hospitalizations (per 1,000 people); Substance Use-Related Hospitalizations (per 1,000 people); Homelessness Rate (per 1,000 people).

Scale
Site

Lowest Priority (0)
Lowest presence of detention-first, prevention-last conditions

Highest Priority (1)
Highest presence of detention-first, prevention-last conditions

New Park Priority Area Scoring Notes
Used square as site

Figure 12. PNA Criteria: Criminalization Burden. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: Justice Equity Need Index (JENI) Criminalization Risk (Catalyst California)

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT HISTORY

Medium-Weight Criteria

THE HISTORIC CAPITAL INVESTMENT IN THIS SITE PER PARK ACRE.

Dataset and/or source
RAP Prop K, Quimby, Grants and Non Grants Funding

Description
Capital project investment per park acre from 2003-2024. New Park Priority Areas and sites with no investment data are rated as having low historic investment.

Scale
Site

Lowest Priority (0)
Highest historic investment

Highest Priority (1)
Lowest historic investment

New Park Priority Area Scoring Notes
One (Same as a park that has had no money spent)




Figure 13. PNA Criteria: Capital Improvement Project History. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: RAP Prop K, Quimby, Grants and Non Grants Funding

EXTREME HEAT RISK

Medium-Weight Criteria

THE RISK OF EXTREME HEAT IMPACTING COMMUNITIES AROUND THE PARK.

Dataset and/or source
LA County Chief Sustainability Office, LAC Climate Vulnerability Assessment.[10]

Description
The LA County CVA (Climate Vulnerability Assessment) categorizes Extreme Heat Risk for communities that are both exposed to, and at high social risk of the impacts of, extreme heat. These take into account the projected average and high temperatures as well as indicators such as ER hospitalization rates due to extreme heat exposure and other demographic and social risk factors.

Scale
Parkshed

Lowest Priority (0)
Lowest projected exposure and susceptibility to extreme heat

Highest Priority (1)
Highest projected exposure and susceptibility to extreme heat

New Park Priority Area Scoring Notes
Used square as parkshed





Figure 14. PNA Criteria: Extreme Heat Risk. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: LA County Chief Sustainability Office, LAC Climate Vulnerability Assessment.

LACK OF PRIVATE OPEN SPACE

Medium-Weight Criteria

THE LACK OF PRIVATE OPEN SPACE NEAR THE PARK.



Dataset and/or source
Walkshed from RAP Parks (RAP Access Points (2025) and LA County CAMS Road Segments), Impervious Cover by Residential Parcel (Tree People and Loyola Marymount University)[11]

Description
Percent Impervious land cover of residential parcels within a 10-minute walk of each park, calculated as the combined percentage of roads, buildings, driveways and other pavement.

Scale
Parkshed

Lowest Priority (0)
Lowest percentage of impervious landcover

Highest Priority (1)
Highest percentage of impervious landcover


New Park Priority Area Scoring Notes
Used square as parkshed

Figure 15. PNA Criteria: Lack of Private Open Space. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: Walkshed from RAP Parks (RAP Access Points (2025) and LA County CAMS Road Segments), Impervious Cover by Residential Parcel (Tree People and Loyola Marymount University)

BIODIVERSITY AND HABITAT CONSERVATION

Medium-Weight Criteria

THE PRESENCE, OR ABSENCE, OF A VARIETY OF PLANTS AND ANIMALS NEAR THE PARK.



Dataset and/or source
Urban Habitat Quality Score. City of LA Department of Sanitation (LASAN).[12]

Description
Proximity to biodiverse and habitat rich areas, based on the presence of an area within a half-mile walk that is rated 7 or higher in LASAN's Biodiversity Index Urban Habitat Quality Score, which rates areas within the city on a scale from 1 to 10 from low to high quality habitat.

Scale
Site

Lowest Priority (0)
Does not contain high quality habitat and is within a half mile of high quality habitat (already close by)

Highest Priority (1)
Contains high quality habitat (that should be maintained) or is further than a half mile from quality habitat (introduction of habitat is needed)


New Park Priority Area Scoring Notes
Used square as site

Figure 16. PNA Criteria: Biodiversity and Habitat Conservation. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: Urban Habitat Quality Score. City of LA Department of Sanitation (LASAN).

METRO CORRIDORS

Low-Weight Criteria

THE PROXIMITY OF THE PARK TO A METRO STATION.



Dataset and/or source
Walkshed from RAP Parks (RAP Access Points (2025) and LA County CAMS Road Segments), LA County Metropolitan Transit Authority (LAC MTA).

Description
Proximity to Metro Rail and Metrolink, as measured by being within a 10-minute walk of an existing station.

Scale
Site

Lowest Priority (0)
Sites outside of a 10-minute walk of an existing station

Highest Priority (1)
Sites within a 10-minute walk of an existing station

New Park Priority Area Scoring Notes
Used square as site


Figure 17. PNA Criteria: Metro Corridors. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: Walkshed from RAP Parks (RAP Access Points (2025) and LA County CAMS Road Segments), LA County Metropolitan Transit Authority (LAC MTA).

PERCEIVED PARK CONDITION

Low-Weight Criteria

THE PERCENTAGE OF RESIDENTS WHO THINK PARKS ARE IN POOR CONDITION BY COUNCIL DISTRICT.

Uses Statistically Valid Survey Results



Dataset and/or source
PNA Statistically Valid Survey Results, 2025.

Description
Residents' perception of the physical condition of parks by council district, based on responses to the question "How would you rate the physical condition?" by those who have visited any RAP parks in the past 12 months. Responses were multiple choice: Excellent, Good, Fair, or Poor.

Scale
Council District

Lowest Priority (0)
Lowest percentage of respondents who rated the physical condition of parks as fair or poor

Highest Priority (1)
Highest percentage of respondents who rated the physical condition of parks as fair or poor

New Park Priority Area Scoring Notes
Used square as site


Figure 18. PNA Criteria: Perceived Park Condition. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: PNA Statistically Valid Survey Results, 2025.

PERCEIVED RECREATION CENTER CONDITION

Low-Weight Criteria

THE PERCENTAGE OF RESIDENTS WHO THINK RECREATION CENTERS ARE IN POOR CONDITION BY COUNCIL DISTRICT.

Uses Statistically Valid Survey Results



Dataset and/or source
PNA Statistically Valid Survey Results, 2025.

Description
Residents' perception of the physical condition of recreation centers by council district, based on responses to the question "How would you rate the physical condition?" by those who have visited any RAP recreation center in the past 12 months. Responses were multiple choice: Excellent, Good, Fair, or Poor.

Scale
Council District

Lowest Priority (0)
Lowest percentage of respondents who rated the physical condition of recreation centers as fair or poor

Highest Priority (1)
Highest percentage of respondents who rated the physical condition of recreation centers as fair or poor

New Park Priority Area Scoring Notes
Used square as site


Figure 19. PNA Criteria: Perceived Recreation Center Condition. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: PNA Statistically Valid Survey Results, 2025.

PERCEIVED WALKABILITY

Low-Weight Criteria

INDICATES IF RESIDENTS FEEL THAT THEY CAN WALK TO A PARK OR RECREATION CENTER FROM THEIR HOME BY COUNCIL DISTRICT.

Uses Statistically Valid Survey Results



Dataset and/or source
PNA Statistically Valid Survey Results, 2025.

Description
Residents' perception of walkability by council district, based on responses to the question "Do you feel there is a sufficient number of parks and/or recreation centers within walking distance of your residence?" Responses were collected as either "yes" or "no".

Scale
Council District

Lowest Priority (0)
Highest percentage of respondents who feel there are a sufficient parks and/or recreation centers within walking distance

Highest Priority (1)
Lowest percentage of respondents who feel there are sufficient parks and/or recreation centers within walking distance

New Park Priority Area Scoring Notes
Used square as site


Figure 20. PNA Criteria: Perceived Walkability. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: PNA Statistically Valid Survey Results, 2025.

PRESENCE OF COMMUNITY PRIORITY AMENITIES

Low-Weight Criteria

THE AVAILABILITY AT THIS PARK OF THE TOP 5 AMENITIES RESIDENTS PRIORITIZED IN THIS COUNCIL DISTRICT.

Uses Statistically Valid Survey Results



Dataset and/or source
PNA Statistically Valid Survey Results, 2025.

Description
Availability of the top 5 indoor and outdoor facilities by council district, as identified by residents' responses to the question "Which four of the outdoor facilities [indoor facilities] listed above do you think are most important to you and the members of your household?", are available at each site.

Scale
Site

Lowest Priority (0)
Has all of residents' top 5 most important facilities

Highest Priority (1)
Has none of residents' top 5 most important facilities


New Park Priority Area Scoring Notes
One (Same as a park with no amenities)

Figure 21. PNA Criteria: Presence of Community Priority Amenities. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: PNA Statistically Valid Survey Results, 2025.

PARK VISITATION

Low-Weight Criteria

THE DIFFERENCE IN NUMBER OF VISITORS PER ACRE AT THIS PARK COMPARED TO THE CITYWIDE AVERAGE.



Dataset and/or source
Placer.ai[13] data of park visitation

Description
Estimated number of visits per acre between April 1, 2024 and March 31, 2025 based on Placer.ai's statistical extrapolation of aggregated, anonymized cell phone data. Roughly 50 parks do not have visitation data because Placer.ai's privacy policy precludes publishing data on sensitive locations such as schools and small sites with only playgrounds to protect younger park users.[14] These sites will be considered to have median visitation in the prioritization process.

Scale
Site

Lowest Priority (0)
Visitation around the median

Highest Priority (1)
Visitation that is much higher (overuse) or much lower (underuse) than the median

New Park Priority Area Scoring Notes
Median value (same as Park with No Data)

Figure 22. PNA Criteria: Park Visitation. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: Placer.ai data of park visitation

MYLA311 REQUESTS

Low-Weight Criteria

THE NUMBER OF MYLA311 REQUESTS PER ACRE FOR THIS PARK.



Dataset and/or source
City of LA MyLA311 requests (2025)

Description
Number of MyLA311 requests per acre, based on published MyLA311 data from April 1, 2024 through March 31, 2025.

Scale
Site

Lowest Priority (0)
lowest number of MyLA311 requests per acre

Highest Priority (1)
highest number of MyLA311 requests per acre


New Park Priority Area Scoring Notes
Median value

Figure 23. PNA Criteria: MyLA311 Requests. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: City of LA MyLA311 requests (2025)

HABITAT CONNECTIVITY

Low-Weight Criteria

THE LOCATION OF A PARK WITHIN A HALF MILE OF A HABITAT CONNECTIVITY POINT.



Dataset and/or source
Citywide Wildlife Connectivity. City of LA Department of Sanitation (LASAN).[15]

Description
Proximity to a wildlife connectivity pinch point, based on the presence of a pinch point from the LASAN Biodiversity Index Citywide Wildlife Connectivity Score within a half-mile walk. The Biodiversity Index defines a pinch point as a bottleneck where further habitat loss could restrict movement.[16]

Scale
Site

Lowest Priority (0)
Is farther than a half mile from a pinch point

Highest Priority (1)
Contains or is within a half mile of a pinch point

New Park Priority Area Scoring Notes
Use square as site

Figure 24. PNA Criteria: Habitat Connectivity. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: Citywide Wildlife Connectivity. City of LA Department of Sanitation (LASAN).

TREE SPECIES COMPOSITION

Low-Weight Criteria

PERCENTAGE OF LIVING NONNATIVE TREES IN THE PARK.



Dataset and/or source
City of LA RAP, Tree Inventory and OLIN, 2025.

Description
Percentage of trees in each park that are native species and viable, based on RAP's inventory of trees within their system. Approximately 40% of viable trees in this database are native species.

Scale
Site

Lowest Priority (0)
Highest percentage of trees that are native species

Highest Priority (1)
Lowest percentage of trees that are native species


New Park Priority Area Scoring Notes
Median Value

Figure 25. PNA Criteria: Tree Species Composition. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: City of LA RAP, Tree Inventory and OLIN (2025).

INFILTRATION AND RECHARGE OPPORTUNITIES

Low-Weight Criteria

IF THE PARK IS LOCATED IN AN AREA WHERE GROUNDWATER RECHARGE AND INFILTRATION ARE MOST FEASIBLE.



Dataset and/or source
LADWP Stormwater Capture Master Plan, 2015.

Description
Suitability for groundwater recharge and infiltration, based on the geophysical categories for infiltration in LADWP's Stormwater Capture Master Plan.

Scale
Site

Lowest Priority (0)
Lowest infiltration opportunity

Highest Priority (1)
Highest infiltration opportunity


New Park Priority Area Scoring Notes
Use square as site

Figure 26. PNA Criteria: Infiltration and Recharge Opportunities. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: LADWP Stormwater Capture Master Plan, 2015.

WATER QUALITY PRIORITY

Low-Weight Criteria

PERCENTAGE OF LIVING NONNATIVE TREES IN THE PARK.



Dataset and/or source
Walkshed from RAP Parks (RAP Access Points (2025) and LA County CAMS Road Segments), Water Quality Priority from LA County Public Works, Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP) LSPC Model Input (2012) and Geosyntec (2018).

Description
Priority of the watershed each site is in for water quality improvements, based on LA County Public Works' Water Quality Priority scores.

Scale
Site

Lowest Priority (0)
Within a watershed that has the lowest water quality need

Highest Priority (1)
Within a watershed that has the highest water quality need


New Park Priority Area Scoring Notes
Used square as parkshed

Figure 27. PNA Criteria: Water Quality Priority. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: Walkshed from RAP Parks (RAP Access Points (2025) and LA County CAMS Road Segments), Water Quality Priority from LA County Public Works, Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP) LSPC Model Input (2012) and Geosyntec (2018).

LA COUNTY PNA

Low-Weight Criteria

THE SITE'S PARK NEED ACCORDING TO THE 2016 LA COUNTY PARK NEEDS ASSESSMENT.



Dataset and/or source
Detailed LA County Park Needs Assessment Park Need (LA County)[17]

Description
Park need as identified by the 2016 LA County Park Needs Assessment, which considered a walkshed analysis, park pressure, and park conditions.

Scale
Parkshed

Lowest Priority (0)
Lowest park need score

Highest Priority (1)
Highest park need score

New Park Priority Area Scoring Notes
Used square as parkshed

Figure 28. PNA Criteria: LA County Park Needs Assessment. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: Detailed LA County Park Needs Assessment Park Need (LA County)



Figure 29. Drone image of Echo Park. Source: Calvada Surveying, 2025.



PERSQUAREMILE DETAILS

NEW PARK PRIORITY AREAS

The PerSquareMile tool identifies potential locations where RAP might invest in developing new parks.

WHAT IS A PERSQUAREMILE GRID?


The PerSquareMile analysis identifies the most populous, park-underserved 1-mile grid areas in Los Angeles. It then narrows these areas by identifying the grids with people experiencing the highest social and environmental vulnerabilities. This analysis guides investments in creating new park spaces to maximize impact.

ACCESS AND SUPPLY METRICS

The square-mile grid cells chosen as New Park Priority Areas contain the top 25% of residents lacking in either the park access or park supply and are also either in the top quartile of exposure based on their CalEnviroScreen4.0 (CES) or identified as a Disadvantaged Community (DAC). The PerSquareMile grid uses the DAC definition from the Statewide Parks Program, the largest park funding program in California history. In that program, DAC is defined as areas below 80% of statewide median household income. Through this process, 36 New Park Priority Areas were added to the Universe of Sites alongside the 482 existing parks.

PERSQUAREMILE GRIDS

1. PerSquareMile - Vermont Knolls
2. PerSquareMile - Florence
3. PerSquareMile - Vermont-Slauson
4. PerSquareMile - Harvard Park
5. PerSquareMile - Vermont-South Park
6. PerSquareMile - South Park-Florence
7. PerSquareMile - Central-Alameda
8. PerSquareMile - East Vermont Square
9. PerSquareMile - Historic South Central
10. PerSquareMile - Central-Alameda-North
11. PerSquareMile - Exposition Park
12. PerSquareMile - North Historic South Central
13. PerSquareMile - University Park North
14. PerSquareMile - Harvard Heights-Pico
15. PerSquareMile - Pico-Union
16. PerSquareMile - Downtown
17. PerSquareMile - Boyle Heights
18. PerSquareMile - Windsor Square
19. PerSquareMile - Koreatown
20. PerSquareMile - Westlake-Koreatown
21. PerSquareMile - Westlake
22. PerSquareMile - East Hollywood-Koreatown
23. PerSquareMile - East Hollywood
24. PerSquareMile - Tarzana-Encino
25. PerSquareMile - Van Nuys – Valley Glen
26. PerSquareMile - Winetka
27. PerSquareMile - Van Nuys West
28. PerSquareMile - Van Nuys Central
29. PerSquareMile - Van Nuys East
30. PerSquareMile - North Hollywood
31. PerSquareMile - Reseda
32. PerSquareMile - South Panorama City
33. PerSquareMile - Sun Valley
34. PerSquareMile - North Hills
35. PerSquareMile - Panorama City West
36. PerSquareMile - Arleta



THIS MAP IDENTIFIES NEW PARK PRIORITY AREAS FOR ADDRESSING THE TOP 25% OF THE NEED FOR NEW PARKS ACCESS AND ADDITIONAL PARK ACREAGE (SUPPLY), AS PART OF THE UNIVERSE OF SITES FOR THE PNA.

LEGEND

- Priority Areas due to Lack of Park Proximity (10 Minute Walk)
- Priority Areas due to Lack of Park Supply (Less than 3 park acres per 1,000 residents)
- Priority Areas due to Lack of Both Park Proximity and Park Supply

Figure 30. Thirty-six New Park Priority Areas were added to the "Universe of Sites" using the PerSquareMile tool. These sites were selected to help address both Park Access and Park Supply.
Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025.

VERMONT - KNOLLS




Figure 31. Parks within and near the Vermont - Knolls Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025.

LOCATION

Region: South

Neighborhoods: Florence, Broadway-Manchester, Vermont Knolls, Vermont Vista

Council Districts: CD 8, CD 9

WHY WAS THIS AREA SELECTED?

All people in PerSquare Mile - Vermont Knolls reside in an area where there is not enough park space for the number of people who live nearby. People here may face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+). Creating new parks in PerSquare Mile - Vermont Knolls can increase the amount of available park space per person and avoid overcrowding.

VERMONT - KNOLLS CHARACTERISTICS

Prioritization Tier: 2

Total Population Farther Than a 10 Minute Walk to a Park: 10.63% of population, 1,893 out of 17,800 people

Park Supply per 1,000 People: 0.82 acres

Suggested optimal is 3.0 acres

Population:

CalEnvironScreen 75+ (CES75+)

Existing Parks within the Vermont - Slauson Grid:


Algin Sutton Recreation Center, Vermont Miracle Park

FUTURE PARK NEED PROJECTIONS

These graphs portray what would happen to people living in the Vermont - Knolls Grid if no actions are taken to increase park access and supply.

POPULATION OF GRID

The population for this grid is predicted to increase by 7.2% between 2023 and 2050, from 21,950 to 23,537.




PARK ACRES PER 1000 PEOPLE

Park pressure is predicted to increase by 7.2% between 2023 and 2050, with acres available per thousand people decreasing from 0.82 to 0.76.




DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES (DAC) POPULATION

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) are predicted to increase by 8.1% between 2023 and 2050, from 17,800 to 19,249.




CALENVIROSCREEN 75TH+ PERCENTILE (CES75+) POPULATION

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) are predicted to increase by 7.2% between 2023 and 2050, from 21,888 to 23,456.




TOTAL POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

The population for this grid without park access is predicted to increase by 6.6% between 2023 and 2050, from 1,893 to 2,017.



DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) without park access are predicted to increase by 7.5% between 2023 and 2050, from 1,804 to 1,939.




CES75+ POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) without park access are predicted to increase by 6.6% between 2023 and 2050, from 1,893 to 2,017.



CES75+ AND DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People considered CES75+ and DAC without park access are predicted to increase by 7.5% between 2023 and 2050, from 1,804 to 1,939.



FLORENCE




Figure 32. Parks within and near the Florence Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply.
Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025.

LOCATION

Region: South

Neighborhoods: Broadway-Manchester, Florence, Green Meadows

Council Districts: 8, 9

WHY WAS THIS AREA SELECTED?

There are not enough parks in PerSquareMile - Florence for the amount of people who live there. People here may face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+). Creating new parks in PerSquareMile - Florence can increase the amount of available park space per person and avoid overcrowding.

FLORENCE CHARACTERISTICS

Prioritization Tier: 2

Total Population Farther Than a 10 Minute Walk to a Park: 1.20% of population, 302 out of 15,359 people

Park Supply per 1,000 People: 0.35 acres

Suggested optimal is 3.0 acres

Population:

CalEnvironScreen 75+ (CES75+)

Existing Parks within the Florence Grid:

Green Meadows Recreation Center

FUTURE PARK NEED PROJECTIONS

These graphs portray what would happen to people living in the Florence Grid if no actions are taken to increase park access and supply.


POPULATION OF GRID

The population for this grid is predicted to decrease by 1.34% between 2023 and 2050, from 23,165 to 22,855.




PARK ACRES PER 1000 PEOPLE

Park pressure is predicted to decrease by 1.34% between 2023 and 2050, with acres available per thousand people increasing from 0.35 to 0.36.



DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES (DAC) POPULATION

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) are predicted to increase by 2.3% between 2023 and 2050, from 15,359 to 15,705.




CALENVIROSCREEN 75TH+ PERCENTILE (CES75+) POPULATION

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) are predicted to decrease by 1.34% between 2023 and 2050, from 23,165 to 22,855.



TOTAL POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

The population for this grid without park access is predicted to decrease by 13.91% between 2023 and 2050, from 302 to 260.




DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) without park access are predicted to decrease by 13.91% between 2023 and 2050, from 302 to 260.




CES75+ POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) without park access are predicted to decrease by 13.91% between 2023 and 2050, from 302 to 260.



CES75+ AND DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People considered CES75+ and DAC without park access are predicted to decrease by 13.91% between 2023 and 2050, from 302 to 260.



VERMONT - SLAUSON




Figure 33. Parks within and near the Vermont - Slauson Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025.

LOCATION

Region: South

Neighborhoods: Vermont Knolls, Vermont-Slauson, Florence

Council Districts: CD 8, CD 9

WHY WAS THIS AREA SELECTED?

All people in PerSquareMile - Vermont-Slauson reside in an area where there is not enough parkspace for the number of people who live nearby. This is one of the most vulnerable areas in the city. The area faces higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+), and most households earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California. That is defined as a Disadvantaged Community (DAC). Creating new parks in PerSquareMile - Vermont-Slauson can increase the amount of available park space per person and avoid overcrowding.

VERMONT - SLOUSON CHARACTERISTICS

Prioritization Tier: 2

Total Population Farther Than a 10 Minute Walk to a Park: 1.08% of population, 224 out of 20,795 people

Park Supply per 1,000 People: 0.23 acres

Suggested optimal is 3.0 acres

Population:

Disadvantaged Community (DAC)

CalEnvironScreen 75+ (CES75+)

Existing Parks within the Vermont - Slauson Grid:

76th St Pocket Park, Hoover Gage Park, Mount Carmel Recreation Center, Mary McLeod Bethune Middle School (CSP), South Los Angeles Activity Center, Vermont Gage Park

FUTURE PARK NEED PROJECTIONS

These graphs portray what would happen to people living in the Vermont - Slauson Grid if no actions are taken to increase park access and supply.

POPULATION OF GRID

The population for this grid is predicted to increase by 0.03% between 2023 and 2050, from 21,255 to 21,261.




PARK ACRES PER 1000 PEOPLE

Park pressure is predicted to increase by 0.03% between 2023 and 2050, with acres available per thousand people staying the same, 0.23.




DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES (DAC) POPULATION

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) are predicted to increase by 0.37% between 2023 and 2050, from 20,795 to 20,871.



CALENVIROSCREEN 75TH+ PERCENTILE (CES75+) POPULATION

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) are predicted to increase by 0.22% between 2023 and 2050, from 20,902 to 20,948.



TOTAL POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

The population for this grid without park access is predicted to increase by 5.4% between 2023 and 2050, from 224 to 236.



DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) without park access are predicted to increase by 5.4% between 2023 and 2050, from 224 to 236.




CES75+ POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) without park access are predicted to increase by 5.4% between 2023 and 2050, from 224 to 236.



CES75+ AND DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People considered CES75+ and DAC without park access are predicted to increase by 5.4% between 2023 and 2050, from 224 to 236.



HARVARD-PARK




Figure 34. Parks within and near the Harvard-Park Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025.

LOCATION

Region: South

Neighborhoods: Chesterfield Square, Harvard Park, Vermont-Slauson, Vermont Square

Council Districts: 8, 9

WHY WAS THIS AREA SELECTED?

There are not enough parks in PerSquareMile - Harvard-Park for the amount of people who live there. People here may face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+). Creating new parks in PerSquare Mile - Harvard Park can increase the amount of available park space per person and avoid overcrowding.

HARVARD-PARK CHARACTERISTICS

Prioritization Tier: 2

Total Population Farther Than a 10 Minute Walk to a Park: 14.00% of population, 2,830 out of 20,221 people

Park Supply per 1,000 People: 0.41 acres

Suggested optimal is 3.0 acres

Population:

CalEnvironScreen 75+ (CES75+)

Existing Parks within the Harvard-Park Grid:


Challengers Boys & Girls Club, Harvard Park

FUTURE PARK NEED PROJECTIONS

These graphs portray what would happen to people living in the Harvard-Park Grid if no actions are taken to increase park access and supply.


POPULATION OF GRID

The population for this grid is predicted to decrease by 11.59% between 2023 and 2050, from 20,221 to 17,877.



PARK ACRES PER 1000 PEOPLE

Park pressure is predicted to decrease by 11.59% between 2023 and 2050, with acres available per thousand people increasing from 0.41 to 0.46.




DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES (DAC) POPULATION

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) are predicted to decrease by 0.72% between 2023 and 2050, from 9,086 to 9,021.




CALENVIROSCREEN 75TH+ PERCENTILE (CES75+) POPULATION

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) are predicted to decrease by 11.59% between 2023 and 2050, from 20,221 to 17,877.



TOTAL POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

The population for this grid without park access is predicted to decrease by 13.25% between 2023 and 2050, from 2,830 to 2,455.




DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) without park access are predicted to decrease by 7.65% between 2023 and 2050, from 1,738 to 1,605.



CES75+ POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) without park access are predicted to decrease by 13.25% between 2023 and 2050, from 2,830 to 2,455.



CES75+ AND DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People considered CES75+ and DAC without park access are predicted to decrease by 7.65% between 2023 and 2050, from 1,738 to 1,605.



VERMONT - SOUTH PARK




Figure 35. Parks within and near the Vermont - South Park Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025.

LOCATION

Region: South

Neighborhoods: Chesterfield Square, Harvard Park, Vermont-Slauson, Vermont Square

Council Districts: CD 8, CD 9

WHY WAS THIS AREA SELECTED?

All people in PerSquareMile - Vermont-South Park reside in an area where there is not enough parkspace for the number of people who live nearby. People here may face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+). Creating new parks in PerSquareMile - Vermont-South Park can increase the amount of available park space per person and avoid overcrowding.

VERMONT - SOUTH PARK CHARACTERISTICS

Prioritization Tier: 2

Total Population Farther Than a 10 Minute Walk to a Park: 73.42% of population, 16,605 out of 22,615 people

Park Supply per 1,000 People: 0.01 acres

Suggested optimal is 3.0 acres

Population:

CalEnvironScreen 75+ (CES75+)

Existing Parks within the Vermont - South Park Grid:


Senator Bill Greene Memorial Park, South Broadway Pocket Park

FUTURE PARK NEED PROJECTIONS

These graphs portray what would happen to people living in the Vermont - South Park Grid if no actions are taken to increase park access and supply.

POPULATION OF GRID

The population for this grid is predicted to decrease by 5.34% between 2023 and 2050, from 22,615 to 21,408.




PARK ACRES PER 1000 PEOPLE

Park pressure is predicted to decrease by 5.34% between 2023 and 2050, with acres available per thousand people staying the same, 0.01.




DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES (DAC) POPULATION

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) are predicted to decrease by 5.87% between 2023 and 2050, from 15,476 to 14,568.




CALENVIROSCREEN 75TH+ PERCENTILE (CES75+) POPULATION

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) are predicted to decrease by 5.34% between 2023 and 2050, from 22,615 to 21,408.




TOTAL POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

The population for this grid without park access is predicted to decrease by 9.28% between 2023 and 2050, from 1,605 to 1,456.




DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) without park access are predicted to decrease by 19.78% between 2023 and 2050, from 455 to 365.




CES75+ POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) without park access are predicted to decrease by 9.28% between 2023 and 2050, from 1,605 to 1,456.





CES75+ AND DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People considered CES75+ and DAC without park access are predicted to decrease by 19.78% between 2023 and 2050, from 455 to 365.



SOUTH PARK - FLORENCE





LEGEND

Existing Parks | Proximity (10 Minute Walk) | Supply (Less than 3 park acres per 1,000 residents) | Both

Figure 36. Parks within and near the South Park - Florence Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025.

LOCATION

Region: South

Neighborhoods: South Park, Florence

Council Districts: CD 9

WHY WAS THIS AREA SELECTED?

All people in PerSquareMile - South Park-Florence reside in an area where parks are too small for the number of people who live nearby. This is an area where most households earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California. That is defined as a Disadvantaged Community (DAC). Creating new parks in PerSquare Mile - South Park-Florence can increase the amount of available park space per person and avoid overcrowding.

SOUTH PARK - FLORENCE CHARACTERISTICS

Prioritization Tier: 2

Total Population Farther Than a 10 Minute Walk to a Park: 0% of population, 0 out of 19,131 people

Park Supply per 1,000 People: 1.48 acres

Suggested optimal is 3.0 acres

Population: Disadvantaged Community (DAC)

Existing Parks within the South Park - Florence Grid:


61st St Pocket Park, South LA Wetlands Park, South Park Recreation Center

FUTURE PARK NEED PROJECTIONS

These graphs portray what would happen to people living in the South Park - Florence Grid if no actions are taken to increase park access and supply.


POPULATION OF GRID

The population for this grid is predicted to decrease by 7.84% between 2023 and 2050, from 19,131 to 17,631.




PARK ACRES PER 1000 PEOPLE

Park pressure is predicted to decrease by 7.84% between 2023 and 2050, with acres available per thousand people increasing from 1.48 to 1.61.




DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES (DAC) POPULATION

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) are predicted to decrease by 7.27% between 2023 and 2050, from 18,668 to 17,310.




CALENVIROSCREEN 75TH+ PERCENTILE (CES75+) POPULATION

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) are predicted to decrease by 7.84% between 2023 and 2050, from 19,131 to 17,631.




TOTAL POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

The population for this grid without park access is predicted to stay the same between 2023 and 2050, from 0 to 0.




DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) without park access are predicted to stay the same between 2023 and 2050, from 0 to 0.




CES75+ POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) without park access are predicted to stay the same between 2023 and 2050, from 0 to 0.





CES75+ AND DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People considered CES75+ and DAC without park access are predicted to stay the same between 2023 and 2050, from 0 to 0.



CENTRAL-ALAMEDA





LEGEND

Existing Parks | Proximity (10 Minute Walk) | Supply (Less than 3 park acres per 1,000 residents) | Both

Figure 37. Parks within and near the Central-Alameda Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025.

LOCATION

Region: South

Neighborhoods: Central-Alameda, Florence, South Park

Council Districts: 9

WHY WAS THIS AREA SELECTED?

There are not enough parks in PerSquareMile - Central-Alameda for the amount of people who live there. This is one of the most vulnerable areas in the city. The area faces higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+), and most households earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California. That is defined as a Disadvantaged Community (DAC). Creating new parks in PerSquareMile - Central-Alameda can increase the amount of available park space per person and avoid overcrowding.

CENTRAL-ALAMEDA CHARACTERISTICS

Prioritization Tier: 2

Total Population Farther Than a 10 Minute Walk to a Park: 0.00% of population, 0 out of 21,337 people

Park Supply per 1,000 People: 0.80 acres

Suggested optimal is 3.0 acres

Population:

CalEnvironScreen 75+ (CES75+)

Disadvantaged Community (DAC)

Existing Parks within the Central-Alameda Grid:


James Slauson Recreation Area, Augustus F Hawkins Natural Park

FUTURE PARK NEED PROJECTIONS

These graphs portray what would happen to people living in the Central-Alameda Grid if no actions are taken to increase park access and supply.


POPULATION OF GRID

The population for this grid is predicted to decrease by 9.27% between 2023 and 2050, from 21,337 to 19,359.




PARK ACRES PER 1000 PEOPLE

Park pressure is predicted to decrease by 9.27% between 2023 and 2050, with acres available per thousand people increasing from 0.80 to 0.88.




DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES (DAC) POPULATION

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) are predicted to decrease by 8.29% between 2023 and 2050, from 20,035 to 18,374.




CALENVIROSCREEN 75TH+ PERCENTILE (CES75+) POPULATION

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) are predicted to decrease by 9.27% between 2023 and 2050, from 21,337 to 19,359.



TOTAL POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

The population for this grid without park access is predicted to stay the same between 2023 and 2050, at 0.




DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) without park access are predicted to stay the same between 2023 and 2050, at 0.



CES75+ POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) without park access is predicted to stay the same between 2023 and 2050, at 0.





CES75+ AND DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People considered CES75+ and DAC without park access are predicted to stay the same between 2023 and 2050, at 0.



EAST VERMONT SQUARE





LEGEND

Existing Parks | Proximity (10 Minute Walk) | Supply (Less than 3 park acres per 1,000 residents) | Both

Figure 38. Parks within and near the East Vermont Square, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025.

LOCATION

Region: South

Neighborhoods: South Park, Historic South-Central, Vermont Square, Exposition Park

Council Districts: 8, 9

WHY WAS THIS AREA SELECTED?

There are not enough parks in PerSquareMile - East Vermont Square for the amount of people who live there. This is one of the most vulnerable areas in the city. The area faces higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+), and most households earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California. That is defined as a Disadvantaged Community (DAC). Creating new parks in PerSquareMile - East Vermont Square can increase the amount of available park space per person and avoid overcrowding.

EAST VERMONT SQUARE CHARACTERISTICS

Prioritization Tier: 1

Total Population Farther Than a 10 Minute Walk to a Park: 6.60% of population, 1,656 out of 25,242 people

Park Supply per 1,000 People: 0.30 acres

Suggested optimal is 3.0 acres

Population:

Disadvantaged Community (DAC)

CalEnvironScreen 75+ (CES75+)

Existing Parks within the East Vermont Square Grid:


EXPO Center, Orchard Ave Park, Julian C Dixon Park

FUTURE PARK NEED PROJECTIONS

These graphs portray what would happen to people living in the East Vermont Square Grid if no actions are taken to increase park access and supply.


POPULATION OF GRID

The population for this grid is predicted to decrease by 3.15% between 2023 and 2050, from 25,242 to 24,448.




PARK ACRES PER 1000 PEOPLE

Park pressure is predicted to decrease by 3.15% between 2023 and 2050, with acres available per thousand people increasing from 0.30 to 0.31.




DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES (DAC) POPULATION

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) are predicted to decrease by 1.64% between 2023 and 2050, from 23,656 to 23,269.



CALENVIROSCREEN 75TH+ PERCENTILE (CES75+) POPULATION

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) are predicted to decrease by 2.97% between 2023 and 2050, from 25,093 to 24,348.



TOTAL POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

The population for this grid without park access is predicted to increase by 2.0% between 2023 and 2050, from 1,656 to 1,689.



DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) without park access are predicted to increase by 2.0% between 2023 and 2050, from 1,656 to 1,689.



CES75+ POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) without park access are predicted to increase by 2.5% between 2023 and 2050, from 1,643 to 1,684.





CES75+ AND DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People considered CES75+ and DAC without park access are predicted to increase by 2.5% between 2023 and 2050, from 1,643 to 1,684.



HISTORIC SOUTH CENTRAL





LEGEND

Existing Parks | Proximity (10 Minute Walk) | Supply (Less than 3 park acres per 1,000 residents) | Both

Figure 39. Parks within and near the Historic South Central Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025.

LOCATION

Region: South

Neighborhoods: South Park, Historic South Central

Council Districts: CD 9

WHY WAS THIS AREA SELECTED?

All people in PerSquareMile - Historic South Central reside in an area where parks are too small for the number of people who live nearby. This is one of the most vulnerable areas in the city. The area faces higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+), and most households earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California. That is defined as a Disadvantaged Community (DAC). Creating new parks in PerSquare Mile - Historic South Central can increase the amount of available park space per person and avoid overcrowding.

HISTORIC SOUTH CENTRAL CHARACTERISTICS

Prioritization Tier: 1

Total Population Farther Than a 10 Minute Walk to a Park: 0.00% of population, 0 out of 26,397 people

Park Supply per 1,000 People: 0.83 acres

Suggested optimal is 3.0 acres

Population:

Disadvantaged Community (DAC)

CalEnvironScreen 75+ (CES75+)

Existing Parks within the Historic South Central Grid:


Gilbert W Lindsay Recreation Center, South Park Recreation Area

FUTURE PARK NEED PROJECTIONS

These graphs portray what would happen to people living in the Historic South Central Grid if no actions are taken to increase park access and supply.


POPULATION OF GRID

The population for this grid is predicted to decrease by 4.83% between 2023 and 2050, from 26,397 to 25,122.



PARK ACRES PER 1000 PEOPLE

Park pressure is predicted to decrease by 4.83% between 2023 and 2050, with acres available per thousand people increasing from 0.83 to 0.87.




DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES (DAC) POPULATION

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) are predicted to decrease by 5.55% between 2023 and 2050, from 21,117 to 19,946.




CALENVIROSCREEN 75TH+ PERCENTILE (CES75+) POPULATION

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) are predicted to decrease by 4.83% between 2023 and 2050, from 26,397 to 25,122.




TOTAL POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

The population for this grid without park access is predicted to stay the same between 2023 and 2050, at 0.



DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) without park access are predicted to remain the same between 2023 and 2050, at 0



CES75+ POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) without park access are predicted to remain the same between 2023 and 2050, at 0.





CES75+ AND DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People considered CES75+ and DAC without park access are predicted to remain the same between 2023 and 2050, at 0.



CENTRAL-ALAMEDA-NORTH





LEGEND

Existing Parks | Proximity (10 Minute Walk) | Supply (Less than 3 park acres per 1,000 residents) | Both

Figure 40. Parks within and near the Central-Alameda-North Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025.

LOCATION

Region: South

Neighborhoods: South Park, Historic South-Central, Central-Alameda

Council Districts: 10, 13

WHY WAS THIS AREA SELECTED?

There are not enough parks in PerSquareMile - Central-Alameda-North for the amount of people who live there. People here may face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+). Creating new parks in PerSquareMile - Central-Alameda-North can increase the amount of available park space per person and avoid overcrowding.

CENTRAL-ALAMEDA-NORTH CHARACTERISTICS

Prioritization Tier: 2

Total Population Farther Than a 10 Minute Walk to a Park: 0.00% of population, 0 out of 21,653 people

Park Supply per 1,000 People: 0.66 acres

Suggested optimal is 3.0 acres

Population:

CalEnvironScreen 75+ (CES75+)

Existing Parks within the Central-Alameda-North Grid:


Fred Roberts Recreation Center, Ross Snyder Recreation Center

FUTURE PARK NEED PROJECTIONS

These graphs portray what would happen to people living in the Central-Alameda-North Grid if no actions are taken to increase park access and supply.


POPULATION OF GRID

The population for this grid is predicted to decrease by 4.07% between 2023 and 2050, from 21,653 to 20,772.




PARK ACRES PER 1000 PEOPLE

Park pressure is predicted to decrease by 4.07% between 2023 and 2050, with acres available per thousand people increasing from 0.66 to 0.68.



DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES (DAC) POPULATION

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) are predicted to decrease by 1.64% between 2023 and 2050, from 18,190 to 17,891.



CALENVIROSCREEN 75TH+ PERCENTILE (CES75+) POPULATION

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) are predicted to decrease by 4.07% between 2023 and 2050, from 21,653 to 20,772.




TOTAL POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

The population for this grid without park access is predicted to stay the same between 2023 and 2050, at 0.



DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) without park access are predicted to stay the same between 2023 and 2050, at 0.




CES75+ POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) without park access is predicted to stay the same between 2023 and 2050, at 0.



CES75+ AND DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People considered CES75+ and DAC without park access are predicted to stay the same between 2023 and 2050, at 0.



EXPOSITION PARK




Figure 41. Parks within and near the Exposition Park, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply.
Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025.

LOCATION

Region: South

Neighborhoods: Adams-Normandie, Exposition Park, Jefferson Park

Council Districts: 8, 10

WHY WAS THIS AREA SELECTED?

There are not enough parks in PerSquareMile - Exposition Park for the amount of people who live there. This is an area where most households earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California. That is defined as a Disadvantaged Community (DAC). Creating new parks in PerSquare Mile - Exposition Park can increase the amount of available park space per person and avoid overcrowding.

EXPOSITION PARK CHARACTERISTICS

Prioritization Tier: 1

Total Population Farther Than a 10 Minute Walk to a Park: 0.00% of population, 0 out of 22,112 people

Park Supply per 1,000 People: 0.39 acres

Suggested optimal is 3.0 acres

Population:

Disadvantaged Community (DAC)

Existing Parks within the Exposition Park Grid:


Denker Recreation Center, Martin Luther King Jr Park

FUTURE PARK NEED PROJECTIONS

These graphs portray what would happen to people living in the Exposition Park Grid if no actions are taken to increase park access and supply.

POPULATION OF GRID

The population for this grid is predicted to increase by 8.8% between 2023 and 2050, from 22,112 to 24,052.




PARK ACRES PER 1000 PEOPLE

Park pressure is predicted to increase by 8.8% between 2023 and 2050, with acres available per thousand people decreasing from 0.39 to 0.36.




DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES (DAC) POPULATION

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) are predicted to increase by 9.6% between 2023 and 2050, from 19,220 to 21,063.



CALENVIROSCREEN 75TH+ PERCENTILE (CES75+) POPULATION

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) are predicted to increase by 6.9% between 2023 and 2050, from 17,918 to 19,158.




TOTAL POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

The population for this grid without park access is predicted to stay the same between 2023 and 2050, at 0.



DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) without park access are predicted to stay the same between 2023 and 2050, at 0.




CES75+ POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) without park access is predicted to stay the same between 2023 and 2050, at 0.



CES75+ AND DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People considered CES75+ and DAC without park access are predicted to stay the same between 2023 and 2050, at 0.



NORTH HISTORIC SOUTH CENTRAL




Figure 42. Parks within and near the North Historic South Central, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025.

LOCATION

Region: South

Neighborhoods: Historic South-Central

Council Districts: 9

WHY WAS THIS AREA SELECTED?

There are not enough parks in PerSquareMile - North Historic South Central for the amount of people who live there. People here may face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+). Creating new parks in PerSquare Mile - North Historic South Central can increase the amount of available park space per person and avoid overcrowding.

NORTH HISTORIC SOUTH CENTRAL CHARACTERISTICS

Prioritization Tier: 1

Total Population Farther Than a 10 Minute Walk to a Park: 3.40% of population, 832 out of 21,695 people

Park Supply per 1,000 People: 0.10 acres

Suggested optimal is 3.0 acres

Population:

CalEnvironScreen 75+ (CES75+)

Existing Parks within the North Historic South Central Grid:


Trinity Recreation Center

FUTURE PARK NEED PROJECTIONS

These graphs portray what would happen to people living in the North Historic South Central Grid if no actions are taken to increase park access and supply.


POPULATION OF GRID

The population for this grid is predicted to increase by 2.9% between 2023 and 2050, from 21,695 to 22,315.




PARK ACRES PER 1000 PEOPLE

Park pressure is predicted to increase by 2.9% between 2023 and 2050, with acres available per thousand people decreasing from 0.10 to 0.09.




DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES (DAC) POPULATION

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) are predicted to increase by 7.3% between 2023 and 2050, from 16,526 to 17,732.



CALENVIROSCREEN 75TH+ PERCENTILE (CES75+) POPULATION

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) are predicted to increase by 2.9% between 2023 and 2050, from 21,695 to 22,315.




TOTAL POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

The population for this grid without park access is predicted to decrease by 5.41% between 2023 and 2050, from 832 to 787.



DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) without park access are predicted to decrease by 2.70% between 2023 and 2050, from 704 to 685.



CES75+ POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) without park access are predicted to decrease by 5.41% between 2023 and 2050, from 832 to 787.



CES75+ AND DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People considered CES75+ and DAC without park access are predicted to decrease by 2.70% between 2023 and 2050, from 704 to 685.



UNIVERSITY PARK NORTH




Figure 43. Parks within and near the University Park North, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025.

LOCATION

Region: East/Central

Neighborhoods: Adams-Normandie, Historic South-Central, Pico-Union, University Park

Council Districts: 1, 8, 9

WHY WAS THIS AREA SELECTED?

There are not enough parks in PerSquareMile - University Park North for the amount of people who live there. This is one of the most vulnerable areas in the city. The area faces higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+), and most households earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California. That is defined as a Disadvantaged Community (DAC). Creating new parks in PerSquare Mile - University Park North can increase the amount of available park space per person and avoid overcrowding.

UNIVERSITY PARK NORTH CHARACTERISTICS

Prioritization Tier: 1

Total Population Farther Than a 10 Minute Walk to a Park: 0.00% of population, , 0 out of 21,770 people

Park Supply per 1,000 People: 0.35 acres

Suggested optimal is 3.0 acres

Population:

Disadvantaged Community (DAC)

CalEnvironScreen 75+ (CES75+)

Existing Parks within the University Park North Grid:


Hoover Recreation Center, Parque Nativo Lopez, Saint James Park, Toberman Recreation Center

FUTURE PARK NEED PROJECTIONS

These graphs portray what would happen to people living in the University Park North Grid if no actions are taken to increase park access and supply.


POPULATION OF GRID

The population for this grid is predicted to increase by 13% between 2023 and 2050, from 21,770 to 24,545.




PARK ACRES PER 1000 PEOPLE

Park pressure is predicted to increase by 13% between 2023 and 2050, with acres available per thousand people decreasing from 0.35 to 0.31.




DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES (DAC) POPULATION

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) are predicted to increase by 15% between 2023 and 2050, from 20,460 to 23,508.



CALENVIROSCREEN 75TH+ PERCENTILE (CES75+) POPULATION

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) are predicted to increase by 13% between 2023 and 2050, from 21,756 to 24,528.




TOTAL POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

The population for this grid without park access is predicted to stay the same between 2023 and 2050, at 0.



DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) without park access are predicted to stay the same between 2023 and 2050, at 0.



CES75+ POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) without park access is predicted to stay the same between 2023 and 2050, at 0.





CES75+ AND DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People considered CES75+ and DAC without park access are predicted to stay the same between 2023 and 2050, at 0.



HARVARD HEIGHTS-PICO





LEGEND

Existing Parks | Proximity (10 Minute Walk) | Supply (Less than 3 park acres per 1,000 residents) | Both

Figure 44. Parks within and near the Harvard Heights-Pico Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025.

LOCATION

Region: South

Neighborhoods: Pico-Union, Koreatown, Harvard Heights

Council Districts: 1, 10

WHY WAS THIS AREA SELECTED?

There are not enough parks in PerSquareMile - Harvard Heights-Pico for the amount of people who live there. This is an area where most households earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California. That is defined as a Disadvantaged Community (DAC). Creating new parks in PerSquareMile - Harvard Heights-Pico can increase the amount of available park space per person and avoid overcrowding.

HARVARD HEIGHTS-PICO CHARACTERISTICS

Prioritization Tier: 2

Total Population Farther Than a 10 Minute Walk to a Park: 0.05% of population, 146 out of 27,182 people

Park Supply per 1,000 People: 0.25 acres

Suggested optimal is 3.0 acres

Population:

Disadvantaged Community (DAC)

Existing Parks within the Harvard-Heights-Pico Grid:


Normandie Recreation Center, Seoul Internation Park

FUTURE PARK NEED PROJECTIONS

These graphs portray what would happen to people living in the Harvard Heights-Pico Grid if no actions are taken to increase park access and supply.


POPULATION OF GRID

The population for this grid is predicted to increase by 26% between 2023 and 2050, from 27,182 to 34,211.




PARK ACRES PER 1000 PEOPLE

Park pressure is predicted to increase by 26% between 2023 and 2050, with acres available per thousand people decreasing from 0.25 to 0.20.




DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES (DAC) POPULATION

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) are predicted to increase by 26% between 2023 and 2050, from 26,395 to 33,291.



CALENVIROSCREEN 75TH+ PERCENTILE (CES75+) POPULATION

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) are predicted to increase by 30% between 2023 and 2050, from 16,905 to 22,002.



TOTAL POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

The population for this grid without park access is predicted to decrease by 5.48% between 2023 and 2050, from 146 to 138.



DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) without park access are predicted to decrease by 5.48% between 2023 and 2050, from 146 to 138.



CES75+ POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) without park access are predicted to decrease by 5.48% between 2023 and 2050, from 146 to 138.





CES75+ AND DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People considered CES75+ and DAC without park access are predicted to decrease by 5.48% between 2023 and 2050, from 146 to 138.



PICO-UNION





LEGEND

Existing Parks | Proximity (10 Minute Walk) | Supply (Less than 3 park acres per 1,000 residents) | Both

Figure 45. Parks within and near the Pico-Union, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply.
Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025.

LOCATION

Region: East/Central

Neighborhoods: Westlake Pico-Union, Koreatown

Council Districts: 1, 10

WHY WAS THIS AREA SELECTED?

There are not enough parks in PerSquareMile - Pico-Union for the amount of people who live there. This is one of the most vulnerable areas in the city. The area faces higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+), and most households earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California. That is defined as a Disadvantaged Community (DAC). Creating new parks in PerSquare Mile - Pico-Union can increase the amount of available park space per person and avoid overcrowding.

PICO-UNION CHARACTERISTICS

Prioritization Tier: 1

Total Population Farther Than a 10 Minute Walk to a Park: 1.53% of population, 616 out of 40,301 people

Park Supply per 1,000 People: 0.04 acres

Suggested optimal is 3.0 acres

Population:

Disadvantaged Community (DAC)

CalEnvironScreen 75+ (CES75+)

Existing Parks within the Pico-Union Grid:


Alvarado Terrace Park, Hope and Peace Park, Leo Politi Elementary School (CSP)

FUTURE PARK NEED PROJECTIONS

These graphs portray what would happen to people living in the Pico-Union Grid if no actions are taken to increase park access and supply.

POPULATION OF GRID

The population for this grid is predicted to increase by 12% between 2023 and 2050, from 40,301 to 45,071.




PARK ACRES PER 1000 PEOPLE

Park pressure is predicted to increase by 12% between 2023 and 2050, with acres available per thousand people decreasing from 0.04 to 0.03.




DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES (DAC) POPULATION

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) are predicted to increase by 12% between 2023 and 2050, from 40,152 to 44,954.




CALENVIROSCREEN 75TH+ PERCENTILE (CES75+) POPULATION

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) are predicted to increase by 11% between 2023 and 2050, from 37,979 to 42,295.




TOTAL POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

The population for this grid without park access is predicted to increase by 35% between 2023 and 2050, from 616 to 829.



DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) without park access are predicted to increase by 35% between 2023 and 2050, from 616 to 829.



CES75+ POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) without park access are predicted to increase by 35% between 2023 and 2050, from 616 to 829.



CES75+ AND DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People considered CES75+ and DAC without park access are predicted to increase by 35% between 2023 and 2050, from 616 to 829.



DOWNTOWN




Figure 46. Parks within and near the Downtown, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply.
Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025.

LOCATION

Region: South

Neighborhoods: Downtown

Council Districts: 1, 14

WHY WAS THIS AREA SELECTED?

There are not enough parks in PerSquareMile - Downtown for the amount of people who live there. People here may face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+). Creating new parks in PerSquare Mile - Downtown can increase the amount of available park space per person and avoid overcrowding.

DOWNTOWN CHARACTERISTICS

Prioritization Tier: 1

Total Population Farther Than a 10 Minute Walk to a Park: 0.00% of population, 0 out of 27,533 people

Park Supply per 1,000 People: 0.61 acres

Suggested optimal is 3.0 acres

Population:

CalEnvironScreen 75+ (CES75+)

Existing Parks within the Downtown Grid:


1st and Broadway Civic Center, City Hall Park, Pershing Square, San Julian Park, Spring Street Park

FUTURE PARK NEED PROJECTIONS

These graphs portray what would happen to people living in the Downtown Grid if no actions are taken to increase park access and supply.


POPULATION OF GRID

The population for this grid is predicted to increase by 158% between 2023 and 2050, from 27,533 to 70,978.




PARK ACRES PER 1000 PEOPLE

Park pressure is predicted to increase by 158% between 2023 and 2050, with acres available per thousand people decreasing from 0.61 to 0.24.




DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES (DAC) POPULATION

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) are predicted to increase by 220% between 2023 and 2050, from 14,752 to 47,255.




CALENVIROSCREEN 75TH+ PERCENTILE (CES75+) POPULATION

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) are predicted to increase by 170% between 2023 and 2050, from 24,751 to 66,743.




TOTAL POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

The population for this grid without park access is predicted to stay the same between 2023 and 2050, at 0.




DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) without park access are predicted to stay the same between 2023 and 2050, at 0.




CES75+ POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) without park access is predicted to stay the same between 2023 and 2050, at 0.



CES75+ AND DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People considered CES75+ and DAC without park access are predicted to stay the same between 2023 and 2050, at 0.



BOYLE HEIGHTS




Figure 47. Parks within and near the Boyle Heights Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025.

LOCATION

Region: East/Central

Neighborhoods: Boyle Heights

Council Districts: 14

WHY WAS THIS AREA SELECTED?

There are not enough parks in PerSquareMile - Boyle Heights for the amount of people who live there. This is one of the most vulnerable areas in the city. The area faces higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+), and most households earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California. That is defined as a Disadvantaged Community (DAC). Creating new parks in PerSquareMile - Boyle Heights can increase the amount of available park space per person and avoid overcrowding.

BOYLE HEIGHTS CHARACTERISTICS

Prioritization Tier: 2

Total Population Farther Than a 10 Minute Walk to a Park: 0.00% of population, 0 out of 20,970 people

Park Supply per 1,000 People: 0.55 acres

Suggested optimal is 3.0 acres

Population:

CalEnvironScreen 75+ (CES75+)

Disadvantaged Community (DAC)

Existing Parks within the Boyle Heights Grid:


Brooklyn Heights Park, Hollenbeck Park, Prospect Park, Ross Valencia Community Park, State Street Recreation Center

FUTURE PARK NEED PROJECTIONS

These graphs portray what would happen to people living in the Boyle Heights Grid if no actions are taken to increase park access and supply.


POPULATION OF GRID

The population for this grid is predicted to decrease by 2.96% between 2023 and 2050, from 20,970 to 20,350.




