



W. E. S. C. A.

“We are a group of concerned community members dedicated to making our area a better place to live.”

Honorable Mayor Beverly O’Neill
Members of the Long Beach City Council
333 West Ocean Boulevard
Long Beach, CA 90802

Dear Mayor O’Neill and Members of the City Council:

On behalf of the of the West East-side Community Association (WESCA) I want to voice our opposition to the use of Federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds to support a bond for parks and open space. WESCA is concerned over the fiscal impact this bond measure will have on our neighborhoods and the process by which this measure is being presented for a vote.

WESCA is the neighborhood located between Cherry Avenue to Redondo Avenue, 10th Street to Pacific Coast Highway. We are a neighborhood that will be directly impacted by the reduction in programs and services of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds. The trees, murals, home improvements, new small businesses, sidewalks, façade improvement and community events have been a result of CDBG funds. Neighborhood Services Bureau has done a tremendous job in distributing and managing these funds in our neighborhood. The improvements in our community of lower crime, higher property values and better quality of life have been due to the efforts of Neighborhood Services Bureau and CDBG.

The potential impact on CDBG funded programs and services that must be reduced if CDBG funds are committed for an annual bond payment over the next 20 years will negatively impact our neighborhoods. WESCA understands that other neighborhoods need more parks and open spaces. Until recently WESCA only had one park in our neighborhood. However, we looked at

creative ways to leverage the current CDBG funds to develop a new open green space in our neighborhood. WESCA was directly involved in the development of the Rotary Club Park and 15th Street / Hile Project. For the 15th Street and Hile project we leveraged funds through the Neighborhood Partners Program Grant which allowed us to create green space in our neighborhood. The continual reduction in CDBG funds through a bond measure is not the way to approach this concern. This year CDBG funds were reduced by over \$500,000. The budget for the next year will include an additional reduction of over \$1 million more. In addition President Bush has proposed an additional CDBG funding reduction of 25 percent the following fiscal year. The funds available for our community are already being impacted by federal policy. The reduction of \$1 million dollars will take away the crucial programs and services that our neighborhood needs. CDBG funds have helped to leverage resources, opportunities and money for neighborhood improvement projects.

As a resident of the city of Long Beach and President of WESCA I am directly involved in the process of CDBG funds. I attend the public hearings to provide my input to the distribution and management of the CDBG funds. I am very concerned in the way this bond measure is being presented before council. One of the pillars of municipal governments is citizen participation. I do not think that the residents of Long Beach have had the time and opportunity to understand the full impact of this bond measure will have. Each year neighborhood residents, non-profits and community-based organizations take time to provide comments on the distribution of these funds. This bond measure goes against all of the time we have spent in participating in the input process and development of CDBG funds. In addition, this item has not gone before the Community Development Advisory Commission that was established to oversee these funds. Tactics such as the development and presentation of this bond measure are archaic and do not help to build trust and community. We are asking for the opposition to this measure not only based on the impact to our neighborhoods but to send a message that these political tactics are not part of the political practices of the City of Long Beach and its council.

Thank you for the opportunity to share our concerns regarding the impact this bond will have on our City. We can see the impact and benefits that each CDBG dollar has had across the City in each tree, home business, community center and mural that has been added to our neighborhoods through these funds. Reducing CDBG begins to cut out the roots of our neighborhood growth.

Respectfully,

Jan Ward,
President



<Carrol.cg@verizon.net>
t>
Sent by: "Carrol
Goddard"
<res0ubq1@verizon.net
>

04/16/2006 09:10 AM

To: "Beverly O'Neill" <beverly_o'neill@longbeach.gov>, "Val Lerch" <val_lerch@longbeach.gov>, "Bonnie Lowenthal" <bonnie_lowenthal@longbeach.gov>, "Frank Colonna" <frank_colonna@longbeach.gov>, "Jackie Kell" <jackie_kell@longbeach.gov>, "Laura Richardson" <laura_richardson@longbeach.gov>, "Patrick O'Donnell" <district4@longbeach.gov>, "Rae Gabelich" <district8@longbeach.gov>, "Tonia Reyes Uranga" <tonia_uranga@longbeach.gov>
cc: "Jerry Miller" <jerry_miller@longbeach.gov>
Subject: Agenda Item 40. 06-0281 Bonding for more park and open space

Honorable Council Members and Mayor O'Neill,:

I strongly urge you to NOT support bonding against CDBG funds to create more park land. While I advocate the creation of more open green space in the City of Long Beach, I feel this is not the way to accomplish it.

