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BURLINGAME COMMUNITY CENTER MASTER PLAN

BCCMP DESIGN NARRATIVE

Community centers are evolving, providing new educational, cultural, and social programs along with traditional recreation classes to serve the varied interests and needs of today’s communities. Community centers tailored to meet the needs of the 21st century provide something for everyone, from early childhood recreation and preschool programs to teen-centric educational and social programs to fitness programs for active adults. Multi-purpose and multi-generational models are becoming more efficient and flexible to better utilize limited resources and staff. Services for seniors, teens and children are expanding and there are increasing numbers of educational, cultural, social and community events. These activities range from small collaborative or social gatherings to larger public meetings and lectures. These multi-generational centers are magnets that bring the community together.

The future Burlingame Community Center will be a beautiful and functional building designed to serve the community for decades to come. With more program opportunities than recreation centers, a community center will better reflect the current needs and opportunities for Burlingame residents. This new Community Center will be the centerpiece of the revitalized Washington Park. Just south of the former Gunst Estate and existing softball field, this area of the park will be redeveloped to seamlessly integrate the new building through a meandering pathway with a myriad of activities along its spine. The building’s location arose from the voices of the community through a series of public meetings and community outreach in which the desire to integrate the building into the park was repeatedly emphasized. The new 35,000 square foot two-story Community Center will create strong indoor and outdoor connections that both visually and physically maximize the opportunities of its excellent context.

For Community Meeting Exhibits, see www.burlingame.org/communitycenter
SITE - THE INTEGRATION OF A NEW COMMUNITY CENTER INTO WASHINGTON PARK

The new Community Center’s site has been developed with direct, ongoing consultation with the community-at-large, park users, neighbors, and City staff. Through this process, the site for the new building has moved slightly to the west of the existing Recreation Center. This subtle shift allows the building to act as a nexus for the park, organizing events around the patios that connect interior and exterior spaces. Additionally, a small surface parking lot with ample trees and landscaping takes the place of the existing building location and provides a buffer between the new building’s activity and the homes directly adjacent to the east edge of the park. The building itself will act as the eastern most anchor of the new “charm bracelet” of park amenities connecting downtown Burlingame to the Community Center.

The “charm bracelet” concept melds the new construction with the incredibly well-used and popular amenities of the current park. A wide, organically-shaped promenade clearly links the park’s existing and new amenities with the landscape and mature trees. From west to east, this new promenade links the tennis courts, horseshoe pits, bocce courts, a basketball court, the Lions’ Club, picnic area, a fenced children’s play area, and the new Community Center with a well-lit, safely-designed linkage for both pedestrians and cyclists.

Depending upon the selected parking scheme (see “Parking for Washington Park and the new Community Center”), the promenade may incorporate terraced, amphitheater style seating areas for people to gather and enjoy the park. These spaces would overlook the bocce courts and the softball diamond, amplifying the usage of these amenities.
PARKING- AN INTEGRATED APPROACH FOR WASHINGTON PARK AND THE COMMUNITY CENTER

Through direct communication with the community, the City, and the parking consultant, the Burlingame Community Center Master Plan recommends providing 143 off-street parking spaces to serve all of the functions in Washington Park, including the new Community Center (currently, the Park and existing Recreation Center have only 88 parking spaces). Per City Staff’s request, the Master Plan carries forward two options for meeting this need.

• The first option places 70 parking spaces directly below the building and in a new parking lot on the southeast edge of the park. The added construction cost of mechanical ventilation for under-building parking is offset somewhat by sharing a single structural system with the new building above. These spaces also have the advantage of being able to directly tie into the new Community Center through a lower level vestibule containing interior stairs and an elevator into the Community Center lobby.

• The second option raises the tennis courts up a half-level and creates terraced, amphitheater-style seating. Parking is depressed a half-level below grade to provide approximately 70 parking spaces. Natural ventilation reduces the overall cost relative to parking that is fully below-grade.

In both schemes, the remaining 73 spaces would be dispersed between the new parking lot on the southeast edge of the park and the parking lot adjacent to the Lions’ Club (with a slight reduction in surface parking at this location to accommodate the relocated basketball court).
THE NEW COMMUNITY CENTER - BUILDING FORM AND ORIENTATION

The new Community Center will be a two-story, 35,000 square foot building. By creating a new two-story structure, the building’s footprint (the actual amount of site the building takes up) is slightly less than the existing 25,000 square foot Recreation Center. The new building is buffered by outdoor patios and landscaped areas, and blends seamlessly into Washington Park. Additionally, the new building footprint is built at the location of the existing building and the existing children’s play area. In this manner, the mature tree canopy of the park can be retained as much as possible. In order to further support these connections between building and park, the building is an L shape in plan. By using two wings and a central lobby, the majority of rooms in the building have views into the park.

For Community Meeting Exhibits, see www.burlingame.org/communitycenter
THE NEW COMMUNITY CENTER - PATRON/STAFF EXPERIENCE AND PROGRAM ORGANIZATION

Visitors entering the new Community Center from Burlingame Avenue are welcomed into a light-filled, two story space with direct views through the building and into the park itself. This connection reinforces the strong adjacency of park and Community Center. The lobby also features doors from the park side and the amenities of the “charm bracelet,” physically linking the building to the park.

The two wings of the building are organized along programmatic lines. One wing emphasizes the arts, with multi-purpose arts spaces, a dedicated ceramics space with kiln, and an outdoor arts patio on the first floor; the second floor provides a dance studio set amongst the trees, and a technology lab. The inter-generational spaces in the other wing include three second-floor multi-purpose classrooms. The ground floor is composed primarily of staff spaces, a catering kitchen, and a 5,000+ square foot, double-height multi-purpose room that can accommodate weddings and other revenue-generating events. This multi-purpose room has a primary indoor-outdoor connection to a large patio on the north side of the building with views out to the Gunst Estate, and provides the opportunity to incorporate Music in the Park and other Parks and Recreation Department events into the building. Direct entry from the park or parking area would allow for independent, after-hours usage and increased revenue-generation potential. Functionally, direct adjacency to the parking area on the east side of the building allows for ease of access for drop-off and deliveries to the catering kitchen.

A central service desk has views into both wings of the building. This is one of the strategies that allow the new, larger building to be operated with staff levels similar to today’s Burlingame Recreation Center, while providing significantly more public amenities and increasing the operational efficiency of the Parks and Recreation Department.

For Community Meeting Exhibits, see www.burlingame.org/communitycenter
THE NEW COMMUNITY CENTER - SUSTAINABILITY

The new Community Center will incorporate best-practice sustainable design strategies. By integrating into the park and reducing the building footprint, the park becomes more prominent along Burlingame Avenue. Additionally, the building strives for reduced energy consumption through an integrated sustainable design approach. Through a detailed study of the site, energy reduction would be optimized through a deliberate and rigorous approach to building systems, window locations and orientation, and solar shading designs. These strategies will be further developed during future architectural design phases.

BURLINGAME COMMUNITY CENTER MASTER PLAN - CONCLUSION

The Burlingame Community Center project will provide necessary infrastructural improvements and expanded program options to serve the current and future recreational needs of Burlingame residents. Additionally, the new building will improve the functional aspects of Washington Park and mitigate current vehicular parking issues along adjacent residential streets. The building itself will allow for growth and development of Parks and Recreation programs within the new Community Center, Washington Park, and Burlingame-at-large. Finally, the flexibility of the new spaces within the community center will allow all ages to utilize the building throughout the day, and provide excellent opportunities to integrate with the park for special events.
MASTER PLAN PROCESS
BURLINGAME COMMUNITY CENTER MASTER PLAN
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

WHAT IS A MASTER PLAN?
The Burlingame Community Center Master Plan defines the framework and vision for the Burlingame Community Center. The recommendations of the Master Plan are based on analyzing the recreational needs of the community, best practices and future trends of community centers, as well as an assessment of the existing facility. The vision and recommendations of the Master Plan have been developed with the Burlingame Community through an engaging, open and participatory process. Through a series of statements defining the parameters of the project, the Burlingame Community Center Master Plan will create a pragmatic, implementable, master plan that will respond to the needs and goals of the community of Burlingame.

