PORTLAND PARKS AND RECREATION

Analysis By: Ryan Kinsella

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Funds Budget Summary</th>
<th>Adopted FY 2014-15</th>
<th>Request Base FY 2015-16</th>
<th>Decision Pkgs FY 2015-16</th>
<th>Request Total FY 2015-16</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgeted Beginning Fund Bal</td>
<td>$31,804,278</td>
<td>$17,193,605</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$17,193,605</td>
<td>-45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes</td>
<td>1,446</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licenses &amp; Permits</td>
<td>434,608</td>
<td>475,996</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>475,996</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges for Services</td>
<td>39,172,560</td>
<td>40,362,319</td>
<td>(170,000)</td>
<td>40,192,319</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental Revenues</td>
<td>3,945,771</td>
<td>1,903,870</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,903,870</td>
<td>-51.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interagency Revenue</td>
<td>2,121,387</td>
<td>2,125,121</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,125,121</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Transfers - Revenue</td>
<td>2,319,710</td>
<td>2,260,140</td>
<td>3,484,287</td>
<td>5,744,427</td>
<td>147.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond and Note Proceeds</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>20,718,738</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20,718,738</td>
<td>2489.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Sources</td>
<td>3,230,121</td>
<td>2,387,862</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,387,862</td>
<td>-26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Discretionary</td>
<td>46,370,808</td>
<td>51,047,693</td>
<td>3,326,882</td>
<td>54,374,575</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Resources</td>
<td>$130,200,689</td>
<td>$138,475,344</td>
<td>$6,641,169</td>
<td>$145,116,513</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditures

| Personnel Services            | $52,679,306        | $58,639,005             | 1,028,412                | $59,667,417             | 13.3%          |
| External Materials and Services| 23,567,473        | 26,740,826              | 2,034,257                | 28,775,083              | 22.1%          |
| Internal Materials and Services| 9,547,001         | 10,837,712              | 0                        | 10,837,712              | 13.5%          |
| Capital Outlay                | 28,491,074         | 32,491,124              | 3,578,500                | 36,069,624              | 26.6%          |
| Debt Service                  | 1,371,179          | 1,102,623               | 0                        | 1,102,623               | -19.6%         |
| Fund Transfers - Expense      | 1,501,732          | 1,110,176               | 0                        | 1,110,176               | -26.1%         |
| Contingency                   | 12,880,134         | 7,391,088               | 0                        | 7,391,088               | -42.6%         |
| Unappropriated Fund Balance   | 162,790            | 162,790                 | 0                        | 162,790                 | 0.0%           |
| Total Requirements            | $130,200,689       | $138,475,344            | $6,641,169               | $145,116,513            | 11.5%          |

Total Bureau FTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Bureau FTE</td>
<td>458.00</td>
<td>456.57</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>481.57</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent Change is the change from FY 2014-15 Adopted Budget to FY 2015-16 Total Requested Budget.

Key Issues

Portland Parks and Recreation (Parks) faces unique budgetary challenges due to recent increases in SDC revenues and the recent approval of a $68 million repair and replacement bond. System expansion, catalyzed by the influx of SDC revenues, provide resources to increase access to parks, natural areas, and community centers, and ultimately “moving the dial” in key strategic goals. Moreover, approval of the bond will allow the bureau to address the most pressing major maintenance needs. Concurrently the bureau faces ongoing system needs to maintain and operate facilities while also expanding services to underserved households.
System Development Charges and Parks’ System Expansion
Due to the economic recovery over the past four years, the bureau has experienced a steady increase in system development charge (SDC) revenues. Last year the bureau collected $20.0 million in residential and commercial revenues, and end the year with a balance of $32.7 million. Bureau initial estimates are for an additional $10.5 million in revenues in FY 2015-16, leaving $44.5 million for SDC funded projects (and administrative and overhead support). The following chart shows the growth of SDCs over the last several years. The line indicates the inflow of SDC revenues, the bars show the year end balance, less any project costs incurred during the year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parks' SDC Revenues and Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projects confirmed to be funded with SDCs in the five-year plan include:
- Beech Park ($11.0 million total)
- Colwood ($6.4 million)
- Gateway Urban Plaza ($9.0 million)
- Khunamokswt Park ($2.5 million)
- Spring Garden Development ($1.5 million)
- Delta Park Fields ($4.1 million)
- Portland Tennis Bubble ($1.1 million)
- South Waterfront Greenway Central Trail ($7.5 million)

In addition, over the next five-years, the bureau has plans to allocate the balance and forecasted revenues of $36.0 million to development of other parks and facilities, and $7.7 million allocated for property acquisition.
The influx of SDC revenues create a unique challenge for the bureau: since system expansion, funded by SDC revenues, requires ongoing resources to fund operations and maintenance. The total ongoing increase for O&M over the past five years was $3.5 million; additionally the bureau received $690,000 in FY 2015-16 for projects funded by SDC revenues and other resources. Since FY 2010-11 the bureau has also received additional O&M increases for items previously funded by the 2002 Parks Levy. Including these amounts, the annual increase for O&M costs is $4.5 million over the past five years.

The bureau requested $398,000 in ongoing General Fund resources to support O&M for the following parks, for which the bureau will ask Council to approve in the coming year: Beech Park and Gateway Urban Plaza. Given current SDC resources, CBO and the bureau estimate that new, SDC-funded parks may result in the need for $500,000 to $1.5 million of ongoing resources to support operating costs over the next five years.

In the past, O&M costs have been funded by General Fund resources. There are few options for funding O&M, all with varying levels of challenges and risks:

- **Reduce service across the parks system.** Base on prior practices and public expectation, the bureau has established a certain service level for maintaining and operating parks. Lowering the service levels would increase the bureau’s ability to redirect staff and resources to support the operations and maintenance of new parks at a reestablished, lower level of service. These potential savings are finite, however, and as such, provide a limited solution to overall system growth. A way to mitigate the O&M impact of system expansion may be to design and scope new parks with lesser O&M impacts by reducing amenities and features, and designing parks with intent of minimizing maintenance costs. However, this approach may negatively impact equity as many of the new parks will be developed in underserved parts of the city.

- **Outside resources.** There are a variety of options for outside resources with varying challenges and risks as noted in prior CBO analyses and based on the experience of other cities. These options include increased user fees, private contributions, and grants, development resources such as tax increment financing, and revenues from marketing rights or other iterations of public-private partnerships.

**CBO Recommendation**

Analysis of the challenges and opportunities for each of these options is beyond the scope of this budget review; however, CBO recommends that the Adopted Budget includes a budget note that directs Parks to fully explore each of these options and present the analysis and recommendations to Council prior to FY 2016-17 budget development. CBO is happy to provide feedback and support for this analysis.

