MEETING DATE: December 15, 2015

TITLE: Report on Research Findings for Relocation of Senior Programming

PRESENTED BY: Amy Hall-McGrade, Parks & Recreation Director
Siobhan Foster, Public Works Director
Brian Lee, Community Development Director
Danielle Tellez, Human Resources Director

RECOMMENDATION: A. Review and discuss options for the relocation of senior programming from the Joslyn Center to another facility, including the Valleydale Park Community Center and a possible co-sponsorship agreement with Los Angeles County for Valleydale Park Community Center.
B. Provide direction to staff.

BACKGROUND:
On September 15, 2015, the City Council received and filed the Joslyn Center update, authorized the City Manager to issue a Request for Proposals (RFP) for community and internal outreach to ascertain facility-user needs and Parks & Recreation Department programming needs, including the City Council, and directed staff to identify temporary locations to accommodate senior programming requirements as an interim measure and initiate negotiations with property owners.

On November 10, 2015, the Department of Public Works issued the RFP to Provide Planning, Programming, Architectural and Engineering Services for the Initial Phase of the Covina Senior Center Project. Consulting services for the initial phase of the Project include completion of user and programmatic needs assessments, community and internal engagement, site evaluation and recommendation, visioning and conceptual designs, cost estimates, and project timelines. Seven proposals were received. The consideration of contract award by the City Council is tentatively scheduled for January 19, 2016, followed by the issuance of the Notice to Proceed on January 20, 2016.

DISCUSSION:
An interdepartmental staff team consisting of representatives from the City Manager’s office and the Departments of Public Works, Community Development, Human Resources/Risk Management, and Parks & Recreation have been meeting and researching relocation options for the city’s senior programming from the Joslyn Center to another location. The detailed research findings are included in Attachment A.

A total of 26 facilities were determined as possible locations to relocate senior programming. All available sites were evaluated based on uniform criteria using a “Facility Report Card.” The criteria included ADA compliance, facility condition and parking, space to accommodate
programs, and kitchen/dining capacity for the congregate meal program. Following extensive analysis, including site visits, it was concluded that two facilities (Brunswick Covina Bowl and Valleydale Park Community Center) were viable options based on their ability to accommodate the majority of current programs and services.

In discussions with Brunswick Covina Bowl, the facility use cost provided to City staff appears to make this option prohibitive. Discussions with Los Angeles County regarding the use of Valleydale Park Community Center are much more favorable. County staff have expressed their desire to pursue an agreement with the City, which would allow the City to bring in well-established senior programming and potentially help enhance Valleydale’s current program, which is not well attended. Under this agreement, the City would have access to the facility Monday-Friday, 8 a.m.-2 p.m., along with Saturday options. This would allow for at least 80% of current senior programs to be relocated. Most of the remaining programs would be accommodated in other City of Covina facilities.

The interdepartmental team is ready to proceed with the Valleydale Park Community Center option, and is seeking input from the City Council during today’s Study Session. The process with Los Angeles County will take a minimum of 60 days, as it will need to be considered and approved by the Board of Supervisors. If approved by the City Council, staff would attempt to expedite this process to the extent possible and relocate the senior programming as soon as agreement is reached. In the interim, senior programs will continue to operate at the Joslyn Center, and in the event of inclement weather, established policies will be followed.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**
The exact fiscal impact is unknown at this time. If the Valleydale Park Community Center is used, the potential costs include an approximate $55 per day facility/staff fee, as well as payment of 10% of program fees collected by the city (for classes, events, etc.).

**CEQA (CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT):**
The project has been reviewed for compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and is exempt per Section 15061 (b) (3). The project is covered by the General Rule that CEQA applies on to projects that have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment. The review of senior programming options will not result in any significant effect on the environment.

Respectfully submitted,

Amy Hall-McGrade
Parks & Recreation and Library Services Director

**ATTACHMENTS:**
Attachment A: Report on Research Findings for relocation of Senior Programming
REPORT ON RESEARCH FINDINGS
FOR RELOCATION OF SENIOR PROGRAMMING

Section 1.0 Purpose of Assessment Study

The purpose of this research is to secure a temporary facility for the City of Covina to successfully execute, to the best of its ability, the current level of senior programming for the center’s participants (for an approximate 24-month period). The ultimate goal of the project is the construction of a new, permanent Senior Citizen Center. Therefore, the expenditure of resources to provide temporary accommodation for existing Joslyn Center Senior programs must be evaluated in consideration to the resources required for the construction of the permanent facility.