MASTER PLAN PARTICIPANT GROUPS

PROJECT MANAGEMENT TEAM (PMT):
The Project Management Team (PMT) is comprised of city staff and the project architects, Group 4, Architecture, Research + Planning. The Project Management Team meets regularly to develop initial program, building, and parking options to review with constituent groups ranging from the Citizens Advisory Committee, to Focus Groups, to the community-at-large.

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC):
The Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) was comprised of community stakeholders that represented a broad cross section of the Burlingame community. The Citizens Advisory Committee met to steer the PMT and provide feedback to master plan component options that were reviewed with the community-at-large.

FOCUS GROUPS:
Focus groups consisted of targeted audiences who use the Burlingame Recreation Center and Washington Park. At the beginning of the project these focus groups met with the PMT to discuss their current usage of these spaces and their goals for a new facility. These groups included the community-at-large, the Lion’s Club, active adults, parents, neighbors and teens.

COMMUNITY-AT-LARGE:
The PMT engaged the community-at-large at key intervals in the project to select specific design options that the PMT pursued as the master plan moved forward. The PMT utilized both public meetings at the Recreation Center as well as directed community engagement at Fresh Markets, Music in the Park, etc. to gather the largest cross section of community input as possible. Additionally, a community survey was issued both digitally and in-person to gather public input at the onset of the project to guide the building size, location, and program.
BURLINGAME COMMUNITY CENTER MASTER PLAN
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BCCMP PARKING OPTIONS

PARKING OPTION 1
BELOW BUILDING PARKING (143 SPACES)

- 70 PARKING SPACES BELOW BUILDING
- 38 SURFACE PARKING SPACES
- 29 SURFACE PARKING SPACES

PARKING OPTION 2
1/2 LEVEL DOWN PARKING BELOW TENNIS COURTS (143 SPACES)

- 70 PARKING SPACES BELOW TENNIS COURTS
- 35 SURFACE PARKING SPACES
- 44 SURFACE PARKING SPACES
DRAFT COST MODEL
DRAFT COST MODEL

The following cost model is an estimate based upon the pricing for the amounts and types of site and building elements (site elements, walls, ceilings, floors, structure and all associated finishes) and systems (plumbing, HVAC, electrical, lighting, etc.) included in the Conceptual Design phase of work. It also includes reasonable assumptions for other work not covered in the drawings or specifications, as stated within this document. Typical costs for various elements and their unit prices have been obtained from current records and/or discussions with contractors working in this area.

Pricing reflects the construction costs that can be reasonably expected in Burlingame at the time of writing this report. This estimate is a determination of fair market value for the construction of this project. It is not a prediction of low bid. Pricing assumes competitive bidding for every portion of the construction work for all subcontractors and general contractors, with a minimum of 4 bidders for all items of subcontracted work and 6-7 general contractor bids. Experience indicates that a fewer number of bidders may result in higher bids, conversely an increased number of bidders may result in more competitive bids.

It is also important to note that there are many factors beyond the design team’s control that could affect pricing. Perhaps the most significant among them is the unpredictability of escalation over time. Given that the bid price can be significantly impacted by the number of bids submitted, the design and City project requirements should be carefully planned and specified to promote a competitive bidding environment.
Burlingame Community Center Master Plan

**Executive Summary**

**35,000 GSF New Construction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Data</th>
<th>Project Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross SF</strong></td>
<td><strong>35,000 GSF</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On-Site Parking Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>143 spaces</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7 surface parking spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6 spaces under building or under tennis courts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SF Area or Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Center Demolition</td>
<td>25,000 GSF</td>
<td>$405 / GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center Construction</td>
<td>35,000 GSF</td>
<td>$405 / GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking under Building</td>
<td>70 Spaces</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking 1/2 Level Below Tennis Courts</td>
<td>70 Spaces</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Parking</td>
<td>73 Spaces</td>
<td>$5,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Development - Building</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Development - Building</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Development - Washington Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>Park Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contingency - Construction Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency - Building and Park</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>$3,086,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal - Construction Hard Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$24,719,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Furniture, Equipment, Technology and Other Hard Costs** | |
| FF&E | 35,000 GSF | $20 / GSF | $700,000 | $700,000 |
| Technology Allowance | Allowance | $90,000 | $90,000 |
| **Contingency - FF&E and Technology** | | |
| | 10% | $90,000 | $90,000 |
| **Subtotal - FFE and other Hard Costs** | | |
| | | $990,000 | $990,000 |

| **Total - Hard Cost Budget** | $25,709,000 | $24,129,000 |
| **Soft Costs** | | |
| Engineering and Design Fees | 18% | $4,449,000 | $4,165,000 |
| Construction Management | 5% | $1,236,000 | $1,157,000 |
| Project Management Costs | 3% | $742,000 | $694,000 |
| Permit Fees, Inspections | 1% | $247,000 | $231,000 |
| LEED Commissioning | 1% | $247,000 | $231,000 |
| Other | 0% | $0 | $0 |
| Relocation and Moving Costs, 1 move | 25,000 GSF | $5 / GSF | $125,000 | $125,000 |
| Temporary Facility** | 10,000 GSF | Lump Sum | $635,000 | $635,000 |
| CEQA | allowance | $100,000 | $100,000 |
| **Contingency - Soft Costs** | | |
| | 5% | $390,000 | $367,000 |
| **Total - Soft Cost Budget** | | |
| | | $8,170,000 | $7,705,000 |

| **Project Budget** | $33,879,000 | $31,834,000 |

* Note Estimate is in June 2014 dollars

** Temporary Facility includes 10,000SF of modular units, leased for 24 months, moved both on and off site and required utility connections.
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MEETING ON
12 March 2013

INVITED ATTENDEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Attended</th>
<th>Company or Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aric Agresti</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy Baylock</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Colson</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juliana Fuerbringer</td>
<td>JF</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Gomery</td>
<td>JG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Hesselgreen</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Hunt</td>
<td>MH</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Keighran</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Martin</td>
<td>JM</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Mishra</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Upp McGuire</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nina Orlando</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Pfaff</td>
<td>JP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CAC (Burlingame Historical Society)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik Winkler</td>
<td>EW</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Glomstad</td>
<td>MG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Burlingame Parks and Rec. Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Hager</td>
<td>KH</td>
<td></td>
<td>Burlingame Parks and Rec. Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Gehrke</td>
<td>WG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Group 4 Architecture, Research + Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Merkes</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Group 4 Architecture, Research + Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Jamtgaard</td>
<td>PJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 4 Architecture, Research + Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel LaRossa</td>
<td>DL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Group 4 Architecture, Research + Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A1 PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT INTRODUCTION

- MG- This is the beginning of the process for master planning the Burlingame Community Center. Group 4 and the City have conducted (3) Focus Group meetings to date, with ‘Active Adults,’ Lions Club Members, and Neighbors. MG is looking to reach out to more organizations, other groups within the community.
- CAC recommended reaching out to sports groups and religious organizations.

