

CIVIL GRAND JURY | 2016-2017
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO



PLANNING TO MAKE OUR PARKS EVEN BETTER



Source: Recreation and Parks Department Website

JUNE 2017

THE CIVIL GRAND JURY

The Civil Grand Jury is a government oversight panel of volunteers who serve for one year. It makes findings and recommendations resulting from its investigations.

Reports of the Civil Grand Jury do not identify individuals by name. Disclosure of information about individuals interviewed by the jury is prohibited.

California Penal Code, Section 929.

STATE LAW REQUIREMENT

Each published report includes a list of those public entities that are required to respond to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court within 60 to 90 days as specified.

A copy must be sent to the Board of Supervisors. All responses are made available to the public.

For each finding, the response must:

- 1) agree with the finding, or
- 2) disagree with it, wholly or partially, and explain why.

As to each recommendation the responding party must report that:

- 1) the recommendation has been implemented, with a summary explanation; or
- 2) the recommendation has not been implemented but will be within a set timeframe as provided; or
- 3) the recommendation requires further analysis. The officer or agency head must define what additional study is needed. The Grand Jury expects a progress report within six months; or
- 4) the recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable, with an explanation.

JURORS | 2016 – 2017

KATHIE LOWRY, FOREPERSON

KITSAUN KING, FOREPERSON PRO TEM

CHARLES HEAD, SECRETARY

CHRIS BACON

RICHARD BAKER-LEHNE

CONSTANCE BERNSTEIN

DONNA CASEY

PHYLLIS DEETS

JOHN ERICKSON

SANFORD GALLANTER

LAWRENCE GROO

YANE NORDHAV

ADAM RASKIN

RAE RAUCCI

DANIEL ROSENTHAL

MARVIN STENDER

DAVID TEJEDA

CHARLES THOMPSON

ELLEN LEE ZHOU

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The opportunity the City provides to be outdoors and connect with nature has drawn countless thousands here over time, and it continues today. The goal of the City's Recreation and Parks Department is to support the City's legacy of fine parks and recreational opportunities, and guide the City's future decisions so they can improve that open space system for the benefit of everyone. This is not an easy task. With limited resources, there is always competition for funds to build new parks and maintain existing ones.

A 2013 study by the Office of the Board of Supervisors' Budget and Legislative Analyst concluded that the Recreation and Parks Department needed to strengthen its Strategic, Operational and Capital Plans, as well improve coordination with its key advisory group. The Civil Grand Jury examined the progress made by the Recreation and Parks Department in developing a sound planning framework.

We found that the Recreation and Parks Department has made good progress in establishing a current framework for its work and in involving key stakeholders in the process. With input from citizen organizations, it has prepared Strategic and Capital Plans. It has also prepared an Operational Plan that builds on the values and goals of the Strategic Plan. However, improved cross-referencing between the three Plans would facilitate understanding and transparency and establish a more seamless connection. Further, the Recreation and Parks Department needs to reexamine its Acquisition Policy which, according to the 2013 Budget and Legislative Analyst study was inconsistent with its existing Park Code.

Maintenance of parks continues to be a sore spot for the City. An October 2016 City auditor's report noted that park evaluation scores have suffered due to the lack of adequate maintenance. This was also an issue raised during our review. To determine the extent preventative maintenance is performed when it should be, the Recreation and Parks Department needs to conduct an updated condition assessment. The last time a complete assessment was done was in 2006.

This report recommends steps to improve the Recreation and Parks Department's planning systems and improve accountability and transparency. We also make recommendations for developing a plan to conduct preventative maintenance and limit growth in deferred maintenance. The recommendations regarding maintenance are in support of work that the department has already begun in this area.

The Civil Grand Jury would like to note that all of our findings and recommendations are intended to complement the important and significant progress the Recreation and Parks Department has made in the past 5 years, and the successes they have achieved.