PARK ACRES PER 1000 PEOPLE

Park pressure is predicted to decrease by 2.96% between 2023 and 2050, with acres available per thousand people increasing from 0.55 to 0.56.




DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES (DAC) POPULATION

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) are predicted to decrease by 2.86% between 2023 and 2050, from 19,290 to 18,739.



CALENVIROSCREEN 75TH+ PERCENTILE (CES75+) POPULATION

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) are predicted to decrease by 2.35% between 2023 and 2050, from 20,461 to 19,981.




TOTAL POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

The population for this grid without park access is predicted to stay the same between 2023 and 2050, at 0.




DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) without park access are predicted to stay the same between 2023 and 2050, at 0.




CES75+ POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) without park access is predicted to stay the same between 2023 and 2050, at 0.



CES75+ AND DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People considered CES75+ and DAC without park access are predicted to stay the same between 2023 and 2050, at 0.



WINDSOR SQUARE




Figure 48. Parks within and near the Windsor Square Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025.

LOCATION

Region: East/Central

Neighborhoods: Hancock Park, Koreatown, Mid-Wilshire, Windsor Square

Council Districts: CD 5, CD 10, CD 13

WHY WAS THIS AREA SELECTED?

Many people in PerSquareMile - Windsor Square lack access to a park within a 10-minute walk (a half mile). This is an area where most households earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California. That is defined as a Disadvantaged Community (DAC). Creating new parks in PerSquareMile - Windsor Square can counterbalance the well-being challenges these communities face by bringing parks closer.

WINDSOR SQUARE CHARACTERISTICS

Prioritization Tier: 2

Total Population Farther Than a 10 Minute Walk to a Park: 60.60% of population, 12.117 out of 19,995 people

Park Supply per 1,000 People: 0.08 acres

Suggested optimal is 3.0 acres

Population:

Disadvantaged Community (DAC)

CalEnvironScreen 75+ (CES75+)

Existing Parks within the Windsor Square Grid:


Harold A Henry Park

FUTURE PARK NEED PROJECTIONS

These graphs portray what would happen to people living in the Windsor Square Grid if no actions are taken to increase park access and supply.

POPULATION OF GRID

The population for this grid is predicted to increase by 18% between 2023 and 2050, from 19,995 to 23,689.




PARK ACRES PER 1000 PEOPLE

Park pressure is predicted to increase by 18% between 2023 and 2050, with acres available per thousand people decreasing from 0.08 to 0.07.




DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES (DAC) POPULATION

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) are predicted to increase by 21% between 2023 and 2050, from 14,614 to 17,704.




CALENVIROSCREEN 75TH+ PERCENTILE (CES75+) POPULATION

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) are predicted to increase by 43% between 2023 and 2050, from 402 to 574.




TOTAL POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

The population for this grid without park access is predicted to increase by 16% between 2023 and 2050, from 12,117 to 14,093.




DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) without park access are predicted to increase by 19% between 2023 and 2050, from 10,698 to 12,712.




CES75+ POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) without park access are predicted to increase by 88% between 2023 and 2050, from 83 to 156.



CES75+ AND DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People considered CES75+ and DAC without park access are predicted to increase by 88% between 2023 and 2050, from 83 to 156.



KOREATOWN




Figure 49. Parks within and near the Koreatown Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply.
Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025.

LOCATION

Region: Central/East

Neighborhoods: Koreatown

Council Districts: CD 1, CD 10, CD 13

WHY WAS THIS AREA SELECTED?

People in PerSquare Mile - Koreatown live in a park-underserved Disadvantaged Community. Many people lack access to parks within a 10-minute walk (a half mile). Others are in areas where the parks are too small for the number of people who live nearby. Most households earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California. That is defined as a Disadvantaged Community (DAC). Creating new parks in PerSquare Mile - Koreatown can increase the amount of available park space per person and improve their access to nearby parks.

KOREATOWN CHARACTERISTICS

Prioritization Tier: 2

Total Population Farther Than a 10 Minute Walk to a Park: 37.01% of population, 17,970 out of 48,561 people

Park Supply per 1,000 People: 0.0 acres

Suggested optimal is 3.0 acres

Population:

Disadvantaged Community (DAC)

Existing Parks within the Koreatown Grid:


Pio Pico Library Pocket Park

FUTURE PARK NEED PROJECTIONS

These graphs portray what would happen to people living in the Koreatown Grid if no actions are taken to increase park access and supply.


POPULATION OF GRID

The population for this grid is predicted to increase by 14% between 2023 and 2050, from 48,561 to 55,509.




PARK ACRES PER 1000 PEOPLE

There are no parks in this PerSquareMile grid. The absence of parks means there is no parkland to relieve the population pressure at all, and it gets more urgent as the population increases.




DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES (DAC) POPULATION

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) are predicted to increase by 14% between 2023 and 2050, from 45,408 to 51,610.




CALENVIROSCREEN 75TH+ PERCENTILE (CES75+) POPULATION

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) are predicted to increase by 14% between 2023 and 2050, from 15,357 to 17,491.




TOTAL POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

The population for this grid without park access is predicted to increase by 21% between 2023 and 2050, from 17,970 to 21,783.



DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) without park access are predicted to increase by 21% between 2023 and 2050, from 17,907 to 21,688.



CES75+ POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) without park access are predicted to increase by 22% between 2023 and 2050, from 4,065 to 4,953.





CES75+ AND DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People considered CES75+ and DAC without park access are predicted to increase by 22% between 2023 and 2050, from 4,065 to 4,953.



WESTLAKE-KOREATOWN





LEGEND

Existing Parks | Proximity (10 Minute Walk) | Supply (Less than 3 park acres per 1,000 residents) | Both

Figure 50. Parks within and near the Westlake-Koreatown Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025.

LOCATION

Region: East/Central

Neighborhoods: Koreatown, Westlake

Council Districts: 1, 10

WHY WAS THIS AREA SELECTED?

There are not enough parks in PerSquareMile - Westlake-Koreatown for the amount of people who live there. This is one of the most vulnerable areas in the city. The area faces higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+), and most households earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California. That is defined as a Disadvantaged Community (DAC). Creating new parks in PerSquare Mile - Westlake-Koreatown can increase the amount of available park space per person and avoid overcrowding.

WESTLAKE-KOREATOWN CHARACTERISTICS

Prioritization Tier: 1

Total Population Farther Than a 10 Minute Walk to a Park: 0.00% of population, 0 out of 92,950 people

Park Supply per 1,000 People: 0.43 acres

Suggested optimal is 3.0 acres

Population:

Disadvantaged Community (DAC)

CalEnvironScreen 75+ (CES75+)

Existing Parks within the Westlake-Koreatown Grid:


Golden Age Park, Lafayette Recreation Center, MacArthur Park, Shatto Park Recreation Center

FUTURE PARK NEED PROJECTIONS

These graphs portray what would happen to people living in the Westlake-Koreatown Grid if no actions are taken to increase park access and supply.


POPULATION OF GRID

The population for this grid is predicted to increase by 17% between 2023 and 2050, from 40,384 to 47,259.




PARK ACRES PER 1000 PEOPLE

Park pressure is predicted to increase by 17% between 2023 and 2050, with acres available per thousand people decreasing from 1.17 to 1.00.




DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES (DAC) POPULATION

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) are predicted to increase by 19% between 2023 and 2050, from 35,633 to 42,532.




CALENVIROSCREEN 75TH+ PERCENTILE (CES75+) POPULATION

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) are predicted to increase by 19% between 2023 and 2050, from 33,281 to 39,589.



TOTAL POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

The population for this grid without park access is predicted to stay the same between 2023 and 2050, at 0.




DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) without park access are predicted to stay the same between 2023 and 2050, at 0.



CES75+ POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) without park access is predicted to stay the same between 2023 and 2050, at 0.




CES75+ AND DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People considered CES75+ and DAC without park access are predicted to stay the same between 2023 and 2050, at 0.



WESTLAKE



LEGEND

Existing Parks | Proximity (10 Minute Walk) | Supply (Less than 3 park acres per 1,000 residents) | Both

Figure 51. Parks within and near the Westlake Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply.
Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025.

LOCATION

Region: East/Central

Neighborhoods: Westlake, Downtown, Echo Park

Council Districts: 1, 13

WHY WAS THIS AREA SELECTED?

There are not enough parks in PerSquareMile - Westlake for the amount of people who live there. This is one of the most vulnerable areas in the city. The area faces higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+), and most households earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California. That is defined as a Disadvantaged Community (DAC). Creating new parks in PerSquare Mile - Westlake can increase the amount of available park space per person and avoid overcrowding.

WESTLAKE CHARACTERISTICS

Prioritization Tier: 1

Total Population Farther Than a 10 Minute Walk to a Park: 0.00% of population, 0 out of 38,451 people

Park Supply per 1,000 People: 0.46 acres

Suggested optimal is 3.0 acres

Population:

Disadvantaged Community (DAC)

CalEnvironScreen 75+ (CES75+)

Existing Parks within the Westlake Grid:


Echo Park, Lake Street Park, Rockwood Community Park, Unidad Park, Vista Hermosa Park

FUTURE PARK NEED PROJECTIONS

These graphs portray what would happen to people living in the Westlake Grid if no actions are taken to increase park access and supply.


POPULATION OF GRID

The population for this grid is predicted to increase by 9.5% between 2023 and 2050, from 38,451 to 42,111.




PARK ACRES PER 1000 PEOPLE

Park pressure is predicted to increase by 9.5% between 2023 and 2050, with acres available per thousand people decreasing from 0.46 to 0.42.




DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES (DAC) POPULATION

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) are predicted to increase by 12% between 2023 and 2050, from 30,679 to 34,320.




CALENVIROSCREEN 75TH+ PERCENTILE (CES75+) POPULATION

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) are predicted to increase by 8.6% between 2023 and 2050, from 36,605 to 39,737.



TOTAL POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

The population for this grid without park access is predicted to stay the same between 2023 and 2050, at 0.




DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) without park access are predicted to stay the same between 2023 and 2050, at 0.



CES75+ POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) without park access is predicted to stay the same between 2023 and 2050, at 0.



CES75+ AND DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People considered CES75+ and DAC without park access are predicted to stay the same between 2023 and 2050, at 0.



EAST HOLLYWOOD - KOREATOWN




Figure 52. Parks within and near the East Hollywood-Koreatown Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025.

LOCATION

Region: East/Central

Neighborhoods: East Hollywood, Koreatown

Council Districts: 10, 13

WHY WAS THIS AREA SELECTED?

There are not enough parks in PerSquareMile - East Hollywood-Koreatown for the amount of people who live there. This is one of the most vulnerable areas in the city. The area faces higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+), and most households earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California. That is defined as a Disadvantaged Community (DAC). Creating new parks in PerSquareMile - East Hollywood-Koreatown can increase the amount of available park space per person and avoid overcrowding.

EAST HOLLYWOOD-KOREATOWN CHARACTERISTICS

Prioritization Tier: 2

Total Population Farther Than a 10 Minute Walk to a Park: 0.00% of population, 0 out of 29,982 people

Park Supply per 1,000 People: 0.01 acres

Suggested optimal is 3.0 acres

Population:

CalEnvironScreen 75+ (CES75+)

Disadvantaged Community (DAC)

Existing Parks within the East Hollywood-Koreatown Grid:


Harvard Elementary School (CSP)

FUTURE PARK NEED PROJECTIONS

These graphs portray what would happen to people living in the East Hollywood-Koreatown Grid if no actions are taken to increase park access and supply.


POPULATION OF GRID

The population for this grid is predicted to increase by 7.7% between 2023 and 2050, from 29,982 to 32,288.




PARK ACRES PER 1000 PEOPLE

Park pressure is predicted to increase by 7.7% between 2023 and 2050, with acres available per thousand people staying the same, 0.01.




DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES (DAC) POPULATION

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) are predicted to increase by 7.8% between 2023 and 2050, from 29,609 to 31,924




CALENVIROSCREEN 75TH+ PERCENTILE (CES75+) POPULATION

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) are predicted to increase by 8.5% between 2023 and 2050, from 21,651 to 23,487.



TOTAL POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

The population for this grid without park access is predicted to increase by 7.0% between 2023 and 2050, from 2,701 to 2,890.




DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) without park access are predicted to increase by 7.0% between 2023 and 2050, from 2,701 to 2,890.



CES75+ POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) without park access are predicted to decrease by 5.86% between 2023 and 2050, from 1,161 to 1,093.



CES75+ AND DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People considered CES75+ and DAC without park access are predicted to decrease by 5.86% between 2023 and 2050, from 1,161 to 1,093.



EAST HOLLYWOOD




Figure 53. Parks within and near the East Hollywood Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025.

LOCATION

Region: East/Central

Neighborhoods: East Hollywood, Los Feliz

Council Districts: 4, 13

WHY WAS THIS AREA SELECTED?

There are not enough parks in PerSquareMile - East Hollywood for the amount of people who live there. People here may face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+). Creating new parks in PerSquareMile - Florence can increase the amount of available park space per person and avoid overcrowding.

EAST HOLLYWOOD CHARACTERISTICS

Prioritization Tier: 2

Total Population Farther Than a 10 Minute Walk to a Park: 0.00% of population, 0 out of 28,209 people

Park Supply per 1,000 People: 0.41 acres

Suggested optimal is 3.0 acres

Population:

CalEnvironScreen 75+ (CES75+)

Existing Parks within the East Hollywood Grid:


Barnsdall Park, La Mirada Park, Lemon Grove Recreation Center, Ramona Elementary School (CSP)

FUTURE PARK NEED PROJECTIONS

These graphs portray what would happen to people living in the East Hollywood Grid if no actions are taken to increase park access and supply.


POPULATION OF GRID

The population for this grid is predicted to increase by 6.0% between 2023 and 2050, from 28,209 to 29,912.




PARK ACRES PER 1000 PEOPLE

Park pressure is predicted to increase by 6.0% between 2023 and 2050, with acres available per thousand people decreasing from 0.41 to 0.39.




DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES (DAC) POPULATION

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) are predicted to increase by 4.7% between 2023 and 2050, from 26,743 to 28,004.




CALENVIROSCREEN 75TH+ PERCENTILE (CES75+) POPULATION

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) are predicted to increase by 9.0% between 2023 and 2050, from 24,387 to 26,573.




TOTAL POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

The population for this grid without park access is predicted to stay the same between 2023 and 2050, at 0.




DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) without park access are predicted to stay the same between 2023 and 2050, at 0.




CES75+ POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) without park access is predicted to stay the same between 2023 and 2050, at 0.



CES75+ AND DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People considered CES75+ and DAC without park access are predicted to stay the same between 2023 and 2050, at 0.



TARZANA - ENCINO




Figure 54. Parks within and near the Tarzana - Encino Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025.

LOCATION

Region: Valley

Neighborhoods: Tarzana, Encino

Council Districts: CD 3, CD 4

WHY WAS THIS AREA SELECTED?

Many people in PerSquare Mile - Tarzana-Encino lack access to a park within a 10-minute walk (a half mile). This is an area where most households earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California. That is defined as a Disadvantaged Community (DAC). Creating new parks in PerSquare Mile - Tarzana-Encino can counterbalance the well-being challenges these communities face by bringing parks closer.

TARZANA - ENCINO CHARACTERISTICS

Prioritization Tier: 2

Total Population Farther Than a 10 Minute Walk to a Park: 87.93% of population, 16,817 out of 19,126 people

Park Supply per 1,000 People: 0.00 acres

Suggested optimal is 3.0 acres

Population:

Disadvantaged Community (DAC)

Existing Parks within the Tarzana Encino Grid:


None

FUTURE PARK NEED PROJECTIONS

These graphs portray what would happen to people living in the Tarzana Encino Grid if no actions are taken to increase park access and supply.

POPULATION OF GRID

The population for this grid is predicted to increase by 1.0% between 2023 and 2050, from 19,126 to 19,319.




PARK ACRES PER 1000 PEOPLE

There are no parks in this PerSquareMile grid. The absence of parks means there is no parkland to relieve the population pressure at all, and it gets more urgent as the population increases.




DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES (DAC) POPULATION

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) are predicted to decrease by 5.22% between 2023 and 2050, from 12,393 to 11,746.




CALENVIROSCREEN 75TH+ PERCENTILE (CES75+) POPULATION

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) are predicted to decrease by 1.36% between 2023 and 2050, from 6,772 to 6,680.




TOTAL POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

The population for this grid without park access is predicted to increase by 0.40% between 2023 and 2050, from 16,817 to 16,884.



DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) without park access are predicted to increase by 1.5% between 2023 and 2050, from 13,184 to 13,381.




CES75+ POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) without park access are predicted to decrease by 1.21% between 2023 and 2050, from 6,356 to 6,279.



CES75+ AND DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People considered CES75+ and DAC without park access are predicted to decrease by 1.21% between 2023 and 2050, from 6,356 to 6,279.



VAN NUYS – VALLEY GLEN




Figure 55. Parks within and near the Van Nuys – Valley Glen Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025.

LOCATION

Region: Valley

Neighborhoods: Van Nuys, Valley Glen

Council Districts: 2, 4, 6

WHY WAS THIS AREA SELECTED?

Many people in PerSquare Mile - Van Nuys - Valley Glen lack access to a park within a 10-minute walk (a half mile). They also face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+). Creating new parks in PerSquare Mile - Van Nuys - Valley Glen would provide needed green space, recreation, and health benefits to residents.

VAN NUYS – VALLEY GLEN CHARACTERISTICS

Prioritization Tier: 1

Total Population Farther Than a 10 Minute Walk to a Park: 0.00% of population, 0 out of 18,370 people

Park Supply per 1,000 People: 0.08 acres

Suggested optimal is 3.0 acres

Population:

CalEnvironScreen 75+ (CES75+)

Existing Parks within the Van Nuys – Valley Glen Grid:


Van Nuys Multipurpose Center

FUTURE PARK NEED PROJECTIONS

These graphs portray what would happen to people living in the Van Nuys - Valley Glen Grid if no actions are taken to increase park access and supply.


POPULATION OF GRID

The population for this grid is predicted to increase by 7.9% between 2023 and 2050, from 18,370 to 19,823.




PARK ACRES PER 1000 PEOPLE

Park pressure is predicted to increase by 7.9% between 2023 and 2050, with acres available per thousand people decreasing from 0.08 to 0.07.




DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES (DAC) POPULATION

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) are predicted to increase by 6.6% between 2023 and 2050, from 15,346 to 16,359.




CALENVIROSCREEN 75TH+ PERCENTILE (CES75+) POPULATION

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) are predicted to increase by 6.8% between 2023 and 2050, from 16,566 to 17,698.




TOTAL POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

The population for this grid without park access is predicted to increase by 13% between 2023 and 2050, from 9,317 to 10,485.




DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) without park access are predicted to increase by 13% between 2023 and 2050, from 6,492 to 7,338.




CES75+ POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) without park access are predicted to increase by 12% between 2023 and 2050, from 7,778 to 8,690.



CES75+ AND DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People considered CES75+ and DAC without park access are predicted to increase by 12% between 2023 and 2050, from 6,492 to 7,268.



WINETKA




Figure 56. Parks within and near the Winetka Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply.
Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025.

LOCATION

Region: Valley

Neighborhoods: Winetka, Encino, Tarzana

Council Districts: CD 3, CD 4

WHY WAS THIS AREA SELECTED?

Many people in PerSquareMile - Winetka lack access to a park within a 10-minute walk (a half mile). They also face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+). Creating new parks in PerSquareMile - Winetka would provide needed green space, recreation, and health benefits to residents.

WINETKA CHARACTERISTICS

Prioritization Tier: 2

Total Population Farther Than a 10 Minute Walk to a Park: 76.70% of population, 9,925 out of 12,895 people

Park Supply per 1,000 People: 0.00 acres

Suggested optimal is 3.0 acres

Population:

CalEnvironScreen 75+ (CES75+)

Existing Parks within the Winetka Grid:


None

FUTURE PARK NEED PROJECTIONS

These graphs portray what would happen to people living in the Winetka Grid if no actions are taken to increase park access and supply.


POPULATION OF GRID

The population for this grid is predicted to decrease by 4.84% between 2023 and 2050, from 12,895 to 12,271.




PARK ACRES PER 1000 PEOPLE

There are no parks in this PerSquareMile grid. The absence of parks means there is no parkland to relieve the population pressure at all, and it gets more urgent as the population increases.




DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES (DAC) POPULATION

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) are predicted to decrease by 7.63% between 2023 and 2050, from 3,461 to 3,197.




CALENVIROSCREEN 75TH+ PERCENTILE (CES75+) POPULATION

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) are predicted to decrease by 4.84% between 2023 and 2050, from 12,895 to 12,271.



TOTAL POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

The population for this grid without park access is predicted to decrease by 4.35% between 2023 and 2050, from 10,376 to 9,925.




DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) without park access are predicted to decrease by 10.43% between 2023 and 2050, from 2,943 to 2,636.




CES75+ POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) without park access are predicted to decrease by 4.35% between 2023 and 2050, from 10,376 to 9,925.



CES75+ AND DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People considered CES75+ and DAC without park access are predicted to decrease by 10.43% between 2023 and 2050, from 2,943 to 2,636.



VAN NUYS WEST




Figure 57. Parks within and near the Van Nuys West Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025.

LOCATION

Region: Valley

Neighborhoods: Van Nuys

Council Districts: CD 6

WHY WAS THIS AREA SELECTED?

Many people in PerSquareMile - Van Nuys West lack access to a park within a 10-minute walk (a half mile). This is one of the most vulnerable areas in the city. People here may face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+). This is an area where most households earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California. Creating new parks in PerSquareMile - Van Nuys West would provide needed green space, recreation, and health benefits to residents.

VAN NUYS WEST CHARACTERISTICS

Prioritization Tier: 2

Total Population Farther Than a 10 Minute Walk to a Park: 89.28% of population, 13,738 out of 15,388 people

Park Supply per 1,000 People: 0.00 acres, *Suggested optimal is 3.0 acres*

Population:

Disadvantaged Community (DAC)

CalEnvironScreen 75+ (CES75+)

Existing Parks within the Van Nuys West Grid:


None

FUTURE PARK NEED PROJECTIONS

These graphs portray what would happen to people living in the Van Nuys West Grid if no actions are taken to increase park access and supply.

POPULATION OF GRID

The population for this grid is predicted to increase by 8.4% between 2023 and 2050, from 17,015 to 18,442.




PARK ACRES PER 1000 PEOPLE

There are no parks in this PerSquareMile grid. The absence of parks means there is no parkland to relieve the population pressure at all, and it gets more urgent as the population increases.




DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES (DAC) POPULATION

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) are predicted to increase by 7.9% between 2023 and 2050, from 15,388 to 16,605.




CALENVIROSCREEN 75TH+ PERCENTILE (CES75+) POPULATION

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) are predicted to increase by 8.4% between 2023 and 2050, from 17,015 to 18,442.




TOTAL POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

The population for this grid without park access is predicted to increase by 9.8% between 2023 and 2050, from 13,738 to 15,085.




DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) without park access are predicted to increase by 9.4% between 2023 and 2050, from 12,111 to 13,248.




CES75+ POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) without park access are predicted to increase by 9.8% between 2023 and 2050, from 13,738 to 15,085.



CES75+ AND DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People considered CES75+ and DAC without park access are predicted to increase by 9.4% between 2023 and 2050, from 12,111 to 13,248.



VAN NUYS CENTRAL




Figure 58. Parks within and near the Van Nuys Central Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025.

LOCATION

Region: Valley

Neighborhoods: Van Nuys

Council Districts: CD 2, CD 6

WHY WAS THIS AREA SELECTED?

Many people in PerSquareMile - Van Nuys Central lack access to a park within a 10-minute walk (a half mile). This is one of the most vulnerable areas in the city. People here may face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+). This is an area where most households earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California.Creating new parks in PerSquareMile - Van Nuys Central would provide needed green space, recreation, and health benefits to residents.

VAN NUYS CENTRAL CHARACTERISTICS

Prioritization Tier: 2

Total Population Farther Than a 10 Minute Walk to a Park: 63.02% of population, 11,799 out of 18,722 people

Park Supply per 1,000 People: 0.00 acres

Suggested optimal is 3.0 acres

Population:

Disadvantaged Community (DAC)

CalEnvironScreen 75+ (CES75+)

Existing Parks within the Van Nuys Central Grid:


None

FUTURE PARK NEED PROJECTIONS

These graphs portray what would happen to people living in the Van Nuys Central Grid if no actions are taken to increase park access and supply.

POPULATION OF GRID

The population for this grid is predicted to increase by 13% between 2023 and 2050, from 18,722 to 21,116.




PARK ACRES PER 1000 PEOPLE

There are no parks in this PerSquareMile grid. The absence of parks means there is no parkland to relieve the population pressure at all, and it gets more urgent as the population increases.




DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES (DAC) POPULATION

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) are predicted to increase by 16% between 2023 and 2050, from 11,510 to 13,340.




CALENVIROSCREEN 75TH+ PERCENTILE (CES75+) POPULATION

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) are predicted to increase by 16% between 2023 and 2050, from 11,510 to 13,340.




TOTAL POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

The population for this grid without park access is predicted to increase by 5.5% between 2023 and 2050, from 11,799 to 12,448.




DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) without park access are predicted to increase by 7.2% between 2023 and 2050, from 8,083 to 8,664.




CES75+ POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) without park access are predicted to increase by 5.5% between 2023 and 2050, from 11,799 to 12,448.



CES75+ AND DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People considered CES75+ and DAC without park access are predicted to increase by 7.2% between 2023 and 2050, from 8,083 to 8,664.



VAN NUYS EAST




Figure 59. Parks within and near the Van Nuys East Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025.

LOCATION

Region: Valley

Neighborhoods: Van Nuys, Valley Glen

Council Districts: CD 2, CD 6

WHY WAS THIS AREA SELECTED?

All people in PerSquare Mile - Van Nuys East reside in an area where parks are too small for the number of people who live nearby. People here may face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+). Creating new parks in PerSquare Mile - Van Nuys East can increase the amount of available park space per person and avoid overcrowding.

VAN NUYS EAST CHARACTERISTICS

Prioritization Tier: 1

Total Population Farther Than a 10 Minute Walk to a Park: 5.19% of population, 1,082 out of 20,856 people

Park Supply per 1,000 People: 0.22 acres

Suggested optimal is 3.0 acres

Population: CalEnvironScreen 75+ (CES75+)

Existing Parks within the Van Nuys East Grid:


Greenwood Square Park, Hartland Mini Park, Van Nuys Recreation Center

FUTURE PARK NEED PROJECTIONS

These graphs portray what would happen to people living in the Van Nuys East Grid if no actions are taken to increase park access and supply.

POPULATION OF GRID

The population for this grid is predicted to increase by 5.2% between 2023 and 2050, from 19,826 to 20,856.




PARK ACRES PER 1000 PEOPLE

Park pressure is predicted to increase by 5.2% between 2023 and 2050, with acres available per thousand people decreasing from 0.22 to 0.21.




DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES (DAC) POPULATION

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) are predicted to increase by 4.4% between 2023 and 2050, from 17,308 to 18,071.




CALENVIROSCREEN 75TH+ PERCENTILE (CES75+) POPULATION

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) are predicted to increase by 5.2% between 2023 and 2050, from 19,826 to 20,856.




TOTAL POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

The population for this grid without park access is predicted to decrease by 1.10% between 2023 and 2050, from 1,094 to 1,082.




DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) without park access are predicted to decrease by 1.10% between 2023 and 2050, from 1,094 to 1,082.



CES75+ POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) without park access are predicted to decrease by 1.10% between 2023 and 2050, from 1,094 to 1,082.



CES75+ AND DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People considered CES75+ and DAC without park access are predicted to decrease by 1.10% between 2023 and 2050, from 1,094 to 1,082.



NORTH HOLLYWOOD




Figure 60. Parks within and near the North Hollywood, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply.
Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025.

LOCATION

Region: Valley

Neighborhoods: North Hollywood, Sun Valley

Council Districts: 2

WHY WAS THIS AREA SELECTED?

There are not enough parks in PerSquareMile - North Hollywood for the amount of people who live there. This is one of the most vulnerable areas in the city. People here may face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+). This is an area where most households earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California. Creating new parks in PerSquare Mile - North Hollywood would provide needed green space, recreation, and health benefits to residents.

NORTH HOLLYWOOD CHARACTERISTICS

Prioritization Tier: 1

Total Population Farther Than a 10 Minute Walk to a Park: 75.0% of population, 9,964 out of 13,557 people

Park Supply per 1,000 People:0.00 acres

Suggested optimal is 3.0 acres

Population:

Disadvantaged Community (DAC)

CalEnvironScreen 75+ (CES75+)

Existing Parks within the North Hollywood Grid:


None

FUTURE PARK NEED PROJECTIONS

These graphs portray what would happen to people living in the North Hollywood Grid if no actions are taken to increase park access and supply.


POPULATION OF GRID

The population for this grid is predicted to increase by 3.8% between 2023 and 2050, from 13,557 to 14,069




PARK ACRES PER 1000 PEOPLE

There are no parks in this PerSquareMile grid. The absence of parks means there is no parkland to relieve the population pressure at all, and it gets more urgent as the population increases.




DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES (DAC) POPULATION

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) are predicted to increase by 8.2% between 2023 and 2050, from 11,361 to 12,293.




CALENVIROSCREEN 75TH+ PERCENTILE (CES75+) POPULATION

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) are predicted to increase by 3.8% between 2023 and 2050, from 13,557 to 14,069.




TOTAL POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

The population for this grid without park access is predicted to increase by 1.9% between 2023 and 2050, from 9,964 to 10,155.




DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) without park access are predicted to increase by 6.9% between 2023 and 2050, from 8,344 to 8,922.




CES75+ POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) without park access are predicted to increase by 1.9% between 2023 and 2050, from 9,964 to 10,155.



CES75+ AND DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People considered CES75+ and DAC without park access are predicted to increase by 6.9% between 2023 and 2050, from 8,344 to 8,922.



RESEDA




Figure 61. Parks within and near the Reseda Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply.
Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025.

LOCATION

Region: Valley

Neighborhoods: Reseda, Northridge

Council Districts: CD 3, CD 4, CD 12

WHY WAS THIS AREA SELECTED?

Many people in PerSquareMile - Reseda lack access to a park within a 10-minute walk (a half mile). They also face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+). Creating new parks in PerSquare Mile - Reseda would provide needed green space, recreation, and health benefits to residents.

RESEDA

CHARACTERISTICS

Prioritization Tier: 2

Total Population Farther Than a 10 Minute Walk to a Park: 77.11% of population, 8,776 out of 11,381 people

Park Supply per 1,000 People: 0.07 acres

Suggested optimal is 3.0 acres

Population:

CalEnvironScreen 75+ (CES75+)

Existing Parks within the Reseda Grid:


None

FUTURE PARK NEED PROJECTIONS

These graphs portray what would happen to people living in the Reseda Grid if no actions are taken to increase park access and supply.

POPULATION OF GRID

The population for this grid is predicted to increase by 8.2% between 2023 and 2050, from 11,381 to 12,316.




PARK ACRES PER 1000 PEOPLE

Park pressure is predicted to increase by 8.2% between 2023 and 2050, with acres available per thousand people decreasing from 0.07 to 0.06.




DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES (DAC) POPULATION

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) are predicted to increase by 7.4% between 2023 and 2050, from 6,652 to 7,144.




CALENVIROSCREEN 75TH+ PERCENTILE (CES75+) POPULATION

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) are predicted to increase by 6.4% between 2023 and 2050, from 10,153 to 10,801.




TOTAL POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

The population for this grid without park access is predicted to increase by 8.8% between 2023 and 2050, from 8,776 to 9,547.




DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) without park access are predicted to increase by 10% between 2023 and 2050, from 5,889 to 6,482.




CES75+ POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) without park access are predicted to increase by 8.6% between 2023 and 2050, from 8,669 to 9,415.





CES75+ AND DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People considered CES75+ and DAC without park access are predicted to increase by 10% between 2023 and 2050, from 5,889 to 6,482.



SOUTH PANORAMA CITY





LEGEND

Existing Parks | Proximity (10 Minute Walk) | Supply (Less than 3 park acres per 1,000 residents) | Both

Figure 62. Parks within and near the South Panorama City Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025.

LOCATION

Region: Valley

Neighborhoods: Panorama City

Council Districts: CD 2, CD 6

WHY WAS THIS AREA SELECTED?

Many people in PerSquareMile - South Panorama City lack access to a park within a 10-minute walk (a half mile). They also face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+). Creating new parks in PerSquare Mile - South Panorama City would provide needed green space, recreation, and health benefits to residents.

SOUTH PANORAMA CITY CHARACTERISTICS

Prioritization Tier: 2

Total Population Farther Than a 10 Minute Walk to a Park: 82.60% of population, 9,207 out of 11,147 people

Park Supply per 1,000 People: 0.0 acres

Suggested optimal is 3.0 acres

Population:

CalEnvironScreen 75+ (CES75+)

Existing Parks within the South Panorama City Grid:


None

FUTURE PARK NEED PROJECTIONS

These graphs portray what would happen to people living in the South Panorama City Grid if no actions are taken to increase park access and supply.


POPULATION OF GRID

The population for this grid is predicted to increase by 5.6% between 2023 and 2050, from 11,147 to 11,766.




PARK ACRES PER 1000 PEOPLE

There are no parks in this PerSquareMile grid. The absence of parks means there is no parkland to relieve the population pressure at all, and it gets more urgent as the population increases.




DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES (DAC) POPULATION

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) are predicted to increase by 7.5% between 2023 and 2050, from 9,474 to 10,180.




CALENVIROSCREEN 75TH+ PERCENTILE (CES75+) POPULATION

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) are predicted to increase by 5.7% between 2023 and 2050, from 11,037 to 11,667.




TOTAL POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

The population for this grid without park access is predicted to increase by 3.8% between 2023 and 2050, from 9,207 to 9,558.




DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) without park access are predicted to increase by 5.8% between 2023 and 2050, from 7,534 to 7,973.




CES75+ POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) without park access are predicted to increase by 4.0% between 2023 and 2050, from 9,097 to 9,459.



CES75+ AND DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People considered CES75+ and DAC without park access are predicted to increase by 5.8% between 2023 and 2050, from 7,527 to 7,965.



SUN VALLEY




Figure 63. Parks within and near the Sun Valley Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply.
Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025.

LOCATION

Region: Valley

Neighborhoods: Sun Valley

Council Districts: CD 2, CD 6

WHY WAS THIS AREA SELECTED?

Many people in PerSquareMile - Sun Valley lack access to a park within a 10-minute walk (a half mile). This is one of the most vulnerable areas in the city. People here may face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+). This is an area where most households earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California. Creating new parks in PerSquare Mile - Sun Valley would provide needed green space, recreation, and health benefits to residents.

SUN VALLEY CHARACTERISTICS

Prioritization Tier: 2

Total Population Farther Than a 10 Minute Walk to a Park: 87.93% of population, 16,817 out of 19,126 people

Park Supply per 1,000 People: 0.00 acres

Suggested optimal is 3.0 acres

Population:

Disadvantaged Community (DAC)

CalEnvironScreen 75+ (CES75+)

Existing Parks within the Sun Valley Grid:


Camillia Ave Elementary School (CSP)

FUTURE PARK NEED PROJECTIONS

These graphs portray what would happen to people living in the Sun Valley Grid if no actions are taken to increase park access and supply.


POPULATION OF GRID

The population for this grid is predicted to increase by 0.42% between 2023 and 2050, from 12,577 to 12,630.




PARK ACRES PER 1000 PEOPLE

There are no parks in this PerSquareMile grid. The absence of parks means there is no parkland to relieve the population pressure at all, and it gets more urgent as the population increases.



DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES (DAC) POPULATION

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) are predicted to decrease by 0.30% between 2023 and 2050, from 9,803 to 9,774.



CALENVIROSCREEN 75TH+ PERCENTILE (CES75+) POPULATION

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) are predicted to increase by 0.42% between 2023 and 2050, from 12,577 to 12,630.




TOTAL POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

The population for this grid without park access is predicted to decrease by 0.65% between 2023 and 2050, from 11,149 to 11,076.



DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) without park access are predicted to decrease by 1.84% between 2023 and 2050, from 8,375 to 8,221.




CES75+ POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) without park access are predicted to decrease by 0.65% between 2023 and 2050, from 11,149 to 11,076.



CES75+ AND DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People considered CES75+ and DAC without park access are predicted to decrease by 1.84% between 2023 and 2050, from 8,375 to 8,221.



NORTH HILLS




Figure 64. Parks within and near the North Hills Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply.
Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025.

LOCATION

Region: Valley

Neighborhoods: North Hills, Panorama City, Van Nuys

Council Districts: CD 6, CD 7, CD 12

WHY WAS THIS AREA SELECTED?

All people in PerSquareMile - North Hills reside in an area where parks are too small for the number of people who live nearby. People here may face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+). Creating new parks in PerSquareMile - North Hills can increase the amount of available park space per person and avoid overcrowding.

NORTH HILLS CHARACTERISTICS

Prioritization Tier: 2

Total Population Farther Than a 10 Minute Walk to a Park: 16.21% of population, 3,308 out of 20,410 people

Park Supply per 1,000 People: 0.036 acres

Suggested optimal is 3.0 acres

Population:

CalEnvironScreen 75+ (CES75+)

Existing Parks within the North Hills Grid:


North Hills Community Park

FUTURE PARK NEED PROJECTIONS

These graphs portray what would happen to people living in the North Hills Grid if no actions are taken to increase park access and supply.


POPULATION OF GRID

The population for this grid is predicted to increase by 4.7% between 2023 and 2050, from 19,499 to 20,410.




PARK ACRES PER 1000 PEOPLE

Park pressure is predicted to increase by 4.7% between 2023 and 2050, with acres available per thousand people decreasing from 0.20 to 0.19.



DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES (DAC) POPULATION

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) are predicted to increase by 6.9% between 2023 and 2050, from 16,394 to 17,521.




CALENVIROSCREEN 75TH+ PERCENTILE (CES75+) POPULATION

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) are predicted to increase by 4.7% between 2023 and 2050, from 19,499 to 20,410.



TOTAL POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

The population for this grid without park access is predicted to decrease by 4.50% between 2023 and 2050, from 3,464 to 3,308.



DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) without park access are predicted to increase by 18% between 2023 and 2050, from 679 to 799.



CES75+ POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) without park access are predicted to decrease by 4.50% between 2023 and 2050, from 3,464 to 3,308.



CES75+ AND DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People considered CES75+ and DAC without park access are predicted to increase by 18% between 2023 and 2050, from 679 to 799.



PANORAMA CITY WEST




Figure 65. Parks within and near the Panorama City West Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025.

LOCATION

Region: Valley

Neighborhoods: Panorama City, Van Nuys

Council Districts: CD 6, CD 7

WHY WAS THIS AREA SELECTED?

All people in PerSquareMile - Panorama City West reside in an area where there is not enough park space for the number of people who live nearby. This is one of the most vulnerable areas in the city. The area faces higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+), and most households earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California. That is defined as a Disadvantaged Community (DAC). Creating new parks in PerSquareMile - Panorama City West can increase the amount of available park space per person and avoid overcrowding.

PANORAMA CITY WEST CHARACTERISTICS

Prioritization Tier: 2

Total Population Farther Than a 10 Minute Walk to a Park: 0.49% of population, 140 out of 29,872 people

Park Supply per 1,000 People: 0.036 acres

Suggested optimal is 3.0 acres

Population:

Disadvantaged Community (DAC)

CalEnvironScreen 75+ (CES75+)

Existing Parks within the Panorama City West Grid:


Sepulveda Recreation Center

FUTURE PARK NEED PROJECTIONS

These graphs portray what would happen to people living in the Panorama City West Grid if no actions are taken to increase park access and supply.


POPULATION OF GRID

The population for this grid is predicted to decrease by 0.34% between 2023 and 2050, from 29,872 to 29,769.




PARK ACRES PER 1000 PEOPLE

Park pressure is predicted to decrease by 0.34% between 2023 and 2050, with acres available per thousand people staying the same, 0.36.



DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES (DAC) POPULATION

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) are predicted to decrease by 0.27% between 2023 and 2050, from 29,457 to 29,376.



CALENVIROSCREEN 75TH+ PERCENTILE (CES75+) POPULATION

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) are predicted to decrease by 0.34% between 2023 and 2050, from 29,872 to 29,769.



TOTAL POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

The population for this grid without park access is predicted to increase by 12% between 2023 and 2050, from 140 to 157.




DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) without park access are predicted to increase by 12% between 2023 and 2050, from 140 to 157.




CES75+ POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) without park access are predicted to increase by 12% between 2023 and 2050, from 140 to 157.



CES75+ AND DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People considered CES75+ and DAC without park access are predicted to increase by 12% between 2023 and 2050, from 140 to 157.



ARLETA




Figure 66. Parks within and near the Arleta Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply.
Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025.

LOCATION

Region: Valley

Neighborhoods: Arleta, Panorama City

Council Districts: CD 6

WHY WAS THIS AREA SELECTED?

Many people in PerSquareMile - Arleta lack access to a park within a 10-minute walk (a half mile). They also face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+). Creating new parks in PerSquareMile - Arleta would provide needed green space, recreation, and health benefits to residents.

ARLETA CHARACTERISTICS

Prioritization Tier: 3

Total Population Farther Than a 10 Minute Walk to a Park: 74.88% of population, 9,255 out of 12,359 people

Park Supply per 1,000 People: 0.00 acres

Suggested optimal is 3.0 acres

Population:

Disadvantaged Community (DAC)

CalEnvironScreen 75+ (CES75+)

Existing Parks within the Arleta Grid:

None

FUTURE PARK NEED PROJECTIONS

These graphs portray what would happen to people living in the Arleta Grid if no actions are taken to increase park access and supply.

POPULATION OF GRID

The population for this grid is predicted to increase by 0.82% between 2023 and 2050, from 12,359 to 12,460.




PARK ACRES PER 1000 PEOPLE

There are no parks in this PerSquareMile grid. The absence of parks means there is no parkland to relieve the population pressure at all, and it gets more urgent as the population increases.




DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES (DAC) POPULATION

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) are predicted to increase by 2.5% between 2023 and 2050, from 2,604 to 2,669.




CALENVIROSCREEN 75TH+ PERCENTILE (CES75+) POPULATION

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) are predicted to increase by 0.79% between 2023 and 2050, from 12,334 to 12,432.



TOTAL POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

The population for this grid without park access is predicted to increase by 0.88% between 2023 and 2050, from 9,255 to 9,336.




DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

Households that earn less than 80% of what the median household earns in California (DAC) without park access are predicted to increase by 8.4% between 2023 and 2050, from 1,238 to 1,342.



CES75+ POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People that face higher environmental risks than 75% of communities in California (CES75+) without park access are predicted to increase by 0.83% between 2023 and 2050, from 9,230 to 9,307.



CES75+ AND DAC POPULATION WHO LACK PARKS WITHIN A 10-MINUTE WALK

People considered CES75+ and DAC without park access are predicted to increase by 8.3% between 2023 and 2050, from 1,213 to 1,314.







Figure 67. Flying over Sixth Stree Viaduct during the 2025 CicLAVia Heart of LA event when cyclists have exclusive right-of-way. Source: Calvada Surveying, 2025.



DETAILED SITE PRIORITIZATION SCORES

UNIVERSE OF SITES

Organized alphabetically by priority tier.

Highest Weight

FIRST PRIORITY

Rank	Title	Size (Acres)	PNA Classification	Region	Composite Score	Park Pressure	Walk Network Connectivity	Park Conditions Assessment	Env., Social, and Health Equity
24	105th Street Pocket Park	**0.11**	Mini Park	South	0.8057	1.00	0.30	0.25	1.00
1	11th Avenue Park	**0.21**	Mini Park	South	1.0000	1.00	0.32	0.50	1.00
5	97th Street Pocket Park	**0.13**	Mini Park	South	0.8741	1.00	0.37	0.50	1.00
11	Arts District Park	**0.51**	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.8537	1.00	0.45	0.50	1.00
13	LAR Greenway - Mason to Vanalden	**6.22**	Greenway	North	0.8499	0.75	0.14	0.00	1.00
20	Leo Politi Elementary School (CSP)	**2.02**	Community School Park	Cen/East	0.8184	0.75	0.34	0.00	1.00
12	Little Green Acres Park	**0.23**	Mini Park	South	0.8535	1.00	0.19	0.50	1.00
25	Ord And Yale Street Park	**0.60**	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.8049	0.75	0.40	0.00	1.00
10	PerSquareMile - Downtown	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	Cen/East	0.8573	0.75	0.35	0.00	1.00
15	PerSquareMile - East Vermont Square	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	South	0.8475	0.50	0.35	0.00	1.00
19	PerSquareMile - Exposition Park	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	South	0.8271	0.50	0.35	0.00	1.00
14	PerSquareMile - N Hist South Central	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	South	0.8495	0.75	0.35	0.00	1.00
23	PerSquareMile - North Hollywood	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	North	0.8058	0.50	0.35	0.00	1.00
22	PerSquareMile - Pico-Union	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	Cen/East	0.8139	0.50	0.35	0.00	1.00
6	PerSquareMile - University Park North	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	Cen/East	0.8667	0.50	0.35	0.00	1.00
17	PerSquareMile - Van Nuys - Valley Glen	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	North	0.8349	0.50	0.35	0.00	1.00
7	PerSquareMile - Westlake	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	Cen/East	0.8630	0.75	0.35	0.00	1.00
9	PerSquareMile - Westlake-Koreatown	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	Cen/East	0.8603	0.50	0.35	0.00	1.00
21	Rolland Curtis Park	**0.09**	Mini Park	South	0.8151	1.00	0.19	0.00	1.00
2	Saint James Park	**0.90**	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.9024	0.75	0.46	1.00	1.00
3	San Julian Park	**0.29**	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.8948	1.00	0.20	0.67	1.00
16	Sixth Street Viaduct Park	**12.52**	Community Park	Cen/East	0.8451	0.25	0.06	0.00	1.00
4	South Victoria Avenue Park	**0.26**	Mini Park	South	0.8871	1.00	0.27	0.25	1.00
8	Valencia Triangle	**0.06**	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.8610	1.00	0.20	0.00	1.00
18	Vermont Miracle Park	**0.22**	Mini Park	South	0.8329	1.00	0.23	0.50	1.00

SECOND PRIORITY

Rank	Title	Size (Acres)	PNA Classification	Region	Composite Score	Park Pressure	Walk Network Connectivity	Park Conditions Assessment	Env., Social, and Health Equity
45	111th Place Pocket Park	**0.09**	Mini Park	South	0.7707	1.00	0.31	0.50	1.00
80	1st And Broadway Civic Center Park	**1.96**	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	0.7249	0.75	0.17	0.00	1.00
132	4206 S Main St Maintenance Yard	**0.48**	Single Purpose Site	South	0.6561	1.00	0.24	0.00	1.00
119	49th Street Pocket Park	**0.19**	Mini Park	South	0.6720	0.50	0.30	0.75	1.00
97	61st Street Pocket Park	**0.12**	Mini Park	South	0.6969	1.00	0.31	0.33	1.00
74	6th & Gladys Street Park	**0.34**	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.7317	1.00	0.15	0.20	1.00
73	76th Street Pocket Park	**0.13**	Mini Park	South	0.7323	1.00	0.30	0.50	1.00
162	Algin Sutton Recreation Center	**16.46**	Community Park	South	0.6155	0.25	0.18	0.11	1.00
29	Aliso Triangle	**0.04**	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.7919	1.00	0.34	0.00	1.00
158	Alpine Recreation Center	**1.94**	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	0.6206	0.75	0.24	0.30	1.00
69	Alvarado Terrace Park	**0.91**	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.7337	0.75	0.24	0.00	1.00
84	Amistad Park	**0.14**	Mini Park	North	0.7163	1.00	0.29	0.75	1.00
65	Angeles Mesa Park	**0.15**	Mini Park	South	0.7397	1.00	0.17	0.00	1.00
110	Arroyo Rosa De Castilla	**0.73**	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.6872	0.50	0.54	0.00	1.00
120	Augustus F Hawkins Natural Park	**8.12**	Large Neighborhood Park	South	0.6672	0.50	0.13	0.50	1.00
112	Boyle Heights Sports Center	**8.51**	Large Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	0.6854	0.25	0.35	0.70	1.00
66	Brooklyn Heights Park	**0.20**	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.7373	1.00	0.24	0.50	1.00

Highest Weight				Medium Weight					Lowest Weight										
Low Shade Cover	Climate Vulnerability	Perceived Park Safety	Criminalization Burden	CIP Project History	Extreme Heat Risk	Lack of Private Open Space	Biodiversity and Habitat Cons	Metro Corridors	Perceived Park Condition	Perceived Rec Center Condition	Perceived Walkability	Presence of Com Prio Amenities	Park Visitation	MyLA311 Requests	Habitat Connectivity	Tree Species Composition	Infiltration & Recharge Opps	Water Quality Priority	LAC Park Needs Assessment
0.73	0.40	0.74	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.72	1.00	1.00	0.63	0.52	1.00	1.00	0.41	0.00	0.00	0.80	0.00	0.75	0.77
0.79	0.80	0.74	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.83	1.00	1.00	0.63	0.52	1.00	1.00	0.29	0.00	1.00	0.78	0.50	1.00	0.78
0.81	0.40	0.74	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.55	1.00	1.00	0.63	0.52	1.00	1.00	0.90	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.75	0.87
0.92	0.40	0.90	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.95	0.00	1.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	0.60	0.10	0.75	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.54
0.74	0.60	1.00	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.77	1.00	1.00	0.84	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.81	0.50	0.00	1.00	0.39	0.75	0.60
0.87	0.60	0.76	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.99	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	0.60	0.50	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.89
0.82	0.40	0.74	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.72	1.00	1.00	0.63	0.52	1.00	1.00	0.66	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.75	0.77
0.96	0.40	0.76	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.87	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	1.00	0.60	1.00	1.00	0.84	0.00	0.25	0.41
0.59	0.60	0.90	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.63	1.00	1.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	1.00	0.50	0.50	1.00	0.89	0.34	1.00	0.43
0.80	0.60	0.80	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.68	1.00	1.00	0.55	0.00	0.57	1.00	0.50	0.50	1.00	0.89	0.60	1.00	0.95
0.77	0.60	0.74	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.77	1.00	1.00	0.63	0.52	1.00	1.00	0.50	0.50	1.00	0.89	0.26	1.00	0.86
0.79	0.60	0.80	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.68	1.00	1.00	0.55	0.00	0.57	1.00	0.50	0.50	1.00	0.89	0.92	1.00	0.95
0.72	0.60	1.00	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.66	1.00	0.00	0.62	0.86	0.57	1.00	0.50	0.50	1.00	0.89	1.00	1.00	0.84
0.74	0.60	0.76	0.25	1.00	1.00	0.66	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	1.00	0.50	0.50	1.00	0.89	0.34	1.00	0.91
0.79	0.60	0.76	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.66	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	1.00	0.50	0.50	1.00	0.89	0.42	1.00	0.91
0.85	0.40	1.00	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.47	1.00	1.00	0.62	0.86	0.57	1.00	0.50	0.50	1.00	0.89	0.50	0.75	0.86
0.74	0.60	0.76	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.77	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	1.00	0.50	0.50	1.00	0.89	0.04	0.75	0.63
0.76	0.60	0.76	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.99	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	1.00	0.50	0.50	1.00	0.89	0.23	1.00	0.89
0.78	0.60	0.74	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.75	0.00	1.00	0.63	0.52	1.00	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.50	0.75	1.00
0.83	0.60	0.76	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.81	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	0.40	0.02	0.75	1.00	0.75	0.50	1.00	0.63
0.67	0.60	0.90	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.95	0.00	1.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	0.80	0.10	1.00	0.00	0.95	1.00	1.00	0.54
1.00	0.60	0.90	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.94	1.00	1.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	1.00	0.03	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.39
0.84	0.80	0.74	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.83	1.00	1.00	0.63	0.52	1.00	1.00	0.63	1.00	0.00	0.57	0.50	1.00	0.78
0.93	0.60	0.76	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.89	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	0.60	0.22	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.86
0.88	0.40	0.74	0.75	0.00	1.00	0.53	1.00	1.00	0.63	0.52	1.00	1.00	0.46	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.82
0.89	0.40	0.74	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.54	0.00	0.00	0.63	0.52	1.00	1.00	0.10	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.75	0.66
0.99	0.40	0.90	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.63	0.00	1.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	0.80	0.19	0.25	1.00	0.88	0.00	1.00	0.43
0.89	0.60	0.80	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.68	0.00	0.00	0.55	0.00	0.57	1.00	0.11	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.95
0.76	0.60	0.80	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.62	0.00	0.00	0.55	0.00	0.57	0.60	0.50	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.90
0.68	0.60	0.80	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.98	0.00	0.00	0.55	0.00	0.57	1.00	0.05	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.78
0.85	0.60	0.90	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.95	0.00	1.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	0.80	0.22	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.54
0.73	0.40	0.74	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.02	0.00	1.00	0.63	0.52	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.80	0.00	1.00	0.90
0.86	0.40	0.74	0.75	0.00	1.00	0.72	1.00	1.00	0.63	0.52	1.00	0.60	0.00	0.25	0.00	0.90	0.36	1.00	0.88
0.76	0.60	0.90	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.50	0.00	1.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	1.00	0.07	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.75	0.36
0.90	0.40	0.76	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.87	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	0.40	0.54	1.00	1.00	0.88	0.06	0.25	0.41
0.74	0.60	0.76	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.66	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	0.40	0.31	0.75	0.00	0.98	0.50	1.00	0.91
0.72	0.40	0.64	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.49	1.00	0.00	0.96	0.68	0.51	0.40	0.13	0.00	0.00	0.50	1.00	0.75	0.72
0.78	0.80	0.74	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.35	0.00	1.00	0.63	0.52	1.00	1.00	0.11	1.00	0.00	0.86	0.00	0.75	0.54
0.68	0.60	0.90	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.79	0.00	0.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	1.00	0.86	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.50	0.46
0.51	0.60	0.80	0.50	0.50	1.00	0.45	1.00	1.00	0.55	0.00	0.57	0.60	0.02	0.25	1.00	0.40	0.75	1.00	0.73
0.64	0.40	0.90	0.75	0.25	1.00	0.88	0.00	1.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	0.60	0.50	0.75	1.00	0.96	0.23	0.50	0.50
0.66	0.40	0.90	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.82	0.00	1.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	1.00	0.02	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.50	0.50	0.93