A2 GROUP 4 INTRODUCTION AND SCHEDULE

- DM- This process extends through the end of 2013 in order to be thorough and engage as many parties as possible. The role of the CAC is to advise on outreach, act as steering committee, and serve as ambassadors to the community at large. G4 will develop options to meet needs stated by community through analyzing different facility locations, sizes, etc. The goal is to develop a shared community vision and to prioritize community input. For example, the Neighbors focus group really appreciated meeting early in the project and having the opportunity to express the concerns.
- G4 will conduct a supplemental Community Center Tour to familiarize the Committee with current community center spaces and standards. G4 will issue a Doodle poll to the CAC for April 19th, May 3rd, and June 7th in order to find the best date.
- G4 will prepare an online community survey that will be advertised and distributed to the community to increase the awareness and outreach.

B NEEDS ASSESSMENT

B1 FACILITY NEEDS ASSESSMENT

- DM- The existing facility, while quite active and well used, is outdated. All program spaces are multiuse and meetings/programs are conducted whenever and wherever possible. From a functionality standpoint, the facility is outdated, and requires significant infrastructural, building code, and ADA compliance upgrades.
- WG- The current facility has excess circulation, too much undefined common area, poor staff sight lines, and poor connection to outside. Additionally, the brick walls in the auditorium are seismically inadequate. G4 is in the process of putting together an existing use summary as well.
- MG- During the school year, the Teen Room can not be active because Parks and Rec. doesn’t have the personnel to have dedicated staff in the teen room. The existing location of the teen room makes use of it limited.

C SITE ANALYSIS

C1 WASHINGTON PARK ASSESSMENT

- WG- On the site, parking and its impact on the adjacent neighborhood is a major issue. Also, the current site is an odd location, directly adjacent to single-
family residential properties. However, the park has excellent proximity to
downtown, high school, and retail. Additionally, the drop-off area is too small,
limiting safety and resulting in vehicular/pedestrian conflicts. The building also
acts as a barrier to the park, limiting visibility beyond. In rethinking the building
and park, there is also an opportunity to better utilize the existing active areas of
the park.

- The adjacent Lions Club building is under a long term lease between the City
  and is currently being improved. The Lions Club has expressed an interest in
  shared outdoor space, and desire better parking.
- Suggested possible locations for a new community center include the tennis
courts, Lion’s Club parking lot, and existing building footprint. There is also
  potential for parking under the building, as well as a two story building to
  reduce the overall footprint and provide more space to the park.

C2 CAC COMMENTS ON SITE ANALYSIS

- JP- Is it possible to flip the recreation center with the play area? This would
  allow the existing building to remain functional during construction. Would it
  be possible to move the Lions Club either east or west to create a larger area
  mid-block? WG- Yes, it could be accomplished to provide a more usable space.
- JF- Can it be more than one building? WG- Multiple buildings typically cost
  more to build and operate and would have a larger park impact. MG- Staffing
  would be more difficult as well.
- CB- Is a full size gym possible? It might need to be split off to a second
  building closer to downtown. Is it possible to incorporate Burlingame square
  into the building design, use as a drop-off spot? JG- It could result in major
  traffic backups during Burlingame High School drop-off and pick-up times.
- JP- High speed rail will be coming through here, how will it impact the
  building? What will the noise impact be?
- AK- Is rooftop parking an option instead of underground? This could save
  some cost. JM- Be careful of the lost creeks.
- MH- 1440 Chapin is excellent because it hides its parking in two levels below
  ground. JG- There is space underground for parking. JG would recommend a
  clear promenade from downtown, increased pedestrian connection, side street
  access, and avoiding competition with school drop-off.

D PROGRAM OPTIONS

D1 Program Options

- See attached Results of the Program Options dot exercise. Please note that
  green dots indicate a positive response. Red dots indicate a negative response.
These minutes were prepared on 18 April 2013.

Discussion of this meeting has been recorded as understood by the recorder noted below. If there are any omissions or corrections, please contact this office within 5 days. Unless notified to the contrary, these notes are assumed to be accurate.

GROUP 4 ARCHITECTURE, RESEARCH + PLANNING, INC.

Dawn Merkes
Principal

DM/dl
CAC MEETING #1 EXHIBITS

City of Burlingame
Community Center Facilities Master Plan
CAC Meeting #1 03.12.2013

CAC AGENDA
1. Introduction and Project Overview
   - CAC Participation
   - CAC Supplemental Facility Tour
   - Project Schedule
2. Needs Assessment
   - Community Facilities Assessment
   - Recreation Center Assessment
   - Focus Group Notes
3. Site Analysis
   - Access and Circulation
   - Opportunities and Constraints
   - Discussion
4. Program Options (Dot Exercise)
   - Discussion
5. Upcoming Meetings
   - CAC Meeting
   - Community Meeting
   - Focus Groups

REC. CENTER - Existing Spaces

• Art Rooms 3,300
• Lounges 1,300
• Social Hall 1,200
• Teen Room 500
• Dance Studio 750
• Auditorium 3,500
• Computer 600

Subtotal 21,300
Total Program 25,000 sf

REC. CENTER - Site Functionality

• Insufficient parking to support facility uses
• Limited space for drop-off resulting in pedestrian/vehicular conflicts
• Building creates barrier to the park
• Poor integration of interior and exterior spaces
• Overflow of parking impacts neighborhood and streets
• Limited visibility to existing recreation center

REC. CENTER - Existing Programs

• After-school enrichment, chess club, adult education, language classes, fitness (aerobics)

MULTI-PURPOSE SPACE
• Athletics, karate, performing arts, gymnastics, ballet, fitness, senior, yoga, lectures

AUDITORIUM
• Athletics, karate, performing arts, gymnastics, ballet, fitness, senior, yoga, lectures

TEEN ROOM
• Teen activities, drama classes, summer camps

DANCE STUDIO
• Yoga, dance, youth dance, senior exercise

STUDIO B
• Piano, language, singing lessons

ARTS
• Watercolor, oil painting, knitting

CERAMICS
• Ceramics, my first art, jewelry, engineering/LEGOs camp, workshop, kids carpentry

COMPUTER/CONFERENCE
• Computer camps, after-school enrichment, animation camps, senior training, self-improvement, AARP tests

BURLINGAME COMMUNITY CENTER MASTER PLAN
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Burlingame Community Center Master Plan Executive Summary • July, 2014
PROJECT GOALS
- Operationally sustainable and efficient service model
- Good potential for revenue generation
- Implementable and fundable
- Integrated and sustainable building and site design
- Creates a community destination and serves community needs
- Builds support from local organizations and community members
- Creates opportunities for partnerships

EXISTING OUTDOOR COMMUNITY SPACES

EXISTING MEETING SPACES

EXISTING COMMUNITY SPACES, BY SIZE
City of Burlingame

EXISTING COMMUNITY SPACES, BY AGE
City of Burlingame

SITE ANALYSIS
Existing Recreation Center and Washington Park

ACCESS & CIRCULATION
SITE GOALS
- Better building and site relationship, connect to the park
- Safe & convenient access: vehicular, pedestrian, bicycle
- Visibility from Downtown/ CalTrain Station
- Complement residential neighborhood, existing and proposed community uses
- Minimize traffic and parking impact to surrounding neighborhood
- Access to/from outdoor activity areas
- Others?

