



STUDY SESSION

Agenda Item # 1

AGENDA REPORT SUMMARY

Meeting Date: April 27, 2021

Subject: Study Session – Recreation & Community Services Organizational and Community Center Assessment

Prepared by: Jaime Chew, Recreation Manager

Reviewed by: Donna Legge, Recreation & Community Services Director

Approved by: Brad Kilger, Interim City Manager

Attachment(s):

- A. Operations Assessment
- B. Community Input Summary
- C. Comparables Summary
- D. Godbe Research Survey Report
- E. Godbe Research Survey Power Point Presentation

Initiated by:

City Staff

Previous Council Consideration:

April 13, 2021

Fiscal Impact:

None

Environmental Review:

Not applicable

Policy Question(s) for Council Consideration:

- What is City Council vision for the operation of the Los Altos Community Center?
- What is City Council position on city-wide cost recovery targets for the Recreation & Community Services Department?

Summary:

- In April 2020, Recreation & Community Services engaged Blue Point Planning
- A city-wide Organizational and Community Center Assessment was completed in June 2020
- The Los Altos Community Center is projected to be completed by mid-summer 2021
- On April 13, 2021, City Council approved the Phased Opening Plan for the Los Altos Community Center

Reviewed By:

City Manager

BK

City Attorney

JH

Finance Director

JM



Subject: Study Session – Recreation & Community Services Organizational and Community Center Assessment

Staff Recommendation:

Review assessment of the Recreation & Community Services Department operations and new Community Center. Provide feedback on city-wide park, facility, and recreation program cost recovery approach.



Subject: Study Session – Recreation & Community Services Organizational and Community Center Assessment

Purpose

Review assessment of the Recreation & Community Services Department operations and new Community Center. Provide feedback on city-wide park, facility, and recreation program cost recovery approach.

Background

In December 2019, the Recreation & Community Services Department identified the need for an organizational assessment and development of a strategic plan for the new Los Altos Community Center. As a result, a Professional Services Agreement with Blue Point Planning was executed in April 2020. The comprehensive scope of work includes the following tasks:

Phase I

- Organizational Review and Analysis - COMPLETE
- Survey/Stakeholder Interviews - COMPLETE
- Organizational Assessment Memo and Strategy – COMPLETE

Phase II

- Vision and Goals for New Community Center - COMPLETE
- Trends Analysis and Comparables - COMPLETE
- City-wide and Community Center Programming and Events – IN PROGRESS
- Community Center Revenue and Operations Costs – IN PROGRESS
- Community Center Operations Plan – IN PROGRESS
- City-wide Department Policies and Procedures – IN PROGRESS
- Development of a Staffing Plan – IN PROGRESS

The assessment process involved collaboration with other City departments, organizations, and community members. In addition, several outreach exercises were conducted by Blue Point through individual interviews and focus groups held in August 2020. A scientific survey conducted by Godbe Research followed shortly thereafter in October 2020. Both studies, in combination with the comparables analysis of 6 cities, resulted in the following assessment findings:

- Establish a new city-wide organizational structure to improve staff retention and recruitment
- Better optimize use of facilities and parks city-wide
- Increase city-wide revenues and efficiencies
- Balance new Community Center with services city-wide
- Ensure there is a city-wide service orientation to new and existing customers



Subject: Study Session – Recreation & Community Services Organizational and Community Center Assessment

- Revised city-wide cost recovery policy, fee structure and scheduling
- Develop a comprehensive city-wide Parks & Recreation Master Plan

Discussion/Analysis

Together with Mindy Craig of Blue Point Planning and Bryan Godbe of Godbe Research, the Recreation Management Team will present a compilation of the data collected, including a summary of the assessment and findings. In addition, the team will solicit input from City Council regarding their vision of success for the new Community Center. The team will facilitate a discussion regarding cost recovery approaches. This will include:

- Understanding the basis and definition of cost recovery for Recreation & Community Services
- Review of cost recovery methodologies and considerations
- Review of the precedent for cost recovery for Recreation & Community Services

Pending feedback and direction from City Council, staff will return in June to seek approval of city-wide cost recovery goals for the Recreation & Community Services Department and additional staffing resources to optimize city-wide and Community Center operations.

Options

- 1) Provide feedback and direction on the vision for the operation of the Community Center, and city-wide cost recovery approach for the Recreation & Community Services Department.

Advantages: Staff will have clear direction to better inform the planning process for staffing, scheduling, programming, operations and policies for the Community Center, and will have clear expectations related to city-wide cost recovery goals.

