Your Parks, Your Future
Advisory Committee Meeting #5
AGENDA

Date: April 10, 2019
Time: 5:45 – 7:45 pm
Location: City Hall, 3rd floor conference room

Project Background: The City has initiated a planning process to update the Civic Park & Heather Farm master plans and assess the future arts and recreation programming of Heather Farm Community Center, Clarke Swim Center, Civic Park Community Center and Shadelands Art Center. This may include the rebuilding and/or consolidation of the community centers and swim center. The purpose is to ensure that these parks, community facilities, and programs best serve the community 10 – 15 years into the future. Members of the Advisory Committee have been selected by the City Council.

A. Call to Order
B. Approve Minutes from Meetings #3 and #4
C. Welcome and Introductions
D. Meeting Agenda and Objectives
E. Public Comment Period A (Items not on the Agenda)
F. Recap and Debrief of Advisory Committee Meeting #4
   i. Response to Committee Questions
   ii. Presentation on Overview of Programming in Facilities
   iii. Discussion and Activity: Evaluation Criteria prioritization
G. Presentation: Case Studies of Regional Facilities
H. Presentation: Operational Costs and Revenue Generation
I. Presentation: Overview of Facility Scenario Costs
   i. Civic Park Scenarios
   ii. Heather Farm and Clarke Swim Center Scenarios
   iii. Shadelands Art Center Scenarios
J. Public Comment Period B (Items on the Agenda)
K. Discussion and Activity: Facility Scenarios - Costs and Priorities
   i. Discuss costs and provide comments and preferences on facility Scenarios
   ii. Participate in preference and priority exercise
L. Next Steps
M. Adjourn
MEMORANDUM

Meeting Date: April 10, 2019
To: Members of the Your Parks, Your Future Advisory Committee
From: Jeanine Cavalli, Senior Planner
Subject: Materials for Advisory Committee Meeting #5

Meeting Objectives:

1. Set evaluation criteria priorities for the program analysis.
2. Understand the facility scenario costs, including capital costs, operations and potential revenue generation
3. Provide recommendations on the Facility Scenarios and priorities for implementation.

The first portion of the meeting will be a brief recap of the key feedback on the facility needs analysis from the 3/6 meeting and to revisit the program recommendations from the 2/20 meeting. This will be an opportunity to respond to any outstanding questions and to prioritize the 14 evaluation criteria previously identified. The prioritization of the 14 evaluation criteria will help identify the top 5-7 criteria most important to the committee. The project team will then use this information to reclassify the program categories into the “enhance”, “maintain” and “monitor” recommendation classifications for informational purposes and as a “peer review” of the program recommendations previously presented.

The remainder of the meeting will focus on a presentation of the facility costs and receiving input on facility recommendations. We provide questions in the “homework” section below to help guide an interactive discussion to receive feedback on the facility costs and input on facility recommendations. Committee comments and recommendations will be brought forward to the Arts & PROS Commissions and City Council.

Phase 1 Planning Process Overview

At the November 14 Advisory Committee (AC) meeting, the committee members identified the 14 evaluation criteria to be used by the project team to assess the future arts and recreation programs. The consultant team evaluated the programs and presented program recommendations at the February 20th meeting. The program evaluation criteria and recommendations, along with the project goals, objectives and assumptions, were used as the framework for formulating the facility scenarios included in this packet.
Three scenarios are identified for each facility, each with varying degrees of investment:

A. Replacement: demolish and replace the existing building facilities
B. Hybrid: a combination of new building and renovation
C. Status Quo: limited renovation to improve safety and usability of the facilities

The facility scenarios were then costed out by the project team. The cost figures for capital improvements are very preliminary and based on the schematic space planning. Discussion of the costs and committee recommendations on facility scenarios are the focus of the April 10th AC meeting.

**Comparison of 2017 and 2019 Cost Estimates**

In November 2017, City staff prepared a preliminary estimate of construction costs for future critical facilities for discussion purposes at the City Council retreat in the amount of $52 million to rebuild the Civic Park Community Center and Assembly Hall, Heather Farm Park Community Center, Clarke Swim Center and Shadelands Art Center. As you will see in the attachments, the 2019 estimated costs prepared by the cost estimator for the facility scenarios are much higher. The discrepancy is largely accounted for by the following items, which are included in the 2019 cost estimate, but were excluded or changed from the 2017 estimate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Items Included in the 2019 Estimate</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Difference in costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soft Costs:</strong></td>
<td>Includes:</td>
<td>+ 30 – 35% of total project cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• design and construction management fees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• fixtures, furnishings and equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• utility fees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• testing &amp; inspections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• construction contingencies and more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional construction cost items:</strong></td>
<td>Includes:</td>
<td>15% design contingency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Right-sizing facility spaces including accessory spaces (storage, lockers, circulation, office, lobby, bathrooms)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New Multi-purpose activity space to accommodate demand for health and fitness programs</td>
<td>反映了当前更高的投标气候</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Replacement of additional facilities: Park Place, Studios E, J &amp; H, Shadelands Annex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Site improvements adjacent to new work, including surface parking improvements and landscape</td>
<td>反射了增加的平方英尺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Demolition of existing buildings where required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increases square footage from approximately 55K to 110K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Homework (See attachments A-E):

1. **Materials:** Please review the following materials included in this packet:
   A. Program Recommendation Evaluation Criteria (excerpts from the Program Recommendations Memo)
   B. Explanation of Program Recommendation Assignments
   C. Facility Costs
   D. Revenue and Operational Expenses
   E. Meeting Minutes from AC Meetings #3 and #4

