

2021-22 CIVIL GRAND JURY FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND RESPONSES TO FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

| Report Title [Publication Date] | F# | Finding | Respondent Assigned by CGJ [Response Due Date] | Finding Response (Agree/ Disagree) | Finding Response Text |
|---|----|--|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| Safe and Accessible Parks for All [June 24, 2022] | F1 | Published Hardscape feature scores for the City’s parks fail to reflect the true surface conditions of pathways for pedestrian and wheelchair traffic, thus providing misguided information to the RPD for setting maintenance priorities, and to the public about a park’s accessibility. | Director, Recreation and Parks Department [August 23, 2022] | Disagree wholly | The Park Evaluation Program is based on appearance standards – not maintenance or accessibility standards. Trying to derive accessibility information from this database misunderstands the system. To be an ADA accessible pathway, the pathway must meet specific dimensional requirements such as width, slope, cross-slope, and specific limits to changes in level, in addition to providing a pathway surface that is firm, stable, and slip-resistant. None of these attributes is evaluated or contained in the Park Evaluation Program. Additionally, the Park Evaluation Program does not set maintenance priorities. The Department derives maintenance and renewal priorities from our VFA.Facility asset management database. The VFA.Facility database documents the physical condition and useable life cycle of the Department’s built infrastructure based on condition assessments performed by a team of engineers, architects, and other technical staff. It calculates and assigns each infrastructure component a Facility Condition Index (FCI) that updates annually to show remaining life cycle and forecasts the capital renewal schedule. The Department’s deferred maintenance decisions and priorities are determined from this data. However, VFA.Facility only documents and forecasts renewal of infrastructure for ‘replacement-in-kind.’ It does not measure, calculate, or determine enhancement, accessibility, or changes for existing infrastructure. |
| Safe and Accessible Parks for All [June 24, 2022] | F2 | The RPD doesn’t integrate the park scores into each park’s description. | Director, Recreation and Parks Department [August 23, 2022] | Disagree wholly | Park Evaluation scores are available quarterly; however, attempting to update park feature scores for all parks on a quarterly basis is overly time-consuming and costly. The Controller’s Office releases composite Park Evaluation scores and park feature scores annually in their Annual Report. Once released, that annual composite information is available on the Department’s website. |

2021-22 CIVIL GRAND JURY FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND RESPONSES TO FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

| Report Title [Publication Date] | F# | Finding | Respondent Assigned by CGJ [Response Due Date] | Finding Response (Agree/ Disagree) | Finding Response Text |
|---|----|---|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| Safe and Accessible Parks for All [June 24, 2022] | F3 | The RPD fails to provide park accessibility information on RPD's website and at all park entrances. | Director, Recreation and Parks Department [August 23, 2022] | Agree | The Department could provide park accessibility information in the future on the Department website, once a method for determining pathway accessibility is identified, funded, and implemented. Such accessibility information cannot be determined from the Park Evaluation Program, as that system is based on appearance standards only. The Department's website currently provides a searchable database of all park sites by feature, including accessible sites, accessible children's play areas, accessible parking, accessible picnic areas, and accessible restrooms. This page can be found at https://sfrecpark.org/facilities Additionally, the Department's website has a dedicated page for Accessibility Questions providing information on access to parks, facilities and programs. This page can be found at https://sfrecpark.org/1246/Accessibility-Questions |

2021-22 CIVIL GRAND JURY FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND RESPONSES TO FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

| Report Title [Publication Date] | R# [for F#] | Recommendation | Respondent Assigned by CGJ [Response Due Date] | Recommendation Response (Implementation) | Recommendation Response Text |
|---|------------------|--|--|--|---|
| Safe and Accessible Parks for All [June 24, 2022] | R1.1 [for F1] | The Jury recommends the Controller’s Office create a Pathway Condition feature from existing park scoring systems that specifically assesses pathway surface conditions by December 31, 2022. | Director, Recreation and Parks Department [August 23, 2022] | Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable | The Park Evaluation Program is based solely on appearance standards. A “Pathway Condition” feature that assesses pathway surface conditions for accessibility cannot be extracted or derived from appearance standards. Accessibility determinations require specific tools, metrics, and training which are not part of the Park Evaluation Program. See rationale provided for disagreement with Finding 1 above. |
| Safe and Accessible Parks for All [June 24, 2022] | R1.2 [for F1] | The Jury recommends the RPD set a baseline for the Pathway Condition scores defined in R1.1 by March 31, 2023. | Director, Recreation and Parks Department [August 23, 2022] | Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable | See rationale for non-implementation of Recommendations 1.1 and 1.2 above. |
| Safe and Accessible Parks for All [June 24, 2022] | R1.3 [for F1] | If a park’s Pathway Condition score falls below the baseline defined in R1.2, the Jury recommends the RPD improve that park’s pathway to raise this score to be above the baseline within a reasonable time. | Director, Recreation and Parks Department [August 23, 2022] | Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable | |
| Safe and Accessible Parks for All [June 24, 2022] | R2 [for F2] | The Jury recommends the RPD incorporate the most recent park feature scores under each park’s description on the RPD’s website by December 31, 2022. | Director, Recreation and Parks Department [August 23, 2022] | Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable | |
| Safe and Accessible Parks for All [June 24, 2022] | R3.1 [for F3] | The Jury recommends the RPD include accessibility information on the RPD’s website by July 1, 2023. | Director, Recreation and Parks Department [August 23, 2022] | Requires further analysis | See rationale for partial agreement with Finding 3 above. |

2021-22 CIVIL GRAND JURY FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND RESPONSES TO FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

| Report Title [Publication Date] | R# [for F#] | Recommendation | Respondent Assigned by CGJ [Response Due Date] | Recommendation Response (Implementation) | Recommendation Response Text |
|---|------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Safe and Accessible Parks for All [June 24, 2022] | R3.2 [for F3] | The Jury recommends the RPD post accessibility information at all park entrances by July 1, 2024. | Director, Recreation and Parks Department [August 23, 2022] | Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable | Park accessibility information is currently available, but not in the manner suggested. The Department’s website provides a searchable database of all park sites by feature which contains accessibility information. Park users can make an informed decision on which park to visit prior to going, rather than searching for accessibility signage once there. Additional accessibility information could be available on the Department’s website in the future per the rationale provided above to support partial agreement with Finding 3. |