PROGRAM OPTIONS
Potential Programs for the Burlingame Community Center, by Activity Type

FLEXIBLE MEETING ROOMS

FINE ARTS
BURLINGAME COMMUNITY CENTER MASTER PLAN
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

CAC MEETING #1 EXHIBITS, CONTINUED

COLLABORATION AND MEETING SPACE

EXISTING OUTDOOR COMMUNITY SPACES

MULTI-USE PERFORMANCE / AUDITORIUM / EVENTS

DANCE/EXERCISE
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ACTIVE OUTDOOR ROOMS

PICK-UP AND DROP-OFF SPACES

PROGRAM OPTIONS
Potential Programs for the Burlingame Community Center, by Space

SPACES FOR CHILDREN

SPACES FOR ACTIVE ADULTS

SPACES FOR TEENS

SPACES FOR MULTI-GEN.

UPCOMING MEETINGS
- Supplemental Community Centers Tour
- Community Meeting
- Focus Groups
  - Parents
  - Teens
  - Others (Proposed name)
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INVITED ATTENDEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Attended</th>
<th>Company or Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aric Agresti</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy Baylock</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Colson</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juliana Fuerbringer</td>
<td>JF</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Gomery</td>
<td>JG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Hesselgreen</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Hunt</td>
<td>MH</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Keighran</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Martin</td>
<td>JM</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Mishra</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Upp McGuire</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nina Orlando</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Pfaff</td>
<td>JP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CAC (Burlingame Historical Society)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik Winkler</td>
<td>EW</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Glomstad</td>
<td>MG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Burlingame Parks and Rec. Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Hager</td>
<td>KH</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Burlingame Parks and Rec. Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Gehrke</td>
<td>WG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Group 4 Architecture, Research + Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Merkes</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 4 Architecture, Research + Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Jamtgaard</td>
<td>PJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 4 Architecture, Research + Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel LaRossa</td>
<td>DL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Group 4 Architecture, Research + Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISTRIBUTION
Via E-mail
CAC MEETING #2 NOTES, CONTINUED

Citizen Advisory Committee on September 10, 2013

A PROJECT SCHEDULE AND WORKPLAN

A1 Project Schedule

- G4 presented the current project status and schedule to the CAC, highlighting the Community Meeting next Wednesday, September 18th.

B NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND PROGRAM OPTIONS

B1 Community Feedback

- DL presented Community Feedback on the existing recreation center spaces, programs, and Washington Park. This information was gathered through a series of focus groups, CAC meetings, a CAC bus tour of existing community centers on the Peninsula, and a digital and physical survey completed by the community. See presentation slides for this information.
- DL presented results of this community engagement showing strong support for multi-generational spaces, physical activity spaces, and strong indoor-outdoor connections. Spaces designed for dedicated uses, such as teen centers and desktop technology labs, prompted negative reactions from the Community and CAC.
- The CAC recommended further outreach for the survey through e-news, student newsletters, and other outlets.
- MG confirmed that they would continue outreach and information gathering through the end of the month.
- DL presented (3) program options. Option A showed the current building spaces updated to contemporary standards. Option B included a raised platform in the multi-purpose room for performances. Option C included a gymnasium.
- The CAC recommended showing all (3) options to the Community for their feedback, as well as providing additional details on the variations in the program, such as the number of classrooms, lounges, etc. This will allow further analysis of the differences between the schemes. The CAC noted that A and B were very similar, and that they should be differentiated further by the addition of classrooms or art rooms.

C SITE ANALYSIS AND OPTIONS

C1 Site Option 1 – CAC Feedback

- WG presented Option 1, which consisted of the existing site with a more efficient layout. Parking is a ¼ level down from tennis courts.
- The CAC commented on Option #1 as follows:
  - Preserve the park, or even improve it. How should the building deal with safety and traffic along adjacent streets?
  - Lack of proximity between parking and building for elderly, handicapped, will cause problems.
  - Study this site with below grade/building parking.
  - Revise the building slightly east, put playground back in current location.
C2 Site Option 2 – CAC Feedback

- WG presented this option in which the building is surrounded by the park with adjacent surface parking.
- The CAC commented on Option #2 as follows:
  - The CAC does not prefer this option, they felt that it sits too close to the Lion’s Club, with too much surface parking.
  - Many CAC members felt that the project should be done right, even if it takes longer to do it correctly.
  - Is it possible to show under building parking here?

C3 Site Option 3 – CAC Feedback

- WG summarized that this option connects to downtown, and potentially has fully below ground parking.
- The CAC commented on Option #3 as follows:
  - Aggravating to be so close to the train station, and not relaxing.
  - Opens up the park and brings the estate to the street at the existing recreation center site.
  - Tennis players asking about the project. Lit courts on one end and rec. center on the other results in eyes on the street, safety. Moving the building and tennis courts to one end could result in safety issues at the other end of the park. No longer self-policing.
  - Not integrated with the park, concerned about BHS traffic and circulation.
  - Loses the potential for indoor-outdoor park connections, since adjacencies are close to train station and baseball diamond.
  - What about vertical car stackers below ground?
  - Is it possible to go down (2) levels?

C4 General Parking Comments

- Show split parking as an option as well.
- Parking on just one side creates more problems than it solves. Is it possible to do a split parking strategy?
- The building will last 50-100 years. Do it right, show the ‘Cadillac.’
- Start with the ‘Cadillac’ and trim down as necessary.
- Liked the downtown location, parking seems premature.
- Address the issue of security parking underground, similar to the library.
- The community is comfortable with deck parking, must be designed right.
- Find good, positive examples of different parking strategies, show images.
- Seniors won’t walk across the park.
- Feels better with underground parking for teenagers, so kids won’t have to walk the park at night.
**D COMMUNITY MEETING PRESENTATION COMMENTS**

D1 Community Meeting Format

- WG presented the Community Meeting format as an initial chance to get feedback from the Community overall on the project. G4 would present Design Values, and then break into small groups to discuss the Site Options, Program Options and Parking.
- The CAC recommended against presenting Parking Options. Instead, the CAC preferred discussing parking strategies with the Community, and showing examples of parking concepts. The CAC recommended that the PMT further study parking needs, requirements, and options (below ground, half level down, surface parking, rooftop parking, and options combining these schemes).

Further CAC comments were as follows:
- Recommend showing all (3) options for transparency, but discussed as strategies, not options.
- Proposed that the Community Meeting be stripped down to focus upon 1) program options with examples 2) feedback on the current site 3) feedback on the site options and 4) potential parking strategies (not plans). The PMT will to finalize the Community Meeting agenda and exhibits.
- More about programming, less about parking for Community Meeting.
- For Site Options, make all buildings the same footprint.

These minutes were prepared on September 13, 2013.

Discussion of this meeting has been recorded as understood by the recorder noted below. If there are any omissions or corrections, please contact this office within 5 days. Unless notified to the contrary, these notes are assumed to be accurate.

GROUP 4 ARCHITECTURE, RESEARCH + PLANNING, INC.

