

**Fairbank Community Center Report: Questions for PROs Consulting**  
**March 1, 2018**

**Questions related to competition**

1. (1) Are there 5-10 community centers in Massachusetts towns that would be comparable to the one proposed? Which are they? How much revenue do they generate, and how much of their operating costs are recovered?
2. (3) Why aren't Bosse, Longfellow Health Club, Thoreau Club, and Boston Sports Clubs – Wayland including on the tables on pages 17 & 19?
3. (4) The Similar Provider Analysis didn't use the two closest facilities in it's comparison. Longfellow and Bosse both have many Sudbury residents as members. I realize that Bosse is very expensive but Longfellow isn't and both are significantly closer than any of those providers in the analysis. Why didn't they use Longfellow or Bosse?
4. (9) Pg 17, 19 – no private gyms in Sudbury listed? What about Bosse, Longfellow, Field House, etc? Two of the three have pools, curious why private gyms in other towns were mentioned but not those in Sudbury
5. (28) (page 17) This doesn't include the Longfellow Club or Bosse. It also doesn't include private clubs like Sudbury Swim & Tennis. Why not? How would that affect the conclusions?
6. (33) (page 111) *Pricing comparisons to other fitness related facilities were used for guidelines for developing the pricing schedule, however, the ultimate goal of value provided was utilized for developing the pro forma.* What does this mean?
7. (40) pg 17 - competitive providers are missing many private clubs - Thoreau, Longfellow, Bosse, Lifetime, Wayside, etc.
8. (REM1) pg 18 -- Why were Maynard and Hudson not listed? Maynard provides a nine hole town golf course.
9. (REM2) pg 18 – What is the total committee investments fixed or operational expenses that neighboring towns commit to their citizens in the way of park, recreation or senior centers?

**Partnership and outside funding**

1. (2) Why does the plan include a partner for the therapy pool? What can the partner do that the Town can't? Would access pricing be part of the competitive bidding process?
2. (6) How realistic is the concept of partnership opportunities?

**Financials**

1. (5) This doesn't seem to have a break even financial plan-how is any shortfall going to be covered? Will Park and Rec come back to the town annually to cover those costs? –  
**TOWN**

**Currently the Town funds a portion of the Park and Recreation budget through the tax levy, in this scenario, that seems to continue. I anticipate we would continue that process. However, it should be noted that any shortfall in revenue will need to be made up by the tax levy. Additionally, it would take one year for the revenues anticipated by the consultant to be realized.**

2. (11) Pg 39 – 85% would pay up to \$200/yr more in taxes...42% up to \$300...19% up to \$400, 9% up to \$500. What would a bond look like on a 30 million center? I think a 20 yr bond would cost about \$400/house/yr and a 30 yr bond would be \$300/house/year? This survey is an indicator that this will fail at the polls? not enough support based on initial survey?
3. (12) Pg 54 – Same questions...this one says 81% % would pay up to \$200/yr more in taxes...45% up to \$300...19% up to \$400, 5% up to \$500.
4. (13) Pg 111 – Says Fairbank earns 77% of operations costs now but new model calls for 91%? What does that mean in terms of \$? 9% new is likely higher than 23% of current, right? Seeing how staffing is nearly doubling.... -- PROs Pg 114 says new will set us back \$334,191 per year -- what is current \$? – **TOWN**  
**This is a very difficult question to answer. Currently the Town budgets for park and recreation and council on aging in several ways. We have general fund budgets (funded by taxes), enterprise funds (pays for pool and a portion of recreation staff) and revolving funds that pay for programming. This system is completely changed in the consultant's analysis.**
5. (14) Pg 113 - Daily pricing exists now at the community side of the facility. New daily rates are \$13 dollars for an adult, \$10 dollars for youth and \$8 dollars for a senior. What are current rates?? -- **TOWN**  
**Currently we charge per program. The memberships that currently exist are for the pool.**
6. (15) Pg 114 – I expected Gymnasium to be higher and parties to be lower. Passes at \$807852 works out to ~62,000 pass at \$13 each What does a pass entitle user to? Why is there revenue from passes as well as fitness and pool? Wouldn't a pass get me into those things? Or are the pool-only passes (I'm sure this is spelled out in there, somehow I just missed it)
7. (16) Pg 115 – 90% cost recovery (334,190) only for first year...year 6 we are at 79% (932,064). Should bond be setup in such a fashion to pay for the growing deficit? Or can it? We can't sell this to voters as a 90% recovery if it's going to be 79% or worse long run – **TOWN?** or PROs?  
**The bond can not fund operating only debt. They are assuming that we would not increase the rates as costs increase. A better mechanism would be to have the rates increase by a small percentage each year as the costs increase in order to maintain the 90%, or whatever number is realistic.**
8. (17) Pg 117 – slightly misleading on monthly passes – for example half way down Full Facility Monthly would have to sell 1200 monthly passes at 69 bucks to make your \$82,800 – **Comment? Or confirm by PROs?**
9. (18) Pg 117 thru 119 – Just tallying up the number of instances where a “resident” buys something throughout the year I get 24,678. Granted much of that is daily passes but

we are counting on each Sudbury resident to buy at least 1.3 passes of some sort per year, and that doesn't count the recreation, group fitness, aquatic programs, gymnasium rentals, functions, programs, services, etc. Realistic?!? **Comment? Or confirm by PROS?**