**Funding Gap**

SDC revenues provide resources for some of the bureaus expansion plans but the bureau is also challenged with maintaining the current system. As part of the Citywide Asset Managers Group’s 2014 Annual Report, Parks’ will report an annual funding gap of $72.1 million over the next ten years comprised of primarily two components: $47.7 million to expand services and build capacity, and $24.4 million for
rehabilitation, repair, and replacement of current assets and other mandated projects. This amount reflects the projects included in the first ten years of the 20-year capital plan, annualized evenly. Current funding, including the major maintenance allocation, SDC revenues, and the 2014 bond are estimated to provide 19% ($165.2 million) in funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Plan Funding Gap ($878.2 million total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond amount $68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Maintenance $17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDCs $80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total $165.2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Remaining Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation, Repair, and Replacement, and Mandated Projects $236 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Capacity Projects $477 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total $713 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New capacity projects included in the 20-year capital plan would increase access to parks and recreation centers to new households, making progress towards the goal of having a park within ½ mile of every household and a community center within three miles of every Portland household. The bureau has not determined what percent of new households would be served in its 20-year capital plan. Notably, the plan does not account for density changes, and so to the degree that housing density increases around new capacity projects, this figure may understate the impact. In addition to $477 million for new capacity projects, Parks would also need ongoing resources to fund the O&M costs of new assets once in service, which is not included in this figure.

**Funding Strategies**

Several recent developments provide further context on how Parks may address its funding gap. First, CBO and bureau asset managers in October 2014 provided Council with recommendations for how to address recurring major maintenance and replacement needs of City infrastructure. This group recommended that the City re-establish the General Fund Capital Set-aside and develop options for ongoing General Fund allocations to bureaus. To further address Citywide infrastructure needs, Council recently passed Resolution 37107 that sets aside 50 percent of one-time General Fund resources to fund emergency preparedness, transportation and parks infrastructure. Given this context, outlined below are strategies for how Parks might address its long-term infrastructure needs. These strategies reiterate prior CBO recommendations and echo the recommendations of bureau asset managers.

The most effective strategy for addressing Parks repair, rehabilitation and replacement project gap uses two primary funding strategies: (1) an annual increase for regular, small-to-medium sized projects, and (2) one-time resources – either allocated from a City capital set-aside or bond proceeds – to address larger, infrequent infrastructure needs.
Regular Major Maintenance Needs. Ongoing resources, such as increased General Fund appropriation, may be more appropriate for certain types of projects. Characteristics of these projects would include:

- Shorter service life
- Predictable life cycle of the asset
- Projects that require little public involvement
- Less costly (no greater than $500,000 - $2.0 million)
- Construction causes less disruption to current service levels

For example, heating and cooling systems, which have relatively predictable life-cycles and are less costly, would be best funded through an ongoing appropriation.

One-time, Infrequent Infrastructure Needs. Large projects would still require significant, one-time investment that would address projects with estimated costs of over $2.0 million. These projects may be more appropriately funded through infrequent, significant resources, such as a parks bond, major grant or donation, or a significant allocation from the General Fund. Characteristics of these projects would include:

- Long-term service
- Unpredictable lifecycle of the asset
- Require significant public involvement
- Relatively costly (greater than $2.0 million)

The replacement of a community center or acquisition and development of a new park would be best funded through this type of resource.

The Asset Management group continues to refine the amount need for regular maintenance, acknowledging that this amount is likely substantially less than the industry standard of 2-4% of total replacement values; for Parks, the current replacement value of all assets is estimated at $1.3 billion. Rather, based on refined estimates of asset conditions, the bureau estimates an annual investment of $5 to $15 million would address all small projects ($10,000-$400,000) and most medium-sized projects ($400,000-$2.0 million), in addition to routine and preventative maintenance.

The bureau largely depends upon its major maintenance allocation in addition to one-time General Fund allocations to address many of these projects. Currently, Parks receives $1.5 million in ongoing General Fund resources for major maintenance. As part of this year’s requested budget, the bureau submitted one-time capital improvements and asset management requests of $4,008,500, consisting of eight requests for projects under $1.0 million. Lastly, the approval of the recent $68 million bond will address a significant portion of the bureaus current major maintenance needs --- approximately 28% of the identified $236 million of the rehabilitation, repair, and replacement needs.

CBO Recommendation
CBO believes that an ongoing General Fund allocation is the appropriate mechanism for funding small-to-medium projects, which would address scheduled and predictable projects. As previously recommended,
CBO also believes that establishing a voter-approved bond program as a permanent feature on Portlanders’ tax bill is fundamental to managing the lifecycle of the City’s massive parks infrastructure.

**Bond Update**
The bureau is currently in the process of preparing for the upcoming bond issuances by hiring program and project staff and by completing initial design work on projects funded through bond proceeds.

**Bond Coordination**
Recently the bureau requested position authority to hire 7.0 FTE including five project/construction managers and two support staff in addition to the bond program manager, which was approved by Council earlier this year. One of the positions will provide full-time community relations support and the other will provide basic administrative support to the program. These positions will be funded by bond proceeds that are expected to be issued in summer of 2015; costs incurred prior to the issuance will be reimbursed by bond proceeds. Once the bureau has hired the bond program manager, the bureau will continue to plan intra-bureau coordination on projects, further development staffing implications, plan project sequencing, and project cash flows. These positions will be hired as regular, full-time positions but with an expected end date in 2020.

**Project Development**
By midyear the bureau will have refined cost estimates for the projects included in the first bond issuance, allowing the bureau to calculate the estimated remaining balance for the second issuance. Based on public feedback for the first issuance, the bureau has developed a draft list of projects that may be funded by the second issuance. The bureau plans to conduct a public engagement process, based on recommended projects, to refine the list of projects for the second issuance. The target date for finalizing the second project list is November 2016.

**Key Performance Measures**
Portland Parks and Recreation identified six key performance measures as part of its FY 2015-16 requested budget that measure core bureau services and the bureau’s strategic direction. To summarize: these metrics track resident access to, and perceived quality of, parks, natural areas, and community centers; the condition of parks facilities, and work on natural areas. These measures are highlighted in the bureau’s annual performance report, and these measures have been vetted by senior management. Highlighted below are trends in these metrics.

**Percentage of Households within 1/2 mile of a Park or Natural Area and within 3 miles of a full service community center**
The bureau has set a goal that all Portland households live within ½ mile of a park or natural area and within three miles of a community center. The proximity to parks and community centers are outlined in Portland Plan’s 20 Minute Neighborhood and based on the idea that within 20 minutes residents can walk to a park or travel via car or public transportation to a community center. Currently 80% of Portland households live within ½ mile of park or nature area. This proportion has remained nearly the same over the past four years as park development has tracked at the same pace as new development. While over
80% of households have access to parks in most neighborhoods, two areas have less access: only 62% of residents have access to parks in both east Portland (east of I-205) and outer northeast Portland (Caesar Chavez Ave to I-205). The map below, from the bureau’s 2014 Performance Report, illustrates park access by neighborhood coalition.

*Percentage of households living within ½ mile of a park or natural area (by neighborhood coalition)*

The bureau’s 2020 Vision – its long-term strategic plan – sets the ambitious goal of 100% for all households. Based on the current capital plan, the bureau is unlikely to achieve this target. Approximately 85% of households should have access to parks by 2020 based on current plans, including 75% of east Portland households. Council will also have to determine whether the achieving the targeted number of parks is worth the opportunity costs of not funding other services. Council may also consider whether there is more acceptable target based on a slightly increased measure of household-to-park distance. For instance, already 99.5% of Portlanders live within 1 mile of a park or natural area. However, resetting the access targets would mark a philosophical shift in what City planners have previously defined as a complete “20 minute neighborhood”.

Currently two major park developments will improve access in these areas: Beech Park and Gateway Urban Plaza. Council recently approved planning and design contracts for the parks, and as part of its requested budget, the bureau has O&M funding of $398,000 once the parks open in 2017.