Daniel LaRossa
Job Captain
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

CAC MEETING #2 EXHIBITS

City of Burlingame
Community Center Facilities
Master Plan

CAC Meeting 09.10.2013

CAC AGENDA
1. Introduction and Project Update
   - Project Schedule
   - Facilities Tour Summary
   - Focus Group Meetings
2. Needs Assessment
   - Focus Group Findings
   - Online Survey Findings
3. Program Options
   - Presentation of Program Options
   - Discussion
4. Site Analysis and Options
   - Existing Conditions
   - Presentation of Potential Building Locations
   - Discussion
5. Upcoming Meetings
   - Community Meeting

FACILITIES TOUR SUMMARY

Positive Takeaways
- "The Almaden space, in its two-story format, offered the most classroom space on a small footprint, yet rooms interfaced with the outdoors."  [Image]
- "If we locate the facility near the rail-line it seems that we can have a more urban feel similar to Roosevelt where you transition from street to park."  [Image]
- "The Roosevelt rain filtration system was really a nice way to use nature in the outside environment."  [Image]
- "Very light and airy rooms...nice lobby area...invited socialization...roomy stage."  [Image]
- "Large multi-purpose rooms with floor to ceiling windows that bring the outside in."  [Image]
- "A "stage" area for small performances or music is nice and I liked the Almaden one that connected to the outside with movable doors - maybe balconies that connect on the second floor."  [Image]
- "Space for young children's classes, a dance studio space or yoga area would be great - it needs to serve many uses."  [Image]

Negative Takeaways
- "All four facilities...had acres of parking. Their noble goal of attracting as many users as possible may not address this issue FIRST before we can decide the type of users and users we want to attract."  [Image]
- "...hallways at Morgan Hill isolated staff from the users...the layout was not intuitive to self-navigation"  [Image]
- "I would not make dedicated teen or 50+ areas but rather multi-use and generational use areas."  [Image]
- "I thought the Grand stairwell in the lobby of the Roosevelt Center wasted a lot of potentially usable space, I thought the design was more 'busy' than some other facilities. I am not sure how you would create a sense of flow. I would not want to see a lot of space..."  [Image]
- "Arrilaga: sterile like a hospital...no warm and fuzzy feeling...signage was like a hospital...bad acoustics"  [Image]

FACILITIES TOUR SUMMARY - IMAGES

1. Centennial Recreation Center, Morgan Hill, CA
   - $10,000SF, completed in 2009
   - Funding: Redevelopment Agency
   - Senior Center, Youth Center, Day Care, Computer Lab, Multi-Purpose Room

2. Almaden Library and Community Center, San Jose, CA
   - $5,000SF, completed in 2005
   - Funding: Branch Libraries Bond Projects Fund, Parks and Recreation Bond Projects Fund
   - Library, Community Room, Gym, Children's Rooms, Teen Room, Senior Rooms

3. Roosevelt Community Center, San Jose, CA
   - $10,000SF, completed in 2005
   - Funding: Branch Libraries Bond Projects Fund, Construction Tax and Property Conveyance Tax Fund, Subdivision Park Trust Fund, Stormwater Operating Fund
   - Community Center, Computer Lab, Multi-Purpose Room, Kitchen, Teen Room, Fitness Center, Dance Room

4. Arrilaga Community Center, Menlo Park, CA
   - 24,000SF, Gymnasium, 12,500SF Gymnastics Center, completed in 2012
   - Funding: Mechanism: Private donation, City Funds
   - Renovation of the existing Community Center

FOCUS GROUP MEETINGS

1. Neighbors Focus Group
   - February 2, 2013

2. Seniors Focus Group
   - February 2, 2013

3. Lions Club Focus Group
   - February 2, 2013

4. Teens Focus Group
   - April 16, 2013

5. Parents Focus Group
   - May 6, 2013

6. Others Focus Group
   - July 24, 2013
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FOCUS GROUP FINDINGS

WHAT CRITERIA SHOULD DRIVE THE PROJECT?

SITE
- Parking needs and traffic impacts
- Sensitivity to neighbors
- Connection to the park, both from and through the building
- Connection to downtown
- Maintain green space, baseball diamond
- Retain as many trees as possible

PROGRAM
- Strong indoor-outdoor connection
- Expanded multi-gen and program spaces
- Outdoor performance and gathering space
- Sustainability
- Dance and fitness
- Universal access

ONLINE SURVEY FINDINGS

- As of September 4, 2013, 267 people have responded to the survey, providing insight into their usage of the existing recreation center as well as their vision for new programs and spaces.

EXISTING COMMUNITY SPACES, BY SIZE

City of Burlingame

| Space | Small Group (1-4) | Conference (20-75) | Corporate Dinner | Classroom | Community | Community
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burlingame Community Center</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlingame Millenium Park</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlingame High School*</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlingame Boys Club</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlingame Women's Club</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercy Center**</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlingame Public Library*</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlingame Community Center</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXISTING COMMUNITY SPACES, BY USE

- Computer, Library, Meeting, Conference, Room, Kids, Classes, Dance, Yoga, Science, Daycare, Space, Large Group, Education, Social Program, Senior, Adult, Youth

CURRENT PROGRAMS – Community Survey

- The respondents highest priorities for the Center included: physical activity spaces, multi-purpose rooms, outdoor patios, art and classrooms, and rental spaces.

PROGRAM IDEAS – Community Survey

- The most popular new programs requested by the respondents include: continuing education programs, nature, environment, and wellness programs; biking and walking programs.

CURRENT USAGE – Community Survey

- Approximately 40% of the respondents use the Recreation Center once or twice a week or more.
- Approximately 25% of the respondents rarely or never use the Recreation Center for programs.

PROGRAM IDEAS – Community Survey

- The respondents highest priorities for the Center included: physical activity spaces, multi-purpose rooms, outdoor patios, art and classrooms, and rental spaces.

ONLINE SURVEY FINDINGS

- As of September 4, 2013, 267 people have responded to the survey, providing insight into their usage of the existing recreation center as well as their vision for new programs and spaces.

EXISTING COMMUNITY SPACES, BY SIZE

City of Burlingame

| Space | Small Group (1-4) | Conference (20-75) | Corporate Dinner | Classroom | Community | Community
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burlingame Community Center</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlingame Millenium Park</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlingame High School*</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlingame Boys Club</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlingame Women’s Club</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercy Center**</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlingame Public Library*</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlingame Community Center</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXISTING COMMUNITY SPACES, BY USE

- Computer, Library, Meeting, Conference, Room, Kids, Classes, Dance, Yoga, Science, Daycare, Space, Large Group, Education, Social Program, Senior, Adult, Youth

CURRENT PROGRAMS – Community Survey

- The respondents highest priorities for the Center included: physical activity spaces, multi-purpose rooms, outdoor patios, art and classrooms, and rental spaces.

PROGRAM IDEAS – Community Survey

- The most popular new programs requested by the respondents include: continuing education programs, nature, environment, and wellness programs; biking and walking programs.

CURRENT USAGE – Community Survey

- Approximately 40% of the respondents use the Recreation Center once or twice a week or more.
- Approximately 25% of the respondents rarely or never use the Recreation Center for programs.

PROGRAM IDEAS – Community Survey

- The respondents highest priorities for the Center included: physical activity spaces, multi-purpose rooms, outdoor patios, art and classrooms, and rental spaces.

ONLINE SURVEY FINDINGS

- As of September 4, 2013, 267 people have responded to the survey, providing insight into their usage of the existing recreation center as well as their vision for new programs and spaces.
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PROGRAM IDEAS – Community Survey

HIGH PRIORITY
- Physical activity spaces
- Multi-purpose room
- Outdoor patio
- Art spaces
- Classrooms
- Facility rentals
- Music room
- Meeting spaces
- Cafe

*Grand Opening 11 AM this Friday, September 13th at Bayside Fields
** On behalf of the City of Burlingame, aquatics programs are run by the Burlingame Aquatics Club.