2. **Discussion Questions:** We look forward to hearing your preferences on the facility scenarios for each site. Please come prepared to discuss the following:

   a. Which of the evaluation criteria used to assess programs are most important to you?
      i. See Attachment A for an explanation of each criteria, and attachment B for an explanation of the methodology previously used. Consider which of these 14 evaluation criteria should be a top priority for evaluating the programs. We will participate in a prioritization activity at the meeting.

   b. Provide your feedback on the Facility Scenarios for each site. Identify your preferred scenario for each location (Scenarios A-C).
      i. Civic Park
      ii. Heather Farm (including Clarke Swim Center)
      iii. Shadelands Art Center

   c. Consider as part of your feedback whether you would recommend any modifications to the preferred scenarios.
3. Program Recommendation Framework
The Program Recommendation Framework is used to organize the recommendations into three different categories. These recommendations are based on the program evaluation assessment described in sections 4 and 5 of this report.

- **Expand/Enhance Programs** – the programs in this category should be expanded or enhanced based on the availability of resources, regardless of facility improvements. The renovation and/or replacement of the facilities where they are housed will only improve the ability to expand or enhance these program categories.

- **Maintain Programs at Current Levels** – the programs in this category should continue to be offered through the Department and maintained at current levels given available facilities. If facilities are renovated and/or expanded there is the possibility that some of the program categories could grow.

- **Monitor Programs** – the programs in this category should continue to be offered through the Department. However, based on the population that they serve and trends within the industry they should be monitored to ensure they continue to meet the goals of the Department. Monitoring can be defined as tracking participation, population they serve, and revenue generation. If numbers in those areas begin to trend downward the Department may look to contract programs, seek a partner to help deliver services, or investigate an alternative delivery method.

4. Evaluation Criteria

The following evaluation criteria were approved by the Advisory Committee and City Council to analyze the City’s existing programs. It is important to note that the numbers which identify the criteria correspond to the program matrix on page 6 of the document and are not a ranking of the priority of the criteria.

1. Cost Recovery – the Department has an established cost recovery policy that they use to guide the development and administration of their programs.
   - $ - Total Cost Recovery Target of 30%
   - $$ - Total Cost Recovery Target of 31-70%
   - $$$ - Total Cost Recovery Target of 71%+

2. Location of Programs – the Department offers programs throughout the City. For purposes of the study, the locations identified in the matrix will be limited to Civic Park, Heather Farm Park, and Shadelands.
   - CP – Civic Park
   - HF – Heather Farm Park
S – Shadelands

3. Community Priorities – as part of the master plan process an open house, pop-up workshops (2) and online survey have been conducted. This category identifies the program areas that were identified as “priorities.”

   P – Priority Program Identified in Public Input Process

4. National Trends – based on information from the National Sporting Goods Association and the National Endowment for the Arts, national program trends are identified based on use and popularity.

   + There is an increase in national demand for the program category
   - There is a decrease in national demand for the program category
   S The national demand for the program category is static

5. Local Trends – based on participation information provided by the Department through Commission reports and numbers of programs offered, local program trends are identified based on use and popularity.

   + There is an increase in local demand for the program category
   - There is a decrease in local demand for the program category
   S The demand for the program category is static

6. Programs and Activities Unique & Special to Walnut Creek – the Department offers a wide variety of program categories and programs within each category. This helps identify if a program category or programs within that category are unique and/or special to the Department and City in comparison to the other local and regional providers.

   Y The program is unique and special to Walnut Creek
   N The program is not unique and special to Walnut Creek

7. Facility Flexibility – in order to accommodate a program there often is a facility associated with said program. Facility spaces can be flexible or not flexible based on the program type. Example: a meeting room is very flexible, while a pool is relatively inflexible in the programs it can accommodate.

   Y The facility needed for the program category is flexible
   N The facility needed for the program category is not flexible

8. Cost of Facilities – in addition to flexibility there is also the cost associated with operating various spaces. This category identifies if the facility associated with a program category has a relatively low, medium, or high cost to operate. Primary impacts on the cost to operate a facility are utilities (gas, electric, water) and staffing (part-time, full-time).

   + Low
   ++ Medium
   +++ High
9. Legacy Programs – defined as programs and program categories that the Department and City has a history of offering 10+ years. As such there could be significant attachment to these programs through the patrons that continue to attend.
   Y This is a legacy program
   N This is not a legacy program

10. Potential for Combining Classes with Other Providers – This identifies programs and program categories that have the potential for being combined, due to low attendance or similarity of offerings, with other providers in the region.
    Y There is the ability or potential to combine with other providers
    N There is not the ability or potential to combine with other providers

11. Resources Available to offer the Program – this identifies whether the Department and City has the space, equipment and instructors necessary to continue to offer the program in the current facilities that they are housed.
    Y There are resources available
    N There are not resources available

12. Other Providers in the Region Offering that Program – from the D.1 report, alternative providers have been identified in the public, non-profit and private sector. This category identifies the scope of other providers in the region for the program category.
    + Limited providers
    ++ Some providers
    +++ Plethora of providers

13. Variety of Programs – within a program category it is important to determine the variety of programs that could be offered to the community. For purposes of this category variety can be defined as different types of programs and skill levels within a category.
    + Limited variety of programs
    ++ Some variety of programs
    +++ Lots of variety of programs

14. Multi-Generational Programs – this identifies if the programs within the category are multi-generational or if they serve a very specific age segment of the population.
    Y The program is multi-generational
    N The program is not multi-generational
D.2 Methodology For Assigning Program Categories to 3 Groups

- **Evaluation Criteria** – Program Categories were reviewed based on 14 evaluation criteria that were identified by the Advisory Committee at the November 2018 committee meeting.