*Percentage of Residents rating the overall quality of recreation centers and parks as good or very good*
Perceived quality of parks and recreation centers has remained relatively unchanged in the past five years, where nearly 85% or greater across neighborhoods with the exception of east Portland. The bureau has set a target that 90% of residents rate parks as good or very good. Factors that influence a resident’s
perception of park quality likely include how well a park is maintained, the amenities offered, and access to parks. The map below, from the bureau’s 2014 Performance Report, illustrates perceived park quality by neighborhood coalition.

*Percentage of households rating the quality of parks as good or very good (by neighborhood coalition)*

Measures of access and perceived quality of parks indicate that east Portland remains underserved. Similar to access, perceived quality of parks is less in east Portland. To the degree that access significantly impacts perceived quality, this may explain the lower ratings of east Portland residents. Unless expanding and improving parks in east Portland, there will continue to be an inequitable distribution of services.

*Facility Condition Index*

To measure the bureau’s stewardship of facilities, the bureau tracks facilities’ current deficiencies (current or deferred replacement and repair needs) relative to the facilities’ current replacement value. This measure was recommended by the Portland City Auditor as part of the 2013 “Portland Parks and Recreation: Managing Diverse Assets Requires Evaluation of Maintenance”, based on best practices in the industry. The current index of 7.5 is considered “fair” by industry standards. (Currently, the measure only includes buildings and pools; other assets - playgrounds, park amenities, roads, etc - will be added as assessments are completed.) This measure worsens by the deterioration of current and the increase value of assets (i.e., building new and replacing assets).
The bureau estimates that the upcoming bond-funded improvements will improve the facility conditions index from 7.5 to 7.0 once projects are completed beginning in 2017.

**Acres of Invasive Weeds Treated**

Invasive weeds are treated as part of routine maintenance of parks and natural areas; in addition, there are two programs that target invasive removal and aim to improve ecological health of natural areas: the bureau’s Protect the Best program and the Bureau of Environmental Services’ Re-Veg program. Ultimately, the goal of the City Nature division is to improve the overall ecological health of Portland natural areas, and particularly those owned by Parks. The bureau currently tracks an “ecological health rating”, which is an index of variety of factors that contribute to healthy ecosystems, but this data is considered out-of-date and thus ineffective for decision-making. (The Bureau of Environmental Services tracks a similar metric that measures the ecological health of watersheds through an index that factors hydrology, physical habitat, water quality, and biological communities.

Two decision packages submitted in its FY 2015-16 requested budget would provide resources to improve the measurement of ecological health. In PK_21, the bureau requests funding for a natural areas inventory system, allowing for a more refined tracking of naturals with the intent that the bureau could more efficiently allocate resources to areas of most need. In PK_20, the bureau request funding to refine the process of conducting the natural areas inventory, including updating procedures and assessment criteria.

**Decision Package Analysis & Recommendations**

**Realignment – Reduction of Fountains, PK_01, $0, (3.00) FTE**

The bureau requests to realign $430,000 in General Fund ongoing resources, including 3.0 FTE, from the City’s 19 decorative fountains to fund several items that were previously funded by the 2002 Parks Levy including staff at Sellwood Community Center, Buckman Pool, and maintenance workers.

Several decisions were made as part of the FY 2013-14 budget process that provided important context for this decision. First, the responsibility of operating and maintaining the City’s 19 decorative fountains was transferred from the Portland Water Bureau to Portland Parks and Recreation, for which the bureau received $466,000 and 2.0 FTE. (Council approved a limited-term mechanic for fountain maintenance in the FY 2014-15 Fall BMP.) The FY 2013-14 Adopted Budget also approved that the remaining levy balance would be used to provide temporary funding for these requested items: 2.0 FTE and approximately 40 season employees at Sellwood Community Center, 1.0 FTE and 15-20 seasonal employees at Buckman Pool, and two Central Services positions. Also approved was the use of levy-balance to fund several other items: $50,000 to fund natural area and trail maintenance for two years, $65,787 to fund major maintenance for one year, and 1.0 FTE seasonal maintenance worker for the Foster Flood Plain. Three items that were shared with Multnomah County have been addressed ($234,468 for SUN schools, and $136,000 SUN school pass though, and $211,909 for the Aging and Disability Pass Through.)
If this realignment is approved by Council and the subsequent restoration of fountain funding in PK_02 is not approved, then the 19 fountains would be shutdown indefinitely and services will be maintained at Sellwood Community Center and Buckman Pool. If Council rejects this realignment, then the service to the fountains will continue but the bureau would close Buckman Pool and Sellwood Community Center.

*Impact of fountain shutdown:*

Parks would continue to operate splashpads that were already included in parks prior to the transfer; however, fountains that would be turned off include six interactive fountains that are used for recreation similar to splashpads, including Salmon Street Springs Fountain (SW Salmon and Naito), Jamison Square Fountain, Holladay Park Fountain, McCoy Park Fountain, Bill Naito Legacy Fountain in Waterfront Park, Teachers Fountain in Director Park, and the Ira Keller Fountain.

*Impact of closing Sellwood Community Center and Buckman Pool*

During FY 2012-13, the Buckman Pool received 21,140 visits. Buckman Pool is the only one to offer gender-specific swims. These currently accommodate an average of five women and girls during each weekly session and two men and boys during each weekly session. Should the pool cease to operate, options would include Matt Dishman (2.2 miles – 9-11 minutes driving – 27-42 minutes by transit – 16 minutes biking) or East Portland (5.1 miles – 18 minutes driving – 32-49 minutes by transit – 32-36 minutes biking). Several private pool providers are in the area; however, prices may vary significantly from Parks’ rates. There would be no alternatives for the gender-specific swim. In FY 2013-14, fees covered 34% of total costs and the General Fund subsidized $134,000.

During FY 2012-13, Sellwood Community Center received 40,004 visits. If Council rejects the realignment, the bureau would continue the preschool at the center as well as Community Music Center satellite classes, but discontinue most other activities. The facility would still be rented, generating revenue sufficient to reach a breakeven point, according to PP&R. In FY 2013-14, fees covered 60% of total costs and the General Fund subsidized $244,000.

CBO recognizes that, as the newest program added to Parks, the bureau ranks the decorative fountains below all others. However, when Council transferred the fountains from the Portland Water Bureau to the Portland Parks Bureau as part of the FY 2013-14 budget process, the intent was not to discontinue the program. Moreover, although the number of visitors to the fountains is unknown, due to their central locations within the City it is reasonable to assume that a larger number of residents would be impacted if the fountains were to be shut-off. The equity impact of shutting down the fountains versus Sellwood Community Center and Buckman Pool are not clear.

Despite these concerns, CBO recommends the realignment because of the central importance of Buckman Pool and Sellwood Community Center as part of Parks’ offerings. In addition CBO recommends one-time bridge funding for the fountains (see PK_02).

*CBO Recommendation: $0, (3.00) FTE*
**Restore Fountain Maintenance 1-Time Bridge Funds, PK_02, $567,669, 4.00 FTE**

The bureau requests one-time funding of $567,000 to restore operation of the decorative fountains for one year. This funding is only needed if Council approves PK_01, the realignment of resources from decorative fountains to positions currently funded by the 2002 Parks Levy.