Disadvantages: None

- 2) Do not provide feedback and direction on the vision for the operation of the Los Altos Community Center, and city-wide cost recovery approach for the Recreation & Community Services Department.

Advantages: None

Disadvantages: Staff will not have clear direction to inform the planning process for staffing, scheduling, programming, operations and policies for the Community Center, and will not have clear expectations related to city-wide cost recovery goals.

Recommendation



Subject: Study Session – Recreation & Community Services Organizational and
Community Center Assessment

The staff recommends Option 1.



**Parks
Make
Life
Better!**

Los Altos Recreation and
Community Services Department
**Organizational Review
& Strategy**



Prepared by BluePoint Planning
August 17, 2020



Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| TABLE OF CONTENTS..... | 1 |
| INTRODUCTION | 2 |
| ASSESSMENT PROCESS | 3 |
| FINDINGS | 4 |
| INITIAL BUDGET AND REVENUE ASSESSMENT | 4 |
| ORGANIZATIONAL ASSESSMENT | 6 |
| COMMUNITY AND STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK | 7 |
| COMPARABLE ANALYSIS | 10 |
| SUMMARY | 10 |
| INITIAL STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK | 13 |
| ORGANIZATION STRUCTURE | 18 |
| APPENDIX | 21 |



Introduction

The City of Los Altos is in the process of constructing a state-of-the-art community center that is planned to be a dynamic, welcoming, heart of the community and gathering place. In preparation for this new facility and the expectations related to operating it at the highest level, the Los Altos Recreation and Community Services Department (Department) contracted with BluePoint Planning to conduct an *Organizational Review and Strategy (Current operations)* and a *Future Organizational Plan* for integrating the new Community Center. This work is being led by the Department's new Director in close coordination with her management staff.

The project is being undertaken in two phases and this document is a summary of the process, findings, and recommendations for the first phase, *Operational Review and Strategy*. In phase 2, we will focus on how to best schedule and operate the Community Center and ensure consistency in fees and policies across all of the City's facilities. Phase 2 will also include a community survey by the research firm Godbe and Associates, which will assess overall community needs, including programming needs at Grant Park. Overall, this work will help the Department operate more effectively, better meet the needs of the community, and ensure the success of the new Community Center.

The City of Los Altos has a stable population of just over 30,000 people with a high median age of 46, and an equally high median income of \$157,000. The City has 11 parks with just over 45 acres of land, and 6 various recreation buildings used for classes, rentals, and meetings. Los Altos has a low park acreage ratio. The Department runs programs for all ages, but the primary audiences served are youth and seniors. The Department is responsible for programming, scheduling, and managing the use of the facilities and parks. Park and facility maintenance are managed by the Maintenance Services Department, independent of the Recreation and Community Services Department. The oversight of the capital improvement projects is managed by the Engineering Department. Inter-department coordination is collaborative and routine. The City completed a Parks Plan in 2012 is not comprehensive or strategic and does not include a needs assessment, public input, recreation facilities or program planning elements to guide overall decision making, priorities, programs, operations or future resource allocation.

At the onset of this process, a global pandemic essentially minimized operations and in-person programs for the Department. This includes a delay in the completion of the Community Center to 2021. The Department has adapted to the health orders including virtual programs, community morale building initiatives, senior support, and referral services. Long-term implications to the City's programs and facilities will be explored more



Los Altos Recreation and Community Services Organizational Review & Strategy

in the next phase, but it is anticipated to create new challenges and opportunities as the Department and community further adapts.

Assessment Process

To assess the current organization, BluePoint Planning conducted the following activities:

- Overall organizational review of operations including:
 - Department Budget
 - Organization and staffing
 - Facilities and amenities review
 - Programs overview
 - Community Center Building Review
- Stakeholder, City and department staff input
 - Department Staff Surveys (12)
 - Community Stakeholder Surveys (82 responses out of 132)
 - Small group meetings (6 groups of 6 people)
 - One-on-one stakeholder interviews (6)
- Comparable analysis of similar city's parks and recreation departments
- Series of conversations with the Department core team



Findings

The following is a summary of the key findings from the assessment of Department operations, stakeholder feedback, and comparable analysis. In general, the Department and the staff is well respected and liked. While the community appears to be generally satisfied particularly related to seniors and youth programs, there are a number of issues that were discussed that should be addressed. There is a need for more relevant programs, more offerings for active adults, increases in citywide community (not just youth) events, and better distribution of programs and activities across the city (north and south). Park maintenance was also mentioned with the sports stakeholders. Both staff, city leaders, and community members mentioned staff recruitment, retention, and succession planning as a persistent concern.

