



REPORT

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO TO THE PARK AND RECREATION BOARD

DATE ISSUED: June 28, 2021 REPORT NO. 202

ATTENTION: San Diego Park and Recreation Board
Agenda of July 15, 2021

SUBJECT: Park Amenity Condition Assessments Final Report

SUMMARY

This report provides results from the park amenity condition assessments, which were performed from Fiscal Year 2014 through Fiscal Year 2019. Attachment A is the Park Amenity Assessment Cumulative Report for all assessed community, neighborhood, and mini parks. Attachment B is the Park Amenity Assessment Balboa Park Cumulative Report for the Balboa Park assessment performed in Fiscal Year 2016. Exhibit C is the Park Amenity Assessment Mission Bay Park Cumulative Report for the Mission Bay Park assessment performed in Fiscal Year 2017. This staff report combines the results of these three condition assessment reports to provide an overall evaluation of the condition of the assessed developed parks within the City's park system.

The dollar amounts identified in this report reflect 2021 dollars.

This is an information item only. There are no actions required for this item.

BACKGROUND

In December 2013, City Council authorized (by Resolution No. R-308581) the award of three Facilities Condition Assessment (FCA) consultant agreements for assessing the condition of the City's facilities. Each of the three agreements was authorized for a maximum contract value of \$5 million and up to 5 years. Through the annual budget process, the City Council has approved an allocation of \$300,000 per year from Fiscal Year (FY) 2014 through FY 2019 for park amenity condition assessments.

A total of 235 parks have been assessed, including Balboa Park and Mission Bay Park. Each year, the parks to be assessed were chosen from across the City and Council Districts to provide a representative sampling of park amenities. The initial emphasis for the condition assessments was on older community parks and neighborhood parks with aging infrastructure to establish an assessment methodology and develop a

baseline of values associated with the park amenities assessed. In FY 2016, these condition assessment methods and values were applied to Balboa Park, the first regional park to be assessed and continued in FY17 with the assessment of Mission Bay Park.

At the time the assessments were completed, the City's park system consisted 297 parks that were classified as developed parks (regional, community, neighborhood, and mini) in its park inventory representing 8,940 acres: 258 were developed and 39 were undeveloped. The total developed acreage within the 258 developed parks was approximately 2,675 acres. Since the time the assessments were completed, the park inventory grew with the addition of Pacific Highlands Ranch Community Park and T+C Park.

The park amenity assessments did not include certain developed parks. These included:

- Developer or homeowners' association-maintained parks
- Parks within business district Maintenance Assessment Districts
- Leased facilities maintained by a private entity
- Parks with few amenities (mostly open space, only turf or beach)
- Golf courses

The PCA program focuses on the developed acreage within the developed parks where infrastructure has been built or installed that is utilized by the public. This infrastructure in the developed areas of the parks deteriorates over time and requires operations, maintenance and capital replacement expenditures. Therefore, the park condition assessments were focused on completing the 2,589 developed acres within the 235 developed parks assessed so that the City can develop an asset management plan for the infrastructure in the developed areas of the parks.

Park Type by Function	Totals for Each Park Type	Acres Assessed
Regional Park	5	967
Community Park	52	826
Neighborhood Park	132	766
Mini Park	46	30
Total assessed	235	2,589

This report provides PCA data and a proposed service level for the 235 parks assessed. These parks have been assessed, the data analyzed, and a service level developed using the same methodology as was used for the City-occupied and leased building facilities condition assessments previously reported to the City Council by the Public Works Department with some minor modifications for parks. The primary difference

between calculating a building Facility Condition Index (FCI) and a Park Condition Index (PCI) is that a building FCI is based on the value of the replacement of that entire building while a park PCI is based on replacing those amenities within the park that were assessed, not the full replacement value of the park. Not all systems which support the successful operation of a park were assessed. Aside from limited investigation in Balboa Park, underground utilities, storm drainpipes, irrigation systems, and other below-ground assets were not included in the park assessments; therefore, they were not included in the replacement value used in determining the PCI.