The bureau has requested one-time funding, indicating that this would provide a bridge until ongoing resources can be identified. To date, the bureau is unaware of any external resources from either an outside entity or by a new funding source. If the bureau is unable to identify outside resources to fund the fountains beginning in FY 2016-17, the fountains will then be shutdown or the bureau will need to realign budget from lesser valued programs (potentially including items previously funded by the levy). As other alternatives, the bureau may request ongoing or continued bridge funding as part of the FY 2016-17 budget process; or, Council could choose to provide ongoing funding for the levy backfilled items/decorative fountains beginning in FY 2015-16.

CBO recommends the requested one-time bridge resources with the intent that the bureau will identify outside resources or realign bureau resources for the FY 2015-16 budget.

**CBO Recommendation: $567,669, 4.00 FTE**

**Seasonal Park Ranger Conversion, PK_03, ($84,552), 6.00 FTE**

The bureau requests $84,000 of General Fund ongoing resources to convert 6.0 seasonal park rangers into full-time positions. In addition to the new General Fund support, the bureau would reallocate $240,000 from the bureau’s budget for seasonal/casual employees. The conversion would result in a net zero impact to total number of ranger service hours over the course of the year. The incremental cost of each conversion is roughly $14,000 per position, primarily driven by an average $2 increase in hourly wage, health and PERS benefits as well as paid time off.

Over the last several decades, the bureau has increased its reliance on seasonal and contract employees. This is partly due to the seasonal nature of the work, but partly due to the bureau’s efforts to maximize levels of service with existing resources. According to the bureau, this budget request would address the right-sizing of the bureau; appropriately seasonal staff would remain seasonal while positions that are effectively full-time would become regular, full-time positions.

It should be noted that, due to faster escalation of benefits costs, the outyear impacts of these conversions would be greater than those represented in the request; benefits increases would be built into future year Current Appropriation Levels through the standard health and PERS escalation assumptions.

CBO recognizes that this decision is driven less by service needs but rather a determination of whether the seasonal status for current employees is appropriate; Council addressed a similar decision in the FY 2014-15 Adopted Budget, when 20 seasonal workers within Parks were converted into full-time positions.
However, because this request does not improve service levels, CBO has not recommended the increased funding for these positions.

_CBO Recommendation: $0, 0.00 FTE_

**Seasonal Ranger Conversion Offset, PK_04, $(84,552), 0.00 FTE**

As an offset to PK_03 Seasonal Ranger Conversion, the bureau requests to reduce its casual budget for seasonal ranger staffing. If the offset is taken, the bureau would hire three fewer rangers, decreasing the number of hours of ranger services 2800 over the course of the four peak months (May-August) in the Central Business District.

The hours lost due to the conversion would primarily decrease the amount of time rangers have to lock and unlock the 62 bathrooms and 7 gates at 58 different parks between 5pm and midnight. The bureau has indicated that some bathrooms at the least critical sites will likely be permanently locked or unlocked during peak months. Bathrooms are historically locked due to safety reasons, including the potential misuse for illegal camping, drug use, prostitution and vandalism. According to bureau records, there were 303 criminal offenses in 2014 in the Central Business District.

CBO does not recommend the conversion of the seasonal rangers (PK_03) and therefore does not recommend this requested offset (PK_04).

_CBO Recommendation: $0, 0.00 FTE_

**Seasonal Maintenance Worker Conversion to FTE, PK_05, $73,500, 2.00 FTE**

The bureau requests $73,500 of General Fund ongoing resources to convert 2.0 seasonal maintenance workers into full-time positions. The conversion would result in a net zero impact to total number of seasonal maintenance workers, as currently the bureau uses seasonal maintenance workers over all 12 months. The incremental cost of each conversion is roughly $36,750 per position, primarily driven by an average $6 increase in hourly wage, health and PERS benefits as well as paid time off.

Like the requested conversion of seasonal rangers (PK_03 and PK_04), this request would not impact bureau services. As requested, the bureau would reallocate funding for 12 months of two seasonal maintenance workers to its budget for full-time employees. To the degree that full-time positions attract employees with additional skillsets, services may improve and become more efficient as stable, benefited positions with additional training complete tasks instead of rotating seasonal staff providing the year-round service.

Over the last several decades, the bureau has increased its reliance on seasonal and contract employees. This is partly due to the seasonal nature of the work, but partly due to the bureau’s efforts to maximize levels of service with existing resources. According to the bureau, this budget request would address the right-sizing of the bureau; appropriately seasonal staff would remain seasonal while positions that are effectively full-time would become regular, full-time positions.
It should be noted that, due to faster escalation of benefits costs, the outyear impacts of these conversions will be greater than those represented in the request; benefits increases would be built into future year Current Appropriation Levels through the standard health and PERS escalation assumptions.

CBO recognizes that this decision is driven less by service needs but rather a determination of whether the seasonal status for current employees is appropriate; Council addressed a similar decision in the FY 2014-15 Adopted Budget, when 20 seasonal workers within Parks were converted into full-time positions. However, because this request does not improve service levels, CBO has not recommended the increased funding for these positions.

*CBO Recommendation: 0, 0.00 FTE*

**Seasonal Maintenance Worker Conversion Offset, PK_06, ($73,500)**
If the offset is taken for the seasonal maintenance worker conversion, the bureau would not hire three forestry seasonal maintenance workers and three developed park maintenance seasonal maintenance workers. The reduction in the forestry program would likely impact the City’s Dutch elm disease response program that uses seasonal employees to monitor and respond to Dutch elm infections in Portland. The reduction in the developed parks would decrease the number of hours for litter and leaf pick-up, and timely trash can removal from a number of park locations.

CBO does not recommend the conversion of the seasonal workers (PK_05) and therefore does not recommend this requested offset (PK_06).

**Scholarship Program, PK_07, $360,000, 1.00 FTE**
The bureau requests $360,000 of General Fund one-time resources to increase participation and recreation programming options for the bureau’s scholarship program for low-income individuals. The funding would offset $200,000 in program revenues and 1.0 limited-term program coordinator position. Over the past year the bureau has evaluated and developed recommended policy changes on how to improve the program. The program coordinator would implement the recommended policy and program changes by conducting outreach to potential participants, serving as the primary contact for any questions, evaluating participant applications, and seeking outside funding.

The current policy grants scholarships for courses and memberships based on an individual’s household income and family size; however, site directors have discretion to override qualification criteria in order to improve access to programming. In a survey of staff who interact with scholarship participants, the largest concern was inconsistency in promoting the scholarship program at different sites. A survey of scholarship participants found that participants were frustrated with the inconsistency in customer service and application of policy across sites; the survey also found that participants often misunderstand the policy.
In some cases site directors assess whether they have financial capacity to allow additional scholarship participants by determining if current enrollment covers direct costs of the program (e.g., instructor and materials). If costs are not covered through current enrollment, then site directors may redirect scholarship participants to enroll in alternative programs that have space availability and that have covered direct costs through current enrollment.

CBO notes that the revenues lost from the scholarship program is currently built into the overall costs of services: program costs less the amount of program revenues equals the total subsidy to the program. In effect, scholarship participants receive a discount, however, even full price participants generally do not pay the full amount in order for the bureau to achieve cost recovery. (The bureau estimates that an additional $600,000 of revenues would have been received in FY 2013-14 if scholarship participants paid full price.) For context, in FY 2013-14 total cost recovery for recreating programming was 41%.