UNIVERSE OF SITES

SECOND PRIORITY

Highest Weight

Rank	Title	Size (Acres)	PNA Classification	Region	Composite Score	Park Pressure	Walk Network Connectivity	Park Conditions Assessment	Env., Social, and Health Equity
28	Caballero Creek Confluence Park	**1.53**	Neighborhood Park	North	0.7969	0.50	0.38	0.00	1.00
70	Camellia Avenue Elem School (CSP)	**2.37**	Community School Park	North	0.7337	0.75	0.26	0.00	1.00
153	Canoga Park Senior Citizen Center	**0.77**	Single Purpose Site	North	0.6278	1.00	0.25	0.50	1.00
151	Carlton Way Park	**0.19**	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.6285	1.00	0.30	0.75	1.00
44	Central Avenue Jazz Park	**0.19**	Mini Park	South	0.7714	1.00	0.18	1.00	1.00
161	Central Recreation Center	**1.45**	Neighborhood Park	South	0.6157	0.75	0.29	0.20	1.00
114	Challengers Boys And Girls Club	**0.84**	Single Purpose Site	South	0.6797	0.75	0.30	0.00	1.00
88	Circle Park (5th Ave)	**0.17**	Mini Park	South	0.7134	1.00	0.19	0.00	1.00
72	Circle Park (S Gramercy Pl)	**0.17**	Mini Park	South	0.7335	1.00	0.18	0.00	1.00
104	City Hall Park	**1.71**	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	0.6922	0.75	0.11	0.00	1.00
169	Culver-Slauson Park	**3.27**	Large Neighborhood Park	West	0.6042	0.50	0.83	0.25	1.00
129	David M Gonzales Recreation Center	**6.80**	Large Neighborhood Park	North	0.6598	0.50	0.33	0.30	1.00
101	Denker Recreation Center	**2.81**	Neighborhood Park	South	0.6947	0.75	0.24	0.17	1.00
78	Dorothy J and Benjamin B Smith Park	**0.49**	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.7278	1.00	0.27	1.00	1.00
150	East Los Angeles Park	**0.32**	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.6295	0.75	0.51	0.00	1.00
61	Echo Park Community Center	**0.29**	Single Purpose Site	Cen/East	0.7444	0.75	0.37	0.50	1.00
170	Echo Park Deep Pool	**2.07**	Single Purpose Site	Cen/East	0.6042	0.50	0.38	0.50	1.00
77	El Pueblo de LA Historic Monument	**2.03**	Historic Landmark Site	Cen/East	0.7280	0.75	0.16	0.00	1.00
94	El Sereno Community Garden	**0.77**	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.7045	1.00	0.35	0.50	1.00
167	El Sereno Recreation Center	**13.94**	Community Park	Cen/East	0.6135	0.25	0.63	0.30	1.00
91	Elysian Park	**547.54**	Regional Park	Cen/East	0.7110	0.00	0.44	0.19	1.00
165	Ernest E Debs Regional Park	**318.62**	Regional Park	Cen/East	0.6145	0.00	0.46	0.50	1.00
157	Evergreen Recreation Center	**6.66**	Large Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	0.6217	0.50	0.28	0.22	1.00
64	EXPO Center	**6.65**	Regional Park	South	0.7402	0.50	0.28	0.38	1.00
124	Exposition Park Rose Garden	**10.39**	Historic Landmark Site	South	0.6628	0.25	0.36	0.00	1.00
79	Francis Avenue Community Garden	**0.15**	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.7253	1.00	0.24	0.50	1.00
163	Fred Roberts Recreation Center	**2.90**	Neighborhood Park	South	0.6149	0.50	0.25	0.25	1.00
36	Fremont High School Pool	**0.64**	School Pool	South	0.7792	1.00	0.38	1.00	1.00
128	Fulton Avenue Park	**0.40**	Mini Park	North	0.6603	1.00	0.31	0.00	1.00
144	Gage and Avalon Triangle Pocket Park	**0.26**	Mini Park	South	0.6411	1.00	0.37	0.00	1.00
58	Grand Hope Park	**2.00**	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	0.7501	1.00	0.11	0.50	0.00
49	Greenwood Square Park	**0.31**	Mini Park	North	0.7673	1.00	0.25	0.00	1.00
171	Grigsby Pocket Park	**0.28**	Mini Park	South	0.6037	0.75	0.40	0.00	1.00
142	Harbor View Memorial Park	**2.85**	Neighborhood Park	South	0.6444	0.50	0.36	0.50	1.00
86	Hartland Mini-Park	**0.07**	Mini Park	North	0.7142	1.00	0.34	0.00	1.00
172	Harvard Elementary School (CSP)	**1.22**	Community School Park	Cen/East	0.6020	1.00	0.31	0.00	1.00
37	Hazard Recreation Center	**24.99**	Large Community Park	Cen/East	0.7767	0.25	0.24	0.46	1.00
125	Hollenbeck Park	**18.30**	Community Park	Cen/East	0.6616	0.25	0.20	0.31	1.00
141	Hoover Pedestrian Mall	**2.16**	Greenway	South	0.6454	0.75	0.31	0.00	1.00
71	Hoover Recreation Center	**2.95**	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	0.7336	0.75	0.28	0.25	1.00
147	Hoover-Gage Park	**0.21**	Mini Park	South	0.6354	1.00	0.23	0.25	1.00
43	Hope and Peace Park	**0.57**	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.7725	1.00	0.21	0.40	1.00
145	Inell Woods Park	**0.27**	Mini Park	South	0.6383	1.00	0.14	0.00	1.00
90	Jacaranda Park	**5.35**	Linear Park	South	0.7129	0.75	0.16	0.30	1.00
155	Julian C Dixon Park	**0.96**	Mini Park	South	0.6221	0.75	0.16	0.33	1.00

Highest Weight				Medium Weight					Lowest Weight										
Low Shade Cover	Climate Vulnerability	Perceived Park Safety	Criminalization Burden	CIP Project History	Extreme Heat Risk	Lack of Private Open Space	Biodiversity and Habitat Cons	Metro Corridors	Perceived Park Condition	Perceived Rec Center Condition	Perceived Walkability	Presence of Com Prio Amenities	Park Visitation	MyLA311 Requests	Habitat Connectivity	Tree Species Composition	Infiltration & Recharge Opps	Water Quality Priority	LAC Park Needs Assessment
0.62	0.60	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.11	1.00	1.00	0.84	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.94	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.50	0.75	0.34
0.80	0.60	1.00	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.66	0.00	0.00	0.62	0.86	0.57	1.00	0.50	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.84
0.74	0.40	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.66	0.00	1.00	0.84	1.00	1.00	0.80	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.95	0.10	0.50	0.77
0.66	0.60	0.56	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.57	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.41	0.69	0.80	0.10	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.75	0.49
0.89	0.60	0.80	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.35	0.00	0.00	0.55	0.00	0.57	0.80	0.19	0.75	0.00	0.88	1.00	1.00	0.97
0.97	0.60	0.80	0.75	0.00	1.00	0.50	0.00	1.00	0.55	0.00	0.57	0.60	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.80	1.00	1.00	0.81
0.87	0.60	0.80	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.52	0.00	0.00	0.55	0.00	0.57	1.00	0.93	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.50	0.75	0.87
0.90	0.80	0.74	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.71	0.00	0.00	0.63	0.52	1.00	1.00	0.83	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.50	0.50	0.67
0.91	0.80	0.74	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.71	0.00	0.00	0.63	0.52	1.00	1.00	0.78	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.50	0.67
0.59	0.60	0.90	1.00	0.25	1.00	0.63	1.00	1.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	0.80	0.03	0.00	1.00	0.80	0.00	1.00	0.43
0.69	1.00	0.41	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.68	1.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	0.80	0.06	1.00	1.00	0.72	0.00	0.75	0.78
0.78	0.40	0.64	0.50	0.50	1.00	0.76	0.00	1.00	0.96	0.68	0.51	0.60	0.01	0.50	1.00	0.90	1.00	0.75	0.44
0.84	0.60	0.74	0.75	0.00	1.00	0.77	0.00	1.00	0.63	0.52	1.00	0.80	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.65	0.00	1.00	0.86
0.55	0.60	0.56	1.00	0.50	0.00	0.72	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.41	0.69	1.00	0.33	1.00	1.00	0.96	0.30	0.75	0.48
0.80	0.40	0.90	0.50	1.00	0.00	0.91	1.00	0.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	1.00	0.03	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.75	0.54
0.83	0.60	0.76	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.77	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	0.60	0.25	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.75	0.63
0.72	0.60	0.76	0.50	0.25	1.00	0.77	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	0.00	0.18	1.00	1.00	0.97	0.00	0.75	0.63
0.69	0.40	0.90	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.63	0.00	1.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	0.80	0.64	0.75	1.00	0.92	0.00	1.00	0.43
0.50	0.60	0.90	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.61	0.00	0.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	1.00	0.61	1.00	0.00	0.90	0.00	0.50	0.68
0.75	0.40	0.90	0.75	0.50	1.00	0.76	1.00	0.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	1.00	0.13	0.50	0.00	0.95	0.00	0.25	0.30
0.60	0.60	0.76	1.00	0.75	1.00	0.95	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	0.20	0.58	0.25	1.00	0.81	0.02	0.25	0.15
0.63	0.40	0.76	0.50	0.75	1.00	0.36	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	0.20	0.90	0.25	0.00	0.54	0.01	0.50	0.32
0.79	0.40	0.90	1.00	0.25	1.00	0.65	0.00	1.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	0.80	0.04	0.50	0.00	0.90	0.40	0.50	0.80
0.82	0.60	0.80	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.87	0.00	1.00	0.55	0.00	0.57	0.40	0.40	0.25	1.00	0.90	1.00	1.00	0.67
0.69	0.60	0.80	0.50	0.25	1.00	0.87	1.00	1.00	0.55	0.00	0.57	0.60	0.16	0.00	1.00	0.90	1.00	1.00	0.67
0.45	0.60	0.76	0.25	0.00	1.00	0.99	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	0.20	0.03	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.89
0.75	0.60	0.80	0.75	0.00	1.00	0.75	0.00	1.00	0.55	0.00	0.57	1.00	0.11	0.50	0.00	0.76	1.00	1.00	0.75
0.88	0.60	0.80	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.75	0.00	0.00	0.55	0.00	0.57	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.88
0.69	0.60	1.00	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.44	0.00	0.00	0.62	0.86	0.57	0.00	0.01	1.00	0.00	0.96	1.00	0.75	0.77
0.85	0.60	0.80	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.98	0.00	0.00	0.55	0.00	0.57	1.00	0.33	0.75	0.00	0.98	0.50	1.00	0.78
0.80	0.60	0.90	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.97	0.00	1.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	0.80	0.24	0.75	1.00	0.63	0.50	1.00	0.43
0.79	0.60	1.00	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.66	0.00	1.00	0.62	0.86	0.57	0.00	0.50	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.95
0.73	0.60	0.43	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.59	0.00	1.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	1.00	0.01	1.00	0.00	0.80	0.00	0.75	0.50
0.71	0.60	0.43	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.82	0.00	1.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	1.00	0.99	0.50	1.00	0.99	0.00	0.00	0.47
0.56	0.60	1.00	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.47	0.00	0.00	0.62	0.86	0.57	1.00	0.39	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.50	0.75	0.86
0.88	0.60	0.56	0.50	1.00	0.00	0.95	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.41	0.69	1.00	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.58	0.50	0.75	1.00
0.77	0.40	0.90	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.94	1.00	1.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	0.80	0.71	0.25	1.00	0.85	0.00	0.75	0.35
0.73	0.40	0.90	0.75	0.25	1.00	0.29	1.00	1.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	0.60	0.26	0.75	1.00	0.86	0.18	0.75	0.58
0.67	0.60	0.80	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.81	0.00	1.00	0.55	0.00	0.57	0.60	0.50	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.63
0.81	0.60	0.76	0.50	0.75	1.00	0.81	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	0.60	0.06	0.75	0.00	0.94	0.50	1.00	0.63
0.63	0.60	0.80	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.86	0.00	0.00	0.55	0.00	0.57	0.80	0.15	1.00	0.00	0.67	0.00	0.75	0.89
0.82	0.60	0.76	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.89	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	0.60	0.23	0.75	0.00	0.77	0.50	1.00	0.86
0.83	0.80	0.80	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.60	0.00	0.00	0.55	0.00	0.57	1.00	0.13	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.75	0.78
0.74	0.60	0.74	0.75	0.00	1.00	0.64	1.00	0.00	0.63	0.52	1.00	1.00	0.85	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.75	0.77
0.80	0.60	0.80	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.52	0.00	0.00	0.55	0.00	0.57	0.80	0.09	0.50	0.00	0.83	0.50	0.75	0.87

UNIVERSE OF SITES

SECOND PRIORITY

Highest Weight

Rank	Title	Size (Acres)	PNA Classification	Region	Composite Score	Park Pressure	Walk Network Connectivity	Park Conditions Assessment	Env., Social, and Health Equity
121	Ken Malloy Harbor Regional Park	**290.87**	Regional Park	South	0.6671	0.00	0.49	0.47	1.00
107	Keswick Park	**0.36**	Mini Park	North	0.6898	1.00	0.23	0.00	1.00
92	Kittridge Mini-Park	**0.09**	Mini Park	North	0.7064	1.00	0.38	0.00	1.00
160	LAPD SWAT Officer R.D.Simmons Pk	**8.08**	Large Neighborhood Park	North	0.6158	0.25	0.27	0.00	1.00
156	LAR & Aliso Creek Confluence Park	**2.59**	Linear Park	North	0.6220	0.50	0.50	0.00	1.00
152	Latham Park	**0.19**	Mini Park	South	0.6278	1.00	0.20	0.00	1.00
111	Lincoln Park	**42.81**	Regional Park	Cen/East	0.6867	0.00	0.21	0.64	1.00
126	Loren Miller Recreation Center	**2.4**	Neighborhood Park	South	0.6615	0.75	0.19	0.29	1.00
103	Los Angeles Maritime Museum	**2.5**	Historic Landmark Site	South	0.6924	0.00	0.62	0.50	1.00
63	Lou Costello Jr Recreation Center	**3.46**	Large Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	0.7437	0.75	0.27	0.39	1.00
95	MacArthur Park	**29.90**	Large Community Park	Cen/East	0.7027	0.25	0.04	0.00	1.00
137	Madison West Park	**0.52**	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.6502	1.00	0.43	0.75	1.00
87	Marson Street Pocket Park	**0.29**	Mini Park	North	0.7142	1.00	0.55	0.50	1.00
139	Martin Luther King Jr Park	**6.53**	Large Neighborhood Park	South	0.6469	0.50	0.19	0.33	1.00
134	Mary McLeod Bethune Mid. Sch. (CSP)	**8.20**	Community School Park	South	0.6535	0.25	0.55	0.00	1.00
102	McKinley Avenue Park	**0.11**	Mini Park	South	0.6946	1.00	0.20	0.50	1.00
135	Monsignor Ramon Garcia Rec Center	**6.49**	Large Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	0.6530	0.25	0.44	0.28	1.00
122	Montecito Heights Recreation Center	**22.53**	Large Community Park	Cen/East	0.6638	0.00	0.76	0.38	1.00
75	Normandie Recreation Center	**3.27**	Large Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	0.7317	0.75	0.36	0.07	1.00
52	North San Fernando Park	**0.24**	Mini Park	North	0.7578	1.00	0.62	0.50	1.00
83	Obama Global Prep Academy (CSP)	**3.00**	Community School Park	South	0.7179	0.50	0.37	0.00	1.00
60	Orchard Ave Park	**0.14**	Mini Park	South	0.7455	1.00	0.34	0.50	1.00
106	Orthopedic Hospital UAP	**0.33**	Mini Park	South	0.6912	1.00	0.25	0.33	1.00
34	Parkview Photo Center	**0.96**	Single Purpose Site	Cen/East	0.7846	0.75	0.36	0.00	1.00
76	Parque Nativo Lopez	**0.72**	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.7287	0.75	0.24	0.17	1.00
82	Parthenia Park	**1.42**	Neighborhood Park	North	0.7216	0.75	0.50	0.17	1.00
68	Pecan Recreation Center	**4.28**	Large Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	0.7343	0.50	0.35	0.44	1.00
118	Pershing Square	**4.44**	Community Park	Cen/East	0.6730	0.75	0.09	0.17	0.00
39	PerSquareMile - Boyle Heights	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	Cen/East	0.7742	0.25	0.35	0.00	1.00
55	PerSquareMile - Central-Alameda	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	South	0.7549	0.25	0.35	0.00	1.00
59	PerSquareMile - Central-Alameda-N.	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	South	0.7475	0.50	0.35	0.00	1.00
41	PerSquareMile - E Hollywood-Ktown	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	Cen/East	0.7741	0.75	0.35	0.00	1.00
140	PerSquareMile - East Hollywood	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	Cen/East	0.6461	0.50	0.35	0.00	1.00
38	PerSquareMile - Florence	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	South	0.7757	0.50	0.35	0.00	1.00
100	PerSquareMile - Harvard Heights-Pico	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	South	0.6952	0.50	0.35	0.00	1.00
62	PerSquareMile - Harvard Park	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	South	0.7443	0.75	0.35	0.00	1.00
27	PerSquareMile - Historic South Central	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	South	0.7982	0.25	0.35	0.00	1.00
57	PerSquareMile - Koreatown	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	South	0.7510	0.75	0.35	0.00	1.00
98	PerSquareMile - North Hills	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	North	0.6967	0.75	0.35	0.00	1.00
136	PerSquareMile - Panorama City West	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	North	0.6515	0.50	0.35	0.00	1.00
89	PerSquareMile - Reseda	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	North	0.7134	0.50	0.35	0.00	1.00
53	PerSquareMile - South Panorama City	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	North	0.7576	0.50	0.35	0.00	1.00
46	PerSquareMile - South Park-Florence	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	South	0.7703	0.25	0.35	0.00	1.00
30	PerSquareMile - Sun Valley	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	North	0.7914	0.50	0.35	0.00	1.00
48	PerSquareMile - Tarzana-Encino	**3.00**	New Park Priority Area	North	0.7673	0.75	0.35	0.00	1.00

Highest Weight				Medium Weight					Lowest Weight										
Low Shade Cover	Climate Vulnerability	Perceived Park Safety	Criminalization Burden	CIP Project History	Extreme Heat Risk	Lack of Private Open Space	Biodiversity and Habitat Cons	Metro Corridors	Perceived Park Condition	Perceived Rec Center Condition	Perceived Walkability	Presence of Com Prio Amenities	Park Visitation	MyLA311 Requests	Habitat Connectivity	Tree Species Composition	Infiltration & Recharge Opps	Water Quality Priority	LAC Park Needs Assessment
0.73	0.60	0.43	0.75	0.75	1.00	0.56	1.00	1.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	1.00	0.74	0.25	1.00	0.89	0.02	1.00	0.26
0.56	0.40	1.00	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.69	0.00	0.00	0.62	0.86	0.57	1.00	0.24	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.69
0.71	0.60	1.00	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.44	0.00	0.00	0.62	0.86	0.57	0.40	0.38	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.75	0.77
0.61	0.60	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.77	0.00	0.00	0.84	1.00	1.00	0.80	0.34	0.25	0.00	0.86	0.50	0.75	0.60
0.81	0.60	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.77	0.00	0.00	0.84	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.92	0.25	0.00	0.29	0.40	0.75	0.60
0.62	0.60	0.80	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.45	0.00	0.00	0.55	0.00	0.57	1.00	0.50	0.75	0.00	0.79	1.00	1.00	0.73
0.77	0.40	0.90	0.50	0.25	1.00	0.94	1.00	1.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	0.80	0.13	0.50	1.00	0.83	0.06	0.75	0.35
0.83	0.60	0.74	0.75	0.00	1.00	0.77	0.00	0.00	0.63	0.52	1.00	0.80	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.68	0.50	1.00	0.86
0.98	0.60	0.43	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.48	1.00	1.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	1.00	0.01	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.13	0.00	0.57
0.87	0.60	0.90	0.75	0.25	1.00	0.84	0.00	1.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	0.80	0.01	0.75	0.00	0.99	1.00	0.75	0.54
0.78	0.60	0.76	1.00	0.25	1.00	0.89	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	0.60	0.50	0.75	0.00	0.82	0.13	1.00	0.86
0.85	0.60	0.56	0.50	0.50	0.00	0.01	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.41	0.69	0.80	0.01	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.50	0.75	0.74
0.66	0.60	0.30	0.50	0.00	1.00	0.98	1.00	0.00	0.88	0.43	0.51	0.60	0.07	1.00	1.00	0.96	0.50	0.50	0.73
0.77	0.60	0.74	1.00	0.25	1.00	0.54	0.00	1.00	0.63	0.52	1.00	0.80	0.06	0.75	0.00	0.89	0.10	0.75	0.94
0.95	0.60	0.80	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.98	0.00	0.00	0.55	0.00	0.57	1.00	0.50	0.25	0.00	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.78
0.77	0.60	0.80	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.62	0.00	0.00	0.55	0.00	0.57	1.00	0.15	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.90
0.83	0.40	0.90	0.75	0.50	1.00	0.85	0.00	1.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	1.00	0.50	0.50	0.00	0.90	0.17	0.50	0.66
0.58	0.40	0.76	0.50	0.75	1.00	0.54	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	0.60	0.41	0.75	0.00	0.54	0.04	0.50	0.27
0.89	0.60	0.76	0.75	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	0.60	0.17	0.00	0.00	0.99	0.50	1.00	0.85
0.75	0.60	0.64	0.75	0.00	1.00	0.66	0.00	1.00	0.96	0.68	0.51	1.00	0.15	1.00	0.00	0.93	0.50	0.50	0.61
0.94	0.60	0.74	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.71	1.00	0.00	0.63	0.52	1.00	1.00	0.50	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.75	0.78
0.73	0.60	0.80	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.52	0.00	0.00	0.55	0.00	0.57	1.00	0.42	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.50	0.75	0.96
0.78	0.60	0.80	0.50	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.55	0.00	0.57	1.00	0.09	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.45
0.73	0.60	0.76	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.92	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	0.60	0.09	1.00	0.00	0.98	0.13	1.00	0.90
0.66	0.60	0.76	0.75	1.00	0.00	0.66	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	0.60	0.50	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.91
0.56	0.60	1.00	0.50	0.25	1.00	0.46	0.00	1.00	0.84	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.01	1.00	1.00	0.74	0.50	0.50	0.42
0.93	0.60	0.90	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.50	0.00	1.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	0.60	0.06	1.00	1.00	0.92	0.79	0.75	0.36
0.84	0.60	0.90	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.97	0.00	1.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	0.60	1.00	0.75	1.00	0.96	0.50	1.00	0.43
0.82	0.40	0.90	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	1.00	0.50	0.50	1.00	0.89	0.39	0.75	0.36
0.66	0.60	0.80	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.62	1.00	1.00	0.55	0.00	0.57	1.00	0.50	0.50	1.00	0.89	0.79	1.00	0.90
0.92	0.80	0.80	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.62	0.00	1.00	0.55	0.00	0.57	1.00	0.50	0.50	0.00	0.89	0.99	1.00	0.90
0.82	0.60	0.56	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.67	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.41	0.69	1.00	0.50	0.50	1.00	0.89	0.28	0.75	0.76
0.63	0.60	0.56	0.50	1.00	0.00	0.82	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.41	0.69	1.00	0.50	0.50	1.00	0.89	0.56	0.75	0.54
0.74	0.60	0.80	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.55	0.00	0.57	1.00	0.50	0.50	1.00	0.89	0.02	1.00	0.88
0.87	0.60	0.00	0.25	1.00	1.00	0.98	1.00	1.00	0.16	0.29	0.85	1.00	0.50	0.50	1.00	0.89	0.30	0.75	0.86
0.85	0.60	0.74	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.52	0.00	1.00	0.63	0.52	1.00	1.00	0.50	0.50	0.00	0.89	0.09	0.75	0.87
0.73	0.60	0.80	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.68	1.00	1.00	0.55	0.00	0.57	1.00	0.50	0.50	1.00	0.89	0.90	1.00	0.95
0.76	0.60	0.00	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.99	1.00	1.00	0.16	0.29	0.85	1.00	0.50	0.50	1.00	0.89	0.38	1.00	0.89
0.75	0.60	0.30	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.98	1.00	0.00	0.88	0.43	0.51	1.00	0.50	0.50	1.00	0.89	0.41	0.50	0.73
0.76	0.60	0.30	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.33	1.00	1.00	0.88	0.43	0.51	1.00	0.50	0.50	0.00	0.89	0.46	0.50	0.65
0.81	0.60	1.00	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.27	1.00	0.00	0.84	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.50	0.50	0.00	0.89	0.02	0.75	0.60
0.72	0.60	0.30	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.66	1.00	1.00	0.88	0.43	0.51	1.00	0.50	0.50	1.00	0.89	0.59	1.00	0.95
0.85	0.60	0.80	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.62	1.00	1.00	0.55	0.00	0.57	1.00	0.50	0.50	1.00	0.89	0.58	1.00	0.90
0.80	0.60	0.30	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.66	1.00	1.00	0.88	0.43	0.51	1.00	0.50	0.50	1.00	0.89	0.72	1.00	0.84
0.72	0.60	0.11	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.89	1.00	1.00	0.28	0.40	0.56	1.00	0.50	0.50	1.00	0.89	0.60	1.00	0.61

UNIVERSE OF SITES

SECOND PRIORITY

Highest Weight

Rank	Title	Size (Acres)	PNA Classification	Region	Composite Score	Park Pressure	Walk Network Connectivity	Park Conditions Assessment	Env., Social, and Health Equity
32	PerSquareMile - Van Nuys Central	3.00	New Park Priority Area	North	0.7860	0.75	0.35	0.00	1.00
26	PerSquareMile - Van Nuys East	3.00	New Park Priority Area	North	0.7997	0.50	0.35	0.00	1.00
56	PerSquareMile - Van Nuys West	3.00	New Park Priority Area	North	0.7530	0.75	0.35	0.00	1.00
131	PerSquareMile - Vermont Knolls	3.00	New Park Priority Area	South	0.6571	0.50	0.35	0.00	1.00
31	PerSquareMile - Vermont-Slauson	3.00	New Park Priority Area	South	0.7907	0.25	0.35	0.00	1.00
40	PerSquareMile - Vermont-South Park	3.00	New Park Priority Area	South	0.7742	0.25	0.35	0.00	1.00
130	PerSquareMile - Windsor Square	3.00	New Park Priority Area	Cen/East	0.6582	0.75	0.35	0.00	1.00
33	PerSquareMile - Winetka	3.00	New Park Priority Area	North	0.7853	0.50	0.35	0.00	1.00
67	Pio Union Community Garden	0.29	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.7350	1.00	0.15	0.50	1.00
51	Prospect Park	2.71	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	0.7582	0.25	0.61	0.50	1.00
115	Ramona Elementary School (CSP)	1.48	Community School Park	Cen/East	0.6768	0.75	0.36	0.00	1.00
109	Reseda Park	29.68	Large Community Park	North	0.6878	0.25	0.22	0.39	1.00
105	Reseda Skate Facility	2.28	Single Purpose Site	North	0.6917	0.75	0.32	0.00	1.00
47	Richardson Family Park	0.32	Mini Park	South	0.7692	1.00	0.25	0.33	1.00
123	Roosevelt High School Pool	1.49	School Pool	Cen/East	0.6637	0.50	0.34	0.50	1.00
164	Ross Snyder Recreation Center	11.34	Community Park	South	0.6148	0.25	0.28	0.29	1.00
96	Ross Valencia Community Park	0.30	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.7023	1.00	0.23	0.00	1.00
166	Runnymede Park	5.93	Large Neighborhood Park	North	0.6136	0.50	0.29	0.42	1.00
50	Selma Park	0.22	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.7614	1.00	0.22	0.50	1.00
108	Senator Bill Greene Memorial Park	0.47	Mini Park	South	0.6878	1.00	0.14	0.00	1.00
149	Sepulveda Basin Recreation Area	1542.46	Regional Park	North	0.6311	0.00	0.37	0.77	1.00
117	South Broadway Pocket Park	0.1	Mini Park	South	0.6760	1.00	0.20	0.50	1.00
99	South Palos Verdes Street Park	0.41	Mini Park	South	0.6957	1.00	0.47	0.50	1.00
54	Spring Street Park	0.80	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.7558	1.00	0.18	0.50	1.00
113	State Street Recreation Center	2.62	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	0.6799	0.50	0.36	0.33	1.00
154	Strathern Park, West	9.40	Greenway	North	0.6224	0.00	0.68	0.00	1.00
133	Sun Valley Park	17.26	Community Park	North	0.6546	0.25	0.34	0.25	1.00
173	Telfair Park	1.29	Neighborhood Park	North	0.6008	0.50	0.37	0.50	1.00
35	Toberman Recreation Center	2.74	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	0.7800	0.50	0.21	0.29	1.00
116	Trinity Recreation Center	2.06	Neighborhood Park	South	0.6763	0.75	0.16	0.17	1.00
85	Van Nuys Multipurpose Center	1.4	Neighborhood Park	North	0.7156	0.75	0.17	0.00	1.00
146	Vanalden Park	10.89	Community Park	North	0.6356	0.25	0.75	0.25	1.00
168	Vermont Gage Park	0.31	Mini Park	South	0.6051	1.00	0.18	0.00	1.00
42	Wabash Recreation Center	1.87	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	0.7739	0.75	0.34	0.25	1.00
148	Wall Street Community Park	0.10	Mini Park	South	0.6343	1.00	0.22	0.50	1.00
159	Watts Senior Citizen Center	1.30	Neighborhood Park	South	0.6198	0.75	0.28	0.50	1.00
93	West Adam Heights Park	0.09	Mini Park	South	0.7048	1.00	0.23	0.75	1.00
81	Western And Gage Community Park	0.15	Mini Park	South	0.7246	1.00	0.24	0.00	1.00
138	Wilmington Athletic Complex	18.87	Community Park	South	0.6479	0.00	0.70	0.50	1.00
143	Wilmington Town Square	0.48	Mini Park	South	0.6416	1.00	0.30	0.00	1.00
127	Winnetka Recreation Center	15.95	Community Park	North	0.6609	0.25	0.27	0.41	1.00

Highest Weight				Medium Weight					Lowest Weight										
Low Shade Cover	Climate Vulnerability	Perceived Park Safety	Criminalization Burden	CIP Project History	Extreme Heat Risk	Lack of Private Open Space	Biodiversity and Habitat Cons	Metro Corridors	Perceived Park Condition	Perceived Rec Center Condition	Perceived Walkability	Presence of Com Prio Amenities	Park Visitation	MyLA311 Requests	Habitat Connectivity	Tree Species Composition	Infiltration & Recharge Opps	Water Quality Priority	LAC Park Needs Assessment
0.72	0.60	0.30	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.66	1.00	1.00	0.88	0.43	0.51	1.00	0.50	0.50	1.00	0.89	0.50	1.00	0.95
0.62	0.40	1.00	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.44	1.00	1.00	0.62	0.86	0.57	1.00	0.50	0.50	1.00	0.89	0.50	0.75	0.77
0.72	0.60	0.30	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.37	1.00	1.00	0.88	0.43	0.51	1.00	0.50	0.50	1.00	0.89	0.46	1.00	0.78
0.85	0.40	0.74	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.02	0.00	1.00	0.63	0.52	1.00	1.00	0.50	0.50	0.00	0.89	0.14	1.00	0.90
0.69	0.60	0.74	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.98	1.00	1.00	0.63	0.52	1.00	1.00	0.50	0.50	0.00	0.89	0.09	1.00	0.78
0.75	0.60	0.80	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.98	1.00	1.00	0.55	0.00	0.57	1.00	0.50	0.50	0.00	0.89	0.36	1.00	0.78
0.59	0.60	0.56	0.50	1.00	0.00	0.98	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.41	0.69	1.00	0.50	0.50	0.00	0.89	0.55	0.75	0.86
0.72	0.40	1.00	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.77	1.00	1.00	0.84	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.50	0.50	0.00	0.89	0.08	0.75	0.60
0.38	0.60	0.76	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.66	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	1.00	0.08	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.91
0.76	0.40	0.90	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.50	0.00	1.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	0.80	0.43	0.25	1.00	0.85	0.50	0.75	0.36
0.84	0.60	0.56	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.89	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.41	0.69	1.00	0.50	0.25	1.00	1.00	0.50	0.75	0.91
0.64	0.60	1.00	1.00	0.25	1.00	0.11	1.00	1.00	0.84	1.00	1.00	0.60	0.01	0.50	0.00	0.80	0.50	0.75	0.34
0.79	0.60	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.71	0.00	0.00	0.84	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.59	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.75	0.72
0.66	0.60	0.74	0.50	0.00	1.00	0.92	0.00	1.00	0.63	0.52	1.00	1.00	0.48	1.00	1.00	0.60	0.50	1.00	0.92
0.73	0.40	0.90	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.82	0.00	1.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	0.80	0.50	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.50	0.50	0.93
0.76	0.60	0.80	0.75	0.25	1.00	0.84	0.00	1.00	0.55	0.00	0.57	0.60	0.18	0.75	0.00	0.65	1.00	1.00	0.74
0.49	0.40	0.90	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.82	0.00	1.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	0.80	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.94	1.00	0.50	0.93
0.60	0.40	1.00	0.50	0.75	1.00	0.63	0.00	0.00	0.84	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.94	0.00	0.75	0.72
0.65	0.60	0.56	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.92	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.41	0.69	0.80	0.50	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.75	0.49
0.86	0.60	0.80	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.43	0.00	1.00	0.55	0.00	0.57	1.00	0.04	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.50	0.75	0.90
0.66	0.60	0.30	0.75	0.75	1.00	0.33	1.00	1.00	0.88	0.43	0.51	0.20	0.71	0.25	1.00	0.77	0.29	0.00	0.23
0.75	0.60	0.80	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.45	0.00	1.00	0.55	0.00	0.57	1.00	0.73	0.00	0.00	0.60	0.50	0.75	0.92
0.68	0.60	0.43	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.48	0.00	1.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	0.80	0.74	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.57
0.95	0.60	0.90	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.63	0.00	1.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	0.80	0.26	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.43
0.82	0.40	0.90	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.51	0.00	1.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	0.80	0.01	0.00	1.00	0.82	0.50	0.75	0.53
0.75	0.40	1.00	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.76	0.00	0.00	0.62	0.86	0.57	1.00	0.89	0.00	1.00	0.82	1.00	0.25	0.34
0.83	0.60	0.30	1.00	0.25	1.00	0.99	1.00	1.00	0.88	0.43	0.51	0.20	0.09	0.75	0.00	0.85	1.00	0.25	0.45
0.76	0.40	0.64	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.34	0.00	0.00	0.96	0.68	0.51	0.60	0.51	0.50	1.00	0.76	0.00	0.75	0.38
0.81	0.60	0.76	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.66	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	0.60	0.50	0.75	1.00	0.96	0.50	1.00	0.91
0.84	0.60	0.80	0.75	0.00	1.00	0.93	0.00	1.00	0.55	0.00	0.57	1.00	0.29	0.75	0.00	0.86	1.00	1.00	0.75
0.84	0.40	1.00	0.75	0.25	1.00	0.69	0.00	1.00	0.62	0.86	0.57	0.40	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.98	0.50	1.00	0.72
0.74	0.60	0.41	0.75	0.50	1.00	0.27	1.00	1.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	0.40	0.30	0.75	1.00	0.89	0.11	0.50	0.29
0.84	0.60	0.80	0.75	0.00	1.00	0.86	0.00	1.00	0.55	0.00	0.57	1.00	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.87	0.00	0.75	0.89
0.88	0.40	0.90	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.94	0.00	1.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	1.00	0.02	0.75	0.00	0.96	0.50	1.00	0.90
0.74	0.60	0.80	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.60	0.00	0.00	0.55	0.00	0.57	0.60	0.10	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.75	0.78
0.77	0.60	0.43	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.07	0.00	1.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	0.60	0.62	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.75	0.73
0.92	0.60	0.00	0.75	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.16	0.29	0.85	1.00	0.12	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.85
0.87	0.60	0.74	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.71	0.00	0.00	0.63	0.52	1.00	1.00	0.82	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.75	0.70
0.80	0.60	0.43	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.31	0.00	1.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	1.00	0.80	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.12	1.00	0.36
0.94	0.40	0.43	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.85	1.00	0.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	0.80	0.02	1.00	1.00	0.44	0.00	0.75	0.42
0.72	0.40	1.00	0.50	0.50	1.00	0.92	0.00	0.00	0.84	1.00	1.00	0.80	0.34	0.50	1.00	0.90	1.00	0.75	0.61

UNIVERSE OF SITES

THIRD PRIORITY

Highest Weight

Rank	Title	Size (Acres)	PNA Classification	Region	Composite Score	Park Pressure	Walk Network Connectivity	Park Conditions Assessment	Env., Social, and Health Equity
204	109th Street Recreation Center	3.17	Large Neighborhood Park	South	0.5707	0.50	0.44	0.36	1.00
315	Albert Piantanida Intergen. Cntr	2.66	Neighborhood Park	North	0.4409	0.75	0.42	0.00	0.00
198	Allegheny Park	1.05	Neighborhood Park	North	0.5774	0.75	0.46	0.00	1.00
175	Anderson Memorial Senior Citizen Cntr	1.62	Neighborhood Park	South	0.5959	0.75	0.21	0.38	1.00
232	Andres + Maria Cardenas Rec Cntr	0.70	Neighborhood Park	North	0.5352	0.75	0.55	0.25	1.00
263	Arroyo Seco Park	87.46	Regional Park	Cen/East	0.5053	0.00	0.41	0.25	0.00
218	Ascot Hills Park	92.44	Regional Nature Park	Cen/East	0.5570	0.00	0.58	0.25	1.00
264	Baldwin Hills Recreation Center	10.87	Community Park	South	0.5052	0.25	0.74	0.33	1.00
174	Bandini Canyon Park	4.97	Linear Park	South	0.5995	0.25	0.25	0.50	1.00
253	Banning High School Pool	0.52	School Pool	South	0.5146	0.75	0.38	0.00	1.00
249	Barnsdall Park	14.59	Historic Landmark Site	Cen/East	0.5217	0.50	0.22	0.00	1.00
258	Bellaire Avenue Park	0.14	Mini Park	North	0.5122	1.00	0.22	0.00	1.00
310	Bellevue Recreation Center	9.11	Large Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	0.4482	0.50	0.28	0.39	0.00
306	Benny H Potter W. Adams Ave Mem Pk	1.62	Neighborhood Park	South	0.4526	0.75	0.31	0.38	1.00
261	Betty F Day Park	0.12	Mini Park	South	0.5088	1.00	0.38	0.00	1.00
223	Brand Park	17.75	Community Park	North	0.5509	0.25	0.37	0.19	1.00
180	Cabrillo Beach	40.07	Beach	South	0.5906	0.00	0.84	0.58	1.00
245	Campo De Cahuenga	0.73	Historic Landmark Site	North	0.5268	0.50	0.64	0.50	0.00
283	Carey Ranch Park	23.80	Large Community Park	North	0.4738	0.00	0.61	0.50	0.00
313	Carlin G Smith Recreation Center	2.64	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	0.4450	0.25	0.58	0.63	0.00
328	Charles F Lummis Home and Gardens	1.75	Historic Landmark Site	Cen/East	0.4288	0.25	0.43	0.50	1.00
327	Chatsworth Park South	73.07	Regional Nature Park	North	0.4289	0.00	0.77	0.25	0.00
184	Chesterfield Square Park	1.89	Neighborhood Park	South	0.5895	0.75	0.27	0.25	1.00
222	Chevy Chase Park	2.44	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	0.5533	0.50	0.39	0.25	1.00
269	Country Club Heritage Park	0.08	Mini Park	South	0.5007	1.00	0.13	0.50	1.00
193	Cypress Park Club House	0.18	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.5805	1.00	0.43	0.00	1.00
307	Cypress Recreation Center	3.49	Large Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	0.4523	0.25	0.53	0.28	1.00
196	De Garmo Park	1.64	Linear Park	North	0.5786	0.50	0.50	0.00	1.00
252	De Longpre Park	1.4	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	0.5146	0.75	0.23	0.00	1.00
200	Delano Recreation Center	4.45	Large Neighborhood Park	North	0.5721	0.50	0.50	0.40	1.00
242	Devonshire Arleta Park	1.82	Neighborhood Park	North	0.5310	0.50	0.54	0.50	1.00
243	Devonwood Park	4.84	Large Neighborhood Park	North	0.5281	0.25	0.34	0.50	0.00
248	Downey Recreation Center	10.87	Community Park	Cen/East	0.5232	0.25	0.24	0.19	1.00
236	Drew Street Park	0.12	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.5336	1.00	0.61	0.50	1.00
219	Drum Barracks Civil War Museum	0.92	Historic Landmark Site	South	0.5559	0.50	0.53	0.50	1.00
303	East Wilmington Greenbelt Comm Cntr	0.85	Mini Park	South	0.4558	0.50	0.38	0.25	1.00
212	East Wilmington Vest Pocket Park	0.13	Mini Park	South	0.5660	0.75	0.50	0.50	1.00
237	Echo Park	28.41	Regional Park	Cen/East	0.5334	0.25	0.11	0.24	1.00
230	El Dorado Avenue Park	1.18	Linear Park	North	0.5392	0.75	0.49	0.00	1.00
289	El Sereno Arroyo Playground	2.35	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	0.4711	0.50	0.48	0.00	1.00
190	El Sereno Senior Citizen Center	0.91	Single Purpose Site	Cen/East	0.5821	0.50	0.58	0.00	1.00
342	Elysian Valley Recreation Center	1.99	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	0.4036	0.50	0.58	0.17	1.00
251	Everett Park	0.53	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.5171	0.75	0.73	0.00	1.00
332	Fernangeles Recreation Center	9.26	Large Neighborhood Park	North	0.4269	0.25	0.30	0.39	1.00
266	Fox And Laurel Park	0.28	Mini Park	North	0.5038	1.00	0.24	0.25	1.00

Highest Weight				Medium Weight					Lowest Weight										
Low Shade Cover	Climate Vulnerability	Perceived Park Safety	Criminalization Burden	CIP Project History	Extreme Heat Risk	Lack of Private Open Space	Biodiversity and Habitat Cons	Metro Corridors	Perceived Park Condition	Perceived Rec Center Condition	Perceived Walkability	Presence of Com Prio Amenities	Park Visitation	MyLA311 Requests	Habitat Connectivity	Tree Species Composition	Infiltration & Recharge Opps	Water Quality Priority	LAC Park Needs Assessment
0.91	0.60	0.43	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.73	0.00	1.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	1.00	0.22	0.50	0.00	0.99	0.00	0.75	0.56
0.60	0.40	0.30	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.72	0.00	1.00	0.88	0.43	0.51	0.40	0.08	0.25	0.00	0.84	1.00	0.50	0.86
0.89	0.60	0.30	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.72	0.00	0.00	0.88	0.43	0.51	1.00	0.35	0.75	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.43
0.82	0.80	0.43	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.48	0.00	1.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	0.60	0.04	0.75	1.00	0.73	0.00	0.00	0.57
0.73	0.60	0.30	0.50	0.00	1.00	0.33	0.00	1.00	0.88	0.43	0.51	0.60	0.11	0.75	0.00	0.70	0.50	0.50	0.65
0.55	0.60	0.90	0.25	0.75	1.00	0.36	1.00	1.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	0.60	0.76	0.75	1.00	0.51	0.01	0.50	0.32
0.76	0.40	0.90	0.75	0.50	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	0.60	0.50	0.25	0.00	0.53	0.00	0.25	0.22
0.81	0.60	0.00	1.00	0.25	1.00	0.53	0.00	1.00	0.16	0.29	0.85	0.60	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.89	0.00	1.00	0.25
0.71	0.40	0.43	1.00	0.25	1.00	0.47	1.00	1.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	0.80	0.93	0.50	1.00	0.93	0.08	0.25	0.31
0.96	0.40	0.43	0.75	0.25	1.00	0.59	1.00	0.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	1.00	0.50	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.46
0.63	0.60	0.56	0.50	0.25	0.00	0.82	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.41	0.69	1.00	0.50	0.75	0.00	0.94	0.26	0.75	0.54
0.80	0.40	1.00	0.75	0.25	1.00	0.76	0.00	0.00	0.62	0.86	0.57	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.83	1.00	0.25	0.34
0.63	0.60	0.56	0.50	0.25	0.00	0.67	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.41	0.69	1.00	0.08	0.25	1.00	0.84	0.27	0.75	0.76
0.60	0.60	0.00	0.75	0.00	1.00	0.89	0.00	0.00	0.16	0.29	0.85	0.80	0.25	0.75	0.00	0.88	0.00	1.00	0.75
0.35	0.40	0.43	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.07	0.00	1.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	0.80	0.51	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.75	0.87
0.74	0.40	0.64	0.75	0.50	1.00	0.85	1.00	0.00	0.96	0.68	0.51	0.40	0.00	0.50	0.00	0.83	0.50	0.50	0.32
0.85	0.80	0.43	1.00	0.25	1.00	0.56	1.00	0.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	1.00	0.07	0.25	1.00	0.98	0.00	0.00	0.21
0.71	0.40	1.00	0.75	0.25	0.00	0.50	0.00	1.00	0.62	0.86	0.57	0.20	0.08	1.00	1.00	0.97	1.00	0.75	0.31
0.58	0.60	0.64	0.75	0.75	1.00	0.46	1.00	0.00	0.96	0.68	0.51	0.80	0.29	0.75	0.00	0.83	0.07	0.25	0.55
0.40	0.40	0.76	0.50	0.75	0.00	0.54	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	0.20	0.83	0.00	0.00	0.80	0.00	0.50	0.27
0.24	0.40	0.76	0.50	0.50	0.00	0.30	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	0.20	0.85	1.00	0.00	0.64	0.00	0.50	0.33
0.59	1.00	0.41	1.00	0.75	1.00	0.73	1.00	0.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	0.80	0.72	0.25	0.00	0.42	0.28	0.00	0.04
0.59	0.60	0.74	1.00	0.25	1.00	0.71	0.00	0.00	0.63	0.52	1.00	1.00	0.55	0.75	0.00	0.69	0.00	0.75	0.67
0.84	0.40	0.56	0.25	0.75	1.00	0.39	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.41	0.69	0.60	0.18	0.75	1.00	0.84	0.00	1.00	0.19
0.63	0.60	0.00	0.75	0.00	1.00	0.98	0.00	0.00	0.16	0.29	0.85	1.00	0.06	1.00	0.00	0.50	0.50	0.75	0.86
0.85	0.40	0.76	0.50	1.00	0.00	0.46	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	0.60	0.85	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.25	0.42
0.78	0.40	0.76	0.50	0.75	0.00	0.46	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	0.60	0.08	0.75	1.00	0.90	0.00	0.25	0.42
0.68	0.60	1.00	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.35	0.00	0.00	0.62	0.86	0.57	0.20	0.81	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.75	0.25	0.23
0.52	0.40	0.56	1.00	0.25	0.00	0.92	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.41	0.69	1.00	0.12	0.25	1.00	0.89	1.00	0.75	0.49
0.83	0.40	0.30	0.75	0.00	1.00	0.55	0.00	1.00	0.88	0.43	0.51	0.60	0.32	0.75	0.00	0.97	0.30	1.00	0.50
0.76	0.40	0.30	0.50	0.00	1.00	0.53	0.00	1.00	0.88	0.43	0.51	0.20	0.47	0.00	1.00	0.78	0.43	0.50	0.46
0.66	0.40	0.64	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.67	1.00	0.00	0.96	0.68	0.51	0.80	0.02	0.75	0.00	0.86	0.91	0.50	0.45
0.87	0.60	0.76	0.50	0.00	1.00	0.95	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	0.40	0.69	0.75	1.00	0.94	0.23	0.25	0.15
0.62	0.40	0.56	0.50	1.00	0.00	0.60	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.41	0.69	0.60	0.49	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.50	0.25	0.56
0.87	0.40	0.43	0.75	0.00	1.00	0.51	1.00	0.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	0.80	0.78	0.75	1.00	0.63	0.00	0.25	0.45
0.88	0.40	0.43	0.75	0.00	1.00	0.39	1.00	0.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	1.00	0.01	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.25	0.45
0.87	0.40	0.43	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.37	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	1.00	0.72	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.25	0.51
0.74	0.40	0.56	0.50	0.25	1.00	0.77	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.41	0.69	0.60	0.19	0.75	0.00	0.81	0.00	0.75	0.63
0.83	0.60	0.64	0.25	0.00	1.00	0.51	0.00	0.00	0.96	0.68	0.51	1.00	0.99	0.00	1.00	0.50	0.63	0.75	0.42
0.52	0.60	0.90	0.00	0.25	1.00	0.79	0.00	0.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	1.00	0.50	0.75	1.00	0.24	0.00	0.50	0.46
0.63	0.40	0.90	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.76	0.00	0.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.25	0.30
0.86	0.60	0.56	0.25	0.50	0.00	0.81	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.41	0.69	1.00	0.05	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.50	0.17
0.65	0.40	0.76	0.50	1.00	0.00	0.70	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	0.20	0.69	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.25	0.52
0.74	0.40	0.30	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.88	0.43	0.51	0.60	0.01	0.75	0.00	0.64	1.00	0.00	0.31
0.57	0.60	0.64	0.25	0.00	1.00	0.60	0.00	0.00	0.96	0.68	0.51	0.40	0.07	1.00	0.00	0.94	0.50	1.00	0.42

UNIVERSE OF SITES

THIRD PRIORITY

Highest Weight

Rank	Title	Size (Acres)	PNA Classification	Region	Composite Score	Park Pressure	Walk Network Connectivity	Park Conditions Assessment	Env., Social, and Health Equity
246	Garden Grove Elementary School (CSP)	3.00	Community School Park	North	0.5262	0.50	0.38	0.00	1.00
284	Genesee Avenue Park	0.75	Mini Park	South	0.4728	0.75	0.32	0.00	1.00
192	Gilbert W Lindsay Recreation Center	14.62	Community Park	South	0.5815	0.25	0.13	0.17	1.00
268	Gladys Jean Wesson Park	0.21	Mini Park	South	0.5018	1.00	0.24	0.50	1.00
321	Glassell Park Rec Cen. and Youth Cen.	12.69	Community Park	Cen/East	0.4348	0.25	0.41	0.37	1.00
301	Glenhurst Park	0.29	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.4579	1.00	0.44	0.00	1.00
279	Greayer's Oak Park	0.60	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.4801	0.75	0.29	0.00	1.00
270	Green Meadows Recreation Center	7.64	Large Neighborhood Park	South	0.5001	0.50	0.07	0.29	1.00
265	Griffith Park	4574.35	Regional Park	North	0.5052	0.00	0.51	0.34	1.00
195	Hansen Dam Recreation Area	1450	Regional Park	North	0.5789	0.00	0.60	0.17	1.00
329	Harbor City Park	11.1	Community Park	South	0.4285	0.50	0.49	0.25	1.00
340	Harbor Highlands Park	3.24	Large Neighborhood Park	South	0.4129	0.50	0.56	0.25	0.00
240	Heritage Square	4.16	Historic Landmark Site	Cen/East	0.5318	0.25	0.61	0.50	1.00
275	Hollywood Recreation Center	3.12	Large Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	0.4939	0.75	0.19	0.50	1.00
288	Howard Finn Park	3.66	Large Neighborhood Park	North	0.4714	0.50	0.19	0.50	0.00
305	Hubert H Humphrey Memorial Park	9.99	Large Neighborhood Park	North	0.4530	0.25	0.37	0.22	1.00
181	Isidore B Dockweiler State Beach	228.31	Beach	West	0.5902	0.00	0.82	0.36	1.00
255	Jackie Tatum / Harvard Rec Center	12.88	Community Park	South	0.5139	0.25	0.09	0.43	1.00
229	Jaime Beth Slavin Park	7.00	Large Neighborhood Park	North	0.5430	0.25	0.28	0.00	1.00
176	James Slauson Recreation Center	3.63	Large Neighborhood Park	South	0.5926	0.25	0.23	0.30	1.00
250	Jim Gilliam Recreation Center	17.63	Community Park	South	0.5216	0.25	0.58	0.15	1.00
311	John Quimby Park	3.82	Large Neighborhood Park	North	0.4467	0.75	0.34	0.50	0.00
320	Kagel Canyon Park	3.46	Large Neighborhood Park	North	0.4358	0.50	0.45	0.00	0.00
322	La Mirada Park	0.17	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.4336	1.00	0.24	0.00	1.00
286	La Tierra de la Culebra	0.56	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.4716	0.75	0.42	0.00	1.00
241	Lacy Street Neighborhood Park	0.37	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.5312	0.75	0.36	0.00	1.00
207	Lafayette Recreation Center	9.72	Large Neighborhood Park	South	0.5701	0.50	0.10	0.20	1.00
205	Lanark Recreation Center	19.20	Community Park	North	0.5706	0.25	0.23	0.27	1.00
239	LAR Greenway - Brown's Creek	3.66	Greenway	North	0.5318	0.75	0.19	0.00	0.00
273	LAR Greenway - Coldwater to Whitsett	2.30	Greenway	North	0.4974	0.75	0.12	0.00	0.00
323	LAR Greenway - Sepulveda to Kester	2.59	Greenway	North	0.4322	0.50	0.19	0.00	0.00
213	LAR Greenway / Elysian Valley Bikeway	4.82	Greenway	Cen/East	0.5635	0.25	0.93	0.00	1.00
259	Larissa Parkway	0.22	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.5102	1.00	0.45	0.00	1.00
254	Las Palmas Senior Citizen Center	1.14	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	0.5143	0.50	0.35	0.75	0.00
206	Laurel and Hardy Park	0.32	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.5705	1.00	0.29	0.00	1.00
214	Leimert Plaza	1.14	Neighborhood Park	South	0.5624	0.75	0.06	0.00	1.00
331	Leland Recreation Center	15.76	Community Park	South	0.4274	0.00	0.43	0.00	1.00
290	Lemon Grove Recreation Center	3.87	Large Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	0.4694	0.75	0.47	0.25	1.00
271	Leslie N Shaw Park	0.66	Mini Park	South	0.4989	1.00	0.21	0.25	1.00
210	Lexington Avenue Pocket Park	0.17	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.5676	1.00	0.26	1.00	1.00
282	Limekiln Canyon Park	95.78	Canyon Park	North	0.4766	0.00	0.60	1.00	0.00
325	Lincoln Heights Recreation Center	2.88	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	0.4307	0.50	0.29	0.00	1.00
297	Lincoln Heights Youth Center	0.74	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	0.4648	0.75	0.26	0.25	1.00
304	Linnie Canal Park	0.13	Mini Park	West	0.4536	1.00	0.38	0.50	0.00
316	Little Landers Park	1.14	Historic Landmark Site	North	0.4379	0.75	0.21	0.33	1.00