DISCUSSION

The PCA is a visual assessment of the park assets that are outside and visually apparent above the ground. Underground assets such as utilities, pipes, and irrigation were not included in the PCA due to the inability to visually assess these assets. The following table lists the park assets included in the PCA.

Assets included in the PCA	
Playgrounds	Park Furnishings
Landscaping	Fences and Walls
Above-Ground Storm Water Devices	Pedestrian Paving
Playing Fields	Parking Lots
Outdoor Courts	Park Roads

To obtain a more complete picture of a park's condition, it is recommended to include the park buildings with the outdoor assets assessed in the PCA. This report provides the methodology and results of the developed park amenity condition assessments and combines the results of the park amenity condition assessments with the park building condition assessments to derive a total reinvestment need for the assessed parks to bring them to a desired service level. The park buildings are included in the Facilities Condition Assessment (FCA) program and two reports were docketed at City Council in April 2016 and March 2017.

Park Amenity Condition Assessment Methodology:

Each park was visited by a team of assessment professionals using checklists to ensure each asset type was captured and assessed in a consistent manner. During the park site visits, each asset type listed above was inventoried and evaluated for repairs and remaining useful life. The remaining useful life is based on industry standard lifecycle charts and the consultant's professional experience. The inventory information along with the repairs and remaining useful life for each asset type were used to estimate the maintenance and capital backlog and to project future capital renewal costs over a 20-year period.

A detailed report was generated for each park assessed as well as the three summary reports that are attached to this report (Attachments A, B and C). The reports outline the immediate maintenance and capital needs within the park as well as the projected costs associated with each asset type and the year major maintenance or replacement is necessary over the 20-year period. The projected costs in the 20-year outlook assumes the immediate maintenance and replacement needs were performed in the fiscal year the park was assessed. For example, if an assessment conducted in FY 2015 indicated a playground needed to be replaced and was in fact replaced that year, the 20-year outlook shows the playground being replaced again at the end of its 15-year useful life, or in 2030. This assumption was made because it is impossible to predict when funding will become available for the repair or replacement of an asset or how long the repair or replacement may take.

Repair or replacement costs shown on the individual park assessment reports and summary reports only reflect the repair or replacement of the existing asset. These costs do not reflect expansions, upgrades, or enhancements to the asset.

Terminology:

The maintenance backlog for a facility is a summation of the estimated cost of repairs for each asset type assessed within the park. It does not include routine or daily maintenance.

The capital backlog is a summation of the estimated cost of replacement of the asset type that have no remaining useful life within the park. Park assets that have no remaining useful life, but are still in service, will eventually need to be replaced due to failure or deterioration. While these park assets may still be in service past the end of their useful life, assets such a playground equipment are routinely evaluated to ensure they are safe.

Capital renewal for a particular year is a summation of the estimated cost of replacement of the park asset type that have reached the point where they have no remaining useful life in the particular year. If playground equipment is identified as a capital backlog and is replaced, the capital renewal will cost will reflect minor capital improvements until such time the playground equipment replacement occurs in 15 years at the end of the new play equipment's useful life. Capital renewal is used for budgeting future needs.

The Asset Functions of the developed park inventory are based on the Recreation Element of the City's General Plan and are shown in the table below.

Developed Park Types by Asset Functions		
Regional Parks	Regional asset, tourist destination, special natural or cultural features	Balboa Park Mission Bay Park Chicano Park
Community Parks	Serve a population of approximately 25,000 residents	Parks containing both passive and active recreation. May include athletic fields, recreation centers, and aquatic centers
Neighborhood Parks	Serve a population of approximately 5,000 residents	Normally provide passive recreation such as picnic areas and turf for informal play
Mini Parks	Serve residents within 1/2 mile of the park	Normally include passive areas, playgrounds, and plazas

Condition Ratings and Park Condition Index (PCI):

Facility Condition Index (FCI) which was used in the FCA program is an industry-standard calculation of a facility's condition that can be used to compare the condition of facilities within an inventory that have been assessed with a consistent methodology. While there is no industry-standard for park facilities, the methodology used to calculate a building's FCI can be modified slightly to apply to park assets. The primary difference between a building FCI and a Park Condition Index (PCI) is in how the Plant Replacement Value (PRV) is calculated. For building assessments, the PRV includes the cost to replace the entire building. Since not all assets within the parks were assessed, primarily underground assets such as storm drain pipes, electrical systems, and irrigation systems, the park PRV is calculated by including the replacement value of only those assets within the park that have been assessed, not the full replacement of the park.