- **Purpose of Programming Review** – The project scope of services included a review of facilities from a programming perspective to determine current success, demand, growth potential, cost recovery and gaps. We looked at best practices and trends locally, regionally, and nationally-today and into the future. Current facilities and alternative providers were mapped, and site visits and stakeholder interviews took place. These steps led to a series of recommendations to address long-term needs in the community.

- **Program Categories** – Since the Department offers hundreds of programs, the 17 program categories identified in the City’s Cost Recovery Policy were used in evaluation. The programs in each category have similar functions and space needs.

- **Evaluation** – Each of the 17 program categories were analyzed using the evaluation criteria. There was not a simple calculation or scoring of the programs from a quantitative perspective because of the number of evaluation criteria that were identified. As such when grouping the categories community priorities, trends, cost of facility, and facility flexibility played a significant role in determining Program Recommendation Groupings.

- **Three Broad Category Groups** – Three Program Recommendations were identified to provide differentiation that would help inform the Building Facility Assessment. Though Expand/Enhance, Maintain, and Monitor refers to a recommendation for the program categories, not necessarily the physical space in the building, these titles still reflect the research about trends and future direction of the program category.

- **Reduction or Elimination of Programs** – Though analyzing existing programs to potentially be eliminated was not specifically part of the scope of services, B*K considered the elimination of Program Categories if warranted by the data. However, the program evaluation did not support any recommendations for the reduction or elimination of any programs. This does not preclude the Department from eliminating individual programs within the Categories, using review protocols already in place within the Department.
- **Facility Limitations** – Some Program Categories are not able to expand further based on the facilities where they are currently housed but could depending on the future facilities.

**Program Recommendation Groupings**

The following is a general summary of how program categories were assigned to one of three recommendation groups.

1. The Program Categories that were placed in **Expand/Enhance Grouping** are those that reach a significant population of users as illustrated by data from the National Sporting Goods Association and the National Endowment for the Arts participation statistics, are trending upward based on Department and Regional data, are popular amongst the local population, and grow entry level program participation that feed into the Maintain Grouping.

2. The Program Categories that were placed in the **Maintain Grouping** are those that can be identified as hallmarks of the Department, are traditional in that they are found in many Departments in the region, have growth potential on a local level based on participation statistics, are popular amongst the local population, and are intermediate or high level programs that can be fed into from entry level programs that will grow in the Expand/Enhance Grouping.

3. The Program Categories that were placed in the **Monitor Grouping** are those that reach a particular market within the local and regional community and continue to have a static to positive trend. A distinguishing characteristic of the programs in this Grouping is that the programs are subject to unique and/or external factors, such as the trend away from “senior” branded programming towards “multi-generational” programming and the City’s philosophy of prioritizing programming needs over rentals. There is the opportunity for program categories to move to a different Grouping based on demand.
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Facility Costs

April 2019

Prepared by,
Noll & Tam
1. The Overall project cost includes both construction cost and soft costs.

2. The **Construction Cost** includes the following:
   a. Building(s)
   b. Building Demolition if required
   c. Site work limited to
      - landscaped areas localized to the immediate areas adjacent to the site;
      - surface parking if applicable
      - site utilities
   d. 15% Design contingency
      This is carried to cover scope that lacks definition early in the design process but is anticipated to be included in the final design. As the design becomes more complete, the design contingency is reduced.

3. The construction cost estimate does NOT include:
   a. Escalation (cost is in today’s dollars)
   b. Construction phasing premiums; to be determined in Phase II
   c. Premium foundation systems
   d. Over excavation and recompaction of soils
   e. Hazardous materials abatement

4. Soft costs are currently estimated as 30% of total project cost for new construction and 35% of total project cost for renovation. The actual soft cost list should be confirmed by the City as every city may have different cost that need to be accounted for (i.e. land acquisition costs)
   These costs typically include:
   a. Design and construction management fees
   b. Other city staff fees charged to the project
   c. Moving costs/interim housing costs
   d. Utility fees
   e. Site surveys, Geotech reports
   f. 3rd party inspection and testing fees
   g. Permits
   h. AV/telecommunications/security equipment
   i. Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment (FF&E)
   j. Project/Construction contingency- (10% typical)
## Civic Park Phase 1 Building Facilities

### A. OPTIMIZED: ALL NEW CONSTRUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Changes</th>
<th>Program Needs Addressed</th>
<th>Deficiencies Addressed</th>
<th>Bldg Area</th>
<th>Existing Facility Retained</th>
<th>Proposed Building Area</th>
<th>Future Footprint</th>
<th>Gain/Loss of Park Space</th>
<th>Total Construction Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Park Community Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,585</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Park Assembly Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,785</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>Contains programs from demolished buildings except Ceramics &amp; Jewelry (moved to Shadelands)</td>
<td>Seismic, ADA, HVAC, Energy Code, Water Table/Flood Plain, Fire Systems</td>
<td>24,476</td>
<td>12,500*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health &amp; Fitness spaces increased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Underutilized spaces consolidated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current &amp; future programs accommodated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23,350</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>10,850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain/Loss of Park Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Construction Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. HYBRID: NEW CONSTRUCTION + RENOVATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Changes</th>
<th>Program Needs Addressed</th>
<th>Deficiencies Addressed</th>
<th>Bldg Area</th>
<th>Existing Facility Retained</th>
<th>Proposed Building Area</th>
<th>Future Footprint</th>
<th>Gain/Loss of Park Space</th>
<th>Total Construction Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovate (Structural changes to occur; 75% of finishes, 50% of systems replaced)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Park Assembly Hall†</td>
<td>Health &amp; Fitness spaces increased</td>
<td>Seismic, HVAC, ADA</td>
<td>5,980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refurbish (75% of finishes, 50% of systems replaced)</td>
<td>Underutilized spaces consolidated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Park Community Center</td>
<td>Extend building life</td>
<td>HVAC, ADA</td>
<td>8,585</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Place</td>
<td>Extend building life</td>
<td>ADA</td>
<td>1,785</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>16,350</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain/Loss of Park Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Construction Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. STATUS QUO: REFURBISHMENT ONLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Changes</th>
<th>Program Needs Addressed</th>
<th>Deficiencies Addressed</th>
<th>Bldg Area</th>
<th>Existing Facility Retained</th>
<th>Proposed Building Area</th>
<th>Future Footprint</th>
<th>Gain/Loss of Park Space</th>
<th>Total Construction Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refurbish (50% of finishes, 30% of systems replaced)</td>
<td>Civic Park Community Center</td>
<td>Extend building life</td>
<td>HVAC, ADA</td>
<td>8,585</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civic Park Assembly Hall</td>
<td>Extend building life</td>
<td>HVAC, ADA</td>
<td>5,980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceramic Arts</td>
<td>Extend building life</td>
<td>ADA</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Park Place</td>
<td>Extend building life</td>
<td>ADA</td>
<td>1,785</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23,350</td>
<td>no change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain/Loss of Park Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Construction Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