Highest Weight				Medium Weight					Lowest Weight										
Low Shade Cover	Climate Vulnerability	Perceived Park Safety	Criminalization Burden	CIP Project History	Extreme Heat Risk	Lack of Private Open Space	Biodiversity and Habitat Cons	Metro Corridors	Perceived Park Condition	Perceived Rec Center Condition	Perceived Walkability	Presence of Com Prio Amenities	Park Visitation	MyLA311 Requests	Habitat Connectivity	Tree Species Composition	Infiltration & Recharge Opps	Water Quality Priority	LAC Park Needs Assessment
0.74	0.60	0.11	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.71	0.00	0.00	0.28	0.40	0.56	1.00	0.50	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.75	0.72
0.64	0.80	0.00	1.00	0.25	0.00	0.63	0.00	1.00	0.16	0.29	0.85	0.80	0.09	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.75	0.36
0.77	0.60	0.80	0.75	0.25	1.00	0.68	1.00	0.00	0.55	0.00	0.57	0.80	0.08	0.50	0.00	0.91	1.00	1.00	0.95
0.66	0.60	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.95	0.00	0.00	0.16	0.29	0.85	0.80	0.57	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.75	0.71
0.74	0.40	0.76	0.50	0.25	0.00	0.37	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	0.20	0.50	0.75	0.00	0.76	0.00	0.25	0.52
0.59	0.60	0.56	0.25	1.00	0.00	0.42	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.41	0.69	1.00	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.82	0.00	0.50	0.20
0.40	0.40	0.76	0.50	1.00	0.00	0.30	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	0.20	0.23	1.00	0.00	0.90	0.50	0.50	0.33
0.81	0.60	0.80	1.00	0.25	1.00	0.60	0.00	0.00	0.55	0.00	0.57	0.80	0.00	0.75	0.00	0.89	0.00	0.75	0.78
0.42	0.60	0.11	0.50	0.75	1.00	0.39	1.00	1.00	0.28	0.40	0.56	0.20	0.67	0.25	1.00	0.57	0.07	0.75	0.16
0.59	0.80	0.64	0.75	0.75	1.00	0.20	1.00	0.00	0.96	0.68	0.51	0.40	0.89	0.25	1.00	0.75	0.39	0.00	0.18
0.84	0.60	0.43	0.50	0.25	1.00	0.38	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	0.80	0.50	0.75	0.00	0.83	0.00	1.00	0.44
0.62	0.60	0.43	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.80	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	1.00	0.01	0.50	1.00	0.93	0.07	0.25	0.30
0.39	0.40	0.76	0.50	1.00	0.00	0.30	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	0.20	0.00	0.25	0.00	0.52	0.11	0.50	0.33
0.80	0.60	0.56	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.92	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.41	0.69	0.80	0.05	0.25	1.00	0.89	0.50	0.75	0.49
0.74	0.60	0.64	1.00	0.75	0.00	0.41	1.00	0.00	0.96	0.68	0.51	0.40	0.50	0.75	0.00	0.83	1.00	0.50	0.36
0.87	0.40	0.64	0.50	0.25	1.00	0.58	0.00	0.00	0.96	0.68	0.51	0.60	0.15	0.25	0.00	0.92	0.71	0.75	0.41
0.92	1.00	0.41	0.50	1.00	0.00	0.72	1.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	1.00	0.02	0.25	1.00	1.00	0.01	0.50	0.36
0.87	0.60	0.74	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.71	0.00	0.00	0.63	0.52	1.00	0.40	0.03	1.00	0.00	0.91	0.00	0.75	0.70
0.75	0.40	1.00	0.75	0.75	1.00	0.76	0.00	0.00	0.62	0.86	0.57	0.00	0.43	0.50	1.00	0.88	1.00	0.25	0.34
0.85	0.60	0.80	0.75	0.00	1.00	0.45	0.00	1.00	0.55	0.00	0.57	0.80	0.28	0.00	1.00	0.72	1.00	1.00	0.73
0.71	0.60	0.00	1.00	0.75	1.00	0.26	1.00	0.00	0.16	0.29	0.85	0.80	0.46	0.75	0.00	0.89	0.00	0.75	0.62
0.77	0.40	1.00	0.00	0.50	1.00	0.51	0.00	0.00	0.84	1.00	1.00	0.80	0.01	0.50	0.00	0.80	0.00	0.75	0.76
0.77	1.00	0.64	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.96	0.68	0.51	0.60	0.27	0.75	0.00	0.89	1.00	0.00	0.22
0.77	0.60	0.56	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.41	0.69	0.60	0.24	0.75	1.00	0.70	1.00	0.75	0.80
0.29	0.40	0.76	0.50	0.00	1.00	0.36	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	0.20	0.34	1.00	0.00	0.90	0.00	0.50	0.32
0.52	0.60	0.76	0.50	1.00	0.00	0.44	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	0.40	0.30	0.00	1.00	0.71	0.50	0.25	0.25
0.75	0.60	0.00	0.25	0.00	1.00	0.92	1.00	1.00	0.16	0.29	0.85	0.40	0.16	0.75	1.00	0.89	0.43	1.00	0.90
0.66	0.40	1.00	0.50	0.25	1.00	0.39	0.00	1.00	0.84	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.02	0.25	0.00	0.85	0.77	0.75	0.46
0.74	0.60	0.41	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.02	1.00	1.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	1.00	0.58	0.25	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.75	0.21
0.76	0.40	0.11	0.25	1.00	1.00	0.61	1.00	1.00	0.28	0.40	0.56	1.00	0.90	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.21	1.00	0.47
0.59	0.40	0.11	0.25	1.00	1.00	0.61	1.00	1.00	0.28	0.40	0.56	0.60	0.85	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.18	1.00	0.47
0.72	0.60	0.56	0.50	1.00	0.00	0.81	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.41	0.69	1.00	0.38	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.50	0.17
0.46	0.40	0.56	0.50	1.00	0.00	0.67	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.41	0.69	1.00	0.46	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.21	0.75	0.76
0.73	0.60	0.56	1.00	0.50	0.00	0.72	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.41	0.69	1.00	0.22	0.75	1.00	0.92	0.20	0.75	0.48
0.67	0.60	0.56	0.50	1.00	0.00	0.67	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.41	0.69	1.00	0.07	1.00	0.00	0.94	0.30	0.75	0.76
0.55	0.80	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.77	0.00	1.00	0.16	0.29	0.85	1.00	0.18	0.75	0.00	0.94	0.00	0.75	0.50
0.60	0.40	0.43	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.47	0.00	1.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	0.80	0.85	0.25	1.00	0.86	0.02	0.25	0.31
0.70	0.60	0.56	1.00	0.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.41	0.69	1.00	0.11	0.75	1.00	0.78	0.50	0.75	0.80
0.63	0.60	0.00	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.24	0.00	0.00	0.16	0.29	0.85	1.00	0.10	1.00	0.00	0.67	0.00	1.00	0.85
0.68	0.40	0.56	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.41	0.69	1.00	0.22	1.00	1.00	0.98	1.00	0.75	0.80
0.52	0.40	0.41	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.39	1.00	0.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	0.80	0.89	0.25	1.00	0.42	0.00	0.50	0.18
0.75	0.40	0.76	0.50	0.25	0.00	0.95	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	0.40	0.24	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.50	0.75	0.50
0.87	0.40	0.76	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.91	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	0.20	0.28	0.75	0.00	1.00	0.50	0.75	0.54
0.68	0.40	0.41	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.48	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	0.80	0.50	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.61
0.37	0.40	0.64	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.86	0.00	0.00	0.96	0.68	0.51	0.80	0.12	0.75	0.00	0.69	1.00	0.75	0.44

UNIVERSE OF SITES

THIRD PRIORITY

Highest Weight

Rank	Title	Size (Acres)	PNA Classification	Region	Composite Score	Park Pressure	Walk Network Connectivity	Park Conditions Assessment	Env., Social, and Health Equity
278	Los Angeles Sister Cities Plaza	0.33	Mini Park	South	0.4817	0.75	0.26	0.00	1.00
312	Louise Park	6.48	Large Neighborhood Park	North	0.4460	0.50	0.17	0.20	1.00
300	Lummis Public Forest Park	0.29	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.4599	0.75	0.35	0.00	1.00
216	Madison Ave Park and Comm Garden	0.56	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.5588	1.00	0.29	0.33	1.00
309	Mascot Park	0.19	Mini Park	South	0.4492	1.00	0.20	0.00	1.00
203	Mecca Avenue Park	0.18	Mini Park	North	0.5708	1.00	0.27	0.00	0.00
274	Media Park	1.00	Neighborhood Park	West	0.4969	0.75	0.21	0.00	1.00
189	Mount Carmel Recreation Center	3.41	Large Neighborhood Park	South	0.5834	0.50	0.24	0.33	1.00
262	Mount Olympus Park	8.91	Neighborhood Nature Park	Cen/East	0.5068	0.00	0.60	0.00	1.00
224	Nevin Avenue Park	0.26	Mini Park	South	0.5481	1.00	0.36	0.00	1.00
215	North East Valley Multipurpose Center	2	Neighborhood Park	North	0.5601	0.75	0.33	0.00	1.00
324	North Hollywood Recreation Center	55.60	Regional Park	North	0.4321	0.25	0.00	0.24	0.00
225	North Weddington Recreation Center	10.21	Community Park	North	0.5472	0.25	0.68	0.25	1.00
317	Northridge Middle School (CSP)	11.58	Community School Park	North	0.4369	0.25	0.61	0.00	1.00
302	Old Mission Trail	13.60	Linear Park	North	0.4572	0.00	0.67	0.00	0.00
314	Open Magnet Charter School (CSP)	2.80	Community School Park	West	0.4448	0.50	0.45	0.00	0.00
318	Oro Vista Park	8.23	Large Neighborhood Park	North	0.4367	0.00	0.77	0.25	0.00
336	Pacific Region Headquarters	2.62	Single Purpose Site	South	0.4178	0.25	0.60	0.00	1.00
257	Panorama City Recreation Center	6.00	Large Neighborhood Park	North	0.5124	0.50	0.22	0.23	1.00
194	Patton St Pocket Park	0.40	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.5794	0.50	0.39	0.50	1.00
187	PerSquareMile - Arleta	3.00	New Park Priority Area	North	0.5851	0.50	0.35	0.00	1.00
343	Pio Pico Library Pocket Park	0.55	Mini Park	South	0.4011	1.00	0.16	0.00	0.00
220	Pio Pico Middle School (CSP)	3.54	Community School Park	South	0.5551	0.75	0.34	0.00	1.00
201	Point Fermin Park	39.13	Community Park	South	0.5718	0.00	0.68	0.60	1.00
185	Ralph C Daniels Field Sports Center	3.59	Large Neighborhood Park	South	0.5888	0.50	0.23	0.44	1.00
256	Ritchie Valens Paxton Rec Center	25.77	Large Community Park	North	0.5136	0.25	0.29	0.42	1.00
235	Rockwood Community Park	0.43	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.5336	0.50	0.24	0.50	1.00
234	Roger W Jessup Park	14.41	Community Park	North	0.5337	0.00	0.67	0.90	1.00
272	Rose Hill Recreation Center	2.26	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	0.4984	0.50	0.38	0.30	1.00
267	Rosecrans Recreation Center	10.55	Community Park	South	0.5033	0.25	0.61	0.08	1.00
333	Runyon Canyon Park	141.50	Canyon Park	North	0.4220	0.00	0.65	0.50	0.00
179	Saint Andrews Recreation Center	8.58	Large Neighborhood Park	South	0.5913	0.50	0.17	0.13	1.00
326	San Juan Garage	0.12	Single Purpose Site	West	0.4293	0.75	0.34	0.00	0.00
285	San Pedro Plaza Park	3.51	Linear Park	South	0.4719	0.50	0.41	0.00	1.00
233	San Pedro Welcome Park	0.40	Mini Park	South	0.5350	0.75	0.26	0.00	1.00
226	SE Valley Roller & Skateboard Park	2.20	Single Purpose Site	North	0.5465	0.25	0.43	0.75	1.00
276	Seily Rodriguez Park	0.34	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.4838	1.00	0.28	0.00	1.00
337	Seoul International Park	3.47	Large Neighborhood Park	South	0.4164	0.75	0.12	0.50	1.00
292	Sepulveda Recreation Center	10.59	Community Park	North	0.4681	0.50	0.21	0.23	1.00
186	Shatto Recreation Center	5.45	Large Neighborhood Park	South	0.5863	0.75	0.32	0.27	1.00
221	Sheldon-Arleta Park	45.16	Regional Park	North	0.5539	0.00	0.53	0.50	1.00
291	Sherman Oaks Castle Park	4.98	Single Purpose Site	North	0.4689	0.25	0.47	0.50	0.00
227	South LA Wetlands Park	9.01	Large Neighborhood Park	South	0.5448	0.25	0.16	0.00	1.00
228	South Los Angeles Sports Activity Cntr	1.00	Single Purpose Site	South	0.5447	0.75	0.22	0.00	1.00
208	South Park Recreation Center	18.25	Community Park	South	0.5689	0.25	0.07	0.13	1.00

Highest Weight				Medium Weight					Lowest Weight										
Low Shade Cover	Climate Vulnerability	Perceived Park Safety	Criminalization Burden	CIP Project History	Extreme Heat Risk	Lack of Private Open Space	Biodiversity and Habitat Cons	Metro Corridors	Perceived Park Condition	Perceived Rec Center Condition	Perceived Walkability	Presence of Com Prio Amenities	Park Visitation	MyLA311 Requests	Habitat Connectivity	Tree Species Composition	Infiltration & Recharge Opps	Water Quality Priority	LAC Park Needs Assessment
0.71	0.60	0.43	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.47	0.00	1.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	0.80	0.05	0.00	1.00	0.54	0.00	0.25	0.31
0.72	0.40	0.30	0.50	0.75	1.00	0.71	0.00	0.00	0.88	0.43	0.51	0.60	0.08	0.50	0.00	0.84	1.00	0.75	0.33
0.31	0.40	0.76	0.50	1.00	0.00	0.54	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	1.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.50	0.27
0.64	0.60	0.56	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.42	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.41	0.69	1.00	0.15	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.50	0.75	0.74
0.57	0.60	0.00	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.70	0.00	0.00	0.16	0.29	0.85	0.80	0.03	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.75	0.93
0.65	0.40	1.00	0.75	0.50	1.00	0.89	0.00	0.00	0.84	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.59	1.00	0.00	0.85	0.50	1.00	0.61
0.53	0.60	0.01	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.85	0.00	1.00	0.28	0.13	0.47	1.00	0.12	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.40
0.88	0.40	0.74	0.75	0.25	1.00	0.02	0.00	1.00	0.63	0.52	1.00	0.80	0.08	1.00	0.00	0.71	0.00	1.00	0.90
0.53	0.40	0.76	0.50	0.50	0.00	0.54	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	1.00	0.98	0.25	0.00	0.85	0.07	0.25	0.34
0.80	0.40	0.80	0.75	0.00	1.00	0.84	0.00	0.00	0.55	0.00	0.57	1.00	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.74
0.88	0.40	0.64	0.50	0.75	1.00	0.58	0.00	0.00	0.96	0.68	0.51	0.80	0.50	0.75	0.00	0.83	0.50	0.75	0.41
0.81	0.40	1.00	0.75	0.50	0.00	0.55	1.00	1.00	0.62	0.86	0.57	0.00	0.47	0.50	0.00	0.80	0.40	1.00	0.52
0.67	0.40	1.00	0.50	0.75	0.00	0.34	0.00	1.00	0.62	0.86	0.57	0.20	0.07	0.50	1.00	0.69	0.45	0.75	0.45
0.70	0.40	0.41	0.25	1.00	1.00	0.41	0.00	0.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	1.00	0.95	0.25	0.00	1.00	0.50	0.75	0.81
0.77	0.60	0.41	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.39	1.00	0.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	1.00	0.99	0.50	1.00	0.82	0.04	0.50	0.18
0.64	0.60	0.41	0.25	1.00	1.00	0.57	0.00	1.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	1.00	0.50	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.13	1.00	0.71
0.87	0.80	0.64	0.75	0.50	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.96	0.68	0.51	0.40	0.63	0.25	0.00	0.59	0.67	0.00	0.32
0.57	0.60	0.43	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.75	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	1.00	0.38	0.25	0.00	0.94	0.00	0.75	0.48
0.82	0.40	0.30	0.50	0.50	1.00	0.62	1.00	0.00	0.88	0.43	0.51	0.60	0.03	0.25	0.00	0.99	0.50	0.75	0.70
0.66	0.60	0.76	0.50	0.00	1.00	0.77	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	0.20	0.04	1.00	1.00	0.98	0.00	0.75	0.63
0.72	0.40	0.30	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.72	0.00	1.00	0.88	0.43	0.51	1.00	0.50	0.50	0.00	0.89	0.63	0.50	0.86
0.79	0.60	0.00	0.25	1.00	0.00	0.96	0.00	1.00	0.16	0.29	0.85	1.00	0.19	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.50	0.75	0.88
0.87	0.60	0.00	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.98	0.00	0.00	0.16	0.29	0.85	1.00	0.50	0.25	0.00	1.00	0.50	0.75	0.86
0.85	0.80	0.43	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.56	1.00	0.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	0.60	0.01	0.25	1.00	0.95	0.00	0.00	0.21
0.79	0.60	0.43	1.00	0.25	1.00	0.65	0.00	1.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	1.00	0.50	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.59
0.75	0.40	0.64	0.50	0.50	1.00	0.51	0.00	0.00	0.96	0.68	0.51	0.40	0.09	0.50	1.00	0.79	0.95	0.75	0.42
0.61	0.40	0.56	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.77	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.41	0.69	0.60	0.11	1.00	1.00	0.59	0.00	0.75	0.63
0.54	0.40	0.64	0.50	0.25	1.00	0.20	1.00	0.00	0.96	0.68	0.51	0.40	0.55	0.00	1.00	0.83	0.30	0.00	0.18
0.74	0.40	0.90	0.75	0.25	1.00	0.68	0.00	0.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	0.80	0.39	0.50	0.00	0.61	0.00	0.50	0.33
0.83	0.40	0.43	0.50	0.50	1.00	0.24	1.00	1.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	1.00	0.12	0.50	0.00	0.46	0.00	0.75	0.52
0.62	0.60	0.11	0.75	0.50	0.00	0.72	1.00	1.00	0.28	0.40	0.56	0.60	0.61	0.25	1.00	0.88	0.00	0.75	0.48
0.76	0.80	0.74	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.97	0.00	0.00	0.63	0.52	1.00	0.80	0.51	0.50	0.00	0.88	0.00	0.50	0.52
0.94	0.60	0.41	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.91	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	1.00	0.54	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.25	0.67
0.65	0.60	0.43	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.48	0.00	1.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	1.00	0.61	0.00	1.00	0.99	0.00	0.00	0.57
0.71	0.60	0.43	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.47	0.00	1.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	0.80	0.81	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.25	0.31
0.75	0.40	0.30	1.00	0.25	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.00	0.88	0.43	0.51	0.60	0.06	0.50	0.00	0.63	1.00	0.00	0.31
0.86	0.60	0.56	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.41	0.69	0.80	0.28	1.00	1.00	0.98	1.00	0.75	0.80
0.77	0.60	0.00	0.75	0.25	0.00	0.86	0.00	0.00	0.16	0.29	0.85	0.60	0.47	0.75	0.00	0.87	0.50	0.75	0.90
0.75	0.60	0.30	0.50	0.00	1.00	0.39	0.00	1.00	0.88	0.43	0.51	0.60	0.06	0.75	0.00	0.77	0.33	0.50	0.87
0.79	0.60	0.00	0.25	0.25	1.00	0.92	0.00	1.00	0.16	0.29	0.85	0.40	0.15	1.00	1.00	0.91	0.29	1.00	0.90
0.86	0.40	0.30	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.00	0.88	0.43	0.51	0.60	0.79	0.75	0.00	0.75	0.45	0.00	0.31
0.68	0.40	0.11	0.25	1.00	1.00	0.51	1.00	0.00	0.28	0.40	0.56	1.00	0.75	0.75	1.00	0.95	0.41	1.00	0.44
0.81	0.60	0.80	0.75	0.25	1.00	0.62	1.00	0.00	0.55	0.00	0.57	1.00	0.07	1.00	0.00	0.36	0.50	1.00	0.90
0.89	0.60	0.74	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.96	0.00	0.00	0.63	0.52	1.00	0.80	0.08	0.00	0.00	0.57	0.00	1.00	0.93
0.85	0.60	0.80	0.75	0.25	1.00	0.62	1.00	0.00	0.55	0.00	0.57	0.60	0.02	0.75	0.00	0.93	0.95	1.00	0.90

UNIVERSE OF SITES

Highest Weight

THIRD PRIORITY

Rank	Title	Size (Acres)	PNA Classification	Region	Composite Score	Park Pressure	Walk Network Connectivity	Park Conditions Assessment	Env., Social, and Health Equity
293	South Seas House Park	1.03	Historic Landmark Site	South	0.4679	0.75	0.21	0.50	1.00
335	South Weddington Park	14.48	Community Park	North	0.4188	0.00	0.70	0.17	0.00
183	Stetson Ranch Park	28.31	Large Community Park	North	0.5897	0.00	0.74	0.60	1.00
247	Stonehurst Recreation Center	13.71	Community Park	North	0.5256	0.00	0.58	0.29	1.00
209	Strathern Park - North	12.74	Community Park	North	0.5689	0.00	0.56	0.50	1.00
287	Sycamore Grove Park	15.87	Community Park	Cen/East	0.4714	0.00	0.70	0.44	0.00
280	Tarzana Recreation Center	5.57	Large Neighborhood Park	North	0.4785	0.25	0.64	0.43	0.00
244	Tiara Street Park	1.56	Neighborhood Park	North	0.5269	0.75	0.17	0.40	1.00
295	Tobias Avenue Park	1.61	Neighborhood Park	North	0.4658	0.75	0.28	0.17	1.00
338	Triangle Park	0.09	Mini Park	West	0.4160	1.00	0.54	0.50	0.00
277	Tujunga Greenbelt	8.22	Greenway	North	0.4835	0.50	0.19	0.00	0.00
330	Tujunga Infiltration Galleries	47.37	Regional Park	North	0.4280	0.00	0.93	0.50	0.00
238	Unidad Park	0.32	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.5320	1.00	0.29	0.50	1.00
182	Valley Plaza Park	77.64	Large Community Park	North	0.5898	0.25	0.10	0.27	1.00
199	Van Ness Recreation Center	7.81	Large Neighborhood Park	South	0.5738	0.25	0.38	0.18	1.00
202	Van Nuys Recreation Center	3.90	Large Neighborhood Park	North	0.5718	0.50	0.28	0.20	1.00
281	Venice Beach	160.75	Beach	West	0.4772	0.00	0.61	0.68	0.00
294	Verdugo Hills Pool	0.75	School Pool	North	0.4667	0.75	0.35	1.00	0.00
178	Vermont Square Park	3.01	Large Neighborhood Park	South	0.5918	0.75	0.14	0.38	1.00
191	Vernon Branch Library Pocket Park	0.15	Mini Park	South	0.5818	1.00	0.19	0.00	1.00
177	Victory-Vineland Recreation Center	6.48	Large Neighborhood Park	North	0.5919	0.50	0.18	0.33	1.00
298	Vineyard Recreation Center	0.93	Mini Park	South	0.4637	0.75	0.15	0.00	1.00
339	Vista Del Mar Park	1.41	Neighborhood Park	West	0.4142	0.00	0.70	1.00	1.00
341	Warner Ranch Park	16.68	Community Park	North	0.4090	0.25	0.33	0.13	0.00
231	Washington Irving Pocket Park	0.13	Mini Park	South	0.5359	1.00	0.30	0.00	1.00
319	Watts Cultural Crescent	2.96	Linear Park	South	0.4362	0.50	0.27	0.00	1.00
296	Watts Serenity Park	1.12	Neighborhood Park	South	0.4648	0.50	0.40	0.00	1.00
197	Watts Skate Park	0.79	Single Purpose Site	South	0.5782	1.00	0.53	0.00	1.00
188	West Lakeside Street Park	6.16	Large Neighborhood Park	North	0.5844	0.25	0.69	0.00	1.00
211	Westside Neighborhood Park	3.98	Linear Park	South	0.5675	0.50	0.44	0.17	1.00
217	White Point Park Nature Preserve	95.00	Regional Nature Park	South	0.5580	0.00	0.72	0.83	0.00
260	Whitnall Highway Park	10.52	Linear Park	North	0.5092	0.50	0.12	0.00	1.00
334	Will Rogers State Beach	102.90	Beach	West	0.4215	0.00	0.81	0.50	0.00
308	Woodbridge Park	4.71	Large Neighborhood Park	North	0.4504	0.50	0.28	0.50	1.00
299	Yucca Community Center	0.97	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.4629	0.75	0.32	0.20	0.00

FOURTH PRIORITY

459	Aliso Canyon Park	60.45	Canyon Park	North	0.2448	0.00	0.73	0.00	0.00
355	Alizondo Drive Park	6.65	Linear Park	North	0.3876	0.25	0.52	0.00	0.00
361	Alma Park	2.26	Neighborhood Park	South	0.3811	0.75	0.23	0.00	0.00
453	Amoroso Triangle	0.03	Mini Park	West	0.2529	1.00	0.25	0.00	0.00
358	Andres Pico Adobe Park	2.20	Historic Landmark Site	North	0.3868	0.25	0.49	0.50	0.00
363	Angels Gate Park	70.44	Regional Park	South	0.3801	0.00	0.48	0.43	0.00
413	Averill Park	10.75	Community Park	South	0.3158	0.25	0.26	0.50	0.00

Highest Weight				Medium Weight					Lowest Weight										
Low Shade Cover	Climate Vulnerability	Perceived Park Safety	Criminalization Burden	CIP Project History	Extreme Heat Risk	Lack of Private Open Space	Biodiversity and Habitat Cons	Metro Corridors	Perceived Park Condition	Perceived Rec Center Condition	Perceived Walkability	Presence of Com Prio Amenities	Park Visitation	MyLA311 Requests	Habitat Connectivity	Tree Species Composition	Infiltration & Recharge Opps	Water Quality Priority	LAC Park Needs Assessment
0.68	0.60	0.00	0.75	0.00	1.00	0.89	0.00	0.00	0.16	0.29	0.85	0.80	0.05	0.75	0.00	0.92	0.19	1.00	0.75
0.62	0.40	1.00	0.75	0.50	0.00	0.50	0.00	1.00	0.62	0.86	0.57	0.00	0.71	0.75	1.00	0.87	0.50	0.75	0.31
0.77	0.40	0.64	0.75	0.75	1.00	0.25	1.00	0.00	0.96	0.68	0.51	0.80	0.95	0.00	0.00	0.94	0.03	0.00	0.25
0.65	0.60	0.64	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.63	0.00	0.00	0.96	0.68	0.51	0.40	0.50	0.25	0.00	0.74	1.00	1.00	0.00
0.92	0.40	1.00	0.75	0.50	1.00	0.76	0.00	0.00	0.62	0.86	0.57	0.40	0.33	0.50	0.00	0.56	1.00	0.25	0.34
0.49	0.40	0.76	0.50	0.50	1.00	0.54	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	0.60	0.25	0.25	0.00	0.52	0.00	0.50	0.27
0.63	0.40	1.00	0.75	0.25	0.00	0.37	0.00	1.00	0.84	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.12	0.50	1.00	0.92	0.50	0.50	0.31
0.87	0.40	1.00	0.75	0.00	0.00	0.78	0.00	0.00	0.62	0.86	0.57	0.20	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.82	1.00	1.00	0.75
0.57	0.40	0.30	0.50	0.25	1.00	0.72	0.00	1.00	0.88	0.43	0.51	0.40	0.32	0.00	0.00	0.46	0.50	0.50	0.86
0.88	0.40	0.41	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.67	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	1.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.52
0.52	0.40	1.00	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.82	0.00	1.00	0.62	0.86	0.57	0.40	0.51	0.25	0.00	0.84	0.38	0.75	0.50
0.60	0.80	0.64	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.96	0.68	0.51	0.80	0.97	0.25	0.00	0.47	0.22	0.00	0.04
0.70	0.40	0.56	0.50	0.00	1.00	0.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.41	0.69	0.60	0.22	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.69
0.81	0.40	1.00	0.75	0.50	1.00	0.47	1.00	0.00	0.62	0.86	0.57	0.00	0.04	0.75	1.00	0.79	0.50	0.75	0.29
0.83	0.60	0.74	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.71	0.00	0.00	0.63	0.52	1.00	0.60	0.50	0.75	1.00	0.93	0.00	0.75	0.67
0.82	0.40	0.30	0.50	0.50	1.00	0.69	0.00	1.00	0.88	0.43	0.51	0.60	0.30	1.00	0.00	0.84	0.50	1.00	0.72
0.95	0.80	0.41	1.00	0.50	0.00	0.48	1.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	0.80	0.07	0.75	1.00	0.98	0.00	1.00	0.61
0.81	0.80	0.64	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.41	0.00	0.00	0.96	0.68	0.51	0.80	0.50	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.50	0.36
0.79	0.60	0.80	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.52	0.00	0.00	0.55	0.00	0.57	0.80	0.07	0.75	0.00	0.85	0.50	0.75	0.87
0.78	0.60	0.80	0.75	0.00	1.00	0.35	0.00	0.00	0.55	0.00	0.57	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.97
0.73	0.40	1.00	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.94	0.00	0.00	0.62	0.86	0.57	0.00	0.02	0.50	0.00	0.87	1.00	0.75	0.64
0.74	0.60	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.30	0.00	1.00	0.16	0.29	0.85	0.60	0.50	1.00	0.00	0.95	0.00	1.00	0.50
0.78	0.40	0.41	0.25	0.50	0.00	0.67	1.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	0.80	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.86	0.00	0.50	0.19
0.66	0.40	1.00	0.25	0.75	1.00	0.96	0.00	0.00	0.84	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.02	0.50	0.00	0.84	0.09	1.00	0.38
0.70	0.60	0.00	0.75	0.00	1.00	0.64	1.00	0.00	0.16	0.29	0.85	1.00	0.20	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.77
0.80	0.40	0.43	0.75	0.25	1.00	0.07	0.00	1.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	1.00	0.40	0.75	0.00	0.94	0.00	0.75	0.87
0.66	0.60	0.43	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.59	0.00	1.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	1.00	0.61	0.50	0.00	0.41	0.00	0.75	0.50
0.83	0.60	0.43	1.00	0.25	1.00	0.59	0.00	1.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	1.00	0.24	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.75	0.50
0.79	0.40	0.64	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.34	1.00	0.00	0.96	0.68	0.51	1.00	0.23	0.25	0.00	0.70	0.00	0.75	0.38
0.75	0.80	0.00	1.00	0.25	1.00	0.63	0.00	1.00	0.16	0.29	0.85	0.80	0.21	0.50	1.00	0.90	0.00	0.75	0.36
0.83	0.80	0.43	1.00	0.75	1.00	0.85	1.00	0.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	0.60	0.92	0.25	1.00	0.89	0.00	0.00	0.19
0.77	0.40	1.00	0.75	0.75	0.00	0.63	0.00	0.00	0.62	0.86	0.57	0.40	0.00	0.75	1.00	0.97	1.00	0.75	0.66
0.81	1.00	0.41	0.75	1.00	0.00	0.29	1.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	1.00	0.12	0.25	1.00	0.99	0.02	0.00	0.17
0.44	0.40	1.00	0.50	0.50	0.00	0.38	0.00	0.00	0.62	0.86	0.57	0.00	0.05	0.75	1.00	0.78	0.94	0.75	0.43
0.83	0.60	0.56	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.72	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.41	0.69	1.00	0.07	1.00	1.00	0.85	0.67	0.75	0.48
0.55	0.40	0.41	0.00	0.75	1.00	0.52	1.00	0.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	0.80	0.90	0.00	1.00	0.24	0.00	0.25	0.22
0.46	0.60	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.84	1.00	1.00	0.60	0.92	0.25	1.00	0.53	0.00	0.50	0.22
0.49	0.40	0.43	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.69	1.00	0.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	0.80	0.32	1.00	0.00	0.90	0.00	0.00	0.49
0.36	0.40	0.41	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.78	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	1.00	0.70	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.25	0.54
0.60	0.40	0.64	0.75	0.25	1.00	0.85	0.00	0.00	0.96	0.68	0.51	0.40	0.74	0.50	0.00	0.89	0.50	0.50	0.32
0.82	0.80	0.43	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.56	1.00	0.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	0.40	0.00	0.25	1.00	0.90	0.00	0.00	0.21
0.43	0.60	0.43	0.50	0.50	1.00	0.89	1.00	0.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	0.80	0.11	0.00	1.00	0.91	0.00	0.00	0.25

UNIVERSE OF SITES

FOURTH PRIORITY

Highest Weight

Rank	Title	Size (Acres)	PNA Classification	Region	Composite Score	Park Pressure	Walk Network Connectivity	Park Conditions Assessment	Env., Social, and Health Equity
357	Banning Park	21.09	Large Community Park	South	0.3869	0.25	0.33	0.39	1.00
414	Bee Canyon Park	22.21	Canyon Park	North	0.3157	0.00	0.49	0.50	0.00
386	Bell Canyon Park	122.78	Regional Nature Park	North	0.3438	0.00	0.78	0.00	0.00
447	Bill Rosendahl Del Rey Park	4.82	Large Neighborhood Park	West	0.2654	0.50	0.54	0.29	0.00
370	Branford Recreation Center	13.38	Community Park	North	0.3723	0.25	0.30	0.08	1.00
377	Bridewell Armory	1.90	Single Purpose Site	Cen/East	0.3686	0.25	0.38	0.00	0.00
366	Browns Creek Park	51.99	Canyon Park	North	0.3750	0.00	0.89	0.00	0.00
344	Budd Wiener Park	0.79	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.3982	0.75	0.59	0.00	0.00
410	Buena Vista Park	8.71	Large Neighborhood Park	North	0.3223	0.00	0.44	0.00	0.00
372	Caplow Property	16.96	Community Nature Park	North	0.3707	0.00	0.95	0.00	0.00
421	Carthay Circle Park	0.97	Greenway	West	0.3109	1.00	0.15	0.00	0.00
368	Chatsworth Oaks Park	2.90	Neighborhood Park	North	0.3734	0.00	0.82	0.50	0.00
371	Chatsworth Park North	24.15	Large Community Park	North	0.3714	0.00	0.70	0.29	0.00
391	Chatsworth Reservoir Site	149.54	Regional Park	North	0.3357	0.00	0.75	0.00	0.00
417	Cheviot Hills Recreation Center	182.61	Large Community Park	West	0.3137	0.00	0.46	0.29	0.00
375	Claude Pepper Senior Citizen Center	0.40	Single Purpose Site	South	0.3699	1.00	0.24	0.50	0.00
423	Cleland Avenue Bicentennial Park	0.92	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.3092	0.75	0.54	0.00	0.00
446	Cleveland High School Pool	0.79	School Pool	North	0.2670	0.75	0.35	0.00	0.00
415	Cohasset-Melba Park	2.00	Neighborhood Park	North	0.3152	0.50	0.48	0.00	0.00
350	Corbin Canyon Park	40.51	Regional Nature Park	North	0.3925	0.00	0.84	0.00	0.00
369	Costanso Fire Station 84 Park	0.36	Mini Park	North	0.3724	1.00	0.33	0.00	0.00
477	Crescent Place Triangle	0.02	Mini Park	West	0.2014	1.00	0.26	0.00	0.00
430	Dearborn Park	9.12	Large Neighborhood Park	North	0.2913	0.25	0.22	0.08	0.00
471	Deervale-Stone Canyon Park	79.40	Regional Nature Park	North	0.2275	0.00	0.96	0.00	0.00
440	Del Rey Lagoon	10.99	Community Park	West	0.2736	0.00	0.75	0.20	0.00
382	Eagle Rock City Hall	0.32	Historic Landmark Site	Cen/East	0.3511	1.00	0.30	0.00	0.00
393	Eagle Rock Hillside Park	27.58	Community Nature Park	Cen/East	0.3334	0.00	0.92	0.00	0.00
463	Eagle Rock Historical Landmark	2.17	Historic Landmark Site	Cen/East	0.2430	0.25	0.54	0.00	0.00
466	Eagle Rock Recreation Center	20.68	Large Community Park	Cen/East	0.2343	0.00	0.44	0.32	0.00
408	East Wilmington Greenbelt Park	3.96	Linear Park	South	0.3227	0.25	0.34	0.25	1.00
445	Eddleston Park	6.31	Neighborhood Nature Park	North	0.2678	0.00	0.59	0.00	0.00
359	El Escorpion Park	61.29	Regional Nature Park	North	0.3833	0.00	0.96	0.00	0.00
406	Eleanor Green Roberts Aquatic Center	0.75	Single Purpose Site	South	0.3234	0.75	0.27	0.00	1.00
451	Fairfax Senior Citizen Center	0.38	Single Purpose Site	West	0.2570	1.00	0.18	0.50	0.00
379	Fallbrook Park	0.30	Mini Park	North	0.3583	0.50	0.68	0.50	0.00
352	Fehlhaber-Houk Park	1.16	Neighborhood Park	North	0.3904	0.50	0.66	0.00	0.00
399	Felicia Mahood Multipurpose Center	0.82	Single Purpose Site	West	0.3296	0.75	0.20	0.75	0.00
364	Franklin-Ivar Park	0.93	Mini Park	North	0.3778	0.75	0.21	0.00	0.00
405	Gaffey Street "Field of Dreams"	17.95	Community Park	South	0.3254	0.00	0.80	0.25	0.00
468	Garvanza Park	5.59	Large Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	0.2327	0.50	0.24	0.44	0.00
411	Granada Hills Recreation Center	17.76	Community Park	North	0.3163	0.25	0.15	0.62	0.00
428	Granada Hills Youth Recreation Center	18.22	Community Park	North	0.2969	0.00	0.64	0.50	0.00
354	Guardia Park	3.08	Large Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	0.3893	0.25	0.65	0.30	0.00
395	Haines Canyon Park	52.38	Regional Nature Park	North	0.3325	0.00	0.76	0.00	0.00
412	Harbor Gateway Park	0.08	Mini Park	South	0.3161	1.00	0.35	0.00	1.00

Highest Weight				Medium Weight					Lowest Weight										
Low Shade Cover	Climate Vulnerability	Perceived Park Safety	Criminalization Burden	CIP Project History	Extreme Heat Risk	Lack of Private Open Space	Biodiversity and Habitat Cons	Metro Corridors	Perceived Park Condition	Perceived Rec Center Condition	Perceived Walkability	Presence of Com Prio Amenities	Park Visitation	MyLA311 Requests	Habitat Connectivity	Tree Species Composition	Infiltration & Recharge Opps	Water Quality Priority	LAC Park Needs Assessment
0.67	0.60	0.43	0.75	0.50	1.00	0.59	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	0.60	0.02	0.25	0.00	0.89	0.00	1.00	0.46
0.79	0.60	0.41	0.25	0.75	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	0.80	0.76	0.25	1.00	0.59	0.00	0.00	0.08
0.60	0.80	0.41	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.03	1.00	0.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	0.80	0.99	0.00	1.00	0.58	0.09	0.00	0.23
0.64	0.40	0.41	0.50	0.75	0.00	0.51	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	0.80	0.10	0.50	1.00	0.81	0.00	1.00	0.56
0.75	0.60	0.30	0.50	0.25	1.00	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.88	0.43	0.51	0.40	0.07	0.50	0.00	0.83	1.00	0.75	0.63
0.57	0.60	0.90	0.50	1.00	0.00	0.36	1.00	0.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	1.00	0.75	0.75	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.50	0.32
0.54	0.80	0.41	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.51	1.00	0.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	1.00	0.99	0.25	0.00	0.07	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.55	0.40	0.90	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.36	0.00	0.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	1.00	0.01	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.25	0.25
0.68	0.60	0.11	0.75	1.00	1.00	0.97	0.00	1.00	0.28	0.40	0.56	0.60	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.57	0.13	0.75	0.16
0.38	0.60	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.84	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.25	0.10
0.45	0.80	0.01	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.58	0.00	1.00	0.28	0.13	0.47	0.60	0.19	0.00	0.00	0.97	0.25	0.75	0.57
0.60	0.60	0.41	1.00	0.75	1.00	0.52	1.00	0.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	0.80	0.19	0.00	0.00	0.54	0.28	0.00	0.09
0.58	1.00	0.41	1.00	0.25	1.00	0.73	1.00	0.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	0.80	0.69	0.25	0.00	0.29	0.21	0.00	0.04
0.60	0.80	0.41	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.52	1.00	0.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	1.00	0.98	0.25	0.00	0.14	0.17	0.00	0.09
0.64	0.80	0.01	1.00	0.75	0.00	0.67	1.00	0.00	0.28	0.13	0.47	0.40	0.62	0.25	1.00	0.82	0.02	0.75	0.48
0.90	0.60	0.00	0.75	0.50	0.00	0.36	0.00	1.00	0.16	0.29	0.85	0.80	0.50	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.75	0.68
0.51	0.40	0.76	0.50	0.25	0.00	0.49	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	0.40	0.50	0.50	0.00	0.62	0.10	0.25	0.34
0.81	0.60	0.11	1.00	0.25	1.00	0.27	0.00	0.00	0.28	0.40	0.56	0.60	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.97	0.00	0.75	0.60
0.54	0.60	0.41	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.70	0.00	0.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	0.60	0.62	0.75	0.00	0.91	0.50	0.25	0.23
0.56	0.40	1.00	0.75	1.00	0.00	0.29	1.00	0.00	0.84	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.63	0.04	0.50	0.01
0.70	0.40	1.00	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.74	0.00	0.00	0.84	1.00	1.00	0.60	0.15	0.75	1.00	0.65	0.00	1.00	0.26
0.35	0.40	0.41	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.78	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	1.00	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.40	0.00	0.25	0.54
0.59	0.60	0.41	0.25	0.50	1.00	0.52	1.00	0.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	0.80	0.03	0.75	0.00	0.88	0.73	0.75	0.35
0.23	0.40	0.11	0.25	0.50	0.00	0.10	1.00	1.00	0.28	0.40	0.56	1.00	0.98	0.00	1.00	0.86	0.03	0.50	0.26
0.84	0.60	0.41	0.25	0.50	0.00	0.72	1.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	0.80	0.05	0.75	0.00	0.97	0.00	0.50	0.36
0.55	0.40	0.90	0.75	1.00	0.00	0.09	0.00	1.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	1.00	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.75	0.00	0.25	0.54
0.48	0.40	0.90	0.75	0.50	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	1.00	0.99	0.00	0.00	0.20	0.00	0.25	0.26
0.29	0.40	0.90	1.00	0.50	0.00	0.39	1.00	0.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	0.60	0.94	0.25	0.00	0.13	0.00	0.25	0.13
0.40	0.40	0.90	0.75	0.25	0.00	0.39	1.00	0.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	0.80	0.03	0.75	0.00	0.87	0.00	0.25	0.13
0.84	0.40	0.43	0.75	0.50	1.00	0.39	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	0.60	0.02	0.75	0.00	0.56	0.00	0.25	0.45
0.65	0.40	0.41	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.52	1.00	0.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	0.80	0.97	0.00	1.00	0.27	0.00	0.25	0.26
0.58	0.80	0.41	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.37	1.00	0.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	0.80	0.95	0.25	1.00	0.14	0.09	0.00	0.22
0.89	0.60	0.00	0.75	0.00	0.00	0.80	0.00	0.00	0.16	0.29	0.85	0.60	0.20	0.75	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.75	0.65
0.73	0.40	0.01	0.75	0.00	0.00	0.39	0.00	0.00	0.28	0.13	0.47	1.00	0.30	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.75	0.69
0.95	0.60	0.41	0.50	0.00	1.00	0.53	1.00	0.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	0.60	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.61	0.50	0.00	0.12
0.38	0.40	0.64	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.67	1.00	0.00	0.96	0.68	0.51	0.60	0.77	1.00	0.00	0.50	0.00	0.25	0.08
0.82	0.20	0.41	0.50	0.25	0.00	0.83	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	1.00	0.13	1.00	1.00	0.86	0.00	1.00	0.54
0.74	0.60	0.11	0.50	1.00	0.00	0.95	0.00	1.00	0.28	0.40	0.56	1.00	0.61	0.50	0.00	1.00	0.50	0.75	0.43
0.93	0.40	0.43	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.30	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	1.00	0.63	0.00	1.00	0.90	0.07	0.75	0.10
0.68	0.40	0.90	0.50	0.25	0.00	0.29	0.00	0.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	0.80	0.18	0.75	0.00	0.77	0.00	0.50	0.40
0.72	0.40	0.41	0.25	0.25	1.00	0.72	1.00	0.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	0.80	0.04	0.50	0.00	0.79	0.50	0.50	0.64
0.72	0.60	0.41	0.25	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	0.80	0.55	0.00	1.00	0.91	0.29	0.75	0.00
0.63	0.60	0.90	0.75	0.50	1.00	0.32	0.00	0.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	1.00	0.44	0.25	0.00	0.85	0.00	0.50	0.46
0.42	0.40	0.64	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.67	1.00	0.00	0.96	0.68	0.51	1.00	1.00	0.50	0.00	0.08	0.00	0.25	0.08
0.75	0.60	0.43	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.51	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	1.00	0.72	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.50	0.66

UNIVERSE OF SITES

FOURTH PRIORITY

Highest Weight

Rank	Title	Size (Acres)	PNA Classification	Region	Composite Score	Park Pressure	Walk Network Connectivity	Park Conditions Assessment	Env., Social, and Health Equity
474	Harold A Henry Park	1.60	Neighborhood Park	West	0.2234	0.75	0.28	0.00	0.00
439	Highland Park Recreation Center	5.41	Large Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	0.2751	0.25	0.25	0.29	0.00
381	Highland Park Senior Citizen Center	3.81	Large Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	0.3512	0.25	0.32	0.50	0.00
457	Holleigh Bernson Memorial Park	12.51	Community Park	North	0.2476	0.00	0.60	0.25	0.00
396	Holmby Park	8.52	Large Neighborhood Park	West	0.3303	0.25	0.41	0.15	0.00
473	Irving Schacter Park	0.31	Mini Park	West	0.2250	0.75	0.27	0.50	0.00
441	Jane and Bert Boeckmann Park	50.11	Regional Park	North	0.2733	0.00	0.79	0.00	0.00
346	Jessie Owens Mini-Park	1.64	Neighborhood Park	North	0.3977	0.75	0.25	0.25	1.00
402	Juntos Family Park	1.64	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	0.3261	0.25	0.64	0.50	1.00
365	Knapp Ranch Park	69.11	Regional Park	North	0.3761	0.00	0.57	0.42	0.00
404	LA Center for Enriched Studies	7.44	School Pool	South	0.3259	0.50	0.18	0.50	0.00
455	La Tuna Canyon Park	73.61	Regional Nature Park	North	0.2503	0.00	0.96	0.00	0.00
397	Lake Street Park	1.52	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	0.3298	0.75	0.25	0.25	0.00
392	Lanark Shelby Mini-Park	0.27	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.3350	1.00	0.38	0.50	0.00
449	LAR Greenway - Laurel Canyon Gwy	3.04	Greenway	North	0.2631	0.50	0.26	0.00	0.00
424	LAR Greenway - Laurelgrove Ped Bridge	0.03	Greenway	North	0.3077	1.00	0.52	0.00	0.00
470	Laurel Canyon Mulholland Park	1.71	Neighborhood Park	North	0.2307	0.25	0.51	0.00	0.00
444	Laurel Canyon Park	23.44	Large Community Park	North	0.2706	0.00	1.00	0.50	0.00
426	Lookout Point Park	1.39	Neighborhood Park	South	0.3016	0.25	0.51	0.00	0.00
427	Mae Boyar Recreation Center	2.23	Neighborhood Park	North	0.2970	0.50	0.54	0.83	0.00
472	Marco Triangle	0.03	Mini Park	West	0.2270	1.00	0.25	0.00	0.00
351	Martin J Bogdanovich Recreation Cntr	13.52	Community Park	South	0.3916	0.00	0.61	0.50	0.00
347	Mason Recreation Center	17.07	Community Park	North	0.3972	0.25	0.31	0.35	0.00
362	McGroarty Park and Cultural Art Center	16.89	Historic Landmark Site	North	0.3803	0.00	0.57	0.83	0.00
420	Moon Canyon Park	4.49	Neighborhood Nature Park	Cen/East	0.3122	0.25	0.67	0.00	0.00
460	Moonshine Canyon Park	25.88	Canyon Park	North	0.2447	0.00	0.78	0.00	0.00
383	Norman O Houston Park	9.50	Large Neighborhood Park	South	0.3506	0.25	0.56	0.17	0.00
388	Normandale Recreation Center	8.32	Large Neighborhood Park	South	0.3388	0.50	0.38	0.11	1.00
345	North Hills Community Park	3.89	Large Neighborhood Park	North	0.3981	0.75	0.42	0.17	1.00
418	Northridge Recreation Center	24.02	Large Community Park	North	0.3135	0.25	0.38	0.50	0.00
456	Nowita Triangle	0.03	Mini Park	West	0.2482	1.00	0.28	0.00	0.00
462	Oakridge Residence	9.34	Historic Landmark Site	North	0.2437	0.00	0.75	0.25	0.00
443	O'Melveny Park	695.71	Regional Nature Park	North	0.2709	0.00	0.87	0.00	0.00
454	Orcutt Ranch Horticultural Center	24.10	Historic Landmark Site	North	0.2525	0.00	0.74	0.25	0.00
467	Palisades Park (Pacific Palisades)	26.43	Community Nature Park	West	0.2335	0.00	0.66	0.00	0.00
403	Palisades Park (Porter Ranch)	113.65	Canyon Park	North	0.3260	0.00	0.74	0.00	0.00
448	Palisades-Asilomar Park	1.44	Greenway	West	0.2653	0.25	0.78	0.00	0.00
398	Peck Park	74.52	Regional Park	South	0.3298	0.00	0.37	0.18	0.00
400	Pilson Property	14.59	Community Nature Park	North	0.3290	0.00	0.81	0.00	0.00
416	Porter Ranch Park	40.96	Canyon Park	North	0.3140	0.00	0.66	0.00	0.00
458	Porter Ridge Park	17.78	Community Park	North	0.2456	0.00	0.65	0.00	0.00
452	Queen Anne Recreation Center	5.23	Large Neighborhood Park	South	0.2547	0.25	0.31	0.05	1.00
419	Ramona Hall Community Center	1.43	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	0.3125	0.00	0.67	0.50	0.00
348	Rancho Cienega Park	28.97	Large Community Park	South	0.3954	0.25	0.27	0.08	1.00
407	Reynier Park	1.03	Neighborhood Park	South	0.3234	0.75	0.28	0.33	1.00

Highest Weight				Medium Weight					Lowest Weight										
Low Shade Cover	Climate Vulnerability	Perceived Park Safety	Criminalization Burden	CIP Project History	Extreme Heat Risk	Lack of Private Open Space	Biodiversity and Habitat Cons	Metro Corridors	Perceived Park Condition	Perceived Rec Center Condition	Perceived Walkability	Presence of Com Prio Amenities	Park Visitation	MyLA311 Requests	Habitat Connectivity	Tree Species Composition	Infiltration & Recharge Opps	Water Quality Priority	LAC Park Needs Assessment
0.35	0.60	0.01	0.25	0.25	0.00	0.90	0.00	1.00	0.28	0.13	0.47	0.60	0.34	1.00	0.00	0.91	0.67	0.75	0.64
0.72	0.40	0.90	0.50	0.25	0.00	0.36	0.00	1.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	0.60	0.10	1.00	0.00	0.80	0.00	0.50	0.32
0.60	0.60	0.90	0.50	0.50	0.00	0.36	0.00	1.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	1.00	0.06	0.75	0.00	0.86	0.00	0.50	0.32
0.82	0.60	0.41	0.00	0.75	1.00	0.23	1.00	0.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	0.60	0.06	0.25	0.00	0.80	0.00	0.50	0.07
0.41	0.60	0.01	0.50	0.50	1.00	0.77	1.00	1.00	0.28	0.13	0.47	0.60	0.15	0.25	0.00	0.87	0.19	0.75	0.33
0.54	0.40	0.01	0.75	0.25	0.00	0.32	1.00	0.00	0.28	0.13	0.47	1.00	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.94	0.00	0.75	0.48
0.75	0.60	0.41	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.23	1.00	0.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	1.00	0.83	0.25	0.00	0.11	0.00	0.50	0.07
0.40	0.40	0.30	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.32	0.00	0.00	0.88	0.43	0.51	0.60	0.08	0.00	0.00	0.74	0.50	0.75	0.42
0.70	0.40	0.56	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.60	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.41	0.69	0.80	0.02	1.00	0.00	0.86	0.00	0.25	0.56
0.53	0.80	0.41	0.50	0.75	1.00	0.46	1.00	0.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	0.60	0.78	0.00	1.00	0.92	0.08	0.00	0.26
0.92	0.60	0.00	0.75	1.00	0.00	0.36	0.00	1.00	0.16	0.29	0.85	0.40	0.50	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.75	0.68
0.00	0.40	0.64	0.75	0.75	1.00	0.03	1.00	0.00	0.96	0.68	0.51	1.00	0.97	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.74	0.40	0.56	0.50	0.00	1.00	0.84	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.41	0.69	0.80	0.23	0.75	0.00	0.80	0.00	1.00	0.84
0.54	0.40	0.90	0.75	1.00	0.00	0.15	0.00	0.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	0.60	0.25	0.00	0.00	0.83	0.25	0.25	0.21
0.34	0.40	0.11	0.75	1.00	0.00	0.62	1.00	0.00	0.28	0.40	0.56	0.60	0.72	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.22	1.00	0.14
0.34	0.40	0.11	0.75	1.00	0.00	0.62	1.00	0.00	0.28	0.40	0.56	1.00	0.12	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.17	1.00	0.14
0.41	0.40	0.11	0.75	1.00	0.00	0.65	1.00	0.00	0.28	0.40	0.56	1.00	0.66	0.00	1.00	0.09	0.00	0.75	0.16
0.22	0.40	0.11	0.75	0.50	0.00	0.65	1.00	0.00	0.28	0.40	0.56	0.60	0.69	0.25	1.00	0.48	0.00	0.75	0.16
0.62	0.80	0.43	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.56	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	0.80	0.10	0.00	1.00	0.87	0.00	0.00	0.21
0.51	0.60	0.41	0.50	1.00	0.00	0.48	0.00	0.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	0.80	0.01	0.50	0.00	0.85	0.86	0.00	0.26
0.31	0.40	0.41	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.78	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	1.00	0.24	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.25	0.54
0.70	0.80	0.43	0.50	0.75	1.00	0.45	1.00	0.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	0.80	0.50	0.25	1.00	0.77	0.00	0.00	0.20
0.72	0.80	0.41	1.00	0.25	1.00	0.57	1.00	0.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	0.60	0.03	0.25	0.00	0.89	0.88	0.75	0.20
0.33	0.40	0.64	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.70	1.00	0.00	0.96	0.68	0.51	0.60	0.50	0.25	0.00	0.33	0.19	0.25	0.21
0.52	0.40	0.76	0.50	1.00	0.00	0.22	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	0.20	0.50	0.50	0.00	0.96	0.00	0.50	0.27
0.52	0.40	0.41	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.23	1.00	0.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	0.80	0.94	0.00	1.00	0.12	0.00	0.50	0.07
0.80	0.60	0.74	1.00	0.25	1.00	0.38	0.00	0.00	0.63	0.52	1.00	1.00	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.81	0.00	0.75	0.17
0.90	0.40	0.43	0.50	0.25	0.00	0.40	1.00	0.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	0.60	0.51	0.25	0.00	0.86	0.00	0.50	0.61
0.71	0.40	0.30	0.50	0.00	1.00	0.39	0.00	0.00	0.88	0.43	0.51	0.60	0.13	0.25	0.00	0.92	0.50	0.50	0.87
0.68	0.40	0.41	0.75	0.25	1.00	0.58	1.00	0.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	0.40	0.00	0.25	0.00	0.82	0.35	0.50	0.45
0.37	0.40	0.41	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.78	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	1.00	0.44	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.25	0.54
0.61	0.40	0.41	0.75	0.25	1.00	0.58	0.00	0.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	0.80	0.86	0.25	0.00	0.56	0.30	0.50	0.45
0.79	0.60	0.41	0.25	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	0.60	0.98	0.00	0.00	0.65	0.00	0.00	0.08
0.33	0.60	0.41	0.50	0.50	1.00	0.38	1.00	0.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	0.40	0.76	0.25	0.00	0.76	0.23	0.00	0.25
0.49	0.80	0.41	0.25	0.50	0.00	0.51	1.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	1.00	0.82	0.25	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.20
0.73	0.40	0.41	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.52	1.00	0.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	0.80	0.85	0.25	1.00	0.81	0.00	0.25	0.26
0.67	0.40	0.41	0.25	1.00	0.00	0.67	1.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	1.00	0.03	0.00	1.00	0.95	0.00	0.00	0.25
0.62	0.60	0.43	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.47	1.00	0.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	0.80	0.49	0.25	1.00	0.92	0.03	0.25	0.31
0.15	0.60	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.00	0.24	1.00	0.00	0.84	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.62	0.60	0.41	0.00	0.75	1.00	0.39	1.00	0.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	1.00	0.95	0.00	1.00	0.82	0.25	0.50	0.18
0.55	0.40	0.41	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.52	1.00	0.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	0.80	0.83	0.25	0.00	0.82	0.00	0.25	0.22
0.80	0.60	0.00	0.75	0.25	0.00	0.80	0.00	0.00	0.16	0.29	0.85	0.60	0.22	0.25	0.00	0.88	0.05	0.75	0.65
0.49	0.40	0.76	0.50	0.75	0.00	0.54	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	0.40	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.92	0.00	0.50	0.27
0.81	0.60	0.00	1.00	0.25	1.00	0.30	0.00	1.00	0.16	0.29	0.85	0.40	0.08	0.25	0.00	0.93	0.00	1.00	0.50
0.69	0.40	0.00	0.75	0.25	0.00	0.38	0.00	0.00	0.16	0.29	0.85	1.00	0.36	1.00	0.00	0.83	0.00	0.75	0.53