A park's PCI rating is a modified building industry standard FCI, which incorporates the cost of the maintenance backlog and capital backlog divided by the PRV of assets assessed. The PCI formula used for the assessments is:

$$PCI = \frac{\text{Estimated Cost of Maintenance Backlog} + \text{Capital Backlog}}{\text{Plant Replacement Value (PRV) of Assets Assessed}}$$

The PCI Condition Ratings are comparable with the FCI condition ratings implemented in the City's FCA program for structures and buildings.

PCI Condition Ratings		Examples:
Good	0% to 20%	Balboa Park Nobel Athletic Area
Fair	21% to 29%	South Clairemont Community Park Dusty Rhodes Neighborhood Park
Poor	30% or higher	Allied Gardens Community Park Keiller Neighborhood Park

PCI Summary

The following table provides the average PCI for the four park types (also called Park Asset Functions). The average PCI rating is an average of the parks assessed in each asset function. Regardless of the average PCI, the PCI of individual parks may rate from good to poor. An average PCI of fair, for example, does not mean that every park that has been assessed is in fair condition. For example, the average PCI of the parks assessed to date is 11, which corresponds with good condition. Specific examples include Balboa Park, which has a PCI of 5 – good condition, while Clay Neighborhood Park has a PCI of 41 – poor condition.

Park Types by Asset Functions	No. Parks Assessed	Acres Assessed	Average PCI ¹	# of Facilities with PCI of Good	# of Facilities with PCI of Fair	# of Facilities with PCI of Poor
Regional Parks	5	967	10	5	0	0
Community Parks	52	826	10	45	7	0
Neighborhood Parks	132	766	13	96	22	14
Mini Parks	46	30	19	32	1	13
Total Parks Assessed	235	2,589	11	178	30	27

Note 1 – It is not Industry Best Management Practice or typical for agencies to improve facilities to a PCI of 0.

Note 2 – The PCI of poor for a park may be influenced by the need to replace a single asset type. For example, Cedar Ridge Mini Park contains walkways, a playground, and landscaping. The fact that the playground needs to be replaced heavily influenced the PCI of this park. If the playground were new, this park would have received a much lower PCI number possibly moving it from Poor to the Good category.

Reliability Levels:

Identifying a service level for our parks is a vital step in developing an asset management plan and determining the reinvestment needed to execute the asset management plan and achieve service level goals. While the Recreation Element within the City’s General Plan provides service levels for the different types of parks, those service levels are based on mission-specific goals such as meeting an overall park availability goal (acres/population). This report focuses on the service level associated with condition assessments of existing developed parks and is based on condition goals which assure the asset is functional, reliable, and safe throughout its lifecycle.

A PCI in fair or poor condition indicates a backlog of maintenance repairs and capital replacements. Even parks with a PCI in good condition may have a backlog of maintenance repairs and capital replacements. The type of subsystems that will need to be replaced must be clearly identified so that an effective capital and maintenance program can be developed. Targeting funding strategically toward park subsystems that are critical to the operation of the park will ensure reliability of the park inventory.

Park subsystems are not all equal in terms of their ability to provide a park that is reliable (e.g., playground vs. a picnic table). Therefore, the park subsystems have been categorized into three reliability levels based on their impact to park operations as shown in the table below. The three reliability levels are Level 1 Operations Impacts, Level 2 Deterioration, and Level 3 Appearance.

