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What does it mean to be an Angeleno?
There’s no place like it on Earth. Culturally diverse. Great weather. Seamos más unidos y que todos seamos iguales.

Resilient

We love the mountains, the ocean, and the vitality of Los Angeles. Una persona con ganas de salir adelante.


—Respondents from Loyola Marymount University’s 2016 Public Outlook Survey
About Us
The Thomas and Dorothy Leavey Center for the Study of Los Angeles at Loyola Marymount University is one of the leading undergraduate research centers in the nation. We are a respected leader in public opinion surveys, exit polling, and leadership and community studies. Founded in 1996, the Center conducts groundbreaking research through its LA Votes exit poll project, LA Riots Anniversary Studies, and Los Angeles Public Opinion and Leaders Surveys. We provide rigorous, mentored research experiences for undergraduate students at Loyola Marymount University with an emphasis on hands-on field research. As the preamble to the LMU mission states, “We benefit from our location in Los Angeles, a dynamic city that brings into sharp focus the issues of our time and provides an ideal context for study, research, creative work, and active engagement. We invite men and women diverse in talents, interests, and cultural backgrounds to enrich our educational community.” The Center brings this mission alive, taking pride in our work’s emphasis on understanding and communicating the issues of our time.

Loyola Marymount University
LMU is a private Catholic university with 6,000 undergraduates, 2,200 graduate students and 1,100 law students from diverse backgrounds and many perspectives. The seven colleges and schools at LMU boast best-in-the-nation programs in film and television, business, education and more. The university’s stunning campus in West Los Angeles is a sun-soaked oasis overlooking the Pacific coast and a model of sustainability. LMU is rooted in the heart of Los Angeles, a global capital for arts and entertainment, innovation and technology, business and entrepreneurship. The university’s mission is grounded in a centuries-old Jesuit educational tradition that produces extraordinary men and women dedicated to service and social justice. LMU is proud of more than 85,000 LMU alumni whose professional achievements are matched by a deep commitment to improving the lives of others.

Fernando J. Guerra, professor of political science and Chicana/o studies, is the founding director of the Center for the Study of Los Angeles at Loyola Marymount University. He earned his doctorate in Political Science from the University of Michigan and his B.A. from the University of Southern California. Guerra has served on standing commissions, blue ribbon committees, and ad hoc task forces for the City of Los Angeles, the State of California, and regional bodies in Southern California. He is a source for the media at the local, national, and international level and has published in the area of state and local government and urban and ethnic politics.

Brianne Gilbert is the associate director for the Center for the Study of Los Angeles and an adjunct faculty member in political science and urban studies at Loyola Marymount University. She has worked on dozens of studies involving voter polls, public opinion research, and leaders/elite surveys and has served as a consultant in the fields of sociology, anthropology, GIS (geographic information systems), education, public opinion research, international affairs, geology, and medicine. She also is the author of Statistics in the Social Sciences: Inferential Statistics as Rhetoric in Sociology. Gilbert earned her B.A. from Wittenberg University and her M.A. from Florida International University.
Berto Solis is a research associate at the Center for the Study of Los Angeles. Solis manages visual and editorial unity across the Center’s print, web, and audio visual materials. He also serves as the Center’s special events coordinator, promoting, planning, and executing Center activities including lectures, forums, and conferences. He mentors undergraduate students on research design and presentation skills during large scale academic projects run by the Center. Solis earned a double B.A. in Spanish and Latin American & Iberian Studies from UC Santa Barbara.

Maia Krause is a research associate at the Center for the Study of Los Angeles. She manages select survey research projects, facilitating survey development, implementation, and dissemination, and acts as writing and editing consultant to Center researchers. In conjunction with staff, she mentors and manages undergraduate researchers, especially as their work pertains to survey research. Krause earned her B.A. in English from Stanford University, and her Ph.D. in English from UC Irvine.

Alejandra Alarcon is the research coordinator for the Center for the Study of Los Angeles. She serves as the Center’s office manager and scheduler and is the first point of contact for Center communications. She leads the Center’s undergraduate research assistants and mentors them through research projects as they continue to develop their methodological and technical skills. Her research interests include race-sex-gender studies, contemporary urban issues and community studies. Alarcon earned her B.A. in Chicana/o Studies from Loyola Marymount University.

Brianda Alvarez is a graduate assistant at the Center for the Study of Los Angeles. She provides administrative support for daily operations, assists Center researchers with various research projects, and works closely with the Center’s undergraduate research assistants. Alvarez is currently a graduate student in the Counseling program at LMU and is pursuing a career in K-12 School Counseling. Her previous work experience includes working for the Ethnic Resource Centers at UC Santa Cruz and serving as a Program Manager for SACNAS, a national STEM organization dedicated to fostering the success of Hispanic/Chicano and Native American scientists in college and beyond. Alvarez earned her B.A. in Sociology from UC Santa Cruz.
Introduction

Forecast LA is an annual conference that integrates a triad of forecasting metrics: the opinions of residents, the opinions of leaders, and traditional economic indicators. In its third year, Forecast LA explores the civic and economic concerns, cultural identities, and levels of satisfaction of residents and leaders in the Los Angeles region. Forecast LA aids decision makers in shaping the future of Los Angeles by providing annual snapshots of the region. These snapshots provide a comparative framework that depicts trends across time, demography, and outlook in the Los Angeles region. This holistic approach distinguishes Forecast LA from other regional forecasts which focus on economic indicators but exclude public opinion and the perspective of regional leaders.
Methodology

As part of Forecast LA’s unique approach to forecasting in the Los Angeles region, the Center for the Study of Los Angeles conducted two outlook surveys. The Los Angeles Leaders Survey involved face-to-face interviews with Los Angeles County public school superintendents who discussed their priorities for their school districts, how their districts will fare economically in the short and long term, and other education policy issues. The Los Angeles Public Opinion Survey involved 20-minute telephone sessions with more than 2,400 adults living in Los Angeles County. Survey respondents were asked about quality-of-life perceptions, personal economic wellbeing, economic concerns, overall life satisfaction, and various civic issues.
Leaders Survey: Public School Superintendents of LA County

SAMPLING
The universe for the Leaders Survey was the 80 sitting superintendents of public school districts of Los Angeles County (interim and acting superintendents were included if necessary). The survey was completed by 52 of the 80 superintendents.

DATA COLLECTION
In an initial letter sent to each of the 80 public school superintendents, the Center for the Study of Los Angeles explained the purpose of the survey and requested their participation in an in-person survey. Researchers followed up with email and phone requests. Surveys were conducted over a four and a half month period from October 2015 to February 2016. Superintendents were surveyed in meeting rooms or offices at their respective school districts. The survey consisted of three sets of questions which the superintendents were asked to complete on an iPad or on paper, and a set of open-ended interview questions. Surveys took about 45 minutes to complete.

The subject consent form took approximately five minutes to read and sign, including time for any questions from the superintendents for the researcher about the survey or the consent process. At any point the superintendent was allowed to opt out of the survey. In addition, superintendents were informed that there were minimal risks associated with this study, that no penalties existed if he or she chose not to participate, and that no individual responses would be reported without his or her explicit consent.

Los Angeles Public Opinion Survey

SAMPLING
Since the primary purpose of this study was to gather representative input from adult residents within the Los Angeles region, an initial random digit dial (RDD) sample was employed. The RDD sample was drawn by determining the active phone exchanges (the first three numbers of a seven-digit phone number) and blocks with a given sampling area (in this case, by the zip codes that comprise the county). A random list of all active residential and cell phone numbers in the area was produced. This method included both listed and unlisted phone numbers. Listed samples were used to meet particular quotas for racial/ethnic categories and geographic location.

SCREENERS
The protocol for this study involved asking potential respondents a series of questions, referred to as screeners, which were used to ensure that the person lived within the county and was at least 18 years old. The target sample size was 1,200 residents from the city of Los Angeles and 1,200 residents from Los Angeles County who live outside the city of LA. The first quota was a random digit dialing of approximately 1,300 residents (with 30% cell phone). Upon completion of each wave, the remaining necessary quotas were determined, and the racial/ethnic and geographic quotas were employed: 250 African American residents, 400 Asian residents, 400 residents from the San Fernando Valley (only within the city of Los Angeles) and 400 residents from the San Gabriel Valley. Given the demographic proportion of Latino and white residents in the region, both groups were expected to naturally fall out from the initial wave of 1,300 subjects.

DATA COLLECTION
Telephone interviews were conducted the first four full weeks in January 2016 and first two weeks in February between the hours of 4:30pm and 9pm during the week, 10am to 4pm on Saturday, and 10am to 5pm on Sunday. The survey was translated into Spanish, Mandarin, and Korean. Translators who spoke Spanish, Mandarin, and Korean were available to conduct interviews for residents who only spoke, or were more comfortable speaking any of those languages.