First of all, CDBG funding supports many, many needed services in the City of Long Beach, some of which take pressure off the general fund. Just one example is the tons of trash that are removed from our streets and alleys by neighborhood volunteers at community clean ups taking some of the burden off Public Works to keep our City clean. The monies needed to repay the bond will force the reduction of services provided from CDBG funds. Since CDBG funds support various programs in our existing parks, creating additional park space while cutting activities in all parks does not seem logical.

It is also fiscally irresponsible to bond against monies that are not stable. As long as the war in Iraq continues, domestic funding will be reduced by the federal government. CDBG funds have already been cut in prior years, Long Beach expects an additional \$1 million hit in this CDBG budget cycle, and more cuts are foreseen in future budgets. Once again to bond against funds that are not stable, but in fact, are trending toward reduction is not fiscally sound and will put the General Fund in jeopardy of having to repay the bond.

A similar plan of bonding against CDBG funds was presented to the Central Project Redevelopment Area Committee (CPAC) last year to provide funding for a Central Area Police Substation and was soundly rejected by membership. Those of us who are actively involved in our neighborhoods know exactly how precious and useful CDBG funds are. Please do everything you can to keep those funds available for the many non-profit organizations (including homeless services), neighborhoods, residents, youth, and businesses (including the City of Long Beach) who utilize them.

Sincerely,

Carrol Goddard

1st District Resident
Willmore City's CPAC Rep.

e-mail: Carrol@GoddardGroup.net

Primary #: (562) 618-9507

(562) 435-5843 (fax)



"Annie
Greenfeld-Wisner"
<shorti2448@msn.com
>

To: "district4" <district4@ci.long-beach.ca.us>
cc:
Subject: Park Bond

04/16/2006 10:27 AM

Patrick:

I know I am not in your district, but as a someone who care about Long Beach, I'd like to clarify my position:

On its face, the agenda item sounds good - but both you and the people of Long Beach do not know everything.

Agenda item #40 on the council agenda for this Tues? It reads: "Recommendation to authorize City Manager to develop bond documents in preparation of financing the expansion of parks and open space in underserved communities and once the documents are prepared return to City Council with the proposed bond financing and issuance of debt in an amount not to exceed \$25 Million. (Districts 1,2,6,7,9)."

No where in the backup is District 2 included.

Doesn't it seem strange to anyone

else that in attachment B of the backup item, 8 of the 15 parks are in the 6th district, 2 are in the 7th district and 4 in the 1st district and 1 in the 9th district?

Which parks will get the money first? I can bet it will be the parks in the 6th.

Doesn't it also seem strange that \$25 Million could finance 15 parks? - in what lifetime does that happen?

You and I both know that this is only being done to free up redevelopment funds for the construction of the central police station that Laura Richardson has been trying to get done! Chief Batts wants more police - not a building he cannot staff.

Isn't anyone going to ask what

services have to be cut from CDBG funds to accomplish this bond?

Just in case you're interested, here are some of the services that CDBG dollars help:

1. Home Improvement Rebate Program
321 Single Family Housing Units Upgraded
198 Multi-Family Housing Units Upgraded
2. Tool Rental Assistance Program
52 Single Housing Units Served
8 Multi-Family Housing Units Served
3. Home Security Program
94 Single Family Housing Units Served
128 Multi-Family Housing Units Served
4. Graffiti Removal Program
29,820 Sites had graffiti removed
5. Neighborhood Revitalization & Beautification (NIS) Social Services
92, 189 NIS Residents Served

