

Appendix F: Recreation Activity Center Implementation Matrix

WHAT	HOW	WHO		WHEN	HOW MUCH
		Potential Lead Entity	Key Support Entity(ies)		
Continue Task Force meetings	<p>Proceed with ongoing meetings of the empaneled Task Force on indoor recreation to determine a preferred phased option for development of new addition to the current facility</p> <p>Begin outreach to potential funding entities and identification of grant opportunities to pursue to support for indoor recreation capacity expansion</p> <p>Enlist partners (either on contract or pro bono) to support production of development schemes and cost scenarios for renovation to the existing rec center and the new addition</p>	<p>Task Force</p> <p>DCRC Board</p>	<p>COM</p> <p>MCC</p> <p>DCED</p> <p>DCT</p>	M1-12	\$5,000-\$10,000 – contingency for potential hiring of contractor to help Task Force envision design options, features, and cost requirements for different models
Create a Recreation Activity Center development plan	<p>Develop phasing of renovations and new addition, contract with a planning firm to create a development plan for the expanded center</p> <p>Leverage previous and new resource development activities to fund the development plan and establish a resource campaign to cover the costs of renovations to the current facility and developing the new addition</p>	<p>Task Force</p> <p>DCRC Board</p>	<p>COM</p> <p>MCC</p> <p>DCED</p> <p>DCT</p>	M13-18	\$100,000-150,000 – development plan

WHAT	HOW	WHO		WHEN	HOW MUCH
		Potential Lead Entity	Key Support Entity(ies)		
Renovate the existing facility	<p>Manage construction of the DCRC renovation</p> <p>Develop programming</p> <p>Hire staff</p> <p>Develop operations and marketing plan for renovated space and future new addition</p> <p>Open renovated facility and promote construction of new addition</p> <p>Annually assess facility(ies), programs, amenities, and operations based on guidelines referenced in Manchester Placemaking Plan</p>	DCRC Board or Board for New Recreation Center	<p>COM</p> <p>MCC</p> <p>DCED</p> <p>DCT</p>	M19-25	<p>Costs highly variable based on chosen amenities to be included in enhanced indoor recreation space</p> <p>Could range from a few hundred thousand dollars to refresh the DCRC to millions for building a new or greatly expanded facility</p> <p>Staffing, programming, and operating costs also variable based on chosen development model(s)</p>
Build expanded indoor activity center	<p>Manage construction of the new addition</p> <p>Develop programming</p> <p>Expand staff, as necessary</p> <p>Implement expanded operations and marketing plan</p> <p>Open new addition and promote on ongoing basis</p> <p>Annually assess facility(ies), programs, amenities, and operations based on guidelines referenced in Manchester Placemaking Plan</p>	DCRC Board or Board for New Recreation Center	<p>COM</p> <p>MCC</p> <p>DCED</p> <p>DCT</p>	M26-36	<p>Costs highly variable based on chosen amenities to be included in enhanced indoor recreation space</p> <p>Could range from a few hundred thousand dollars to refresh the DCRC to millions for building a new or greatly expanded facility</p> <p>Staffing, programming, and operating costs also variable based on chosen development model(s)</p>

WHAT	HOW	WHO		WHEN	HOW MUCH
		Potential Lead Entity	Key Support Entity(ies)		
Pursue Phase II indoor recreation option	<p>Action steps contingent on decisions made by Task Force during Year 1 of their efforts</p> <p>Renovate DCRC and pursue longer-term development of expanded planning and discussions would be based on that vision</p> <p>It is assumed that Task Force would continue in an oversight role to shepherd the advancement of Phase II development</p>	<p>Task Force</p> <p>DCRC Board</p>	<p>COM</p> <p>MCC</p> <p>DCED</p>	M12+	TBD

Comparison Examples of Indoor Recreation Centers

Recreation and Fitness Center – Cedar Falls, Iowa

The discussions and need for a city Recreation Center began in 1973. Subsequently, the city converted a former school building into a new recreation facility. After years of public debate, a new permanent facility was constructed in 1993. In January 2005, an expansion doubled the size of the existing recreation center.

As Cedar Falls has continue to grow and its current Recreation Center has shown signs of age, the city is again considering the merits of expanding the facility to modern standards. On November 7, 2019 a Recreation and Fitness Center, Operations and Facility Needs Assessment was delivered to the City of Cedar Falls by the firm RDG Planning and Design. It is illustrative for Manchester because many of the issues raised during the Placemaking plan public input are echoed in the contents of the Cedar Falls report.

