



# Real Estate & Facilities Management Provision of Services to the Park Board

Park Board Committee Meeting  
Monday, April 30, 2018



- To review the current operating model for facilities management services to the Park Board; and
- Review and seek approval on recommendations to improve the delivery of facility related services between Park Board and REFM.

- 1) A review of the Consolidated Facilities Services project;
- 2) A review of available facility maintenance request and 311 data;
- 3) A review of key stakeholder experiences;
- 4) A root cause analysis;
- 5) An evaluation of options to improve service; and
- 6) Proposed recommendations



# BACKGROUND



- A. “THAT the Vancouver Board of Parks and Recreation direct staff to ***initiate a review of facility and infrastructure service requests and related data*** (such as but not limited to 311 case and public complaints, Community Centre Association and partner complaints and concerns), as may be available prior to and post implementation of the shared services model;
- B. THAT staff ***present an analysis and report*** to the Board of the findings no later than the end of January 2018, giving due consideration to the upcoming 2018 operational year; and
- C. THAT staff ***present the Board with recommendations*** such as returning management of facilities back to the Park Board or implementation of a service level agreement, in order to identify solutions for delivering an acceptable level of service for the Vancouver public and for Park Board partners.

- CFS launched according to Council direction and delivered from 2011-16;
- Project Goals: consolidate services to minimize redundancy; achieve cost efficiency; develop leading practices; and provide value for money;
- Partnership Agreement: formalized services between REFM and Park Board - Nov 07, 2014, revised July 12, 2016;
- Benefits: expanded scope of services and compliance programs delivered by REFM that did not exist under Park Board;
- Challenges: ambiguity of roles and responsibilities and undefined service levels; and capacity and accountability gaps in both Park Board and REFM.

# ANALYSIS

## 1) 311 Interaction Data

- Data captures interaction counts (volume only)
- Data could not be used to make meaningful conclusions

## 2) Facility Maintenance Request Work Order Data

- Data and information gaps; work order data was not intended as a performance management tool
- Challenging to make any like for like comparisons regarding pre- and post-consolidation responsiveness from this information
- Service has been variable over the sample, and trending downwards; improvements in 2017 due to project SIMBA



## 1) Community partners

- Experience delays in getting project and maintenance work done;
- Find it difficult to navigate and communicate within the system; and are
- Dissatisfied with quality of janitorial services particularly in washrooms.

## 2) Park Board and REFM staff

- Are unclear on service level expectations, roles and responsibilities for assets and joint processes;
- Are concerned about investment levels and condition of certain assets;
- Lack a single point of contact at Park Board and REFM; and
- Experience communication, productivity and financial challenges.

- 1) Unclear roles and responsibilities and undefined service levels and expectations between REFM and Park Board;
- 2) Resourcing gaps (budget and staff) in both REFM and Park Board;
- 3) Communication and collaboration gaps within REFM and between REFM and Park Board and partners;
- 4) Ineffective management tools and processes; and
- 5) Data and information gaps.

# OPTIONS TO IMPROVE SERVICE



- Benefits and challenges associated with the implementation of the shared service model for both Park Board and REFM
- Benefits: Expanded scope; service times are improving
- Challenges: Undefined service levels; insufficient staff for work volume; and insufficient investments in assets
- Creation of Strategic Operations Planning and Program Management (SOPPM) to oversee operational effectiveness of REFM
- REFM improvement projects to address root cause of service issues
- Opportunity to leverage resources on active projects; existing Partnership Agreement; and close gaps from CFS

- Scope: REFM developing Operating Level Agreements (OLA's) with all client departments
- Goal: increase consistency in facility-related service delivery across the City of Vancouver
- Initiatives Planned:
  - Service levels and performance targets for work requests and projects
  - Supporting process for performance management
  - Customer satisfaction process
  - Training and implementation plan
- Cost: Funded by REFM and the City of Vancouver
- Schedule: ~ Nine months from approval

- Program Manager (1)
  - Develop and manage OLA, act as interface with REFM on project SIMBA, resolve operational issues related to facility management services
- Asset Planner (1)
  - Programming for non- building asset management activities for Park Board
- Building Services Supervisor (2)
  - First priority to develop action plan to resolve user issues related to park washroom condition
- Cost: \$500k annually
- Schedule: ~ Six months from funding approval

- Scope: multi-year, multi-initiative project, multi-disciplinary team
- Goal: achieve significant improvements in the delivery of facility-related services to REFM's client departments.
- Initiatives Complete:
  - 50% increase in capital funding in 10yr outlook
  - 6 new electrical shop resources to improve service times
  - Improvements to work control system to increase productivity
  - Performance dashboards and regular review meetings with management
- Cost: funded by REFM and the City
- Schedule: ~ 2 years

- Scope: JOA Implementation Manual outlines several policies and procedures related to facilities management services.
- Goals: Clarify roles, responsibilities and improve communication and engagement in long term planning and issues resolution for facility related work between Park Board, CCA's and REFM.
- Planned Initiatives:
  - Link work procedures for facility management related services that involve Park Board, CCA's and REFM.
- Opportunity: make the corresponding link to procedures in OLA; leverage process for other Park Board partners and tenants.



# Return Facility Management Services to Park Board



- Duplicates facility management services across the City of Vancouver
- Does not address root causes of service issues
- Park Board would need to make many of the same improvements as REFM in asset management, processes and investment levels
- Potential disruption to staff and community partners
- Project cost: \$ 900k; Annual cost: \$14.2M (+/- 25%)
- Project schedule - 3 + years

Subject to Park Board approval staff will:

- 1) Proceed with the development of an OLA with REFM; and
- 2) Seek the funding required for the new positions; and
- 3) Continue to collaborate on relevant project SIMBA initiatives at appropriate intervals and link the CCA JOA Implementation Manual to the REFM OLA.
- 4) Staff will report back on the performance of the above initiatives in 2019.



# RECOMMENDATIONS



- A. THAT the Vancouver Park Board continue the shared services model, with Real Estate & Facilities Management (REFM) providing facility management services to the Park Board;
- B. THAT staff proceed with the following recommendations to improve service delivery, as outlined in this report:
  - i. Develop an Operating Level Agreement (OLA) with REFM to clarify roles, responsibilities, and service level expectations;
  - ii. Seek additional funding to address the identified staff capacity issues;
  - iii. Collaborate with REFM on their “Safely Improve Management of Building Assets” (SIMBA) project; and
  - iv. Link the Community Centre Association Implementation Manual with the REFM OLA to clarify roles, responsibilities and expectations in relation to facility maintenance work; and
- C. THAT staff report back on the performance of the above initiatives in 2019.

# Recommendations (final motion as amended)



- A. THAT the Vancouver Park Board continue the shared services model, with Real Estate & Facilities Management (REFM) providing facility management services to the Park Board;
- B. THAT staff proceed with the following recommendations to improve service delivery, as outlined in this report:
  - i. Develop an Operating Level Agreement (OLA) with REFM to clarify roles, responsibilities, and service level;
  - ii. Seek additional funding to address the identified staff capacity issues;
  - iii. Collaborate with REFM on their “Safely Improve Management of Building Assets” (SIMBA) project; and
  - iv. Link the Community Centre Association Implementation Manual with the REFM OLA to clarify roles, responsibilities and expectations in relation to facility maintenance work; and
- C. THAT staff report back on the performance of the above initiatives in **2020 to determine if continuation of a shared services model is warranted.**