The margin of error is ±3.0% for the entire sample of 2,425 residents.
PLEASE NOTE:
Some districts overlap (i.e., an elementary school district overlaps with a high school district). All areas shaded as interviewed indicate at least one (often both) of the superintendents in that geographic area were interviewed.
Demographics: Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RACE/ETHNICITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple responses allowed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 &amp; over</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S.-born</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-born</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLITICAL PARTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declined to state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLITICAL IDEOLOGY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARITAL STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/Domestic partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated/Divorced/Widowed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEARS LIVED IN LOS ANGELES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-25 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 years or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LOS ANGELES COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS INTERVIEWED

MARTIN GALINDO
El Rancho Unified School District

MELISSA MOORE
El Segundo Unified School District

JOEL SHAWN
Glendale Unified School District

ROBERT VOORS
Glendora Unified School District

HELEN MORGAN
Hawthorne School District

PATRICIA ESCALANTE
Hermosa Beach City School District

STEVE MARTINEZ
Hughes-Elizabeth Lakes Union School District

DONALD BRANN
Inglewood Unified School District

MICHELE BOWERS
Lancaster School District

DAN STEFENOSKY
Los Virgenes Unified School District

ELLEN DOUGHERTY
Lawndale School District

KENT TAYLOR
Lennox School District

PHILLIP PEREZ
Little Lake City School District

MICHÈLLE KING
Los Angeles Unified School District

JONATHAN VASQUEZ
Los Nietos School District

BONNIE BELL
Lowell Joint School District

PAUL GOTHOLD
Lynwood Unified School District

MICHAEL MATTHEWS
Manhattan Beach Unified School District

KATHERINE FUNDUKIAN THORROSSIAN
Monrovia Unified School District

SUSANNA CONTRERAS SMITH
Montebello Unified School District

LILLIAN MALDONADO FRENCH
Mountain View School District

PAUL CORDEIRO
Newhall School District

RUTH PÉREZ
Paramount Unified School District

BRIAN MCDONALD
Pasadena Unified School District

RICHARD MARTINEZ
Pomona Unified School District

STEVEN KELLER
Redondo Beach Unified School District

AMY ENOMOTO-PEREZ
Rosemead School District

JOHN PAPPALARDO
San Gabriel Unified School District

SANDRA LYON
Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District

JOAN LUCID
Saugus Unified School District

GEOFF YANTZ
South Pasadena Unified School District

CATHERINE KAWAGUCHI
Sulphur Springs School District

MARY LOUISE LABRUCHERIE
Valle Linda Elementary School District

REGINA ROSSALL
Westside Union School District

RON CARRUTH
Whittier City School District

SANDRA THORSTENSON
Whittier Union High School District

VICKI ENGREICH
William S. Hart Union High School District

TERESA GREY
Willsonton School District

TOM JOHNSTONE
Wiseburn School District
DEMOGRAPHICS: RESIDENTS

Residents surveyed (2,425)
## Demographics: Residents / 18 and Older

### Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed full-time</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed part-time</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not working</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Political Ideology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Race/Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other ethnicity</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-29</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-44</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 &amp; over</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High/tech school grad</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College grad</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $40K</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40K–69,999</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70K–99,999</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100K–149,999</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150K or more</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/Domestic partnership</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/Separated/Widowed</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Birth Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S.-born</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-born</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Years Lived in Los Angeles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 years or less</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15 years</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-25 years</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 or more years</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANGELENO OPTIMISM

by Maia Krause, Ph.D.

Angelenos are an optimistic people. Leaders, residents, people of all ages, incomes, ethnicities, all consistently believe that their hometown is headed in the right direction. Yes, there are slight differences: Asian Americans and Latinos are more optimistic than whites and African Americans; liberals are more optimistic than conservatives; foreign born are more optimistic than US born. But on the whole, Angelenos are optimistic about the future of Los Angeles.

What does it mean when that optimism declines?

In 2016, when asked, “How do you think things are going in the Los Angeles Region,” 65 percent of Angelenos said the region was headed in the right direction, 74 percent said their city was headed in the right direction, and 75 percent said their neighborhood was headed in the right direction. As with results from past years, the closer to home, the more optimistic the response. However, last year, all of these numbers were higher: 69 percent, 75 percent, and 80 percent, respectively.

What has driven this change? Is optimism leveling off at 2014/2016 levels?

There is no single answer, but one fact is clear: Latinos’ optimism, in particular, has dropped off the most. They are still one of the most optimistic groups, but while last year they had the largest increases in optimism this year they have the largest declines.

Asian Americans and Latinos typically drive optimism in the region. Seventy-four percent of Asian Americans and 65 percent of Latinos believe the region is going in the right direction. However, these two groups also experienced the greatest drops in optimism between 2015 and 2016. Asian Americans experienced a drop of five percent and Latinos a drop of eight percent, while African Americans dropped by only two percent and whites actually increased in optimism by two percent.

Driving the drop amongst Latinos were surveys taken by native Spanish speakers. Fifteen percent less Spanish speakers felt the region was headed in the right direction in 2016. Notably, there was also a drop for foreign-born respondents: nine percent.

Other drops in optimism were seen with demographics who are younger, less educated, and have lower income: a drop of eight percent in Millennials, nine percent in high school/tech school graduates, and nine percent in those making under $40k/year. Essentially, two of the most optimistic groups of 2015, young Angelenos and Latino Angelenos, are also those whose optimism declined the most. Why?

First and foremost, these groups are especially influenced by the national narrative surrounding the 2016 election season. Latinos have been highly impacted by the negative rhetoric around immigration, especially emphasized by Donald Trump. Bernie Sanders persistently highlights issues of income inequality, which speaks to young and less wealthy Angelenos. The campaign season has brought the lingering effects of the recession and problems of economic disparity to everyone’s attention.

In the end, it becomes clear that optimism locally can still be impacted by larger issues and the national conversation about the future. Americans of all backgrounds and political affiliations are currently concerned about the future. The future of Los Angeles is always part of a larger story.

The future of Los Angeles is always part of a larger story.
How do you think things are going in the Los Angeles region/your city/your neighborhood: In the right direction or the wrong direction?

### LA REGION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Right Direction</th>
<th>Wrong Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>59% ▲</td>
<td>41% ▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>69% ▲</td>
<td>31% ▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>65% ▲</td>
<td>35% ▼</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### YOUR CITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Right Direction</th>
<th>Wrong Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>70% ▲</td>
<td>30% ▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>75% ▲</td>
<td>25% ▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>74% ▲</td>
<td>26% ▼</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Right Direction</th>
<th>Wrong Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>75% ▲</td>
<td>25% ▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>80% ▲</td>
<td>20% ▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>75% ▲</td>
<td>25% ▼</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How do you think things are going in the Los Angeles region: In the right direction or the wrong direction?

### LA REGION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Right Direction</th>
<th>Wrong Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>61% ▲</td>
<td>39% ▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>74% ▲</td>
<td>26% ▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>63% ▲</td>
<td>37% ▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>65% ▲</td>
<td>35% ▼</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DOES PUBLIC PERCEPTION CORRESPOND TO ECONOMIC REALITY?

*Forecast LA is unlike any other forecast.*

Where traditional economic forecasts focus on economic indicators, Forecast LA incorporates the opinions of Los Angeles residents and regional leaders. After listening to the experts discuss the national, state, and regional economy, and the attitudes and opinions of residents, what are your takeaways? How do you build upon the information presented at the conference to interpret these charts?
In general, do you believe the national economy will do much better, somewhat better, somewhat worse, or much worse in 2016 than 2015?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATIONAL ECONOMY</th>
<th>MUCH BETTER</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT BETTER</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT WORSE</th>
<th>MUCH WORSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you believe the Los Angeles’ regional economy will do much better, somewhat better, somewhat worse, or much worse in 2016 than 2015?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGIONAL ECONOMY</th>
<th>MUCH BETTER</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT BETTER</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT WORSE</th>
<th>MUCH WORSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which of the following sectors do you think is the most important to the county’s economy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOURISM</th>
<th>TRADE</th>
<th>FINANCE</th>
<th>MANUFACTURING</th>
<th>REAL ESTATE</th>
<th>TECHNOLOGY</th>
<th>ENTERTAINMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1: OUTLOOK

ECONOMIC INDICATORS

by Berto Solis

For three years running, the Los Angeles Public Opinion Survey has examined expectations of change in unemployment rates, housing prices, and healthcare costs in addition to perceptions of home affordability. The responses to these economic indicators have held steady since they were first asked in 2014: Angelenos continue to expect housing and healthcare costs to increase; are split about the unemployment rate increasing, staying the same, or decreasing; and very strongly believe that most people can’t afford a home in their city or area.

Racial and ethnic patterns have also held steady for three years. African Americans are the most likely to expect increases in the unemployment rate. Asian Americans are the most likely to expect housing prices to stay the same or decrease, whites are the most likely to expect their health care costs to increase, and Latinos serve as the bellwether group, reflecting the general trend albeit with higher levels of optimism.

These observations follow the regional narratives of these populations. African Americans and whites are no longer the majority they once were as demographics shift towards an Asian American/Latino majority. They are older populations and the ever-increasing costs of housing and healthcare concern them most directly as they approach retirement age (especially healthcare for whites).

Age influences perception, with youth correlating with brighter outlooks. Millennials expect the least increases on five of the six indicators examined in 2016 and have more optimistic expectations regarding home affordability than older generations. This pattern holds even when figures are broken down by age and ethnicity. Since the Latinos are the youngest ethnic population, their brighter outlook is no surprise.

Angelenos continue to expect housing and healthcare costs to increase; are split about the unemployment rate increasing, staying the same, or decreasing; and very strongly believe that most people can’t afford a home in their city or area.

Three new indicators were added to the survey this year; gas prices, interest rates, and food costs are all expected to increase in 2016. African American and Latinos are more likely to expect increases in costs than Asian Americans and whites. These differences in opinion align with educational attainment; on average African Americans and Latinos have lower educational attainments than do Asian Americans and whites.

Overall, Latinos and Asians are more optimistic in their expectations relative to African Americans and whites; this pattern is most readily apparent in the home affordability question. Sixty-nine percent of Asians and 47 percent of Latinos are foreign born, suggesting Asian American and Latino optimism connects most directly to the narrative of the American Dream. Despite having a significant percentage of their populations making less than $40K a year (49 and 58 percent respectively) Asian Americans and Latinos show the most optimism in regards to home affordability. •
Do you believe the following will increase, stay about the same, or decrease by the end of the year?

### UNEMPLOYMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Stay About the Same</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HOUSING PRICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Stay About the Same</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HEALTHCARE COSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Stay About the Same</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GAS PRICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Stay About the Same</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FOOD PRICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Stay About the Same</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INTEREST RATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Stay About the Same</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you think a majority of residents can afford to buy a home in your city?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Angelenos continue to believe that there will be an increase in economic disparity between the rich and the poor. But they seem to have trouble believing that they themselves are either rich or poor. According to the Angelenos in our survey, they are nearly all in the middle class. The results for these questions are contradictory: while Angelenos believe the economic disparity will increase, very few think they are part of the rich who are getting richer or the poor who are getting poorer.

By national standards, the 10 percent of respondents who have a total household income of $150,000 or more should be categorized as upper class and the 43 percent of respondents who are making under $40,000 should be categorized as lower class.

Yet 42 percent of Angelenos see themselves belonging to the middle class and another 42 percent identify in the other two middle categories. The national dialogue cries that America has a shrinking middle class yet more people, 84 percent total, see themselves solidly in one of the three tiers of the “middle class.”