Initial Budget and Revenue Assessment

An initial analysis of the projected 2020 Department budget and revenues was completed in this phase. The second phase will further evaluate of the details, including review and recommending new fees and revenue opportunities. Several elements identified below will be explored further.

- The majority of department program expenses are in youth sports, programs and camps (43%) with just 5% for adults and 5% for teens. 26% is dedicated to senior programs. These reflect the stakeholder input about what kind of programs are available or not. (Figure 1)
- 44% of revenues for the department come from field rentals, 26% from youth programs and just 12% from adults. There was no income for facility rentals or teen programs. Senior programs represent 3% of revenue. (Figure 2)




Figure 1. Program Expenses by age category (2020 est.)




Figure 2. Revenue by Program Age Group (2020 Est.)




Figure 3. Expense and Revenue Comparison (2020 Est.)




Los Altos Recreation and Community Services Organizational Review & Strategy

- Facilities and fields rentals, primarily field rentals and adult programs generate revenues and youth programs have a high cost recovery.
- Senior programs are substantially subsidized, as are tiny tots and teen programs.

Organizational Assessment

The Department currently has 8 full-time equivalent employees (FTEs), 2 part-time equivalent employees (PTE), and a range of temporary seasonal staff and contractors to deliver programs. There is a one vacancy for an FTE recreation coordinator (teens and camps) and two part-time recreation specialists (volunteers and marketing). There is a Director, one Manager and one Recreation Supervisor, with 4 recreation coordinators and 1 Office Assistant II. (Figure 4)

The current staffing and structure are a result of the 2008 economic downturn, staffing gaps, and long-term adjustments rather than strategic and effective analysis of what is best for the City. The staff have been agile and effective as possible with this structure and limited staffing, but the number of staff who have left, community feedback, as well as increased demands and the need to manage the new Community Center means that this organization is not sustainable.





Several important functions are currently not being done nor could be done with current staff levels without taking away from another critical area:

- Adult and teen program and activities
- Contract class management and enhancement
- Consistent community engagement and feedback
- Facilities and parks optimization for community use and revenue generation
- Volunteer management
- Expansion of programs and activities citywide such as continuing senior programs at Grant Park as well as at the new center. This includes efficiently streamlining the Grant Park Senior Volunteer Program with City programs.
- Coordination and enhancement of Civic Center programs and activities, including collaboration with the museum
- When the community center comes on line, lack of effective focused oversight and management to meet expectations.

Community and Stakeholder Feedback

To understand the current state and various perspectives of individuals, community members, and leaders, BluePoint conducted a range of engagement activities including two surveys, six small group meetings, and six individual interviews with stakeholders. The first survey targeted an open-ended audience which mainly consisted of community members




Figure 5. What should be the Department's top priority in the next 1-3 years?



Los Altos Recreation and Community Services Organizational Review & Strategy

and individuals from organizations affiliated with the Recreation and Community Services Department (82 responses), and the second survey consisted of employed staff members (12 responses). Six small interest group meetings were held (consisting of 5-6 people each) to further understand audiences who had similar interests and concerns. Finally, six one-on-one interviews were conducted to understand the thoughts and concerns of community leaders. In summary, approximately 135 total respondents were engaged. The feedback echoed many of the same themes, but also provided additional information around a vision for the future of the Recreation and Community Services Department, including its oversight and operations of the new Community Center. Below is a summary of the input and key themes, with detailed responses for each activity provided on the following pages. (A detailed summary of all input and surveys is provided in Appendix 1.)

Major Themes

There were a number of important themes, but the following comments were mentioned multiple times by a variety of respondents.

- When asked what the most important priorities are for the department in the next 1 to 3 years, respondents overwhelmingly indicated that the main priority should be ensuring services are equitably provided across the city, followed by making the community center a success. (Figure 5)
- Develop strategies to mitigate the perceived divide between northern and southern areas of Los Altos. While it is certain that the Recreation and Community Services Department cannot alleviate the north and south divide alone, perhaps it could provide community integration which in turn may reduce these concerns.
- Revitalize existing programs and create new programs that appeal to a wider variety of individuals (i.e. add more interesting classes for seniors and youth). Although the department does already offer a range of programs, the existing ones do not meet the interests of the general community; further investigation should be done to uncover the community's interests, so that each individual's needs can be accommodated.
- Re-evaluate fee charges, budgetary restrictions, cost-recovery goal, and cost.
- Retain and support excellent staff. The Department staff were widely hailed as excellent and critical to its success, while at the same time recognizing the need to do a better job of retaining staff and avoiding frequent turn over.