10. (19) Pg 117 thru 119 – If I tally up the \$ figures for the passes above I get \$795,871. Dividing that by our current rough # of households 6200 we have to get roughly \$128/household of pass revenue (this does not include the parties, classes, etc and does not include non-residents either) on top of paying for the bond and paying for the yearly deficit (\$932,064 in year 6). Tally this up and it will cost the typical household at least \$678/yr to operate this facility (someone should definitely check my math!)  
**Comment? (whose?)**
11. (23) Pg. 24 – Explain 70%/30% split in recreation budget strategy
12. (25) Page 117 – What programs are included in the \$626K+ existing recreation revenue?
13. (26) Have Melissa/Dennis reviewed the costs/revenue and are they comfortable with the numbers? **TOWN**  
**As I have shared, I do have concerns about some of the numbers. One good example of that is the amount of revenues estimated for party rentals. Another would be the revenues estimated for concessions.**
14. (29) (page 24) *There is a 70%/30% spilt in recreation budget strategy.* What does that mean?
15. (34) (page 112) *General benefits for full-time staff have been calculated based on input from the Town of Sudbury.* Does this include pension and OPEB obligations?
16. (35) (page 128) Existing revenue from the pool (\$249,191 for existing aquatic admission revenue and \$124,947 for existing aquatic program revenue) is added to the total aquatic revenue, and accounts for about 61% of it. Confirm: the rest of the revenue is due to the new facility.
17. (36) (page 131) Due to the increased personnel costs, the gymnasium loses money. Confirm.
18. (37) (page 132) \$40,000 in birthday parties means about \$770 every week. Is that right?
19. (42) pg 115 - shows revenue increases are not projected to keep up with expense increases. This is not sustainable.
20. (43) pg 117 - non-resident fees should always be higher than resident fees. Most are but one isn't - non-resident youth daily pass is lower than resident youth daily pass.
21. (44) pg 116 - pass revenues from pg 117 are not reflected correctly on pg 116. Verify other entries on pg 116 are correct - there are several mistakes.
22. (45) None of the ProForma Revenue and Expense tables are dated. Are these current or projected?
23. (46) Sensitivity analysis of revenue project
  - a. What happens to the revenue projection if we only get 50 or 75% of the people?
  - b. What happens to the operating cost if we only get 50 or 75% of the people?
24. (50) What is the estimated reduction in revenue for Park and Rec during demolition and construction?

25. (REM3) Is \$30 million over thirty years feasible with the other town needs considered? Is \$20 million? What is feasible? **TOWN or PROs?**  
**We have the capacity to bond this project as well as other projects.**
26. (REM4) Discussion of the total added cost of this plan for each household or per total taxes paid by household would be a plus.
27. (REM21) p 113 “Membership Assumptions” first three bullet points refer to “management”. This is business management: a new function.
28. (REM13) p 2 -- Naming is only one aspect of a detailed funding strategy which should become part of the deliverable to the town. We must show a sensitivity to the magnitude of the funding requirement. A funding sub-team should be able to deliver several millions in a variety of ways including “naming” but also name a brick, cost sharing arrangements, etc. **TOWN? or PROs? (**  
**I think there is potential for fundraising or partnership opportunities, but many of those are small in nature when compared to the entire project.**
29. REM14) p 111 Is the 77% recovery of Fairbank Center costs confirmed by the Town Manager? **TOWN**  
**Yes, due to the way that the town currently budgets this number is reasonable.**
30. (REM22) p 113 “Programs assume that 70% of the classes will make the minimum number to hold the class” Can this percentage be confirmed?
31. (REM 23) p 110 -- “The additional staff will also cover marketing and business development needs of the community center. “ This is the major talking point of the entire plan for a new center. It implies a willingness to operate the center (at least the Parkand Rec. portions) as a business not only as a service center. Business management skills are very specialized and often unique in a Town Structure typically. Is it time to consider the creation of a new distinct “District” structure for the entire Park and REC. operations. This is a structure used in many other towns across the US. IT creates a legal structure similar to our present Regional High School Structure. A related question is: Should we create a Regional Park and Rec. Structure. Partnering with Lincoln, and Maynard could be feasible in theory.  
 A review of the Town Manager’s span of control is important as this is a significant role change and added time drain.  
 The Position of Business Manager with staff is to become the driving force to delivering the revenue plan.  
 Competition exists within the town already for several of the proposed added services. These include: the new town Hall proposal which makes the Town Hall a fee-based meeting Center in order to justify renovation costs. Hard to sell that the town needs to expand both buildings for added general meeting or “party” space.