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY i

CONTENTS..... I

BACKGROUND... 1

INVESTIGATION OBJECTIVE..... 2

METHODOLOGY..... 2

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS..... 2

 STRATEGIC PLAN..... 2

 OPERATIONAL PLAN..... 4

 CAPITAL PLAN..... 6

 ACQUISITION POLICY..... 6

 PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE..... 8

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS..... 9

REQUEST FOR RESPONSES..... 11

ABBREVIATIONS..... 13

BIBLIOGRAPHY..... 14

BACKGROUND

With its dramatic physical setting comprised of hilltops and mountains, surrounded by San Francisco Bay and the Pacific Ocean, with nature woven through the landscape, San Francisco has an intrinsic connection with its environment. The opportunity the City provides to connect with nature has drawn countless thousands here over time, and that continues today.

If San Francisco is to continue to offer its residents, visitors, and workers a vibrant environment, it needs a planning framework that ensures a world-class open space system within a limited budget environment. The goal of the City's Recreation and Parks Department (Rec & Parks) is to continue the City's legacy of fine parks and recreational opportunities, and guide the City's future decisions to improve the open space system for the benefit of everyone.

On June 2, 2000, in an effort to increase public involvement in and awareness of the management of the City's parklands, the Board of Supervisors approved an ordinance amending the City Charter to create the Park, Recreation and Open Space Advisory Committee (PROSAC). Among its other duties, PROSAC is required to submit written comments to Rec & Parks on its proposed Strategic, Capital and Operational Plans, and all updates to such plans within 30 days after the plan is delivered to PROSAC. PROSAC also serves as a liaison with City residents, neighborhood groups, and organizations dedicated to park and recreational issues in their districts.

In 2013, a member of the Board of Supervisors requested that its Budget and Legislative Analyst (BLA) conduct an overview of PROSAC to include a review of:

- the initial intent of PROSAC and whether it is meeting that intent,
- PROSAC's process for providing input to Rec & Parks five-year Strategic and Capital Plans and its two-year Operational Plan, and
- the Park, Recreation and Open Space Fund budget and property acquisition selection process over the last ten years.

In September 2013, the Budget and Legislative Analyst submitted its report to the requesting Supervisor. The report included numerous findings and presented a series of policy options to address its findings.

INVESTIGATION OBJECTIVE

The objective of this investigation is to assess the progress Rec & Parks has made in strengthening its Strategic, Operational, and Capital Planning and in updating its Acquisition Policy. We also obtained information on the extent that delaying preventative maintenance is a factor in the condition of the City's parks.

METHODOLOGY

To achieve our investigative objective we held numerous discussions with officials from Rec & Parks, PROSAC, the Office of the Budget and Legislative Analyst, and other individuals associated with the City's parks. We also reviewed key documents referenced in the BLA's report, including the Rec & Parks Strategic, Capital, and Operational Plans, and its Acquisition Policy. We further reviewed key documents obtained from PROSAC. A listing of key documents reviewed is shown in the Bibliography on Page 16. We conducted our review from August 2016 to June 2017.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSES

The 2013 BLA Report concluded that while PROSAC members serve as advocates for their districts and as community liaisons, they had been unable to fulfill their obligation to review and comment on Rec & Parks' Strategic, Operational and Capital Plans. The absence of a current Strategic Plan, according to the report, left Rec & Parks without an overarching vision, goals and objectives that would provide PROSAC a useful framework for its input. The BLA Report added that because Rec & Parks prepared individual program plans rather than a comprehensive Operational Plan, PROSAC had to review Department plans for individual programs on a piecemeal basis. The Report continued that Rec & Parks Acquisition Policy, last completed in 2011, included multiple objectives, some consistent with the City Charter and Park Code and others that were not.

Strategic Plan

A Strategic Plan is a key document that reaffirms a department's mission, establishes priorities, sets short-term and long-term goals, and guides decisions about where to direct scarce resources. According to the BLA Report, Rec & Parks last Strategic Plan was prepared in 2002 and, since then, the Department, as well as the City, had undergone significant change. The absence of a current Strategic Plan leaves Rec & Parks without an overarching vision and goals and objectives that would provide PROSAC with a useful framework for its input. An updated Strategic Plan, the 2013 BLA Report concluded, was needed to reflect the changes that had taken place, particularly with respect to Rec & Parks goals and objectives. It would also assist Rec & Parks employees in understanding their role within the Department, and the Department's goals and strategies for meeting these goals.