† Adjacent site work and parking included in cost

*Future Facility estimated as 2-Story

---

Future park improvements and amenities to be determined in Phase 2 Master Planning

---

TBD
## Building Facilities Scenarios Summary

### A: OPTIMIZED: ALL NEW CONSTRUCTION

- **Demolish**
  - Clarke Bath House: 5,680 sf
  - Heather Farm Community Center: 9,135 sf
  - Studio H Building: 3,020 sf

- **New Construction**
  - New Aquatics & Community Center†
    - Current & future programs accommodated
    - Increased Health & Fitness space
    - Contains program from demolished buildings except Quilting/Weaving Studio (moved to Shadelands)
  - Seismic, ADA, HVAC, Energy Code, Water Damage
  - Plus Net Zero Energy: predicted 2030 CA code compliance

- **Future Footprint (sf)**: 33,075 sf
- **Gain/Loss of Park Space (sf)**: 17,835 sf
- **Total Construction Cost (Low)**: $32,100,000
- **Total Construction Cost (High)**: $39,800,000

### B: HYBRID: NEW CONSTRUCTION + RENOVATION

- **Demolish**
  - Clarke Bath House: 5,680 sf

- **New Construction**
  - Clarke Bath House, expanded†
    - Classrooms & Offices made efficient, increase storage space
    - Locker rooms increased
  - Seismic, ADA, HVAC, Energy Code, Water Damage
  - Plus Net Zero Energy compl.

- **Renovate (Structural changes to occur; 75% of finishes, 50% of systems replaced)**
  - Heather Farm Community Center†
    - Expanded Lobby & Offices to address deficiencies
  - HVAC, ADA

- **Refurbish (75% of finishes, 50% of systems replaced)**
  - Studio H Building
    - Extend building life; Quilting/Weaving Studio moved to Shadelands
  - HVAC, ADA

- **Future Footprint (sf)**: 11,482 sf
- **Gain/Loss of Park Space (sf)**: 7,796 sf
- **Total Construction Cost (Low)**: $14,700,000
- **Total Construction Cost (High)**: $17,850,000

### C: STATUS QUO: LIMITED NEW CONSTRUCTION + REFURBISHMENT

- **Demolish**
  - Clarke Bath House: 5,680 sf

- **New Construction**
  - Clarke Bath House, same size†
    - Current size can accommodate reduced pool demand
    - Seismic, ADA, HVAC, Water damage; Net Zero Energy

- **Refurbish (50% of finishes, 30% of systems replaced)**
  - Heather Farm Community Center
    - Extend building life
  - HVAC
  - Studio H Building
    - Extend building life
    - ADA

- **Future Footprint (sf)**: 9,135 sf
- **Gain/Loss of Park Space (sf)**: 3,020 sf
- **Total Construction Cost (Low)**: $8,400,000
- **Total Construction Cost (High)**: $10,500,000

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Area (sf)</th>
<th>Gain/Loss of Park Space (sf)</th>
<th>Total Construction Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†Adjacent site work and parking included in cost

*Future Facility estimated as 2-Story

---

Phase 2

Future park improvements and amenities to be determined in Phase 2 Master Planning

TBD

---

Attachment C
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Site</th>
<th>Building Facilities Scenarios Summary</th>
<th>Total Construction Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong> OPTIMIZED: ALL NEW CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td></td>
<td>$32,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadelands Main Building</td>
<td>16,180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadelands Annex</td>
<td>4,020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Performing Arts Building†</td>
<td>Optimized studio &amp; storage space Current &amp; future programs accom.</td>
<td>Seismic, HVAC, ADA Plus Net Zero Energy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| New Industrial Arts Building† | Contains Visual Arts programs from
| | | | 12,275 | 6,300* |
| Totals = | 20,200 | 18,800 | 1,400 gain |
| **B** HYBRID: NEW CONSTRUCTION + RENOVATION | | $15,200,000 |
| Demolish | | |
| Shadelands Annex | 4,020 | |
| New Construction | | |
| Refurbish (75% of finishes, 50% of systems replaced) | | |
| Shadelands Main Building | Update finishes for full program functionality Current programs accommodated | Extend building life | 16,180 | |
| Totals = | 4,020 | 16,180 | 6,300 | 2,280 loss |
| **C** STATUS QUO: LIMITED NEW CONSTRUCTION + REFURBISHMENT | | $7,600,000 |
| Demolish | | |
| Shadelands Annex | 4,020 | |
| New Construction | | |
| Shadelands Annex, same size† | Extend building life | Seismic, HVAC, ADA, Plus Net Zero Energy | 4,020 | 4,020 |
| Refurbish (50% of finishes, 30% of systems replaced) | | |
| Shadelands Main Building | Extend building life | ADA | 16,180 | |
| Totals = | 4,020 | 16,180 | 4,020 | no change |