When we reviewed the data to see how the richest and poorest households identified, we saw that the lowest household income category, under $40,000, was almost evenly split into thirds in self-identification between the middle, working, and lower classes. Of the upper class of our survey, those in households making $150,000 or more, over 90 percent identified as belonging to one of the middle class categories. Less than 10 percent identified as upper class. In fact, nearly as many people in the highest household income category identified as being part of the upper class as identified with being part of the working class! If the vast majority identify as belonging somewhere within the middle class, how do we study a phenomenon of a shrinking middle class? What happens when the percentage of people in the actual numerical middle class shrinks, but everyone still identifies with it? Is it that residents want to avoid a potential stigma of being part of the upper or lower classes? Possibly.

Our assessment is that lower income respondents see themselves as upwardly mobile and becoming part of the middle class. In contrast, higher income respondents see that the high cost of living in LA doesn’t lend itself to the lifestyle that it might elsewhere in the country or that it did in the past. As a result, higher income respondents relatively speaking are able to view themselves living a middle-class lifestyle.

Nearly everyone sees both richer and poorer people around them in the diverse LA community and so most of them self-identify as being somewhere in the middle. It’s not surprising that residents want to avoid the negative connotations that come with being rich or poor and instead claim America’s proud tradition of the middle class.

Is that the truth of the present and future reality for most Angelenos? How can we aid the economic and civic dialogue around income disparity if no one will consider themselves to be actually be part of the disparate groups?

Everyone seems to think they are more equal in income than they actually are. For LA residents to deal with the possible implications of income inequality, they first need to be able to accurately assess where they stand.

### (CLASS) IDENTITY CRISIS IN LA

by Brianne Gilbert, Maia Krause, Ph.D., & Candace Yamanishi, LMU Class of 2017

If you were asked to use one of these five names for your social class, which would you say you belong in: upper class, upper-middle class, middle class, working class, or lower class?

- 42%
- 30%
- 12%
- 2%
- 13%

**UPPER CLASS**

**UPPER-MIDDLE CLASS**

**MIDDLE CLASS**

**WORKING CLASS**

**LOWER CLASS**

Which category best describes your total household income?

- 43%
- 21%
- 15%
- 11%
- 10%

**$150K+**

**$100K–<$$150K**

**$70K–<$$100K**

**$40K–<$$70K**

**UNDER $40K**
By the end of the year, do you expect the financial situation in your household to improve, stay the same, or worsen?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Improve</th>
<th>Stay the Same</th>
<th>Worsen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you believe the following will increase, stay about the same, or decrease by the end of the year?

**Your Annual Income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Stay the Same</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Your Total Debt**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Stay the Same</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you think the growing economic disparity between the rich and the poor will increase, stay the same, or decrease in the future?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Stay the Same</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 2
CURRENT CHALLENGES
In the past several years, housing affordability in Los Angeles has reached crisis levels. It is not surprising therefore, that the 2016 Los Angeles Public Opinion Survey found that residents across all age groups and ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds have a rather pessimistic view of the housing market. Approximately 73 percent of respondents believe that the city’s already unaffordable housing prices will only increase by the end of 2016. I have to say that I agree with them.

It was not always this way. In the 1950s, Los Angeles was a haven for middle-class residents. Housing was largely affordable due to few regulations on growth, so supply was plentiful and relatively cheap. Since then, a confluence of land use regulations, community opposition, downzoning and rent control laws have stunted Los Angeles’ housing supply while the population has soared.

MORE JOBS THAN HOUSING

Today, the growth of jobs in Los Angeles far outpaces the supply of housing, adding to the critical shortage. As of the fourth quarter of 2015, Los Angeles is projected to have 5.9 times more new jobs than new housing supply. This means that on top of the existing supply and demand imbalance, the city projects there will be 5.9 new jobs added for each new future housing unit. This leads to an important question: Where will all of these workers live?

A significant contributing factor to the disparity between jobs and housing is Los Angeles’ severe lack of rental housing. The city’s rent control laws, which passed in 1978, apply to approximately 80 percent of its multifamily units. The laws limit supply by reducing turnover, so a large percentage of rent controlled units do not regularly come on the market as current renters are unwilling to move. As a result, this forces anyone looking for a rental to compete for available market-rate units, which have been limited in number due to zoning laws and other regulations.

High demand and short supply drive up real estate, including rentals. This makes it difficult for many residents to stay in the city, including police officers, firefighters and others who hold important municipal jobs.

PRODUCING MORE SUPPLY

Recognizing that Los Angeles needs more housing options for all residents, Los Angeles Mayor Eric Garcetti has set forth a goal to create 100,000 new housing units by 2021. In order to make this a reality, the city is reducing barriers to development and streamlining the entitlement process. This has made projects such as CityView’s current Koreatown development and its Barker Block community in the downtown arts district a reality.

For example, the City of Los Angeles now has expedited services available to evaluate requests for zoning changes and entitlements. Likewise, the Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety has instituted a number of programs that are improving the design and permitting process. These programs are reducing the amount of time needed to complete a project, which is encouraging to both developers and residents.

In addition, the City and County of Los Angeles are working on resourceful financing options for housing developments. Pension funds have a long history of investing in real estate as a way to generate returns that will help them meet future financial obligations. To this end, local pension funds such as the Los Angeles County Employees Retirement Association and the Los Angeles Fire and Police Plan are investing in the city’s housing market by deploying capital through real estate developers and investors such as CityView. This gives developers the money they need to finance construction, provides a solid investment opportunity for pension funds, and benefits the local community by providing much needed housing.
GREAT CITIES NEED A MIX OF PEOPLE AND HOUSING

Every great city has a mix of workers doing very different types of jobs for different levels of pay. In turn, a mix of housing types is needed at various affordability levels. It is counterproductive if real estate is so expensive that people cannot afford to live in the city where they work. One simple way to address this issue is to promote the generation of additional supply, particularly housing units targeted to working families.

The buildup to today’s housing crisis in Los Angeles did not happen overnight, but rather over several decades. As such, it will take years to correct this imbalance and bring housing prices down to a more affordable level for all residents. Fortunately, Los Angeles is currently implementing a number of positive steps to correct this pressing issue and, if successful, these initiatives will benefit residents and help this city continue to thrive.

Henry Cisneros is the co-founder and chairman of CityView, a premier investment management and development firm focused on urban multifamily real estate in the Western United States. He served as Secretary of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development from 1992 to 1997.

Do you believe housing prices will increase, stay about the same, or decrease by the end of the year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Stay About the Same</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Over half the participants in the survey, or 53 percent, assessed the status of homelessness in the City and County as “poor.” For those living in the City of Los Angeles versus areas in the County at large there is a 30+ point spread in these numbers with the City reporting a much more negative outlook (73 percent in the City versus 41 percent in the rest of the County). In the past homelessness in the City of Los Angeles was more concentrated internally within the City in places like Skid Row and Venice. The growth in homelessness has meant that all areas of the City are experiencing homelessness of a variety of types. Different types of homelessness require different responses.

Six different policy areas to address homelessness are indicated in the survey. From these six, two are shelter or housing-related, one is related to employment, one enforcement, and two are focused on improving services, either for mental health or for our veterans. The Comprehensive Homeless Strategy addresses all of these policy areas and is heavily integrated with the County plans to do the same.

1) EXPANSION OF TEMPORARY HOUSING

There is a need to provide additional short-term housing options while more permanent housing solutions are created, primarily the building of more affordable and permanent supportive housing. This process includes enhancing the existing shelter system and forging stronger connections with LAHSA and the city’s non-profit partners. Several strategies in the CHS address these needs and one has been prioritized for immediate implementation.

2) DEVELOPMENT OF SERVICES TO HELP HOMELESS FIND PERMANENT HOUSING

The Los Angeles region has been facing a housing crisis affecting all Angelenos. Over the last 40 years, Los Angeles has created the least new housing of 17 major cities in the U.S. This lack of new housing combined with a City and region whose population continues to grow has meant very low vacancy rates (housing availability) and rising prices for those able to find housing. In a housing market with increasingly limited options to buy or rent, lower income individuals and families are the most affected. Homelessness in Los Angeles continues to grow as housing prices increase and affordable housing options in once lower-cost areas decrease. This decrease in affordable options stems from...
middle and higher income individuals seeking housing in lower-cost areas due to the lack of supply throughout the region. Nearly half of the 64 strategies within the Comprehensive Homeless Strategy deal with increasing the supply of permanent housing for the homeless. Strategies include increasing public subsidies for affordable housing, reducing barriers for the construction of this housing, and enhancing the coordinated system of homeless case workers to help place homeless individuals and families into housing.

3) DEVELOPMENT OF SERVICES TO HELP HOMELESS FIND JOBS
For the homeless who have been forced to live on the streets for purely economic reasons, ensuring connection to jobs through employment counseling, professional development and by lowering barriers is also addressed in the CHS. Section 9 of the CHS outlines several strategies the City is implementing to create greater opportunity for the homeless to be employed so they can afford their housing and build a new life. Policy areas include city partnerships with social enterprise organizations, lowering barriers for the homeless and formerly homeless to be employed by the City and ensuring that particular needs of subgroups of homeless like young adults and women are more adequately met.

4) BETTER POLICING OF NEIGHBORHOODS
Every day the City’s Police and Fire Departments are on the frontlines of homelessness, regularly interacting with men, women and families living on the streets. Sometimes these interactions are positive and productive. Many times they are not. Out of the 64 strategies, the first ones mentioned in the CHS involve law enforcement and first responders. Stronger connections to services and assistance to the homeless, including mental health services, are possible, and first responders are uniquely positioned to make these connections.

5) EXPANSION OF MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES
Though the City of Los Angeles does not administer the health or mental health systems, the County does. The Comprehensive Homeless Strategy was written with this structure in mind and wherever possible, connection between City services and County health services are being strengthened. This emphasis on strengthening connections is occurring even at the level of law enforcement where County Department of Mental Health workers are being deployed alongside LAPD officers to ensure we respond appropriately to the health needs of homeless Angelenos.

6) EXPANSION OF SERVICES FOR VETERANS
After returning home from difficult foreign deployments, veterans are often left with few tools to navigate the employment and housing systems back here at home. Many fall into homelessness. This outcome is unacceptable and the City’s political leadership has responded by focusing on the needs of this group. In 2016 Los Angeles is on track to end veteran homelessness. This has been achieved with unprecedented collaboration between local and federal resources, policy changes and alignment toward a shared goal. Thousands of units of veteran housing will be coming online in the years ahead as well, to ensure there is an inventory and system in place to guarantee veteran homelessness will be a thing of the past.