The 2013 BLA Report noted that, as community liaisons, PROSAC's input into the Strategic Plan was a valuable resource particularly in helping define the Department's goals. PROSAC's involvement should have ensured that the goals of the Strategic Plan reflect the community's needs. Moreover, a Strategic Plan would provide PROSAC with a clear understanding of the Department's long-term and short-term goals, objectives, and strategies to accomplish these goals. This should enable PROSAC to assist Rec & Parks with achieving these goals and making sure its activities are on track with the goals. According to PROSAC, it has been encouraging Rec & Parks to update its Strategic Plan so that it provides a more complete view of its strategy for managing the park system.

Rec & Parks updated its five-year Strategic Plan (2017-2021) in 2016. The new plan presents Rec & Parks core strategies and objectives, equity metrics, and specific initiatives it plans to undertake to achieve its goals. Key sections of the updated 2017-2021 Strategic Plan include:

- Rec & Parks mission, vision, and values;
- Highlight of its accomplishments for 2016;
- Equity metrics including establishing a baseline of services and resources in low income neighborhoods and disadvantaged communities, and an assessment of performance against the metrics and goals for the upcoming year (see Table 1 below); and
- Strategies and objectives for moving forward, including a list of planned initiatives and status updates.

According to PROSAC, in 2014 it established a working group to provide input to Rec & Parks on the updated Strategic Plan, adding that Rec & Parks has done a good job both in updating its Strategic Plan as well as collaborating with PROSAC throughout the process. It stated that much of PROSAC's input was accepted. It also said that its relationship with Rec & Parks has substantially improved in recent years and it looks forward to continuing its involvement as the Strategic Plan matures.

Table 1: Equity Metrics

Demographics		Equity Zone (See Note below)	Non- Equity Zone	City-Wide
	Population	163,906	641,329	805,235
	% Population	20%	80%	100%
Metrics				
Park Access	Number of Parks	77	142	219
	% of Parks	35%	65%	100%
	Number of parks/1,000 people	0.47	0.22	0.27
	Park Acreage	611	2,614	3,225
	% of Park Acreage	19%	81%	100%
	Acres of park/1,000 people	3.7	4.1	4.0
Safety	SFPD Incidents within 500' of Parks/1,000 people	65	13	23
	% of Incidents within 500' of Parks	57%	43%	100%
Maintenance	Park Evaluation Scores	85%	87%	86%
	Maintenance and repair requests completed	84%	82%	83%
Investment	Capital Investment/1,000 people	\$124,298	\$30,598	\$49,600
	% of Capital Investment	52%	48%	100%
Volunteers	Recreation Volunteers Hours/1,000 people	135	101	108
	Park Volunteers Hours/acre	30	28	28
	% of Total Volunteer hours	22%	78%	100%
Recreation	Hours of Recreational Resources/1,000 people	393	120	176
	% of Recreational Resources	46%	54%	100%
	Scholarships Granted/1,000 people	4.9	2.3	2.8
	% of Scholarships	36%	64%	100%

Note: With the approval of Proposition B in June 2016, a revision to Section 16.107 Park, Recreation, and Open Space Fund of the City Charter mandates the Department to formally consider and measure equity. Specifically, the Charter directs “... the Department shall develop, and the Commission shall adopt, a set of equity metrics to be used to establish a baseline of existing Recreation and park services and resources in “low” income neighborhoods and disadvantaged communities [Equity Zone], compared to services and resources available in the City as a whole.”

Operational Plan

The purpose of the Operational Plan is to detail proposed improvements to Rec & Parks services and responsiveness to customer needs and to serve as a tool for improving the Department’s operational efficiency by including measurable performance standards. In this way, it provides Rec & Parks personnel and the public with a clear picture of Rec & Parks tasks and responsibilities in line with the goals and objectives in the Strategic Plan.

A comprehensive Operational Plan would also provide PROSAC with an official source document and a useful tool to refer to when advising on operational issues and a better understanding of Rec & Parks operational goals. Also, similar to the other plans, PROSAC's feedback on the Operational Plan would be valuable in that they can convey the community's concerns regarding all of Rec & Parks operations.