In this sense, the bureau could continue the program without additional revenues and determine an amount of lost revenues that would be explicitly reserved for scholarship participants; however, this would result in fewer allowed scholarship participants. The requested funding would increase options for scholarship participants, as participants would not be excluded from joining courses that had not fully recovered costs.

The number of potentially new participants is unknown. Approximately 80% of the 3700 scholarship participants are youth. Based on the updated policy, for which participation in the free and reduce lunch program is a criteria for qualifying for the scholarship program, the bureau anticipates a large demand for scholarships as there were 35,033 students in 2014 who qualify for Free and Reduced Lunch within the Portland area’s four school districts. The bureau estimates that there is a potentially large unmet demand for scholarships in outer east Portland where income levels tend to be lowest.

CBO does not recommend funding for this program at this time. Rather, CBO recommends that the bureau continue the program and implement the update scholarship policy within current resources. CBO also recommends that the bureau determine the number of spaces available for scholarship participants based on current program costs of service and recovery amounts under the new policy.

CBO notes that the bureau has several packages that address low-income and equity initiatives, all of which include request for staffing support for projects in the pilot stage, totaling $810,000 and 4.0 FTE. CBO has recommended funding for one of the positions (PK_13 Equity and Inclusion Investment); to the degree available, CBO recommends that any additional equity-related positions provide support to the scholarship program.

CBO Recommendation: $0, 0.00 FTE

Charles Jordan Community Center Roof, PK_08, $603,000, 0.00 FTE
The bureau requests $603,000 of General Fund one-time resources to replace the roof at the Charles Jordan Community Center. In addition, the bureau has budgeted $199,000 from its major maintenance
allocation to this project. The bureau requested funding for this project in the Fall BMP, and the project is eligible for bond proceeds but it is not included in current plans for either issuance.

Charles Jordan Community Center receives approximately 200,000 visitors per year. Due to leaks in the roof, the gym is occasionally closed, disrupting service and thereby reducing revenues. Ongoing roof leaks will also compromise the building structure over the long-term. The households in the service area for Charles Jordan Community Center serve a higher percentage of non-white and low-income residents than the City average.

As noted in prior CBO analyses, roof replacement for Parks facilities is an element of the list of unfunded, regularly scheduled major maintenance projects; roofs require replacement on a somewhat predictable basis such that roof replacement should be a stable and predictable part of the bureau's major maintenance budget. CBO continues to recommend that the bureau perform an analysis on all the elements of the bureau's assets that require ongoing regularly scheduled maintenance so that CBO and the bureau can work together to develop a funding plan for these predictable, recurring items. Such a funding plan might involve new or reallocated resources.

This project ranked first in the FY 2015-16 Infrastructure Project Ranking due to the potential safety hazards, service disruption (greater than 10,000 customers), and lawsuit against the City. Because of these concerns, CBO recommends funding.

_CBO Recommendation: $603,000_

Parks for New Portlanders Pilot, PK_09, $250,000, 2.00 FTE
The bureau requests $250,000 of General Fund one-time resources to create a pilot program that targets increased participation of underserved and immigrant refugee communities in east Portland by expanding culturally responsive recreation activities and increasing outreach. Funding would support 2.0 limited-term FTE for one-year including a program specialist and recreation center coordinator who would be tasked with planning outreach and programming, implementing and evaluating the program expansions. The program expansion would be primarily located in East Portland Community Center with the goal of expanding to serve refugee and immigrant populations throughout the city.

The program, as it is requested, would provide funding to pilot the expansion of the World Cup and Mobile Playground program to refuge and immigrant communities. To determine whether the pilot program is effective, there would need to be a measureable increase in refuge and immigrants participants. The bureau targets an increase of 250 participants. The current participation of the World Cup (approximately 2,000 youth) and Mobile Playgrounds demonstrates that the bureau will likely be successful in expanding services to the targeted 250 refuge and immigrant participants.

If successful, the bureau is likely to request ongoing funding in the FY 2017-18 budget. Because CBO has reservations about expanding a program with one-time resources, CBO does not recommend this request.
Rather, CBO recommends that any core responsibilities of the program be expanded to immigrant and refugee communities to the degree possible within current resources.

CBO notes that the bureau has several packages that address low-income and equity initiatives, all of which include request for staffing support for projects in the pilot stage, totaling $810,000 and 4.0 FTE. CBO has recommended funding for one of the positions (PK_13 Equity and Inclusion Investment); to the degree available, CBO recommends that any additional equity-related positions provide support to the Parks for New Portlanders initiative.

CBO Recommendation: $0, 0.00 FTE

Willamette Boat Ramp Dredging, PK_10, $239,000, 0.00 FTE.
The bureau requests $239,000 of General Fund one-time resources to dredge the boat ramp at Willamette Park. Oregon State Marine Board may provide a $500,000 grant to support the project if approved.

Currently the bureau receives approximately $100,000 per year in parking revenue at the Willamette Park boat launch lot, of which $40,000 is allocated for annual maintenance and operations in the parking lot and the other $60,000 is set aside for larger projects to parking area and park maintenance. The bureau has indicated that these funds could not be used for dredging costs based on how these fees were originally presented to the public. Increasing fees to recover dredging costs would require that the bureau amend its agreement with the Marine Board.

The Marine Board awarded funding of $500,000 for the ramp dredging in 2013; however, because permits for repairs and multi-use dredging were not completed at that time, the bureau did not accept the grant but indicated that they would reapply for the funding once the permits were approved. The Oregon State Marine Board has indicated that the boat ramp is a high priority, and so the bureau is relatively confident that if Council approves the requested $239,000 in General Fund resources, the Marine Board will reward the funding.

The boat launch receives 20,000 visits per year; the number of unique visitor is unknown. This boat launch is the only public boat launch on the west side of the Willamette, but there other public motorboat launches are on the east side, including Cathedral Park and Swan Island docks. The Willamette river boat ramp is the City’s largest and most heavily used public boat ramp in Portland.

Current sediment build-up limits the usability of the ramp in low water. The bureau estimates that the ramp would need to be closed within three to five years if not dredged. A 1997 grant from the Marine Board also stipulated that the ramp must remain open for 20 years or the grant funding of $580,000 would need to be returned.
This project ranked 12th of 15 in the FY 2015-16 Infrastructure Project Ranking, largely due to the potential service and financial impact. Because this project leverages outside resources, supports long-term City needs, maintains and protects infrastructure, CBO recommends funding.

**CBO Recommendation: $239,000**

**Renew Forest Park, PK_11, $672,500.**

The bureau requests $672,000 of General Fund one-time resources for the bureau’s Renew Forest Park initiative, including these specific components: (1) removal of invasive species, (2) repair four culverts in Forest Park, and (3) fund limited-term or contract staff for the initial stages project management. In total, the Renew Forest Park Initiative is estimated to cost $16 million $20 million, and includes three primary components including $9 million restoration work within the park, $3 million for trail improvements, and $4 million to $8 million in creating a primary Forest Park entrance.

**Invasive Species Removal ($300,000)**

The bureau requests $300,000 for to remove invasive species within 155 acres in the Balch Creek Subwatershed. After completing the initial restoration work, subsequent treatment is required for approximately five years, until the area has stabilized.