UNIVERSE OF SITES

FOURTH PRIORITY

Rank	Title	Size (Acres)	PNA Classification	Region	Composite Score	Park Pressure	Walk Network Connectivity	Park Conditions Assessment	Env., Social, and Health Equity
					Highest Weight				
373	Rio de Los Angeles State Park	39.39	Large Community Park	Cen/East	0.3702	0.00	0.67	0.00	1.00
378	Robert L Burns Park	1.68	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	0.3604	0.75	0.26	0.00	0.00
437	Roscoe-Valley Circle Park	44.35	Regional Nature Park	North	0.2799	0.00	0.77	0.00	0.00
436	Sean Brown Park	5.97	Large Neighborhood Park	North	0.2800	0.25	0.41	0.00	0.00
349	Serrania Avenue Park	36.54	Large Community Park	North	0.3933	0.00	0.64	0.50	0.00
409	Silver Lake Meadows Park	3.45	Large Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	0.3224	0.50	0.46	0.00	0.00
432	Silver Lake Recreation Center	3.93	Large Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	0.2889	0.50	0.42	0.17	0.00
387	Stoney Point Park	29.06	Community Nature Park	North	0.3397	0.00	0.69	0.00	0.00
425	Sunland Park	14.32	Community Park	North	0.3072	0.25	0.27	0.17	0.00
384	Sylmar Recreation Center	19.78	Community Park	North	0.3463	0.25	0.26	0.26	0.00
429	Temescal Canyon Park	37.59	Canyon Park	West	0.2927	0.00	0.62	0.68	0.00
433	Titmouse Park	0.29	Mini Park	West	0.2855	0.50	0.69	0.00	0.00
465	Tommy Lasorda's Field of Dreams	1.80	Neighborhood Park	Cen/East	0.2355	0.25	0.55	0.25	0.00
476	Trask Triangle Park	0.24	Mini Park	West	0.2058	1.00	0.44	0.00	0.00
374	Valley Glen Community Park	5.70	Large Neighborhood Park	North	0.3701	0.50	0.35	0.00	0.00
464	Van Norman Lakes Reservoir	10.90	Community Park	North	0.2423	0.25	0.57	0.00	0.00
442	Van Nuys Sherman Oaks War Mem Park	65.18	Large Community Park	North	0.2724	0.00	0.19	0.20	0.00
422	Venice High School Pool	1.47	School Pool	West	0.3104	0.75	0.27	1.00	0.00
390	Venice Reservoir Site	14.33	Community Park	West	0.3363	0.25	0.53	0.20	0.00
353	Verdugo Mountain Park	587.97	Regional Nature Park	North	0.3897	0.00	0.89	0.00	0.00
389	Veterans' Barrington Park	13.73	Community Park	West	0.3364	0.00	0.65	0.00	1.00
367	Via Dolce Park	0.14	Mini Park	West	0.3737	0.75	0.71	0.50	0.00
450	Viking Park	10.07	Community Park	North	0.2586	0.00	0.62	0.25	0.00
385	Wattles Garden Park	47.58	Canyon Park	North	0.3449	0.00	0.64	1.00	0.00
461	West Hills Sport Center	15.05	Community Park	North	0.2442	0.00	0.62	0.31	0.00
401	Westminster Park	2.24	Neighborhood Park	West	0.3264	0.25	0.28	0.50	0.00
435	Westwood Gardens Park	0.29	Mini Park	West	0.2802	1.00	0.23	0.00	0.00
431	Westwood Recreation Center	26.70	Large Community Park	West	0.2901	0.25	0.18	0.07	0.00
376	Wilbur-Tampa Park	7.29	Large Neighborhood Park	North	0.3686	0.00	0.60	0.50	0.00
394	William S Hart Park - Dog Park	0.83	Mini Park	North	0.3325	1.00	0.36	0.00	0.00
356	Wilmington Recreation Center	7.31	Large Neighborhood Park	South	0.3873	0.50	0.30	0.38	1.00
434	Woodbine Park	0.67	Mini Park	West	0.2835	1.00	0.29	0.00	0.00
469	Woodland Hills Recreation Center	18.76	Community Park	North	0.2315	0.25	0.44	0.10	0.00
360	Woodside Triangle	0.17	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.3823	0.25	0.74	0.00	0.00
438	York Blvd Pocket Park	0.29	Mini Park	Cen/East	0.2757	1.00	0.26	0.17	0.00
380	Yosemite Recreation Center	10.00	Community Park	Cen/East	0.3562	0.25	0.37	0.23	0.00

FIFTH PRIORITY

505	Barrington Recreation Center	4.91	Large Neighborhood Park	West	0.1230	0.25	0.67	0.21	0.00
506	Beverly Glen Park	85.74	Regional Nature Park	West	0.1227	0.00	0.73	0.00	0.00
497	Briarwood Park	10.75	Community Park	West	0.1614	0.00	0.87	0.33	0.00
490	Castle Peak Park	3.09	Large Neighborhood Park	North	0.1761	0.25	0.48	0.00	0.00
498	Club Circle Park	0.30	Mini Park	West	0.1597	0.75	0.18	0.00	0.00
517	Coldwater Canyon Park	41.16	Regional Park	North	0.0176	0.00	0.85	0.00	0.00

Highest Weight				Medium Weight					Lowest Weight										
Low Shade Cover	Climate Vulnerability	Perceived Park Safety	Criminalization Burden	CIP Project History	Extreme Heat Risk	Lack of Private Open Space	Biodiversity and Habitat Cons	Metro Corridors	Perceived Park Condition	Perceived Rec Center Condition	Perceived Walkability	Presence of Com Prio Amenities	Park Visitation	MyLA311 Requests	Habitat Connectivity	Tree Species Composition	Infiltration & Recharge Opps	Water Quality Priority	LAC Park Needs Assessment
0.72	0.40	0.76	0.50	0.25	0.00	0.47	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	0.20	0.01	0.25	1.00	0.30	0.00	0.25	0.41
0.59	0.60	0.56	0.50	0.25	0.00	0.84	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.41	0.69	1.00	0.20	0.75	0.00	0.92	0.83	0.75	0.73
0.59	0.80	0.41	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.03	1.00	0.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	0.40	1.00	0.25	0.00	0.38	0.00	0.00	0.25
0.68	0.40	0.41	0.50	0.75	1.00	0.53	1.00	0.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	0.80	0.74	0.25	0.00	0.93	0.18	0.00	0.12
0.62	0.60	1.00	0.50	0.50	0.00	0.37	1.00	0.00	0.84	1.00	1.00	0.80	0.24	0.25	0.00	0.61	0.00	0.75	0.22
0.67	0.60	0.56	0.50	0.75	0.00	0.78	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.41	0.69	0.60	0.06	0.00	1.00	0.69	0.00	0.75	0.22
0.47	0.60	0.56	0.50	0.50	0.00	0.78	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.41	0.69	0.60	0.11	0.75	0.00	0.72	0.11	0.75	0.22
0.64	1.00	0.41	1.00	0.50	1.00	0.40	1.00	0.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	0.40	0.80	0.25	0.00	0.61	0.33	0.00	0.02
0.66	0.80	0.64	0.75	0.25	1.00	0.51	0.00	0.00	0.96	0.68	0.51	0.80	0.14	0.50	0.00	0.66	0.65	0.00	0.24
0.71	0.60	0.64	0.75	0.50	1.00	0.36	0.00	0.00	0.96	0.68	0.51	0.60	0.06	0.50	0.00	0.75	0.50	1.00	0.47
0.72	0.80	0.41	0.25	0.50	0.00	0.51	1.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	0.60	0.50	0.25	1.00	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.20
0.46	0.60	0.41	0.25	1.00	0.00	0.72	1.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	0.60	0.71	0.00	0.00	0.99	0.00	0.50	0.36
0.57	0.60	0.56	0.25	1.00	0.00	0.78	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.41	0.69	0.80	0.58	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.75	0.22
0.50	0.60	0.41	0.25	1.00	0.00	0.67	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	0.80	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.98	0.00	0.50	0.19
0.68	0.40	1.00	0.75	0.50	1.00	0.82	0.00	0.00	0.62	0.86	0.57	0.20	0.08	0.25	0.00	0.75	0.50	0.75	0.50
0.92	0.40	0.41	0.25	0.75	1.00	0.55	0.00	0.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	0.80	0.39	0.00	0.00	0.93	0.64	0.25	0.41
0.75	0.40	0.11	0.25	0.50	1.00	0.61	1.00	0.00	0.28	0.40	0.56	0.40	0.12	0.50	1.00	0.81	0.50	1.00	0.47
0.81	0.40	0.41	1.00	0.25	0.00	0.43	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	1.00	0.50	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.25	0.62
0.70	0.60	0.41	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.44	1.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	1.00	0.44	0.25	0.00	0.91	0.00	0.25	0.43
0.64	0.40	1.00	1.00	0.75	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.62	0.86	0.57	0.40	1.00	0.25	1.00	0.93	0.01	0.25	0.24
0.87	0.40	0.41	0.75	1.00	0.00	0.58	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	1.00	0.82	0.00	0.00	0.97	0.00	0.25	0.54
0.93	0.60	0.41	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.84	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	1.00	0.25	1.00	1.00	0.63	0.00	0.25	0.64
0.67	0.40	0.41	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.71	1.00	0.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	0.80	0.87	0.00	1.00	0.88	0.00	0.25	0.25
0.62	0.60	0.11	0.75	0.50	0.00	0.28	1.00	0.00	0.28	0.40	0.56	0.20	0.77	0.25	1.00	0.82	0.01	0.75	0.39
0.69	0.80	0.41	0.50	0.50	1.00	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	0.80	0.01	0.25	1.00	0.94	0.40	0.00	0.23
0.74	0.60	0.41	1.00	0.75	0.00	0.91	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	1.00	0.00	0.50	1.00	0.94	0.00	0.25	0.67
0.69	0.40	0.01	0.50	0.00	1.00	0.41	0.00	1.00	0.28	0.13	0.47	1.00	0.09	0.75	0.00	0.86	0.00	0.75	0.73
0.75	0.40	0.01	0.50	0.50	1.00	0.83	0.00	1.00	0.28	0.13	0.47	1.00	0.15	0.25	1.00	0.65	0.00	1.00	0.54
0.76	0.40	0.41	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.39	1.00	0.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	0.60	0.85	0.50	1.00	0.69	0.00	0.50	0.18
0.88	0.40	0.11	0.75	1.00	0.00	0.44	0.00	1.00	0.28	0.40	0.56	0.60	0.16	0.00	0.00	0.97	0.13	0.75	0.66
0.86	0.40	0.43	0.75	0.00	1.00	0.89	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	0.80	0.05	0.75	0.00	0.78	0.00	0.25	0.41
0.61	0.40	0.01	0.75	0.00	0.00	0.64	0.00	1.00	0.28	0.13	0.47	1.00	0.22	1.00	0.00	0.92	0.40	1.00	0.85
0.71	0.40	1.00	0.25	0.00	0.00	0.51	0.00	0.00	0.84	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.10	0.50	0.00	0.92	0.14	0.50	0.55
0.56	0.40	0.76	0.50	1.00	0.00	0.54	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.96	0.51	0.60	0.70	1.00	0.00	0.50	0.00	0.50	0.27
0.72	0.40	0.90	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.38	0.00	0.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	1.00	0.20	1.00	0.00	0.82	0.00	0.25	0.60
0.47	0.40	0.90	0.75	0.25	0.00	0.52	1.00	1.00	0.45	0.78	0.57	0.60	0.04	0.75	0.00	0.66	0.06	0.25	0.59
0.67	0.40	0.41	0.00	0.50	0.00	0.58	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	1.00	0.06	0.50	0.00	0.92	0.00	0.25	0.54
0.10	0.60	0.01	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.33	1.00	0.00	0.28	0.13	0.47	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.88	0.00	0.50	0.00
0.12	0.40	0.01	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.33	1.00	0.00	0.28	0.13	0.47	1.00	0.97	0.00	1.00	0.93	0.00	0.50	0.00
0.61	0.80	0.41	0.50	0.25	1.00	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	0.80	0.26	0.00	1.00	0.92	0.22	0.00	0.23
0.58	0.40	0.01	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.67	0.00	0.00	0.28	0.13	0.47	0.80	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.90	0.17	0.75	0.48
0.12	0.40	0.11	0.75	0.25	0.00	0.31	1.00	0.00	0.28	0.40	0.56	0.20	0.40	0.00	0.00	0.30	0.00	0.50	0.08

UNIVERSE OF SITES

FIFTH PRIORITY


Highest Weight

Rank	Title	Size (Acres)	PNA Classification	Region	Composite Score	Park Pressure	Walk Network Connectivity	Park Conditions Assessment	Env., Social, and Health Equity
511	Crestwood Hills Recreation Center	**15.78**	Community Park	West	**0.1059**	**0.00**	**0.88**	**0.50**	**0.00**
518	De Neve Square Park	**0.61**	Mini Park	West	**0.0000**	**0.25**	**0.41**	**0.00**	**0.00**
502	El Paseo De Cahuenga Park	**1.29**	Neighborhood Park	North	**0.1449**	**0.50**	**0.50**	**0.00**	**0.00**
491	Encino Park	**5.27**	Large Neighborhood Park	North	**0.1738**	**0.25**	**0.30**	**0.44**	**0.00**
489	Gateway Triangle	**0.04**	Mini Park	West	**0.1812**	**1.00**	**0.41**	**0.00**	**0.00**
482	George Wolfberg Park at Potrero Canyn	**35.49**	Canyon Park	West	**0.1951**	**0.00**	**0.74**	**0.00**	**0.00**
504	Lazy J Ranch Park	**8.43**	Large Neighborhood Park	North	**0.1329**	**0.00**	**0.27**	**0.00**	**0.00**
480	Los Angeles High Memorial Park	**2.51**	Neighborhood Park	West	**0.1990**	**0.50**	**0.27**	**0.00**	**0.00**
507	Mandeville Canyon Park	**131.20**	Regional Nature Park	West	**0.1186**	**0.00**	**0.87**	**0.00**	**0.00**
495	Mar Vista Recreation Center	**18.51**	Community Park	West	**0.1708**	**0.25**	**0.18**	**0.36**	**0.00**
487	Marco Place Parkway	**0.03**	Mini Park	West	**0.1855**	**0.75**	**0.27**	**0.00**	**0.00**
484	Moorpark Park	**3.22**	Large Neighborhood Park	North	**0.1924**	**0.50**	**0.27**	**0.50**	**0.00**
496	Mulholland View Site No 16	**0.21**	Mini Park	North	**0.1624**	**0.50**	**0.58**	**0.00**	**0.00**
478	Oakwood Recreation Center	**3.63**	Large Neighborhood Park	West	**0.1998**	**0.50**	**0.19**	**0.42**	**0.00**
493	Palisades Recreation Center	**17.54**	Community Park	West	**0.1733**	**0.00**	**0.46**	**0.44**	**0.00**
485	Palms Recreation Center	**4.81**	Large Neighborhood Park	West	**0.1917**	**0.50**	**0.13**	**0.06**	**0.00**
512	Pan Pacific Park	**32.18**	Large Community Park	West	**0.0920**	**0.25**	**0.13**	**0.25**	**0.00**
514	Penmar Recreation Center	**64.71**	Community Park	West	**0.0774**	**0.00**	**0.49**	**0.14**	**0.00**
501	Poinsettia Recreation Center	**6.29**	Large Neighborhood Park	West	**0.1471**	**0.50**	**0.16**	**0.34**	**0.00**
481	Rena Park	**1.28**	Neighborhood Park	South	**0.1981**	**0.25**	**0.41**	**0.00**	**0.00**
494	Rinaldi Park	**0.08**	Mini Park	North	**0.1728**	**1.00**	**0.44**	**0.00**	**0.00**
516	Rivas Canyon Park	**25.76**	Community Nature Park	West	**0.0677**	**0.00**	**0.35**	**0.00**	**0.00**
492	Robertson Recreation Center	**1.24**	Neighborhood Park	West	**0.1734**	**0.75**	**0.27**	**0.00**	**0.00**
513	Rustic Canyon Park	**44.69**	Regional Nature Park	West	**0.0868**	**0.00**	**0.88**	**0.00**	**0.00**
510	Rustic Canyon Recreation Center	**8.95**	Large Neighborhood Park	West	**0.1086**	**0.00**	**0.80**	**0.32**	**0.00**
508	San Vicente Mountain Park	**31.45**	Community Nature Park	West	**0.1112**	**0.00**	**0.87**	**0.00**	**0.00**
499	Santa Ynez Canyon Park	**337.84**	Canyon Park	West	**0.1487**	**0.00**	**0.97**	**0.00**	**0.00**
503	Shadow Ranch Park	**12.03**	Community Park	North	**0.1405**	**0.25**	**0.42**	**0.29**	**0.00**
486	Steers Property	**21.35**	Community Nature Park	West	**0.1913**	**0.00**	**0.91**	**0.00**	**0.00**
483	Stoner Recreation Center	**8.66**	Large Neighborhood Park	West	**0.1931**	**0.50**	**0.14**	**0.19**	**0.00**
479	Studio City Recreation Center	**8.46**	Large Neighborhood Park	North	**0.1990**	**0.25**	**0.42**	**0.54**	**0.00**
515	Sullivan Canyon Park	**23.29**	Community Nature Park	West	**0.0741**	**0.00**	**0.87**	**0.00**	**0.00**
488	Taxco Trails Park	**2.45**	Neighborhood Park	North	**0.1842**	**0.25**	**0.28**	**0.00**	**0.00**
500	Venice of America Centennial Park	**0.89**	Mini Park	West	**0.1483**	**0.50**	**0.16**	**0.00**	**0.00**
509	Westchester Recreation Center	**23.58**	Large Community Park	West	**0.1093**	**0.25**	**0.12**	**0.13**	**0.00**

Highest Weight				Medium Weight					Lowest Weight										
Low Shade Cover	Climate Vulnerability	Perceived Park Safety	Criminalization Burden	CIP Project History	Extreme Heat Risk	Lack of Private Open Space	Biodiversity and Habitat Cons	Metro Corridors	Perceived Park Condition	Perceived Rec Center Condition	Perceived Walkability	Presence of Com Prio Amenities	Park Visitation	MyLA311 Requests	Habitat Connectivity	Tree Species Composition	Infiltration & Recharge Opps	Water Quality Priority	LAC Park Needs Assessment
0.35	0.40	0.41	0.00	0.50	0.00	0.01	1.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	1.00	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.59	0.06	0.00	0.12
0.09	0.60	0.01	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.19	1.00	0.00	0.28	0.13	0.47	0.80	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.24	0.13	0.75	0.09
0.49	0.40	0.11	0.50	0.25	0.00	0.73	0.00	0.00	0.28	0.40	0.56	0.20	0.67	0.00	1.00	0.75	1.00	0.75	0.21
0.49	0.40	0.11	0.75	0.25	1.00	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.28	0.40	0.56	0.60	0.06	0.50	1.00	0.66	0.50	0.00	0.23
0.45	0.80	0.01	0.75	1.00	0.00	0.26	0.00	0.00	0.28	0.13	0.47	1.00	0.17	0.00	0.00	0.64	0.13	0.50	0.27
0.64	0.40	0.41	0.25	0.50	0.00	0.51	1.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	1.00	0.83	0.00	1.00	0.85	0.00	0.00	0.20
0.66	0.60	0.41	0.50	0.50	1.00	0.38	0.00	0.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	0.80	0.53	0.25	0.00	0.87	0.35	0.00	0.25
0.43	0.60	0.01	0.75	0.50	0.00	0.90	0.00	0.00	0.28	0.13	0.47	0.60	0.50	1.00	0.00	0.91	1.00	0.75	0.64
0.32	0.40	0.41	0.00	0.75	0.00	0.23	1.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	1.00	0.96	0.25	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.60	0.40	0.41	1.00	0.25	0.00	0.47	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	1.00	0.11	0.50	0.00	0.87	0.21	1.00	0.69
0.28	0.40	0.41	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.78	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	1.00	0.05	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.25	0.54
0.51	0.40	0.11	0.75	0.50	0.00	0.62	0.00	0.00	0.28	0.40	0.56	0.40	0.29	0.75	0.00	0.88	0.56	1.00	0.14
0.07	0.40	0.11	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.34	1.00	0.00	0.28	0.40	0.56	1.00	0.71	0.00	1.00	0.93	0.00	0.50	0.10
0.76	0.40	0.41	1.00	0.25	0.00	0.78	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	0.80	0.02	0.75	0.00	0.63	0.00	0.25	0.54
0.64	0.40	0.41	0.25	0.50	0.00	0.51	1.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	0.60	0.04	0.25	1.00	0.77	0.00	0.00	0.20
0.64	0.60	0.01	1.00	0.25	0.00	0.50	0.00	1.00	0.28	0.13	0.47	0.80	0.05	0.25	0.00	0.92	0.34	0.75	0.56
0.58	0.60	0.01	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.77	0.00	0.00	0.28	0.13	0.47	0.40	0.21	0.75	1.00	0.90	0.00	0.75	0.63
0.57	0.40	0.41	1.00	0.50	0.00	0.23	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	0.80	0.02	0.50	0.00	0.85	0.00	0.25	0.29
0.77	0.40	0.01	0.75	0.25	0.00	0.56	0.00	0.00	0.28	0.13	0.47	0.80	0.06	0.75	0.00	0.89	0.50	0.75	0.50
0.57	0.60	0.43	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.47	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.32	0.00	0.80	0.44	0.00	0.00	0.91	0.09	0.25	0.31
0.75	0.40	0.41	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.60	0.00	0.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	0.80	0.01	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.25	0.25
0.72	0.00	0.41	0.25	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.30	0.00	0.75	0.00
0.68	0.60	0.01	0.75	0.00	0.00	0.77	0.00	0.00	0.28	0.13	0.47	1.00	0.50	0.75	0.00	0.83	0.00	0.75	0.72
0.14	0.40	0.41	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	1.00	0.97	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.19	0.60	0.41	0.50	0.50	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	0.40	0.18	0.25	0.00	0.65	0.25	0.00	0.26
0.16	0.40	0.41	0.25	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.01
0.34	0.40	0.41	0.25	0.75	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	1.00	0.99	0.25	1.00	0.17	0.00	0.00	0.12
0.59	0.40	0.41	0.50	0.50	0.00	0.19	0.00	0.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	0.80	0.03	0.50	1.00	0.88	0.50	0.25	0.41
0.42	0.60	0.41	0.25	1.00	0.00	0.24	1.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	1.00	0.99	0.00	0.00	0.88	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.74	0.20	0.41	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.68	0.00	1.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	0.80	0.11	0.75	0.00	0.77	0.00	1.00	0.57
0.58	0.40	0.11	0.75	0.25	0.00	0.63	0.00	0.00	0.28	0.40	0.56	0.40	0.03	0.25	1.00	0.90	1.00	0.75	0.29
0.15	0.60	0.41	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.09	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.57	0.60	0.41	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.38	0.00	0.00	0.43	0.17	0.25	0.60	0.04	0.50	0.00	0.83	0.50	0.00	0.25
0.56	0.40	0.41	1.00	0.25	0.00	0.78	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	1.00	0.28	0.50	1.00	0.14	0.00	0.25	0.54
0.75	0.40	0.41	0.25	0.25	0.00	0.41	1.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.70	0.80	0.03	0.25	0.00	0.90	0.00	0.50	0.47




Figure 68. **Flying over McArthur Park.** Source: Calvada Surveying, 2025.



COUNCIL DISTRICT SNAPSHOTS

COUNCIL DISTRICT 1



Council District 1 (CD 1) encompasses some of the densest neighborhoods of Los Angeles. It also has some of the most varied parks in the city, ranging from the highly urban MacArthur Park to scenic Elysian Park. Across the council district, outreach and the need for sheltering unhoused individuals is paramount, with some key initiatives like a Peace Ambassador program and community clean teams being piloted at MacArthur Park. This is also tied to the need for additional fire mitigation measures in the more natural spaces within RAP's jurisdiction, and the desire for a more active presence from park rangers.


2050 population projections show growing populations in the southern neighborhoods of CD 1, including Pico Union, Westlake, and Elysian Park. Chinatown is expected to see significant growth over the next 25 years, while the neighborhoods of Glassell Park, Montecito Heights, Highland Park, and Mount Washington are projected to see a decline in population.

NEIGHBORHOODS IN COUNCIL DISTRICT 1

ELYSIAN PARK	KOREATOWN	ADAMS-NORMANDIE
CHINATOWN	ANGELINO HEIGHTS	HIGHLAND PARK
LINCOLN HEIGHTS	MONTECITO HEIGHTS	CYPRESS PARK
PICO UNION	ECHO PARK	MOUNT WASHINGTON
WESTLAKE	GLASSELL PARK	

PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES

- Alpine Recreation Center
- Alvarado Terrace Park
- Carlin G Smith Recreation Center
- Charles F Lummis Home and Gardens, El Alisal
- Cleland Avenue Bicentennial Park
- Cypress Park Club House
- Cypress Recreation Center
- Downey Recreation Center
- Echo Park Community Center
- Echo Park Deep Pool
- Elysian Park
- Ernest E Debs Regional Park
- Everett Park
- Francis Avenue Community Garden
- Glassell Park Recreation Center and Youth Center
- Greayer's Oak Park
- Heritage Square
- Hoover Recreation Center
- Hope and Peace Park
- La Tierra de la Culebra
- Lacy Street Neighborhood Park
- Leo Politi Elementary School (CSP)
- Lincoln Heights Recreation Center
- Lincoln Heights Youth Center
- Lummis Public Forest Park
- MacArthur Park
- Montecito Heights Recreation Center
- Moon Canyon Park
- Mount Olympus Park
- Normandie Recreation Center
- Ord And Yale Street Park
- Parkview Photo Center
- Parque Nativo Lopez
- Patton St Pocket Park
- Pio Union Community Garden
- Ramona Hall Community Center
- Rio de Los Angeles State Park
- Saint James Park
- Sycamore Grove Park
- Toberman Recreation Center
- Valencia Triangle
- Woodside Triangle
- *PerSquare Mile - University Park North*
- *PerSquare Mile - Pico-Union*
- *PerSquare Mile - Westlake-Koreatown*
- *PerSquare Mile - Westlake*



Source: City Boundary and Parks: City of LA Data Portal, 2025. Roads: US Census Bureau, 2025., LA River: National Hydrography Database, 2025.

COUNCIL DISTRICT 1

47
City Parks

1,061
Acres of Parkland

296,441
Residents

68
Sports Fields and Courts


40
Playgrounds

22
Recreation & Community Centers

6
Pools & Splashpads

32%
Average Canopy Coverage in Parks

DEMOGRAPHICS



Top 3 languages spoken:

Spanish, English, Korean

$59,379 Median HH income	***$81,173*** *Citywide*
53,582 Income below poverty level	***624,523*** *Citywide*
37.3 Median age	***37.5*** *Citywide*

What we heard..

"We need more access to nice parks in lower-income neighborhoods. They play a crucial role in the development, health, and happiness of youth and seniors, as well as the overall health of the environment. The parks in these locations need to be better maintained, with more trees and better lighting."

"I wish our parks were more focused on native species. I hate seeing palm trees and birds of paradise instead of coast live oaks and black walnuts. Our parks should also capture and infiltrate a significant amount of water, and they should have robust volunteer programs so that people in LA can learn about native species and implement that at home."

"I adore Sycamore Grove in Highland Park. I've met neighbors there, had social gatherings there, and felt more connected to my neighborhood."

"There is nowhere near enough space to play soccer for the number of kids who want to play or even just practice."

Current and Future Needs: Survey Results

CD 1 respondents feel worse than the city as a whole about the physical condition of both City of LA parks and recreation centers.

Parks




Rec Centers




Most CD 1 respondents have visited a City of LA park in the past year, while only about half have visited a City of LA recreation center.


Parks



Rec Centers




Walking Distance



Fewer than half of CD 1 respondents feel that there are enough parks and recreation centers within walking distance of their homes.

Bond Measure



More than half of CD 1 respondents support a bond, levy, or tax to fund parks and recreation facilities.

Top 3 Most Important...

Outdoor Facilities

1. Unprogrammed green spaces
2. Natural areas & wildlife habitats
3. Non-paved, multi-use trails

Indoor Facilities

1. Swimming and lap pool
2. Walking/jogging track
3. Exercise & fitness equipment

Programs

1. Fitness/wellness programs
2. Nature experiences or environmental education
3. Seniors (age 50 & over); Aquatics; Arts + Crafts


Top barriers to visiting parks and recreation centers more often in CD 1:

52%
People experiencing homelessness there

40%
Lack of public restrooms

33%
Poor/uncomfortable atmosphere

31%
Lack of parking by facilities/parks; No visible patrolling presence



COUNCIL DISTRICT 2

Council District Two (CD 2) includes areas in North Hollywood just west of Burbank. The district is home to a well-loved series of parks, including several such as Valley Plaza along the Hollywood Freeway. Several projects are currently underway as a partnership between LADWP and RAP to improve stormwater management at several parks in the district.

Residents raised concerns about the increases in persons experiencing homelessness in parks. Some residents pointed out concerns that in some areas RAP has closed off access to trails or underpasses where persons experiencing homelessness would gather. This unfortunately can also limit access for everyone.

Population projections for CD 2 show pockets of higher growth in the neighborhoods of North Hollywood and Valley Glen by 2050. Overall, CD 2 is expected to see a modest growth in population in the next 25 years.


NEIGHBORHOODS IN COUNCIL DISTRICT 2

NORTH HOLLYWOOD | **SUN VALLEY** | **VALLEY VILLAGE**

VALLEY GLEN | **STUDIO CITY** | **TOLUCA LAKE**

PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES

- Bellaire Avenue Park
- Camellia Avenue Elementary School (CSP)
- Campo De Cahuenga
- De Garmo Park
- Fulton Avenue Park
- Greenwood Square Park
- Hartland Mini-Park
- Jaime Beth Slavin Park
- Keswick Park
- Kittridge Mini-Park
- North Hollywood Recreation Center
- North Weddington Recreation Center
- South Weddington Park
- Strathern Park - North
- Strathern Park, West
- Tiara Street Park
- Tujunga Greenbelt
- Valley Glen Community Park
- Valley Plaza Park
- Van Nuys Multipurpose Center
- Verdugo Mountain Park
- Victory-Vineland Recreation Center
- Whitnall Highway Park
- Woodbridge Park
- *PerSquare Mile - Van Nuys - Valley Glen*
- *PerSquare Mile - Van Nuys East*
- *PerSquare Mile - North Hollywood*



Source: City Boundary and Parks: City of LA Data Portal, 2025. Roads: US Census Bureau, 2025., LA River: National Hydrography Database, 2025.

COUNCIL DISTRICT 2

29
City Parks

885
Acres of Parkland

247,593
Residents

31
Sports Fields and Courts


20
Playgrounds

12
Recreation & Community Centers

3
Pools & Splashpads

27%
Average Canopy Coverage in Parks

DEMOGRAPHICS



Top 3 languages spoken:

English, Spanish, Other Indo-European Languages

$73,120 Median HH income	***$81,173*** *Citywide*
40,385 Income below poverty level	***624,523*** *Citywide*
37.3 Median age	***37.5*** *Citywide*

What we heard..

"We definitely need to make parks a communal space for local neighborhoods, and we should strive to make every park a third place for people to hang out in. Whether that's access to classes, community gardens within the parks, non-hostile architecture, loads of native plants and trees. We have the land and the knowledge to do it, we gotta start now for our future generations."

"I love RAP! I am proud of the hard work our department puts in to preserve the beauty of our parks, and I love seeing our parks flourish. But prior to two or three years ago, our patrons felt a lot safer, and people respected the park rules more than now. I would love to see tourists visit our parks again, and I would love to see people come to our parks without being afraid. Park proud!"

"The parks are very diverse, but most of those options mentioned above are not available anywhere near me in the Valley."

"As we build more dense housing, I want there to be an equal emphasis on maintaining/ increasing green space for all to enjoy."


Current and Future Needs: Survey Results

CD 2 respondents feel worse than the city as a whole about the physical condition of both City of LA parks and recreation centers.

Parks




Rec Centers




Most CD 2 respondents have visited a City of LA park in the past year, while only about half have visited a City of LA recreation center.


Parks



Rec Centers




Walking Distance



Fewer than half of CD 2 respondents feel that there are enough parks and recreation centers within walking distance of their homes.

Bond Measure



Less than half of CD 2 respondents support a bond, levy, or tax to fund parks and recreation facilities.

Top 3 Most Important...

Outdoor Facilities

1. Unprogrammed green spaces
2. Non-paved, multi-use trails
3. Natural areas & wildlife habitats

Indoor Facilities

1. Swimming pool
2. Walking/jogging track
3. Rooms for arts & crafts, & games

Programs

1. Fitness/wellness programs
2. Arts & crafts classes
3. Nature experiences or environmental education


Top barriers to visiting parks and recreation centers more often in CD 2:

59%
People experiencing homelessness there

45%
Do not know where to go/what is offered

43%
Facilities are not well-maintained; Too far from residence

36%
No visible patrolling presence



COUNCIL DISTRICT 3

Council District Three (CD 3) includes the southwest San Fernando Valley. The district is home to the headwaters of the Los Angeles River and a mix of foothill and valley parks. The area is experiencing some population growth which is putting pressure on park facilities and raising concerns for residents about how developer fees for projects occurring in the area such as Warner Center will be spent in the area to improve parks.

Many residents expressed concerns about park operations and maintenance and park rule enforcement. Concerns were raised about the prevalence of persons experiencing homelessness, particularly along the Los Angeles River trail. Other concerns include repeated increased taxes for city services and understanding how dollars are allocated around the city.

Population projections for 2050 reveal that growth is expected to be highest in the neighborhoods of Woodland Hills and Canoga Park, with Tarzana seeing some modest growth.


NEIGHBORHOODS IN COUNCIL DISTRICT 3

CANOGA PARK | **WINNETKA** | **TARZANA**

RESEDA | **WOODLAND HILLS**

PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES

- Alizondo Drive Park
- Caballero Creek Confluence Park
- Canoga Park Senior Citizen Center
- Caplow Property
- Corbin Canyon Park
- Costanso Fire Station 84 Park
- John Quimby Park
- Lanark Recreation Center
- LAPD SWAT Officer Randal D Simmons Park
- Los Angeles River & Aliso Creek Confluence Park
- Los Angeles River Greenway - Mason to Vanalden
- Mecca Avenue Park
- Parthenia Park
- Pilson Property
- Reseda Park
- Reseda Skate Facility
- Runnymede Park
- Serrania Avenue Park
- Tarzana Recreation Center
- Warner Ranch Park
- Winnetka Recreation Center
- Woodland Hills Recreation Center
- *PerSquare Mile - Winetka*
- *PerSquare Mile - Reseda*



Source: City Boundary and Parks: City of LA Data Portal, 2025. Roads: US Census Bureau, 2025., LA River: National Hydrography Database, 2025.

COUNCIL DISTRICT 3

21
City Parks

248
Acres of Parkland

267,084
Residents

37 Sports Fields and Courts


20 Playgrounds

9 Recreation & Community Centers

3 Pools & Splashpads

32% Average Canopy Coverage in Parks

DEMOGRAPHICS



$88,295 Median HH income	*$81,173* Citywide
35,827 Income below poverty level	*624,523* Citywide
39.8 Median age	*37.5* Citywide

Top 3 languages spoken:

English, Spanish, Other Indo-European Languages

What we heard..

"Our family has participated in many programs over the years including summer camp, piano classes, swimming classes, para equestrian and adaptive surfing. I have been very impressed specifically with the adaptive programs which have provided quality programming for free or at a low cost."

"There needs to be much more park space. Most of the parks in the Valley are concentrated in wealthy areas. There's not much for the people in the Valley flats, so the few parks we do have are overcrowded and poorly maintained. It is common to see broken glass bottles and graffiti in the parks in the Valley flats."

"Many of the facilities are old. There is a lack of wild open space. Many parks lack adequate shade for the heat."

"Maintenance! Weeding, mulching to reduce weeds, and judiciously and aesthetically trimming trees and shrubs."

Current and Future Needs: Survey Results

CD 3 respondents feel worse than the city as a whole about the physical condition of both City of LA parks and recreation centers.

Parks




Rec Centers




Most CD 3 respondents have visited a City of LA park in the past year, while only about half have visited a City of LA recreation center.


Parks



Rec Centers




Walking Distance



One-third of CD 3 respondents feel that there are enough parks and recreation centers within walking distance of their homes.

Bond Measure



Less than half of CD 3 respondents support a bond, levy, or tax to fund parks and recreation facilities.

Top 3 Most Important...

Outdoor Facilities

1. Unprogrammed green spaces
2. Non-paved, multi-use trails
3. Paved, multi-use trails

Indoor Facilities

1. Weight rooms/gyms
2. Exercise & fitness equipment
3. Walking/jogging track

Programs

1. Fitness/wellness programs
2. Seniors (age 50 & over)
3. Arts & crafts classes

Top barriers to visiting parks and recreation centers more often in CD 3:


57%
People experiencing homelessness there

43%
Facilities are not well-maintained

39%
Too far from residence; No visible patrolling presence

34%
Lack of public restrooms; Poor/ uncomfortable atmosphere

COUNCIL DISTRICT 4



Council District Four (CD 4) is home to the City's largest park—Griffith Park—as well as a long section of the Los Angeles River, an edge of Sepulveda Basin, and many neighborhoods in the San Fernando Valley, Santa Monica Mountains, and foothills. Rich in overall total parkland acres, the district is challenged by access issues, which are made worse by traffic and significant infrastructure barriers and topographic change. Residents cited opportunities for additional programming such as hiking and swimming as well as the need for flat spaces to walk, run, and bike.

Residents raised significant concerns over the intensity of encampments of persons experiencing homelessness in parks. These issues were similar near South Griffith Park and the South Sepulveda Basin as well as other smaller parks. Operations and maintenance was frequently cited as a community concern.

Equestrian use was a topic of discussion in several communities in this Council District. The history of equestrian use in Griffith Park, at the LA Equestrian Center, along the Los Angeles River, and in some adjacent neighborhoods is considered a culturally significant aspect of the evolution of Los Angeles equine history.


By 2050, it is expected that CD 4 neighborhoods of Hollywood Hills, Hollywood Hills West, and parts of Encino and Sherman Oaks will see overall population growth.

NEIGHBORHOODS IN COUNCIL DISTRICT 4

RESEDA	ENCINO	SILVER LAKE
SHERMAN OAKS	STUDIO CITY	LOS FELIZ
HOLLYWOOD HILLS WEST	HOLLYWOOD HILLS	GRIFFITH PARK

PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES

- Buena Vista Park
- Cleveland High School Pool
- Coldwater Canyon Park
- Deervale-Stone Canyon Park
- El Paseo De Cahuenga Park
- Encino Park
- Franklin-Ivar Park
- Garden Grove Elementary School (CSP)
- Griffith Park
- Laurel Canyon Mulholland Park
- Laurel Canyon Park
- Los Angeles River Greenway - Coldwater to Whitsett
- Los Angeles River Greenway - Laurel Canyon Greenway
- Los Angeles River Greenway - Laurelgrove Pedestrian Bridge
- Los Angeles River Greenway - Sepulveda to Kester
- Moorpark Park
- Mulholland View Site No 16
- Runyon Canyon Park
- Sherman Oaks Castle Park
- Studio City Recreation Center
- Van Nuys Sherman Oaks War Memorial Park
- Wattles Garden Park
- William S Hart Park - Dog Park
- *PerSquare Mile - Tarzana-Encino*



LEGEND

- City of LA Boundary
- City of LA Parks
- City of LA Neighborhoods
- LA River
- LA County
- Major Road/Highway
- Minor Road

Source: City Boundary and Parks: City of LA Data Portal, 2025. Roads: US Census Bureau, 2025., LA River: National Hydrography Database, 2025.

N

0 1 2 mile

COUNCIL DISTRICT 4

48
City Parks

5,940
Acres of Parkland

251,705
Residents

110
Sports Fields and Courts


24
Playgrounds

4
Recreation & Community Centers

5
Pools & Splashpads

35%
Average Canopy Coverage in Parks

DEMOGRAPHICS



Top 3 languages spoken:

English, Spanish, Other Indo-European Languages

$111,450 Median HH income	*$81,173 Citywide*
28,236 Income below poverty level	*624,523 Citywide*
41.3 Median age	*37.5 Citywide*

What we heard..

"More park spaces. More staff. More funding for programs and maintenance.

Overall, a better appreciation (i.e. reflected in budget and City identity) for the values of park space."

"Parks are a good size with lots of amenities from sports facilities to playgrounds to recreational centers. The parks are usually decently clean and offer great parking and green spaces. It is rare that I've had a bad experience at an LA park."

"In the Valley we need more splash pads and shaded areas for playgrounds."

"Some parks need more lighting, especially during the winter time when the sun sets early. its hard to go to the park after work when it is so dark."

Current and Future Needs: Survey Results

CD 4 respondents feel more positive than the city as a whole about the physical condition of both City of LA parks and recreation centers.

Parks




Rec Centers




Most CD 4 respondents have visited a City of LA park in the past year, while only about half have visited a City of LA recreation center.


Parks



Rec Centers




Walking Distance



CD 4 respondents feel similarly to the city as a whole about the number of parks and recreation centers within walking distance of their homes.

Bond Measure



Two-thirds of CD 4 respondents support a bond, levy, or tax to fund parks and recreation facilities.

Top 3 Most Important...

Outdoor Facilities

1. Unprogrammed green spaces
2. Non-paved, multi-use trails
3. Paved, multi-use trails

Indoor Facilities

1. Walking/jogging track
2. Swimming pool
3. Exercise & fitness equipment

Programs

1. Special events/festivals
2. Fitness/wellness programs
3. Nature experiences or environmental education

Top barriers to visiting parks and recreation centers more often in CD 4:


38%
People experiencing homelessness there

35%
Do not know where to go/what is offered

32%
Too far from residence

24%
Facilities are not well-maintained

COUNCIL DISTRICT 5



Council District Five (CD 5) encompasses much of Mid-City and parts of west LA such as UCLA and Bel Air. CD 5 recently conducted a survey of residents independently from the PNA to ask questions about parks and prioritize efforts that the Councilmember would champion. These findings were helpful to the PNA process and added to the PNA survey information.

Priorities for residents of CD 5 included improvements in operations and maintenance as well as modest expansion of recreation facilities. Species biodiversity and the repair of broken ecosystems through reforestation, daylighting streams and springs, and increasing tree canopy were discussed by residents. Residents also wanted to understand options for increasing or replacing current parks funding with new parks measures.


CD 5 is projected to grow in population overall by 2050. There are certain pockets of neighborhoods like Westwood, Century City, Rancho Park, and Pico Robertson that will see higher population growth.

NEIGHBORHOODS IN COUNCIL DISTRICT 5

BEL-AIR	BEVERLY CREST	HANCOCK PARK
WESTWOOD	CENTURY CITY	FAIRFAX
WEST LOS ANGELES	RANCHO PARK	MID-WILSHIRE
CHEVIOT HILLS	PALMS	BEVERLY GROVE
BEVERLYWOOD	PICO-ROBERTSON	CARTHAY

PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES

- Beverly Glen Park
- Briarwood Park
- Carthay Circle Park
- Cheviot Hills Recreation Center
- Club Circle Park
- De Neve Square Park
- Fairfax Senior Citizen Center
- Gateway Triangle
- Harold A Henry Park
- Holmby Park
- Irving Schacter Park
- Los Angeles High Memorial Park
- Media Park
- Palms Recreation Center
- Pan Pacific Park
- Poinsettia Recreation Center
- Robertson Recreation Center
- Westwood Gardens Park
- Westwood Recreation Center
- Woodbine Park



LEGEND

- City of LA Boundary
- City of LA Parks
- City of LA Neighborhoods
- LA River
- LA County
- Major Road/Highway
- Minor Road

Source: City Boundary and Parks: City of LA Data Portal, 2025. Roads: US Census Bureau, 2025., LA River: National Hydrography Database, 2025.

N

0 1 2 mile

COUNCIL DISTRICT 5

23
City Parks

511
Acres of Parkland

263,972
Residents

72 Sports Fields and Courts


25 Playgrounds

12 Recreation & Community Centers

3 Pools & Splashpads

42% Average Canopy Coverage in Parks

DEMOGRAPHICS



Top 3 languages spoken:

English, Spanish, Other Indo-European Languages

$107,866 Median HH income	*$81,173 Citywide*
39,231 Income below poverty level	*624,523 Citywide*
38.6 Median age	*37.5 Citywide*

What we heard..

"LA Parks needs more natural green spaces and trails that are well lit so that our children have nature-based experiences in the city. Seattle does a great job of this, and Chicago's nature reserves are another different but great example. "

"I hate how long it takes me to get to any of the larger/nicer parks in the city via public transportation and the fact that most of them have 0 safe bikeways to get there either. There is not a single park within 20mins walking distance of my apartment."

"Cheviot Park: it's completely ignored and the community has to fund raise to make any improvements."

"Lease space to private businesses (e.g. coffee shops, casual dining) on rec center properties to provide improved services (and generate additional revenues)."

Current and Future Needs: Survey Results

CD 5 respondents feel more positive than the city as a whole about the physical condition of both City of LA parks and recreation centers.

Parks




Rec Centers




Most CD 5 respondents have visited a City of LA park in the past year, while only about half have visited a City of LA recreation center.


Parks



Rec Centers




Walking Distance



About half of CD 5 respondents feel that there are enough parks and/or recreation centers within walking distance of their homes.

Bond Measure



Two-thirds of CD 5 respondents support a bond, levy, or tax to fund parks and recreation facilities.

Top 3 Most Important...

Outdoor Facilities

1. Unprogrammed green spaces
2. Natural areas & wildlife habitats
3. Non-paved and paved, multi-use trails

Indoor Facilities

1. Swimming pool
2. Exercise & fitness equipment
3. Weight rooms/gyms

Programs

1. Fitness/wellness programs
2. Special events/festivals
3. Nature experiences or environmental education


Top barriers to visiting parks and recreation centers more often in CD 5:

45%
Do not know where to go/what is offered

41%
People experiencing homelessness there

35%
Too far from residence

30%
Facilities are not well-maintained



COUNCIL DISTRICT 6

Council District Six (CD 6) encompasses a large portion of the central and north San Fernando Valley. The neighborhoods in this area were historically predominantly single family homes and parks were at greater distances apart, but neighborhoods are densifying with multi-family developments and the distances for these communities to parks is too high in many areas. This is putting significant pressure on park facilities to meet the needs of a growing population in several neighborhoods. The 2050 population projections for the City of LA show growing populations in the neighborhoods of Lake Balboa, Van Nuys, and Panorama City.

Large recreation areas like Sepulveda Basin are within CD 6 and provide significant resources, but the distance to parks and accessibility of parks is a concern of community members. Facilities in need of repair, particularly pools given the increasing heat in the Valley, came up in several community meetings. Playgrounds for young children that are in closer proximity to growing neighborhoods are needed.


NEIGHBORHOODS IN COUNCIL DISTRICT 6

LAKE BALBOA | **SEPULVEDA BASIN** | **ARLETA**

VAN NUYS | **PANORAMA CITY** | **SUN VALLEY**

PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES

- Albert Piantanida Intergenerational Center
- Allegheny Park
- Andres and Maria Cardenas Recreation Center
- Branford Recreation Center
- Delano Recreation Center
- Devonshire Arleta Park
- Fernangeles Recreation Center
- Jessie Owens Mini-Park
- Louise Park
- Marson Street Pocket Park
- North Hills Community Park
- Panorama City Recreation Center
- Sepulveda Basin Recreation Area
- Sepulveda Recreation Center
- Sheldon-Arleta Park
- South East Valley Roller & Skateboard Park
- Sun Valley Park
- Tobias Avenue Park
- Van Nuys Recreation Center
- *PerSquare Mile - Van Nuys West*
- *PerSquare Mile - Van Nuys Central*
- *PerSquare Mile - South Panorama City*
- *PerSquare Mile - Sun Valley*
- *PerSquare Mile - North Hills*
- *PerSquare Mile - Panorama City West*
- *PerSquare Mile - Arleta*



Source: City Boundary and Parks: City of LA Data Portal, 2025. Roads: US Census Bureau, 2025., LA River: National Hydrography Database, 2025.

COUNCIL DISTRICT 6

28
City Parks

2,797
Acres of Parkland

260,095
Residents

123
Sports Fields and Courts


23
Playgrounds

11
Recreation & Community Centers

3
Pools & Splashpads

24%
Average Canopy Coverage in Parks

DEMOGRAPHICS



Top 3 languages spoken:

Spanish, English, Other Indo-European Languages

$68,116 Median HH income	***$81,173*** *Citywide*
47,280 Income below poverty level	***624,523*** *Citywide*
35.6 Median age	***37.5*** *Citywide*

What we heard..

"Unprogrammed grounds, trees and vegetation, walking and jogging path, grass where people sit, more benches and shade needed."

"Maintain what we have: cut weeds, cultivate and trim trees, eliminate graffiti, clean regularly, disallow camping and tenting by homeless, clear dead brush, don't allow loud music. Keep our parks beautiful."

"Most Recreation staff offer programs that benefit the surrounding communities. The Summer Night Watch program was a great addition to keep kids active, off the streets away from gang activity."

"Upgrade buildings, facilities, create a safer space, create a collaborative space with other partners in the community."

Current and Future Needs: Survey Results

CD 6 respondents feel worse than the city as a whole about the physical conditions of City of LA parks but more positive about recreation centers.

Parks




Rec Centers




Most CD 6 respondents have visited a City of LA park in the past year, while 60% have visited a City of LA recreation center.


Parks



Rec Centers




Walking Distance



About half of CD 6 respondents feel that there are enough parks and/or recreation centers within walking distance of their homes.

Bond Measure



Less than half of CD 6 respondents support a bond, levy, or tax to fund parks and recreation facilities.

Top 3 Most Important...

Outdoor Facilities

1. Unprogrammed green spaces
2. Non-paved, multi-use trails
3. Natural areas & wildlife habitats

Indoor Facilities

1. Walking/jogging track
2. Exercise & fitness equipment
3. Swimming pool

Programs

1. Special events/festivals
2. Arts & crafts classes
3. Seniors (age 50 & over)


Top barriers to visiting parks and recreation centers more often in CD 6:

58%
People experiencing homelessness there

36%
Do not know where to go/what is offered

33%
Facilities are not well-maintained; Too far from our residence

31%
Lack of public restrooms



COUNCIL DISTRICT 7

Council District Seven (CD 7) has a deep history intertwined with City of LA Parks, including sites such as Hansen Dam and Lakeview Terrace Recreation Center which are tied to significant cultural histories of the San Fernando Valley, particularly in relation to equestrian and recreational uses. This district includes significant equestrian trails as well as the largest swimming pool in the entire park system.

Many residents in CD 7 expressed a desire for better operations and maintenance of existing facilities rather than expanding and spreading resources too thin across parks. Community members suggested that volunteers and park advisory boards can be helpful in supporting the parks system to offset some of the budget issues faced by RAP.


Population projections by 2050 indicate a more modest growth in CD 7 compared to other council districts, with some neighborhood areas in Sylmar and Lake View Terrace projected to see some population loss.

NEIGHBORHOODS IN COUNCIL DISTRICT 7

- SYLMAR
- MISSION HILLS
- SHADOW HILLS
- PACOIMA
- HANSEN DAM
- TUJUNGA
- LAKE VIEW TERRACE
- SUNLAND

PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES

- Amistad Park
- Andres Pico Adobe Park
- Brand Park
- Carey Ranch Park
- David M Gonzales Recreation Center
- Devonwood Park
- El Dorado Avenue Park
- Fehlhaber-Houk Park
- Fox And Laurel Park
- Haines Canyon Park
- Hansen Dam Recreation Area
- Howard Finn Park
- Hubert H Humphrey Memorial Park
- Kagel Canyon Park
- La Tuna Canyon Park
- Little Landers Park
- McGroarty Park and Cultural Art Center
- North East Valley Multipurpose Center
- North San Fernando Park
- Oro Vista Park
- Ritchie Valens Paxton Recreation Center
- Roger W Jessup Park
- Stetson Ranch Park
- Stonehurst Recreation Center
- Sunland Park
- Sylmar Recreation Center
- Telfair Park
- Tujunga Infiltration Galleries
- Verdugo Hills Pool
- West Lakeside Street Park



Source: City Boundary and Parks: City of LA Data Portal, 2025. Roads: US Census Bureau, 2025., LA River: National Hydrography Database, 2025.