†Adjacent site work and parking included in cost

**Program sf moved from other sites

*Future Facility estimated as 2-Story

Future park improvements and amenities to be determined in Phase 2 Master Planning

TBD
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Site</th>
<th>Pool Scenarios Summary</th>
<th>Pool Area Demo'd (sf)</th>
<th>Existing Facility Retained (sf)</th>
<th>Proposed Pool Area (sf)</th>
<th>Future Footprint (sf)</th>
<th>Gain/Loss of Park Space (sf)</th>
<th>Total Construction Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heather Farm Park</td>
<td><strong>POOL OPTION 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demolish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50m Pool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diving Well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructional Pool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pool Mechanical Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>New Construction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New 25m Pool†</td>
<td></td>
<td>Combined Instructional and Rental Capacity (current programs compromised)</td>
<td>6,152</td>
<td>6,152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Recreational Pool†</td>
<td></td>
<td>Combined Instructional and Recreational Features added</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Pool Mechanical Area</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23,556</td>
<td>15,652</td>
<td>7,904 gain</td>
<td>$4,000,000 $4,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>POOL OPTION 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demolish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50m Pool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diving Well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructional Pool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pool Mechanical Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>New Construction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New 50m Pool†</td>
<td></td>
<td>Combined Instructional and Rental Capacity (current program maintained)</td>
<td>12,303</td>
<td>12,303</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Recreational Pool†</td>
<td></td>
<td>Combined Instructional and Recreational Features added</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Pool Mechanical Area</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23,556</td>
<td>25,003</td>
<td>1,447 loss</td>
<td>$6,300,000 $7,700,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase 2**

Future park improvements and amenities to be determined in Phase 2 Master Planning

†Adjacent pool decking included (5 feet)
### Civic Park

**A OPTIMIZED: ALL NEW CONSTRUCTION**
- Demolish (4) existing buildings
- Construct (1) new building (24,476 sf) + adj. site
- **Construction Costs**
  - Low: $26,200,000
  - High: $31,700,000
- **Soft Costs**
  - Low: $11,228,571
  - High: $13,585,714
- **Total Project Costs**
  - Low: $37,428,571
  - High: $45,285,714

**B HYBRID: NEW CONSTRUCTION + RENOVATION**
- Demolish (1) existing building
- 75/50 Renovate (1) existing building (5,980 sf) + adj. site
- 75/50 Refurbish (2) existing buildings (10,370 sf total)
- **Construction Costs**
  - Low: $7,000,000
  - High: $9,000,000
- **Soft Costs**
  - Low: $3,769,231
  - High: $4,846,154
- **Total Project Costs**
  - Low: $10,769,231
  - High: $13,846,154

**C STATUS QUO: REFURBISHMENT ONLY**
- 50/30 Refurbish (4) existing buildings (23,350 sf total)
- **Construction Costs**
  - Low: $6,000,000
  - High: $8,000,000
- **Soft Costs**
  - Low: $3,230,769
  - High: $4,307,692
- **Total Project Costs**
  - Low: $9,230,769
  - High: $12,307,692

### Heather Farm Park

**A OPTIMIZED: ALL NEW CONSTRUCTION**
- Demolish (3) existing buildings
- Construct (1) new building (33,075 sf) + adj. site
- **Construction Costs**
  - Low: $32,100,000
  - High: $39,900,000
- **Soft Costs**
  - Low: $13,757,143
  - High: $17,057,143
- **Total Project Costs**
  - Low: $45,857,143
  - High: $56,857,143

**B HYBRID: NEW CONSTRUCTION + RENOVATION**
- Demolish (1) existing building
- Construct (1) new building (7,796 sf) + adj. site
- 75/50 Renovate (1) existing building (11,482 sf) + adj. site
- 75/50 Refurbish (1) existing building (3,020 sf)
- **Construction Costs**
  - Low: $14,700,000
  - High: $17,850,000
- **Soft Costs**
  - Low: $7,915,385
  - High: $9,611,538
- **Total Project Costs**
  - Low: $22,615,385
  - High: $27,461,538

**C STATUS QUO: LIMITED NEW CONSTRUCTION + REFURBISHMENT**
- Demolish (1) existing building
- Construct (1) new building (5,680 sf) + adj. site
- 50/30 Refurbish (1) building (16,180 sf)
- **Construction Costs**
  - Low: $8,400,000
  - High: $10,500,000
- **Soft Costs**
  - Low: $4,523,077
  - High: $5,653,846
- **Total Project Costs**
  - Low: $12,923,077
  - High: $16,153,846

### Shadelands Art Center

**A OPTIMIZED: ALL NEW CONSTRUCTION**
- Demolish (2) buildings
- Construct (2) new buildings (37,314 sf total) + adj. site
- **Construction Costs**
  - Low: $32,700,000
  - High: $39,900,000
- **Soft Costs**
  - Low: $14,014,286
  - High: $17,100,000
- **Total Project Costs**
  - Low: $46,714,286
  - High: $57,000,000

