Marin County Board of Supervisors
3501 Civic Center Drive
San Rafael, CA 94903

SUBJECT: Organizational Study of the Department of Parks, Open Space and Cultural Services

Dear Board Members:

RECOMMENDATION: Approve the following actions as a result of the organizational study:

- Create a Department of Cultural Services effective December 1, 2004 while retaining the Parks and Open Space services in a Department of Parks and Open Space.
- Divide the current consolidated Parks, Open Space and Cultural Commission by creating a separate Parks and Open Space Commission and a Cultural Services Commission to reflect the new department organizational structure.
- Direct the County Administrator and Human Resources Director to develop job classification, salary, and recruitment plans for each department director position for Board of Supervisor approval.
- Direct the County Administrator to work with the new Department of Cultural Services on options for additional administrative resources with implementation to coincide with the department’s effective date.

SUMMARY: At your meeting of August 24, 2004, your Board directed the County Administrator to recommend a long-term organizational structure of the department and the commission to maximize the effectiveness of the department’s services.

In response to this direction, the Administrator’s Office conducted an organizational study to review the current structure of the department and commission by interviewing key department staff and commission representatives, reviewing organizational structures of parks departments in other California counties, considering observations and recommendations by Jack Harrison, the temporary interim department director, and reviewing the department’s mission, goals, and objectives.

The organizational study considered three organizational structure options:

- Option 1: Keep the department and commission consolidated.
- Option 2: Create two separate departments and commissions (Cultural Services, Parks and Open Space).
- Option 3: Create three separate departments and commissions (Cultural Services, Parks, and Open Space).
As a result of reviewing the research gathered for the study, the County Administrator recommends Option 2 to split the consolidated department by creating a new Department of Cultural Services while retaining the Parks and Open Space services in a Department of Parks and Open Space. This option would also split the current commission into two smaller commissions. The advantages of this option are in:

- Reflecting the differences among department programs (particularly Parks and Open Space and Cultural Services) and provide additional focus and identity
- Helping raise community profile and identity of Cultural Services at a particularly important time given the development and implementation of the Renaissance Plan.
- Aiding in the recruitment process for department directors by focusing the scope of each department.
- Allowing each commission to narrow its scope of work and to reflect the structure of the departments the commission is advising.

Following action on these recommendations by your Board, the next steps would be to:

- Proceed with implementing approved organizational structure for the Department of Parks, Open Space and Cultural Services and Parks, Open Space and Cultural Commission.
- Develop job classification, salary, and recruitment plan for the Parks and Open Space and Cultural Services department directors for approval by the Board of Supervisors on October 26, 2004.
- Provide recommendations on reconfiguring the membership of the Parks, Open Space and Cultural Commission and standing committees for approval by the Board of Supervisors on October 26, 2004.

**FISCAL IMPACT:** There will need to be some level of additional resources allocated to ensure the new Department of Cultural Services has sufficient administrative capacity. Annual cost increases for this department reorganization should range from $50,000 to $100,000 and would include compensation for the new director as well as upgraded administrative capacity.

**REVIEWED BY:**

- [ ] Auditor-Controller [X] N/A
- [ ] County Counsel [X] N/A
- [ ] Human Resources [X] N/A

Respectfully submitted,

Mark J. Riesenfeld
County Administrator

Attachments

*Principal author of this report is Matt Bronson, CAO Administrative Analyst III*
I. OVERVIEW AND SUMMARY

Overview
Effective May 31, 2004, the director of the Department of Parks, Open Space, and Cultural Services retired. The department has been managed in an interim capacity since this retirement, with the County Administrator overseeing the Parks and Open Space functions of the department while the Deputy Director of Cultural Services has served as the interim Director of Cultural Services. The Board of Supervisors also directed the County Administrator to recommend a long-term department organization structure and a corresponding structure of the Parks, Open Space and Cultural Commission and other related advisory groups.

In response to this direction, the Administrator’s Office undertook an organizational study to review the current structure of the department and recommend to the Board of Supervisors the most effective organizational structure to accomplish the department’s mission and programs. This study also involved reviewing the structure of the commission and related standing committees and recommending a structure for these groups that reflects the department organization structure.

This study was conducted by reviewing information from the following sources:

- Interviews with the three deputy directors of the department and representatives of the commission.
- Organizational structures of parks departments in other counties
- Observations and recommendations from the former interim department director

Summary of Findings and Recommendations
Below is the list of key findings and recommendations included in this organizational study.