Therefore, for the purposes of evaluating the scope and scale of potential temporary facility options for the Joslyn Center Senior programs, the interdepartmental staff team (the “Team”) has defined the primary Senior Citizen programs subject for temporary relocation as the “Core Services.” The Core Services are defined as follows:

- **Core Services No. 1**: Nutrition Program (the lunch program), case management services, and blood pressure checks;
- **Core Services No. 2**: Physical exercise program(s) necessary to address minimum health and wellness fundamentals, and socialization program(s) necessary to address minimum mental health and wellness fundamentals; and,
- **Core Services No. 3**: Selected other programs that can be reasonably accommodated within the physical space of a temporary facility that is of minimally sufficient size to accommodate Core Services Nos. 1 and 2.

Section 2.0 Scope of Assessment Study

To complete the Assessment Study, the Team has determined the minimum facility needs to provide for the Core Services described above are as follows:

- **Facility Need No. 1**: Floor area. A minimum floor area of approximately 3,000 to 4,000 square feet;
- **Facility Need No. 2**: Delineated space/use requirements. A minimum of three rooms (or spaces) is necessary. The dining area at a minimum floor area of approximately 1,500 square feet and a multi-function space to accommodate Core Services Nos. 2 and 3 of approximately 1,000 to 1,500 square feet;
- **Facility Need No. 3**: Handicapped accessible Men’s and Women’s restrooms;
- **Facility Need No. 4**: Sufficient on-site vehicle parking with ADA parking stalls and appropriate ADA path of travel to access the facility; and,
- **Facility Need No. 5**: Sufficient floor area to accommodate incidental on-site program management and staff support.
It should be noted that numerous other Senior Citizen activities and services are currently provided at the Joslyn Senior Citizen’s Center. Examples of these activities and services include, but are not limited to, billiards, various yoga and stretching classes, computer class, quilting, scrapbooking, various art-oriented classes and similar. The number of participating senior citizens in the aforementioned activities range from a low of 4 to 5 to a high of 20 to 40. The estimates of the participation volumes by the City’s senior citizen clients by the Parks & Recreation Department are provided in Appendix E. In an effort to replicate the breadth and quality of services available to the City’s senior citizen client base, the Team concluded some of the activities may be able to be provided in other facility locations. This scenario will be further discussed in this Temporary Relocation Strategy Assessment.

**Section 3.0 Discussion of Minimum Temporary Facility Requirements Hypothesis**

As discussed in Section 2.0, the Team identified a minimum of five facility needs in order to provide the minimum services of the Core Service activities identified in Section 1.0. The discussion of the explanation of five facility needs is as follows:

- **Facility Need Nos. 1 and 2**: Floor area. A minimum floor area of approximately 3,000 to 4,000 square feet.

In determining the minimum amount of floor area necessary to provide the Core Services, an evaluation of minimum necessary floor area is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Service</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Floor Area</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Service No. 1</td>
<td>Senior Citizen Lunch Program – Max. 80 served.</td>
<td>Approximately 1,500 sq.ft.</td>
<td>8 people per 6 ft. table = 10 tables. 120 sq.ft. total + 80 people @ 7 sq.ft./person = 560 sq.ft. total. Min. floor area req. = 680 sq.ft. Floor area necessary for serving tables and warmers = 100 sq.ft. Total minimum floor area = 780. Double the floor area to provide for reasonably comfortable circulation and access = 1,560 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Service No. 2</td>
<td>Physical and mental exercise programs and classes</td>
<td>Approximately 1,000 sq.ft. to 1,500 sq.ft.</td>
<td>The participation level is estimated at approximately 80 people. A room of 1,000 sq.ft. would allow 12.5 sq.ft. per person @ a maximum 80 people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Service No. 3</td>
<td>Miscellaneous programs.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Miscellaneous programs that could be accommodated within the floor area provided for Core Services Nos. 1 through 2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• **Facility Need No. 3:** Handicapped accessible Men’s and Women’s restrooms.

In order to provide accommodation to a facility that serves approximately 100 people, two ADA accessible restrooms (Men’s and Women’s) would be required. The public restrooms on the ground floor of City Hall are a good visualization example. Each restroom is approximately 220 square feet in size. Total square footage required for two public restrooms would total approximately 440 square feet.