**B HYBRID: NEW CONSTRUCTION + RENOVATION**
- Demolish (1) building
- Construct (1) new building (12,275 sf) + adj. site
- 75/50 Refurbish(1) building (16,180 sf)
- **Construction Costs**
  - Low: $15,200,000
  - High: $18,400,000
- **Soft Costs**
  - Low: $8,184,615
  - High: $9,907,692
- **Total Project Costs**
  - Low: $23,384,615
  - High: $28,307,692

**C STATUS QUO: LIMITED NEW CONSTRUCTION + REFURBISHMENT**
- Demolish (1) building
- Construct (1) new building (4,020 sf) + adj. site
- 50/30 Refurbish (1) building (16,180 sf)
- **Construction Costs**
  - Low: $7,600,000
  - High: $9,310,000
- **Soft Costs**
  - Low: $4,092,308
  - High: $5,013,077
- **Total Project Costs**
  - Low: $11,692,308
  - High: $14,323,077

### Heather Farm Park

**Pool Scenarios Summary**

**Pool Option 1**
- Demolish (3) existing pools
- Construct (2) new pools (25m Lap Pool + 7000 sf Rec. Pool)
- **Construction Costs**
  - Low: $4,000,000
  - High: $4,900,000
- **Soft Costs**
  - Low: $1,714,286
  - High: $2,100,000
- **Total Project Costs**
  - Low: $5,714,286
  - High: $7,000,000

**Pool Option 2**
- Demolish (3) existing pools
- Construct (2) new pools (50m Lap Pool + 7000 sf Rec. Pool)
- **Construction Costs**
  - Low: $6,300,000
  - High: $7,700,000
- **Soft Costs**
  - Low: $2,700,000
  - High: $3,300,000
- **Total Project Costs**
  - Low: $9,000,000
  - High: $11,000,000

---

*Pool costs include mechanical/filtration area + equipment, recreation features if applicable, and demolition of existing pools. Pool house building costs are included in the building costs above.*
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For: Your Parks, Your Future Project
     City of Walnut Creek
     Arts & Recreation Department

Date: April 3, 2019

Prepared by: Ballard*King & Associates
Section I – Methodology, Data & Assumptions

Section II – Estimated Operational Cost & Revenue Generation
Section I – Methodology, Data and Assumptions

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide operational expense ranges and revenue impacts for the program categories that were discussed in the Program Analysis and Program Recommendations report. The ranges will focus on areas where the Department may realize a change in revenue and/or operational expenses.

Assumptions

Operational Expenses
Operational expenses may include the following:
- Staffing (full-time, part-time, contract)
- Maintenance
- Commodities
  - Pool Chemicals
  - Program Supplies
- Contractual Obligations
- Utilities

The operational ranges do not include any ongoing capital investment in the facility.

For each park location, Heather Farm Park, Civic Park and Shadelands Art Center, three facility scenarios have been identified: Optimized, Hybrid, and Status Quo. For each scenario, the operational expense impact will fluctuate. Based on trends in the field, different levels of operational expense increases have been assumed for each of the scenarios.

Revenue Generation
Revenue generation is assumed to be equal to the amount of increased participation in the arts and recreation programs. For example, a 5% increase in participation is assumed to result in a 5% increase in revenue generation. The factors assumed to play a role in increased participation include, but are not limited to:

- Increase in Marketing
- Appeal of Renovated/New Facilities
- New Programs Introduced by the Department
- Old Programs Being Removed by the Department
- Space Availability
- Increases Other Agencies Have Experienced in the Greater Bay Area
The analysis conducted assumes the same cost recovery philosophy the Department currently employs will continue to apply. It is assumed for the purposes of this analysis that program fees stay the same. However, if program fees are increased and participation numbers are maintained, it is possible the Department could generate more revenue and increase the cost recovery percentage.

Below is a summary of participation data that B*K utilized while creating the operational expense range increases. By forecasting potential increases in participation by program category, B*K can translate those participation increases into increased revenue generation by site. The sources of this information are from:

- 2014 Cost Recovery & Pricing Plan
- 2017 Critical Infrastructure Priority – Programming Plan Perspective (Arts and Recreation Department of Walnut Creek, November 2017 presentation)

B*K took the participation numbers from both reports and cross referenced the information, and in some cases rounded those to the nearest hundredth, or thousandth. In the case of some activities like Performing/Visual Arts, assumptions were made as to how the participation numbers were split amongst Beginner, Intermediate, and Advanced. This was largely determined by number of programs offered for each. For other categories, like aquatics, the numbers were split between the two pool facilities Larkey and Clarke and weighted based on the number of amenities provided at each.
Participation Numbers for All 3 Facilities Combined (minus aquatics):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Current Participation or Hours</th>
<th>Projected Future Participation</th>
<th>Potential Percent Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performing/Visual Arts Classes (beg)</td>
<td>1,300 pt</td>
<td>1,495 pt</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing/Visual Art Classes (int)</td>
<td>1,300 pt</td>
<td>1,495 pt</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/Fitness Classes (youth)</td>
<td>150 pt</td>
<td>180 pt</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/Fitness Classes (adult)</td>
<td>2,000 pt</td>
<td>2,400 pt</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing/Visual Art Classes (adv)</td>
<td>2,000 pt</td>
<td>2,020 pt</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Enrichment (youth)</td>
<td>800 pt</td>
<td>880 pt</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Enrichment (adult)</td>
<td>1,000 pt</td>
<td>1,100 pt</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschools</td>
<td>215 pt</td>
<td>237 pt</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camps</td>
<td>1,200 pt</td>
<td>1,365 pt</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Classes (seniors)</td>
<td>1,100 pt</td>
<td>1,210 pt</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Social Services/Drop-In Services</td>
<td>1,300 pt</td>
<td>1,365 pt</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Recreation</td>
<td>650 pt</td>
<td>663 pt</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Transportation/Meals</td>
<td>11,000 pt</td>
<td>11,220 pt</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Rentals</td>
<td>9,500 hr</td>
<td>10,308 hr</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Blue – Expand/Enhance
- Green – Maintain
- Purple – Monitor
- pt – Participants
- hr – Hours