Finding 1: The current consolidated structure of the department is not optimal for the long-term viability of the department’s services given the differences in mission, service needs, and culture between Parks, Open Space, and Cultural Services functions. It is difficult to balance these different needs within one department and to hire a director who would give equal attention to all three areas.

Recommendation 1: Create a separate Department of Cultural Services effective on December 1, 2004 while retaining the Parks and Open Space services in a Department of Parks and Open Space. Develop job classification, salary, and recruitment plan for each department director position for Board of Supervisors approval.

Finding 2: The Parks, Open Space, and Cultural Commission currently has a mission that mirrors the department’s consolidated structure. To continue its valuable role, the commission

---

1 The Parks Deputy Director and Open Space Assistant General Manager continued their responsibility for day-to-day operations of their respective functions in this interim structure.
should reflect the recommended change in the department structure by dividing into two commissions: Parks and Open Space, and Cultural Services. This would allow each commission to focus its time and efforts on a particular functional area. The related standing committees could continue their current role of advising the commissions on particular issues and align themselves to the appropriate commissions.

**Recommendation 2**: Divide the Parks, Open Space, and Cultural Commission into a Parks and Open Space Commission and a Cultural Services Commission. Consider membership of seven to nine members on each commission. Align the related sub-committees to the appropriate commission.

**Finding 3**: The Cultural Services Division currently has a small administrative staff, with most administrative services for the division provided by the consolidated department administrative staff. A free-standing Department of Cultural Services would likely require some level of additional resources to provide basic administrative services to the department, including budgeting, accounting, payroll, and other services. Options to provide these resources include upgrading current administrative position(s) to handle broader administrative issues and adding extra-hire funds for administrative support. Cultural Services should review its current payments to the Parks Division for providing administrative support to fund part or all of these administrative needs.

**Recommendation 3**: Work with the Department of Cultural Services on options for additional administrative resources with implementation to coincide with the department's effective date.

**Finding 4**: The scope of this study focused on the organizational structure of the department and corresponding public commission. However, there are several short- and long-term issues impacting the effectiveness of the department that should be reviewed. These issues include the future of the visitor services program (including the Civic Center gift shop), funding for and maintenance of landscape maintenance at the Civic Center, and collaboration and coordination between the Parks Division and Open Space District on long-term projects.

**Recommendation 4**: Work with the Departments of Parks and Open Space and Cultural Services to review the issues noted in Finding 4 and make appropriate policy recommendations.
II. CURRENT ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Department Structure and Programs
Below is the current structure of the Department of Parks, Open Space and Cultural Services:

The mission of the department is to “enhance and maintain a high quality of life for Marin’s residents and visitors through protection of Marin’s special lands and the provision of facilities, events, and services that promote a healthy and culturally enriched life.” The department is responsible for operating and maintaining park facilities, open space areas, and cultural facilities (such as the Marin Center). The department also provides landscaping maintenance services at County facilities, including the Civic Center campus.

The specific programs provided by the department include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>FTEs</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>Net County Cost (NCC)</th>
<th>Program % of NCC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open Space District</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>6,834,139</td>
<td>(6,834,139)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Facilities</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>1,698,014</td>
<td>(1,157,504)</td>
<td>540,510</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin Center Operations</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>2,253,917</td>
<td>(1,570,000)</td>
<td>683,917</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Maintenance</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>1,207,437</td>
<td>(367,983)</td>
<td>839,454</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Planning and Administration</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>941,856</td>
<td>(310,207)</td>
<td>631,649</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin Center Administration</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>464,645</td>
<td>(185,000)</td>
<td>279,645</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Center Gift Shop</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>165,886</td>
<td>(103,000)</td>
<td>62,886</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Services Special Projects</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>76,641</td>
<td>(6,050)</td>
<td>70,591</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Center Café</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>52,250</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>52,150</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>75.50</td>
<td>13,694,785</td>
<td>(10,533,983)</td>
<td>3,160,802</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Advisory Group Structure**
Below is the current structure of the public advisory groups relating to the Department of Parks, Open Space, and Cultural Services:

```
          Parks, Open Space, and Cultural Commission
             |
          Parks Committee          Open Space and Trails Committee          Cultural Development Committee          Fair Committee
```

The Parks, Open Space, and Cultural Commission is an advisory group that studies and makes recommendations concerning all functions of the department, including parks, open space, and cultural services. Department staff present a variety of policy and operational issues to the commission for the commission's review and recommendation. The commission is comprised of 16 members, made up of two representatives chosen from each supervisorial district, five at-large representatives and one veterans representative.