Invasive species removal is needed to maintain forest structure, habitat complexity and native species biodiversity; ultimately, invasive species removal helps to preserve the health, vitality and long-term resiliency of Forest Park. In total, the bureau currently spends approximately $970,000 in invasive species removal including $314,000 directly in Forest Parks. Costs include bureau staff time and some contracted work.

**Culvert Repair ($172,500)**

Funding of $172,500 would replace four or more of the highest risk, failing culverts along Leif Erikson Drive within Forest Park. The Bureau of Environmental Services would match the amount of $172,500 and would manage the project construction.

Erosion caused by the failed culverts causes in-stream sedimentation and suspended solids, slumping of stream channel, and further eroding stream-bed vegetation – all of which degrade habitats. Additionally, the culvert repair would reduce maintenance costs and avoid more significant repair or replacement costs of Leif Erikson Drive. The bureau estimates that routine maintenance, including the repair of culverts, avoids approximately 75% of potential costs.
The bureau submitted this portion of the project as part of the FY 2015-16 Infrastructure Project Rankings, in which it ranked 7th of 15, largely due to the potential safety hazards of not maintaining this access road, the potentially large disruption to customers if Leif Erikson Drive were to close, and avoidance of long-term costs by maintaining the roadbeds.

Initial Project Management ($200,000)
The requested funding for limited-term position for one year; however, the Renew Forest Park initiative has long-term staffing needs, likely to include a project manager, a natural resource ecologist, botanic technician in addition to funding for a contract crew for two months per year.

The Renew Forest Park initiative a marks significant endeavor for the bureau and the City. Large portions of the initiative remain unfunded. Pieces of the initiative can be completed periodically; however, the invasive species removal requires a sustained effort, which is currently not funded.

CBO recommends funding of $172,500 for the repair of four culverts; however, before recommending the other portions of the project, CBO recommends that the bureau present its entire plan for invasive species removal and project management need. CBO also notes that natural asset inventory (PK_20 and PK_21) may provide further clarity on which natural area management needs are most pressing. Due to concerns of the financial and operational capacity required to successfully embark on this initiative, CBO does not recommend the remainder of this package at this time.

CBO Recommendation: $172,500

Gateway Green Match Funding, PK_12, $250,000, 0.00 FTE.
The bureau requests $250,000 of General Fund one-time resources to support the development of Gateway Green. Funding would contribute to the Friends of Gateway Green’s goal of raising $1 million by 2016, which would then allow them to receive a matching grant of $1 million from Metro’s Nature in Neighborhoods grant program. If the City’s contribution were to be used on capital construction, then SDC revenues could be used as an alternative funding source.

Fund raising for the project is scheduled through December 2015, followed by further design work in 2016, and construction beginning in 2017. Total project costs are estimated at $5.4 million in addition to ongoing O&M funding after completion. The bureau has not yet developed an O&M estimate and has not requested funding.

The completed Gateway Green will primarily serve cyclocross riders but also include pedestrian trails, a children’s play area, and a field house for environmental education classes. With the planned access improvements, the park will serve 413 households within ½ mile of the park to the west of I-205.

While this project does increase park access to households, other bureau capital projects would provide greater increased access to a broader group of residents. As such, CBO does not recommend funding for this project at this time. As an alternative, CBO recommends that the bureau work with Gateway Green to
determine whether bureau funds could best used for capital construction and thereby allow funding options to include SDC revenues. The bureau could then decide whether this park ranks higher than other expansion needs.

CBO Recommendation: $0

Equity and Inclusion Investment, PK_13, $200,000, 1.00 FTE.
The bureau requests $200,000 of General Fund one-time resources to provide additional training for frontline staff who work with limited English proficiency (LEP) populations. Funding would also be used to translate materials, signs and critical business documents into other languages.

The bureau does not consistently tracked the number of persons with limited English proficiency who visit community services, but currently under development is a system that will allow the bureau to better track the language preferences and needs of participants. Anecdotally, these interactions mostly occur at Mount Scott and East Portland community centers.

A 2014 study, in collaboration with PSU, conducted three Latino focus groups and concluded that the inability to communicate with Parks staff was a top barrier for using bureau services. Feedback from organizations representing the Somali, Bhutanese, Russian, and other organizations support this conclusion.

Because the scope of this equity initiative has potentially the largest impact in reaching more Portlanders, CBO recommends this request; however, CBO notes that the bureau has several packages that address low-income and equity initiatives, all of which include request for staffing support for projects in the pilot stage. These packages include:

- $360,000 and 1.0 FTE for the Scholarship Program (PK_07)
- $250,000 and 2.0 FTE for Parks for New Portlanders program (PK_09)
- $200,000 and 1.0 FTE for Equity and Inclusion Investment (PK_13)

In total, the bureau requests $810,000 and 4.0 FTE for these initiatives. CBO recommends that the added limited-term position, to the degree available, provide outreach and program support to the Scholarship Program and the Parks for New Portlanders program, based on the bureau’s discretion as to which of these initiatives are highest priority.

CBO recommends funding this requests but also recommends that the bureau work with the Office of Equity and Human Rights to fund current translation needs by using match-funding approved by Council for FY 2014-15.

CBO Recommendation: $200,000, 1.00 FTE.
Summer Free for All Program, PK_14, $130,000, 0.00 FTE.

The bureau requests $130,000 of General Fund one-time resources to support the Summer Free for All program. Additional funding is requested due to a loss of sponsorship in the program, increased program costs, and growing demand for the program. Between 2007 through 2013, Daimler provided premier sponsorship for years focusing on Washington Parks Summer Festival and supporting the concerts program. Annual donations ranged from $50,000 to $175,000. Daimler did not provide funding in 2009, during which the Sondland Family and Nike provided premier sponsorship. The requested funding would replace the estimated loss of $130,000 due to the discontinuation of Daimler’s sponsorship.

Of last year’s total program costs of $663,000, the General Fund provides $238,000. Additional resources were as follows in FY 2013-14:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund resources</td>
<td>$238,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate sponsors</td>
<td>190,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood contributions</td>
<td>210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks Memorial Fund - fees and charges</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$663,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over the past five years, the bureau estimates that participation has grown by approximately 13%. Other changes in the program include:

- Number of concerts have not changed (Washington Park reduced concerts from 10 to 8 nights last year)
- Number of movie showings have grown from 13 shows in 2007 to 52 shows in the summer of 2014
- Number of lunches increased from 62,000 to 111,000 lunches

If funding is not approved, certain events and services would be discontinued. The bureau’s tentative plan would be to reduce one more mobile program around the city ($16,000) and four lunch sites (two in outer east Portland and four in north Portland). Of the 43 days that Summer Free for All sites are in service, the bureau would reduce the number of service hours to 4-6 hours per day down from 6-8 hours at 11 sites.

Because of the expectedly large impact of discontinuing portions of the program, the urgency of needing to continue with planning process, and because of the one-time nature of the request, CBO recommends this package.

*CBO Recommendation: $130,000*

Mount Scott Community Center HVAC, PK_15, $818,000, 0.00 FTE.

The bureau requests $818,000 of General Fund one-time resources to install HVAC at Mount Scott Community Center. The bureau requested funding for this project in Fall BMP, and the project is eligible for bond proceeds; however, it is not included in current plans for either issuance.
HVAC disruptions are currently impacting services, and as a result of increased outages, the number of hours of servicing the HVAC system has increased. Due to heating failures, preschool students occasionally wear jackets, yoga classes are cancelled. The bureau also notes that the auditorium and skating rink are underutilized due to the lack of HVAC, limiting program offerings and opportunities for rental revenues.