• **Facility Need No. 4:** Sufficient on-site vehicle parking with ADA parking stalls and appropriate ADA path of travel to access the facility.

The Parks & Recreation Department estimates that on-site vehicle parking sufficient to accommodate the current 118 vehicles in Kelby Park. A parking lot that provides for 118 parking spaces, a minimum of 3 of those parking spaces would need to be designated for handicapped accessibility (ADA accessibility).

• **Facility Need No. 5:** Sufficient floor area to accommodate incidental on-site program management and staff support.

A floor area space of approximately 200 to 400 square feet should be sufficient, depending upon the number of on-site staff and modest supply storage needs.

**Section 4.0 Discussion of the Accommodation of Non-Core Services**

Appendix E is a list of all the services and activities that are currently provided at the Joslyn Senior Citizen Center. Pursuant to Section 2.0, a significant amount of currently provided services and activities would be classified as “Non-Core Services.” Being classified as “Non-Core Services” does not mean that those services are not valuable or important; but when evaluated in consideration to the baseline project hypothesis discussed in Section 1.0, the Team has made the value-judgement that providing temporary accommodations for the “Non-Core Services” does not maximize the City’s available resources when evaluated through the lens of the overall project goal. However, it is possible to provide accommodations for Non-Core Services, if the space needs for the Non-Core Services can be provided in other existing City facilities and/or for reasonable cost.

In assessing the space needs demands for the Non-Core Services, it appears as if many of those activities and services are utilized (on average) by a client base of approximately 12 senior citizens or less. Following is a brief discussion of possible alternative accommodations that may be feasible:

• **4.1. City Hall Duplicating/ Mail Room:** The City Hall Duplicating/ Mail Room is approximately 900 square feet. Due to staff and function reorganization, the tasks that occurred in this space have been transferred to different locations and departments within
City Hall. The result is that the space previously allocated to the duplicating/mail room functions is now available for reuse. One of the reuse alternatives being considered for the Duplicating/Mail Room is to transform the space into a City meeting room/multipurpose room. The reason the Duplicating/Mail Room option becomes advantageous is the expense to transform the space into a meeting facility for temporary Senior Citizen activities and services wouldn’t be wasted. This is because after the completion of the permanent Senior Citizen Center, the transformed Duplicating/Mail Room would become useable City Hall meeting space. The Team determined that this space could provide room for the Billiard program from 9-11 a.m., 2-4 p.m., Monday-Thursday (no Fridays). Legal and Notary Services could be scheduled at the same time to accommodate the office space inside Duplicating.

**Table No. 4.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.1.1</strong> The Duplicating/Mail Room space is available for reuse.</td>
<td>Funding for the conversion of the Duplicating/Mail Room into useable meeting space would need to be secured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.1.2</strong> Adequate public parking with appropriate ADA parking is provided. No financial investment is required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.1.3</strong> Adequate access to public restrooms is available on the ground floor of City Hall.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.1.4</strong> Expenditure of resources would not be used on non-City owned facilities. The converted space would continue to be used for City activities after the completion of the permanent Senior Citizen Center.</td>
<td>The activities/services placed in the converted Duplicating/Mail Room space would be separated from the larger Senior Citizen activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.1.5</strong> Current and future need for additional meeting space for City Hall functions could be addressed concurrent with providing temporary Senior Citizen access.</td>
<td>See 4.1.4 above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **4.2. Lease of Non-City-Owned Property:** The temporary leasing of non-City-owned property is also an option. This would involve the leasing of either currently vacant commercial space or institutional space. If the temporary leased space is to provide for Non-Core Services, then the square footage floor area demand could be limited to less than 1,000 square feet. Essentially, the Non-Core Services would be to provide for quasi-office (i.e., case management) or small group functions (i.e., class instruction). A listing of potentially available Non-City-Owned properties is provided in the Joslyn Center Facilities Report Card & Analysis. A brief discussion of the general categories of potentially available Non-City-Owned properties is as follows:
Table 4.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-City-Owned Property</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1 Available church facilities.</td>
<td>Many churches have meeting rooms of varying sizes that are not fully used by the church.</td>
<td>Long term lease arrangements may not always be available; the quality of the facilities vary; ADA access and facility accommodations will apply; and, lease rates may vary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.2 Commercial properties.</td>
<td>There are existing commercial retail properties available within the boundaries of the City.</td>
<td>Scheduling and cost issues are challenges. Typically, commercial properties will require commercial lease rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.3 Office properties.</td>
<td>There are existing office properties available within the boundaries of the City.</td>
<td>Same as with 4.3.2, however, lease rates may be less with office properties than commercial retail properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.4 Other – Specialty. (Example, vacant storefront properties in the downtown – Olsen mixed use.)</td>
<td>Use of vacant mixed use store area would “populate” the streetscape for approximately 24 months.</td>
<td>Tenant Improvement expenses for ADA restrooms, etc. would be required, as well as ongoing lease rates. Also, zoning considerations would be required for non-retail activity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 5.0 Evaluation of Relocation Alternatives