Reliability Levels by Park Subsystem

Reliability Level 1 Operations Impacts	Reliability Level 2 Deterioration	Reliability Level 3 Appearance
Playgrounds	Parking Lots	Landscaping
Athletic Fields	Park Roads	Park Furnishings
Pedestrian Walkways	Above-Ground Stormwater Devices	Fences
Outdoor Courts		Signage

The definitions of the three reliability levels are:

- Level 1 Operations Impacts are those subsystems that if in poor condition or no longer in service, the primary mission of the park may not be able to be met. We have identified those core subsystems to be playgrounds, athletic fields, walkways and outdoor courts. These are the primary assets people come to the parks to use. They are the highest priority assets to be addressed as funding becomes available. Depending on the primary mission of the park, any of the Level 1 subsystems would be the top priority for funding.
- Level 2 Deterioration are those subsystems which will impact park users in some manner if they are in poor condition or no longer in service, but do not stop people from using the park as it was intended. These include parking lots, because users can walk into the park from an adjacent street, park roads, and storm water devices. In the case of storm water devices, if a drainage inlet is not functioning, a portion of the park could be flooded for a period.
- Level 3 Appearance are cosmetic or non-essential subsystems. While some people may visit a park to enjoy its landscape, the landscape is not always essential to the functionality of the park.

Critical deficiencies in the Level 1 Operations Impacts must be identified followed by the Level 2 Deterioration subsystems and Level 3 Appearance to ensure usability of the park.

The table below summarizes the estimated backlog by Reliability Level for each park type. Completing all the backlog for existing facilities indicated in the table below is not industry Best Management Practice and is not a recommended service level. The purpose of this table is to characterize the backlog so that a service level can be

established that addresses the most critical systems to maintain safety and operations.

Park Type by Function	No. Parks Assessed	Acres Assessed	Level 1 Operations Impacts	Level 2 Deterioration	Level 3 Appearance	Total Backlog
Regional Parks	5	967	\$23.7M	\$48.8M	\$0.4M	\$72.9M
Community Parks	52	826	\$45.8M	\$34.0M	\$2.0M	\$81.8M
Neighborhood Parks	132	766	\$58.1M	\$9.4M	\$3.6M	\$71.1M
Mini Parks	46	30	\$3.7M	\$0.2M	\$1.7M	\$5.6M
Total Parks	235	2,589	\$131.3M	\$92.4M	\$7.7M	\$231.4M

Proposed Service Level for Developed Parks:

Asset management is critical to developing an effective capital and maintenance program which, if implemented, will ensure the safety and reliability of the parks inventory. To plan for future funding needs so that an effective capital and maintenance program can be implemented, it is necessary to establish condition goals called Service Level PCI goals.

Since the methodology to derive a park’s PCI score is like deriving a building’s FCI score, staff in consultation with the assessment professionals determined that the same service level should be used for both PCI and FCI. The proposed PCI goal is 15 which is consistent with the FCA program proposed FCI goal of 15 for public buildings. The FCA program proposed the FCI goal of 20 for city offices and sheds on developed parks since these types of buildings do not serve a public use. An FCI of 20 is still in good condition, just not quite as good as the public use buildings with an FCI of 15. Using the same service level goal for parks and the public use buildings within those parks ensures the total reinvestment calculation is consistent for both assets. It also ensures that park facilities are weighted equally to address the different users of that park. Some users may rate a recreation center as being the most critical asset within a park while other users may rate an athletic field as being more important. Weighting these very different assets equally provides a holistic approach to managing the city’s assets.

The following chart shows the necessary reinvestment amount for each park type to achieve a PCI of 15 for each park. Balboa Park has a PCI of 5; therefore, Balboa Park’s park amenities (which excludes facilities and buildings) does not need additional reinvestment because it exceeds the goal PCI of 15. The necessary reinvestment amounts are not an asset management plan. They are provided as an estimate of what it would cost only to rehabilitate the developed park inventory to the proposed service

level goals. Asset management planning will combine condition data with mission criticality and functional adequacy so that the City can develop a prioritized listing and long-term plan for each asset in the inventory. Reinvestment in assets that are already at the service level PCI goal might be warranted in the case of regional assets such as Balboa Park that have higher patronage. While the community parks assessed have an average PCI of 10, there are several community parks which individually have a PCI higher than 15. The necessary reinvestment shown for community parks represents the 2021-dollar amount to bring those with a PCI of 16 or higher to a PCI of 15. The same is true for neighborhood and mini parks.