PROGRAM IDEAS – Community Survey

KEY SPACES – Community Survey

- multi-generational activity rooms
- improved storage
- up to current standards
- build new spaces for existing programs
- multi-purpose room w/raised platform
- fitness and exercise room
- divisible gymnasium and lockers
- dedicated counter and lockers
- expresses and exercise room
- multi-generational activity rooms
- improved storage
- multi-generational activity rooms

KEY SPACES – Community Survey

PROGRAM OPTIONS - Option A, B + C

A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Total SF</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Purpose Room</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Gen Activity Rooms</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology/Media Labs</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual + Fine Arts</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Spaces</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Spaces</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>33,900</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% Circulation Factor</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Program</td>
<td>27,900</td>
<td>30,900</td>
<td>41,450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- build new spaces for existing programs
- up to current standards
- dedicated changing rooms
- improved storage
- multi-generational activity rooms

SITE STRATEGIES - Existing Site

SITE STRATEGIES - Option 1

DRAFT GENERAL SITE CONCEPT
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SITE STRATEGIES - Option 2

SITE STRATEGIES - Option 3

UPCOMING MEETINGS
- Community Meeting - September 18, 2013, 7-9PM
- Planning Commission Update - November, 2013, date TBD
- City Council Update - January, 2014, date TBD
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MEETING ON
February 12, 2014

INVITED ATTENDEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Attended</th>
<th>Company or Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aric Agresti</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy Baylock</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Colson</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juliana Fuerbringer</td>
<td>JF</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Gomery</td>
<td>JG</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Hesselgreen</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Hunt</td>
<td>MH</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Keighran</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Martin</td>
<td>JM</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Mishra</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Upp McGuire</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nina Orlando</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricardo Ortiz</td>
<td>RO</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Pfaff</td>
<td>JP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CAC (Burlingame Historical Society)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik Winkler</td>
<td>EW</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Glomstad</td>
<td>MG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Burlingame Parks and Rec. Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Hager</td>
<td>KH</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Burlingame Parks and Rec. Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Merkes</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 4 Architecture, Research + Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Jamtgaard</td>
<td>PJ</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Group 4 Architecture, Research + Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel LaRossa</td>
<td>DL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Group 4 Architecture, Research + Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISTRIBUTION

Via E-mail
CAC MEETING #3 NOTES, CONTINUED

A PROJECT SCHEDULE AND WORKPLAN

A1 Project Schedule

- G4 presented the current project status and schedule to the CAC, highlighting the meetings to date.

B NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND PROGRAM OPTIONS

B1 Community Feedback

- DM presented Community Feedback to date, including the preferred Parking Approach, Site Strategies, and Program Options.
- CAC confirmed Site Program Approach (Option B), Site Option approaches, the Master Plan Statement Building Program and Parking Approach (see attached exhibits).

C SITE ANALYSIS AND OPTIONS

C1 Site Option A – CAC Feedback

- CAC had no comments on Option A.

C2 Site Option B – CAC Feedback

- Basketball Court
  - Quality of court? JP – full. Paved space for other activities.
- Tennis Courts
  - ½ down, ½ up option for parking. When building is central, play area in SE corner
- Community Center
  - Option maintaining play area
- Fenced Play Area
  - MH – proximity to houses, long summer days
  - JM – concerns about sand + sounds, great space as is.

C3 Site Option C – CAC Feedback

- CAC had no comments on Option C.
These minutes were prepared on March 25, 2014.

Discussion of this meeting has been recorded as understood by the recorder noted below. If there are any omissions or corrections, please contact this office within 5 days. Unless notified to the contrary, these notes are assumed to be accurate.

GROUP 4 ARCHITECTURE, RESEARCH + PLANNING, INC.

Daniel LaRossa
Job Captain

DL/bh
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City of Burlingame
Community Center Facilities Master Plan
CAC Meeting #3  02.12.2014

AGENDA
1. Welcome & Introduction - Project Schedule - Community Participation to Date
2. Work Plan - Overview - Building Program - Parking Approach - BCCMP Statements
3. Master Plan Options - Site Options - Parking Options - Building Options
4. Design Values Exercise - Site Design Values - Landscape Design Values - Building Design Values
5. Report Back - Next Steps

COMMUNITY FEEDBACK

Parking Approach Feedback

Site Strategies Feedback

WORK PLAN
BCCMP
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PROGRAM OPTIONS - Option B

BUILDING PROGRAM
- Provide a 35,500 square foot Community Center for the city of Burlingame
- Provide a two-story building to accommodate the larger building program on a smaller footprint

PARKING APPROACH
- Provide 143 parking spaces for both Washington Park and the new Community Center per the ITE Parking Rate of 3.2 cars/1000SF of building area
- Provide a combination of surface and underground parking to meet minimum parking requirements
- If funding is available, utilize under-building parking to minimize surface parking within the park
- Utilize off-site parking strategies for large events and peak use

SITE GOALS
- Better building and site relationship, connect to the park
- Safe & convenient access: vehicular, pedestrian, bicycle
- Visibility from Downtown/ CalTrain Station
- Complement residential neighborhood, existing and proposed community uses
- Minimize traffic and parking impact to surrounding neighborhoods
- Access to/ from outdoor activity areas
- Others?

COMMUNITY FEEDBACK
Parking Approach Feedback

Building Siting Options
Locations along Burlingame Avenue

COMMUNITY SURVEY
- Site Amenities (CAC Discussion tonight and continued with Community and Commissions)
- Building Program (Confirm tonight)
- Parking Approach (Confirm tonight)

SITE PROGRAM
- Provide a 2-story building to accommodate the larger building program on a smaller footprint
- Provide 143 parking spaces for both Washington Park and the new Community Center per the ITE Parking Rate of 3.2 cars/1000SF of building area
- Provide a combination of surface and underground parking to meet minimum parking requirements
- If funding is available, utilize under-building parking to minimize surface parking within the park
- Utilize off-site parking strategies for large events and peak use

BURLINGAME COMMUNITY CENTER MASTER PLAN STATEMENTS

NEEDS ASSESSMENT
- Site Amenities (CAC Discussion tonight and continued with Community and Commissions)
- Building Program (Confirm tonight)
- Parking Approach (Confirm tonight)
- SITE OPTIONS (CAC Discussion tonight and continued with Community and Commissions)

SITE OPTIONS (CAC Discussion tonight and continued with Community and Commissions)
- Option A
- Option B
- Option C

DESIGN VALUES (CAC Discussion tonight and continued with Community and Commissions)

- Site Landscape
- Building Vision

PROGRAM OPTIONS - Option A, B + C

PROGRAM OPTIONS - Option B

- build new spaces for existing programs up to current standards
- 500 of larger multi-purpose room w/ raised platform
- multi-generational activity rooms
- small group meeting rooms
- improved storage
- 2 additional classrooms
- park restrooms

BURLINGAME COMMUNITY CENTER MASTER PLAN STATEMENTS

- Building Program
- Site Amenities
- Parking Approach
- Master Plan Components

- Site Amenities (CAC Discussion tonight and continued with Community and Commissions)
- Building Program (Confirm tonight)
- Parking Approach (Confirm tonight)
- SITE OPTIONS (CAC Discussion tonight and continued with Community and Commissions)

- Option A
- Option B
- Option C

- DESIGN VALUES (CAC Discussion tonight and continued with Community and Commissions)

- Site Landscape
- Building Vision

- NEEDS ASSESSMENT
- COMMUNITY SURVEY

- Site Amenities (CAC Discussion tonight and continued with Community and Commissions)
- Building Program (Confirm tonight)
- Parking Approach (Confirm tonight)
- SITE OPTIONS (CAC Discussion tonight and continued with Community and Commissions)

- Option A
- Option B
- Option C

- DESIGN VALUES (CAC Discussion tonight and continued with Community and Commissions)