Participation Numbers for Clarke Swim Center:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Current Participation or Hours</th>
<th>Projected Future Participation</th>
<th>Potential Percent Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Aquatics</td>
<td>1,850 pt</td>
<td>1,980 pt</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation/Fitness Aquatics</td>
<td>19,500 pt</td>
<td>23,400 pt</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic Rentals</td>
<td>3,825 hr</td>
<td>3,825 hr</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Blue – Expand/Enhance
- Green – Maintain
- pt – Participants
- hr – Hours
Section II – Estimated Operational Costs and Revenue Generation

Revenue Generation & Operational Expenses

The following revenue generation ranges along with expense ranges were made with best available information at the time of the study. When developing operational expense ranges, B*K takes a conservative approach.

- Civic Park
  - Option A
    - Revenue/Participation Increase 3-7%
    - Revenue/Rental Increase 5-10%
    - Operational Expense Increase 3-5%
  - Option B
    - Revenue/Participation Increase 1-3%
    - Revenue/Rental Increase 0-1%
    - Operational Expense Increase 2-3%
  - Option C
    - Revenue/Participation Increase 0-1%
    - Revenue/Rental Increase 0-1%
    - Operational Expense Increase 0-2%

- Heather Farm Park
  - Option A
    - Revenue/Participation Increase 8-13%
    - Revenue/Rental Increase 10-15%
    - Operational Expense Increase 5-7%
  - Option B
    - Revenue/Participation Increase 2-5%
    - Revenue/Rental Increase 5-10%
    - Operational Expense Increase 3-5%
  - Option C
    - Revenue/Participation Increase 0-1%
    - Revenue/Rental Increase 0-1%
    - Operational Expense Increase 0-2%
• Clarke Swim Center
  o Option 1 – Leisure Pool + 25M Pool
    ▪ Revenue/Participation Increase 14-23%
    ▪ Revenue/Rental Decrease 40-50%
    ▪ Operational Expense Increase 3-5%
  o Option 2 – Leisure Pool + 50M Pool
    ▪ Revenue/Participation Increase 19-28%
    ▪ Revenue/Rental Increase 3-5%
    ▪ Operational Expense Increase 10-15%

• Shadelands Art Center
  o Option A
    ▪ Revenue/Participation Increase 6-10%
    ▪ Revenue/Rental Increase 1-2%
    ▪ Operational Expense Increase 3-5%
  o Option B
    ▪ Revenue/Participation Increase 3-7%
    ▪ Revenue/Rental Increase 1-2%
    ▪ Operational Expense Increase 2-3%
  o Option C
    ▪ Revenue/Participation Increase 0-1%
    ▪ Revenue/Rental Increase 0-1%
    ▪ Operational Expense Increase 0-1%
Summary of Potential Revenue Generation & Operational Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Scenario</th>
<th>Increase in Revenue Generation</th>
<th>Increase in Operational Cost</th>
<th>Net Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civic Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option A</td>
<td>4-8%</td>
<td>3-5%</td>
<td>+1 to 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option B</td>
<td>1-2%</td>
<td>2-3%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option C</td>
<td>0-1%</td>
<td>0-2%</td>
<td>0 to -1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option A</td>
<td>9-14%</td>
<td>5-7%</td>
<td>+4 to 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option B</td>
<td>4-8%</td>
<td>3-5%</td>
<td>+1 to 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option C</td>
<td>0-1%</td>
<td>0-2%</td>
<td>0 to -1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke Swim Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>4-14%</td>
<td>3-5%</td>
<td>+1 to 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>16-25%</td>
<td>10-15%</td>
<td>+6 to 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadelands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option A</td>
<td>4-6%</td>
<td>3-5%</td>
<td>+1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option B</td>
<td>2-4%</td>
<td>2-3%</td>
<td>+0 to 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option C</td>
<td>0-1%</td>
<td>0-2%</td>
<td>0 to -1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Increase in revenue generation was based on combining the increase in participation in various program categories, plus rentals.

- Increase in operational cost was based on B*K’s collective experience of 40+ years of operating arts, recreation, and aquatic facilities, our work in San Francisco, San Manteo, Millbrae, San Mateo, San Jose, and maintaining consistency with the City’s cost recovery policy by program category.
Your Parks, Your Future
Advisory Committee Meeting #3
ACTION MINUTES

Date: February 20, 2019
Time: 5:30 – 7:30 pm
Location: City Hall, 3rd floor conference room

Project Background: The City has initiated a planning process to update the Civic Park & Heather Farm master plans and assess the future programming of Heather Farm Community Center, Clarke Swim Center, Civic Park Community Center and Shadelands Art Center. This may include the rebuilding and/or consolidation of the community centers and swim center. The purpose is to ensure that these parks, community facilities, and programs best serve the community 10 – 15 years into the future. Members of the Advisory Committee have been selected by the City Council.

Meeting Objective:

The objective of the meeting is to provide an overview of and receive feedback on the three program recommendations. These recommendations will be used to determine the facility space needs presented at the March 6 meeting.

