

# PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES ASSESSMENT

---

City Council

September 4, 2018



## Recommended Action

Adopt a Resolution approving a Professional Services Agreement with Kitchell in the amount of \$156,871 for a Parks and Recreation Facilities Assessment, increasing appropriations to the Fiscal Year 2018-19 Community Services Capital Improvement Fund by \$61,871, and authorizing the City Manager to execute the agreement

# Background

- City's FY16-18 adopted Capital Improvement Program included funding for an update to the Parks and Open Space Plan
- Upon further review, staff recommended that the project be restructured to conduct a “facilities assessment”:
  - Assesses the current state of park and recreation facilities (buildings, grounds, infrastructure, site amenities, etc.)
  - Expected life cycle and replacement costs of facility components
  - Future needs that are identified through the assessment process
- Facilities assessments are used to help develop long-term improvement plans
  - City: conducted facility assessments of City buildings in 2011 and 2014; results have been implemented through Measure V projects
  - School District: conducted district-wide facility assessment in 2011; results helped shape recent bond measures


# Proposal Process

- Issued a request for proposal in January
- Four firms submitted proposals; others contacted City to indicate interest but work load prevented these firms from submitting
- Staff interviewed three firms: Kitchell, MIG, RHAA
- Recommending Kitchell
  - Leader in construction and facility management
  - Conducted numerous facility assessments throughout California.

# Assessment Process


- Data review and incorporation (e.g. ADA study, Community Center master plan, Swim Center study, etc.)
- Data collection (site visits and analysis at 20 sites)
  - Including GIS database inventory of assets for use in upcoming asset management program
- Targeted user group meetings (e.g. recreation park, sports associations, dog park users)
- Analysis (condition, lifecycle estimates, costs, etc.)
- Documentation (report)

# Sample Report



City of San Diego Park and Recreation Department  
Park Amenity Assessment

## Balboa Park – East Mesa Park Amenity Assessment




Facility Statistics	
Council District	3
Community Group	Balboa Park
Year Built	1915
Gross Area	146.71 Ac. (3,390,962 Sq. Ft.)
Developed Area	145.71 Ac. (3,390,962 Sq. Ft.)
Address	San Diego, CA
Latitude	32.7390
Longitude	-117.1208
Site Value (1)	\$ 70,834,717
Replacement Value (1)	\$ 70,834,717
Park Amenity Conditions and Needs (2)	
Condition Factor	3
Park Condition Index	Good
Maintenance Needs (1)	\$ 96,803
Capital Needs (1)	\$ 2,315,045
Total Needs (1)	\$ 2,411,848

(1) Value and needs include developed site areas only. Underdeveloped areas and buildings or other major structures were excluded.  
(2) Needs are current FY 2016 and do not include future needs. Total cost includes annual percentage reserved for certain systems; see Cost Report (Appendix).

**I. General Facility Description**  
The East Mesa of Balboa Park comprises approximately 147 acres of the overall Balboa Park area. The East Mesa is bordered to the east by 26<sup>th</sup> Street, to the north by Upas Street, to the west by Florida Drive and to the south by Russ Boulevard. The East Mesa is comprised of a variety of assets including tennis courts, baseball fields, a velodrome, playgrounds, picnic areas. Golden Hill Park, located along Golden Hill Drive, is also included within the limits of the East Mesa.

**A. Site Roadways**  
The East Mesa has numerous roadways that traverse across the East Mesa. The roadways are comprised of asphalt and vary in condition. The majority of the deficient asphalt will require grind and overlay whereas some areas will require full depth replacement due to structural failure. Repaving of curbs and resurfacing of the streets is required as well.

**B. Site Parking Lots**  
The East Mesa contains four main parking lots. The northern most, and biggest, is located adjacent to the tennis center and pool. There is a second lot directly to the east of the baseball fields. The third lot services the northern of the two dog parks (next to the tennis center) and the fourth parking lot serves the Grape Street Dog Park. The parking lot near the tennis courts was in good condition as was the lot serving the north dog park. The lot east of the baseball fields



June 30, 2016  
Page 1


Year	Priority	Location	Description	Photo	Subsystem	Funding Type	Replacement
2016	Critical	On Site	Repair Environment Improvement, #K.1		Electrical	Capital	\$2,000
2016	Critical	On Site	Repair Drain Component Repair, #K.2		Electrical	Maintenance	\$7,000
2017 2018	Recommended	On Site	Repair Lighting, Irrigation, Jack hammer, and concrete, #K.3		Site Development Paving/Rebound Course	Maintenance	\$1,000,000



June 30, 2016  
Page 11

Cost Model Report - East Mesa  
Cost Model Name (1916)

Subsystem	Priority	Cost Per Square Foot	Cost Per Square Foot	Gross Square Foot	Percent Replaced	System Replacement Cost	Last Replaced Year	Last Replaced Year	Next Replaced Year	Overhaul Interval Replaced Year	Total Replacement
Value		\$/Sq. Ft.	\$/Sq. Ft.			\$/Sq.Ft.					\$/Sq.Ft.
Roadways	Priority Critical	\$1.30	\$1.88	3,391,281	110	\$13,728,069	1990	20	2010	2016	\$485,027
Parking Lots	Necessary	\$0.80	\$1.20	3,391,281	110	\$8,438,227	1990	20	2010	2016	\$302,221
Pedestrian Paving	Critical	\$0.42	\$0.63	3,391,281	110	\$4,428,519	1935	30	1965	2016	\$87,174
Site Development Fencing, Walls, Signage, Other	Critical	\$1.17	\$1.76	3,391,281	110	\$12,375,132	1970	18	1988	2016	\$2,894
Site Development Paving/Rebound Course	Necessary	\$0.04	\$0.29	3,391,281	100	\$878,167	1935	18	1953	2016	\$11,380
Site Development Paving/Park and Course	Priority Critical	\$1.91	\$2.87	3,391,281	110	\$20,178,842	1924	20	1944	2016	\$47,736
Site Development Playground	Critical	\$0.10	\$0.18	3,391,281	140	\$1,396,000	2000	18	2018	2016	\$1,396,000
Accessibility	Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	3,391,281	100	\$0	2000	0	2000	2016	\$29,328
Landscaping	Recommended	\$0.74	\$1.11	3,391,281	100	\$7,294,100	1918	20	1938	2016	\$1,763
Above-Ground Stormwater		\$0.02	\$0.03	3,391,281	110	\$210,808	1930	21	1951	2016	\$0
Electrical	Critical	\$0.23	\$0.38	3,391,281	110	\$2,485,968	1987	20	2007	2016	\$75,894



June 30, 2016  
Page 4

# Fiscal Impact

- Estimated project cost in FY17-18/18-19 Capital Improvement Program: \$120,000
- Additional work:
  - GIS inventory database (\$26,880), targeted user group sessions (\$9,991)

## Recommended Action

Adopt a Resolution approving a Professional Services Agreement with Kitchell in the amount of \$156,871 for a Parks and Recreation Facilities Assessment, increasing appropriations to the Fiscal Year 2018-19 Community Services Capital Improvement Fund by \$61,871, and authorizing the City Manager to execute the agreement