According to the 2013 BLA Report, Rec & Parks had not developed a formal or comprehensive Operational Plan to guide its staff members and operating divisions. The Operational Plan should include measurable performance standards taking into consideration detailed maintenance work plans for each facility.

The 2013 BLA Report concluded that because Rec & Parks approach towards an Operational Plan was fragmented, PROSAC review of planned projects had to be done in a piecemeal fashion rather than as a review of a comprehensive Department-wide plan. As a result, PROSAC members often did not have a comprehensive understanding of Rec & Parks operational goals, making it difficult for PROSAC to provide meaningful input.

The need for an Operational Plan was reinforced when voters approved the June 2016 Proposition B, revising the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Fund in the City Charter. Proposition B states,

“By February 1, 2017 and for each annual or biennial budgetary cycle...the Department shall prepare, for Commission consideration and approval, an Operational Plan. The Department shall base the Operational Plan on the then-current Strategic Plan, and the Operational Plan shall be in addition to the Department's budget. The Department shall include in the Operational Plan a statement of the objectives and initiatives within the Strategic Plan that the Department plans to undertake and/or accomplish during the next budgetary period, including performance indicators and targets. The Operational Plan shall include an equity analysis of Recreation and Park services and resources, using the equity metrics adopted under subsection (b)(1). Each Operational Plan shall further include an assessment of the Department's progress on the previous Operational Plan.”

The Civil Grand Jury found that Rec & Parks has developed an abbreviated type of Operational Plan that provides a two-year view (Fiscal Years 17-18 and 18-19) of how it plans to implement the longer-term goals set forth in its Strategic Plan. However, the Operational Plan does not (1) identify specific park acquisitions it intends to make, (2) identify the specific existing parks it intends to improve and what improvement it intends to make, nor (3) include performance metrics that would link budget and performance, measure progress, and allow for improving performance across all services areas. Rec and Parks officials advised that much of the above information, while not in the Operational Plan, is included in either the Strategic or Capital Plans and it is their intent that the three Plans have a “seamless” connection to one another. They acknowledge that this connection between the three Plans and their interrelationship could be improved by greater cross-referencing. We agree.

Rec & Parks also stated that there is a limit to how much detail can be provided about its short-term and long-term plans. Some of this is because they don't have control over such actions as acquiring

property for new parks or the resources available to them for park maintenance and improvements. They also stated that they need a degree of flexibility to react to changing events and conditions. We accept that there are limitations to what they can control and need management flexibility. However, this should not prevent them from laying out a coherent plan for public view and providing performance benchmarks, recognizing that plans change.

Capital Plan

As mandated by Park Code, PROSAC provides input on Rec & Parks capital project plans. However, according to the 2013 BLA Report, Rec & Parks capital project plan documents were not consistent with its Capital Plan document. According to the Report, neither the Citywide Ten-Year Capital Plan nor the Department's bond plans included proposed properties for acquisition which should be included in the Capital Plan. Further, the bond plan documents only covered projects to be funded with bond proceeds and thus may not include capital projects funded by sources other than bond proceeds. The report recommended that Rec & Parks include the specific properties that are being considered for acquisition in the City's Capital Plan and in any Department-prepared bond plans.

The Civil Grand Jury was unable to find a current report that listed all of Rec & Parks planned capital investments in one place. Such a report would reflect the "whole picture". It would show both current and planned capital investments, a timetable for accomplishment, and investment distribution between equity and non-equity zones. This would allow PROSAC to have a comprehensive picture of all Rec & Parks present and planned capital investments. Greater cross-referencing between the Capital, Operational, and Capital Plans would provide a more complete and interconnected picture of Rec & Parks planned capital investments. Going one step further, it would appear useful to combine the Strategic, Operational, and Capital Plans into one document. This should facilitate PROSAC's review of Rec & Parks plans as well as improve understanding by the general public.

Acquisition Policy

The 2013 BLA Report noted that the Recreation and Parks Commission had not developed an Acquisition Policy that was consistent with Park Code criteria. Table 2 highlights these differences.