Much work still lies ahead for the LA region to fully address homelessness. With nearly 45,000 people homeless in the County at any given time, the City and County are investing in a decade-long journey to eliminate homelessness. Both jurisdictions have detailed, complimentary plans in order to achieve this goal. What remains is a long-term focus and alignment of resources. The CHS detailed the need for over $1.8 billion in housing expenditures over a 10 year period to house the homeless. Los Angeles lacks a long-term revenue source to fully address this issue, so voters may be called upon to authorize new funding at the City and County level.

I have confidence that as we move forward in addressing this issue we will restore the public’s trust that government, when paired with a strong advocacy and non-profit community, can systematically address societal issues as complex as homelessness. A link to the full report can be found here: http://clkrep.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2015/15-1138-S1_misc_02-05-2016.pdf.

Miguel Santana is the City Administrative Officer for the City of Los Angeles. Mr. Santana has more than 25 years of experience managing numerous fiscal, legislative, political, and community issues in the City of Los Angeles and Los Angeles County.

Given the 12% increase in the homeless population in LA County over the last two years, which of the following programs to address homelessness do you think your city/Los Angeles County should prioritize in 2016?

**DEVELOPMENT OF SERVICES TO HELP HOMELESS FIND JOBS 35%**
**EXPANSION OF MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES 22%**
**DEVELOPMENT OF SERVICES TO HELP HOMELESS FIND PERMANENT HOUSING 19%**
**EXPANSION OF SERVICES FOR VETERANS 12%**
**EXPANSION OF TEMPORARY HOUSING 7%**
**BETTER POLICING OF NEIGHBORHOODS 6%**
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FATE OF STUDENTS AND FUNDING: DIFFERENCES IN OPINION
by Karie Huchting, Ph.D.

In the numerous surveys conducted by the Center for the Study of Los Angeles at Loyola Marymount University, when asked about the most important issue facing our communities, respondents consistently point to education as the major issue of concern.

As a native Angeleno, an Assistant Professor in the Department of Educational Leadership at LMU, and as a mother of a school-aged child, I agree with my fellow residents that education is the most important issue confronting our communities. The fate of our children is directly connected to the strength of our education system and the future of our community lies with our children.

Our education system is large and complex. In Los Angeles County, we have an array of public, charter, and private schools from which to choose. There are 80 public school districts and close to two million children educated in these K-12 schools. Los Angeles residents elect the members of their local school boards, who, in turn, appoint superintendents to lead their districts. The average tenure of a superintendent is about three years.

These superintendents are the educational leaders of their district. Their role includes many responsibilities—elected official, manager, communicator, instructional leader, social scientist, and more. While these duties are important aspects of effective leadership, some contend that a superintendent’s primary role should be to cultivate relationships (Houston & Eadie, 2002).

Strong relationships with the local school board are crucial to a superintendent’s effectiveness; however, collaborative relationships with constituents—teachers, parents, students, and principals—are essential. Thus, one opportunity for district leaders to evaluate the strength of their relationships is to examine whether their perceptions are aligned with that of their constituents.

If the state said it needed more money to maintain current funding for K-12 public education, would you/residents in your district be willing to pay higher taxes for this purpose?

According to data from both LA residents and superintendents, there are notable distinctions in perceptions of how well students will fare in 2016. The majority of superintendents (71 percent) believe students will fare better; 22 percent believe students will remain the same; and only 8 percent believe students will do worse. By comparison, 34 percent of the public believes students will fare better; 52 percent believe students will remain the same; and 14 percent believe students will do worse. Collectively, these findings might be interpreted positively such that the vast majority of superintendents (92 percent) and the public (86 percent) believe students will fare the same or better. However, comparing the inter-group percentages suggests that educational leaders and their constituents are not quite aligned in their outlook for 2016. In fact, superintendents are more optimistic about the future than are resident Angelenos.

Similarly, superintendents indicated that funding is a significant challenge to district success and further indicated that Adequate Basic Funding is the primary financial reform necessary to improve

Relative to the students in schools in the rest of Los Angeles County, how will students in your local school district fare in 2016?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESIDENTS</th>
<th>BETTER</th>
<th>ABOUT THE SAME</th>
<th>WORSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relative to the students in schools in the rest of the county, how will your students fare in 2016?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEADERS</th>
<th>BETTER</th>
<th>ABOUT THE SAME</th>
<th>WORSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Considering the overall state of education in Los Angeles County, what do you believe is/are the most important issue(s) facing public schools?

**RESIDENTS**

#1 FUNDING

#2 TEACHER QUALITY

#3 STUDENT/TEACHER RATIO

#4 NEED FOR SAFER SCHOOLS

#5 QUALITY OF EDUCATION

#6 PAY FOR TEACHERS

**LEADERS**

#2 IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMON CORE AND SMARTER BALANCED ASSESSMENTS

#3 HIRING AND TRAINING TEACHERS

#4 STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT AND SUCCESS

#5 EQUITY AND SUPPORT FOR HIGH NEEDS STUDENTS

#6 TECHNOLOGY AND SCHOOL INFRASTRUCTURE (TIED)
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ARE BODY CAMERAS THE ANSWER?

by Steve Soboroff

During the last decade the badge of the LAPD has been polished to be the finest in the nation. Large and small police departments from all over the world, looking at best practices to improve their own departments, call and visit the LAPD every week. The responses to the questions from the Center for the Study of Los Angeles’ Los Angeles Public Opinion Survey regarding the police and public safety are significant for planning our City’s future. My fellow LA Police Commissioners and I will find this a useful tool in moving forward to assure that the LAPD remains at the forefront of America’s finest community policing agencies.

The results of the survey, with 91 percent supporting the use of body cameras by the police, is a great validation of what we have been doing to lead the nation in the use of on-body cameras in big cities. The “on-body camera,” sometimes referred to “body cam,” or “on-officer camera,” is one of the most transformational positive developments in recent law enforcement history. This technology will provide an independent view of the interaction or action that a police officer has with a community member.

Starting with my first statement as Commissioner, I stressed the need for the LAPD to fully integrate use of cameras in policing:

**It is our plan to succeed by aggressively acknowledging, promoting, and innovating the positive while also transparently, tirelessly, and appropriately dealing with the problems that arise. The community policing model embraced by Chief Beck needs to be supported, expanded, technologically improved, and celebrated by this department and every single citizen in this great city. For example, we need the technology of in-car cameras, complimented or supplemented by lapel/on-body cameras soon. I mean within 18 months, not 18 years! To quote from the Consent Decree Final Report, “this initiative is critical and will protect against biased policing while enhancing officer safety and risk management analysis, and mitigating liability claims.” It will save tens of millions of dollars in court cases, thousands of man hours in both the LAPD and City Attorney’s offices, and serve to further cut crime as the “he said, she said” arguments will be a thing of the past.**

Cities across the country are increasingly making their police officers wear body-worn video cameras to record interactions with the public. Do you think this is a good idea or a bad idea?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOOD IDEA</th>
<th>BAD IDEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Soon after I became Commissioner, I surveyed dozens of folks knowledgeable about law enforcement including Councilmember Mitch Englander, the Los Angeles Police Protective League, and the ACLU, and was surprised to hear that virtually everyone wanted on-officer cameras. From there, we focused on the potential value of the emerging technology of on-body cameras for both the police and the community. At the same time, we noted the limited funds available to the City of Los Angeles for this technology. Given the budget constraints, a significant community fundraising effort was launched with approximately 1.6 million dollars raised from private sources and donated to the Los Angeles Police Foundation. The Department completed a pilot project, testing a variety of cameras and storage applications, and ultimately recommended that approximately 800 on-body cameras be purchased by the Police Foundation with the funds raised. This amount would cover all costs, technology upgrades, storage, and security for three years, during which time our hope was that the City Council would see the benefits, then order 7,000 more!

After the tragic events in Ferguson, Missouri, the family of Michael Brown, from the depth of their grief, called for on-body cameras for every law enforcement officer in America. President Obama followed with support and major funding for the purchase of on-body cameras...
for every law enforcement agency in the country. In Los Angeles we have had incidents of use of force, as recently as the officer involved shooting of Mr. Ezell Ford, that have occurred where the video from an on-body camera would be additional information in an investigation to get to the truth of the matter and what occurred. In a bold leadership move, Mayor Garcetti announced on December 16, 2014 that he was including in his budget for the Fiscal Year beginning July 1, 2015 sufficient funding to buy an additional 7,000 on-body cameras. His goal is to record every officer interaction with the public by July 2017. He was supported by Councilmembers led by Public Safety Committee chair Englander and others in a demonstration of unity.

With funding from a grant by the National Institute of Justice, LAPF conducted an evaluation of body-worn video technology in the Los Angeles Police Department, studying how the technology is used in the field as well as its impact on police-citizen behavior and on crime. Researchers developed a draft of the policy and sought community input through a number of small focus groups, the use of an online survey, and survey mailers that the Police Commission sent to over 1,000 individuals who provided their email addresses to the Commission.

The results from the smaller cities where cameras had been used were remarkable: over 60 percent reduction in officer related complaints, over 50 percent reduction in uses of force, and, most notable, the presence of the cameras deescalated situations so they did not require arrest and use of force. If we were to have similar results, the potential savings in dollars, time, lives, and damage in a large city would be historic. The Center’s survey respondents are confident that body cameras would have a similar impact on policing in Los Angeles: 80 percent believe cameras would minimize confrontations/use of force, 85 percent believe that they would result in increased police transparency, and 86 percent believe they would result in improved police conduct.

The first 90 cameras during the test period brought positive results in the three areas above. The audio and video (from different perspectives) add an important tool for the Los Angeles Police Commission to use in adjudicating all LAPD use of force cases.

Now we are completing the training and deployment of the remaining 740+ cameras. The purchase of the balance of the 7,000 should be completed by fall of this year.

Steve Soboroff currently serves as the Vice President of the Los Angeles Police Commission. He previously served as the commission’s President. Soboroff ran for Los Angeles Mayor in 2001. He is the current Chair of both the Weingart Foundation Board and the Center for the Study of Los Angeles’ Development Council.

Do you think body cameras will have any of the following impacts?

