

## Attachment Two - Local Board Resolutions

September 2016

The following are resolutions and/or feedback provided by this local board to inform the Request for Proposal document.

### **Puketapapa**

The Puketāpapa Local Board considered this proposal at a combined workshop with Albert-Eden and Whau Local Boards on 9 August 2016.

A report was then included on the 25 August 2016 Puketāpapa Local Board business meeting agenda. The report sought *“local board feedback on proposed maintenance service specifications where they may have an impact on levels of service for local activities, to inform a Request for Proposal to the supplier market (due to be published in early October 2016).”*

The board resolved to *“delegate authority to the Chair and Deputy Chair to provide the board’s feedback on the proposed service specifications, local outcomes and the overall structure for new Community Facilities maintenance contracts by 23 September 2016.”*

The local board feedback is as follows:

### **Opening comments**

#### **Focus on overall outcomes not outputs**

- This point can be illustrated through an example. A couple of years ago at Keith Hay Park, Council removed an area of flax that was blocking sightlines at a cycleway junction. The flax came out, and the grass and weeds started to grow. Weeks and months went by with contractors coming in to mow the rest of the park, weed gardens, and conduct other maintenance. But because the de-flaxed area was not on the maintenance schedule, it was left. Eventually when I noticed it, waist high and looking terrible, it was logged and it was dealt with.
- This scenario stems from a tick-box outputs approach. The contractors are paid to do tasks x, y, and z. Nothing else matters. In fact, if they do something else, they are taking away time from doing x, y, and z, and are effectively financially penalised. Council contracts need to work in some overall outcomes to ensure that obvious maintenance tasks that are not on the pre-prepared list get pro-actively dealt with.
- While the board supports the proposed approach for the 2017 Parks and Building Maintenance Contracts, it emphasises that the local outcomes should reflect local character, not one generic outcome across the region. In this instance, and for the purposes of this submission ‘local’ refers to the proposed *Rua cluster* rather than the *Puketāpapa Local Board area*.
- In the move to more outcomes focussed Parks and Building Maintenance Contracts is supported, the board notes that some prescriptive requirements will remain to ensure that the transition to the new approach is successful over time.

#### **Flexibility for Local Boards**

- At the time the last contracts were given out, Local Boards were promised that within overall envelopes they would have some discretion and flexibility. Our understanding was that we would be able to increase a service level in one place and lower it in another if that better met community expectations. In reality this was not possible and

we discovered that there was basically no flexibility. Whenever we tried to do this, we were told that the contracted tasks were set across the whole contract area and it was impossible to localise them.

- As an example – after the last contracts were let, Council dropped maintenance at Hillsborough Cemetery. It then fell in to a state of disrepair. We sought to work through our local service levels to see if we could reduce slightly in one area in order to fund work at the Cemetery, but we were told that this was basically impossible. In the end we resolved the issue in another way.
- There need to be built in mechanisms to enable boards to have very clear oversight of the service levels, tasks, and costs, associated with the contracts in our areas. There also needs to be a practical ability to prioritise within this. We understand the potential inefficiencies of boards changing service levels frequently but believe a balance needs to be struck. We believe that the contracts should include provision that overall service levels and allocated tasks within a cluster area will be reviewed by the relevant boards every three years, coinciding with the Local Board Plan revision. At the beginning of each financial year boards should have the discretion to adjust service levels.

### **Proposed specifications**

- The board has been limited in its ability to give specific feedback on the outcomes in asset groups, due to inaccuracies in the list of assets supplied by the department. This has constrained its ability to understand existing levels of service for asset groups and where changes might be needed. Particularly in regard to what enhanced and standard mean, and how to have something categorised as a premier as opposed to neighbourhood park.
- The proposed service specifications outcomes for the 2017 Parks and Building Maintenance Contracts should be reviewed to remove all subjective statements (such as high-quality and visually pleasing) and replaced with definitive statements.
- The board has the following general feedback for asset groups:
  - add 'maintenance of sightlines to ensure Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design Standards (CPTED) are met'
  - add 'coordinate maintenance programmes with ad hoc events, when necessary'
  - remove reference to toilet cleaning in asset groups (because this has its own asset group classification)
  - playground areas, dog exercise areas, sportsparks and other areas that children are likely to visit should be spray free where possible.
- The board has the following specific feedback for asset groups:
  - Sportsparks – remove grass clippings

### **Geographical clusters and term of contracts**

- supports the concept of geographic clusters for the 2017 Parks and Building Maintenance Contracts and the makeup of the Rua cluster, with the exception of the Gulf Islands
- requests clarification about the rationale for the proposed term of the 2017 Parks and Building Maintenance Contracts, in particular how this will improve political oversight
- contracts should include provision that overall service levels and allocated tasks within a cluster area will be reviewed by the relevant boards every three years, coinciding with the Local Board Plan revision. At the beginning of each financial year boards should have the discretion to adjust service levels within their board area.

### **Procurement principles**

- considers that providing more opportunities for local suppliers for the 2017 Parks and Building Maintenance Contracts will allow for:
  - greater economic opportunities for these local providers
  - greater pride and ownership in the work and consequently better standards

- economic development in local areas, including jobs closer to where people live.
- requests that staff ensure that the 2017 Parks and Building Maintenance Contracts provide a sustainable procurement approach as per the Council's procurement policy which includes "increased local spend and enhanced local capability where appropriate". The board considers a sustainable procurement approach would support a Living Wage and equal opportunities for marginalised sectors of the community.
- request that the principle of the Living Wage is embedded in the Smart Procurement Principles document
- requests that staff, when considering the tenders for the 2017 Parks and Building Maintenance Contracts, give greater weight to tenderers who have included a higher proportion of local suppliers from the Rua cluster and will prioritise employment for people within Rua
- requests that staff, as per the Council's procurement policy, ensure that local suppliers are provided advice and support so they have a full and fair opportunity to compete for the 2017 Parks and Building Maintenance Contracts
- requests that the 2017 Parks and Building Maintenance Contracts have a "local impact assessment" as part of the procurement process as per the Council's procurement policy and requests that local boards have input at the strategic level on the development of the "local impact assessment"
- supports staff incorporating creative solutions and opportunities to build community empowerment into the 2017 Parks and Building Maintenance Contracts e.g. a local community group could undertake all the maintenance of a local park
- requests that the 2017 Parks and Building Maintenance Contracts be designed to allow for enough flexibility for local boards to make minor changes to levels of service without the need for locally driven initiative funding
- requests that the 2017 Parks and Building Maintenance Contracts be designed to enable local boards to use locally driven initiative funding for major increases to levels of service on an annual basis.

#### **Reporting, advice and ongoing support**

- notes that staff have confirmed that there is no intention to reduce existing service levels as part of the 2017 Parks and Building Maintenance Contracts and requests staff to provide options to address any reductions to the affected local boards for consideration within existing asset-based services budgets
- requests that staff provide local boards with timely, relevant and high-quality advice during the annual planning process which will enable local boards to make informed level of service decisions following consultation with the community as part of the annual planning process
- requests quarterly reporting on the performance of contractors against the 2017 Parks and Building Maintenance Contracts as part of the regular local board quarterly reports.
- requests confirmation from staff as to how the new contracts will be managed by Community Facilities and how the local boards will be supported by staff - i.e. which staff will work with local boards at relevant portfolio, workshop and business meetings.

#### **Note specific questions on the service specifications from the local board**