COUNCIL DISTRICT 7

38
City Parks

2,298
Acres of Parkland

254,284
Residents

56
Sports Fields and Courts


29
Playgrounds

15
Recreation & Community Centers

8
Pools & Splashpads

31%
Average Canopy Coverage in Parks

DEMOGRAPHICS



Top 3 languages spoken:

Spanish, English, Other Indo-European Languages

$89,145 Median HH income	***$81,173*** *Citywide*
35,528 Income below poverty level	***624,523*** *Citywide*
38.5 Median age	***37.5*** *Citywide*

What we heard..

"There are some unused open spaces that can have low use recreation such as a few benches are frisbee golf but no other facilities are needed. I am referring to the open space at La Tuna and Tujunga. "

"Los Angeles needs to bring more resources to the parks, such as building spaces and facilities big enough to accommodate the population of a community. For example Ritchie Vallen's pool is too small for the neighborhood of Pacoima.

Los Angeles also needs to improve the cleanliness of the parks. "

"Sylmar park needs major upgrades and repairs

"Providing updated spaces with regards to infrastructure, and providing the staff with all the resources they need to keep them happy."

Current and Future Needs: Survey Results

CD 7 respondents feel worse than the city as a whole about the physical condition of both City of LA parks and recreation centers.

Parks




Rec Centers




Most CD 7 respondents have visited a City of LA park in the past year, while less than half have visited a City of LA recreation center.


Parks



Rec Centers




Walking Distance



About half of CD 7 respondents feel that there are enough parks and/or recreation centers within walking distance of their homes.

Bond Measure



About half of CD 7 respondents support a bond, levy, or tax to fund parks and recreation facilities.

Top 3 Most Important...

Outdoor Facilities

1. Unprogrammed green spaces
2. Non-paved, multi-use trails
3. Natural areas & wildlife habitats; Playgrounds

Indoor Facilities

1. Exercise & fitness equipment
2. Swimming pool
3. Walking/jogging track

Programs

1. Seniors (age 50 & over)
2. Recreation (drop-in)
3. Aquatics (lessons, fitness, teams)


Top barriers to visiting parks and recreation centers more often in CD 7:

46%
People experiencing homelessness there

34%
No viable patrolling presence

30%
Facilities are not well-maintained

27%
Too far from our residence



COUNCIL DISTRICT 8

Council District Eight (CD 8) is located in South Los Angeles and is known for its rich cultural identity and community strength but faces critical challenges related to park access, safety, and environmental equity.

CD 8 has one of the lowest parkland-to-resident ratios in the city—just 0.5 acres per 1,000 residents—limiting opportunities for recreation and physical activity. The area also suffers from severe shade inequity, with tree canopy coverage as low as 5% in some parts, worsening urban heat and health risks.

Current initiatives focus on increasing tree planting, improving park safety through the Community Safety Partnership, and enhancing accessibility and programming. These efforts aim to create more equitable, healthy, and vibrant public spaces for residents.


Compared to other council districts, CD 8 is expected to see a much more modest growth in population by 2050, according to population projections. Neighborhoods like High Park will see some increase in population, but by and large, there is little growth and some population decline that is expected across the neighborhoods.

NEIGHBORHOODS IN COUNCIL DISTRICT 8

BALDWIN HILLS	WEST ADAMS	LEIMERT PARK
CHESTERFIELD SQUARE	CRENSHAW MANOR	JEFFERSON PARK
CRENSHAW	MAGNOLIA SQUARE	VERMONT VISTA

PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES

- 105th Street Pocket Park
- 111th Place Pocket Park
- 11th Avenue Park
- 76th Street Pocket Park
- 97th Street Pocket Park
- Algin Sutton Recreation Center
- Angeles Mesa Park
- Chesterfield Square Park
- Circle Park (5th Ave)
- Circle Park (S Gramercy Pl)
- Denker Recreation Center
- Jacaranda Park
- Jackie Tatum / Harvard Recreation Center
- Little Green Acres Park
- Loren Miller Recreation Center
- Martin Luther King Jr Park
- Mount Carmel Recreation Center
- Norman O Houston Park
- Obama Global Prep Academy (CSP)
- Richardson Family Park
- Rolland Curtis Park
- Saint Andrews Recreation Center
- South Los Angeles Sports Activity Center
- South Victoria Avenue Park
- Van Ness Recreation Center
- Vermont Miracle Park
- Western And Gage Community Park
- *PerSquare Mile - Vermont Knolls*
- *PerSquare Mile - Vermont-Slauson*
- *PerSquare Mile - Harvard Park*
- *PerSquare Mile - Exposition Park*



Source: City Boundary and Parks: City of LA Data Portal, 2025. Roads: US Census Bureau, 2025., LA River: National Hydrography Database, 2025.

COUNCIL DISTRICT 8

27
City Parks

81
Acres of Parkland

251,469
Residents

57
Sports Fields and Courts


28
Playgrounds

13
Recreation & Community Centers

4
Pools & Splashpads

18%
Average Canopy Coverage in Parks

DEMOGRAPHICS



$56,959
Median HH income

$81,173
Citywide

57,445
Income below poverty level

624,523
Citywide

31.3
Median age

37.5
Citywide

Top 3 languages spoken:

English, Spanish, Other and Unspecified Languages

What we heard..

"I strongly believe there's a need for more public running tracks. Los Angeles has one of the largest running communities, with numerous free, open-to-the-public run clubs constantly searching for accessible track spaces. Currently, Rancho Cienega Park is the only park with a dedicated running track. Expanding this infrastructure to additional parks could encourage more walkers and runners, promoting health and wellness citywide. "

"Council District 8 has the best pools. I love how the pools are clean. I have seen significant improvement in Algin Sutton Park and the pool at Van Ness is very well kept."

"In general parks could use more lighting and/or enforcement presence. Many of the facilities look dated but are usable, except for restrooms."

"From the parks I've visited the most (South LA) all parks are well maintained/ clean which is very appreciated."

Current and Future Needs: Survey Results

CD 8 respondents feel worse than the city as a whole about the physical condition of both City of LA parks and recreation centers.

Parks




Rec Centers




Most CD 8 respondents have visited a City of LA park in the past year, while 60% have visited a City of LA recreation center.


Parks



Rec Centers




Walking Distance



One-third of CD 8 respondents feel that there are enough parks and/or recreation centers within walking distance of their homes.

Bond Measure



About half of CD 8 respondents support a bond, levy, or tax to fund parks and recreation facilities.

Top 3 Most Important...

Outdoor Facilities

1. Playgrounds
2. Swimming pool
3. Paved, multi-use trails

Indoor Facilities

1. Swimming pool
2. Rooms for arts & crafts & games
3. Walking/jogging track

Programs

1. Aquatics (lessons, fitness, teams)
2. Fitness/wellness programs
3. Nature experiences or environmental education

Top barriers to visiting parks and recreation centers more often in CD 8:

41%
People experiencing homelessness there

39%
Too far from our residence; No viable patrolling presence

32%
Facilities are not well-maintained

30%
Inadequate shade

COUNCIL DISTRICT 9



Council District Nine (CD 9) is located in South Los Angeles and includes some of the city's most historically significant and culturally vibrant neighborhoods. The district has a predominantly Latino and Black population and faces systemic challenges such as high poverty rates, limited access to quality green space, and aging park infrastructure. Environmental concerns, including heat vulnerability and air pollution, are pressing issues.

Despite these challenges, CD 9 has a strong sense of community pride and resilience. Residents are vocal about the need for safer, better-maintained parks, increased shade, ADA-compliant amenities, and culturally inclusive programming. The district is seeing renewed attention with equity-driven initiatives from RAP and local partners aimed at revitalizing public spaces, expanding access, and celebrating the unique culture of the area.

With the exception of University City Park, there is little growth expected by 2050 in CD 9, according to population projections. Neighborhoods like South Park and Central Alameda are expected to see mostly population decline over the next 25 years.

NEIGHBORHOODS IN COUNCIL DISTRICT 9


VERMONT SQUARE | **EXPOSITION PARK** | **SOUTH PARK**

CENTRAL ALAMEDA | **UNIVERSITY PARK** | **SOUTH CENTRAL**

GREEN MEADOWS | **FLORENCE**

PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES

- 4206 S Main St Maintenance Yard
- 49th Street Pocket Park
- 61st Street Pocket Park
- Augustus F Hawkins Natural Park
- Central Avenue Jazz Park
- Central Recreation Center
- Challengers Boys And Girls Club
- EXPO Center
- Exposition Park Rose Garden
- Fred Roberts Recreation Center
- Fremont High School Pool
- Gage and Avalon Triangle Pocket Park
- Gilbert W Lindsay Recreation Center
- Green Meadows Recreation Center
- Hoover Pedestrian Mall
- Hoover-Gage Park
- Inell Woods Park
- James Slauson Recreation Center
- Julian C Dixon Park
- Latham Park
- Mary McLeod Bethune Middle School (CSP)
- McKinley Avenue Park
- Nevin Avenue Park
- Orchard Ave Park
- Orthopedic Hospital Universal Access Playground
- Ross Snyder Recreation Center
- Senator Bill Greene Memorial Park
- South Broadway Pocket Park
- South LA Wetlands Park
- South Park Recreation Center
- Trinity Recreation Center
- Vermont Gage Park
- Vermont Square Park
- Vernon Branch Library Pocket Park
- Wall Street Community Park
- *PerSquare Mile - Florence*
- *PerSquare Mile - Vermont-South Park*
- *PerSquare Mile - South Park-Florence*
- *PerSquare Mile - Central-Alameda*
- *PerSquare Mile - East Vermont Square*
- *PerSquare Mile - Historic South Central*
- *PerSquare Mile - Central-Alameda-North*
- *PerSquare Mile - N Hist South Central*



LEGEND

- City of LA Boundary
- City of LA Parks
- City of LA Neighborhoods
- LA River
- LA County
- Major Road/Highway
- Minor Road

Source: City Boundary and Parks: City of LA Data Portal, 2025. Roads: US Census Bureau, 2025., LA River: National Hydrography Database, 2025.

COUNCIL DISTRICT 9

35
City Parks

110
Acres of Parkland

262,374
Residents

34
Sports Fields and Courts


32
Playgrounds

11
Recreation & Community Centers

6
Pools & Splashpads

26%
Average Canopy Coverage in Parks

DEMOGRAPHICS



Top 3 languages spoken:

Spanish, English, Korean

$53,472 Median HH income	*$81,173 Citywide*
77,306 Income below poverty level	*624,523 Citywide*
31.2 Median age	*37.5 Citywide*

What we heard..

"There aren't enough shaded areas, making it difficult to enjoy the park during hot days."

"Safety is a concern, especially in the evenings. Better lighting and security patrols would help."

"The new playground equipment at our local park has been a big hit with the kids. It's great to see investments being made."

"I appreciate the efforts to keep the park clean and the addition of new benches and picnic areas."

"Community events hosted in the park have brought neighbors together and created a stronger sense of community."

"Some facilities are outdated and in need of repair. The restrooms, in particular, could use an upgrade.

"More programs for teens and young adults would be beneficial. There's not much for them to do currently."

Current and Future Needs: Survey Results

CD 9 respondents feel similarly to the city as a whole about the physical conditions of City of LA parks but more positive about recreation centers.

Parks




Rec Centers




Most CD 9 respondents have visited a City of LA park in the past year, while less than half have visited a City of LA recreation center.


Parks



Rec Centers




Walking Distance



CD 9 respondents feel similarly to the city as a whole about the number of parks and recreation centers within walking distance of their homes.

Bond Measure



About half of CD 9 respondents support a bond, levy, or tax to fund parks and recreation facilities.

Top 3 Most Important...

Outdoor Facilities

1. Paved, multi-use trails
2. Unprogrammed green spaces
3. Swimming pool

Indoor Facilities

1. Exercise & fitness equipment
2. Swimming pool
3. Walking/jogging track

Programs

1. Recreation (drop-in)
2. Fitness/wellness programs
3. Seniors (age 50 & over)

Top barriers to visiting parks and recreation centers more often in CD 9:


46%
People experiencing homelessness there

39%
Do not know where to go/what is offered

39%
Too far from our residence

31%
Lack of public restrooms; No visible patrolling presence

COUNCIL DISTRICT 10



City Council District Ten (CD 10) is a diverse, centrally located area characterized by dense housing, a mix of commercial corridors, and strong cultural heritage. It includes a broad demographic cross-section of Angelenos, including immigrant communities, long-time residents, and working families. CD 10 faces challenges such as limited access to high-quality green space, aging park infrastructure, and concerns around public safety and maintenance. Despite these issues, the district also benefits from active community involvement and creative initiatives aimed at expanding shade equity, improving walk-ability, and integrating arts and culture into public spaces. Ongoing efforts by the Department of Recreation and Parks (RAP) are focused on making parks more inclusive, better maintained, and reflective of the needs of local communities.


According to population projections, CD 10 as a whole is expected to grow in population by 2050. Neighborhoods like Baldwin Hills/Crenshaw, Jefferson Park, Mid City, and Koreatown will see higher growth rates than other areas of the council district.

NEIGHBORHOODS IN COUNCIL DISTRICT 10

ARLINGTON HEIGHTS	SOUTH ROBERTSON	OLYMPIC PARK
KOREATOWN	WEST ADAMS	WILSHIRE CENTER
MID-CITY	WEST PICO	PALMS
MACARTHUR PARK	PICO-UNION	MID-WILSHIRE

PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES

- Baldwin Hills Recreation Center
- Benny H Potter West Adams Avenues Memorial Park
- Claude Pepper Senior Citizen Center
- Country Club Heritage Park
- Eleanor Green Roberts Aquatic Center
- Genesee Avenue Park
- Gladys Jean Wesson Park
- Jim Gilliam Recreation Center
- Lafayette Recreation Center
- Leimert Plaza
- Leslie N Shaw Park
- Los Angeles Center for Enriched Studies (LACES)
- Mascot Park
- Pio Pico Library Pocket Park
- Pio Pico Middle School (CSP)
- Queen Anne Recreation Center
- Rancho Cienega Park
- Reynier Park
- Seoul International Park
- Shatto Recreation Center
- South Seas House Park
- Vineyard Recreation Center
- Washington Irving Pocket Park
- West Adam Heights Park
- Westside Neighborhood Park
- *PerSquare Mile - Harvard Heights-Pico*
- *PerSquare Mile - Koreatown*



Source: City Boundary and Parks: City of LA Data Portal, 2025. Roads: US Census Bureau, 2025., LA River: National Hydrography Database, 2025.

COUNCIL DISTRICT 10

25
City Parks

103
Acres of Parkland

267,194
Residents

93
Sports Fields and Courts


23
Playgrounds

14
Recreation & Community Centers

2
Pools & Splashpads

27%
Average Canopy Coverage in Parks

DEMOGRAPHICS



Top 3 languages spoken:

English, Spanish, Korean

$60,089 Median HH income
$81,173 Citywide

61,115 Income below poverty level
624,523 Citywide

31.8 Median age
37.5 Citywide

What we heard..

"I bring my grandkids to Jefferson Park every weekend. It's one of the few places in the neighborhood where you can feel the history and the energy of the community."

"It's nice to see art and culture showing up more in the parks. Leimert Park always feels alive with music and local talent."

"We're always hearing about funding, but it doesn't feel like it reaches our parks. We just want basics — shade, clean water fountains, safe spaces."

"We need more programs for seniors and youth — the park's there, but not much is happening in it unless there's a special event."

"It's great to have a new playground, but where's the shade? The equipment gets so hot it's unusable by noon."

"The permitting process to host community events is too complicated and slow. Local artists and organizers give up halfway."


Current and Future Needs: Survey Results

CD 10 respondents feel more positive than the city as a whole about the physical condition of both City of LA parks and recreation centers.

Parks




Rec Centers




Most CD 10 respondents have visited a City of LA park in the past year, while less than half have visited a City of LA recreation center.


Parks



Rec Centers




Walking Distance



Less than half of CD 10 respondents feel that there are enough parks and/or recreation centers within walking distance of their homes.

Bond Measure



About three-fourths of CD 10 respondents support a bond, levy, or tax to fund parks and recreation facilities.

Top 3 Most Important...

Outdoor Facilities

1. Unprogrammed green spaces
2. Paved, multi-use trails
3. Non-paved, multi-use trails

Indoor Facilities

1. Swimming pool
2. Exercise & fitness equipment
3. Traditional hard courts

Programs

1. Special events/festivals
2. Fitness/wellness programs
3. Seniors (age 50 & over); Recreation (drop-in)

Top barriers to visiting parks and recreation centers more often in CD 9:


50%
Too far from our residence

49%
People experiencing homelessness there

35%
Facility operating hours are not convenient; Do not know where to go/ what is offered

35%
Facilities are not well-maintained; Lack of parking by facilities/ parks

COUNCIL DISTRICT 11



Council District Eleven (CD 11) includes a large range of neighborhoods, encompassing areas as far south as LAX and stretching north of Santa Monica in areas recently impacted by the Palisades Fire. Boasting world famous landscapes such as Venice Beach and the Palisades, CD 11 is also home to many community and neighborhood parks that are beloved for recreation and community life.

Residents shared concerns about pressure on recreation resources, particularly for sports growing in popularity such as pickleball. Concerns were also raised about the level of operations and maintenance, particularly in relation to park restrooms and park surfaces such as tennis or handball courts, playgrounds, and dog parks. ADA compliant restrooms and senior center vans were brought up by neighborhood council members as needs.

Safety concerns were also raised by residents, and additional enforcement and park rangers were requested. Several users raised concerns about the recent fires and whether testing of soils and sand at parks downwind from the Palisades Fire would be tested for harmful substances. Given the intensity of use of the beach landscapes and frequent filming, residents noted concerns about the commercialization of parks. Others felt there could be more opportunities for rentals and revenue generation with more recreation resources.


In CD 11, the neighborhoods of Sawtelle, Venice, and Playa Vista are expected to see moderate population growth while the Pacific Palisades and Brentwood are expected to see mostly population loss by 2050.

NEIGHBORHOODS IN COUNCIL DISTRICT 11

PACIFIC PALISADES	BRENTWOOD	PLAYA VISTA
SAWTELLE	MAR VISTA	PLAYA DEL REY
VENICE	DEL REY	WESTCHESTER

PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES

- Amoroso Triangle
- Barrington Recreation Center
- Bill Rosendahl Del Rey Park
- Crescent Place Triangle
- Crestwood Hills Recreation Center
- Culver-Slauson Park
- Del Rey Lagoon
- Felicia Mahood Multipurpose Center
- George Wolfberg Park at Potrero Canyon
- Isidore B Dockweiler State Beach
- Linnie Canal Park
- Mandeville Canyon Park
- Mar Vista Recreation Center
- Marco Place Parkway
- Marco Triangle
- Nowita Triangle
- Oakwood Recreation Center
- Open Magnet Charter School (CSP)
- Palisades Park (Pacific Palisades)
- Palisades Recreation Center
- Palisades-Asilomar Park
- Penmar Recreation Center
- Rivas Canyon Park
- Rustic Canyon Park
- Rustic Canyon Recreation Center
- San Juan Garage
- San Vicente Mountain Park
- Santa Ynez Canyon Park
- Steers Property
- Stoner Recreation Center
- Sullivan Canyon Park
- Temescal Canyon Park
- Titmouse Park
- Trask Triangle Park
- Triangle Park
- Venice Beach
- Venice High School Pool
- Venice of America Centennial Park
- Venice Reservoir Site
- Veterans' Barrington Park
- Via Dolce Park
- Vista Del Mar Park
- Westchester Recreation Center
- Westminster Park
- Will Rogers State Beach



LEGEND

- City of LA Boundary
- City of LA Parks
- City of LA Neighborhoods
- LA River
- LA County
- Major Road/Highway
- Minor Road

Source: City Boundary and Parks: City of LA Data Portal, 2025. Roads: US Census Bureau, 2025., LA River: National Hydrography Database, 2025.

N

0 1 2 mile

COUNCIL DISTRICT 11

49
City Parks

1,441
Acres of Parkland

264,841
Residents

151
Sports Fields and Courts


27
Playgrounds

12
Recreation & Community Centers

6
Pools & Splashpads

34%
Average Canopy Coverage in Parks

DEMOGRAPHICS



$129,286 Median HH income	*$81,173 Citywide*
23,583 Income below poverty level	*624,523 Citywide*
40.4 Median age	*37.5 Citywide*

Top 3 languages spoken:

English, Spanish, Other Indo-European Languages

What we heard..

"Los Angeles has a lot of parks and recreation spaces compared to other cities where I've lived, and many of these natural areas and facilities are well-maintained. It's easy to find information on how to access these areas and what is happening on any given day."

"I was really impressed by the park and community center in Rustic Canyon recently. Would love for Venice's Penmar Park to feel a little safer and have more programs like Rustic Canyon's did."

"Bathrooms in my local park are in bad shape, there are not enough of them, they are not ADA compliant, and one of the few bathrooms is a portapotty."

"Provides a place for all to enjoy sports, family gatherings, lectures, community events, libraries, green spaces."

Current and Future Needs: Survey Results

CD 11 respondents feel more positive than the city as a whole about the physical condition of both City of LA parks and recreation centers.

Parks




Rec Centers




Most CD 11 respondents have visited a City of LA park in the past year, while less than half have visited a City of LA recreation center.


Parks



Rec Centers




Walking Distance



Less than half of CD 11 respondents feel that there are enough parks and/or recreation centers within walking distance of their homes.

Bond Measure



About two-thirds of CD 11 respondents support a bond, levy, or tax to fund parks and recreation facilities.

Top 3 Most Important...

Outdoor Facilities

1. Unprogrammed green spaces
2. Non-paved, multi-use trails
3. Paved, multi-use trails

Indoor Facilities

1. Exercise & fitness equipment
2. Swimming pool
3. Weight rooms/gyms

Programs

1. Special events/festivals
2. Fitness/wellness programs
3. Recreation (drop-in)

Top barriers to visiting parks and recreation centers more often in CD 11:


54%
People experiencing homelessness there

32%
Lack of parking by facilities/parks

31%
Facilities are not well-maintained

28%
No visible patrolling presence

COUNCIL DISTRICT 12



Council District Twelve (CD 12) encompasses areas of the northwest San Fernando Valley and is populated with several beloved parks and active neighborhood council and park advisory boards. The Valley climate is projected to get hotter in the coming decades, making shade and green space critical for the community, particularly in communities with limited access to green space.

Many residents in these neighborhoods expressed a desire for better operations and maintenance of their park facilities and the completion of projects such as efforts at the Oakridge Estates Park. Park land expansion was less of a priority for some neighborhoods in CD 12 while others felt park need and distance to parks was very high for some neighborhoods, citing that in the 2016 LA County Park Needs Assessment there were areas with high park access need.

Enforcement of park policies to control littering, unpermitted uses, and fireworks is a concern for several neighborhoods. Residents expressed desire for more park rangers or park ambassadors or monitors that could help manage park use, especially on weekends.

CD 12 is expected to see population growth by 2050 in pockets of Granada Hills and Chatsworth; however, these same neighborhoods are also expected to see some areas with a decline in population.

NEIGHBORHOODS IN COUNCIL DISTRICT 12

WEST HILLS

CHATSWORTH RESERVOIR

NORTH HILLS

CHATSWORTH


PORTER RANCH

GRANADA HILLS

NORTHRIDGE

PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES

- Aliso Canyon Park
- Bee Canyon Park
- Bell Canyon Park
- Browns Creek Park
- Castle Peak Park
- Chatsworth Oaks Park
- Chatsworth Park North
- Chatsworth Park South
- Chatsworth Reservoir Site
- Cohasset-Melba Park
- Dearborn Park
- Eddleston Park
- El Escorpion Park
- Fallbrook Park
- Granada Hills Recreation Center
- Granada Hills Youth Recreation Center
- Holleigh Bernson Memorial Park
- Jane and Bert Boeckmann Park
- Knapp Ranch Park
- Lazy J Ranch Park
- Limekiln Canyon Park
- Los Angeles River Greenway - Brown's Creek
- Mae Boyar Recreation Center
- Mason Recreation Center
- Moonshine Canyon Park
- Northridge Middle School (CSP)
- Northridge Recreation Center
- Oakridge Residence
- Old Mission Trail
- O'Melveny Park
- Orcutt Ranch Horticultural Center
- Palisades Park (Porter Ranch)
- Porter Ranch Park
- Porter Ridge Park
- Rinaldi Park
- Roscoe-Valley Circle Park
- Sean Brown Park
- Shadow Ranch Park
- Stoney Point Park
- Taxco Trails Park
- Van Norman Lakes Reservoir
- Vanalden Park
- Viking Park
- West Hills Sport Center
- Wilbur-Tampa Park
- Zelzah Park



Source: City Boundary and Parks: City of LA Data Portal, 2025. Roads: US Census Bureau, 2025., LA River: National Hydrography Database, 2025.

COUNCIL DISTRICT 12

47 City Parks

2,024 Acres of Parkland

262,774 Residents

66 Sports Fields and Courts


32 Playgrounds

8 Recreation & Community Centers

3 Pools & Splashpads

32% Average Canopy Coverage in Parks

DEMOGRAPHICS



$122,440 Median HH income — ***$81,173*** *Citywide*

23,232 Income below poverty level — ***624,523*** *Citywide*

43.3 Median age — ***37.5*** *Citywide*

Top 3 languages spoken:

English, Spanish, Other Indo-European Languages

What we heard..

"I've lived in places like Irvine, and they have beautiful parks and community centers. It's sad to see the SFV that I grew up in fall behind. My wife and I aren't even comfortable sometimes walking in the park, let alone if we had a baby."

"The overall vibe of most parks I've visited is one of deterioration or minimal maintenance. I also wish more parks (near me anyway) had the variety of fitness equipment laid out as stations with nice walkable space between each station ("walkable being a trail surrounded by as much nature as possible with concrete and/or soft fill at the fitness locations only)"

"The climate is changing - the playgrounds need shade! I have taken my kids to playgrounds that are too hot to touch, making them useless."

"Maintenance of our trees, brush, trails are hazardous and washed out in Aliso Canyon Park. Fire hazard because not trimming trees on regular basis or removing brush. Invasive plants are a problem as well. "

Current and Future Needs: Survey Results

CD 12 respondents feel similarly to the city as a whole about the physical conditions of City of LA parks but more positive about recreation centers.

Parks




Rec Centers




Most CD 12 respondents have visited a City of LA park in the past year, while half have visited a City of LA recreation center.


Parks



Rec Centers




Walking Distance



CD 12 respondents feel better than the city as a whole about the number of parks and recreation centers within walking distance of their homes.

Bond Measure



Less than half of CD 12 respondents support a bond, levy, or tax to fund parks and recreation facilities.

Top 3 Most Important...

Outdoor Facilities

1. Unprogrammed green spaces
2. Non-paved, multi-use trails
3. Paved, multi-use trails

Indoor Facilities

1. Walking/jogging track
2. Exercise & fitness equipment
3. Swimming pool

Programs

1. Seniors (age 50 & over)
2. Fitness/wellness programs; Youth & family
3. Special events/festivals

Top barriers to visiting parks and recreation centers more often in CD 12:

52%
People experiencing homelessness there

33%
No viable patrolling presence

31%
Lack of parking by facilities/parks; Lack of public restrooms

29%
Facilities are not well-maintained



COUNCIL DISTRICT 13

Council District Thirteen (CD 13) is the most diverse council district in Los Angeles, and is home to iconic parks such Echo Park. It is also marked by vast inequities from one neighborhood to another, with shade cover being a key factor that was highlighted by local neighborhood councils, particularly in areas such as East Hollywood. Parks such as Echo Park and Barnsdall Park draw people from all over the city to appreciate their festivals and events, and have been identified as areas needing sustained attention and investment.


CD 13 is expected to see modest population growth over the next 25 years with more growth concentrated in areas of neighborhoods like Hollywood and East Hollywood, according to population projections.

NEIGHBORHOODS IN COUNCIL DISTRICT 13

ATWATER VILLAGE	EAST HOLLYWOOD	LITTLE ARMENIA
SILVER LAKE	GLASSELL PARK	SPAULDING SQUARE
RAMPART VILLAGE	HOLLYWOOD	HISTORIC FILIPINOTOWN
ECHO PARK	ELYSIAN VALLEY	LARCHMONT VILLAGE

PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES

- Barnsdall Park
- Bellevue Recreation Center
- Carlton Way Park
- Chevy Chase Park
- De Longpre Park
- Dorothy J and Benjamin B Smith Park
- Drew Street Park
- Echo Park
- Elysian Valley Recreation Center
- Glenhurst Park
- Harvard Elementary School (CSP)
- Hollywood Recreation Center
- Juntos Family Park
- La Mirada Park
- Lake Street Park
- Larissa Parkway
- Las Palmas Senior Citizen Center
- Laurel and Hardy Park
- Lemon Grove Recreation Center
- Lexington Avenue Pocket Park
- Los Angeles River Greenway / Elysian Valley Bikeway
- Madison Avenue Park and Community Garden
- Madison West Park
- Ramona Elementary School (CSP)
- Robert L Burns Park
- Rockwood Community Park
- Seily Rodriguez Park
- Selma Park
- Silver Lake Meadows Park
- Silver Lake Recreation Center
- Tommy Lasorda's Field of Dreams
- Unidad Park
- Yucca Community Center
- *PerSquare Mile - Windsor Square*
- *PerSquare Mile - E Hollywood-Ktown*
- *PerSquare Mile - East Hollywood*



LEGEND

- City of LA Boundary
- City of LA Parks
- City of LA Neighborhoods
- LA River
- LA County
- Major Road/Highway
- Minor Road

Source: City Boundary and Parks: City of LA Data Portal, 2025. Roads: US Census Bureau, 2025., LA River: National Hydrography Database, 2025.

N

0 1 2 mile

COUNCIL DISTRICT 13

38
City Parks

156
Acres of Parkland

252,652
Residents

30
Sports Fields and Courts


36
Playgrounds

10
Recreation & Community Centers

1
Pools & Splashpads

32%
Average Canopy Coverage in Parks

DEMOGRAPHICS



$71,136 Median HH income	***$81,173*** *Citywide*
52,009 Income below poverty level	***624,523*** *Citywide*
37.8 Median age	***37.5*** *Citywide*

Top 3 languages spoken:

English, Spanish, Tagalog (incl. Filipino)

What we heard..

"Safety is an important concern for many folks when it comes to the parks. RAPs should continue to work with community organizations and council districts to ensure safety of all visitors at the park. Substance use at the parks is also a concern. How can RAPs create a safe space for ALL and be a hub of resources and referrals?"

"I live in Silver Lake where we have lots of convenient parks facilities, but other nearby neighborhoods like Historic Filipinotown and Koreatown have much less convenient access to green space. I'd like to see more public transit that goes near parks and more pocket parks or creative adaptations of city-owned space for public use."

"I'd love to see more biking/running trails throughout the city to connect neighborhoods to parks. More composting options and more native plants."

"I am lucky to live near Griffith Parkland every time I'm there I can't believe I'm in the city of Los Angeles!"

Current and Future Needs: Survey Results

CD 13 respondents feel more positive than the city as a whole about the physical condition of both City of LA parks and recreation centers.

Parks




Rec Centers




Most CD 13 respondents have visited a City of LA park in the past year, while less than half have visited a City of LA recreation center.


Parks



Rec Centers




Walking Distance



Less than half of CD 13 respondents feel that there are enough parks and/or recreation centers within walking distance of their homes.

Bond Measure



About two-thirds of CD 13 respondents support a bond, levy, or tax to fund parks and recreation facilities.

Top 3 Most Important...

Outdoor Facilities

1. Unprogrammed green spaces
2. Non-paved, multi-use trails
3. Paved, multi-use trails

Indoor Facilities

1. Exercise & fitness equipment
2. Walking/jogging track
3. Swimming pool

Programs

1. Special events/festivals
2. Arts & crafts classes
3. Nature experiences or environmental education

Top barriers to visiting parks and recreation centers more often in CD 13:


45%
Too far from our residence

44%
Do not know where to go/what is offered

41%
People experiencing homelessness there

36%
Lack of parking by facilities/parks; Facilities are not well-maintained

COUNCIL DISTRICT 14



Council District Fourteen (CD 14), located on the eastern edge of the city and encompassing Downtown Los Angeles, is experiencing densification in neighborhoods like Boyle Heights. Densification is a concern for residents because it adds pressure on neighborhood parks and amenities. CD 14 also includes Skid Row, which has the highest population of individuals experiencing homelessness in the city. There are significant open spaces like Debs Park, where the desire for park rangers, fire mitigation, and trail maintenance is high. Neighborhood councils across the district highlighted that many of their parks have basic infrastructure, but lack consistent maintenance.


In comparison to the whole City, parts of CD 14 are expected to see the highest population growth by 2050. Population projections show high growth clustered in Downtown LA and the western edges of Boyle Heights; however, El Sereno will see an overall population decline.

NEIGHBORHOODS IN COUNCIL DISTRICT 14

- BOYLE HEIGHTS
- DOWNTOWN
- MONTEREY HILLS
- EAGLE ROCK
- EL SERENO
- MONTECITO HEIGHTS
- GARVANZA
- HIGHLAND PARK
- LINCOLN HEIGHTS
- GLASSELL PARK

PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES

- 1st And Broadway Civic Center Park
- 6th & Gladys Street Park
- Aliso Triangle
- Arroyo Rosa De Castilla
- Arroyo Seco Park
- Arts District Park
- Ascot Hills Park
- Boyle Heights Sports Center
- Bridewell Armory
- Brooklyn Heights Park
- Budd Wiener Park
- City Hall Park
- Eagle Rock City Hall
- Eagle Rock Hillside Park
- Eagle Rock Historical Landmark
- Eagle Rock Recreation Center
- East Los Angeles Park
- El Pueblo de Los Angeles Historic Monument
- El Sereno Arroyo Playground
- El Sereno Community Garden
- El Sereno Recreation Center
- El Sereno Senior Citizen Center
- Evergreen Recreation Center
- Garvanza Park
- Grand Hope Park
- Guardia Park
- Hazard Recreation Center
- Highland Park Recreation Center
- Highland Park Senior Citizen Center
- Hollenbeck Park
- Lanark Shelby Mini-Park
- Lincoln Park
- Lou Costello Jr Recreation Center
- Monsignor Ramon Garcia Recreation Center
- Pecan Recreation Center
- Pershing Square
- Prospect Park
- Roosevelt High School Pool
- Rose Hill Recreation Center
- Ross Valencia Community Park
- San Julian Park
- Sixth Street Viaduct Park
- Spring Street Park
- State Street Recreation Center
- Wabash Recreation Center
- York Blvd Pocket Park
- Yosemite Recreation Center
- *PerSquare Mile - Downtown*
- *PerSquare Mile - Boyle Heights*



LEGEND

- City of LA Boundary
- City of LA Parks
- City of LA Neighborhoods
- LA River
- LA County
- Major Road/Highway
- Minor Road

Source: City Boundary and Parks: City of LA Data Portal, 2025. Roads: US Census Bureau, 2025., LA River: National Hydrography Database, 2025.

N

0 1 2 mile

COUNCIL DISTRICT 14

58
City Parks

525
Acres of Parkland

270,834
Residents

105
Sports Fields and Courts


43
Playgrounds

24
Recreation & Community Centers

6
Pools & Splashpads

34%
Average Canopy Coverage in Parks

DEMOGRAPHICS



$74,701
Median HH income

$81,173
Citywide

52,887
Income below poverty level

624,523
Citywide

37.6
Median age

37.5
Citywide

Top 3 languages spoken:

Spanish, English, Chinese (incl. Mandarin, Cantonese)

What we heard..

"Downtown Los Angeles parks are showing their wear and tear from great use, especially Gladys Park and San Julian Park in Skid Row. We need to make physical improvements to these parks and increase health and wellness programming, ideally with an arts focus where possible. We also need more green space overall in Downtown Los Angeles and the surrounding neighborhoods."

"Improve on quality of the facilities (cleanliness, more shade trees, places to sit and gather), remove barriers to parks (physical fences, no public restrooms or limited restrooms, limited hours, over-policing), make them more accessible for all modes of transport -- biking, public transit, walking etc.."

"We could do better about making sure that our facilities serve people with disabilities and have inclusive programming."

"I have such fond memories of taking my kids and my friend's kids to the swimming classes at Lincoln Park Pool."

Current and Future Needs: Survey Results

CD 14 respondents feel similarly to the city as a whole about the physical conditions of City of LA parks but worse about recreation centers.

Parks




Rec Centers




Most CD 14 respondents have visited a City of LA park in the past year, while only about half have visited a City of LA recreation center.


Parks



Rec Centers




Walking Distance



CD 14 respondents feel similarly to the city as a whole about the number of parks and recreation centers within walking distance of their homes.

Bond Measure



About two-thirds of CD 14 respondents support a bond, levy, or tax to fund parks and recreation facilities.

Top 3 Most Important...

Outdoor Facilities

1. Unprogrammed green spaces
2. Non-paved, multi-use trails
3. Paved, multi-use trails

Indoor Facilities

1. Swimming pool
2. Walking/jogging track
3. Exercise & fitness equipment

Programs

1. Special events/festivals
2. Fitness/wellness programs
3. Arts & crafts classes


Top barriers to visiting parks and recreation centers more often in CD 14:

51%
People experiencing homelessness there

44%
Lack of public restrooms

40%
Facilities are not well-maintained; Do not know where to go/what is offered

39%
No visible patrolling presence; Too far from our residence



COUNCIL DISTRICT 15

Council District Fifteen (CD 15) represents the southernmost portion of Los Angeles, spanning key coastal and industrial communities. The district plays a vital role in the region's economy due to its proximity to the Port of Los Angeles and significant transportation infrastructure. CD 15 is defined by its working-class character, diverse population, and strong community identity.

The district's parks serve as crucial spaces for recreation, environmental access, and cultural gathering—especially in areas where green space is limited and environmental burdens are high. Residents face persistent challenges related to air quality, industrial pollution, and inadequate tree canopy coverage. Despite these challenges, there is strong community interest in revitalizing parks with improvements to safety, accessibility, and programming. Priorities include climate resilience, increased shade, equitable access to resources, and opportunities for youth and families to gather, play, and thrive.

Population projections for 2050 show slight growing populations in neighborhoods like San Pedro and parts of Harbor Gateway, while neighborhoods like Harbor City and Wilmington are expected to see an overall population decline.


NEIGHBORHOODS IN COUNCIL DISTRICT 15

SAN PEDRO | **WILMINGTON** | **WATTS**

HARBOR CITY | **HARBOR GATEWAY**

PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES

- 109th Street Recreation Center
- Alma Park
- Anderson Memorial Senior Citizen Center
- Angels Gate Park
- Averill Park
- Bandini Canyon Park
- Banning High School Pool
- Banning Park
- Betty F Day Park
- Cabrillo Beach
- Drum Barracks Civil War Museum
- East Wilmington Greenbelt Community Center
- East Wilmington Greenbelt Park
- East Wilmington Vest Pocket Park
- Gaffey Street "Field of Dreams"
- Grigsby Pocket Park
- Harbor City Park
- Harbor Gateway Park
- Harbor Highlands Park
- Harbor View Memorial Park
- Ken Malloy Harbor Regional Park
- Leland Recreation Center
- Lookout Point Park
- Los Angeles Maritime Museum
- Los Angeles Sister Cities Plaza
- Martin J Bogdanovich Recreation Center
- Normandale Recreation Center
- Pacific Region Headquarters
- Peck Park
- Point Fermin Park
- Ralph C Daniels Field Sports Center
- Rena Park
- Rosecrans Recreation Center
- San Pedro Plaza Park
- San Pedro Welcome Park
- South Palos Verdes Street Park
- Watts Cultural Crescent
- Watts Senior Citizen Center
- Watts Serenity Park
- Watts Skate Park
- White Point Park Nature Preserve
- Wilmington Athletic Complex
- Wilmington Recreation Center
- Wilmington Town Square



LEGEND

- City of LA Boundary
- City of LA Parks
- City of LA Neighborhoods
- LA River
- LA County
- Major Road/Highway
- Minor Road

Source: City Boundary and Parks: City of LA Data Portal, 2025. Roads: US Census Bureau, 2025., LA River: National Hydrography Database, 2025.

N

0 1 2 mile

COUNCIL DISTRICT 15

49
City Parks

850
Acres of Parkland

256,368
Residents

82
Sports Fields and Courts


45
Playgrounds

21
Recreation & Community Centers

5
Pools & Splashpads

29%
Average Canopy Coverage in Parks

DEMOGRAPHICS



$69,615
Median HH income

$81,173
Citywide

45,262
Income below poverty level

624,523
Citywide

31.8
Median age

37.5
Citywide

Top 3 languages spoken:

Spanish, English, Other Asian and Pacific Island Language

What we heard..

"It's hard to enjoy the parks when there's no real shade and the pavement radiates heat. We need trees, not just concrete."

"There are days when I worry about letting my kids play outside. The smell from nearby industry makes me question the air quality."

"More trees would make a huge difference. Right now, it feels like you're walking on a frying pan by midday."

"Living near the port means constant noise and diesel pollution. Parks should be places to get relief from that—not be surrounded by it."

"We can't breathe some days—between the trucks, the refineries, and the port traffic, the air feels heavy and dirty."

"It's ironic that a park is supposed to be a green space, but it's just dry turf and pavement."

"The park closest to us feels abandoned at night. You want to feel safe, not anxious, when you're just trying to walk your dog."

"We need shaded spaces—not everyone has air conditioning, and the park is the only place to cool down."


Current and Future Needs: Survey Results

CD 15 respondents feel more positive than the city as a whole about the physical condition of both City of LA parks and recreation centers.

Parks




Rec Centers




Most CD 15 respondents have visited a City of LA park in the past year, while only about half have visited a City of LA recreation center.


Parks



Rec Centers




Walking Distance



Almost two-thirds of CD 15 respondents feel that there are enough parks and/or recreation centers within walking distance of their homes.

Bond Measure



About half of CD 15 respondents support a bond, levy, or tax to fund parks and recreation facilities.

Top 3 Most Important...

Outdoor Facilities

1. Unprogrammed green spaces
2. Paved, multi-use trails
3. Natural areas & wildlife habitats

Indoor Facilities

1. Walking/jogging track
2. Exercise & fitness equipment
3. Swimming pool

Programs

1. Fitness/wellness programs
2. Youth & family; Arts & crafts classes
3. Special events/festivals

Top barriers to visiting parks and recreation centers more often in CD 15:

43%
People experiencing homelessness there


36%
Do not know where to go/what is offered

31%
Too far from our residence

26%
No visible patrolling presence



Figure 69. **Flying over Echo Park Lake.** Source: Calvada Surveying, 2025.



PARKS BY CLASSIFICATION

PARKS BY CLASSIFICATION

MINI PARK

105th Street Pocket Park

111th Place Pocket Park

11th Avenue Park

49th Street Pocket Park

61st Street Pocket Park

6th & Gladys Street Park

76th Street Pocket Park

97th Street Pocket Park

Aliso Triangle

Alvarado Terrace Park

Amistad Park

Amoroso Triangle

Angeles Mesa Park

Arroyo Rosa De Castilla

Arts District Park

Bellaire Avenue Park

Betty F Day Park

Brooklyn Heights Park

Budd Wiener Park

Carlton Way Park

Central Avenue Jazz Park

Circle Park (5th Ave)

Circle Park (S Gramercy Pl)

Cleland Avenue Bicentennial Park

Club Circle Park

Costanso Fire Station 84 Park

Country Club Heritage Park

Crescent Place Triangle

Cypress Park Club House

De Neve Square Park

Dorothy J and Benjamin B Smith Park

Drew Street Park

East Los Angeles Park

East Wilmington Greenbelt Community Center

East Wilmington Vest Pocket Park

El Sereno Community Garden

Everett Park

Fallbrook Park

Fox And Laurel Park

Francis Avenue Community Garden

Franklin-Ivar Park

Fulton Avenue Park

Gage and Avalon Triangle Pocket Park

Gateway Triangle

Genesee Avenue Park

Gladys Jean Wesson Park

Glenhurst Park

Greayer's Oak Park

Greenwood Square Park

Grigsby Pocket Park

Harbor Gateway Park

Hartland Mini-Park

Hoover-Gage Park

Hope and Peace Park

Inell Woods Park

Irving Schacter Park

Julian C Dixon Park

Keswick Park

Kittridge Mini-Park

La Mirada Park

La Tierra de la Culebra

Lacy Street Neighborhood Park

Lanark Shelby Mini-Park

Larissa Parkway

Latham Park

Laurel and Hardy Park

Leslie N Shaw Park

Lexington Avenue Pocket Park

Linnie Canal Park

Little Green Acres Park

Los Angeles Sister Cities Plaza

Lummis Public Forest Park

Madison Avenue Park and Community Garden

Madison West Park

Marco Place Parkway

Marco Triangle

Marson Street Pocket Park

Mascot Park

McKinley Avenue Park

Mecca Avenue Park

Mulholland View Site No 16

Nevin Avenue Park

North San Fernando Park

Nowita Triangle

Orchard Ave Park

Ord And Yale Street Park

Orthopedic Hospital Universal Access Playground

Parque Nativo Lopez

Patton St Pocket Park

Pio Pico Library Pocket Park

Pio Union Community Garden

Richardson Family Park

Rinaldi Park

Rockwood Community Park

Rolland Curtis Park

Ross Valencia Community Park

Saint James Park

San Julian Park

San Pedro Welcome Park

Seily Rodriguez Park

Selma Park

Senator Bill Greene Memorial Park

South Broadway Pocket Park

South Palos Verdes Street Park

South Victoria Avenue Park

Spring Street Park

Titmouse Park

Trask Triangle Park

Triangle Park

Unidad Park

Valencia Triangle

Venice of America Centennial Park

Vermont Gage Park

Vermont Miracle Park

Vernon Branch Library Pocket Park

Via Dolce Park

Vineyard Recreation Center

Wall Street Community Park

Washington Irving Pocket Park

West Adam Heights Park

Western And Gage Community Park

Westwood Gardens Park

William S Hart Park - Dog Park

Wilmington Town Square

Woodbine Park

Woodside Triangle

York Blvd Pocket Park

Yucca Community Center

NEIGHBORHOOD PARK

Andres and Maria Cardenas Recreation Center

Lincoln Heights Youth Center

1st And Broadway Civic Center Park

Albert Piantanida Intergenerational Center

Allegheny Park

Alma Park

Alpine Recreation Center

Anderson Memorial Senior Citizen Center

Benny H Potter West Adams Avenues Memorial Park

Caballero Creek

Confluence Park

Carlin G Smith Recreation Center

Chatsworth Oaks Park Central Recreation Center

Chesterfield Square Park

Chevy Chase Park

City Hall Park

Cohasset-Melba Park

De Longpre Park

Denker Recreation Center

Devonshire Arleta Park

El Paseo De Cahuenga Park

El Sereno Arroyo

Playground

Elysian Valley Recreation Center

Fehlhaber-Houk Park

Fred Roberts Recreation Center

Grand Hope Park

Harbor View Memorial Park

Harold A Henry Park

Hoover Recreation Center

Jessie Owens Mini-Park

Juntos Family Park

Lake Street Park

Las Palmas Senior Citizen Center

Laurel Canyon Mulholland Park

Leimert Plaza

Lincoln Heights Recreation Center

Lookout Point Park

Loren Miller Recreation Center

Los Angeles High Memorial Park

Mae Boyar Recreation Center

Media Park

North East Valley Multipurpose Center

Parthenia Park

Prospect Park

Ramona Hall

NEIGHBORHOOD PARK CONTINUED

Community Center

Rena Park

Reynier Park

Robert L Burns Park

Robertson Recreation Center

Rose Hill Recreation Center

State Street Recreation Center

Taxco Trails Park

Telfair Park

Tiara Street Park

Toberman Recreation Center

Tobias Avenue Park

Tommy Lasorda's Field of Dreams

Trinity Recreation Center

Van Nuys Multipurpose Center

Vista Del Mar Park

Wabash Recreation Center

Watts Senior Citizen Center

Watts Serenity Park

Westminster Park

LARGE NEIGHBORHOOD PARK

109th Street Recreation Center

Augustus F Hawkins Natural Park

Barrington Recreation Center

Bellevue Recreation Center

Bill Rosendahl Del Rey Park

Boyle Heights Sports Center

Buena Vista Park

Castle Peak Park

Culver-Slauson Park

Cypress Recreation Center

David M Gonzales Recreation Center

Dearborn Park

Delano Recreation Center

Devonwood Park

Encino Park

Evergreen Recreation Center

Fernangeles Recreation Center

Garvanza Park

Green Meadows Recreation Center

Guardia Park

Harbor Highlands Park

Highland Park Recreation Center

Highland Park Senior Citizen Center

Hollywood Recreation Center

Holmby Park

Howard Finn Park

Hubert H Humphrey Memorial Park

Jaime Beth Slavin Park

James Slauson Recreation Center

John Quimby Park

Kagel Canyon Park

Lafayette Recreation Center

LAPD SWAT Officer Randal D Simmons Park

Lazy J Ranch Park

Lemon Grove Recreation Center

Lou Costello Jr Recreation Center

Louise Park

Martin Luther King Jr Park

Monsignor Ramon Garcia Recreation Center

Moorpark Park

Mount Carmel Recreation Center

Norman O Houston Park

Normandale Recreation Center

Normandie Recreation Center

North Hills Community Park

Oakwood Recreation Center

Oro Vista Park

Palms Recreation Center

Panorama City Recreation Center

Pecan Recreation Center

Poinsettia Recreation Center

Queen Anne Recreation Center

Ralph C Daniels Field Sports Center

Runnymede Park

Rustic Canyon Recreation Center

Saint Andrews Recreation Center

Sean Brown Park

Seoul International Park

Shatto Recreation Center

Silver Lake Meadows Park

Silver Lake Recreation Center

South LA Wetlands Park

Stoner Recreation Center

Studio City Recreation Center

Tarzana Recreation Center

Van Ness Recreation Center

Van Nuys Recreation Center

Valley Glen Community Park

Vermont Square Park

Victory-Vineland Recreation Center

West Lakeside Street Park

Wilbur-Tampa Park

Wilmington Recreation Center

Woodbridge Park

Zelzah Park

NEIGHBORHOOD NATURE PARK

Eddleston Park

Moon Canyon Park

Mount Olympus Park

COMMUNITY PARK

Algin Sutton Recreation Center

Averill Park

Baldwin Hills Recreation Center

Brand Park

Branford Recreation Center

Briarwood Park

Crestwood Hills Recreation Center

Del Rey Lagoon

Downey Recreation Center

El Sereno Recreation Center

Gaffey Street "Field of Dreams"

Gilbert W Lindsay Recreation Center

Glassell Park Recreation Center and Youth Center

Granada Hills Recreation Center

Granada Hills Youth Recreation Center

Harbor City Park

Holleigh Bernson Memorial Park

Hollenbeck Park

Jackie Tatum / Harvard Recreation Center

Jim Gilliam Recreation Center

Lanark Recreation Center

Leland Recreation Center

Mar Vista Recreation Center

Martin J Bogdanovich Recreation Center

Mason Recreation Center

North Weddington Recreation Center

Palisades Recreation Center

Penmar Recreation Center

Pershing Square

Point Fermin Park

Porter Ridge Park

Roger W Jessup Park

Rosecrans Recreation Center

Ross Snyder Recreation Center

Sepulveda Recreation Center

Shadow Ranch Park

South Park Recreation Center

South Weddington Park

Stonehurst Recreation Center

Strathern Park - North

Sun Valley Park

Sunland Park

Sycamore Grove Park

Sylmar Recreation Center

Van Norman Lakes Reservoir

Vanalden Park

Venice Reservoir Site

Veterans' Barrington Park

Viking Park

Warner Ranch Park

West Hills Sport Center

Wilmington Athletic Complex

Winnetka Recreation Center

Woodland Hills Recreation Center

Yosemite Recreation Center

Sixth Street Viaduct Park

LARGE COMMUNITY PARK

Banning Park

Carey Ranch Park*

Chatsworth Park North*

Cheviot Hills Recreation Center

Eagle Rock Recreation Center

Hazard Recreation Center

Laurel Canyon Park

MacArthur Park

Montecito Heights Recreation Center

Northridge Recreation Center

Pan Pacific Park

Rancho Cienega Park

Reseda Park

Rio de Los Angeles State Park

Ritchie Valens Paxton Recreation Center

Serrania Avenue Park*

Stetson Ranch Park

Valley Plaza Park

Van Nuys Sherman Oaks War Memorial Park

Westchester Recreation Center

Westwood Recreation Center

COMMUNITY NATURE PARK

Caplow Property

Eagle Rock Hillside Park

Palisades Park (Pacific Palisades)

Pilson Property

Rivas Canyon Park

San Vicente Mountain Park

Steers Property

Stoney Point Park

Sullivan Canyon Park

REGIONAL PARK

Arroyo Seco Park

Angels Gate Park

Chatsworth Reservoir Site

Coldwater Canyon Park

Echo Park

Elysian Park

Ernest E Debs Regional Park

EXPO Center

Griffith Park

Hansen Dam Recreation Area

Jane and Bert Boeckmann Park

Ken Malloy Harbor Regional Park

Knapp Ranch Park

Lincoln Park

North Hollywood Recreation Center

Peck Park

Sepulveda Basin Recreation Area

Sheldon-Arleta Park

Tujunga Infiltration Galleries

REGIONAL NATURE PARK

Ascot Hills Park

Bell Canyon Park

Beverly Glen Park

Chatsworth Park South

Corbin Canyon Park

Deervale-Stone Canyon Park

El Escorpion Park

Haines Canyon Park

La Tuna Canyon Park

Mandeville Canyon Park

O'Melveny Park

Roscoe-Valley Circle Park

Rustic Canyon Park

Verdugo Mountain Park

White Point Park Nature Preserve

HISTORIC LANDMARK SITE

Andres Pico Adobe Park

Barnsdall Park

Charles F Lummis Home and Gardens, El Alisal

Drum Barracks Civil War Museum

Eagle Rock City Hall

Eagle Rock Historical Landmark

El Pueblo de Los Angeles Historic Monument

Exposition Park Rose Garden

Little Landers Park

Los Angeles Maritime Museum

McGroarty Park and Cultural Art Center

Oakridge Residence

Orcutt Ranch Horticultural Center

Heritage Square

South Seas House Park

Campo De Cahuenga

GREENWAY

Carthay Circle Park

Hoover Pedestrian Mall

Palisades-Asilomar Park

Strathern Park, West

Tujunga Greenbelt

LA River Greenway - Coldwater to Whitsett

LA River Greenway - Brown's Creek

LA River Greenway - Laurel Canyon reenway

LA River Greenway - Laurelgrove Pedestrian Bridge

LA River Greenway - Mason to Vanalden

LA River Greenway - Sepulveda to Kester

LA River Greenway / Elysian Valley Bikeway

LINEAR PARK

Alizondo Drive Park

Bandini Canyon Park

De Garmo Park

El Dorado Avenue Park

East Wilmington Greenbelt Park

Jacaranda Park

Old Mission Trail

Los Angeles River & Aliso Creek Confluence Park

San Pedro Plaza Park

Watts Cultural Crescent

Westside Neighborhood Park

Whitnall Highway Park

CANYON PARK

Aliso Canyon Park

Bee Canyon Park

Browns Creek Park

George Wolfberg Park at Potrero Canyon

Limekiln Canyon Park

Moonshine Canyon Park

Porter Ranch Park

Palisades Park (Porter Ranch)

Runyon Canyon Park

Santa Ynez Canyon Park

Temescal Canyon Park

Wattles Garden Park

COMMUNITY SCHOOL PARK

Camellia Avenue Elementary School (CSP)

Garden Grove Elementary School (CSP)

Harvard Elementary School (CSP)

Leo Politi Elementary School (CSP)

Mary McLeod Bethune Middle School (CSP)

Northridge Middle School (CSP)

Obama Global Prep Academy (CSP)

Open Magnet Charter School (CSP)

Pio Pico Middle School (CSP)

Ramona Elementary School (CSP)

SCHOOL POOL

Los Angeles Center for Enriched Studies (LACES)

Banning High School Pool

Cleveland High School Pool

Fremont High School Pool

Roosevelt High School Pool

Venice High School Pool

Verdugo Hills Pool

BEACH

Cabrillo Beach

Isidore B Dockweiler State Beach

Venice Beach

Will Rogers State Beach

MOUNTAIN CAMP

Builders Of Youth Camp

Camp High Sierra

Camp Radford

Camp Seely

Camp Valcrest

SINGLE PURPOSE SITE

4206 S Main St Maintenance Yard

Bridewell Armory

Canoga Park Senior Citizen Center

Challengers Boys And Girls Club

Claude Pepper Senior Citizen Center

Echo Park Community Center

Echo Park Deep Pool

El Sereno Senior Citizen Center

Eleanor Green Roberts Aquatic Center

Fairfax Senior Citizen Center

Felicia Mahood Multipurpose Center

Pacific Region Headquarters

Parkview Photo Center

Reseda Skate Facility

San Juan Garage

Sherman Oaks Castle Park

South East Valley Roller & Skateboard Park

South Los Angeles Sports Activity Center

Watts Skate Park

GOLF COURSE

Armand Hammer Golf Course

Balboa Golf Course

Encino Golf Course

Hansen Dam Golf Course

Harbor Park Golf Course

Harding Golf Course

Los Feliz Golf Course

Penmar Golf Course

Rancho Park Golf Course

Roosevelt Golf Course

Wilson Golf Course

Woodley Lakes Golf Course



Figure 70. Skaters at the South East Valley Roller and Skateboard Park. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks.

