

**Questions from Kelly Moran in email to Councilmember Rodriguez dated 1/22/19
Compilation of staff responses**

(1) At the November City Council study session, staff said that there were 3,932 people enrolled in city recreation programs. Is this an annual total? Do staff know what fraction are San Mateo residents? Does the city have any counts of the number of residents that use the city recreation centers covered by the master plan process?

Ms. Moran appears to be referencing the Powerpoint slide #3- one of the graphics illustrating this page was a GIS map with the heading "Combined- All Facilities 3932 Residents enrolled".

This map is located in Appendix B2- Registrant Proximity to Facilities. The first page of the appendix provides an explanation of maps, their purposes and limitations. That explanation includes answers to each of Ms. Moran's questions.

Is this an annual total?

No. It represents registrants (not registrations) who enrolled in courses during the period 12/2016 through 8/2017, and only those registering for activities located at one or more of the centers/pools noted. Registrants registered for activities at more than one facility are counted and shown only once on this map.

Do staff know what fraction are San Mateo residents?

Appendix B2 notes that approximately 15-20% of registrants are Non-Residents. Since the intent was to look at residents only the Appendix B2 exported data set did not include non-residents.

Does the city have any counts of the number of residents that use the city recreation centers covered by the master plan process?

No. For many uses we get head counts for a specific date and have no way of tracking individuals and whether they are duplicated in multiple dates or other activities. The numbers shown represent patrons enrolled in programs and do not include numbers from other types of activities where registration is not taken, i.e. recreation swim, gym drop-in, rental attendees, one-time special event attendees, etc. As noted in Appendix B2 the data included therein represents only a fraction of the users.

(2) What is the status of conversations with the San Mateo Event Center around the concept of permanent off-site parking to support a recreation center at Bay Meadows Park?

City staff have expressed our interest to the San Mateo Event Center for exploring opportunities for the development of shared parking on the Event Center site. Improvements that have been proposed as part of the Event Center Master Plan, such as office and hotel buildings will also require additional parking and may well be candidates for shared parking opportunities.

Staff would also reference the discussion provided in the previously distributed *Recreation Facilities-Vision to Reality Progress Report, October 2018* regarding the Bay Meadows site:

“The PMT (Project Management Team) recommends that only minimal surface parking be included in the plan and that primary parking be provided either on the adjacent Event Center site, if a cooperative agreement can be reached, or underground in the park...The PMT recommends that if neither of these two parking solutions is possible, that the City Council revisit whether a facility at Bay Meadows is still desirable, and if so, at what size and scope.”
(p.21)

(3) What approach do staff propose for controlling parking for Bay Meadows Park to prevent it from being taken up by people seeking to avoid paying the \$15 Event Center parking fee and/or the \$5.50 Caltrain parking fee (recognizing that the train station will be only a block away from the park).

Although we have not conducted any formal feasibility studies this early in the conceptual development process, staff would certainly be open to considering options such as paid parking, validated parking, limited hour parking, incentives for using shared ride services, car pooling, etc.

(4) What is the status of the funds that staff told the City Council in the Recreation Facilities Master Plan Administrative Report on Tuesday, September 06, 2016 had been appropriated for the Bay Meadows Community Park master plan?

As shown below, there is an appropriated balance of \$95,500 in the Bay Meadows Community Park Capital Improvement Project.

(5) What are the other major capital improvement projects in the Parks & Recreation Dept.’s queue and what are the total budgets for each project (if phased, please include all phases)? Please include all types of projects in the Department with total budgets >\$1 million, e.g., Central Park.

The table below provides the projects and amounts to be shown in the FY1920 Capital Improvements Plan proposed budget.

**Parks and Recreation
Capital Improvements Plan
Projects Exceeding \$1 million**

Project	Appropriated Balance	5-Year Plan	Unfunded
Citywide Park Play Area Upgrade	203,450	5,600,000	2,750,000
Sports Field Conversion: Synthetic Turf	2,336,700	100,000	
Central Park	5,713,400	3,400,000	29,500,000
Bay Meadows Community Park	95,500		35,000,000
Laurelwood Sugarloaf Open Space			3,345,000
Borel Park		1,400,000	

(6) Did the operating cost information presented to the city council in November cover all facilities or just the lifestyle recreation center? What would the net operating costs for all facilities (including maintenance and full staff costs, e.g., retirement cost) be?

Slide #29, which provided percentage ranges of net operating cost increase for each strategy were estimates for all facilities. The table below provides approximate percentage and dollar amount net changes from the current budget. Please note that the current budget amount used is Recreation Division net general fund subsidy (cost - fees revenue = net general fund subsidy). The Recreation Division budget includes a portion of departmental administration, Public Works Building Maintenance charge backs, capital outlay sinking funds charges for computers, furniture/program equipment and major equipment rental. The FY1819 Recreation Division net general fund subsidy is \$5,578,000.

% Ranges:	Net Revenue	Net Cost
Status Quo	1%-2%	
Preferred		<1%-9%
2 nd Alternative		<8%-14%
\$ Ranges		
Status Quo	\$50,000-\$100,000	
Preferred		\$25,000-\$480,000
2 nd Alternative		\$450,000-\$805,000

Viewed as a percentage of the City overall general fund budget, the percentage impacts for the Preferred and 2nd Alternatives are as follows:

0.02%	Preferred Low
0.40%	Preferred High
0.38%	2nd Low
0.67%	2nd High

(7) What fee levels were used to generate the cost estimates? Where private alternatives exist (e.g., moderately priced fitness centers like 24-hour fitness, San Mateo Athletic Club, Fitness-19 and Snap Fitness; moderately priced pools like the YMCA and the Highlands Recreation District pool) how do these private fees compare?

A highly accurate fee comparison is difficult because of the varying amenities, which are accessible with different memberships, the variety of activities and the way the plans are structured. A simplified comparison is attached. It includes fees at each of the three Lifestyle Center type facilities near San Mateo, the fees used in the modelling for San Mateo, and several of the non-City facilities in San Mateo highlighted by Ms. Moran.