Programs and Services Themes

- Uphold the vision of the Community Center being a positive place where all members of the community can interact and come together



Los Altos Recreation and Community Services Organizational Review & Strategy

- Capitalize on the excitement of the new community center (i.e. increase awareness through social media, and leverage community advocates)
- Implement a better method of communication that can be easily accessed by the public (i.e. an events calendar, and increase informational emails)
- Expand partnerships and relationships with neighboring towns, school district, and community organizations
- Make the Recreation department in charge of oversight of the Civic Center to unite and expand events and coordination
- Consider COVID limitations while creating community social distancing events and online classes or programs to maintain community engagement
 - Build on Downtown street closures and consider how recreation can help to activate the streets
- Address (in partnership with other departments) accessibility and transportation issues related to parking, bikeability, and walkability to provide better connections and access to recreation services across town
- Consider adding more programs and classes that revolve around fitness, health, and education (i.e. active classes, healthy cooking classes, etc.)
- Increase maintenance and cleanliness of all facilities
- Schedule Community Events that integrate both the northern and southern areas of the town

Department and Organizational Themes

- Clarify the roles of each employee, whom they report to, and their responsibilities
 - Improve onboarding of new employees
- Consider offering more benefits to reduce turnover rate (i.e. offer training resources for new employees, and provide a competitive salary)
- Online Registration and Advanced Registration must be implemented, as the current process is long and tedious
- Need to restructure the department to offer more promotional opportunities and efficiencies in operation
- Evaluate past successful programs and events, and consider reintroducing them



Comparable Analysis

The following provides a brief summary of key similarities and differences in the Parks, Parks and Recreation Departments, fees and prices, and other amenities existing in cities that are comparable to Los Altos in size, location and relative population. (A detailed report about each city is also provided as Appendix 2.) These figures are based on research of city's budgets, online activity guides and have been analyzed to compare a wide variety of elements as consistently as possible. However, each city has different ways of reporting budget information, setting fees, etc. that may result in some anomalies. Therefore, this information should be considered an order of magnitude analysis to help in better understanding how Los Altos compares rather than a definitive assessment of each comparable city's operations.

Summary

The following is a snapshot of the eight cities, including Los Altos that were analyzed. Costs are difficult to provide a clear, apples to apples comparison as many of the neighboring cities operate both their parks and the recreation function. Revenues are a more easily evaluated metric, and Los Altos is similar in most respects except for Belmont who has over 2 times the revenue. Cost recovery differences are also very stark with Los Altos having a very high one. This should be further analyzed by adding the cost of parks maintenance to get a more realistic picture. Los Altos has the lowest levels of park acreage or open space. In regards for developed parks, Los Altos has the lowest ratio of park land for 1000 residents except for Belmont who does not have as much developed parks but does have a substantial amount of open space.

Demographic Similarities

Demographically, Los Altos shares similar populations of people "Under 14" and "Teenagers 15 to 19" as Burlington, Foster City, Menlo Park, San Carlos and Saratoga; all cities share a similar population of "Middle Age 35 to 65"; San Carlos, and Los Altos share a similar population of "Young Adults 20 to 34"; Foster City, and Los Altos share a similar population of "Older Adults over 65"; Los Altos is extremely similar to Saratoga's age distribution population, and is uniquely similar in median income, single family households, and multifamily households.



Los Altos Recreation and Community Services Organizational Review & Strategy

Table 1. Overview comparison of similar cities' parks and recreation departments

| Population | Density/ Sq. Mile | # Parks | Acres of Parks | Acres of Open Space | # Rec. Facilities | Acres of Parks/1,000 Residents | Operating Budget | Revenues | Est. Cost Recovery | Recreation FTEs |
|--------------------|----------------------|---------|-------------------|------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Belmont | | | | | | | | | | |
| 26,503 | 5,724 | 14 | 31 | 335 | 6 | 1.17 | \$8,463,977 | \$5,058,379 | 59.76% | 14 |
| Burlingame | | | | | | | | | | |
| 29,618 | 4,890 | 14 | 55 | 42.5 | 1 | 1.86 | \$9,843,886 | \$2,898,000 | 29.44% | 13 |
| Foster City | | | | | | | | | | |
| 31,806 | 1,603 | 23 | 109 | 51 | 1 | 3.43 | \$9,140,214 | \$2,141,049 | 23.42% | 36.5 |
| Los Altos | | | | | | | | | | |
| 29,762 | 4,588 | 11 | 45.45 | n/a | 6 | 1.53 | \$2,384,730 | \$2,176,000 | 91.25% | 8 |
| Menlo Park | | | | | | | | | | |
| 32,792 | 1,883 | 14 | 59.5 | 172.5 | 7 | 1.81 | \$10,200,000 | \$5,514,323 | 54.06% | 52.5 |
| San Carlos | | | | | | | | | | |
| 29,166 | 5,264 | 16 | 62 | 73 | 3 | 2.13 | \$3,710,300 | \$2,264,800 | 61.04% | 10 |
| Saratoga | | | | | | | | | | |
| 30,627 | 2,473 | 17 | 87 | 250+ | 4 | 2.84 | \$1,387,250 | \$1,001,300 | 72.18% | 6 |