### **Demographics/Projections**

1. (8) Pg 6 – this graph shows a nearly linear trend up for both households and population but that isn’t consistent with state projections, school/nesdec, MAPC, or housing...State says we will flatten out or even tick backwards in population between now and 2035
2. (31) (pages 31 and 38) These show 32% of survey responders currently use the Fairbank Center at least weekly, but that 67% would use a new center weekly.

Assuming we double facility use, how many people would that be? Is our parking and traffic infrastructure adequate? **TOWN?**

**The parking as show in the pros plan is adequate. We would need to better study the traffic in order to fully answer.**

3. (39) pg 3 - 28% of the population is under 18 years but on page 6 it says 86% of the households are families. This doesn't make sense. Might need more description.
4. (REM10) pg 22 Does the town build out plan accommodate 700 new housing units? How about over 750 households. If these are to come from multistory or age restricted units such as at Meadow Walk perhaps our forecasts for senior growth are low. We should ask our town Realtor Association for their opinions to confirm the trends especially for the outlying years. **TOWN or PROs?**
5. (REM7) p 22 A related concern with the growth in housing units and an increase in household size is an implication that the town's budgets will be placed under added strain which could most likely only be met by property tax increases. **TOWN or PROs? Community growth is two-fold, it both brings budgetary burdens as well as new tax revenue.**
6. (REM9) The chart on page 23 is very critical. Observe the growth of the 55+ to over 41% of total. Not sure these out years projections are consistent with those of the state. That doesn't make them wrong however. Observe the shrinkage of the age group of 35-64. This means the primary earning years group is shrinking. This could imply disposable income will shrink for the entire town. This forecast could demand a discussion of the capacity of the town to fund this project and others.

### **Transition**

1. (47) What is the plan to keep programs and Senior Center open during construction? **TOWN?** or PROs?  
**This will be determined during the next phase of this project, design.**
2. (48) Estimated cost if programs need to find other places to operate? **TOWN See above.**
3. (49) Is there money already in place for any phase in or relocation of any programs.. Estimated cost? **TOWN- See above.**

### **Space Allocation**

1. (51) Kitchen - needs to be placed to handle daily food delivers and pick-up for meals on wheels program. Room for delivery truck.
2. (52) Senior Space to be clearly listed as Senior Space not to include space allocated to the kitchen or lobby.
3. (53) 4.3.5 Senior Space --What does take "maximum advantage of shared community program spaces" mean?
1. (52) On proposed square foot chart, Title - Facility Administrator should read Senior Center Administration.

2. (57) Who should incur the cost of fixing parts in the building? Would it be rec? senior center? The center now is broken up where it is clear but with a new building there might be some questions on who would pay for what.

**TOWN or PROs?**

This would be part of the capital process.

**Miscellaneous**

1. (7) How much more would it cost to build a green building and what would the long term savings be for that?
2. (10) Pg 27 – This is a pet peeve of mine - people using stats that aren't true. Sudbury is not highest median income – Weston is. Sudbury is 3 (Dover #2). Sudbury does not have highest tax rate is the state – not even in the top 20. Longmeadow is #1 for residential tax rate (\$24.34/1000), sadly Pittsfield (my home town) has highest commercial rate (\$39.98/1000).
3. (20) Page 137 PROS suggest that the Town develop a community statistical valid survey along with a series of public input sessions to share the total building changes that could occur including open houses for people to see the facility so they have a good understanding of the needs of the existing facility before they move forward with a vote to residents. Do we have time to do this survey and digest results before Town Meeting? **TOWN Unknown**
4. (21) What would it cost to renovate current space and expand into the SPS administration area? I am assuming that the following would need to happen at a minimum. Is this correct? **TOWN or can we get estimates from PROs?**

Past studies did this analysis

P&R Administration and Program area

- Roof structure replaced
- Exterior windows replaced
- Insulate exterior walls
- Replace HVAC system

Cafetorium

- Adapt to provide a large multi-purpose room

Boiler Room

- Roof structure reinforced

Atkinson Pool and Locker Room

- Reroof with insulation
- Repair to exterior walls
- Rebuild locker rooms

Senior Center

- Repair windows

3. (22) How much representation was there from Park & Rec, notice that group is not called out in Key Leadership and Stakeholder Interviews **TOWN**