- Site Landscape
- Building Vision

COMMUNITY FEEDBACK
Parking Approach Feedback

Building Siting Options
Locations along Burlingame Avenue

BUILDING PROGRAM
- Provide a 35,500 square foot Community Center for the city of Burlingame
- Provide a two-story building to accommodate the larger building program on a smaller footprint

PARKING APPROACH
- Provide 143 parking spaces for both Washington Park and the new Community Center per the ITE Parking Rate of 3.2 cars/1000SF of building area
- Provide a combination of surface and underground parking to meet minimum parking requirements
- If funding is available, utilize under-building parking to minimize surface parking within the park
- Utilize off-site parking strategies for large events and peak use

SITE GOALS
- Better building and site relationship, connect to the park
- Safe & convenient access: vehicular, pedestrian, bicycle
- Visibility from Downtown/ CalTrain Station
- Complement residential neighborhood, existing and proposed community uses
- Minimize traffic and parking impact to surrounding neighborhoods
- Access to/ from outdoor activity areas
- Others?
CAC MEETING #3 EXHIBITS, CONTINUED

SITE STRATEGIES

DEMOGRAPHICS – Community Survey

CURRENT USAGE – Community Survey

Parking Strategies
Distribution of Surface and Underground Parking

PARKING STRATEGY 1
Surface Parking

PARKING STRATEGY 2
Surface Parking and Supplemental Underground Parking
BURLINGAME COMMUNITY CENTER MASTER PLAN
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CAC MEETING #3 EXHIBITS, CONTINUED

PARKING STRATEGY 3
Underground and Surface Parking

Building Options
Integration of Building into the Park

BUILDING OPTION ‘A’

BUILDING OPTION ‘B’

BUILDING OPTION ‘C’

Building and Site Design Values
Park Amenities, Parking and Design

SITE PARKING + PAVING

SITE PLAY
The integration of the building within the park creates civic presence and a sense of arrival.

Embracing the mature trees of Washington Park.

The site provides strong visible and physical connections of buildings and spaces to and from the surrounding context.

The landscape wisely utilizes natural resources and preserves the natural habitat both in its production and its on-going maintenance.
The appearance of the landscape is easy to maintain throughout the seasons and over time.

The character of the landscape and outdoor spaces are expressed in the choice of plantings, trees, color, complexity, openness, scale, formality, and order.

The facility integrates with its context, both within Washington Park and the community of Burlingame.

The character of the landscape and outdoor spaces are expressed in the choice of plantings, trees, color, complexity, openness, scale, formality, and order.
The building character is expressed in its identity, compatibility, formality, materials, order, openness, color, and scale.
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CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE 4
BURLINGAME COMMUNITY CENTER MASTER PLAN

MEETING ON
May 20, 2014

INVITED ATTENDEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Attended</th>
<th>Company or Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aric Agresti</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy Baylock</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Colson</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juliana Fuerbringer</td>
<td>JF</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Gomery</td>
<td>JG</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Hesselgreen</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Hunt</td>
<td>MH</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Keighran</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Martin</td>
<td>JM</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Mishra</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Upp McGuire</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nina Orlando</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricardo Ortiz</td>
<td>RO</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Pfaff</td>
<td>JP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CAC (Burlingame Historical Society)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik Winkler</td>
<td>EW</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Glomstad</td>
<td>MG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Burlingame Parks and Rec. Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Hager</td>
<td>KH</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Burlingame Parks and Rec. Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Merkes</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Group 4 Architecture, Research + Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Jamtgaard</td>
<td>PJ</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Group 4 Architecture, Research + Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel LaRossa</td>
<td>DL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 4 Architecture, Research + Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISTRIBUTION
Via E-mail
CAC MEETING #4 NOTES, CONTINUED

A PROJECT SCHEDULE AND WORKPLAN

A1 Project Schedule

- G4 presented the current project status and schedule to the CAC, highlighting meetings to date and upcoming summer meetings.

B NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND PROGRAM OPTIONS

B1 Community Feedback

- DM presented Community Feedback to date, including the CAC confirmed preferred Parking Approach, Site Strategies, and Program Options.

C SITE ANALYSIS AND OPTIONS

C1 Site Amenities Confirmation

- CAC confirmed site amenities and locations per promenade Option “B,” the meandering pathway scheme. G4/RHAA to create a revised site plan and site sections showing qualitative aspects of this scheme.

C2 Site Amenities Promenade Confirmation

- CAC confirmed promenade Option “B,” the meandering pathway. This had been the preferred scheme from both the Streets Alive! Community Meeting and the Planning Commission.

These minutes were prepared on June 17, 2014.

Discussion of this meeting has been recorded as understood by the recorder noted below. If there are any omissions or corrections, please contact this office within 5 days. Unless notified to the contrary, these notes are assumed to be accurate.

GROUP 4 ARCHITECTURE, RESEARCH + PLANNING, INC.

Daniel LaRossa
Job Captain

DL/dm
BURLINGAME COMMUNITY CENTER MASTER PLAN
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CAC MEETING #4 EXHIBITS

City of Burlingame
Community Center Facilities
Master Plan

CAC Meeting 04
05.20.2014

AGENDA

1. Introduction
   - Overview
   - Project Schedule
   - Community Participation to date
   - Master Plan Statements
     - Parking Approach
     - Program Approach
     - Building Size and Scale Approach

2. Streets Alive! Site Plan Results
   - Site Design Options Results

3. Master Plan Primary Options Confirmation
   - Building Location Options
   - Parking Strategy and Location Options

4. Master Plan Secondary Options Confirmation
   - Tennis and Basketball Court Location Options
   - Promenade Design Options
   - Playground Location Options

5. Report Back

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT TO DATE
Fall 2012 to Spring 2014 - 550+ respondents

- (1) Fresh Market Community Outreach Session
- (1) Streets Alive! Farmers Market Meeting
- (1) Community Meeting
- (4) Focus Group Meetings
- (3) Citizens Advisory Committee Meetings
- (1) Citizens Advisory Committee Facilities Bus Tour
- (1) Online and in-person Survey, Fall 2013
- (5) Movies in the Park
- (5) Music in the Park
- (1) Dedicated Master Plan website
- (12) eNews
- (1) Parks and Recreation Commission Meeting
- (1) Planning Commission Meeting
- (2) Technical Meetings with City Staff
- (8) Project Management Team Meetings

BURLINGAME COMMUNITY CENTER MASTER PLAN STATEMENTS

Building Program
- Provide a 35,500 square foot Community Center for the city of Burlingame
- Provide a two-story building to accommodate the larger building program on a smaller footprint

Parking Approach
- Provide 143 parking spaces for both Washington Park and the new Community Center per the ITE Parking Rate of 3.2 cars/1000SF of building area
- Provide a combination of surface and underground parking to meet minimum parking requirements
- If funding is available, utilize under-building parking to minimize surface parking within the park*
- *CAC Supported maintaining flexibility on this decision.

BURLINGAME COMMUNITY CENTER MASTER PLAN STATEMENTS - PRELIMINARY PROJECT SCHEDULE

PRELIMINARY PROJECT SCHEDULE

2013
MAR - MAY
JUNE
JULY
AUGUST
SEPTEMBER
OCTOBER

2014
FALL
WINTER

BURLINGAME COMMUNITY CENTER MASTER PLAN STATEMENTS - BUILDING PROGRAM

- Provide a 35,500 square foot Community Center for the city of Burlingame
- Provide a two-story building to accommodate the larger building program on a smaller footprint

BURLINGAME COMMUNITY CENTER MASTER PLAN STATEMENTS - P+R P.C.