The commission has four standing committees that provide greater depth of study and focus on particular issues and make recommendations to the broader commission. These standing committees are:

- Parks Committee (seven commission members, three public representatives)
- Open Space and Trails Committee (eight commission members, three public representatives)
- Cultural Development Committee (seven commission members, three public representatives)
- Fair Committee (seven commission members, three public representatives)
III. INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL RESEARCH

Research for this study was collected primarily from the following sources:

- Interviews with the three deputy directors of the department and with representatives of the Parks, Open Space, and Cultural Commission
- Organizational structures of parks departments in other counties
- Observations and recommendations from the interim department director

Summary of Interviews with Department Staff and Commission Representatives
Interviews were conducted with the three department deputy directors and representatives of the commission to get feedback on the current and alternative structures of the department and commission. The three deputy directors interviewed were Jim Farley (Cultural Services), Ron Miska (Open Space) and Ron Paolini (Parks). Below are themes expressed during the interviews:

- Current consolidated structure could work if the department director had equal interest and experience in all three functional areas, but it is very difficult to find this type of individual.
- General support was expressed for creating a Department of Cultural Services and keeping Parks and Open together in one department
- There are significant differences between Cultural Services and Parks and Open Space in the organizational culture and services provided
- Cultural Services would benefit from the greater focus of being a separate department, particularly with the Renaissance Plan and related fund development needs.
- If two departments were created, the Parks, Open Space and Cultural Commission should reflect this new structure and divide into two commissions.
- If two commissions are created, there should be further consideration given to the current standing committee structure given the smaller size and focus of the new commissions.

The commission representatives interviewed were Carney Campion (chairperson) and Rick Fraites (vice chairperson). Below are themes expressed during the interview:

- In order to address program needs and issues, a different department organization structure could be more effective for the long-term effectiveness of the department’s service areas.
- Parks and Open Space would work well together within one department and Cultural Services would have greater focus as a separate department.
- The current commission does well in reviewing the different programs of the consolidated department. However, the commission structure should reflect the department structure and thus the commission should be divide into two commissions if a Cultural Services is made into a department.
- Most commissioners currently tend to focus on either Parks and Open Space issues or Cultural Services issues, though commissioners can provide different perspectives on issues outside of their subject area.
- The composition of the new commissions could be challenging due to the interests of providing balance on each commission with members serving on their commission of choice.
The current standing committee structure should continue with the committees aligning to their respective commission. Parks and Open Space and Trails Committees would align to Parks and Open Space Commission while Fair and Cultural Development would align to Cultural Services Commission.

Organizational Structures of Parks Departments in Other Counties
Organizational structures of parks departments in eight comparable California counties were also reviewed. These counties included:

- Monterey
- San Francisco
- San Luis Obispo
- San Mateo
- Santa Barbara
- Santa Clara
- Santa Cruz
- Sonoma

Below is a summary of trends among these other counties (full list of comparison information is included as an attachment):

- No other county combines parks and/or open space with cultural services and facilities within one department structure.
- Nearly all counties operate a greater number of park facilities than Marin County, though most of the counties researched have a greater population than Marin County.
- Most counties operate some open space facilities and maintain public trails, though Marin County has the most open space preserves operated by a parks department.
- Parks services are provided by a free-standing parks department in most counties, though parks and recreation is a division of a broader environmental agency in some counties.

Observations and Recommendations from Interim Department Director
This study also considered observations and recommendations concerning the department given by the interim department director who served briefly following the director’s resignation in May 2004. The interim director was previously a deputy director of the state parks department and frequently consults with local governments on parks and open space administration. Below are some highlights of his observations and recommendations:

- County should take lead in collaborating with other parks providers on a needs assessment and inventory to develop a new master plan for determining parks and recreation needs.
- The collaboration between the department and the commission could be strengthened by jointly establishing meeting agendas, identifying commission training opportunities, and establishing commission policies and practices.
- Guidelines should be established to determine operational costs of the Parks and Open Space programs in order to better identify costs of core functions such as patrol, trail maintenance, fire prevention, and landscape maintenance.
- To ensure resources are allocated appropriately, the department should establish priorities based on the County’s goals and implement these priorities through annual work plans for project management.
IV. OPTIONS, RECOMMENDATION AND NEXT STEPS

Organizational Structure Options
This organizational study considered three options for the long-term organizational structure of the department and commission:

- **Option 1**: Keep the current consolidated structure of the department and commission
- **Option 2**: Form two departments by creating a new Department of Cultural Services while retaining the Parks and Open Space services within one department. Commission would also divide into two commissions to reflect the new organizational structure.
- **Option 3**: Form three departments by creating separate Departments of Cultural Services, Parks, and Open Space District. Commission would also divide into three commissions to reflect the new organizational structure.