Table 2: Differences between Park Code and Rec & Parks Acquisition Policy Criteria Governing Use of Open Space Acquisition Fund Monies

Park Code (criteria in priority order)	Rec & Parks Acquisition Policy (criteria in priority order)
1. Acquisition of open space, facilities and property in "high need areas", defined in the Recreation and Open Space Element of the City's General Plan as places where there is a conglomeration of high density and high percentages of children, youth, seniors, and households with low incomes.	1. Acquire open space in locations with high needs, which includes areas covered in City Area Plans ¹ , or areas with "distribution deficiencies"(areas that do not have open space within one-half mile or children's playgrounds within one-fourth mile). This allows for Rec & Parks to give highest priority to properties in areas other than high needs, in contradiction of the priorities specified in the City Park Code.
2. Acquisition of open space, facilities and other real property in neighborhoods that are experiencing a significant increase in residential population and that have few open space or recreational resources.	Rec & Parks Acquisition Policy gives priority to properties in neighborhoods for which Area Plans have been prepared by the Planning Department. These neighborhoods may be subject to significant development and be where growth is planned, but are not necessarily realizing significant increases in residential population, as required by Park Code.
3. Acquisition of significant natural areas that are not otherwise protected from degradation or development.	Some overlap with the broader Acquisition Policy Standard #3 below.
Not part of Park Code criteria.	2. Acquire properties that have identified funding for the purchase, development, and support maintenance of new acquisitions.
Some overlap with the more narrow Park Code criterion #2 above.	3. Acquire properties that encourage a wide variety of potential recreational and open space uses.

The 2013 BLA Report recommended that the Recreation and Park Commission amend its Acquisition Policy to make it consistent with the criteria and priorities in Park Code, or present possible amendments to Park Code to address the inconsistencies. Specifically, it recommended that (1) Rec & Parks discontinue giving equal weight to properties in high needs areas and those in areas with distribution deficiencies, and (2) clarify that properties should not be given priority based on the availability of funding for the purchase, development and maintenance of the property, but that Rec & Parks place top priority on identifying and acquiring properties in high needs areas and endeavor to secure funding for these properties from sources such as the Open Space Acquisition Fund and private sources.

A Rec & Parks official advised us that they have not updated its 2011 Acquisition Policy, but recognize the need to review and, as needed, update its Policy.

Preventative Maintenance

Regular preventative maintenance is necessary for realizing the expected useful life of park assets, and for mitigating the need to continuously repair broken or deteriorating assets. When maintenance is deferred, it becomes a future liability. One area of concern revealed during our investigation is the backlog in park maintenance. An October 2016 City Auditor's evaluation of park maintenance standards noted that park evaluation scores have suffered due to the lack of adequate maintenance.

This is not a new issue. In a September 2015 report, the City Services Auditor found that:

- *“The department’s maintenance program is nearly entirely request or emergency driven, with 99% of work orders in fiscal year (FY) 2013-14 devoted to completing over 15,000 individual request and emergency driven jobs. Graffiti, plumbing, and equipment requests are the most common request types for this year.”*
- *“Less than 1% of structural maintenance staff time was available in this year for preventative maintenance work. This imbalance between request/emergency and preventative maintenance work is out of line with recommended practices, and will degrade the condition of the department’s assets over time.”*

To be fair, performing needed maintenance is not just a park issue; it is a City-wide issue, as was noted by the 2015-16 Civil Grand Jury in its report titled “Maintenance Budgeting and Accounting Challenges for General Fund Departments”.

To obtain a more accurate accounting for the maintenance needs of City parks, a condition assessment needs to be performed. In 2006, the Recreation and Park Department (RPD) contracted with a consultant to conduct a comprehensive assessment of its capital assets. Data from this assessment was entered into its Condition Management Estimation Technology system (COMET). In addition to being the source for the department’s projected renewal needs system wide, COMET is being used to track seismic and other physical deficiencies that establish the Department’s capital spending priorities. According to Rec & Parks officials, it is in the process of replacing COMET with a more robust system which will allow it to better track and plan for park maintenance.

We believe these are positive steps and would allow Rec & Parks to better identify, plan for and conduct preventative maintenance. Resource availability, however, will likely remain a limiting factor in plan execution.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

FINDING 1: Rec & Parks has done a good job in addressing the need for a comprehensive and updated Strategic Plan, as recommended in the 2013 report of the Budget and Legislative Analyst.