05/20/2014

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT TO DATE

Fall 2012 to Spring 2014 - 550+ respondents

- (8) Project Management Team Meetings
- (2) Technical Meetings with City Staff
- (1) Dedicated Master Plan website
- (5) Music in the Park
- (1) Movies in the Park
- (1) Online and in-person Survey, Fall 2013
- (1) Citizens Advisory Committee Facilities Bus Tour
- (4) Focus Group Meetings
- (1) Community Meeting

Building Program Options Recap
Small, Medium and Large Programs

- Needs Assessment
- Community Survey
- Site Program
- Building Program (CAC Recommended)
- Parking Approach (CAC Recommended)
- Site Amenities (CAC discussion/confirmation tonight)
- Option A - Peri Hub
- Option B - Charm Brassette

DRAFT

5. Report Back

- Playground Location Options
- Promenade Design Options
- Tennis and Basketball Court Location Options
- Promenade Design Options
- Playground Location Options

05.20.2014

BUILDING PROGRAM

- Needs Assessment
- Community Survey
- Site Program
- Building Program (CAC Recommended)
- Parking Approach (CAC Recommended)
**PROGRAM OPTIONS - Option A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space Type</th>
<th>Total SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity &amp; Meeting Spaces</td>
<td>3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms</td>
<td>4,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology/Media Lab</td>
<td>3,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual &amp; Fine Arts</td>
<td>6,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Spaces</td>
<td>2,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Spaces</td>
<td>1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Activity Room</td>
<td>1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>28,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Program ~ 35,500 sf**

**PROGRAM OPTIONS - Option B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space Type</th>
<th>Total SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology Lab</td>
<td>1,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500+ sf larger multi-purpose room</td>
<td>4,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Spaces</td>
<td>2,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Spaces</td>
<td>1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>20% Circulation Factor 7,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Program ~ 35,500 sf**

**BURLINGAME COMMUNITY CENTER MASTER PLAN STATEMENTS**

**BUILDING PROGRAM**
- Provide a 35,500 square foot Community Center for the city of Burlingame
- Provide a two-story building to accommodate the larger building program on a smaller footprint

**PARKING APPROACH**
- Provide 143 parking spaces for both Washington Park and the new Community Center per the ITE Parking Rate of 3.2 cars/1000SF of building area
- Provide a combination of surface and underground parking to meet minimum parking requirements
- If funding is available, utilize underground parking to minimize surface parking within the park
- **Utilize off-site parking strategies for large events and peak use.

**Streets Alive!**

**Community Results**

**Design Values**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Prioritization</th>
<th>Play Arts</th>
<th>Senior - Health</th>
<th>Senior - Social</th>
<th>Recreation</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Parks &amp; Open Space</th>
<th>Fine Arts</th>
<th>Senior - Social</th>
<th>Play - Adults</th>
<th>Senior - Health</th>
<th>Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site Option B - Charm Bracelet**

- **A**
- **B**

**Site Option A - Programmed and Posh Hub**

- **A**
- **B**
SITE GOALS
- Better building and site relationship, connect to the park
- Safe & convenient access: vehicular, pedestrian, bicycle
- Visibility from downtown/ CalTrain Station
- Complement residential neighborhood, existing and proposed community uses
- Minimize traffic and parking impact to surrounding neighborhood
- Access to/ from outdoor activity areas
- Provide improved safety for playground
- Retain open space and existing trees

Building Siting Options
Locations along Burlingame Avenue

Site Strategies
Building Location

Master Plan Primary Options
Building Location Options

Option A

Option B

Master Plan Primary Options
Parking Strategy and Location Options
CAC MEETING #4 EXHIBITS, CONTINUED

Option A
Integrated Courts at the Southwest corner of the Park

Master Plan Secondary Options
Promenade Design Options

Option B
Distinct Courts along the South end of the Park

The Park Hub

Site Section Locations within the Park
Option A
The Park Hub

Option B
The Charm Bracelet

Option A
Playground to the North of the Building

Burlingame Community Center Master Plan Executive Summary - July, 2014
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
AND SITE SURVEY
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT TO DATE
Fall 2012 to Summer 2014 - 550+ respondents

- (1) Fresh Market
- (1) Streets Alive!
- (1) Community Meeting
- (6) Focus Group Meetings
- (4) Citizens Advisory Committee Meetings
- (1) Citizens Advisory Committee Facilities Bus Tour
- (1) Online and in-person Survey, Fall 2013
- (1) Movies in the Park
- (5) Music in the Park
- (1) Dedicated Master Plan website
- (12) eNews
- (1) Parks and Recreation Commission Meeting
- (1) Planning Commission Meeting
- (3) Technical Meetings with City Staff
- (9) Project Management Team Meetings
- (1) Burlingame ArtzFest
- (1) BYBA Opening Day
- (1) Family Campout
## Community Survey (In-Person and Online)

### Burlingame Community Center Master Plan Survey - 2013

### Page 2

1. Your gender:
   - Female
   - Male

2. What is your age?
   - 0 to 10
   - 11 to 17
   - 18 to 24
   - 25 to 44
   - 45 to 64
   - 65 or older

3. How many other people of each age group are in your household?

4. Are you a resident of (choose one)?
   - Burlingame
   - Millbrae
   - Hillsborough
   - San Mateo
   - Other (please specify)

### Page 3

5. How often does someone in your household use the recreation center? Please check one.
   - More than twice per week
   - Once or twice per week
   - A few times per month
   - A few times per year
   - Rarely or not at all

6. Which current programs has your household participated in on-site at the Rec. Center in the last year? Please check all programs that your household has used or is currently using.

7. What new programs would your household like to see on-site at the Rec. Center? Please check all programs that your household has used or is currently using.

### Page 4

8. Please fill in any other additional programs your household would like to see on-site at the Rec. Center here:

### Page 5

9. How important to your household would each of the following spaces be in a new recreation center?

- Multi-purpose Room
- Kitchen
- Classrooms
- Art Spaces
- Physical Activity Spaces
- Meeting Spaces
- Technology Lab
- Music Room
- Teen Hangout Room
- Community Lounge
- Cafe
- Family Rentals
- Garden Pits
**BURLINGAME COMMUNITY CENTER MASTER PLAN**  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**COMMUNITY SURVEY RESULTS**

**ONLINE SURVEY FINDINGS**

- As of September 4, 2013, 267 people have responded to the survey, providing insight into their usage of the existing recreation center as well as their vision for new programs and spaces.

**DEMOGRAPHICS – Community Survey**

- 70.4% of respondents are female, while 29.6% are male.

**CURRENT USAGE – Community Survey**

- Approximately 45% of the respondents use the Recreation Center once or twice a week or more.
- Approximately 25% of the respondents rarely or never use the Recreation Center.

**CURRENT PROGRAMS – Community Survey**

- The respondents reported their highest use the Center is for special events, fitness programs and summer camps, followed by music programs, rentals and arts and craft programs.

**PROGRAM IDEAS – Community Survey**

- The most popular new programs requested by the respondents include: continuing education programs; nature, environment, and wellness programs; biking and walking programs.

**KEY SPACES – Community Survey**

- The most important spaces for community engagement include: physical activity spaces, multi-purpose rooms, outdoor patios, art and classrooms, and rental spaces.
NEXT STEPS
NEXT STEPS

The next steps in the process of designing the new Burlingame Community Center are twofold. One option would be to begin the Conceptual Design phase. This phase would include a more detailed building and site design, as well as building program. Another direction would be to begin the process of determining the funding options for the new building. These steps could also take place concurrently. Ongoing community participation would be key to these phases in order to build upon the Burlingame Community Center Master Design Plan included within the Executive Summary.