CURRENT AND FORMER PARK CLASSIFICATIONS

Park Name	New Classification RAP	Former Classification
105th Street Pocket Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
109th Street Recreation Center	Large Neighborhood Park	Community Park
111th Place Pocket Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
11th Avenue Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
1st And Broadway Civic Center Park	Neighborhood Park	Community Park
4206 S Main St Maintenance Yard	Single Purpose Site	Neighborhood Park
49th Street Pocket Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
61st Street Pocket Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
6th & Gladys Street Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
76th Street Pocket Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
97th Street Pocket Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
A. Piantanida Intergenerational Center	Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Algin Sutton Recreation Center	Community Park	Community Park
Aliso Canyon Park	Canyon Park	Regional Park
Aliso Triangle	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Alizondo Drive Park	Linear Park	Neighborhood Park
Allegheny Park	Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park
Alma Park	Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park
Alpine Recreation Center	Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Alvarado Terrace Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Amistad Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Amoroso Triangle	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Anderson Memorial Senior Citizen Center	Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Andres and Maria Cardenas Rec Center	Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Andres Pico Adobe Park	Historic Landmark Site	Regional Park
Angeles Mesa Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Angels Gate Park	Regional Park	Regional Park
Armand Hammer Golf Course	Golf Course	Sub-Park
Arroyo Rosa De Castilla	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Arroyo Seco Park	Regional Park	Neighborhood Park
Arts District Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Ascot Hills Park	Regional Nature Park	Regional Park
Augustus F Hawkins Natural Park	Large Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Averill Park	Community Park	Community Park
B.H. Potter West Adams Ave Mem Park	Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park
Balboa Golf Course	Golf Course	Sub-Park
Baldwin Hills Recreation Center	Community Park	Community Park
Bandini Canyon Park	Linear Park	Neighborhood Park
Banning High School Pool	School Pool	Community Park
Banning Park	Large Community Park	Community Park
Barnsdall Park	Historic Landmark Site	Community Park
Barrington Recreation Center	Large Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Bee Canyon Park	Canyon Park	Neighborhood Park
Bell Canyon Park	Regional Nature Park	Regional Park
Bellaire Avenue Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Bellevue Recreation Center	Large Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Betty F Day Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Beverly Glen Park	Regional Nature Park	Regional Park
Bill Rosendahl Del Rey Park	Large Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Boyle Heights Sports Center	Large Neighborhood Park	Community Park

Park Name	New Classification RAP	Former Classification
Brand Park	Community Park	Community Park
Branford Recreation Center	Community Park	Community Park
Briarwood Park	Community Park	Neighborhood Park
Bridewell Armory	Single Purpose Site	Neighborhood Park
Brooklyn Heights Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Browns Creek Park	Canyon Park	Regional Park
Budd Wiener Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Buena Vista Park	Large Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park
Builders Of Youth Camp	Mountain Camp	Regional Park
Caballero Creek Confluence Park	Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park
Cabrillo Beach	Beach	Regional Park
Camellia Ave Elementary School (CSP)	Community School Park	Neighborhood Park
Camp High Sierra	Mountain Camp	Regional Park
Camp Radford	Mountain Camp	Regional Park
Camp Seely	Mountain Camp	Regional Park
Camp Valcrest	Mountain Camp	Regional Park
Campo De Cahuenga	Historic Landmark Site	Regional Park
Canoga Park Senior Citizen Center	Single Purpose Site	Community Park
Caplow Property	Community Nature Park	Regional Park
Carey Ranch Park*	Large Community Park	Neighborhood Park
Carlin G Smith Recreation Center	Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Carlton Way Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Carthay Circle Park	Greenway	Neighborhood Park
Castle Peak Park	Large Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park
Central Avenue Jazz Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Central Recreation Center	Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Challengers Boys And Girls Club	Single Purpose Site	Community Park
C.F. Lummis Home and Gardens, El Alisal	Historic Landmark Site	Regional Park
Chatsworth Oaks Park	Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park
Chatsworth Park North*	Large Community Park	Community Park
Chatsworth Park South	Regional Nature Park	Community Park
Chatsworth Reservoir Site	Regional Park	Regional Park
Chesterfield Square Park	Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park
Cheviot Hills Recreation Center	Large Community Park	Community Park
Chevy Chase Park	Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Circle Park (5th Ave)	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Circle Park (S Gramercy Pl)	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
City Hall Park	Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park
Claude Pepper Senior Citizen Center	Single Purpose Site	Community Park
Cleland Avenue Bicentennial Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Cleveland High School Pool	School Pool	Community Park
Club Circle Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Cohasset-Melba Park	Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park
Coldwater Canyon Park	Regional Park	Regional Park
Corbin Canyon Park	Regional Nature Park	Regional Park
Costanso Fire Station 84 Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Country Club Heritage Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Crescent Place Triangle	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Crestwood Hills Recreation Center	Community Park	Community Park
Culver-Slauson Park	Large Neighborhood Park	Community Park

Park Name	New Classification RAP	Former Classification
Cypress Park Club House	Mini Park	Community Park
Cypress Recreation Center	Large Neighborhood Park	Community Park
David M Gonzales Recreation Center	Large Neighborhood Park	Community Park
De Garmo Park	Linear Park	Neighborhood Park
De Longpre Park	Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park
De Neve Square Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Dearborn Park	Large Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park
Deervale-Stone Canyon Park	Regional Nature Park	Regional Park
Del Rey Lagoon	Community Park	Community Park
Delano Recreation Center	Large Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Denker Recreation Center	Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Devonshire Arleta Park	Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park
Devonwood Park	Large Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park
Dorothy J and Benjamin B Smith Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Downey Recreation Center	Community Park	Community Park
Drew Street Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Drum Barracks Civil War Museum	Historic Landmark Site	Regional Park
Eagle Rock City Hall	Historic Landmark Site	Neighborhood Park
Eagle Rock Hillside Park	Community Nature Park	Regional Park
Eagle Rock Historical Landmark	Historic Landmark Site	Neighborhood Park
Eagle Rock Recreation Center	Large Community Park	Community Park
East Los Angeles Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
East Wilmington Greenbelt Com Center	Mini Park	Community Park
East Wilmington Greenbelt Park	Linear Park	Neighborhood Park
East Wilmington Vest Pocket Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Echo Park	Regional Park	Community Park
Echo Park Community Center	Single Purpose Site	Neighborhood Park
Echo Park Deep Pool	Single Purpose Site	Community Park
Eddleston Park	Neighborhood Nature Park	Regional Park
El Dorado Avenue Park	Linear Park	Neighborhood Park
El Escorpion Park	Regional Nature Park	Regional Park
El Paseo De Cahuenga Park	Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park
El Pueblo de LA Historic Monument	Historic Landmark Site	Neighborhood Park
El Sereno Arroyo Playground	Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park
El Sereno Community Garden	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
El Sereno Recreation Center	Community Park	Community Park
El Sereno Senior Citizen Center	Single Purpose Site	Community Park
Eleanor Green Roberts Aquatic Center	Single Purpose Site	Community Park
Elysian Park	Regional Park	Regional Park
Elysian Valley Recreation Center	Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Encino Golf Course	Golf Course	Sub-Park
Encino Park	Large Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Ernest E Debs Regional Park	Regional Park	Regional Park
Everett Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Evergreen Recreation Center	Large Neighborhood Park	Community Park
EXPO Center	Regional Park	Community Park
Exposition Park Rose Garden	Historic Landmark Site	Regional Park
Fairfax Senior Citizen Center	Single Purpose Site	Community Park
Fallbrook Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Fehlhaber-Houk Park	Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park

Park Name	New Classification RAP	Former Classification
Felicia Mahood Multipurpose Center	Single Purpose Site	Community Park
Fernangeles Recreation Center	Large Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Fox And Laurel Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Francis Avenue Community Garden	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Franklin-Ivar Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Fred Roberts Recreation Center	Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Fremont High School Pool	School Pool	Community Park
Fulton Avenue Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Gaffey Street "Field of Dreams"	Community Park	Community Park
Gage and Avalon Triangle Pocket Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Garden Grove Elementary School (CSP)	Community School Park	Neighborhood Park
Garvanza Park	Large Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Gateway Triangle	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Genesee Avenue Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
George Wolfberg Park at Potrero Canyon	Canyon Park	Community Park
Gilbert W Lindsay Recreation Center	Community Park	Community Park
Gladys Jean Wesson Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Glassell Park Rec Center + Youth Center	Community Park	Community Park
Glenhurst Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Granada Hills Recreation Center	Community Park	Community Park
Granada Hills Youth Recreation Center	Community Park	Community Park
Grand Hope Park	Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park
Greayer's Oak Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Green Meadows Recreation Center	Large Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Greenwood Square Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Griffith Park	Regional Park	Regional Park
Grigsby Pocket Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Guardia Park	Large Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Haines Canyon Park	Regional Nature Park	Regional Park
Hansen Dam Golf Course	Golf Course	Sub-Park
Hansen Dam Recreation Area	Regional Park	Regional Park
Harbor City Park	Community Park	Community Park
Harbor Gateway Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Harbor Highlands Park	Large Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park
Harbor Park Golf Course	Golf Course	Sub-Park
Harbor View Memorial Park	Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park
Harding Golf Course	Golf Course	Sub-Park
Harold A Henry Park	Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park
Hartland Mini-Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Harvard Elementary School (CSP)	Community School Park	Neighborhood Park
Hazard Recreation Center	Large Community Park	Community Park
Heritage Square	Historic Landmark Site	Regional Park
Highland Park Recreation Center	Large Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Highland Park Senior Citizen Center	Large Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Holleigh Bernson Memorial Park	Community Park	Community Park
Hollenbeck Park	Community Park	Community Park
Hollywood Recreation Center	Large Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Holmby Park	Large Neighborhood Park	Regional Park
Hoover Pedestrian Mall	Greenway	Neighborhood Park
Hoover Recreation Center	Neighborhood Park	Community Park

Park Name	New Classification RAP	Former Classification
Leo Politi Elementary School (CSP)	Community School Park	Neighborhood Park
Leslie N Shaw Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Lexington Avenue Pocket Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Limekiln Canyon Park	Canyon Park	Regional Park
Lincoln Heights Recreation Center	Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Lincoln Heights Youth Center	Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Lincoln Park	Regional Park	Community Park
Linnie Canal Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Little Green Acres Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Little Landers Park	Historic Landmark Site	Regional Park
Lookout Point Park	Neighborhood Park	Regional Park
Loren Miller Recreation Center	Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Los Angeles High Memorial Park	Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park
Los Angeles Maritime Museum	Historic Landmark Site	Regional Park
Los Angeles Sister Cities Plaza	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Los Feliz Golf Course	Golf Course	Sub-Park
Lou Costello Jr Recreation Center	Large Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Louise Park	Large Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park
Lummis Public Forest Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
MacArthur Park	Large Community Park	Community Park
Madison Ave Park and Com Garden	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Madison West Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Mae Boyar Recreation Center	Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park
Mandeville Canyon Park	Regional Nature Park	Regional Park
Mar Vista Recreation Center	Community Park	Community Park
Marco Place Parkway	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Marco Triangle	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Marson Street Pocket Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Martin J Bogdanovich Rec Center	Community Park	Community Park
Martin Luther King Jr Park	Large Neighborhood Park	Community Park
M.M. Bethune Middle School (CSP)	Community School Park	Neighborhood Park
Mascot Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Mason Recreation Center	Community Park	Community Park
McGroarty Park and Cultural Art Center	Historic Landmark Site	Community Park
McKinley Avenue Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Mecca Avenue Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Media Park	Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park
Monsignor Ramon Garcia Rec Center	Large Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Montecito Heights Recreation Center	Large Community Park	Community Park
Moon Canyon Park	Neighborhood Nature Park	Neighborhood Park
Moonshine Canyon Park	Canyon Park	Regional Park
Moorpark Park	Large Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park
Mount Carmel Recreation Center	Large Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Mount Olympus Park	Neighborhood Nature Park	Neighborhood Park
Mulholland View Site No 16	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Nevin Avenue Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Norman O Houston Park	Large Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park
Normandale Recreation Center	Large Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Normandie Recreation Center	Large Neighborhood Park	Community Park
North East Valley Multipurpose Center	Neighborhood Park	Community Park

Park Name	New Classification RAP	Former Classification
Rancho Park Golf Course	Golf Course	Sub-Park
Rena Park	Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park
Reseda Park	Large Community Park	Community Park
Reseda Skate Facility	Single Purpose Site	Community Park
Reynier Park	Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park
Richardson Family Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Rinaldi Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Rio de Los Angeles State Park	Large Community Park	Community Park
Ritchie Valens Paxton Rec Center	Large Community Park	Community Park
Rivas Canyon Park	Community Nature Park	Regional Park
Robert L Burns Park	Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park
Robertson Recreation Center	Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Rockwood Community Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Roger W Jessup Park	Community Park	Neighborhood Park
Rolland Curtis Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Roosevelt Golf Course	Golf Course	Sub-Park
Roosevelt High School Pool	School Pool	Community Park
Roscoe-Valley Circle Park	Regional Nature Park	Regional Park
Rose Hill Recreation Center	Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Rosecrans Recreation Center	Community Park	Community Park
Ross Snyder Recreation Center	Community Park	Community Park
Ross Valencia Community Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Runnymede Park	Large Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park
Runyon Canyon Park	Canyon Park	Regional Park
Rustic Canyon Park	Regional Nature Park	Regional Park
Rustic Canyon Recreation Center	Large Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Saint Andrews Recreation Center	Large Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Saint James Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
San Juan Garage	Single Purpose Site	Neighborhood Park
San Julian Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
San Pedro Plaza Park	Linear Park	Neighborhood Park
San Pedro Welcome Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
San Vicente Mountain Park	Community Nature Park	Regional Park
Santa Ynez Canyon Park	Canyon Park	Regional Park
SE Valley Roller & Skateboard Park	Single Purpose Site	Neighborhood Park
Sean Brown Park	Large Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park
Seily Rodriguez Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Selma Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Senator Bill Greene Memorial Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Seoul International Park	Large Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Sepulveda Basin Recreation Area	Regional Park	Regional Park
Sepulveda Recreation Center	Community Park	Community Park
Serrania Avenue Park*	Large Community Park	Neighborhood Park
Shadow Ranch Park	Community Park	Community Park
Shatto Recreation Center	Large Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Sheldon-Arleta Park	Regional Park	Community Park
Sherman Oaks Castle Park	Single Purpose Site	Regional Park
Silver Lake Meadows Park	Large Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park
Silver Lake Recreation Center	Large Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Sixth Street Viaduct Park	Community Park	Community Park

Park Name	New Classification RAP	Former Classification
South Broadway Pocket Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
South LA Sports Activity Center	Single Purpose Site	Community Park
South LA Wetlands Park	Large Neighborhood Park	Community Park
South Palos Verdes Street Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
South Park Recreation Center	Community Park	Community Park
South Seas House Park	Historic Landmark Site	Community Park
South Victoria Avenue Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
South Weddington Park	Community Park	Community Park
Spring Street Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
State Street Recreation Center	Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Steers Property	Community Nature Park	Regional Park
Stetson Ranch Park	Large Community Park	Community Park
Stonehurst Recreation Center	Community Park	Community Park
Stoner Recreation Center	Large Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Stoney Point Park	Community Nature Park	Regional Park
Strathern Park - North	Community Park	Community Park
Strathern Park, West	Greenway	Neighborhood Park
Studio City Recreation Center	Large Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Sullivan Canyon Park	Community Nature Park	Regional Park
Sun Valley Park	Community Park	Community Park
Sunland Park	Community Park	Community Park
Sycamore Grove Park	Community Park	Community Park
Sylmar Recreation Center	Community Park	Community Park
Tarzana Recreation Center	Large Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Taxco Trails Park	Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park
Telfair Park	Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park
Temescal Canyon Park	Canyon Park	Community Park
Tiara Street Park	Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Titmouse Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Toberman Recreation Center	Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Tobias Avenue Park	Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park
Tommy Lasorda's Field of Dreams	Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Trask Triangle Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Triangle Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Trinity Recreation Center	Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Tujunga Greenbelt	Greenway	Neighborhood Park
Tujunga Infiltration Galleries	Regional Park	Community Park
Unidad Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Valencia Triangle	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Valley Glen Community Park	Large Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park
Valley Plaza Park	Large Community Park	Community Park
Van Ness Recreation Center	Large Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Van Norman Lakes Reservoir	Community Park	Community Park
Van Nuys Multipurpose Center	Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Van Nuys Recreation Center	Large Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Van Nuys Sherman Oaks War Mem. Park	Large Community Park	Community Park
Vanalden Park	Community Park	Community Park
Venice Beach	Beach	Regional Park
Venice High School Pool	School Pool	Community Park
Venice of America Centennial Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park

Park Name	New Classification RAP	Former Classification
Venice Reservoir Site	Community Park	Community Park
Verdugo Hills Pool	School Pool	Community Park
Verdugo Mountain Park	Regional Nature Park	Regional Park
Vermont Gage Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Vermont Miracle Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Vermont Square Park	Large Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park
Vernon Branch Library Pocket Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Veterans' Barrington Park	Community Park	Community Park
Via Dolce Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Victory-Vineland Recreation Center	Large Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Viking Park	Community Park	Neighborhood Park
Vineyard Recreation Center	Mini Park	Community Park
Vista Del Mar Park	Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park
Wabash Recreation Center	Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Wall Street Community Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Warner Ranch Park	Community Park	Community Park
Washington Irving Pocket Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Wattles Garden Park	Canyon Park	Regional Park
Watts Cultural Crescent	Linear Park	Neighborhood Park
Watts Senior Citizen Center	Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Watts Serenity Park	Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park
Watts Skate Park	Single Purpose Site	Community Park
West Adam Heights Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
West Hills Sport Center	Community Park	Community Park
West Lakeside Street Park	Large Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Westchester Recreation Center	Large Community Park	Community Park
Western And Gage Community Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Westminster Park	Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park
Westside Neighborhood Park	Linear Park	Neighborhood Park
Westwood Gardens Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Westwood Recreation Center	Large Community Park	Community Park
White Point Park Nature Preserve	Regional Nature Park	Regional Park
Whitnall Highway Park	Linear Park	Neighborhood Park
Wilbur-Tampa Park	Large Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park
Will Rogers State Beach	Beach	Regional Park
William S Hart Park - Dog Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Wilmington Athletic Complex	Community Park	Community Park
Wilmington Recreation Center	Large Neighborhood Park	Community Park
Wilmington Town Square	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Wilson Golf Course	Golf Course	Sub-Park
Winnetka Recreation Center	Community Park	Community Park
Woodbine Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Woodbridge Park	Large Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park
Woodland Hills Recreation Center	Community Park	Community Park
Woodley Lakes Golf Course	Golf Course	Sub-Park
Woodside Triangle	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
York Blvd Pocket Park	Mini Park	Neighborhood Park
Yosemite Recreation Center	Community Park	Community Park
Yucca Community Center	Mini Park	Community Park
Zelzah Park	Large Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood Park




Figure 71. Flying over O'Melveny Park in the San Fernando Valley. Source: Calvada Surveying Inc. 2025.



TOP THREE SITES BY CLASSIFICATION


TOP RANKED **MINI PARKS**

11TH AVENUE PARK




Overall Rank: **#1**
Overall Priority Group: **1st**
Council District: **8**
Region: **South**
Acres: **0.21**

SAINT JAMES PARK



Overall Rank: **#2**
Overall Priority Group: **1st**
Council District: **1**
Region: **Cen/East**
Acres: **0.90**


SAN JULIAN PARK



Overall Rank: **#3**
Overall Priority Group: **1st**
Council District: **14**
Region: **Cen/East**
Acres: **0.29**


TOP RANKED **NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS**

CABALLERO CREEK CONFLUENCE PARK




Overall Rank: **#28**
Overall Priority Group: **2nd**
Council District: **3**
Region: **North**
Acres: **1.53**

TOBERMAN RECREATION CENTER



Overall Rank: **#35**
Overall Priority Group: **2nd**
Council District: **1**
Region: **Cen/East**
Acres: **2.74**


WABASH RECREATION CENTER



Overall Rank: **#42**
Overall Priority Group: **2nd**
Council District: **14**
Region: **Cen/East**
Acres: **1.87**

TOP RANKED **LARGE NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS**

LOU COSTELLO JR RECREATION CENTER



Overall Rank: **#63**
Overall Priority Group: **2nd**
Council District: **14**
Region: **Cen/East**
Acres: **3.46**

PECAN RECREATION CENTER



Overall Rank: **#68**
Overall Priority Group: **2nd**
Council District: **14**
Region: **Cen/East**
Acres: **4.28**


NORMANDIE RECREATION CENTER



Overall Rank: **#75**
Overall Priority Group: **2nd**
Council District: **1**
Region: **Cen/East**
Acres: **3.27**


TOP RANKED **NEIGHBORHOOD NATURE PARKS**

MOUNT OLYMPUS PARK




Overall Rank: **#262**
Overall Priority Group: **3rd**
Council District: **1**
Region: **Cen/East**
Acres: **8.91**

MOON CANYON PARK



Overall Rank: **#420**
Overall Priority Group: **4th**
Council District: **1**
Region: **Cen/East**
Acres: **4.49**


EDDLESTON PARK



Overall Rank: **#445**
Overall Priority Group: **4th**
Council District: **12**
Region: **North**
Acres: **6.31**


TOP RANKED **COMMUNITY PARK**

SIXTH STREET VIADUCT PARK



Overall Rank: **#16**
Overall Priority Group: **1st**
Council District: **14**
Region: **Cen/East**
Acres: **12.52**

PERSHING SQUARE



Overall Rank: **#118**
Overall Priority Group: **2nd**
Council District: **14**
Region: **Cen/East**
Acres: **4.44**


HOLLENBECK PARK



Overall Rank: **#125**
Overall Priority Group: **2nd**
Council District: **14**
Region: **Cen/East**
Acres: **18.30**


TOP RANKED **LARGE COMMUNITY PARK**

HAZARD RECREATION CENTER




Overall Rank: **#37**
Overall Priority Group: **2nd**
Council District: **14**
Region: **Cen/East**
Acres: **24.99**

MACARTHUR PARK



Overall Rank: **#95**
Overall Priority Group: **2nd**
Council District: **1**
Region: **Cen/East**
Acres: **29.87**


RESEDA PARK



Overall Rank: **#109**
Overall Priority Group: **2nd**
Council District: **3**
Region: **North**
Acres: **29.68**


TOP RANKED **COMMUNITY NATURE PARK**

CAPLOW PROPERTY




Overall Rank: **#372**
Overall Priority Group: **4th**
Council District: **3**
Region: **North**
Acres: **16.96**

STONEY POINT PARK



Overall Rank: **#387**
Overall Priority Group: **4th**
Council District: **12**
Region: **North**
Acres: **29.06**


EAGLE ROCK HILLSIDE PARK



Overall Rank: **#393**
Overall Priority Group: **4th**
Council District: **14**
Region: **Cen/East**
Acres: **27.58**


TOP RANKED **REGIONAL PARK**

EXPO CENTER




Overall Rank: **#64**
Overall Priority Group: **2nd**
Council District: **9**
Region: **South**
Acres: **6.65**

ELYSIAN PARK



Overall Rank: **#91**
Overall Priority Group: **2nd**
Council District: **1**
Region: **Cen/East**
Acres: **547.54**


LINCOLN PARK



Overall Rank: **#111**
Overall Priority Group: **2nd**
Council District: **14**
Region: **Cen/East**
Acres: **42.81**


TOP RANKED **REGIONAL NATURE PARKS**

WHITE POINT PARK NATURE PRESERVE




Overall Rank: **#217**
Overall Priority Group: **3rd**
Council District: **15**
Region: **South**
Acres: **95.00**

ASCOT HILLS PARK



Overall Rank: **#218**
Overall Priority Group: **3rd**
Council District: **14**
Region: **Cen/East**
Acres: **92.44**


CHATSWORTH PARK SOUTH



Overall Rank: **#327**
Overall Priority Group: **3rd**
Council District: **12**
Region: **North**
Acres: **73.07**

TOP RANKED **HISTORIC LANDMARK SITES**

EL PUEBLO DE LA HISTORIC MONUMENT



Overall Rank: **#77**
Overall Priority Group: **2nd**
Council District: **14**
Region: **Cen/East**
Acres: **2.03**

LOS ANGELES MARITIME MUSEUM



Overall Rank: **#103**
Overall Priority Group: **2nd**
Council District: **15**
Region: **South**
Acres: **2.48**


EXPOSITION PARK ROSE GARDEN



Overall Rank: **#124**
Overall Priority Group: **2nd**
Council District: **9**
Region: **South**
Acres: **10.39**


TOP RANKED **GREENWAYS**

LAR GREENWAY - MASON TO VANALDEN




Overall Rank: **#13**
Overall Priority Group: **1st**
Council District: **3**
Region: **North**
Acres: **6.22**

HOOVER PEDESTRIAN MALL



Overall Rank: **#141**
Overall Priority Group: **2nd**
Council District: **9**
Region: **South**
Acres: **2.16**


STRATHERN PARK, WEST



Overall Rank: **#154**
Overall Priority Group: **2nd**
Council District: **2**
Region: **North**
Acres: **9.38**


TOP RANKED **LINEAR PARKS**

JACARANDA PARK




Overall Rank: **#90**
Overall Priority Group: **2nd**
Council District: **8**
Region: **South**
Acres: **5.35**

LAR & ALISO CREEK CONFLUENCE PARK



Overall Rank: **#156**
Overall Priority Group: **2nd**
Council District: **3**
Region: **North**
Acres: **2.59**


BANDINI CANYON PARK



Overall Rank: **#174**
Overall Priority Group: **3rd**
Council District: **15**
Region: **South**
Acres: **4.97**


TOP RANKED **CANYON PARKS**

LIMEKILN CANYON PARK




Overall Rank: **#282**
Overall Priority Group: **3rd**
Council District: **12**
Region: **North**
Acres: **95.78**

RUNYON CANYON PARK



Overall Rank: **#333**
Overall Priority Group: **3rd**
Council District: **4**
Region: **North**
Acres: **141.50**


BROWNS CREEK PARK



Overall Rank: **#366**
Overall Priority Group: **4th**
Council District: **12**
Region: **North**
Acres: **51.99**


TOP RANKED **COMMUNITY SCHOOL PARKS**

LEO POLITI ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (CSP)




Overall Rank: **#20**
Overall Priority Group: **1st**
Council District: **1**
Region: **Cen/East**
Acres: **2.02**

CAMELLIA AVENUE ELEM SCHOOL (CSP)



Overall Rank: **#70**
Overall Priority Group: **2nd**
Council District: **2**
Region: **North**
Acres: **2.37**

OBAMA GLOBAL PREP ACADEMY (CSP)



Overall Rank: **#83**
Overall Priority Group: **2nd**
Council District: **8**
Region: **South**
Acres: **3.00**


TOP RANKED **SCHOOL POOLS**

FREMONT HIGH SCHOOL POOL



Overall Rank: **#36**
Overall Priority Group: **2nd**
Council District: **9**
Region: **South**
Acres: **0.64**

ROOSEVELT HIGH SCHOOL POOL



Overall Rank: **#123**
Overall Priority Group: **2nd**
Council District: **14**
Region: **Cen/East**
Acres: **1.49**


BANNING HIGH SCHOOL POOL



Overall Rank: **#253**
Overall Priority Group: **3rd**
Council District: **15**
Region: **South**
Acres: **0.52**

TOP RANKED **BEACHES**

CABRILLO BEACH



Overall Rank: **#180**
Overall Priority Group: **3rd**
Council District: **15**
Region: **South**
Acres: **40.07**

ISIDORE B DOCKWEILER STATE BEACH



Overall Rank: **#181**
Overall Priority Group: **3rd**
Council District: **11**
Region: **West**
Acres: **228.31**


VENICE BEACH



Overall Rank: **#281**
Overall Priority Group: **3rd**
Council District: **11**
Region: **West**
Acres: **160.75**


TOP RANKED **SINGLE PURPOSE SITES**

PARKVIEW PHOTO CENTER



Overall Rank: **#34**
Overall Priority Group: **2nd**
Council District: **1**
Region: **Cen/East**
Acres: **0.96**

ECHO PARK COMMUNITY CENTER



Overall Rank: **#61**
Overall Priority Group: **2nd**
Council District: **1**
Region: **Cen/East**
Acres: **0.29**


RESEDA SKATE FACILITY



Overall Rank: **#105**
Overall Priority Group: **2nd**
Council District: **3**
Region: **North**
Acres: **2.28**


TOP RANKED **NEW PARK PRIORITY AREAS**

PERSQUAREMILE - UNIVERSITY PARK NORTH




Overall Rank: **#6**
Overall Priority Group: **1st**
Council District: **1**
Region: **Cen/East**
Acres: **3.00**

PERSQUAREMILE - WESTLAKE



Overall Rank: **#7**
Overall Priority Group: **1st**
Council District: **1**
Region: **Cen/East**
Acres: **3.00**

PERSQUAREMILE - WESTLAKE-KOREATOWN



Overall Rank: **#9**
Overall Priority Group: **1st**
Council District: **1**
Region: **Cen/East**
Acres: **3.00**



Figure 72. Flying over Griffith Observatory within Griffith Park. Source: Calvada Surveying, 2025..




Figure 73. Flying over Ken Malloy Harbor Park. Source: Calvada Surveying, 2025.



ADDITIONAL SITE PLANNING GUIDELINES

GUIDELINES FOR MINI PARK



DESIGN

- [x] SYSTEM-WIDE DESIGN LANGUAGE
- [x] DESIGN VOCABULARY
- [x] COHESIVE SITE LAYOUT
- [ ] PARK CORE
- [ ] INDOOR-OUTDOOR CONNECTIONS
- [x] NATIVE PLANTING VARIETY
- [x] PARK USER EQUITY
- [x] CULTURAL/HISTORIC FEATURES
- [x] WATER CONSERVATION
- [ ] FIRE RISK REDUCTION

CONTEXT

- [ ] PARK SUPPORTIVE USES
- [x] BUILDING FRONTAGE
- [ ] COUNTY / REGIONAL PARKS PROPERTY
- [x] PUBLIC PROPERTY/INSTITUTIONAL
- [x] STREETSCAPE ENHANCEMENTS

CONNECTIVITY

- [x] STREET GRID CONNECTIVITY
- [x] SEAMLESS PUBLIC SPACE
- [ ] TRAIL MODE SEPARATION
- [ ] LOOP TRAIL
- [x] INTERNAL WALKING TRAIL
- [ ] TRAIL CONNECTION
- [x] SAFE ROUTES / PASSAGES

WAYFINDING

- [x] GATEWAYS (PRIMARY/SECONDARY)
- [ ] PATH HIERARCHY
- [x] UNIVERSAL WAYFINDING SIGNAGE

TYPICAL AMENITIES

UNIVERSAL ELEMENTS IN ALL ZONES

Seating, Shade, Identity Features, Low Impact Development BMPs, Lighting

IU INTENSIVE USE

Outdoor Event Space, Group Picnic Area, Restroom, Dog Park, Community Garden

PG PROGRAMMABLE GATHERING

Park Shelter, Tiered Seating

RE RECREATION

Outdoor Fitness Equipment, Creative Play Attraction, Playground, Rectangular Field, Diamond Field, Basketball Court, Tennis / Pickleball Court, Volleyball Court, Water Play, Pool

CU CASUAL USE

Individual Picnic Area, Casual Use Space, Internal Walking Trail, Shade Structure

NA NATURAL


Stormwater Management, Natural Space, Unique Landscape Feature

INFRASTRUCTURE


Bike Parking, Transit Stop, Shared Parking, On-Site Parking, Safe Crossings, Comfort Facility, Maintenance Facility, Pickup/ Dropoff, Regional Water Partnerships

GUIDELINES FOR MINI PARK - ARCHITECTURE

SAMPLE OUTCOME(S)



(2) SMALL



(2) SMALL



(1) SMALL




(2) SMALL

DESIGN PRINCIPLES

- ☐ PROGRAMMING
- ☐ INTEGRATION WITH THE LANDSCAPE
- ☐ DESIGN EXCELLENCE
- ☐ MATERIAL STRATEGIES
- ☐ ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY
- ☑ **ACCESSIBILITY & EQUITY**

ARCHITECTURAL RECIPES

MINI PARK (<1 ACRE)




Sculpture *(varies)* | Interpretive Display *(varies)* | Shade Structure *480 sf* | Mural *500 sf*

(0-2) SMALL ELEMENTS

TYPICAL ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS

SMALL ELEMENTS

(<1,000 SF)



Memorial *(varies)* | **Sculpture** *(varies)* | **Interpretive Display** *(varies)* | Storage Container *160 sf*

Restroom Pavilion *400 sf* | **Shade Structure** *480 sf* | **Mural** *500 sf* | Folly/ Monument *600 sf*

Bandshell *800 sf* | Picnic Shelter *800 sf*

MEDIUM ELEMENTS

(1,000 - 6,000 SF)

Greenhouse *1,000 sf* | Concession Stand *1,000 sf* | Visitor Info. Center *4,000 sf* | Art Gallery *4,000 sf*

Nature Center *6,000 sf* | Amphitheater (outdoor) *6,000 sf*


LARGE ELEMENTS

(>6,000 SF)

Wildlife Center *7,000 sf* | Museum *8,000 sf* | Maintenance Facility *8,000 sf* | Childcare Center *10,000 sf*

Equestrian Center *12,000 sf* | Senior Center *12,000 sf* | Recreation Center *18,000 sf*

GUIDELINES FOR NEIGHBORHOOD PARK



DESIGN

- [x] SYSTEM-WIDE DESIGN LANGUAGE
- [x] DESIGN VOCABULARY
- [x] COHESIVE SITE LAYOUT
- [x] PARK CORE
- [x] INDOOR-OUTDOOR CONNECTIONS
- [x] NATIVE PLANTING VARIETY
- [x] PARK USER EQUITY
- [x] CULTURAL/HISTORIC FEATURES
- [x] WATER CONSERVATION
- [ ] FIRE RISK REDUCTION

CONTEXT

- [ ] PARK SUPPORTIVE USES
- [x] BUILDING FRONTAGE
- [ ] COUNTY / REGIONAL PARKS PROPERTY
- [x] PUBLIC PROPERTY/INSTITUTIONAL
- [x] STREETSCAPE ENHANCEMENTS

CONNECTIVITY

- [x] STREET GRID CONNECTIVITY
- [x] SEAMLESS PUBLIC SPACE
- [ ] TRAIL MODE SEPARATION
- [ ] LOOP TRAIL
- [x] INTERNAL WALKING TRAIL
- [ ] TRAIL CONNECTION
- [x] SAFE ROUTES / PASSAGES

WAYFINDING

- [x] GATEWAYS (PRIMARY/SECONDARY)
- [ ] PATH HIERARCHY
- [x] UNIVERSAL WAYFINDING SIGNAGE

TYPICAL AMENITIES

UNIVERSAL ELEMENTS IN ALL ZONES

Seating, Shade, Identity Features, Low Impact Development BMPs, Lighting

IU INTENSIVE USE

Outdoor Event Space, Group Picnic Area, Restroom, Dog Park, Community Garden

PG PROGRAMMABLE GATHERING

Park Shelter, Tiered Seating

RE RECREATION

Outdoor Fitness Equipment, Creative Play Attraction, Playground, Rectangular Field, Diamond Field, Basketball Court, Tennis / Pickleball Court, Volleyball Court, Water Play, Pool

CU CASUAL USE

Individual Picnic Area, Casual Use Space, Internal Walking Trail, Shade Structure

NA NATURAL

Stormwater Management, Natural Space, Unique Landscape Feature

INFRASTRUCTURE

Bike Parking, Transit Stop, Shared Parking, On-Site Parking, Safe Crossings, Comfort Facility, Maintenance Facility, Pickup/ Dropoff, Regional Water Partnerships

GUIDELINES FOR NEIGHBORHOOD PARK - ARCHITECTURE

SAMPLE OUTCOME(S)

Folly/ Monument
600 sf






Storage Container
160 sf

(2) SMALL



(2) SMALL



(3) SMALL




(1) SMALL

DESIGN PRINCIPLES

- [x] **PROGRAMMING**
- [x] **INTEGRATION WITH THE LANDSCAPE**
- [x] **DESIGN EXCELLENCE**
- [x] **MATERIAL STRATEGIES**
- [x] **ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY**
- [x] **ACCESSIBILITY & EQUITY**

ARCHITECTURAL RECIPES

NEIGHBORHOOD PARK (1-3 ACRES)




(1-3) SMALL ELEMENTS

TYPICAL ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS

SMALL ELEMENTS

(<1,000 SF)




MEDIUM ELEMENTS

(1,000 - 6,000 SF)

LARGE ELEMENTS

(>6,000 SF)

GUIDELINES FOR LARGE NEIGHBORHOOD PARK



DESIGN

- [x] SYSTEM-WIDE DESIGN LANGUAGE
- [x] DESIGN VOCABULARY
- [x] COHESIVE SITE LAYOUT
- [x] PARK CORE
- [x] INDOOR-OUTDOOR CONNECTIONS
- [x] NATIVE PLANTING VARIETY
- [x] PARK USER EQUITY
- [x] CULTURAL/HISTORIC FEATURES
- [x] WATER CONSERVATION
- [ ] FIRE RISK REDUCTION

CONTEXT

- [ ] PARK SUPPORTIVE USES
- [x] BUILDING FRONTAGE
- [ ] COUNTY / REGIONAL PARKS PROPERTY
- [x] PUBLIC PROPERTY/INSTITUTIONAL
- [x] STREETSCAPE ENHANCEMENTS

CONNECTIVITY

- [x] STREET GRID CONNECTIVITY
- [x] SEAMLESS PUBLIC SPACE
- [ ] TRAIL MODE SEPARATION
- [x] LOOP TRAIL
- [x] INTERNAL WALKING TRAIL
- [ ] TRAIL CONNECTION
- [x] SAFE ROUTES / PASSAGES

WAYFINDING

- [x] GATEWAYS (PRIMARY/SECONDARY)
- [ ] PATH HIERARCHY
- [x] UNIVERSAL WAYFINDING SIGNAGE

TYPICAL AMENITIES

UNIVERSAL ELEMENTS IN ALL ZONES

Seating, Shade, Identity Features, Low Impact Development BMPs, Lighting

IU INTENSIVE USE

Outdoor Event Space, Group Picnic Area, Restroom, Dog Park, Community Garden

PG PROGRAMMABLE GATHERING

Park Shelter, Tiered Seating

RE RECREATION

Fitness / Exercise Equipment, Creative Play Attraction, Playground, Rectangular Field, Diamond Field, Basketball Court, Tennis / Pickleball Court, Volleyball Court, Water Play, Pool

CU CASUAL USE

Individual Picnic Area, Casual Use Space, Internal Walking Trail, Shade Structure

NA NATURAL


Stormwater Management, Natural Space, Unique Landscape Feature

INFRASTRUCTURE


Bike Parking, Transit Stop, Shared Parking, On-Site Parking, Safe Crossings, Comfort Facility, Maintenance Facility, Pickup/ Dropoff, Regional Water Partnerships

GUIDELINES FOR LARGE NEIGHBORHOOD PARK - ARCHITECTURE

SAMPLE OUTCOME(S)



(2) SMALL + (1) MEDIUM




(3) SMALL **(2) MEDIUM** **(1) LARGE**

DESIGN PRINCIPLES


- [x] **PROGRAMMING**
- [x] **INTEGRATION WITH THE LANDSCAPE**
- [x] **DESIGN EXCELLENCE**
- [x] **MATERIAL STRATEGIES**
- [x] **ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY**
- [x] **ACCESSIBILITY & EQUITY**

ARCHITECTURAL RECIPES

LARGE NEIGHBORHOOD PARK (3-10 ACRES)



(2-3) SMALL ELEMENTS



± (1-2) MEDIUM ELEMENTS




OR (1) LARGE ELEMENT

TYPICAL ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS


SMALL ELEMENTS

(<1,000 SF)



MEDIUM ELEMENTS

(1,000 - 6,000 SF)




LARGE ELEMENTS

(>6,000 SF)



GUIDELINES FOR NEIGHBORHOOD NATURE PARK



DESIGN

- [x] SYSTEM-WIDE DESIGN LANGUAGE
- [x] DESIGN VOCABULARY
- [x] COHESIVE SITE LAYOUT
- [x] PARK CORE
- [x] INDOOR-OUTDOOR CONNECTIONS
- [x] NATIVE PLANTING VARIETY
- [x] PARK USER EQUITY
- [x] CULTURAL/HISTORIC FEATURES
- [x] WATER CONSERVATION
- [x] FIRE RISK REDUCTION

CONTEXT

- [ ] PARK SUPPORTIVE USES
- [ ] BUILDING FRONTAGE
- [ ] COUNTY / REGIONAL PARKS PROPERTY
- [ ] PUBLIC PROPERTY/INSTITUTIONAL
- [x] STREETSCAPE ENHANCEMENTS

CONNECTIVITY

- [x] STREET GRID CONNECTIVITY
- [x] SEAMLESS PUBLIC SPACE
- [ ] TRAIL MODE SEPARATION
- [ ] LOOP TRAIL
- [x] INTERNAL WALKING TRAIL
- [ ] TRAIL CONNECTION
- [x] SAFE ROUTES / PASSAGES

WAYFINDING

- [x] GATEWAYS (PRIMARY/SECONDARY)
- [ ] PATH HIERARCHY
- [x] UNIVERSAL WAYFINDING SIGNAGE

TYPICAL AMENITIES

UNIVERSAL ELEMENTS

Seating, Shade, Identity Features, Low Impact Development BMPs, Lighting

IU INTENSIVE USE

Outdoor Event Space, Group Picnic Area, Restroom, Dog Park, Community Garden

PG PROGRAMMABLE GATHERING

Park Shelter, Tiered Seating

RE RECREATION

Fitness / Exercise Equipment, Creative Play Attraction, Playground, Rectangular Field, Diamond Field, Basketball Court, Tennis / Pickleball Court, Volleyball Court, Water Play, Pool

CU CASUAL USE

Individual Picnic Area, Casual Use Space, Internal Walking Trail, Shade Structure

NA NATURAL


Stormwater Management, Natural Space, Unique Landscape Feature


INFRASTRUCTURE

Bike Parking, Transit Stop, Shared Parking, On-Site Parking, Safe Crossings, Comfort Facility, Maintenance Facility, Pickup/ Dropoff, Regional Water Partnerships


GUIDELINES FOR NEIGHBORHOOD NATURE PARK - ARCHITECTURE

SAMPLE OUTCOME(S)





(2) SMALL + (1) MEDIUM



(2) MEDIUM




(3) SMALL

DESIGN PRINCIPLES

- [ ] PROGRAMMING
- [x] INTEGRATION WITH THE LANDSCAPE
- [x] DESIGN EXCELLENCE
- [x] MATERIAL STRATEGIES
- [x] ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY
- [x] ACCESSIBILITY & EQUITY

ARCHITECTURAL RECIPES

NEIGHBORHOOD NATURE PARK (<10 ACRES)



Sculpture *(varies)*

Interpretive Display *(varies)*

Storage Container *160 sf*

Shade Structure *480 sf*

(1-3) SMALL ELEMENTS




Greenhouse *1,000 sf*

± (1-2) MEDIUM ELEMENTS

TYPICAL ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS

SMALL ELEMENTS

(<1,000 SF)



Memorial *(varies)*

Sculpture *(varies)*

Interpretive Display *(varies)*

Storage Container *160 sf*

Restroom Pavilion *400 sf*

Shade Structure *480 sf*

Mural *500 sf*


Folly/ Monument *600 sf*

Bandshell *800 sf*

Picnic Shelter *800 sf*

MEDIUM ELEMENTS

(1,000 - 6,000 SF)



Greenhouse *1,000 sf*

Concession Stand *1,000 sf*

Visitor Info. Center *4,000 sf*

Art Gallery *4,000 sf*

Nature Center *6,000 sf*

Amphitheater (outdoor) *6,000 sf*

LARGE ELEMENTS

(>6,000 SF)

Wildlife Center *7,000 sf*

Museum *8,000 sf*

Maintenance Facility *8,000 sf*


Childcare Center *10,000 sf*

Equestrian Center *12,000 sf*

Senior Center *12,000 sf*

Recreation Center *18,000 sf*

GUIDELINES FOR COMMUNITY PARK



DESIGN

- [x] SYSTEM-WIDE DESIGN LANGUAGE
- [x] DESIGN VOCABULARY
- [x] COHESIVE SITE LAYOUT
- [x] PARK CORE
- [x] INDOOR-OUTDOOR CONNECTIONS
- [x] NATIVE PLANTING VARIETY
- [x] PARK USER EQUITY
- [x] CULTURAL/HISTORIC FEATURES
- [x] WATER CONSERVATION
- [ ] FIRE RISK REDUCTION

CONTEXT

- [x] PSU PARK SUPPORTIVE USES
- [x] BUILDING FRONTAGE
- [ ] COUNTY / REGIONAL PARKS PROPERTY
- [x] PUBLIC PROPERTY/INSTITUTIONAL
- [x] STREETSCAPE ENHANCEMENTS

CONNECTIVITY

- [x] STREET GRID CONNECTIVITY
- [x] SEAMLESS PUBLIC SPACE
- [ ] TRAIL MODE SEPARATION
- [x] LOOP TRAIL
- [x] INTERNAL WALKING TRAIL
- [ ] TRAIL CONNECTION
- [x] SAFE ROUTES / PASSAGES

WAYFINDING

- [x] GATEWAYS (PRIMARY/SECONDARY)
- [x] PATH HIERARCHY
- [x] UNIVERSAL WAYFINDING SIGNAGE

TYPICAL AMENITIES

UNIVERSAL ELEMENTS IN ALL ZONES

Seating, Shade, Identity Features, Low Impact Development BMPs, Lighting

IU INTENSIVE USE

Outdoor Event Space, Group Picnic Area, Restroom, Dog Park, Community Garden

PG PROGRAMMABLE GATHERING

Park Shelter, Tiered Seating

RE RECREATION

Fitness / Exercise Equipment, Creative Play Attraction, Playground, Rectangular Field, Diamond Field, Basketball Court, Tennis / Pickleball Court, Volleyball Court, Water Play, Pool

CU CASUAL USE

Individual Picnic Area, Casual Use Space, Internal Walking Trail, Shade Structure

NA NATURAL


Stormwater Management, Natural Space, Unique Landscape Feature

INFRASTRUCTURE

Bike Parking, Transit Stop, Shared Parking, On-Site Parking, Safe Crossings, Comfort Facility, Maintenance Facility, Pickup/ Dropoff, Regional Water Partnerships

GUIDELINES FOR COMMUNITY PARK - ARCHITECTURE


SAMPLE OUTCOME(S)



(2) SMALL + (2) MEDIUM



(3) SMALL + (2) MEDIUM



(2) SMALL + (1) MEDIUM + (1) LARGE




(2) MEDIUM + (1) LARGE

DESIGN PRINCIPLES


- [x] **PROGRAMMING**
- [x] **INTEGRATION WITH THE LANDSCAPE**
- [x] **DESIGN EXCELLENCE**
- [x] **MATERIAL STRATEGIES**
- [x] **ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY**
- [x] **ACCESSIBILITY & EQUITY**

ARCHITECTURAL RECIPES


COMMUNITY PARK (10-20 ACRES)



(2-3) SMALL ELEMENTS



± (1-2) MEDIUM ELEMENTS




± (1) LARGE ELEMENT

TYPICAL ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS


SMALL ELEMENTS

(<1,000 SF)




MEDIUM ELEMENTS

(1,000 - 6,000 SF)




LARGE ELEMENTS

(>6,000 SF)



GUIDELINES FOR LARGE COMMUNITY PARK



DESIGN

- [x] SYSTEM-WIDE DESIGN LANGUAGE
- [x] DESIGN VOCABULARY
- [x] COHESIVE SITE LAYOUT
- [x] PARK CORE
- [x] INDOOR-OUTDOOR CONNECTIONS
- [x] NATIVE PLANTING VARIETY
- [x] PARK USER EQUITY
- [x] CULTURAL/HISTORIC FEATURES
- [x] WATER CONSERVATION
- [ ] FIRE RISK REDUCTION

CONTEXT

- [x] PSU PARK SUPPORTIVE USES
- [x] BUILDING FRONTAGE
- [ ] COUNTY / REGIONAL PARKS PROPERTY
- [x] PUBLIC PROPERTY/INSTITUTIONAL
- [x] STREETSCAPE ENHANCEMENTS

CONNECTIVITY

- [x] STREET GRID CONNECTIVITY
- [x] SEAMLESS PUBLIC SPACE
- [x] TRAIL MODE SEPARATION
- [x] LOOP TRAIL
- [x] INTERNAL WALKING TRAIL
- [ ] TRAIL CONNECTION
- [x] SAFE ROUTES / PASSAGES

WAYFINDING

- [x] GATEWAYS (PRIMARY/SECONDARY)
- [x] PATH HIERARCHY
- [x] UNIVERSAL WAYFINDING SIGNAGE

TYPICAL AMENITIES

UNIVERSAL ELEMENTS IN ALL ZONES

Seating, Shade, Identity Features, Low Impact Development BMPs, Lighting

IU INTENSIVE USE

Outdoor Event Space, Group Picnic Area, Restroom, Dog Park, Community Garden

PG PROGRAMMABLE GATHERING

Park Shelter, Tiered Seating

RE RECREATION

Fitness / Exercise Equipment, Creative Play Attraction, Playground, Rectangular Field, Diamond Field, Basketball Court, Tennis / Pickleball Court, Volleyball Court, Water Play, Pool

CU CASUAL USE

Individual Picnic Area, Casual Use Space, Internal Walking Trail, Shade Structure

NA NATURAL


Stormwater Management, Natural Space, Unique Landscape Feature

INFRASTRUCTURE

Bike Parking, Transit Stop, Shared Parking, On-Site Parking, Safe Crossings, Comfort Facility, Maintenance Facility, Pickup/ Dropoff, Regional Water Partnerships

GUIDELINES FOR LARGE COMMUNITY PARK - ARCHITECTURE


SAMPLE OUTCOME(S)




(2) SMALL + (2) MEDIUM + (1) LARGE



(4) SMALL + (2) MEDIUM



(3) SMALL + (2) LARGE




(2) SMALL + (1) MEDIUM + (1) LARGE

DESIGN PRINCIPLES


- [x] **PROGRAMMING**
- [x] **INTEGRATION WITH THE LANDSCAPE**
- [x] **DESIGN EXCELLENCE**
- [x] **MATERIAL STRATEGIES**
- [x] **ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY**
- [x] **ACCESSIBILITY & EQUITY**

ARCHITECTURAL RECIPES


LARGE COMMUNITY PARK (20-40 ACRES)



(2-4) SMALL ELEMENTS



± (1-2) MEDIUM ELEMENTS




± (1-2) LARGE ELEMENTS

TYPICAL ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS


SMALL ELEMENTS

(<1,000 SF)



MEDIUM ELEMENTS

(1,000 - 6,000 SF)



LARGE ELEMENTS

(>6,000 SF)



GUIDELINES FOR COMMUNITY NATURE PARK



DESIGN

- [x] SYSTEM-WIDE DESIGN LANGUAGE
- [x] DESIGN VOCABULARY
- [x] COHESIVE SITE LAYOUT
- [x] PARK CORE
- [x] INDOOR-OUTDOOR CONNECTIONS
- [x] NATIVE PLANTING VARIETY
- [x] PARK USER EQUITY
- [x] CULTURAL/HISTORIC FEATURES
- [x] WATER CONSERVATION
- [x] FIRE RISK REDUCTION

CONTEXT

- [ ] PARK SUPPORTIVE USES
- [ ] BUILDING FRONTAGE
- [ ] COUNTY / REGIONAL PARKS PROPERTY
- [ ] PUBLIC PROPERTY/INSTITUTIONAL
- [x] STREETSCAPE ENHANCEMENTS

CONNECTIVITY

- [x] STREET GRID CONNECTIVITY
- [x] SEAMLESS PUBLIC SPACE
- [ ] TRAIL MODE SEPARATION
- [x] LOOP TRAIL
- [x] INTERNAL WALKING TRAIL
- [ ] TRAIL CONNECTION
- [x] SAFE ROUTES / PASSAGES

WAYFINDING

- [x] GATEWAYS (PRIMARY/SECONDARY)
- [ ] PATH HIERARCHY
- [x] UNIVERSAL WAYFINDING SIGNAGE

TYPICAL AMENITIES

UNIVERSAL ELEMENTS

Seating, Shade, Identity Features, Low Impact Development BMPs, Lighting

IU INTENSIVE USE

Outdoor Event Space, Group Picnic Area, **Restroom**, Dog Park, Community Garden

PG PROGRAMMABLE GATHERING

Park Shelter, **Tiered Seating**

RE RECREATION

Fitness / Exercise Equipment, Creative Play Attraction, Playground, Rectangular Field, Diamond Field