Agenda Items:

A. Call to Order
B. Approve Advisory Committee Meeting #2 Action Minutes
C. Welcome and introductions
D. Meeting Agenda and Objective: Feedback on program recommendations
E. Public Comment Period A – Items not on the Agenda
   One speaker from the Audubon Society expressed concerns about recreational drone use in parks. She urged the City to address this with a policy.
F. Brief Recap of AC Meeting #2
G. Presentation: Overview of Programming Recommendations
   The project team presented a summary of the three programming recommendations:
   a. Recommendation #1: Programs to Enhance / Expand
   b. Recommendation #2: Programs to Maintain
   c. Recommendation #3: Programs to Monitor

   The Advisory Committee (AC) members asked a few clarifying questions during the presentation.
H. Public Comment Period B – Items on the Agenda
   No members of the public spoke at this time.
I. Discussion: Programming Recommendations
The project team facilitated a discussion with the AC regarding the programming recommendations presentation, and organized the discussion based on the following questions:

**a. Are the three Program Recommendations clear?**

The following items were clarified based on committee questions:

- All departmental programs are covered by the 3 categories of recommendations
- City staff regularly monitor and review whether any programs should be expanded or canceled using the cost recovery policy targets
- A clarification that most rooms at the facilities currently, and will continue to share programs and are multi-use, including most of the preschool rooms
- Each program or class is not synonymous with an equivalent space allocation in the facilities since most programs will share spaces. Therefore, the specific numbers of programs does not specifically impact the facility recommendations.
- The intent of the “Monitor” category is not a recommendation for program reductions

**b. Do you support the three Program Recommendations? Are the right program categories listed for each Program Recommendation?**

The following concerns were expressed by one or more committee members:

- There was a need to see facility recommendations before weighing in on program recommendations
- Some expected recommendations for reductions in programs, though others expressed that it was a testament to the success and quality of the programs that none were identified to be reduced
- A concern regarding the potential for specific user groups to influence community priorities for future programming. The project team reminded the committee of the broad outreach strategy that has been employed, including engagement tools such as the numerous Pop-up events, open house workshop, stakeholder meetings, and an online survey with 1200 participants intended to reach the entire community.
- A concern about planning for programs at new facilities when the programs are being monitored on a regular basis

The following clarifications or requests for additional information were sought by one or more members:

- A request for a list of programming trends to watch
- A request for an explanation of the process by which programs were assigned into the three recommendations of “Enhance”, “Maintain” and “Monitor”
- It was agreed that recommendations for the Clarke Swim Center should be consistent with the 2017 City Council direction

**J. Next Steps:**

Advisory Committee Meeting #4- March 6, 2019
Your Parks, Your Future
Advisory Committee Meeting #4
ACTION MINUTES

Date: March 6, 2019
Time: 5:30 – 7:30 pm
Location: City Hall, 3rd floor conference room

Project Background: The City has initiated a planning process to update the Civic Park & Heather Farm master plans and assess the future programming of Heather Farm Community Center, Clarke Swim Center, Civic Park Community Center and Shadelands Art Center. This may include the rebuilding and/or consolidation of the community centers and swim center. The purpose is to ensure that these parks, community facilities, and programs best serve the community 10 – 15 years into the future. Members of the Advisory Committee have been selected by the City Council.

Agenda Items:

A. Call to Order
B. Welcome and introductions
C. Meeting Agenda and Objective: Feedback on the facility scenarios for Civic Park, Heather Farm Park (including Clarke Swim Center), and Shadelands Art Center.
D. Public Comment (Items not on the Agenda)
   No members of the public spoke on this item.
E. Brief Recap of AC Meeting #3
F. Presentation of Facility Needs Analysis
G. Public Comment Period B (Items on the Agenda)
   A representative from Walnut Creek Aquatic Foundation and a member of the public both expressed their support for future aquatics at Heather Farm.

H. Discussion: Facility Needs Analysis
   The project team facilitated a discussion with the Advisory Committee (AC) members regarding the facilities at the three project sites.
   a. General Feedback
      i. Framework is clear
      ii. Like the three-scenario approach of: Optimized, hybrid, and status quo
      iii. Costs and design would ultimately influence opinions on the scenarios
      iv. Consolidation of buildings is preferred for efficiency, cost effectiveness and to maximize park green space
      v. Be sure to “right-size” the rooms and spaces in the future buildings
   b. Civic Park Feedback. The committee members generally agreed on the following:
      i. Preference for consolidating and moving the arts programs to Shadelands
      ii. Five of the seven committee members support the optimized scenario; one of those members also supported B; one member supported B because of a dislike
of the 2-story assumed in Scenario A, and another member supported an alternative to Scenario B where the Assembly Hall is rebuilt and only the Community Center is updated.

iii. Preference for 2-story buildings to maximize allocation of outdoor parkland (with exception of one member who had concerns regarding aesthetics of a 2-story building)

iv. Support for flexible space in the buildings

c. Heather Farm Feedback. The committee members generally agreed on the following (except where noted):
   i. Like consolidation of the bathhouse and community center buildings
   ii. Support moving the arts programs to Shadelands
   iii. Heather Farm is highest priority of the three park sites
   iv. Support for the optimized scenario
   v. One member suggested an alternative sized pool (25m x 35yard) with more lanes
   vi. One member would like to see an indoor pool concept considered
   vii. One member expressed concern about the viability of consolidating Clarke Swim Center and the Community Center given the limitations on parking

d. Shadelands Feedback
   i. Support for consolidation of the industrial arts at Shadelands
   ii. Shadelands was considered to be the lowest priority of the three sites
   iii. Support for both Scenarios A and B, with consideration for a phased approach from B in nearer term to A in longer term

e. Programming follow-up. The committee members requested the project team bring a clear explanation of how the program categories were assigned to the three different recommendations of: “Enhance/expand”, “Maintain” and “Monitor”.

I. Next Steps:
Advisory Committee Meeting #5- April 10, 2019