- **Increased Police Transparency**
  - Yes: 85%
  - No: 15%

- **Increased Police Accountability**
  - Yes: 89%
  - No: 11%

- **Reduced Crime**
  - Yes: 50%
  - No: 50%

- **Minimized Confrontations/Use of Force**
  - Yes: 80%
  - No: 20%

- **Fewer False Accusations of Police**
  - Yes: 88%
  - No: 12%

- **Improved Police Conduct**
  - Yes: 86%
  - No: 14%
CHAPTER 3
IDENTITY
I consider myself an Angeleno.
And if you live in Los Angeles, there’s a 78 percent chance that you do too.

78 percent! Let that number ring across the state and the country. Seventy-eight percent of the huge and representative sampling of LA residents in the Forecast LA survey answered yes to the question: “Do you consider yourself to be an Angeleno?”

We do.
And in the process, we are building a shared identity—as Angelenos—that should bend minds and explode the stereotypes.

After all, Los Angeles is still supposed to be La-La Land, “a constellation of plastic” as Norman Mailer once sneered. Los Angeles is widely reputed to be just a motley mix of fruits and nuts from someplace else; we supposedly root for the visiting teams when they play LA’s teams.

“Los Angelenos,” Billy Joel sang, “All come from somewhere. To live in sunshine. Their funky exile.”

The even crueler knock on us is that we’re cruel to each other, with no real identity and with little loyalty to the city or each other. “LA is the loneliest and most brutal of American cities,” said Jack Kerouac, who was being kind compared to Mike Davis, who 25 years ago labeled LA a “dystopia,” with an “evil” ecology. He predicted that we would dissolve into crime, violence, and ethnic strife.

Something like the opposite of that has happened. Despite our problems, we’ve become a safer, less violent, more connected place. And the city’s people demonstrate a shared commitment to racial, ethnic and other forms of diversity so deep that it has become a defining cultural advantage. And that’s a big deal, and real progress from the days when Woody Allen quipped Southern California was “a place where the only major cultural advantage is that you can turn right on a red light.”

You can see this evolution in the Center’s Los Angeles Public Opinion Survey in two ways. The first is in the lists of answers that those surveyed gave when asked the question: “What does it mean to be an Angeleno?” The most common response was not weather nor good-looking or any of the familiar insults (shallow, conceited, etc.) but the word “diversity.” To be an Angeleno is to be committed to living and working with people who are different—and to see that as a defining virtue. “Being diverse and different but also neighborly,” is how one survey participant put it.

It’s the breadth of this identification with a diverse Los Angeles that is most striking. Big majorities of LA residents and people in every demographic (city or county residents; married or single; union or nonunion; high school dropouts or college graduates, renters or homeowners; Baby Boomers or Millennials) consider themselves Angelenos.

Also worth noting is that these majorities were even bigger among Latinos and Asian Americans than among whites and African Americans. Foreign-born residents were more likely to consider themselves Angelenos than the US born. To be an immigrant here is to belong, and that’s more than a feeling. Immigrant residents of Los Angeles have on average been in LA longer than US-born residents.

An optimism about the future underlies these numbers, particularly among Latinos and Asians. Earlier work, such as the 2010 California Civic Health Index, found that Latinos and Asians who grew up in California were deeply loyal to the state, with more than 80 percent wanting to settle here. This doesn’t mean that rising generations of Californians or Angeleno don’t see problems—particularly in transportation or affordable housing, as the Center’s data show.

But even LA’s whites are different in their commitment to LA’s diversity. Fernando Guerra, the director of the Center for the Study of Los Angeles which produces the survey, says he became interested in the question of Angeleno identity while looking at demographic breakdowns of political opinions, and finding that whites in LA and California were different than whites in the rest of the US. For example, if only whites in the US had voted in the last two presidential
But now, the insult is becoming a point of pride. The 2014 Los Angeles Public Opinion Survey found that “Angelenos are an optimistic people. They believe in their region, their cities, and especially their neighborhoods.” By huge margins, Angelenos recommended their city and their neighborhoods to others, and believe they live in a good and safe place to raise children. They plan to stay here—despite their worries, about growing inequality between rich and poor, about the high costs of housing and health care, and even about the ability to cope with natural disasters. The 2015 report was even more optimistic, with people expecting improvement in their personal finances and employment, and turning more optimistic about public transportation in the region. The biggest gains in optimism were among Latinos and Asian Americans. And the city’s leaders were even more upbeat about the future than the Angelenos surveyed.

Put all of these findings together, and Los Angeles today is developing a collective and optimistic mindset that the rest of the country can only envy. We Angelenos should seize this moment.

Joe Mathews is California editor and columnist for Zocalo Public Square, a nonprofit that blends ideas, journalism, and live events.

Do you consider yourself to be an Angeleno?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Excluding your residence in the Los Angeles region, what other qualities define what it means to be an Angeleno?

This is a curated selection of open-ended responses for this question from LA residents.
Driverless cars are increasingly in the public eye. Companies like Google, GM, Lyft, Tesla, and Uber regularly make headlines with their plans to develop and deploy autonomous vehicle fleets. Concurrently, technology companies working on the infrastructure necessary to achieve this goal continue to receive millions of dollars from investors and other interested stakeholders.

Nearly two-thirds of Angelenos agree that driverless cars will make an impact on the city’s transportation.

Millennials, students, Asian Americans, single Angelenos, and liberals strongly believe that driverless cars will make an impact on the city’s transportation. Meanwhile, the Silent/Greatest Generations, African Americans, retirees, Baby Boomers, and conservatives show much lower levels of confidence about this impact. While younger, wealthier, more educated populations are more likely to foresee the change driverless cars will make in the city, older, less wealthy, less educated populations are not as certain.

Identity rules Los Angeles. That is our greatest strength as much as it’s our greatest weakness. Our vastly inefficient transportation system created geographic isolation, building a patchwork of cultural silos unlike anywhere in the world. Driverless cars will no doubt play a major role in networking that patchwork, but for whom?

Technology does not always behave as the great equalizer it’s promised to be. Potential pushes innovation forward but the transformative change it promises has yet to be delivered. The future of the Greater Los Angeles region hinges on the networks it builds, whether virtual or physical. Silicon Beach is perceived to be a cornerstone of LA’s future, but for it to become a thoroughly transformative force, it can’t stay west of the 405 forever.

To sit and wait in traffic is the reality most Angelenos contend with on a daily basis. Now that companies like Google, Tesla, and Uber are making serious efforts to make driverless cars a reality, sitting in traffic may soon become something we look forward to. Whether that privilege will belong to some of us or all of us is the real question.
Throughout Los Angeles, young, old, white, black, Latino, Asian, conservative, liberal, rich, poor—the list continues. All these groups, all these individuals throughout the Los Angeles region are in agreement about one thing. They are all supportive of the city of Los Angeles hosting the Olympic Games in 2024. Eighty-eight percent are in support. Did you catch that? I wrote 88 percent. When has the region come together to agree on anything to this extent? In my years at the Center for the Study of Los Angeles, I have never seen anything like it.

In 2013 voters in the city of Los Angeles coalesced around Eric Garcetti as the best mayoral candidate by a margin of eight percent. Incumbent Governor Jerry Brown easily won the vote of LA County voters in 2014, but 33 percent of those casting a ballot selected his challenger. When has Los Angeles been so enthused over a particular something...anything?

Last summer our team of researchers at the Center for the Study of Los Angeles conducted a pilot study for our quinquennial survey following the LA Riots. As part of a random sample of Angelenos in the city of Los Angeles we queried residents 65 years and older on their perceptions of the Watts Riots and the ’92 Riots. Then we asked them what was the single most impactful event in the last fifty years. We left the question open ended to get a true range of results. Do you know what a quarter of them said? The 1984 Olympics. We did a survey about the riots and people wanted to talk about the Olympics. It resonates with people and it resonates with Angelenos. Other generations had their opportunity to see the world’s greatest sporting event held in their backyard. Now it is our chance. Every demographic group and every geographic group in the county want to see the Olympic Games held in Los Angeles in 2024. We have to wait until September 2017 to find out if we are the host city. Until then I will keep scanning my data to see if something else garners this much support. Perhaps I won’t hold my breath.

How supportive are you of the City of Los Angeles hosting the Summer Olympic Games in 2024?

OVERALL

88% yes
12% no

STRONGLY SUPPORTIVE

56%

SOMEWHAT SUPPORTIVE

32%

SOMEWHAT OPPOSED

6%

STRONGLY OPPOSED

6%

IF SUPPORTIVE

What is the primary reason for wanting the Olympics in LA: gives an economic boost, is good for LA, creates jobs, increases tourism, is an honor to bring Olympics here, or another reason?

31% GIVES AN ECONOMIC BOOST
18% CREATES JOBS
17% FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED*
16% IS AN HONOR
9% INCREASES TOURISM
5% IS GOOD FOR LA
2% OTHER

* Since a notable proportion of the respondents indicated they supported hosting the Olympics in LA for all of the reasons we stated in the question, a new category reflects their opinion.
As the Lakers continue to decline on the hard court, they also continue to decline in the court of public opinion. While the Lakers and Dodgers dominate as LA’s favorite teams, the Dodgers have almost tied them as the favorite in the three years we have asked the question. From a nine percent advantage in 2014 to only a two percent advantage in 2016, the Lakers’ three losing seasons have taken a toll on their status as the favorite team of Los Angeles. A major narrative in discussing baseball in America is that it is in decline because generations prefer other sports. Our survey supports this narrative. Baby Boomers and the Silent/Greatest Generations prefer baseball’s Dodgers, while Millennials and Generation Xers prefer basketball’s Lakers. Basketball increases its favorability when the Clippers and Angels are taken into account as well. In general, Millennials and Generation Xers are much more diverse as to their favorite LA teams. Millennials prefer hockey by a 13-3 advantage over the Silent/Greatest Generation. Generation X prefers soccer 8-2 over the Silent/Greatest Generation. While the future of LA sports looks much more diverse with Millennials spreading the support to a much greater degree, the Lakers and Dodgers look to continue to be the favorites for the near future. Diversity of support will likely continue with the addition of the Los Angeles Rams and the new soccer team to play in downtown LA.

Many Angelenos are fans of multiple teams. This question made them choose only one as their favorite.

The Chivas played its final season in 2014, but the option was kept on the survey in 2015 as a memorial to the team.
CHAPTER 4

WHAT IT ALL MEANS
Angelenos love living in Los Angeles, but there is more to it than sunny skies year round. In 2016, 71 percent of survey respondents said they were either very satisfied or satisfied with the quality of the services their city provides. This is a steady increase from the last two years with 68 percent in 2015 and 64 percent in 2014 also indicating satisfaction.