**In my opinion, all user groups were adequately involved. Park and Recreation as well as the Council on Aging had both staff involvement as well as Commissioner involvement. Additionally, user groups were represented.**

4. (24) Community survey – 489 responses, senior – 218; were you able determine if there was crossover in the two surveys? – **We can ask, but this wasn't requested.**
5. (27) (page 15) There is no caption or title for the chart on this page. What are we looking at here?
6. (30) (page 26, under “Community Support”) *A goal would be to serve as the central focus of the community.* To what extent would this be a new focus, and to what extent does the existing Fairbank Center serve this goal? **TOWN**  
**This is already a gathering place for meetings and families. I don't think the focus would change.**
7. (32) (page 71) mentions “adequate ceiling space”. How much space is that, and adequate for what?
8. (38) (page 137) *PROS suggest that the Town develop a community statistical valid survey along with a series of public input sessions to share the total building changes that could occur including open houses for people to see the facility so they have a good understanding of the needs of the existing facility before they move forward with a vote to residents.* Not really a question; more about next steps
9. (41) pg 113 - center hours don't reflect current hours
10. (55) If PROS Consulting does the design phase does that mean that PROS Consulting will be the contractor of choice to be the FINAL contractor? .. Or will the construction project go out to bid? **TOWN It goes out to bid**
11. (56) Who set the price for the design phase? Is it really 1.9 million?
12. (58) How will the scheduling of the building work? Leon mentioned The senior Center having certain hours in rooms and then recreation would have the other hours. How would it work if we needed that space when it was designated for the senior center? I know it had been discussed but nothing was ever really definite.
13. (59) The four additional full time staff for recreation – could they be phased in over time if they are even needed at all
14. (REM5) **The plan calls for added full time equivalent staffing for programs but also for building management.** This headcount is critical to the effective operation of the space especially allowing for the added complexity of scheduling the added rooms, and the addition of more paid or volunteer staff. We should be sure the long range plan for Town staffing includes budgets for this added staff. **TOWN- the Town is committed to operating the facility in the best possible manner**
15. (REM6) **An appropriate maintenance plan and suitable capital reserves for an added 20-30K sq. ft. of space is required.** Approximately 4% of the new construction value could be budgeted for maintenance and repair. The town has a horrible record for maintenance of its fixed assets or building and fixtures. If the town cannot properly budget for either or both of these issues other alternatives should be proposed. **TOWN**
16. (REM8) p 23 Again we use “Senior” with multiple definitions. Here age 55. In other documents we use 60. That is confusing. The overall suggestion is a good one however, that the major user groups for the Community center could perhaps be better

characterized by classification of “active” or “low-impact” or “Social”. This could help all appreciate that the community center doesn’t just have park and rec or senior users, but a non-homogeneous blend of users across a broader age distribution.

- 17.(REM11) p 2 While “access” is “free”, programs will often cover their unique costs as much as possible. That could be made clearer.
- 18.(REM12) p 2 This (next to last bullet point) triggers that the Seniors are the only users. Again using terms such as “active”, “low impact” or “social” to relate services to multiple user groups would be more helpful.
- 19.(REM15) p 111 “Revenues projected at 100% of projected revenue capacity beginning in the modeled year ‘Operating Year 1’ ” seems VERY aggressive for such a new business focus. Some form of start up or learning curve would seem more reasonable.
- 20.(REM16) p 111 (last bullet point) These are critical staffing needs. I am glad to see these focused upon. The town seems to skimp on these currently.
- 21.(REM17) p 112 (second bullet point) This is critical and three % is not unreasonable. This would be the first major town facility to budget for this.
- 22.(REM18) p 112 (third bullet point under “Staffing Assumptions”): Then the proforma should reflect this assumption that additional staff may be required as the Center reaches operational and programmatic maturity.
- 23.(REM18) p 112 (third bullet point under “Center Contractual Assumptions”) “Capital Maintenance/Renewal Fund based on 3% of annual straight line depreciated costs in year one.” This is critical to maintain this asset for its planned useful life. The town doesn’t do this now for any major asset.
24. (REM19) p 113 (second bullet point under Center Operating Hours Assumptions) “a monitor to manage the space at \$16 dollars an hour for people who would like to have meetings at the site. “ A useful and important statement which again reflects a change in operation style to allow for a facility manager to coordinate site scheduling of “shared” spaces.
- 25.(REM20) p 113 Operating Hours Assumptions -- What happened to Election Days? Is the assumption that the added total space in the Center allows for Elections without impeding any of Park and Rec. or Senior Center operations?