The Needs Assessment could therefore provide useful context for the Manchester indoor recreation Task Force as they build consensus for a potentially new or expanded recreation capacity in the city.

Manchester Placemaking Plan



In the Assessment, RDG conducted a Market Analysis that determined Cedar Falls had not reached a saturation point for activities and was underserved for fitness exercise, group fitness, indoor swimming, and gymnasium programming. That finding, coupled with flat to downward membership growth for the city's Recreation and Fitness Center, pointed to the importance of making improvements to maintain the facilities position in the marketplace. Again, the Assessment's recommendations can inform the indoor recreation center development process in Manchester. RDG's recommendations included¹:

- Pursuing the development of an indoor swimming pool
- Greatly improving program offerings and membership numbers by upgrading and expanding the Recreation and Fitness Center
- Expanding the facility to meet current and future membership needs

Their research showed that the community supports the need for community recreation and would agree to help fund necessary changes. These may include expanding the current facility in place or pursuing another option if necessary.

¹ <https://www.cedarfalls.com/DocumentCenter/View/9379/Executive-Summary-Rec-Center--Report>



Cedar Falls Recreation and Fitness Center (photo sourced from <https://www.cedarfalls.com/DocumentCenter/View/9379/Executive-Summary-Rec-Center--Report>)

Midco Aquatic Center – Sioux Falls, South Dakota

Responding to a long-expressed desire by community members for a state-of-the-art indoor recreation facility, the City of Sioux Falls began the planning and development process for a new aquatic center at the city's Spellerberg Park in the early 2000s. After voters approved a new facility, the city council approved \$19.8 million for a new center in early 2015, then appropriated an additional \$4 million later that year after visiting comparison facilities and realizing that Sioux Falls' aquatic center lacked certain key amenities. To cover the costs, the city used surplus sales tax dollars, reprioritized existing projects, and attracted additional philanthropic investment.²

Eventually, the local telecommunications firm Midco became title sponsor for the Aquatic Center by gifting \$2.2 million towards its final \$24,065,500 construction cost. Opening to the public in 2016, the Midco Aquatic Center features:

² <https://www.argusleader.com/story/news/2015/01/27/city-council-gets-aquatics-center-update/22394459/>

Manchester Placemaking Plan



- A 50 Meter Pool with lap lanes and four diving boards
- A Recreation Pool with body slide, current channel, lap lanes, lily pad crossing, and interactive water play feature
- A Warm Water Pool
- Stadium spectator seating for 500+
- Outdoor sun deck and splash pad
- Multipurpose rooms
- Concession area
- Locker rooms and changing rooms
- Swimming lessons, water fitness classes, and certifications

What is important for Manchester's indoor recreation Task Force to learn from the Sioux Falls example is the city and private sector leaders knew they only had one chance to get their new aquatic center right and made the additional investment – potentially at a political risk – to up the budget to make it a state-of-the-art facility.

The following are the user fees for the Midco Aquatic Center. Manchester stakeholders concerned that a new or expanded Delaware County Recreation Center would be unaffordable for lower-income residents can take heart that a facility like Midco maintains lower fee scales for qualifying low-income users.

	DAILY	SUMMER	FALL/ WINTER/ SPRING	ANNUAL
	One Day	Indoor and Outdoor	Indoor Only	Indoor and Outdoor Valid for one year from purchase date.
Child: Ages 2-17 <small>Under age 2 is free</small>	\$5	\$30	\$70	\$80
Adult: Ages 18-54	\$6	\$70	\$170	\$190
Senior Citizen: 55+	\$5	\$40	\$95	\$110
Veteran	Standard Rates Apply	\$40	\$95	\$110
Family	Not Available	\$100	\$240	\$300
Reduced-Income Adult <small>For qualifying individuals</small>	\$1 <small>Fall/Winter/Spring only</small>	\$40	\$95	\$110
Reduced-Income Family <small>For qualifying families</small>	\$1 <small>Fall/Winter/Spring only</small>	\$50	\$120	\$155
Free Family/Adult/Senior Citizen Pass <small>For qualifying families</small>	Not Available	FREE	Not Available	Not Available

(source: <https://www.midcoaquaticcenter.org/admission>)



Midco Aquatics Center (picture source: <https://www.siouxfalls.org/parks/spellerberg>)

Manchester Placemaking Plan



Shawnee Recreation Center – Shawnee, Kansas

This suburb of Kansas City had a 2018 population of 67,197 with an estimated service area for the recreation center of 106,182. McClure has chosen to profile the city's pursuit of an indoor recreation center both because it has useful information on cost parameters for these types of facilities but also because it shows the risks associated with investing resources to develop a plan that exceeds the willingness of the voting public to pay for it.