Appendix A presents the potential temporary Relocation Accommodations alternatives studied by the Team. In assessing the viability of the various alternatives a number of factors were taken into consideration. These factors were then translated into Report Card scoring criteria.

The Report Card is broken down into four main sections, with each section having a maximum point value of 25 points. Adding together the four 25-point sections, gave each facility a possible score of 100 total points. Each alternative was assigned a score. The scoring criteria is broken into four areas represented in the following sections:

Section 1: ADA Compliance
- Does facility meet with the current guidelines for ADA Compliance?
- What improvements would be required to bring facility up to those guidelines?
- Is the parking lot ADA accessible?
- Are the restrooms ADA accessible?
Section 2: Facility Condition and Adequate Parking
- Does the facility have adequate parking for all participants? This would include if joining with another city, and determining if the current parking situation would be adequate for both cities’ participants?
- Does the facility have HVAC (Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning)?
- How clean is the facility? Will it require major efforts to bring the facility into move-in condition?
- What structural improvements will the facility require to move in? Will it need painting and carpet cleaning or will it require more significant improvements such as wall repairs, threshold and door replacement, new carpet or flooring, etc.

Section 3: What Current Senior Programs Can Transfer to the Temporary Facility?
- With the help of the Joslyn Center’s Case Manager and Social Worker, the classes and programs were placed in three priority levels based on importance/need. For ratings of programs, classes or activities, refer to Appendix A.
- Point values were developed for each priority level and are as follows:
  - Priority Level 1 (2 points)
  - Priority Level 2 (1 point)
  - Priority Level 3 (1/2 point)
- Each facility’s representative who agreed to look at Covina’s current programming to either “fold in” or “make room for,” took the listing and applied it directly to their own senior programming. In most cases, duplication of classes or programs would result, or there was little space to add in Covina seniors or space availability simply eliminated current Covina programs, classes, and clubs.

Section 4: Nutrition Program, Kitchen Type, and Dining Capacity
- The type of meal program holds the most significant point value in this section, as the current funding for the meal program is provided through CDBG (Community Development Block Grant). Continuing with the same meal program will ensure that there will be no disruption in the current funding source.
- The kitchen type was also evaluated. Currently, Covina seniors are offered a catered-meal with food served from chafing dishes onto trays.
  - Full kitchens with all the amenities provide the option of continuing the same meal service that Covina seniors are used to.
  - Small kitchens or facilities with no kitchen will only allow the YWCA to provide a box lunch, which consists of a warm main portion and cold side dishes.
Each facility was also evaluated on their dining capacities. Could the facility accommodate between 75-80 seniors from the City of Covina.

Table No. 5.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1  Refer to individual Report Cards in Appendix A.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Point Total: 90 – 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2  Refer to individual Report Cards in Appendix A.</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Point Total: 80 – 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3  Refer to individual Report Cards in Appendix A.</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Point Total: 70 – 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4  Refer to individual Report Cards in Appendix A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Point Total: 60 – 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5  Refer to individual Report Cards in Appendix A</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Point Total: 59 or less</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.0 Evaluation of Relocation Alternatives Scoring

The potential Temporary Relocation Accommodations alternatives studied by the Team received scores pursuant to the discussion in Section 5.0. Following is a discussion of the Relocation Accommodation alternatives and the rationale as to in why the alternatives were placed in their assigned scoring category. To complete this section, 26 facilities and two organizations were listed as possible locations or partners to relocate senior programming. All available sites were visited, analyzed, and then scored based on the same criteria using a Facility Report Card.