Historically bureau maintenance workers spend 500-600 hours annually repairing and performing preventative maintenance on HVAC system. Service time has increased to 930 hours per year in the three most recent fiscal years due to increased failures of the system. In total, the capital project ranking committee found that the replacement of the HVAC system would avoid over $2.0 million in asset loss, additional repair costs and lost program revenues.

The lifespan of the building structure is expected to exceed another 70 years. Mechanical and HVAC equipment carries an expected lifespan of 15-20 years. As noted in prior CBO analyses, HVAC replacement for Parks facilities is an element of the list of unfunded, regularly scheduled major maintenance projects; HVACs require replacement on a somewhat predictable basis such that roof replacement should be a stable and predictable part of the bureau’s major maintenance budget. CBO continues to recommend that the bureau perform an analysis on all the elements of the bureau's assets that require ongoing regularly scheduled maintenance so that CBO and the bureau can work together to develop a funding plan for these large, recurring items. Such a funding plan might involve new or reallocated resources.

This project ranked fifth in the FY 2015-16 Infrastructure Project Ranking due to the potential safety hazards and service disruption (greater than 10,000 customers), as described above. Because of these concerns, CBO recommends funding.

*CBO Recommendation: $818,000*

**Chinese Garden Lake Zither Pond, PK_17, $638,000, 0.00 FTE.**

The bureau requests $638,000 of General Fund one-time resources to replace the pond liner at Chinese Garden Lake Zither. Funding would replace the pond lining, increasing the expected lifespan of 40-50 years.

The pond is considered the focal point and the cultural feature of the garden. If the bureau is unable to address the pond lining, either within current resources or new General Fund resources, the bureau anticipates that the garden would need to be closed within 18 to 24 months. Approximately 130,000 persons visit the garden per year. In addition to impacting bureau revenues, closure of the garden may impact businesses that support tourism in Chinatown.

The Chinese Garden has invested approximately $75,000 in garden fees to conduct initial investigation and preliminary design work to identify options for addressing the pond failure. Per the agreement between the Portland Classical Chinese Garden and PP&R, the City is responsible for major maintenance
that exceed $25,000, as the budget allows. The garden has applied for grant assistance for repair costs and received $30,000 in PDC Livability Grant funding.

This project ranked 13th of 15 in the FY 2015-16 Infrastructure Project Ranking due to the service disruption (greater than 10,000 customers), the financial loss of revenues and increased costs of maintaining the pond liner and maintaining minimum water levels, as described above. Because of these concerns, CBO recommends funding.

*CBO Recommendation: $638,000*

**Off-Road Cycling Master Plan, PK_17, $350,000, 0.00 FTE.**

The bureau requests $350,000 of General Fund one-time resources to develop a master plan for off-road cycling at several sites in Portland. Specific sites have not been identified, although prime areas for feasibility analysis include Forest Park, River View property, and East Buttes properties (south of Powell Butte). It is estimated that an off-road cycling master plan may identify four to six miles of new trails. Metro will also contribute resources in FY 2015-16 to identify additional potential sites outside Portland city limits, which would potentially improve connectivity between City and non-City owned sites.

The City provides few options for off-road cycling in Forest Park and Powell Butte; for the options within Forest Park, cyclists share trail use with pedestrians. Current estimated cyclist usage of Forest Park and Powell Butte Park is unknown. Stub Stewart State Park (34 miles west of Portland) receives approximately 20,000 annual (non-unique) bike visits for its six miles of bike trails. Neither the bureau’s five-year capital plan nor its 20-year capital includes off-road cycling projects. The estimated costs of four to six miles is $120,000 to $300,000 per mile, depending on steepness of topography, soil conditions, and the amount of trees and tree removals involved.

The cycling community has expressed strong interest in expanding off-road cycling options; however, the current focus of the bureau’s current capital plan reflects its most pressing needs: maintaining assets and expanding access to underserved resident. Because this project is not included in capital plans and the bureau has other, higher priority capital needs, CBO does not recommend funding this project.

*CBO Recommendation: $0.*

**Innovative Food Production Action Plan, PK_18, $75,000, 0.00.**

The bureau requests $75,000 of General Fund one-time resources to identify areas and develop plans for community food production areas. Unlike community gardens which are generally managed by one entity that assigns specific parcels to individuals or families for their exclusive use during a set period of time, the proposed idea would be to develop City-owned properties for the explicit purpose of food production that maximizes the benefit to local residents. Funding would provide resources to hire a consultant for this analysis. Outcomes of the study include: (1) an inventory of land appropriate for food production, and (2) a process for interested community members to access and use these properties for food production.
Other cities (Seattle, Oakland, Cleveland, Vancouver, BC) have created inventories of public lands that would be suitable for urban agriculture; however, there are very few, if any, instances of citywide efforts to manage urban food production sites. Moreover, current research has not identified how many residents are typically impacted per site (relative to size) or to what degree food produced at sites supplants household food costs or daily dietary needs.

If implemented, the intent is for community members to develop and manage food production sites; however, the bureau anticipates ongoing staffing will be necessary to keep a list of available properties updated, review applications for land, manage the public involvement process, develop and execute land lease agreements, and complete other program administration tasks. The specific ongoing resource needs to implement the program would be included in the plan.

Without further evidence on the potential impact of the food production sites, CBO does not recommend resources to fund the analysis.

CBO Recommendation: $0.

**Public Safety Investment, PK_19, $650,000.**
The bureau requests $650,000 of General Fund one-time resources to replace and add closed-circuit cameras (CCTV) to recreation centers at 21 of the 34 sites. Funding would also provide lockdown mechanisms at community center exists. The bureau requested funding for this project in Fall BMP.

Of the 21 sites that need CCTV, four are considered high priority: Multnomah Arts Center and Annexes, Southwest Community Center, Mt Scott Community Center, and St John’s Community Center. There has been 1 criminal incident and no ranger issued exclusions and warnings at any of these four high-priority sites in 2013 and 2014. The bureau does not have criminal incident or any other comparable incident data for the remaining 17 sites.

Using the bureau’s general technology services budget and potentially underspending, the bureau has incremental progress in replacing CCTV and cameras over the past few years. CBO recommends that the bureau continue these incremental investments and does not recommend funding for the package.

CBO Recommendation: $0.

**Vegetation Monitoring Measure Ecological Health, PK_20, $120,000, 0.00 FTE.**
The bureau requests $120,000 of General Fund one-time resources to measure the ecological health and update the 2003-04 assessment of natural areas. This request would provide funding for consultants to update assessment protocol, create design and collection tools, and train staff. Funding would also be used to hire seasonal staff to conduct field assessments and a database/GIS technician to import and assess the data.
Currently no positions assess natural areas or update the 2003-04 inventory; however, the inventory is updated when the bureau acquires and develops a new natural area. The bureau estimates that 75% of the inventories are now out of date. If funding is approved, the inventory would take approximately two years to complete. Upon completion, City Nature division staff would be trained on the updated monitoring protocol, and assessments of a large portion of properties would be integrated into the division’s annual work plan.