Basketball Court, Tennis / Pickleball Court, Volleyball Court, Water Play, Pool

CU CASUAL USE

Individual Picnic Area, **Casual Use Space**, **Internal Walking Trail**, **Shade Structure**

NA NATURAL

Stormwater Management, **Natural Space**, Unique Landscape Feature


INFRASTRUCTURE

Bike Parking, **Transit Stop**, **Shared Parking**, **On-Site Parking**, **Safe Crossings**


Comfort Facility, Maintenance Facility, **Pickup/ Dropoff**, Regional Water Partnerships

GUIDELINES FOR COMMUNITY NATURE PARK - ARCHITECTURE


SAMPLE OUTCOME(S)




(2) SMALL + (1) MEDIUM + (1) LARGE



(3) SMALL + (2) MEDIUM



(4) SMALL + (1) MEDIUM




(2) SMALL + (1) LARGE

DESIGN PRINCIPLES


- [x] **PROGRAMMING**
- [x] **INTEGRATION WITH THE LANDSCAPE**
- [x] **DESIGN EXCELLENCE**
- [x] **MATERIAL STRATEGIES**
- [x] **ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY**
- [x] **ACCESSIBILITY & EQUITY**

ARCHITECTURAL RECIPES

COMMUNITY NATURE PARK (10-40 ACRES)



(2-4) SMALL ELEMENTS



± (1-2) MEDIUM ELEMENTS




± (1) LARGE ELEMENTS

TYPICAL ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS


SMALL ELEMENTS

(<1,000 SF)




MEDIUM ELEMENTS

(1,000 - 6,000 SF)




LARGE ELEMENTS

(>6,000 SF)



GUIDELINES FOR REGIONAL PARK



DESIGN

- [x] SYSTEM-WIDE DESIGN LANGUAGE
- [x] DESIGN VOCABULARY
- [x] COHESIVE SITE LAYOUT
- [x] PARK CORE
- [x] INDOOR-OUTDOOR CONNECTIONS
- [x] NATIVE PLANTING VARIETY
- [x] PARK USER EQUITY
- [x] CULTURAL/HISTORIC FEATURES
- [x] WATER CONSERVATION
- [x] FIRE RISK REDUCTION

CONTEXT

- [x] PSU PARK SUPPORTIVE USES
- [x] BUILDING FRONTAGE
- [x] COUNTY / REGIONAL PARKS PROPERTY
- [x] PUBLIC PROPERTY/INSTITUTIONAL
- [x] STREETSCAPE ENHANCEMENTS

CONNECTIVITY

- [x] STREET GRID CONNECTIVITY
- [x] SEAMLESS PUBLIC SPACE
- [x] TRAIL MODE SEPARATION
- [x] LOOP TRAIL
- [x] INTERNAL WALKING TRAIL
- [x] TRAIL CONNECTION
- [x] SAFE ROUTES / PASSAGES

WAYFINDING

- [x] GATEWAYS (PRIMARY/SECONDARY)
- [x] PATH HIERARCHY
- [x] UNIVERSAL WAYFINDING SIGNAGE

TYPICAL AMENITIES

UNIVERSAL ELEMENTS IN ALL ZONES

Seating, Shade, Identity Features, Low Impact Development BMPs, Lighting

IU INTENSIVE USE

Outdoor Event Space, Group Picnic Area, Restroom, Dog Park, Community Garden

PG PROGRAMMABLE GATHERING

Park Shelter, Tiered Seating

RE RECREATION

Fitness / Exercise Equipment, Creative Play Attraction, Playground, Rectangular Field, Diamond Field, Basketball Court, Tennis / Pickleball Court, Volleyball Court, Water Play, Pool

CU CASUAL USE

Individual Picnic Area, Casual Use Space, Internal Walking Trail, Shade Structure

NA NATURAL


Stormwater Management, Natural Space, Unique Landscape Feature

INFRASTRUCTURE


Bike Parking, Transit Stop, Shared Parking, On-Site Parking, Safe Crossings, Comfort Facility, Maintenance Facility, Pickup/ Dropoff, Regional Water Partnerships

GUIDELINES FOR REGIONAL PARK - ARCHITECTURE

SAMPLE OUTCOME(S)




(4) SMALL + (2) MEDIUM + (1) LARGE



(4) SMALL + (1) MEDIUM + (1) LARGE



(5) SMALL + (2) LARGE



(3) SMALL + (1) MEDIUM + (2) LARGE

DESIGN PRINCIPLES

- [x] **PROGRAMMING**
- [x] **INTEGRATION WITH THE LANDSCAPE**
- [x] **DESIGN EXCELLENCE**
- [x] **MATERIAL STRATEGIES**
- [x] **ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY**
- [x] **ACCESSIBILITY & EQUITY**

ARCHITECTURAL RECIPES

REGIONAL PARK (40+ ACRES)

Memorial *(varies)*
Sculpture *(varies)*
Interpretive Display *(varies)*
Storage Container *160 sf*
Restroom Pavilion *400 sf*
Shade Structure *480 sf*
Mural *500 sf*
Folly/ Monument *600 sf*
Event Area *800 sf*
Picnic Shelter *800 sf*

(3-5) SMALL ELEMENTS



Greenhouse *1,000 sf*
Concession Stand *1,000 sf*
Visitor Info. Center *4,000 sf*
Art Gallery *4,000 sf*
Amphitheater (outdoor) *6,000 sf*

± (1-3) MEDIUM ELEMENTS



Museum *8,000 sf*
Maintenance Facility *8,000 sf*
Childcare Center *10,000 sf*
Equestrian Center *12,000 sf*
Senior Center *12,000 sf*
Recreation Center *18,000 sf*

± (1-2) LARGE ELEMENTS

TYPICAL ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS

SMALL ELEMENTS

(<1,000 SF)

Memorial *(varies)*
Sculpture *(varies)*
Interpretive Display *(varies)*
Storage Container *160 sf*
Restroom Pavilion *400 sf*
Shade Structure *480 sf*
Mural *500 sf*
Folly/ Monument *600 sf*
Bandshell *800 sf*
Picnic Shelter *800 sf*

MEDIUM ELEMENTS

(1,000 - 6,000 SF)

Greenhouse *1,000 sf*
Concession Stand *1,000 sf*
Visitor Info. Center *4,000 sf*
Art Gallery *4,000 sf*
Nature Center *6,000 sf*
Amphitheater (outdoor) *6,000 sf*

LARGE ELEMENTS

(>6,000 SF)

Wildlife Center *7,000 sf*
Museum *8,000 sf*
Maintenance Facility *8,000 sf*
Childcare Center *10,000 sf*
Equestrian Center *12,000 sf*
Senior Center *12,000 sf*
Recreation Center *18,000 sf*

GUIDELINES FOR REGIONAL NATURE PARK



DESIGN

- [x] SYSTEM-WIDE DESIGN LANGUAGE
- [x] DESIGN VOCABULARY
- [x] COHESIVE SITE LAYOUT
- [x] PARK CORE
- [x] INDOOR-OUTDOOR CONNECTIONS
- [x] NATIVE PLANTING VARIETY
- [x] PARK USER EQUITY
- [x] CULTURAL/HISTORIC FEATURES
- [x] WATER CONSERVATION
- [x] FIRE RISK REDUCTION

CONTEXT

- [ ] PARK SUPPORTIVE USES
- [ ] BUILDING FRONTAGE
- [ ] COUNTY / REGIONAL PARKS PROPERTY
- [ ] PUBLIC PROPERTY/INSTITUTIONAL
- [x] STREETSCAPE ENHANCEMENTS

CONNECTIVITY

- [x] STREET GRID CONNECTIVITY
- [x] SEAMLESS PUBLIC SPACE
- [ ] TRAIL MODE SEPARATION
- [x] LOOP TRAIL
- [x] INTERNAL WALKING TRAIL
- [x] TRAIL CONNECTION
- [x] SAFE ROUTES / PASSAGES

WAYFINDING

- [x] GATEWAYS (PRIMARY/SECONDARY)
- [ ] PATH HIERARCHY
- [x] UNIVERSAL WAYFINDING SIGNAGE

TYPICAL AMENITIES

UNIVERSAL ELEMENTS

Seating, Shade, Identity Features, Low Impact Development BMPs, Lighting

IU INTENSIVE USE

Outdoor Event Space, Group Picnic Area, Restroom, Dog Park, Community Garden

PG PROGRAMMABLE GATHERING

Park Shelter, Tiered Seating

RE RECREATION

Fitness / Exercise Equipment, Creative Play Attraction, Playground, Rectangular Field, Diamond Field, Basketball Court, Tennis / Pickleball Court, Volleyball Court, Water Play, Pool

CU CASUAL USE

Individual Picnic Area, Casual Use Space, Internal Walking Trail, Shade Structure

NA NATURAL


Stormwater Management, Natural Space, Unique Landscape Feature

INFRASTRUCTURE

Bike Parking, Transit Stop, Shared Parking, On-Site Parking, Safe Crossings, Comfort Facility, Maintenance Facility, Pickup/ Dropoff, Regional Water Partnerships

GUIDELINES FOR REGIONAL NATURE PARK - ARCHITECTURE

SAMPLE OUTCOME(S)




(2) SMALL + (2) MEDIUM + (1) LARGE



(3) SMALL + (2) MEDIUM



(3) SMALL + (1) LARGE




(1) SMALL + (2) LARGE

DESIGN PRINCIPLES


- [x] **PROGRAMMING**
- [x] **INTEGRATION WITH THE LANDSCAPE**
- [x] **DESIGN EXCELLENCE**
- [x] **MATERIAL STRATEGIES**
- [x] **ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY**
- [x] **ACCESSIBILITY & EQUITY**

ARCHITECTURAL RECIPES


REGIONAL NATURE PARK (40+ ACRES)



(1-3) SMALL ELEMENTS



± (1-2) MEDIUM ELEMENTS




± (1) LARGE ELEMENT

TYPICAL ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS


SMALL ELEMENTS

(<1,000 SF)



MEDIUM ELEMENTS

(1,000 - 6,000 SF)




LARGE ELEMENTS

(>6,000 SF)



GUIDELINES FOR HISTORIC LANDMARK SITE



DESIGN

- [x] SYSTEM-WIDE DESIGN LANGUAGE
- [x] DESIGN VOCABULARY
- [x] COHESIVE SITE LAYOUT
- [x] PARK CORE
- [x] INDOOR-OUTDOOR CONNECTIONS
- [x] NATIVE PLANTING VARIETY
- [x] PARK USER EQUITY
- [x] CULTURAL/HISTORIC FEATURES
- [x] WATER CONSERVATION
- [ ] FIRE RISK REDUCTION

CONTEXT

- [x] PSU PARK SUPPORTIVE USES
- [x] BUILDING FRONTAGE
- [ ] COUNTY / REGIONAL PARKS PROPERTY
- [x] PUBLIC PROPERTY/INSTITUTIONAL
- [x] STREETSCAPE ENHANCEMENTS

CONNECTIVITY

- [x] STREET GRID CONNECTIVITY
- [x] SEAMLESS PUBLIC SPACE
- [ ] TRAIL MODE SEPARATION
- [ ] LOOP TRAIL
- [x] INTERNAL WALKING TRAIL
- [ ] TRAIL CONNECTION
- [x] SAFE ROUTES / PASSAGES

WAYFINDING

- [x] GATEWAYS (PRIMARY/SECONDARY)
- [ ] PATH HIERARCHY
- [x] UNIVERSAL WAYFINDING SIGNAGE

TYPICAL AMENITIES

UNIVERSAL ELEMENTS IN ALL ZONES

Seating · Shade · Identity Features · Low Impact Development BMPs · Lighting

IU INTENSIVE USE

Outdoor Event Space · Group Picnic Area · Restroom · Dog Park · Community Garden

PG PROGRAMMABLE GATHERING

Park Shelter · Tiered Seating

RE RECREATION

Fitness / Exercise Equipment · Creative Play Attraction · Playground · Rectangular Field · Diamond Field

Basketball Court · Tennis / Pickleball Court · Volleyball Court · Water Play · Pool

CU CASUAL USE

Individual Picnic Area · Casual Use Space · Internal Walking Trail · Shade Structure

NA NATURAL

Stormwater Management · Natural Space · Unique Landscape Feature


INFRASTRUCTURE

Bike Parking · Transit Stop · Shared Parking · On-Site Parking · Safe Crossings

Comfort Facility · Maintenance Facility · Pickup/ Dropoff · Regional Water Partnerships

GUIDELINES FOR HISTORIC LANDMARK SITE - ARCHITECTURE


SAMPLE OUTCOME(S)



(3) SMALL + (1) MEDIUM + (1) LARGE



(2) SMALL + (2) MEDIUM + (1) LARGE



(4) SMALL + (2) MEDIUM




(4) SMALL + (1) LARGE

DESIGN PRINCIPLES


- [x] **PROGRAMMING**
- [x] **INTEGRATION WITH THE LANDSCAPE**
- [x] **DESIGN EXCELLENCE**
- [x] **MATERIAL STRATEGIES**
- [x] **ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY**
- [x] **ACCESSIBILITY & EQUITY**

ARCHITECTURAL RECIPES


HISTORIC LANDMARK PARK (VARIES)



(2-4) SMALL ELEMENTS



± (1-2) MEDIUM ELEMENTS




± (1) LARGE ELEMENT

TYPICAL ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS

SMALL ELEMENTS

(<1,000 SF)




MEDIUM ELEMENTS

(1,000 - 6,000 SF)




LARGE ELEMENTS

(>6,000 SF)



GUIDELINES FOR GREENWAY



DESIGN

- [x] SYSTEM-WIDE DESIGN LANGUAGE
- [x] DESIGN VOCABULARY
- [x] COHESIVE SITE LAYOUT
- [ ] PARK CORE
- [ ] INDOOR-OUTDOOR CONNECTIONS
- [x] NATIVE PLANTING VARIETY
- [x] PARK USER EQUITY
- [x] CULTURAL/HISTORIC FEATURES
- [x] WATER CONSERVATION
- [x] FIRE RISK REDUCTION

CONTEXT

- [x] PSU PARK SUPPORTIVE USES
- [x] BUILDING FRONTAGE
- [ ] COUNTY / REGIONAL PARKS PROPERTY
- [x] PUBLIC PROPERTY/INSTITUTIONAL
- [x] STREETSCAPE ENHANCEMENTS

CONNECTIVITY

- [x] STREET GRID CONNECTIVITY
- [x] SEAMLESS PUBLIC SPACE
- [ ] TRAIL MODE SEPARATION
- [ ] LOOP TRAIL
- [x] INTERNAL WALKING TRAIL
- [x] TRAIL CONNECTION
- [x] SAFE ROUTES / PASSAGES

WAYFINDING

- [x] GATEWAYS (PRIMARY/SECONDARY)
- [ ] PATH HIERARCHY
- [x] UNIVERSAL WAYFINDING SIGNAGE

TYPICAL AMENITIES

UNIVERSAL ELEMENTS

Seating · Shade · Identity Features · Low Impact Development BMPs · Lighting

IU INTENSIVE USE

Outdoor Event Space · Group Picnic Area · Restroom · Dog Park · Community Garden

PG PROGRAMMABLE GATHERING

Park Shelter · Tiered Seating

RE RECREATION

Fitness / Exercise Equipment · Creative Play Attraction · Playground · Rectangular Field · Diamond Field

Basketball Court · Tennis / Pickleball Court · Volleyball Court · Water Play · Pool

CU CASUAL USE

Individual Picnic Area · Casual Use Space · Internal Walking Trail · Shade Structure

NA NATURAL

Stormwater Management · Natural Space · Unique Landscape Feature


INFRASTRUCTURE

Bike Parking · Transit Stop · Shared Parking · On-Site Parking · Safe Crossings


Comfort Facility · Maintenance Facility · Pickup/ Dropoff · Regional Water Partnerships

GUIDELINES FOR GREENWAY - ARCHITECTURE

SAMPLE OUTCOME(S)



(3) SMALL



(2) SMALL



(1) SMALL




(2) SMALL

DESIGN PRINCIPLES

- [ ] PROGRAMMING
- [x] INTEGRATION WITH THE LANDSCAPE
- [x] DESIGN EXCELLENCE
- [x] MATERIAL STRATEGIES
- [x] ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY
- [x] ACCESSIBILITY & EQUITY

ARCHITECTURAL RECIPES

GREENWAY (VARIES)




(1-4) SMALL ELEMENTS

TYPICAL ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS

SMALL ELEMENTS

(<1,000 SF)




MEDIUM ELEMENTS

(1,000 - 6,000 SF)

LARGE ELEMENTS

(>6,000 SF)

GUIDELINES FOR LINEAR PARK



DESIGN

- [x] SYSTEM-WIDE DESIGN LANGUAGE
- [x] DESIGN VOCABULARY
- [x] COHESIVE SITE LAYOUT
- [ ] PARK CORE
- [ ] INDOOR-OUTDOOR CONNECTIONS
- [x] NATIVE PLANTING VARIETY
- [x] PARK USER EQUITY
- [x] CULTURAL/HISTORIC FEATURES
- [x] WATER CONSERVATION
- [x] FIRE RISK REDUCTION

CONTEXT

- PSU [x] PARK SUPPORTIVE USES
- [x] BUILDING FRONTAGE
- [ ] COUNTY / REGIONAL PARKS PROPERTY
- [x] PUBLIC PROPERTY/INSTITUTIONAL
- [x] STREETSCAPE ENHANCEMENTS

CONNECTIVITY

- [x] STREET GRID CONNECTIVITY
- [x] SEAMLESS PUBLIC SPACE
- [ ] TRAIL MODE SEPARATION
- [ ] LOOP TRAIL
- [x] INTERNAL WALKING TRAIL
- [x] TRAIL CONNECTION
- [x] SAFE ROUTES / PASSAGES

WAYFINDING

- [x] GATEWAYS (PRIMARY/SECONDARY)
- [ ] PATH HIERARCHY
- [x] UNIVERSAL WAYFINDING SIGNAGE

TYPICAL AMENITIES

UNIVERSAL ELEMENTS

Seating · Shade · Identity Features · Low Impact Development BMPs · Lighting

IU INTENSIVE USE

Outdoor Event Space · Group Picnic Area · Restroom · Dog Park · Community Garden

PG PROGRAMMABLE GATHERING

Park Shelter · Tiered Seating

RE RECREATION

Fitness / Exercise Equipment · Creative Play Attraction · Playground · Rectangular Field · Diamond Field

Basketball Court · Tennis / Pickleball Court · Volleyball Court · Water Play · Pool

CU CASUAL USE

Individual Picnic Area · Casual Use Space · Internal Walking Trail · Shade Structure

NA NATURAL

Stormwater Management · Natural Space · Unique Landscape Feature


INFRASTRUCTURE

Bike Parking · Transit Stop · Shared Parking · On-Site Parking · Safe Crossings

Comfort Facility · Maintenance Facility · Pickup/ Dropoff · Regional Water Partnerships

GUIDELINES FOR LINEAR PARK - ARCHITECTURE

SAMPLE OUTCOME(S)




(3) SMALL



(2) SMALL



(1) SMALL




(4) SMALL

DESIGN PRINCIPLES

- [ ] PROGRAMMING
- [x] INTEGRATION WITH THE LANDSCAPE
- [x] DESIGN EXCELLENCE
- [x] MATERIAL STRATEGIES
- [x] ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY
- [x] ACCESSIBILITY & EQUITY

ARCHITECTURAL RECIPES

LINEAR PARK (<20 ACRES)




(1-4) SMALL ELEMENTS

TYPICAL ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS

SMALL ELEMENTS

(<1,000 SF)




MEDIUM ELEMENTS

(1,000 - 6,000 SF)

LARGE ELEMENTS

(>6,000 SF)

GUIDELINES FOR CANYON PARK



DESIGN

- [x] SYSTEM-WIDE DESIGN LANGUAGE
- [x] DESIGN VOCABULARY
- [x] COHESIVE SITE LAYOUT
- [x] PARK CORE
- [x] INDOOR-OUTDOOR CONNECTIONS
- [x] NATIVE PLANTING VARIETY
- [x] PARK USER EQUITY
- [x] CULTURAL/HISTORIC FEATURES
- [x] WATER CONSERVATION
- [x] FIRE RISK REDUCTION

CONTEXT

- [x] PSU PARK SUPPORTIVE USES
- [x] BUILDING FRONTAGE
- [x] COUNTY / REGIONAL PARKS PROPERTY
- [x] PUBLIC PROPERTY/INSTITUTIONAL
- [x] STREETSCAPE ENHANCEMENTS

CONNECTIVITY

- [x] STREET GRID CONNECTIVITY
- [x] SEAMLESS PUBLIC SPACE
- [ ] TRAIL MODE SEPARATION
- [ ] LOOP TRAIL
- [x] INTERNAL WALKING TRAIL
- [x] TRAIL CONNECTION
- [x] SAFE ROUTES / PASSAGES

WAYFINDING

- [x] GATEWAYS (PRIMARY/SECONDARY)
- [x] PATH HIERARCHY
- [x] UNIVERSAL WAYFINDING SIGNAGE

TYPICAL AMENITIES

UNIVERSAL ELEMENTS

Seating, Shade, Identity Features, Low Impact Development BMPs, Lighting

IU INTENSIVE USE

Outdoor Event Space, Group Picnic Area, Restroom, Dog Park, Community Garden

PG PROGRAMMABLE GATHERING

Park Shelter, Tiered Seating

RE RECREATION

Fitness / Exercise Equipment, Creative Play Attraction, Playground, Rectangular Field, Diamond Field, Basketball Court, Tennis / Pickleball Court, Volleyball Court, Water Play, Pool

CU CASUAL USE

Individual Picnic Area, Casual Use Space, Internal Walking Trail, Shade Structure

NA NATURAL


Stormwater Management, Natural Space, Unique Landscape Feature

INFRASTRUCTURE

Bike Parking, Transit Stop, Shared Parking, On-Site Parking, Safe Crossings, Comfort Facility, Maintenance Facility, Pickup/ Dropoff, Regional Water Partnerships

GUIDELINES FOR CANYON PARK - ARCHITECTURE


SAMPLE OUTCOME(S)



(3) SMALL + (1) MEDIUM + (1) LARGE



(2) SMALL + (2) MEDIUM + (1) LARGE



(4) SMALL + (2) MEDIUM




(3) SMALL + (1) LARGE

DESIGN PRINCIPLES

- [x] **PROGRAMMING**
- [x] **INTEGRATION WITH THE LANDSCAPE**
- [x] **DESIGN EXCELLENCE**
- [x] **MATERIAL STRATEGIES**
- [x] **ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY**
- [x] **ACCESSIBILITY & EQUITY**

ARCHITECTURAL RECIPES

CANYON PARK (20+)



Memorial *(varies)*

Sculpture *(varies)*

Interpretive Display *(varies)*

Storage Container *160 sf*

Shade Structure *480 sf*

Folly/ Monument *600 sf*

(2-4) SMALL ELEMENTS



Visitor Info. Center *4,000 sf*

Nature Center *6,000 sf*

± (1-2) MEDIUM ELEMENTS




Wildlife Research Center *7,000 sf*

± (1) LARGE ELEMENT

TYPICAL ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS

SMALL ELEMENTS

(<1,000 SF)



Memorial *(varies)*

Sculpture *(varies)*

Interpretive Display *(varies)*

Storage Container *160 sf*

Restroom Pavilion *400 sf*

Shade Structure *480 sf*

Mural *500 sf*


Folly/ Monument *600 sf*

Bandshell *800 sf*

Picnic Shelter *800 sf*

MEDIUM ELEMENTS

(1,000 - 6,000 SF)



Greenhouse *1,000 sf*

Concession Stand *1,000 sf*

Visitor Info. Center *4,000 sf*

Art Gallery *4,000 sf*

Nature Center *6,000 sf*

Amphitheater (outdoor) *6,000 sf*

LARGE ELEMENTS

(>6,000 SF)



Wildlife Center *7,000 sf*

Museum *8,000 sf*

Maintenance Facility *8,000 sf*

Childcare Center *10,000 sf*

Equestrian Center *12,000 sf*

Senior Center *12,000 sf*

Recreation Center *18,000 sf*

GUIDELINES FOR COMMUNITY SCHOOL PARK



DESIGN

- [x] SYSTEM-WIDE DESIGN LANGUAGE
- [x] DESIGN VOCABULARY
- [x] COHESIVE SITE LAYOUT
- [x] PARK CORE
- [x] INDOOR-OUTDOOR CONNECTIONS
- [x] NATIVE PLANTING VARIETY
- [x] PARK USER EQUITY
- [x] CULTURAL/HISTORIC FEATURES
- [x] WATER CONSERVATION
- [ ] FIRE RISK REDUCTION

CONTEXT

- [x] PSU PARK SUPPORTIVE USES
- [x] BUILDING FRONTAGE
- [ ] COUNTY / REGIONAL PARKS PROPERTY
- [x] PUBLIC PROPERTY/INSTITUTIONAL
- [x] STREETSCAPE ENHANCEMENTS

CONNECTIVITY

- [x] STREET GRID CONNECTIVITY
- [x] SEAMLESS PUBLIC SPACE
- [ ] TRAIL MODE SEPARATION
- [ ] LOOP TRAIL
- [x] INTERNAL WALKING TRAIL
- [ ] TRAIL CONNECTION
- [x] SAFE ROUTES / PASSAGES

WAYFINDING

- [x] GATEWAYS (PRIMARY/SECONDARY)
- [ ] PATH HIERARCHY
- [x] UNIVERSAL WAYFINDING SIGNAGE

TYPICAL AMENITIES

UNIVERSAL ELEMENTS

Seating, Shade, Identity Features, Low Impact Development BMPs, Lighting

IU INTENSIVE USE

Outdoor Event Space, Group Picnic Area, Restroom, Dog Park, Community Garden

PG PROGRAMMABLE GATHERING

Park Shelter, Tiered Seating

RE RECREATION

Fitness / Exercise Equipment, Creative Play Attraction, Playground, Rectangular Field, Diamond Field, Basketball Court, Tennis / Pickleball Court, Volleyball Court, Water Play, Pool

CU CASUAL USE

Individual Picnic Area, Casual Use Space, Internal Walking Trail, Shade Structure

NA NATURAL


Stormwater Management, Natural Space, Unique Landscape Feature

INFRASTRUCTURE


Bike Parking, Transit Stop, Shared Parking, On-Site Parking, Safe Crossings, Comfort Facility, Maintenance Facility, Pickup/ Dropoff, Regional Water Partnerships

GUIDELINES FOR COMMUNITY SCHOOL PARK - ARCHITECTURE

SAMPLE OUTCOME(S)




(2) SMALL



(1) SMALL + (1) MEDIUM



(2) SMALL + (1) MEDIUM



(1) MEDIUM


NOTE: The design of community school parks is the Los Angeles Unified School District's responsibility.

DESIGN PRINCIPLES

- [x] **PROGRAMMING**
- [x] **INTEGRATION WITH THE LANDSCAPE**
- [x] **DESIGN EXCELLENCE**
- [x] **MATERIAL STRATEGIES**
- [x] **ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY**
- [x] **ACCESSIBILITY & EQUITY**

ARCHITECTURAL RECIPES

COMMUNITY SCHOOL PARK (VARIES)



(1-2) SMALL ELEMENTS




± (1) MEDIUM ELEMENTS

TYPICAL ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS

SMALL ELEMENTS

(<1,000 SF)



MEDIUM ELEMENTS


(1,000 - 6,000 SF)



LARGE ELEMENTS

(>6,000 SF)

GUIDELINES FOR SCHOOL POOL



DESIGN

- [x] SYSTEM-WIDE DESIGN LANGUAGE
- [x] DESIGN VOCABULARY
- [x] COHESIVE SITE LAYOUT
- [ ] PARK CORE
- [x] INDOOR-OUTDOOR CONNECTIONS
- [ ] NATIVE PLANTING VARIETY
- [x] PARK USER EQUITY
- [ ] CULTURAL/HISTORIC FEATURES
- [x] WATER CONSERVATION
- [ ] FIRE RISK REDUCTION

CONTEXT

- [ ] PARK SUPPORTIVE USES
- [x] BUILDING FRONTAGE
- [ ] COUNTY / REGIONAL PARKS PROPERTY
- [x] PUBLIC PROPERTY/INSTITUTIONAL
- [x] STREETSCAPE ENHANCEMENTS

CONNECTIVITY

- [x] STREET GRID CONNECTIVITY
- [x] SEAMLESS PUBLIC SPACE
- [ ] TRAIL MODE SEPARATION
- [ ] LOOP TRAIL
- [ ] INTERNAL WALKING TRAIL
- [ ] TRAIL CONNECTION
- [x] SAFE ROUTES / PASSAGES

WAYFINDING

- [x] GATEWAYS (PRIMARY/SECONDARY)
- [ ] PATH HIERARCHY
- [x] UNIVERSAL WAYFINDING SIGNAGE

TYPICAL AMENITIES

UNIVERSAL ELEMENTS

Seating, Shade, Identity Features, Low Impact Development BMPs, Lighting

IU INTENSIVE USE

Outdoor Event Space, Group Picnic Area, Restroom, Dog Park, Community Garden

PG PROGRAMMABLE GATHERING

Park Shelter, Tiered Seating

RE RECREATION

Fitness / Exercise Equipment, Creative Play Attraction, Playground, Rectangular Field, Diamond Field, Basketball Court, Tennis / Pickleball Court, Volleyball Court, Water Play, Pool

CU CASUAL USE

Individual Picnic Area, Casual Use Space, Internal Walking Trail, Shade Structure

NA NATURAL


Stormwater Management, Natural Space, Unique Landscape Feature

INFRASTRUCTURE


Bike Parking, Transit Stop, Shared Parking, On-Site Parking, Safe Crossings, Comfort Facility, Maintenance Facility, Pickup/ Dropoff, Regional Water Partnerships

GUIDELINES FOR SCHOOL POOL - ARCHITECTURE


SAMPLE OUTCOME(S)



(1) SMALL + (1) MEDIUM



(2) SMALL



(1) MEDIUM



(1) SMALL

DESIGN PRINCIPLES

- [x] **PROGRAMMING**
- [x] **INTEGRATION WITH THE LANDSCAPE**
- [x] **DESIGN EXCELLENCE**
- [x] **MATERIAL STRATEGIES**
- [x] **ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY**
- [x] **ACCESSIBILITY & EQUITY**

ARCHITECTURAL RECIPES

SCHOOL POOL (VARIES)



Shade Structure *480 sf*

Mural *500 sf*

(1-2) SMALL ELEMENTS




Concession Stand *1,000 sf*

± (1) MEDIUM ELEMENT

TYPICAL ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS

SMALL ELEMENTS

(<1,000 SF)



Memorial *(varies)*

Sculpture *(varies)*

Interpretive Display *(varies)*

Storage Container *160 sf*

Restroom Pavilion *400 sf*

Shade Structure *480 sf*

Mural *500 sf*


Folly/ Monument *600 sf*

Bandshell *800 sf*

Picnic Shelter *800 sf*

MEDIUM ELEMENTS

(1,000 - 6,000 SF)



Greenhouse *1,000 sf*

Concession Stand *1,000 sf*

Visitor Info. Center *4,000 sf*

Art Gallery *4,000 sf*

Nature Center *6,000 sf*

Amphitheater (outdoor) *6,000 sf*

LARGE ELEMENTS

(>6,000 SF)

Wildlife Center *7,000 sf*

Museum *8,000 sf*

Maintenance Facility *8,000 sf*

Childcare Center *10,000 sf*


Equestrian Center *12,000 sf*

Senior Center *12,000 sf*

Recreation Center *18,000 sf*




Figure 74. Drone view over O'Melveny Park shows popular hiking trails in the North San Fernando Valley. ource Calvada Surveying, Inc., 2025.



LEVEL OF SERVICE DETAILS

HOW TO READ THE LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS



The current number of amenities and the number to be added or reduced/removed by 2050.

Whether the recommended level of service (LOS) is ▲ higher or ▼ lower than the current level of service.

The data that was used to build the recommended LOS. These data points are the peer median level of service, priority investment rating, and 5-year national participation change.

How the above data points inform the recommended LOS. For example, if the peer median LOS is greater than Los Angeles, it suggests raising the LOS.

THE FOLLOWING PAGES ARE AMENITIES TRACKED BY THE TRUST FOR PUBLIC LAND ANNUALLY. THIS LIST IS NOT EXHAUSTIVE OF RAP'S PARK SYSTEM, AS IT EXCLUDES FEATURES SUCH AS UNPROGRAMMED OPEN SPACE, A HIGHLY DESIRED AMENITY.

BASKETBALL HOOPS

Population-Based Standard

Level of Service (LOS)

1.8 per 10,000 **Current**


3.8 per 10,000 **Recommended**

Number of Basketball Hoops

692 in 2025


1,625 by 2050

Peer Median




Supports Raising LOS Standard

Priority Investment Rating



Supports Maintaining LOS Standard

5-Year Change in Participation



Supports Raising LOS Standard

COMMUNITY GARDEN SITES

Population-Based Standard


Level of Service (LOS)

0.00 per 1,000 **Current** ▲ **0.04** per 1,000 **Recommended**

Number of Community Garden Sites


19 in 2025 ▲ **176** by 2050

Peer Median



Supports Raising LOS Standard

Priority Investment Rating



Supports Raising LOS Standard

5-Year Change in Participation



DIAMOND FIELDS

Population-Based Standard

Level of Service (LOS)


0.8 per 10,000 **Current**

1.0 per 10,000 **Recommended**

Number of Diamond Fields

304 in 2025

416 by 2050



OFF-LEASH DOG PARKS

Population-Based Standard

Level of Service (LOS)

0.4 per 100,000 **Current**

▲

2.0 per 100,000 **Recommended**

Number of Off-Leash Dog Parks

14 in 2025

▲

85 by 2050



PICKLEBALL COURTS

Population-Based Standard


Level of Service (LOS)

0.3 per 20,000 **Current** ▲ **1.0** per 20,000 **Recommended**

Number of Pickleball Courts


52 in 2025 ▲ **227** by 2050

Peer Median




Supports Raising LOS Standard

Priority Investment Rating



Supports Maintaining LOS Standard

5-Year Change in Participation



Supports Raising LOS Standard

PLAYGROUNDS

Population-Based Standard

Level of Service (LOS)

1.0 per 10,000 **Current** ▲ **1.9** per 10,000 **Recommended**

Number of Playgrounds

398 in 2025 ▲ **828** by 2050



RECTANGULAR FIELDS

Population-Based Standard


Level of Service (LOS)

0.3 per 10,000 **Current** ▲ **0.7** per 10,000 **Recommended**

Number of Rectangular Fields


109 in 2025 ▲ **300** by 2050

Peer Median




▲ Supports Raising LOS Standard

Priority Investment Rating



◆ Supports Maintaining LOS Standard

5-Year Change in Participation



▲ Supports Raising LOS Standard

TENNIS COURTS

Population-Based Standard

Level of Service (LOS)

1.4 per 20,000 **Current**


▲ **3.1** per 20,000 **Recommended**

Number of Tennis Courts

278 in 2025


▲ **679** by 2050

Peer Median




▲ Supports Raising LOS Standard

Priority Investment Rating



◆ Supports Maintaining LOS Standard

5-Year Change in Participation



▲ Supports Raising LOS Standard

VOLLEYBALL COURTS

Population-Based Standard

Level of Service (LOS)

0.9 per 20,000 **Current**

0.2 per 20,000 **Recommended**

Number of Volleyball Courts

175 in 2025

49 by 2050



SWIMMING POOLS (OUTDOOR)

Population-Based Standard

Level of Service (LOS)


1.5 per 100,000 **Current**

1.4 per 100,000 **Recommended**

Number of Swimming Pools

59 in 2025

62 by 2050



SPLASHPADS

Population-Based Standard

Level of Service (LOS)

0.3 per 100,000 **Current**

▲


3.5 per 100,000 **Recommended**

Number of Splashpads

13 in 2025

▲

153 by 2050



BATHROOMS

Population-Based Standard

Level of Service (LOS)

4.2 per 10,000 **Current**


1.6 per 10,000 **Recommended**

Number of Bathrooms

1,618 in 2025

673 by 2050

Peer Median



Supports Lowering LOS Standard

Priority Investment Rating



5-Year Change in Participation



NATURE TRAILS (MILES)

Population-Based Standard

Level of Service (LOS)

2.4 per 100,000 **Current**


3.6 per 100,000 **Recommended**

Miles of Natural Trails

92 in 2025


157 by 2050

Peer Median




Supports Raising LOS Standard

Priority Investment Rating



Supports Raising LOS Standard

5-Year Change in Participation



Supports Raising LOS Standard

DISC GOLF COURSES

Population-Based Standard

Level of Service (LOS)

0.1 per 100,000 **Current** ▲ **0.2** per 100,000 **Recommended**

Number of Disc Golf Courses

3 in 2025 ▲ **8** by 2050



RECREATION AND SENIOR CENTERS

Population-Based Standard

Level of Service (LOS)

1.0 per 20,000 **Current**

▼


0.9 per 20,000 **Recommended**

Number of Recreation and Senior Centers

185 in 2025

▲

202 by 2050



SKATE PARKS

Population-Based Standard

Level of Service (LOS)


0.8 per 100,000 **Current**

0.7 per 100,000 **Recommended**

Number of Skate Parks

29 in 2025

29 by 2050



PARK ACREAGE

Population-Based Standard

Level of Service (LOS)

4.2 per 1,000 **Current**


9.9 per 1,000 **Recommended**

Park Acreage

16,333 in 2025

42,704 by 2050

Peer Median



Supports Raising LOS Standard

Priority Investment Rating



5-Year Change in Participation



ADDRESSING SITE-SPECIFIC NEEDS


While RAP should consider all site planning and engagement guidelines applicable to a park or prospective park site based on its classification, certain guidelines may be particularly useful in addressing site-specific needs. Figure 75 shows which guidelines may help address areas of high need, as defined by the PNA's site prioritization criteria.

For a given site:

1. Find the site in the Universe of Sites table located in the Appendix.
2. Determine for which of the prioritization criteria the site received high values, indicating a high level of need.
3. Find those criteria in the first row of this table.
4. Look down the column to find the guidelines most likely to help address that need.

As an example, for a park or prospective park site that has low shade cover the guidelines for planting variety, shade, and natural areas may be of particular importance.


Figure 75. Certain guidelines may help address areas of high need, as defined by the PNA's site prioritization criteria.
Source: OLIN, 2025.



Medium Weight
Criminalization Burden
Capital Improvement History
Extreme Heat Risk
Lack of Private Open Space
Biodiversity + Habitat Cons.
Metro Corridors
Lowest Weight
Perceived Parks Condition
Perceived Rec Center Condition
Perceived Walkability
Presence of Community Priority Amenities
Park Visitation
Habitat Connectivity
Tree Species Composition
Infiltration and Recharge Opps
Water Quality Priority
LA County PNA

Highest Weight

	Park Pressure	Walk Network Connectivity	Parks Condition Assessment	Environmental, Social, and Health Equity	Low Shade Cover	Climate Vulnerability	Perceived Park Safety
Criteria that Address Rec and Park Needs							
Criteria that Address Equity Needs							
Criteria that Address Resiliency Needs							
Criteria that Address City/County Priority Needs							
CONTEXT							
Park Supportive Uses	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐
Building Frontage	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
County/Regional Parks Connectivity	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Public Property/Institutional	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Streetscape Enhancements	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☑	☐
CONNECTIVITY							
Street Grid Connectivity	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Seamless Public Space	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Trail Mode Separation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Loop Trail	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Internal Walking Trail	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Trail Connections	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Safe Routes/Passages	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑
WAYFINDING							
Gateways (Primary & Secondary)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑
Path Hierarchy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Universal Wayfinding Signage	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑
INFRASTRUCTURE							
Regional Water Partnerships	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐
Bike Parking	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Transit Stop	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Shared Parking	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
On-Site Parking	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Accessible Van Parking and Drop-Off	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Safe Crossings	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑
Comfort Facilities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Maintenance Facilities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐


Medium Weight
Criminalization Burden
Capital Improvement History
Extreme Heat Risk
Lack of Private Open Space
Biodiversity + Habitat Cons.
Metro Corridors
Lowest Weight
Perceived Parks Condition
Perceived Rec Center Condition
Perceived Walkability
Presence of Community Priority Amenities
Park Visitation
Habitat Connectivity
Tree Species Composition
Infiltration and Recharge Opps
Water Quality Priority
LA County PNA

	Highest Weight						
	Park Pressure	Walk Network Connectivity	Parks Condition Assessment	Environmental, Social, and Health Equity	Low Shade Cover	Climate Vulnerability	Perceived Park Safety
Criteria that Address Rec and Park Needs	■	■	■				■
Criteria that Address Equity Needs	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Criteria that Address Resiliency Needs				■	■	■	
Criteria that Address City/County Priority Needs			■	■	■	■	
ZONES							
Universal Elements	☐	☐	☐	☑	☑	☑	☑
Intensive Use Areas	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑
Programmable Gathering Areas	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑
Recreation Areas	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑
Casual Use Areas	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑
Natural Areas	☐	☐	☐	☑	☑	☑	☐
ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS							
Programming	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑
Integration with the Landscape	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Design Excellence	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Material Strategies	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Environmental Sustainability	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Accessibility & Equity	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
ONGOING ENGAGEMENT GUIDELINES							
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS							
Project Pre-Planning	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑
Community-Drive Planning and Design Process	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑
Implementation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑
LONG-TERM STEWARDSHIP, OPERATIONS, AND PROGRAMMING							
Park Ambassador Program	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑
Park Arts Advisory Board	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Programming	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑
'Friends of' Groups and Park Advisory Boards	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑
Hiring	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Medium Weight						Lowest Weight									
Criminalization Burden	Capital Improvement History	Extreme Heat Risk	Lack of Private Open Space	Biodiversity + Habitat Cons.	Metro Corridors	Perceived Parks Condition	Perceived Rec Center Condition	Perceived Walkability	Presence of Community Priority Amenities	Park Visitation	Habitat Connectivity	Tree Species Composition	Infiltration and Recharge Opps	Water Quality Priority	LA County PNA
☐	☐	☑	☑	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☑	☑	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☑	☑	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☑	☑	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☑	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☑	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑
☑	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑
☑	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑
☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

ENDMATTER:
RESOURCES



SOURCES

1. Road Segments, LA County Countywide Address Management System (CAMS), 2024. cams-lacounty.hub.arcgis.com
2. Population 2050, SED TAZ-Tier2-Level Estimates - SCAG Region, 2024. https://hub.scag.ca.gov/
3. Road Segments, LA County Countywide Address Management System (CAMS), 2024. cams-lacounty.hub.arcgis.com
4. https://oehha.ca.gov/calenviroscreen/report/calenviroscreen-40, CalEnviroScreen-4.0, CA OEH, Page Dated May 1, 2023 Accessed April 30, 2025.
5. https://storymaps.arcgis.com/stories/ca477e68657643c9a2bad1fddfe24359, A Great Divide: L.A. Equity Index, LA Controller, Accessed April 30, 2025.
6. https://oehha.ca.gov/calenviroscreen/sb535, SB 535 Disadvantaged Communities, CA OEH, Accessed April 30, 2025.`
7. Tree Canopy - Block Group, Tree People, Center for Urban Resilience (CURes) at Loyola Marymount University, 2020. https://lmu-la.maps.arcgis.com/apps/MapSeries/index.html?appid=8d77f677faba40ce9f51d98e9a3196aa, Accessed April 30, 2025.
8. LA County Chief Sustainability Office, LA County Climate Vulnerability Assessment, October 2021. https://lacounty.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=c78e929d004846bb993958b49c8e8e65, Accessed April 30, 2025.
9. Criminalization Risk, Catalyst California, 2022. https://www.catalystcalifornia.org/campaign-tools/maps-and-data/justice-equity-need-index, Accessed April 30, 2025.
10. LA County Chief Sustainability Office, LA County Climate Vulnerability Assessment, October 2021. https://lacounty.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=c78e929d004846bb993958b49c8e8e65, Accessed April 30, 2025.
11. Tree Canopy - Block Group, Tree People, Center for Urban Resilience (CURes) at Loyola Marymount University, 2020. https://lmu-la.maps.arcgis.com/apps/MapSeries/index.html?appid=8d77f677faba40ce9f51d98e9a3196aa, Accessed April 30, 2025.
12. Urban Habitat Quality Score. City of LA Department of Sanitation (LASAN), Biodiversity Index, 2021. Classification and Assessment with Landsat of Visible Ecological Groupings (CALVEG), Los Angeles Region Imagery Acquisition Consortium (LARIAC), Isaac Brown (UCLA Doctoral Dissertation). https://geohub.lacity.org/maps/b9b9c447cf6543f4872fa18bc7b0193b/explore?location=34.019472%2C-118.414050%2C10.70, Accessed April 30, 2025.
13. https://www.placer.ai/, Home Page, data accessed via subscription, Accessed June 25, 2025.
14. https://www.placer.ai/company/privacy-faq, Privacy FAQ, PlacerAI, Accessed April 30, 2025.
15. Citywide Wildlife Connectivity. City of LA Department of Sanitation (LASAN). LA Biodiversity Index Baseline Report, 2022.
16. Citywide Wildlife Connectivity. City of LA Department of Sanitation (LASAN). LA Biodiversity Index Baseline Report Appendix II Master Methods, Page 18. 2022.
17. Detailed LA County Park Needs Assessment Park Need, LA County Department of Parks and Recreation. 2016. https://egis-lacounty.hub.arcgis.com/maps/8ca2be89332d4cfcb21ba58d9d14f6c8/explore?location=34.080826%2C-118.358500%2C12.08, Accessed April 30, 2025.

TABLE OF FIGURES

Figure 1. The Steering Committee receives an update on PNA progress on May 20, 2025. Source: OLIN, 2025. Found On Page 7

Figure 2. Griffith Park has a beloved trail system crossing through the park. Source: City of LA Recreation and Parks, 2025. Found On Page 11

Figure 3. Engagement meetingsin Phase 3 included food venders and informational boards out in the parks. Source: The Robert Group, 2025. Found On Page 12

Figure 4. A celebration marks opening day at Hope and Peace playground. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found On Page 16

Figure 5. PNA Criteria: Park Pressure. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: Walkshed from RAP Parks (RAP Access Points (2025) and LA County CAMS Road Segments), and Projected 2050 Population (Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Connect SoCal 2024 Growth Projections) Found On Page 18

Figure 6. PNA Criteria: Walk Network Connectivity. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: Walkshed from RAP Parks (RAP Access Points (2025) and LA County CAMS Road Segments) and idealized walkshed (Half-mile buffer from the boundary of RAP parks). Found On Page 19

Figure 7. PNA Criteria: Park Conditions Assessment. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: Parks Conditions Assessment, City of LA Department of Recreation and Parks. 2024. Found On Page 20

Figure 8. PNA Criteria: Environmental, Social, and Health Equity. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: CalEnviroScreen 4.0, 2021, CoLA Equity Index (2024), SB 535 Disadvantaged Communities. Found On Page 21

Figure 9. PNA Criteria: Low Shade Cover. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: Walkshed from RAP Parks (RAP Access Points (2025) and LA County CAMS Road Segments), Tree Canopy Cover by Block Group (Tree People and Loyola Marymount University), and Park Landcover (City of LA Bureau of Public Works - Forest Management, 2025). Found On Page 22

Figure 10. PNA Criteria: Climate Vulnerability. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: LA County Chief Sustainability Office, LAC Climate Vulnerability Assessment. Found On Page 23

Figure 11. PNA Criteria: Perceived Park Safety. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: PNA Statistically Valid Survey Results, 2025. Found On Page 24

Figure 12. PNA Criteria: Criminalization Burden. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: Justice Equity Need Index (JENI) Criminalization Risk (Catalyst California) Found On Page 25

Figure 13. PNA Criteria: Capital Improvement Project History. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: RAP Prop K, Quimby, Grants and Non Grants Funding Found On Page 26

Figure 14. PNA Criteria: Extreme Heat Risk. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: LA County Chief Sustainability Office, LAC Climate Vulnerability Assessment. Found On Page 27

Figure 15. PNA Criteria: Lack of Private Open Space. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: Walkshed from RAP Parks (RAP Access Points (2025) and LA County CAMS Road Segments), Impervious Cover by Residential Parcel (Tree People and Loyola Marymount University) Found On Page 28

Figure 16. PNA Criteria: Biodiversity and Habitat Conservation. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: Urban Habitat Quality Score. City of LA Department of Sanitation (LASAN). Found On Page 29

Figure 17. PNA Criteria: Metro Corridors. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: Walkshed from RAP Parks (RAP Access Points (2025) and LA County CAMS Road Segments), LA County Metropolitan Transit Authority (LAC MTA). Found On Page 30

Figure 18. PNA Criteria: Perceived Park Condition. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: PNA Statistically Valid Survey Results, 2025. Found On Page 31

Figure 19. PNA Criteria: Perceived Recreation Center Condition. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: PNA Statistically Valid Survey Results, 2025. Found On Page 32

Figure 20. PNA Criteria: Perceived Walkability. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: PNA Statistically Valid Survey Results, 2025. Found On Page 33

Figure 21. PNA Criteria: Presence of Community Priority Amenities. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: PNA Statistically Valid Survey Results, 2025. Found On Page 34

Figure 22. PNA Criteria: Park Visitation. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: Placer.ai data of park visitation Found On Page 35

Figure 23. PNA Criteria: MyLA311 Requests. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: City of LA MyLA311 requests (2025) Found On Page 36

Figure 24. PNA Criteria: Habitat Connectivity. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: Citywide Wildlife Connectivity. City of LA Department of Sanitation (LASAN). Found On Page 37

Figure 25. PNA Criteria: Tree Species Composition. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: City of LA RAP, Tree Inventory and OLIN (2025). Found On Page 38

Figure 26. PNA Criteria: Infiltration and Recharge Opportunities. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: LADWP Stormwater Capture Master Plan, 2015. Found On Page 39

Figure 27. PNA Criteria: Water Quality Priority. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: Walkshed from RAP Parks (RAP Access Points (2025) and LA County CAMS Road Segments), Water Quality Priority from LA County Public Works, Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP) LSPC Model Input (2012) and Geosyntec (2018). Found On Page 40

Figure 28. PNA Criteria: LA County Park Needs Assessment. Source: OLIN, 2025 using Data from: Detailed LA County Park Needs Assessment Park Need (LA County) Found On Page 41

Figure 29. Drone image of Echo Park. Source: Calvada Surveying, 2025. Found On Page 42

Figure 30. Thirty-six New Park Priority Areas were added to the “Universe of Sites” using the PerSquareMile tool. These sites were selected to help address both Park Access and Park Supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025. Found On Page 45

TABLE OF FIGURES

Figure 31. Parks within and near the Vermont - Knolls Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025. Found On Page 46

Figure 32. Parks within and near the Florence Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025. Found On Page 48

Figure 33. Parks within and near the Vermont - Slauson Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025. Found On Page 50

Figure 34. Parks within and near the Harvard-Park Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025. Found On Page 52

Figure 35. Parks within and near the Vermont - South Park Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025. Found On Page 54

Figure 36. Parks within and near the South Park - Florence Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025. Found On Page 56

Figure 37. Parks within and near the Central-Alameda Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025. Found On Page 58

Figure 38. Parks within and near the East Vermont Square, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025. Found On Page 60

Figure 39. Parks within and near the Historic South Central Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025. Found On Page 62

Figure 40. Parks within and near the Central-Alameda-North Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025. Found On Page 64

Figure 41. Parks within and near the Exposition Park, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025. Found On Page 66

Figure 42. Parks within and near the North Historic South Central, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025. Found On Page 68

Figure 43. Parks within and near the University Park North, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025. Found On Page 70

Figure 44. Parks within and near the Harvard Heights-Pico Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025. Found On Page 72

Figure 45. Parks within and near the Pico-Union, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025. Found On Page 74

Figure 46. Parks within and near the Downtown, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025. Found On Page 76

Figure 47. Parks within and near the Boyle Heights Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025. Found On Page 78

Figure 48. Parks within and near the Windsor Square Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025. Found On Page 80

Figure 49. Parks within and near the Koreatown Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025. Found On Page 82

Figure 50. Parks within and near the Westlake-Koreatown Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025. Found On Page 84

Figure 51. Parks within and near the Westlake Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025. Found On Page 86

Figure 52. Parks within and near the East Hollywood-Koreatown Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025. Found On Page 88

Figure 53. Parks within and near the East Hollywood Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025. Found On Page 90

Figure 54. Parks within and near the Tarzana - Encino Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025. Found On Page 92

Figure 55. Parks within and near the Van Nuys – Valley Glen Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025. Found On Page 94

Figure 56. Parks within and near the Winetka Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025. Found On Page 96

Figure 57. Parks within and near the Van Nuys West Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025. Found On Page 98

Figure 58. Parks within and near the Van Nuys Central Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025. Found On Page 100

TABLE OF FIGURES

Figure 59. Parks within and near the Van Nuys East Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025. Found On Page 102

Figure 60. Parks within and near the North Hollywood, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025. Found On Page 104

Figure 61. Parks within and near the Reseda Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025. Found On Page 106

Figure 62. Parks within and near the South Panorama City Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025. Found On Page 108

Figure 63. Parks within and near the Sun Valley Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025. Found On Page 110

Figure 64. Parks within and near the North Hills Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025. Found On Page 112

Figure 65. Parks within and near the Panorama City West Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025. Found On Page 114

Figure 66. Parks within and near the Arleta Grid, as a visual measure of park proximity within a 10-minute walk (half-mile) and park supply. Source: GreenInfo Network, OLIN, 2025. Found On Page 116

Figure 67. Flying over Sixth Stree Viaduct during the 2025 CicLAVia Heart of LA event when cyclists have exclusive right-of-way. Source: Calvada Surveying, 2025. Found On Page 118

Figure 68. Flying over McArthur Park. Source: Calvada Surveying, 2025. Found On Page 144

Figure 69. Flying over Echo Park Lake. Source: Calvada Surveying, 2025. Found On Page 206

Figure 70. Skaters at the South East Valley Roller and Skateboard Park. Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. Found On Page 215

Figure 71. Flying over O'Melveny Park in the San Fernando Valley. Source: Calvada Surveying Inc. 2025. Found On Page 224

Figure 72. Flying over Griffith Observatory within Griffith Park. Source: Calvada Surveying, 2025.. Found On Page 235

Figure 73. Flying over Ken Malloy Harbor Park. Source: Calvada Surveying, 2025. Found On Page 236

Figure 74. Drone view over O'Melveny Park shows popular hiking trails in the North San Fernando Valley. Source Calvada Surveying, Inc., 2025. Found On Page 298

Figure 75. Certain guidelines may help address areas of high need, as defined by the PNA's site prioritization criteria. Found On Page 318





PREPARED BY:

OLIN

THE ROBERT GROUP | KOUNKUEY DESIGN INITIATIVE | AGENCY: ARTIFACT | ESTOLANO ADVISORS
BETTER WORLD GROUP | GEOSYNTEC CONSULTANTS | HR&A ADVISORS | WEST OF WEST | GREENINFO NETWORK
LANDAU DESIGN + TECHNOLOGY | DHARAM CONSULTING | CALVADA SURVEYING | ETC INSTITUTE