The most notable variation in opinion can be seen among Angelenos who have lived in the region over different lengths of time. Of those who have lived in the region for five years or less, an overwhelming 82 percent are satisfied with the quality of services provided to them at the local level. Those who have lived in the region between six and 15 years and between 16 and 25 years are also satisfied (75 and 66 percent respectively), but with much less enthusiasm.

Of those who have lived in Los Angeles for five years or less, Millennials are most content with the quality of services their city provides—85 percent indicated satisfaction! These are probably young adults who moved to Los Angeles for college and decided to stay and call it home.

Of those who have lived in the Los Angeles for 25 years or more, the Silent/Greatest Generation is most content with the quality of services. Eighty percent said they were either very satisfied or satisfied. Indeed, there is no place like home.

While satisfied with the quality of the services provided to them, Angelenos overall have mixed feelings about the openness and transparency of their local government. Only 32 percent of residents perceive their local government as open and transparent while 34 percent perceive it to be somewhat open and transparent and another 34 percent do not perceive it to be open and transparent at all. However, of those who do feel that their local government is open and transparent, an overwhelming 91 percent are either very satisfied or satisfied with the quality of services their city provides. What does a government need to do to be perceived as open and transparent?

What efforts can local governments make to further include its constituents in decision-making processes?
**Overall how satisfied would you say you are with the quality of the services that your city provides?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neither Satisfied Nor Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Very Unsatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Do you feel that your local government is open and transparent about its operations?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LMU DAY IN LOS ANGELES**

**Tuesday, September 13, 2016**

LMU Day in LA is a university-wide event to be celebrated in the fall of 2016 in Downtown Los Angeles. LMU Students will spend the day downtown interacting with local leadership including the County Board of Supervisors, City Council, LAUSD, and City Commissions. In the evening students, alumni, administrators, local political leaders, and general managers of public sector organizations will convene for a panel discussion on LA’s characteristics and services.
RECOMMENDING LOS ANGELES
by Maia Krause, Ph.D.

Residents of Los Angeles and LA County are highly satisfied with the lifestyle that LA offers. In 2016, an overwhelming 79 percent of survey respondents said they would recommend their city or area to someone interested in moving. Eighty-four percent would recommend their neighborhood as a place to live overall, and 82 percent for its overall quality of life. While it might be most obvious to note that Angelenos enjoy the warm weather and perpetual sunshine, LA has much more to offer than its superficial characteristics, as one of the most diverse cities in the world, with an economy that provides ample job opportunities across a variety of industries, arts and cultural events of all kinds, and a varied geography encompassing not only the famous beaches, but mountains, urban clusters, and peaceful suburbs. There is something for almost everyone in the Los Angeles region, and Angelenos recommend it.

The diversity of the region as a whole also helps to explain the variations when we examine the data more closely. An individual might live in one part of Los Angeles, work in a different city, hope to eventually move to another area, and eventually plan to retire in a fourth part of the County—and the region as a whole can offer all of these opportunities. It is clear from the data that people prefer the City of Los Angeles as a place to work, but prefer the County more generally as a place to live—which makes sense when we consider that nearly two thirds of Angelenos (65 percent) take more than 15 minutes to get to work, and therefore don’t necessarily expect to live and work in the same neighborhood. When asked if they would recommend their neighborhood as a place to live overall, 79 percent of Los Angeles city residents said yes, compared to 87 percent of residents of LA County outside the City of LA. Similarly, 77 percent of LA city residents would recommend their neighborhood for its overall quality of life, while 85 percent of county residents would recommend their neighborhood. While it’s important to note that all of these data are overwhelmingly positive, there is clearly an added sense of satisfaction for County residents who live outside LA city itself.

However, the data change when individuals are asked about whether they would recommend their neighborhood as a place to work. Sixty-eight percent of residents in the City of LA would recommend their neighborhood, as opposed to 66 percent of residents outside the city. The difference here is within the margin of error, but it is still significant that the numbers here are much closer, and even slightly higher for City residents. Given the commute culture of Los Angeles County, this is not surprising: people are drawn to the City of LA as a workplace, while they prefer to live—and to retire—elsewhere in the county. Notably, only 54 percent of LA City residents would recommend their neighborhood as a place to retire, versus 71 percent of County residents.

Overall, across the satisfaction questions, neighborhood satisfaction increases with wealth and age, as measured by generational group, income level, and work status. For example, when asked to assess their neighborhood as a place to live overall, 73 percent of students, 77 percent of Millennials, and 80 percent of individuals making under $40k/year said yes. Again, this data in itself shows a consistently positive response. However, 84 percent of individuals who work full-time, 89 percent of Baby Boomers, and 88 percent of individuals making $100–$150k said yes to recommending their neighborhood. The positivity becomes even more pronounced with more indications of age and wealth: a full 90 percent of retired individuals and an almost universal 95 percent of individuals with an income of over $150k said they would recommend their neighborhood as a place to live overall.

In many ways this data is not surprising: as individuals become wealthier and more settled into their careers, they are able to move to the parts of LA County that they most prefer. But even the younger and poorer groups are exceptionally satisfied, suggesting it might simply take some time for them to find their place in the region. Generally speaking, renters are less satisfied with their neighborhoods than individuals who own their home (77 percent vs. 90 percent), again suggesting that perhaps they hope to eventually move elsewhere in the area before fully committing to a neighborhood. Given that the majority of Angelenos have no plans to move out of the area in the immediate future (69 percent are not very likely or not likely at all to move), it seems clear that the typical young Angeleno may hope to eventually move to a more preferable neighborhood, but sees the overall quality of life in Los Angeles as something to be greatly valued.

One other significant difference of note, however, is ethnicity. Whites generally express highest satisfaction with their neighborhoods, saying they would recommend their neighborhood as a place to live overall at a high 86 percent; Asian Americans and Latinos both responded positively at 83 percent, and 78 percent of African Americans would recommend their neighborhood overall. To reemphasize: this response is overwhelmingly positive across all ethnic groups. However, the eight percent difference between the highest group, whites, and the lowest group, African Americans, suggests that as diverse and desirable a place as Los Angeles is, there are still racial imbalances to be considered and addressed as the city moves forward.
If someone was interested in moving to your neighborhood, would you recommend it for the following aspects?

**AS A PLACE TO LIVE OVERALL**

- **Yes:**
  - 2014: 85%
  - 2015: 86%
  - 2016: 84%

- **No:**
  - 2014: 15%
  - 2015: 14%
  - 2016: 16%

**AS A SAFE PLACE TO LIVE**

- **Yes:**
  - 2014: 83%
  - 2015: 86%
  - 2016: 84%

- **No:**
  - 2014: 17%
  - 2015: 14%
  - 2016: 16%

**AS A PLACE TO WORK**

- **Yes:**
  - 2014: 65%
  - 2015: 67%
  - 2016: 66%

- **No:**
  - 2014: 35%
  - 2015: 23%
  - 2016: 34%

**AS A PLACE TO RAISE CHILDREN**

- **Yes:**
  - 2014: 77%
  - 2015: 80%
  - 2016: 77%

- **No:**
  - 2014: 23%
  - 2015: 20%
  - 2016: 23%

**AS A PLACE TO RETIRE**

- **Yes:**
  - 2014: 63%
  - 2015: 64%
  - 2016: 64%

- **No:**
  - 2014: 37%
  - 2015: 36%
  - 2016: 36%

**FOR ITS OVERALL QUALITY OF LIFE**

- **Yes:**
  - 2014: 82%
  - 2015: 84%
  - 2016: 82%

- **No:**
  - 2014: 18%
  - 2015: 16%
  - 2016: 18%
Fourth Annual
FORECAST LA

Save the date!
April 2017
Center Activities

The Center for the Study of Los Angeles produces a wide variety of scholarly work, from journal articles, presentations, and studies to commissioned volumes regarding Los Angeles and its prominent members. In addition to these research projects and as part of its commitment to education about the region, the Center for the Study of Los Angeles hosts a diverse range of events, many of which are free and open to the public.

FORECAST LA
Forecast LA is an annual conference that explores the civic and economic concerns, cultural identities, and levels of satisfaction of residents and leaders in the Los Angeles region. As part of the Center’s unique approach to forecasting, it conducts two outlook surveys. The first is a telephone survey of adult residents in LA County, who are asked about personal economic well-being, overall life satisfaction, and various civic issues. The second are face-to-face interviews with a set of LA County leaders. In the case of 2016, the second group consists of LA County’s public school superintendents, who discuss their districts’ priorities, how their students will fare academically, and other topical issues. Forecast LA is a collaboration with one of California’s most distinguished economic research firms, Beacon Economics.

LA VOTES EXIT POLLS
To address methodological issues surrounding the discrepancies in 2000 and 2004 Presidential election exit poll results, LMU researchers developed and implemented an innovative sampling technique in Los Angeles. The racially stratified homogenous precinct approach addressed problems with poor sampling techniques, inaccurate results, and skewed reporting of underrepresented subgroups (e.g., African American and Latino voters). Since then the Center has conducted ten exit polls in the city of Los Angeles and has produced some of the most accurate exit polling results in the country. To date, over 1,000 undergraduate researchers at LMU have collected more than 17,000 surveys.

LA Riots Anniversary Studies
The 1992 LA Riots had a profound impact on nearly every aspect of Los Angeles, including government policy, community relations, quality of life, and demographics. Many wondered how these Riots would affect future quality of life, and believed race relations in LA could no longer be ignored. In observance of each of the 5, 10, 15, and 20 year anniversaries of the LA Riots, the Center sponsored cross-sectional phone surveys of Angelenos to study their attitudes toward Los Angeles in a longitudinal effort to learn more about the Riots’ impact. Coinciding with the Center’s 20 year anniversary, the 25 year anniversary of the LA Riots telephone survey will be conducted next year in the spring.

TOP 100 MOST SIGNIFICANT ELECTED OFFICEHOLDERS IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY
The Top 100 is a database of the 100 most powerful elected positions in LA County dating back to 1960. By recording the name, ethnicity, gender, and election year of each officeholder, the Top 100 database reveals the significant shifts in minority political inclusion over the last several decades. Ethnicities are coded as white, Latino, black, Asian American, and Jewish. The record documents changes in structures such as at-large elections, redistricting, and the creation of new positions. The result is a powerful visual tool that tells the story of a changing political landscape and the future of more equal representation.