Although complementary, PK_20 Vegetation Monitoring and PK_21 Natural Area Asset Management Software could be successful independent of whether the other request is funded.

Because this project would provide further clarity on the status of the City’s green assets, allow the bureau to better prioritize natural needs, and potentially result in long-term efficiencies, CBO recommends this project.

CBO Recommendation: $120,000.

**Natural Areas Management Software, PK_21, $60,000, 0.00 FTE.**

The bureau requests $60,000 of General Fund one-time resources to customize software for natural area tracking and site management. Metro would provide the City with the Terranet software; costs are solely for modifying the software for the bureau’s specific needs. BTS has reviewed and supports the requested software. Other comparable products have been considered by the bureau but found that the Terranet software best suited its needs.

To track natural areas, currently site managers maintain site-specific inventories. The requested software would allow the bureau to systematically track data for the entire natural area system. Moreover, a comprehensive natural area management software allows the bureau to coordinate with regional partners, particularly regarding invasive specific mitigation and the early detection rapid response program. The software would also track reoccurring prescriptions for land management, such as retreatment of trees or vegetation, treatment of early detection and rapid response plants, and monitoring of projects and plans that require by state and federal governments.

Although complementary, PK_20 Vegetation Monitoring and PK_21 Natural Area Asset Management Software could be successful independent of whether the other request is funded.

Funding for this project may be possible within the bureau’s general technology budget. As such, CBO recommends that the bureau move forward with the program but realign resources to fund the project.

CBO Recommendation: $0.

**Westmoreland Park Sckavone Stadium Lighting, PK_22, $828,000, 0.00 FTE.**

The bureau requests $828,000 of General Fund one-time resources to install lighting at Sckavone Stadium in Westmoreland Park. Lighting of the stadium was recently decommissioned after the system failed and...
the electrical room that supported the stadium became dangerous due to outdated equipment. Prior to decommissioning, approximately 9,250 (non-unique) visitors used the stadium per year; the number of visitors decreased to 4,500 per year after stadium lighting was no longer available. Due to decrease programming, the bureau estimates $27,000 in lost revenue.

The bureau maintains four other park sites with lighted stadiums.

- Erv Lind Stadium – approximately 8.5 miles (NE 57th and Halsey St.)
- Delta Park – 10.6 miles (Martin Luther King Jr Blvd and N Marine Drive)
- Lents Park – 4.8 miles (SE 92nd and Holgate Blvd.)

This project ranked 4th of 15 in the FY 2015-16 Infrastructure Project Ranking due to the safety hazard of operating the stadium lights and the financial impact due to the loss of program revenues, as described above. Because of these concerns, CBO recommends funding.

**CBO Recommendation:** $828,000.

**Technical – Position Authority for new O&M, $0.00, 11.00 FTE.**

The bureau requests position authority for 11.00 new FTE to be funded from prior year O&M increases. In total, the bureau will allocate $840,000 for the creation of the positions from the $1.3 million total that was approved by Council for the operations and maintenance of the newly developed parks or acquisitions over the past two years. The function of these positions will address the highest operation and maintenance needs across the parks system – not just serving those parks for which the bureau received O&M.

The bureau also requests to transfer $64,000 from its major maintenance allocation to its General Fund appropriation. This is primarily a technical budget adjustment that allows the bureau to more appropriately align expected expenses with budget authority. Specifically, minor painting and roofing of structures will be budgeted as part of the annual operating budget. Large painting projects will still be budgeted as a capital expense and funded through the bureaus’ major maintenance allocation.

**CBO Recommendation:** $0, 11.00 FTE.

**Operations and Maintenance Request for Future Park Developments, PK_24, $0, 0.00 FTE.**

The bureau requests $397,659 General Fund ongoing resources to support the estimated operations and maintenance costs of two new parks: Gateway Urban Plaza and Beech Park. These funds are not needed in FY 2015-16 and so the request also includes an offsetting one-time reduction for FY 2014-15. As such, the request is for $0 in FY 2015-16 but for ongoing increase of $397,659 after the parks become in service.

These two projects, funded by SDC revenues, are estimated to costs $9.0 million and $11.0 million, respectively. The estimated O&M costs, $270,000 for Gateway Urban Plaza and $127,000 for Beech Park, are low confidence level as the design portions of these developments have not yet been completed. CBO and the bureau will true-up estimated O&M costs in the FY 2016-17 budget.
City policy FIN 2.03.02, recently updated and approved by Council, requires that bureaus request ongoing funding for operations and maintenance on future development projects that are anticipated to be contracted in the upcoming year. Council recently approved planning, design, and construction observation/administration service for these parks, totaling $1.3 million combined. The bureau anticipates submitting construction contracts for these two projects for Council’s approval in FY 2015-16.

Due to expected increase in household access, CBO recommends funding for the operations and maintenance of these parks.

*CBO Recommendation: $0.*
## Portland Parks & Recreation

### Adds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bureau</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Gen Fund</th>
<th>Gen Fund 1-Time</th>
<th>Other Revenues</th>
<th>Total Expenses</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Gen Fund</th>
<th>Gen Fund 1-Time</th>
<th>Other Revenues</th>
<th>Total Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PK_02</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>567,669</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>567,669</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>567,669</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>567,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK_03</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>84,552</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>84,552</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK_05</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>73,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73,500</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK_07</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>360,000</td>
<td>(200,000)</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK_08</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>603,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>603,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>603,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>603,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK_09</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK_10</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>239,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>239,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>239,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>239,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK_11</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>672,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>672,500</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>172,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>172,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK_12</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK_13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK_14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK_15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>818,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>818,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>818,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>818,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK_16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>638,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>668,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>638,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>668,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK_17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK_18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK_19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>650,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>650,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK_20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK_21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK_22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>828,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>828,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>828,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>828,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK_24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>397,659</td>
<td>(397,659)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>397,659</td>
<td>(397,659)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Adds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>555,711</td>
<td>6,413,510</td>
<td>(170,000)</td>
<td>6,799,221</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>397,659</td>
<td>3,918,510</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>4,346,169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reductions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bureau</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Gen Fund</th>
<th>Gen Fund 1-Time</th>
<th>Other Revenues</th>
<th>Total Expenses</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Gen Fund</th>
<th>Gen Fund 1-Time</th>
<th>Other Revenues</th>
<th>Total Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PK_04</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(84,552)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(84,552)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK_06</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(73,500)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(73,500)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Reductions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(158,052)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(158,052)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Realignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bureau</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Gen Fund</th>
<th>Gen Fund 1-Time</th>
<th>Other Revenues</th>
<th>Total Expenses</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Gen Fund</th>
<th>Gen Fund 1-Time</th>
<th>Other Revenues</th>
<th>Total Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PK_01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>(3.00)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(3.00)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Portland Parks & Recreation

### Realignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Realignment Description</th>
<th>Bureau Requested</th>
<th>CBO Analyst Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PK_23 - Technical - Position Authority for new O&amp;M</td>
<td>02 11.00 0 0 0 0 11.00 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Realignments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Gen Fund Ongoing</th>
<th>Gen Fund 1-Time</th>
<th>Other Revenues</th>
<th>Total Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Portland Parks & Recreation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gen Fund</td>
<td>Gen Fund</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>1-Time</td>
<td>Revenues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>397,659</td>
<td>6,413,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>397,659</td>
<td>3,918,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>4,346,169</td>
<td>4,346,169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>