Proposed Service Level PCI 15:					
Park Type by Function	No. Parks. Assessed FY	Acres Assessed in	Avg. <u>ACTUAL</u> PCI	Max. <u>GOAL</u> PCI	Necessary Reinvestment³
Regional Parks	5	967	10 Good	15 Good	\$12.8M
Community Parks	52	826	10 Good	15 Good	\$8.3M
Neighborhood Parks	132	766	13 Good	15 Good	\$19.5M
Mini Parks	46	30	19 Good	15 Good	\$3.0M
Total Parks	235	2,589	11 Good⁴	15 Good	\$43.6M⁵

Note 3 – Necessary reinvestment amounts are based on improving the PCI of each facility within the asset function to the maximum goal PCI.

Note 4 – Represents an average PCI for the inventory.

Note 5 – Necessary reinvestment amounts do not include future capital renewal, improvements, expansion, or enhancements.

Achieving the proposed service level for park amenities assessed requires a reinvestment of \$43.6M for the parks to improve each park to a PCI 15 - Good. The average PCI's reported are for 2019. PCI's increase over time due to deferral of necessary reinvestments and/or deterioration of the park assets.

Since the park amenity assessments began in 2014, several parks have had improvements completed or are in the design or construction process for park asset improvements, such as playground replacements, hardcourt repairs, parking lot resurfacing and walkway replacement. As these park improvements are completed and open to the public, the PCI for each of the parks receiving these improvements will be lowered, possibly moving some from a poor rating to a good rating. When the Parks and Recreation Department becomes a participant in the city-wide asset management program, improvements such as these will be tracked and the 20-year asset management plan for each park will be adjusted.

Combined Results for Park Assets from the PCA and Buildings within Parks from the FCA

To determine the necessary reinvestment amount for a park which includes the outside park assets and the buildings, the PCA data has been combined with the FCA data. The PCA and FCA were completed with the same methodology, but by different consultants. The numbers in the following chart are in 2021 dollars. As with the park amenities, the building costs have increased since the building assessments were completed. The numbers reflect only an inflation factor and do not represent continued deterioration of the assets.

FCA FY19 Proposed Service Level (FCI 15/15/20/20):				
City-Occupied & Leased Public & Semi-Public – FCI 15 Good				
City-Occupied & Leased Office/Work				
Yard/Operations/Commercial/Residential - FCI 20 Good				
Park Type by Function	No. Bldgs. Assessed FY 2014-2017	Avg. ACTUAL FCI	Max.⁷ GOAL FCI	Necessary Reinvestment⁶
Regional Parks	210	40 Poor	15/20 Good	\$465.6M
Community Parks	168	42 Poor	15 Good	\$145.6M
Neighborhood and Mini Parks	124	35 Poor	15 Good	\$7.7M
Misc. Park Structures	248	8 Good	20 Good	\$1.3M
Total Park Buildings	750	40 Poor⁷	15 Good	\$620.2M⁸

Note 6 – Necessary reinvestment amounts are based on improving the FCI of each facility within the asset function to the maximum goal PCI.

Note 7 – Represents an average FCI for the inventory.

Note 8 – Necessary reinvestment amounts do not include future capital renewal, improvements, expansion, upgrades or changes in building codes.

The following chart provides the necessary reinvestment when the park building FCA data is combined with the park assets PCA data for the parks assessed. The numbers indicated in the following chart do not include future capital renewal, improvements, expansions, upgrades or future changes in the building codes which may impact the estimated cost. They simply represent the estimated cost to bring an existing building or park up to an FCI/PCI level of 15.