RECOMMENDATION 1: No recommendation

FINDING 2: Rec & Parks and PROSAC appear to have an improved working relationship.

RECOMMENDATION 2: No recommendation

FINDING 3: It is important that the current momentum be nurtured with support of both the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors.

RECOMMENDATION 3.1: The Mayor should require Rec & Parks, at least annually, to review and, as needed, update its Strategic, Operational, and Capital Plans.

RECOMMENDATION 3.2: The Board of Supervisors should hold a hearing, at least annually, on the progress Rec & Parks has made in reviewing and updating its Strategic, Operational and Capital Plans.

FINDING 4: The Strategic, Operational, and Capital Plans could be better integrated with one another to achieve Rec & Parks goal of seamless connections.

RECOMMENDATION 4.1: Rec & Parks should establish clearer linkages between the Strategic, Operational, and Capital Plans through greater cross-referencing.

RECOMMENDATION 4.2: To further “cement” the seamless nature of the Strategic, Operational, and Capital Plans, Rec & Parks should combine the three Plans into one document for placement on its website so that interested parties can view the Plans together and better understand their interconnectedness.

FINDING 5: The Capital Plan does not list all of Rec & Parks planned capital investments. Including this list in the Plan would allow PROSAC to view a comprehensive picture of all of Rec & Parks present and planned capital investments at once, as was recommended in the 2013 BLA Report.

RECOMMENDATION 5: Rec & Parks should include in the next version of its Capital Plan a report of all Rec & Parks planned capital investments. This report should be broken down by capital investment, timetable for completion, investment amount, maintenance vs. new acquisition, and Equity vs. Non-Equity Zones.

FINDING 6: Rec & Parks continues to operate under the 2011 Acquisition Policy which was found by the 2013 BLA Report to be inconsistent with Park Code.

RECOMMENDATION 6: By January 2018, the Recreation and Parks Commission should review and, as needed, update its Acquisition Policy.

FINDING 7: Rec & Parks assessment of the condition of its park assets needs to be reviewed and updated. Its planned replacement of the current COMET system should contribute to this process.

RECOMMENDATION 7.1: Rec & Parks acquisition of the replacement system for the COMET system and a reassessment of the condition of park assets should be completed by the end of 2018.

RECOMMENDATION 7.2: Using the results of this updated condition assessment, Rec Parks should create an annual department-wide preventative maintenance plan that incorporates previous preventative maintenance projects and outlines prioritized future projects, allocated resources, and timelines for completion.

FINDING 8: Obtaining the resources to conduct needed preventative maintenance has been a continuing challenge for many City departments, and Rec & Parks is no exception. When needed maintenance is deferred, it ends up increasing future costs. This is not just a park issue but it is a City-wide issue.

RECOMMENDATION 8.1: Rec and Parks should consider outsourcing selected park maintenance needs as part of a preventative maintenance program.

REQUEST FOR RESPONSES

FINDING 1: Rec & Parks has done a good job in addressing the need for a comprehensive and updated Strategic Plan, as recommended in the report of the Budget and Legislative Analyst.		RESPONDER
RECOMMENDATION 1: NO RECOMMENDATION	Recreation and Parks Department	

FINDING 2: Rec & Parks and PROSAC appear to have an improved working relationship.		RESPONDER
RECOMMENDATION 2: NO RECOMMENDATION	Recreation and Parks Department	

FINDING 3: It is important that the current momentum be nurtured with support of both the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors.		RESPONDER
RECOMMENDATION 3.1: The Mayor should require Rec & Parks, at least annually, to review and, as needed, update its Strategic, Operational, and Capital Plans.	Mayor	
RECOMMENDATION 3.2: The Board of Supervisors should hold a hearing, at least annually, on the progress Rec & Parks has made in reviewing and updating its Strategic, Operational and Capital Plans.	Board of Supervisors	

FINDING 4: The Strategic, Operational, and Capital Plans could be better integrated with one another to achieve Rec & Parks goal of seamless connections.		RESPONDER
RECOMMENDATION 4.1: Rec & Parks should establish clearer linkages between the Strategic, Operational, and Capital Plans through greater cross-referencing.	Recreation and Parks Department	
RECOMMENDATION 4.2: To further cement the seamless nature of the Strategic, Operational, and Capital Plans, Rec & Parks should combine the three Plans into one document for placement on its website so that interested parties can view the Plans together and better understand their interconnectedness.	Recreation and Parks Department	