After investing thousands in a feasibility study and master plan for a potential recreation center, residents voted down increasing their taxes by \$88.32 a year each to pay for a \$38 million bond issue for the proposed recreation center. This was despite the fact that the planning firm did extensive outreach to the public, hosting multiple public meetings and conducting a statistically valid resident survey.

The Shawnee example is instructive in that the vision for a community recreation center should not exceed residents' perceptions of what the public and government should spend on it. This case study also underscores the need to identify and secure a mix of public, private, and philanthropic resources to fund development of enhanced indoor recreation capacity so that no single partner feels they are bearing too great a load.

	Potential New and Expanded Spaces/Amenities	Total Cost (\$)
GENERAL	Base Building Support	\$4,000,000
	Site Development and Parking	
	Lobby and Administrative Offices	
	Men's, Women's and Family Change Locker Rooms	
	Storage, Maintenance and Mechanical Areas	
AQUATICS	Warm-Water Leisure Pool:	
	8,000SF Natatorium and 4,000SF of Water	\$6,000,000
	Warm-Water Leisure Pool:	
	12,000SF Natatorium and 6,000SF of Water	\$8,000,000
	Indoor Lap Pool, 4- to 6-lane, 25 yards	\$4,500,000
	Competition Indoor Lap Pool, 8- to 10-lane, 25 yards	\$7,000,000
SPORT & FITNESS	Aquatic Therapy, Exercise and Lesson Pool	\$2,500,000
	Two-Court Wood Gymnasium	\$4,500,000
	Multi-Activity (MAC) Gym (cost is per single court)	\$1,500,000
	Indoor Turf Fieldhouse (100'x200')	\$3,000,000
	Indoor Running Track	\$750,000
	Basic Fitness Area (3,000SF)	\$1,800,000
	Enhanced Fitness Area (5,500SF)	\$2,400,000
	Divisible Exercise Studio (1,800SF)	\$1,000,000
	Single Exercise Studio (1,000)	\$700,000
	Climbing / Bouldering Wall	\$800,000
	2-Court Racquetball / Racquet Court Sport Space	\$800,000
(3) Outdoor Fields	\$2,500,000	
COMMUNITY	Multipurpose / Meeting Rooms	\$2,000,000
	Multipurpose Classrooms / Meeting Space (each)	\$300,000
	Senior Social Area	\$400,000
	Senior Activity Area	\$600,000
	Kitchen	\$350,000
YOUTH	Child Sitting Room	\$400,000
	Indoor Playground Area	\$600,000
	Youth Activity Spaces	\$800,000
	Game Room / Teen Activity Center	\$500,000

Note: The costs above represent total project costs including construction escalated to 2019 dollars. Also reflected in these values are project soft costs including design fees, furnishings and equipment, contingencies and development costs for surveys, reports, testing, etc. Each space includes a pro-rata share of building circulation, mechanical, and support space.

Manchester Placemaking Plan



The July 30, 2018 Shawnee Recreation Center Master Plan and Feasibility Study³ developed by Perkins&Will company was interesting in that it contained a “Build-a-Center Worksheet” that effectively conveyed anticipated costs for multiple potential components of a state-of-the-art recreation center. Stakeholders were given a “virtual” budget of \$25,000,000 to spend on the features they would like to see included in a Shawnee Recreation Center.

The ledger at the right was taken from the Build-a-Center Worksheet included in the Shawnee Recreation Center Master Plan and Feasibility Study. It can provide the Manchester Task Force with a rough idea of the cost of particular components of a new-build or expanded recreation center.

While the City of Shawnee and the service area for the proposed recreation center is much larger than Manchester, the Shawnee Recreation Center includes a number of the features that Manchester leaders have expressed a desire to see in their new or expanded facility.

The bottom line of course is that a state-of-the-art indoor recreation is not an inexpensive proposition and would require Manchester to assemble a funding stack inclusive of multiple partners locally, regionally, statewide, and federally.

³ https://cityofshawnee.civicweb.net/document/14707/Shawnee%20Recreation%20Center%20Master%20Plan%20_%20Feasibi.pdf?handle=63331C181AB64BF591FE904C3801A2A6