This process served to be a very valuable way to assess each facility fairly and honestly. It was beneficial to visit the other cities, as it helped to provide valuable insight and information that helped staff develop the Report Card and come to these conclusions and recommendations.

After evaluating each facility through site visits and meetings, it is determined that the majority of the facilities that were on the list do not meet the need or provide the space needed to successfully execute the current level of senior programming.

According to the results of the Report Cards, there are two facilities that best meet the needs of the senior programming for the City of Covina. In addition, the possible use of the Duplicating/Mail Room to be used for the Billiards program and other smaller individual services is viable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Evaluated</th>
<th>Discussion of Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1.1 Brunswick Bowling Alley (Covina Bowl)</td>
<td>Covina Bowl offers an option that would be able to accommodate all the current programming (including billiards). The facility would require some cleaning and minor improvements to door handles with the addition of push bars on some doors, but it provides ample space with four spacious rooms. There is an office with two large rooms that would also be available for staff and smaller-type programs. The facility would be available for senior programming, with an option of adding a senior bowling league, Monday through Friday, from 9 a.m.-4 p.m. (no Saturdays). Staff met with the Facility Supervisor, as well as the District Manager Jeff Varney. A drawback to this facility is the cost. The City was provided with an unofficial quote, by email, for the use of the facility. The quote was $4,500/week. In the meeting with the Mr. Varney, staff learned that the facility sits empty most of the time until the late afternoon. This could make the cost negotiable. Late in the evaluation process, the Team discovered the property owner may have the property up for sale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.2 Valleydale Park Community Center</td>
<td>This center sits on the border of Covina and Azusa on Lark Ellen Avenue, just north of Arrow Highway. The center is run by the Los Angeles County Parks &amp; Recreation Department. Staff met with Frank Gonzales, Deputy Director. They are in favor of creating a co-sponsorship agreement between the City of Covina and the County of Los Angeles Parks &amp; Recreation Department. They are offering the facility for free from 9-2 p.m. There may be minor fees for staff and the facility from 8-9 a.m. However, this is not their intention. If there are any costs at all it will be minimal. The facility has two very large rooms and one medium-sized room. The facility is available for senior programming from 8 a.m.-2 p.m., Monday through Friday, along with the option of adding Saturdays to the senior programming schedule as well. The facility is open on Saturdays, but currently has no programming offered. This would provide the City with ample time on Saturdays to fill in club meetings and special events for the seniors. Currently, Valleydale serves 5-8 seniors in their facility. The partnership would allow the City of Covina to bring in well-established senior programming. Joining forces will also help to enhance Valleydale’s current senior programs and help them build a strong foundation for future senior programs at the facility. This is a win-win situation. The only program that could not be accommodated at transfer to the Valleydale Center is the men’s billiards program. In a meeting that took place on November 23, staff was provided a list of their year-round programs. The County runs an 8-10 week summer day camp program that will run Monday-Friday 8 a.m.-6 p.m. There was a willingness of both County and City staff to work around this to create a solution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.0 Nonviable Facilities Options
The Team reviewed the following options that were deemed nonviable due to cost and building limitations:

7.1 City of Lawndale – Modular Unit Available
In the final stages of this analysis, another option was presented. On Wednesday, November 11, Mike Estes, Director of Community Services for the City of Lawndale, sent out an email blast notifying any interested cities and counties that they had a 1,200 square foot modular unit that they would give away for free. The unit was used to house their senior programs for four years until their new facility was built. The only expense to the recipient would be the cost of transporting and installation. Covina staff responded and was told Covina would be listed as the third entity to call with interest in the unit. The Team determined that the potential costs for the structure to be relocated from Lawndale and the cost of required foundation and utility hookups would be prohibitive. In addition, when the City has completed the construction of the new Center, there would be additional costs in removing the facility.

8.0 Conclusion
According to the letter from the Joslyn Center’s Case Manager and Social Worker Appendix D, all of the programs offered at Joslyn Center have some range of value to each individual senior depending upon need and interest. Each in their own way, brings socialization and keeps seniors’ minds and bodies active, preventing health issues like depression, dementia, and immobilization.

The Valleydale option seems to be the best alternative for meeting the majority of the senior needs. This option would include Covina staff onsite to continue to serve our seniors in cooperation with Los Angeles County Parks & Recreation Department. If approved by City Council and County staff will create a Sponsorship Agreement, to bring back to the City Council and the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors for approval.