The FCA data for all city buildings has not yet been reconciled with park PCA data. The buildings are not identified by park type. While the buildings for Balboa Park and Mission Bay Park can be sorted by community name, the buildings in other regional

parcs cannot. Additional editing of the building data will be necessary to ensure the building FCA data and park PCA data align. The total numbers reflected in the chart below are correct.

Proposed Service Level PCI 15:					
Park Type by Function	Total Needs Parks (PCI of 0)	Reinvestment Parks (PCI of 15)	Total Needs Bldgs. (PCI of 0)	Reinvestment Bldgs. (PCI of 15)	Necessary Reinvestment (FCI/PCI of 15)³
Regional Parks	\$72.9M	\$12.8M	\$727.1M	\$465.6M	\$478.8M
Community Parks	\$81.8M	\$8.3M	\$219.3M	\$145.6M	\$153.5M
Neighborhood Parks and Mini Parks	\$76.7M	\$22.5M	\$12.5M	\$7.7M	\$30.2M
Misc. Park ⁹ Structures	0	0	\$2.8M	\$1.3M	\$1.3M
Total Parks	\$231.4M	\$43.6M	\$961.7M	\$620.2M	\$663.8M

Note 9 – Miscellaneous structures are picnic shelters, maintenance storage sheds, gazebos, etc.

Achieving a proposed service level of 15 requires a reinvestment of \$43.6M for the assessed parks to improve to a PCI of 15 and \$620.2M for the park buildings to improve to a FCI of 15/20. To raise all assessed parks and park buildings to a minimum PCI/FCI of 15 will require an investment of \$663.8M in 2021 dollars. The PCI/FCI's increase over time due to continued deterioration of the asset sub-systems when reinvestment into the assets does not occur. Therefore, funding beyond what is indicated in this report will be required to maintain these goal PCI/FCI goals over time.

SUMMARY:

The park amenity assessments conducted from FY14 through FY19 for developed parks across the city were performed to ascertain the condition of the assets within those parks. The 235 parks assessed include 5 regional parks, 52 community parks, 132 neighborhood parks, and 46 mini parks. In total 2,589 acres of parkland were assessed. In addition, 750 buildings and structures were also assessed within those 235 parks.

The true value of the assessment reports generated for each park and for each facility lies in how the data can be used to develop long-term asset management plans. An important first step in any asset management plan is to identify the assets owned, where those assets are located, and the condition of those assets. Based on the data

obtained in the condition assessments, a service level PCI/FCI goal can be established which than can be used to calculate necessary reinvestment to obtain the desired service level PCI/FCI goal.

Both the developed park condition assessments and the facilities condition assessments were assigned a Park Condition Index and Facility Condition Index service level goal of 15 which is good condition (PCI/FCI of 0 to 20 is good condition). The service level PCI/FCI goal is then used to calculate the necessary reinvestment to bring the outdoor park assets and park buildings to the service level goal of 15. Based on these calculations, \$43.6M of reinvestment is necessary for the park assets and \$620.2M of reinvestment is needed for the buildings and structures within those parks. This equals a total reinvestment need of \$663.8M to bring the parks within the goal of Park Condition Index of 15. The necessary reinvestment amounts do not include future capital renewal, improvements, expansion, or upgrades.

The \$663.8M is in 2021 dollars and will increase in time due to inflation (4% per year) and continuing deterioration of the park assets. The condition assessment data and the proposed reinvestment amounts are a snapshot in time that provide valuable information on the current condition of park assets and the costs associated with maintaining and replacing those assets. This condition assessment data along with a mission-specific business model will be used in developing a city-wide asset management plan that will help the City make the most effective use of its resources.

Respectfully submitted,



Andy Field, Director
Parks and Recreation Department



Prepared by:
Michelle Abella-Shon, Project Officer II
Parks and Recreation Department

Attachments:

Park Amenity Assessment Cumulative Report, Final Report, August 30, 2019, Park & Rec Board Assets Condition Assessment Presentation