- 78 Community Meetings
- 177 Clean Up Activities
- 6. Nuisance Abatement/Property Management Training
 - 126 Housing Units Impacted
- 7. Neighborhood Partners Program
 - 9 beautification projects were completed
- 8. Neighborhood Police Centers
 - 13,130 Total Residents served
- 9. Neighborhood Resource Center 570-1010
 - Neighborhood Groups assisted 584 times
- 10. Neighborhood Leadership Training Program
 - 35 persons graduated from six-month program
- 11. Social Services Grant Program
 - Twenty -two Agencies Awarded Grants
 - 96,780 Total Clients Served by those Agencies
- 12. Multi-Services Center
 - 23,176 Homeless Clients Served
- 13. Youth Programs
 - After school & weekend recreation activities offered to youth
 - 166,336 Total Clients Served within 17 Neighborhood Areas
 - Intervention Prevention Program
 - 3,570 at-risk youth served
 - Mobile Recreation Program
 - 10, 285 youth provided recreation services
 - Mural Arts Program
 - 5,416 youth served
- 14. Code Enforcement - City Prosecutor
 - 1,012 cases initiated
- 15. Code Enforcement - Intensified Code Enforcement (ICE)
 - 26,798 properties inspected
 - 2,388 cases were completed
 - 1,882 cases were opened
- 16. Code Enforcement - Fresh Start
 - 68 severe code cases initiated
 - 99 cases completed
- 17. Neighborhood Improvement Strategy (NIS) Proactive Code Enforcement
 - 97,247 Properties/Businesses Surveyed
 - 1733 Deficiencies identified
 - 757 Cases Opened
 - 358 Cases referred to Home Improvement Rebate Program
- 18. Nonprofit Assistance Program (NAP)
 - 9 Organizations awarded grants averaging \$50,000
 - 59,314 Total Clients benefited from assistance
- 19. Public Facility/Infrastructure Access (Americans with Disabilities Act)
 - 21 facilities made accessible to disabled
- 20. New Park Development
 - Five parks made accessible to the disabled
- 21. Urban Forestry Program
 - 280 Trees Planted
- 22. Neighborhood Sidewalk Program
 - 116,780 Square Feet of Sidewalk Created
- 23. Sidewalk Replacement Project

- 784 Sites received new sidewalks
24. Economic Development Revolving Loan Program
18 Loans funded
39 Jobs for Low-Moderate Income Individuals created
 25. Microenterprise Loan Program
8 Loans were funded to low-income business owners
 26. Commercial Improvement Rebate Program
189 Businesses Facades Improved
 27. Neighborhood Business Investment Program
68 new businesses were awarded \$2,000 start up grants
 28. Small Business Outreach Program
2,339 businesses were interviewed and provided City resources
 29. Hire-A-Youth
72 youth employed
 30. Fair Housing Services
2,684 landlord/tenant complaints received and investigated
184 discrimination complaints received and investigated
2,684 complaints mediated
1,783 other services provided to support housing

ISN'T ANYONE GOING TO QUESTION WHAT IS GOING TO HAPPEN TO THESE SERVICES FOR THE LOW INCOME AND DISABLED? PLEASE, I IMPLOR YOU TO PAY ATTENTION.

THINK OF HOW UNHAPPY YOUR CONSTITUENTS WILL BE WITH PARKS WITHOUT PROGRAMS, NOT TO MENTION THE SERVICES THAT THIS GRANT PAYS FOR.

NOW WE'RE BONDING ON FEDERAL GRANTS, THE REPAYMENT FOR WHICH HAS TO BE BACKED BY THE GENERAL FUND!! WHAT NEXT?
ANOTHER QUESTION THAT NEEDS TO BE ASKED IS HAS HUD OK'D THIS?

I know you are for your community and for parks, but please do not rush to judgment - ask the questions and delay the vote until we have an answer to ALL the questions. I look forward to meeting with you on Monday.

Annie Greenfeld-Wisner



"Don/Joanne"
<newyork2cal@earthli
nk.net>

To: <district4@longbeach.gov>
cc:
Subject: to Pat re-Item 40 Bond matter tonite

04/18/2006 01:13 PM

Hi, Pat -

Today I have called the other council offices, and mayor, to express my opinion on the parks bond, which is "Please Vote NO". This bond threatens existing CDBG programs, not to mention the potential for damage to the general fund. And it directly benefits 5 districts (esp. Ms Richardson's district?).