Below is a brief listing of advantages and disadvantages of each option:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1: Keep current consolidated structure of department and commission</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advantages</strong></td>
<td><strong>Disadvantages</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Some linkage among current programs in implementing department’s mission of “promoting a healthy and culturally enriched life”</td>
<td>- Significant differences in the mission, culture and service needs between Cultural Services and Parks and Open Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Department administrative staff provide administrative support for all divisions</td>
<td>- Difficult for a department director to provide equal leadership to all three areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Wide variety of perspectives as a result of having a consolidated commission</td>
<td>- Difficult for Cultural Services to create community identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Size and broad scope of consolidated commission is challenging</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 2: Form two departments and two commissions</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advantages</strong></td>
<td><strong>Disadvantages</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Helps create separate identity and focus for Cultural Services to raise community profile and convey service needs</td>
<td>- Additional administrative resources and salary increase for director will be needed for new Department of Cultural Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Allows Parks and Open Space functions to focus on their core services without balancing focus with Cultural Services</td>
<td>- Potential loss of additional perspectives once consolidated commission is divided into two commissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provides greater opportunity to find new director for Parks and Open Space given more limited scope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Helps commissions focus more on either Parks and Open Space or Cultural Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3: Form three departments and three commissions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advantages</strong></td>
<td><strong>Disadvantages</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide greater level of focus and identity</td>
<td>• Additional administrative resources and salary increases will be needed for both Cultural Services and Open Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for each service area of the department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Matches structure in other Bay Area counties as</td>
<td>• Might lead to duplication of some services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space is a separate function elsewhere</td>
<td>between Parks and Open Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Each commission would have additional focus on</td>
<td>• Might lead to too much department specialization, particularly with relative small size of each department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their respective department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Commissions might be too specialized and miss out on broader perspectives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation and Issues for Consideration**

Given these stated advantages and disadvantages, the recommendation in this organizational study is to *form two departments and two commissions*. This recommendation would be the most effective structure at this time to accomplish the services provided by the department. Below are specific examples of the benefits of this option to the County:

- **Reflects differences among department programs to provide additional focus and identity to the programs**
  The current consolidated department structure represents a mix of service needs, organizational cultures and constituents. While interview feedback indicates the current structure has been acceptable, it is not the optimal structure to accomplish the mission of each service area and to most effectively provide services. Creating a new Department of Cultural Services while retaining Parks and Open Space services in a Department of Parks and Open Space is a preferred structure to provide greater focus to each functional area and maximize the effectiveness of service delivery.

- **Helps raise community profile and identity of Cultural Services at a particularly important time given the Renaissance Plan**
  The Cultural Services Division is playing a leading role in developing and implementing the Renaissance Plan, a public-private partnership for the future development of the Marin Center cultural facilities. While this leadership role could continue with the current structure, it would be more effectively executed through a free-standing Department of Cultural Services rather than through a division of a broader department. A separate department would likely have a greater profile and identify clear opportunities for donors to support cultural activities.

- **Aids in recruitment process for new department director by focusing mission, goals and scope of department**
  A concern repeatedly expressed through the interviews was the difficulty in finding a department director with the skill set, experience and interest to provide balanced leadership and
management to all three services areas of the department. The likely outcome of this recruitment would be a director with an interest and management preference towards a particular service area. Creating a new Department of Cultural Services would allow the County to focus its search for a new Department of Parks and Open Space director on individuals from the Parks and Open Space disciplines, likely leading to a greater pool of qualified applicants. Though there are still differences between Parks and Open Space, there are much greater similarities between these two areas than with Cultural Services.

- **Allows the commission to also narrow its scope of work and reflect the structure of the departments the commission is advising**

Based on interview feedback, the commission has done well with its current consolidated structure in providing input the department on policy and operational issues. However, dividing the consolidated commission into two commissions would improve the effectiveness of the advisory group by focusing each commission around a more tailored scope of work based on their respective service area. This tailored scope of work could allow each commission to review issues at a greater depth than currently done while narrowing the broad scope of meeting agenda items. The new commissions’ smaller size (7-9 members compared with 16 on the current commission) would also likely expedite discussions and decision-making.