FINDING 5: The Capital Plan does not list all of Rec & Parks planned capital investments. Including this list in the Plan would allow PROSAC to view a comprehensive picture of all of Rec & Parks present and planned capital investments at once, as was recommended in the 2013 BLA Report.		RESPONDER
--	--	-----------

RECOMMENDATION 5: Rec & Parks should include in the next version of its Capital Plan a report of all Rec & Parks planned capital investments. This report should be broken down by capital investment, timetable for completion, investment amount, maintenance vs. new acquisition, and Equity vs. Non-Equity Zones.	Recreation and Parks Department
---	---------------------------------

FINDING 6: Rec & Parks continues to operate under the 2011 Acquisition Policy which was found by the 2013 BLA Report to be inconsistent with Park Code.	RESPONDER
---	-----------

RECOMMENDATION 6: By January 2018, the Recreation and Parks Commission should review and, as needed, update its Acquisition Policy.	Recreation and Parks Commission
---	---------------------------------

FINDING 7: Rec & Parks assessment of the condition of its park assets needs to be reviewed and updated. Its planned replacement of the current COMET system should contribute to this process.	RESPONDER
--	-----------

RECOMMENDATION 7.1: Rec & Parks acquisition of the replacement system for the COMET system and a reassessment of the condition of park assets should be completed by the end of 2018.	Recreation and Parks Department
---	---------------------------------

RECOMMENDATION 7.2: Using the results of the updated condition assessment, Rec Parks should create an annual department-wide preventative maintenance plan that incorporates previous preventative maintenance projects and outlines prioritized future projects, allocated resources, and timelines for completion.	Recreation and Parks Department
--	---------------------------------

FINDING 8: Obtaining the resources to conduct needed preventative maintenance has been a continuing challenge for many City departments, and Rec & Parks is no exception. When needed maintenance is deferred, it ends up increasing future costs. This is not just a park issue but it is a City-wide issue.	RESPONDER
---	-----------

RECOMMENDATION 8.1: Rec and Parks should consider outsourcing selected park maintenance needs as part of a preventative maintenance program.	Recreation and Parks Department
--	---------------------------------

ABBREVIATIONS

BLA - Budget and Legislative Analyst

Rec & Parks – Recreation and Parks Department

PROSAC - Park, Recreation and Open Space Advisory Committee

BIBLIOGRAPHY

2008 Clean & Safe Neighborhood Parks Bond, Quarterly Status Report Presented To the Citizens' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee, September 2016.

2012 San Francisco Clean and Safe Neighborhood Parks Bond, Citizen' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee, September 2016.

Acquisition Policy, Recreation and Parks Department, August 2011.

Capital Plan, the City and County of San Francisco, FY 2106-2025.

Charter Amendment, Park, Recreation and Open Space Fund.

Equity Metrics San Francisco Recreation and Parks, August 2, 2016.

Maintenance Budgeting and Accounting Challenges For General Fund Departments, 2015-16 San Francisco Civil Grand Jury, June 27, 2016.

Park Maintenance Standards, Fiscal Year 2014-15 Annual Report, Office of the Controller, City Services Auditor, November 24, 2015.

Park Maintenance Standards, Fiscal Year 2015-16 Annual Report, Office of the Controller, City Services Auditor, October 25, 2016.

Proposition B, Legal Text.

Recreation & Open Space, San Francisco General Plan, Final, April 2013.

Rec Park Deferred Maintenance Review, Office Of The Controller, September 8, 2015.

Recreation and Parks Department, Annual Capital Plan, December 7, 2016.

Request to Conduct a Review of the Park, Recreation, and Open Space Advisory Committee (PROSAC), the Open Space Property Acquisition Fund Budget and Property Acquisition Process, Board of Supervisors, Budget and Legislative Analyst, September 17, 2013.

San Francisco Park Code, Sec. 13.01, Citizens' Advisory Committee.

Strategic Plan, San Francisco Recreation and Parks, 2017-21 Update.