It bothers me that there has been no real public discussion about a \$25 million dollar bond (or rather, the large sum the bond will cost in the end). If the proponents think it's a great deal, they should have no problem with informing the general public about it. Citizens cannot vote on the bond, but it's ultimately their money--all 9 districts of it. This leaves a bad taste.

Best regards,

Joanne Diamond,
438-1266
(NAC)



Kristen Autry
<liquidelbow@mac.com>

04/18/2006 10:11 AM

To: district1@longbeach.gov, council_district2@longbeach.gov,
district3@longbeach.gov, district4@longbeach.gov,
kell@longbeach.gov, district6@ci.long-beach.ca.us,
district7@ci.long-beach.ca.us, district8@longbeach.gov,
district9@longbeach.gov

cc:
Subject: City Council 4/18/06 Item 40-CDBG: oppose

Hello!

I have read in the paper and received more information via email regarding the Tuesday April 18 city council meeting where you will be voting on whether or not to approve a 25 million dollar bond for the purpose of small parks or park expansions in districts 1,6,7 and 9. I would like to respectfully encourage you to oppose this agenda item. I may not be able to attend tonight's council meeting to have the opportunity to speak.

Please know that I am certainly an advocate for open space and parks. We are very fortunate to have such amazing and thoughtful leadership in our Parks & Recreation and in Community Development. My concern is that the funding pulled from the Community Development Block Grant will severely impact the youth programs currently operating off of that fund. I believe that the youth programs need to remain in place, as we are already witnessing more and more after school program cuts. How will the youth spend their afternoons without these programs available? Will there be less employment for staff?

Could there be incentives to new developers in high density neighborhoods whereby a condition of the RFP to a developer could be to contribute to an open space/green fund? or perhaps include public park areas within the development?

I will always respect your decision making. You have all inspired me.

Sincerely,
Kristen Autry



CITY OF LONG BEACH

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

333 WEST OCEAN BOULEVARD • LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA 90802

Honorable Mayor Beverly O'Neill
Members of the Long Beach City Council
333 West Ocean Boulevard
Long Beach, CA 90802

Dear Mayor O'Neill and Members of the City Council:

On behalf of the Community Development Advisory Commission, I want to voice our opposition to the use of Federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds to support a bond for parks and open space. The Commission was established by the City Council to:

"Assist in the development of plans, programs and activities for community development and to foster public interest and support in such programs".

Until this evening, the Commission has not been given an opportunity to comment on the proposed bond measure and, more important, the public has not had an opportunity to understand its potential impact on CDBG funded programs and services that must be reduced if CDBG funds are committed for an annual bond payment over the next 20 years.

The Commission understands that many neighborhoods need more parks and open space. The Commission has supported the Department of Parks, Recreation and Marine in the last two years by recommending the use of \$1.5 million in CDBG funds to support the expansion of parks in low-income neighborhoods. The Commission, however, voted unanimously not to support a long-term obligation of CDBG for bond repayments due to the adverse impact this commitment will have on the many critically needed programs CDBG funds now support.

This year CDBG funds were reduced by over \$500,000. The budget for the next year will include an additional reduction of over \$1 million more. The President has proposed an additional CDBG funding reduction of 25 percent the following fiscal year. The Commission already has the painful task of recommending to you, cuts in youth programs, homeless services, neighborhood improvement programs, and economic and business assistance services. If this proposed bond obligation proceeds, the level of further reductions to CDBG funded programs will be devastating.

We welcome any opportunity to further discuss this matter with you and, urge you to allow us to conduct a public hearing to solicit public input on this very dramatic change to the CDBG program before proceeding with this decision.

Thank you for the opportunity to share our concerns!

Sincerely,

John Thomas
Chairman
Community Development Advisory Commission

RECEIVED
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
CITY OF LONG BEACH
2006 MAR 31 P 1:42