TOP 300 MOST SIGNIFICANT ELECTED OFFICEHOLDERS IN CALIFORNIA
The Top 300 is an extension of the Top 100. This database includes the state constitutional officers, Board of Equalization, U.S. Representatives, the Board of Supervisors for the ten largest counties, and the city councilmembers of the top ten most populous cities in the state. All of these elected officials are also documented by election year and coded for race (white, Latino, black, and Asian American) as well as gender. The Top 300 shows how power has shifted amongst ethnicities since 1960 and calls attention to the effects of redistricting on minority political inclusion.

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF LOS ANGELES’ STUDENT RESEARCH ASSISTANTS

ZAYD AL-MARAYATI
Class of 2016
CHRISTIAN BELTRAN
Class of 2016
MATTHEW CAMPOS
Class of 2016
DAMIAN GATTO
Class of 2016
ZACHARY HAYES
Class of 2017
ELIN HENNINGSSON
Class of 2016
MIA KARR
Class of 2016
TAYLOR KAY
Class of 2016
BRIANNA MEDINA
Class of 2017
ADRIAN NARAYAN
Class of 2018
FASSA SAR
Class of 2018
PRISCILLA TORRES
Class of 2017
CANDACE YAMANISHI
Class of 2017
The Leadership Initiative is an effort to promote effective leadership development, civic engagement, and public policy advocacy in Los Angeles. The Center is conducting an integrative study of leaders in ten sectors including politics, education, arts/culture, business, community, health, land use/housing, law, media/entertainment, and religion/spirituality. Upon completion, the Center’s Leadership Initiative will have identified and surveyed 1,000 leaders who impact public policy. The objective of this project is to provide data that will encourage collaborative leadership and accountability for better community outcomes in Los Angeles.

Los Angeles/Mexico City (DF) is cutting edge, student-focused Los Angeles/Mexico City partnership and consortium. Developed by the Center in conjunction with a variety of companies, institutions, and organizations that have binational U.S./Mexico operations, LA/DF focuses on developing a new generation of international leadership. A group of LMU students complete a 15-week course of preparatory briefings and local field trips prior to traveling to Mexico City for a week-long immersion. In this program Los Angeles and Mexico City-based college students acquire a greater understanding of their own metropolis through a systematic comparison of the structures and dynamics of these two megacities.
The Undergraduate Research Symposium (URS) is an annual conference hosted by LMU during which the work of several hundred undergraduate students is presented to faculty, staff, family, and other LMU students. Each year, many of the Center’s student researchers design, organize, and present a research project at the URS. In addition to receiving guidance about interviewing methods, data analysis, and writing, students are mentored in the use and application of statistical analysis programs like Stata and SPSS, geographic information systems software like ArcGIS, and survey creation and processing software like Qualtrics. Furthermore, students learn to use and process large datasets including the Center’s Forecast LA, LA Votes, and LA Riots archives, various city clerk and county clerk archives, the American Community Survey, and the U.S. Decennial Census. The process often entails dozens of drafts but yields excellent, graduate-level work.

The Research Collection is a special collection focused on preserving Los Angeles political artifacts. It houses papers of Los Angeles public officials, Los Angeles’ real estate and industrial developers, reformers and reform movements (principally in the late twentieth-century Los Angeles), prominent Roman Catholic families in Los Angeles, and other collections related to Los Angeles history and politics. Most recently the Center celebrated the addition of the Bill Rosendahl-Adelphia Communication Corporate Collection of Public Affairs Television Programs. The Research Collection encourages original undergraduate research and preserves knowledge for future generations of Angelenos.

LECTURE SERIES
The Center organizes two lecture series in addition to various standalone lectures and panels throughout the year. Lectures are filmed and broadcast on LA36 and archived on the Center’s YouTube channel. The Fall Lecture Series examines race, ethnicity, and political inclusion in the region, state, and nation. The spring Forecast LA Lecture Series focuses on the future of Los Angeles especially in terms of culture, politics, infrastructure, education, and elections, and culminates in the Forecast LA conference. All lectures are free and open to the public. These lectures offer students an intimate perspective on Los Angeles and create opportunities for them to interact with public leaders.

LA84 Foundation
Presidential Suite
5550 Wilshire Blvd
Los Angeles, CA 90036

The Thomas and Dorothy Leavey Center for the Study of Los Angeles Research Collection
The Research Collection is a special collection focused on preserving Los Angeles political artifacts. It houses papers of Los Angeles public officials, Los Angeles’ real estate and industrial developers, reformers and reform movements (principally in the late twentieth-century Los Angeles), prominent Roman Catholic families in Los Angeles, and other collections related to Los Angeles history and politics. Most recently the Center celebrated the addition of the Bill Rosendahl-Adelphia Communication Corporate Collection of Public Affairs Television Programs. The Research Collection encourages original undergraduate research and preserves knowledge for future generations of Angelenos.

Lecture Series
The Center organizes two lecture series in addition to various standalone lectures and panels throughout the year. Lectures are filmed and broadcast on LA36 and archived on the Center’s YouTube channel. The Fall Lecture Series examines race, ethnicity, and political inclusion in the region, state, and nation. The spring Forecast LA Lecture Series focuses on the future of Los Angeles especially in terms of culture, politics, infrastructure, education, and elections, and culminates in the Forecast LA conference. All lectures are free and open to the public. These lectures offer students an intimate perspective on Los Angeles and create opportunities for them to interact with public leaders.

THE THOMAS AND DOROTHY LEAVEY CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF LOS ANGELES RESEARCH COLLECTION
The Research Collection is a special collection focused on preserving Los Angeles political artifacts. It houses papers of Los Angeles public officials, Los Angeles’ real estate and industrial developers, reformers and reform movements (principally in the late twentieth-century Los Angeles), prominent Roman Catholic families in Los Angeles, and other collections related to Los Angeles history and politics. Most recently the Center celebrated the addition of the Bill Rosendahl-Adelphia Communication Corporate Collection of Public Affairs Television Programs. The Research Collection encourages original undergraduate research and preserves knowledge for future generations of Angelenos.
The Research Collection is a program of the Thomas and Dorothy Leavey Center for the Study of Los Angeles. The Collection holds papers of Los Angeles public officials; Los Angeles real estate and industrial developers; reformers and reform movements, principally in late twentieth-century Los Angeles; and prominent Roman Catholic families in Los Angeles; and has other collections related to Los Angeles history and politics.

PUBLIC OFFICIALS
- Bob Beverly Papers, 1962-1996 (CSLA-7)
- Mayor Richard J. Riordan Administrative Papers, 1980-2001 (CSLA-17)
- David A. Roberti Papers (CSLA-1)
- Mike Roos Papers, 1977-1991 (CSLA-3)
- Joel Wachs Papers, 1951-2002 (CSLA-29)

LOS ANGELES DEVELOPERS
- Fritz Burns Papers (2 collections: CSLA-2, CSLA-4)
- Daniel Freeman Family Papers, 1849-1957 (CSLA-21)
  Documents for the History of the Daniel Freeman Family and the Rancho Centinela, 1873-1935 (CSLA-33)
- Charles Luckman Papers, 1908-2000 (CSLA-34)
- Jack and Bonita Granville Wrather Papers, 1890-1990 (CSLA-23)
- Wrather Investment Corporation Incorporation Records, 1961 (CSLA-38)

REFORMERS AND REFORM MOVEMENTS
- Catholic Labor Institute, 1944-2003 (CSLA-41)
- Thomas A. Gaudette Papers, 1938-1996 (CSLA-18)
- LAAMP Collection, 1984-2001 (CSLA-16)
- LEARN Collection, 1974-1999 (CSLA-14)
- William F. Masterson Papers, 1960-2001 (CSLA-19)
- Rebuild LA Collection, 1992-1997 (CSLA-6)

ROMAN CATHOLIC FAMILIES
- Dockweiler Family Collections (2 collections: CSLA-12, CSLA-13)
- Documents for the History of the Machado Family and the Rancho La Ballona (CSLA-32)
- Joseph Scott Collection, 1909-1951 (CSLA-10)
- Stephen Mallory White Papers, 1871-1936 (CSLA-8)
- Workman Family Papers, 1881-1997 (CSLA-9)
- Mary Julia Workman Research Materials Collection, 1921-2004 (CSLA-35)

OTHER COLLECTIONS
- Big Pine Citizen Newspaper Collection, 1922, 1924-1928 (CSLA-30)
- Bill Rosendahl-Adelphia Communication Corporate Collection of Public Affairs Television Programs
- J. D. Black Papers, 1876-1999 (CSLA-15)
- The Citizen and Cheviot Chatter, 1927-1960 (CSLA-5)
- Documents for the History of Nineteenth-Century Los Angeles, 1846-1908 (CSLA-22)
- KCET-TV Collection of “Life and Times” video recordings (CSLA-37)
- KCET-TV Collection of “Life and Times” production files (CSLA-38)
- KCET-TV Collection of “California Connected” video recordings (CSLA-39)
- KCET-TV Collection of “California Connected” production files (CSLA-40)
- Pardee Dam Construction Photograph Album (CSLA-42)
- Carroll and Lorrin Morrison Photographic Collection, 1889-1964 (CSLA-26)
- Rancho La Ballona Map, 1876 (CSLA-11)
- Which Way, LAP Collection, 1992-2000 (CSLA-20)
- WPA Transcriptions of Los Angeles City Archives Records, 1825-1850 (CSLA-25)
LMU Day in Los Angeles

LMU Day in LA is a university-wide event to be celebrated in the fall of 2016 in Downtown Los Angeles. LMU Students will spend the day downtown interacting with local leadership including the County Board of Supervisors, City Council, LAUSD, and City Commissions. In the evening students, alumni, administrators, local political leaders, and general managers of public sector organizations will convene for a panel discussion on LA’s characteristics and services.