In implementing this recommendation, the issues below should be considered:

- There will likely need to be some level of additional resources allocated to ensure the new Department of Cultural Services has sufficient administrative capacity. Though a detailed cost estimate was not conducted for this study, the costs to create the Department of Cultural Services could range as high as $100,000 and could include increased compensation for the new director and upgrading administrative staff capacity.

- Dividing the consolidated commission into two smaller commissions could be challenging in balancing the interests of individual members with the broader commission interests. Specifically, some current members might be placed on a commission outside their interest level in order to create balanced and diverse commissions. In addition, if the new commissions were created with only seven members, two current members of the 16-member commission would not be members of the new groups. Eight- or nine-member commissions would be needed if all current commissioners were to be re-appointed.

- There are longer-term issues relating to both Cultural Services and Parks and Open Space that should be considered after implementation of this structural change, including:
  - Long-term fit of visitor services as a program under Cultural Services
  - Collaboration and coordination between Parks and Open Space
  - Landscape maintenance funding and oversight at the Civic Center campus, such as the lagoon park.
Next Steps
Below are the next steps for staff following discussion and action of the Board of Supervisors on September 14, 2004:

1. Proceed with implementing approved organizational structure for the Department of Parks, Open Space and Cultural Services and Parks, Open Space and Cultural Commission.

2. Develop job classification, salary, and recruitment plan for the directors of the Parks and Open Space Department and the Cultural Services Department for approval by the Board of Supervisors on October 26, 2004.

3. Provide recommendations on reconfiguring the membership of the Parks, Open Space and Cultural Commission and standing committees for approval by the Board of Supervisors on October 26, 2004.

Attachments:
- Detailed organization chart of current consolidated department
- Proposed new organizational structure for Department of Cultural Services and Department of Parks and Open Space
- Listing of parks department organizational structures in other California counties
Proposed Organizational Structure of Department of Parks and Open Space
Department and Department of Cultural Services

**Department of Parks and Open Space**

- Parks and Open Space Commission
- Marin County Board of Supervisors/Open Space Board of Directors
- Department of Parks and Open Space Director and General Manager
- Open Space District Assistant General Manager
- Parks and Landscape Services Deputy Director

**Department of Cultural Services**

- Cultural Services Commission
- Marin County Board of Supervisors
- County Fair Board of Directors
- Department of Cultural Services Director
  - Marin Center
  - Visitor Services
  - County Fair
## Summary of Parks Department Organizational Structures in Other California Counties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Department Structure</th>
<th>Key Responsibilities</th>
<th>FY 2003-04 Budget</th>
<th># of Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>Recreation and Parks Department</td>
<td>Administers over 200 parks, playgrounds, and open spaces and offers after-school or drop-in centers</td>
<td>$106.6 million (NCC $31.7 million)</td>
<td>955.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>Environmental Resources Agency (Parks and Recreation Department)</td>
<td>Maintains 27 regional parks comprising total of 45,000 acres</td>
<td>$50.5 million</td>
<td>204.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>Regional Parks Department</td>
<td>Operates 36 park facilities and eight facilities across county for rental</td>
<td>$11.2 million</td>
<td>85.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>Parks Department</td>
<td>Maintains 900 acres of parks and open space, 84 miles of trails, and County buildings</td>
<td>$8.6 million (NCC $1.7 million)</td>
<td>78.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin (current)</td>
<td>Parks, Open Space, and Cultural Services Department</td>
<td>Maintains 15 park facilities and 33 open space preserves and operates the Marin Center facilities for cultural and other events.</td>
<td>$13.8 million (NCC $3.2 million)</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Parks, Open Space, and Cultural Services Department</td>
<td>Maintains 30 park facilities, provides recreational programs, and coordinates public art program</td>
<td>$6.0 million (NCC $3.6 million)</td>
<td>63.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>Environmental Services Agency (Parks and Recreation Division)</td>
<td>Operates 16 parks, three regional and other trails with total of 14,000 acres</td>
<td>$7.8 million (NCC $6.2 million)</td>
<td>63.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Parks Department</td>
<td>Maintains nine County and regional parks and recreation areas</td>
<td>$8.2 million (NCC $1.6 million)</td>
<td>59.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin (proposed)</td>
<td>Parks and Open Space Department</td>
<td>Maintains 15 park facilities and 33 open space preserves.</td>
<td>$10.7 million (NCC $2.0 million)</td>
<td>56.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>Parks Department</td>
<td>Manages 14,000 acres of parkland, including regional parks, community parks, golf courses, and other facilities</td>
<td>$4.8 million (NCC $2.4 million)</td>
<td>37.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>