Tentative Schedule: Tuesday, September 13, 2016

9:00–10:00 AM
LA COUNTY BOARD OF SUP. MEETING
Board Hearing Room,
Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration

10:00–11:00 AM
LA CITY COUNCIL MEETING
John Ferraro Council Chamber,
Los Angeles City Hall

11:00 AM–12:00 PM
LMU DAY IN LOS ANGELES WELCOME
Tom Bradley Tower Room,
Los Angeles City Hall

12:00–1:00 PM
MWD COMMISSION MEETING
Hearing room,
Metropolitan Water District headquarters

1:00–2:00 PM
LAUSD BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
Board Room, LAUSD Office

2:30–3:30 PM
LA CITY COUNCIL COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND LAND USE MGMT.
Edward R. Roybal Hearing Room,
Los Angeles City Hall

3:30–4:30 PM
RECEPTION & NETWORKING HOUR

4:30–5:00 PM
PRESENTATION OF LOS ANGELES PUBLIC OPINION SURVEY DATA

5:00–7:00 PM
FORECAST LA SPEAKER SERIES FEAT. ELECTED OFFICIALS & GEN. MANAGERS
Ronald F. Deaton Civic Auditorium,
Los Angeles Police Department

In fulfillment of LMU Strategic Plan’s (Theme 4, Commitment to Local and Global Citizenship) this event will promote civic engagement through opportunities, experiences and partnerships for both the LA region and LMU.
Loyola Marymount University celebrated the Honorable Senator David A. Roberti by awarding him the President’s Award on Monday, February 29 in Sacramento, CA. The award is conferred on a selective basis to distinguished individuals who merit special recognition for genuine achievement and distinction that enriches humanity and supports the mission of the University. This award was presented by LMU’s sixteenth President Timothy Law Snyder.

The celebration served as a fundraiser for The Honorable David A. Roberti award that funds LMU students participating in the Sacramento Legislative Seminar by assisting them with their travel expenses and registration fees associated with the multi-day program. Senator Roberti generously donated to LMU to establish this fund.
PROGRAM

LMU President’s Award Ceremony
Introduction & Welcome
Fernando J. Guerra, Ph.D.

Invocation
Mario A. Roberti ’57, ’61

Remarks
Former Chief of Staff Jerry Zanelli

Remarks
California Governor Jerry Brown

Remarks
Senate President pro Tempore Kevin de León

Remarks
Senator Ben Allen

Remarks
Senator Bob Hertzberg

Remarks
Senator Steve Glazer

Remarks
LMU President Timothy Law Snyder, Ph.D.

Remarks
Senator David A. Roberti

Closing Remarks
Fernando J. Guerra, Ph.D.

SPONSORS

Governmental Advocates, Inc.
Steve Coony, Manatt, Phelps & Phillips, LLP
Ruben Gonzalez, Gonzalez Strategic Affairs
Kevin Sloat, Sloat, Higgins, Jensen & Associates
Donne Brownsey
Kathy Bowler
Ron and Maeley Tom
Bob Hertzberg, California State Senate
Loreen Snell
Don Maddy, Burlington Northern & Santa Fe Railway Company
Michael K. Woo, Cal Poly, Pomona
Mr and Mrs Mario A Roberti
Jonathan C. Lewis
Fred Taugher and Paula Higashi
Kathleen Brown, Manatt, Phelps & Phillips, LLP
Mel Assagai, Strategic Counsel
Jerry Zanelli
Hedy Govenar
Gene W. Wong, Attorney-at-Law
In the spring of 2005, the Center for the Study of Los Angeles created a lecture series to bring leaders to LMU and engage with its students. Over more than ten years, the Forecast LA Lecture Series (previously called the Urban Lecture Series) has featured hundreds of panelists including current and former mayors, governors, council members, constitutional officers, leaders of non-profits, community activists, policymakers, and educators. Lectures are held on select Tuesdays from 5-7 pm in Ahmanson Auditorium on LMU’s campus. Each lecture is filmed, aired on cable television, and archived on the Center’s YouTube Channel.
2016 Season

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2016
LAUNCH OF LMU’S WORLD POLICY INSTITUTE WITH A DISTINGUISHED PANEL OF FORMER U.S. AMBASSADORS
Alan Blinken, Former U.S. Ambassador
Christopher Robert Hill, Former U.S. Ambassador
Rockwell Schabel, Former U.S. Ambassador
Derek Shearer, Former U.S. Ambassador

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 2016
A DYNAMIC CONVERSATION ABOUT THE FUTURE OF THE REGION WITH ONE OF LA’S FORMER FIGUREHEADS
Antonio Villaraigosa, Former Los Angeles Mayor

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 2016
A PANEL DISCUSSION ABOUT THE POTENTIAL FOR THE OLYMPICS IN LOS ANGELES IN 2024 WITH THREE MEMBERS OF THE LA2024 COMMISSION
John Harper, Chief Operations Officer, LA2024
Jeff Millman, Chief Comm. Officer, LA2024
Anita DeFrantz, U.S. IOC Member & Sr. Advisor for Legacy, LA2024

TUESDAY, MARCH 15, 2016
A DISCUSSION ABOUT THE FUTURE OF HOMELESSNESS IN THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES
Miguel Santana, LA City Administrative Officer

TUESDAY, MARCH 29, 2016
A PANEL DISCUSSION ABOUT THE FUTURE OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS
Paul Gothold, Lynwood USD
Steven E. Keller, Ph.D., Redondo Beach USD
Lillian Maldonado French, Mountain View SD
Tom Johnstone, Ph.D., Wiseburn USD

TUESDAY, APRIL 5, 2016
A PREVIEW OF THE FORECAST LA 2016 CONFERENCE FOR THE LOYOLA MARYMOUNT UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY
Fernando J. Guerra, Ph.D., LMU Professor & Director of the Center for the Study of LA
Robert Kleinhenz, Ph.D., Executive Director of Economic Research, Beacon Economics

Explore our vast lecture archive on YouTube, with over 100 hours of interview footage on municipal, state, and federal issues with the region’s key influencers.

YouTube.com/studyLA
A tip of the cap to you

SoCalGas® applauds Loyola Marymount University’s Forecast LA. SoCalGas partners with the communities we serve and is proud of organizations that empower civic and community opinions and leadership to better the Los Angeles region.
When the community works together, the community works

Every community is made up of people with their own goals and ideas about how to reach them. So bringing a neighborhood together to work for positive change is no small accomplishment.

Bank of America is honored to support leaders with the vision to help create common goals and the long-term commitment to help make them real.

Visit us at bankofamerica.com/Los Angeles

Life’s better when we’re connected®
Together

We Have the Power to Keep the Future Bright

Edison International is proud to sponsor
Loyola Marymount University’s
Third Annual Forecast LA Conference
The vast majority of Angelenos would recommend moving to L.A.? Sounds about right.

And it isn’t just because you can see stars and enjoy the famous weather. Los Angeles is a global classroom tailored perfectly to the Jesuit academic philosophy. It is the world’s capital of creativity and its diversity of thought, culture, religion, and language all interconnect at LMU. Our Silicon Beach location is where tomorrow’s innovation thrives and world-changing ideas are formed. Explore more than 100 academic programs and discover your global imagination at www.lmu.edu.

LMU LA
Loyola Marymount University
¡VOTA!

#GETLOUD
Impressive architectural and design transformations are taking place at many of the LAX terminals, as well as free WiFi, plenty of new charging stations and comfortable new lounges.

Form meets function. A beautifully designed connector walkway will seamlessly and quickly link international travelers to their domestic airline connections, saving time and effort.

We’ve brought in favorite local restaurants such as Umami Burger and Lemonade as well as some of LA’s trendiest shops, like Kitson. Experience the cuisine and style of LA, right at LAX.

We’re not just renovating LAX, we’re reimagining what an airport can be.

Randal Hernandez
Managing Director
Government Relations
562-590-4057

Sylvia Castillo
Foundation and CSR Officer
213-236-5516

©2016 MUFG Union Bank, N.A. All rights reserved. Equal Housing Lender. Member FDIC. Union Bank is a registered trademark and brand name of MUFG Union Bank, N.A.

The L.A. Area Chamber has championed the needs of the business community and the citizens of the L.A. region for more than 128 years. From serving as the voice of the business in the halls of government to promoting economic development and fostering collaboration throughout the community, the Chamber has worked to ensure economic prosperity and quality of life in our region.
LADWP’s water and power infrastructure projects will help fuel economic growth in Southern California through $4.7 billion in economic output supporting 21,000 private sector jobs over the next five years.

For information on our many infrastructure and economic development programs go to www.ladwp.com.
A well-run city government is the core of the CAO’s mission. For information visit cao.lacity.org.

Metro is proud to sponsor Forecast LA.

To learn more about Metro’s projects and programs, visit metro.net.
in connecting data, ideas and people

to create a more prosperous future

for all Angelenos
Economic Insights for Business and Government

Fortune 500 companies, the State of California, major cities and counties, and a leading Wall Street hedge fund all use analysis from Beacon Economics.

Learn more at www.BeaconEcon.com

» Economic & Revenue Forecasting
» Economic Impact Analysis
» Economic Policy Analysis
» Real Estate Market Analysis
» EB-5 Visa Economic Analysis
» Expert Witness Services
» Public Speaking
Take your turn. Every drop we save helps.

Thank you for all you do to make L.A. the best it can be.

We are proud to support Forecast L.A., Forecast LA & Center for the Study of Los Angeles

The ICO Group is proud to be a sponsor of Forecast L.A.

We proudly support & congratulate Thank you for your tremendous leadership.

ICO GROUP
OF COMPANIES

SODEXO
IS A PROUD SPONSOR OF THE 2016 FORECAST L.A. CONFERENCE
PREPARING FOR THE FUTURE OF THE REGION

PlayaVista.com

Forecast LA

bewaterwise.com
Taking stock of our past and present to plan for our future

Wells Fargo is proud to support Forecast LA 2016.

When we come together as a community, we increase our opportunities to create a better and brighter world.

wellsfargo.com

© 2016 Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. All rights reserved. WCS-241116 (04/16)
Get the new KPCC app
Smart. Sound. SoCal.

89.3 KPCC
Southern California Public Radio
kpcc.org/apps
Proud to Support

Forecast LA

The Thomas and Dorothy Leavey Center for the Study of Los Angeles at Loyola Marymount University and Beacon Economics

Employee Benefits:
What we do best!

Pacific Federal, LLC
One of California’s Largest Privately-Owned Employee Benefit Firms

PacFed Insurance Services — CA License #0543099 | PacFed Benefit Administrators — CA License #0B09747
1000 North Central Avenue, Suite 400, Glendale, CA 91202