Note that Saratoga and Los Gatos have a joint parks and recreation district that provides services to the community.

Operational Comparison

Los Altos' Recreation and Community Services Department operating budget is theoretically most comparable to Menlo Park, which likewise does not have a combined Parks Services and Recreation Department. That being said, Menlo Park has 45 more recreational employees, and a cost recovery of 54% (one of the lowest), compared to Los Altos' 91% cost recovery. Furthermore, Los Altos maintains the second smallest amount of Recreation FTEs (The amount of Park FTEs and Recreation FTEs have been accounted for to help visualize facility maintenance spending). Lastly, Los Altos has the second smallest operating budget of all the observed cities.



Los Altos Recreation and Community Services Organizational Review & Strategy

Table 2. Program and Rental Fee Similarities and Differences

| Program Fees | | | | | | Rental Fees | | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------|----------------|--------------------|-----------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Youth Resident | Youth Non Resident | Adult Resident | Adult Non Resident | Senior Resident | Senior Non Resident | Available for Rent | Large Rooms | Meeting Rooms | Picnic Area Rental | Other Outdoor Rentals |
| Belmont | | | | | | | | | | |
| \$15-43 | \$17-48 | \$7-11 | \$8-13 | \$7-11 | \$8-13 | 9 spaces | \$135-275 | \$50-90 per hour | \$99-180 | \$30-75 |
| Burlingame | | | | | | | | | | |
| \$12-86 | \$14-104 | \$8-45 | \$10-52 | \$6-37 | \$8-45 | 9 Rooms | \$148-293 | \$114-\$160 per hour | \$102-357 | \$18-50 |
| Foster City | | | | | | | | | | |
| \$13-27 | \$13-27 | \$7-26 | \$7-26 | Free-\$14 | Free-\$14 | 13 rooms | \$125-300 | \$40-180 | \$75-225 | \$10-35 |
| Los Altos | | | | | | | | | | |
| \$13-45 | \$15-54 | \$3-33 | \$3-39 | Free-\$20 | Free-\$25 | 25 spaces | \$110-138 | \$56-138 per hour | \$199-249 | \$25-56 |
| Menlo Park | | | | | | | | | | |
| \$13-34 | \$18-46 | \$8-74 | \$8-99 | Free-\$3 | Free-\$3 | 28 spaces | \$75-200 | \$55-100 per hour | \$10-18 | \$10-100 |
| San Carlos | | | | | | | | | | |
| \$17-38 | \$19-41 | \$10-41 | \$12-41 | Free-\$41 | Free-\$41 | 2 spaces | \$150-200 | n/a | \$15 | \$15-30 |
| Saratoga | | | | | | | | | | |
| \$15-25 | \$15-25 | \$9-55 | \$9-55 | \$9-55 | \$9 | 10 spaces | \$175-200 | \$75-200 | \$15/hour | \$15/hour |

Los Altos has the second highest maximum fee for the “Youth Resident, Youth Non-Resident, and Adult Resident” program fee behind Burlingame. Regarding rental fees, Los Altos has the second highest “Other Outdoor Rental” minimum, behind Belmont, and the third highest maximum “Other Outdoor Rental” fee behind Menlo Park and Belmont. There may be a benefit of further assessing each fee level to determine what is best for Los Altos in light of a desire for a high cost recovery rate.



Recommendations

Recommendations are presented in two parts: An Initial Strategic Framework; and a New Organizational Structure. The first provides a vision, goals and strategies to address a large number of the issues and concerns identified. The second is a new Organizational Structure to help to phase in additional staff and a restructuring to meet these overall needs and prepare for the new community center.

Initial Strategic Framework

The following vision, goals, strategies, and success metrics provides the Department with a framework to strategically evolve and grow to meet the current and future needs of the community. The strategies will likely be updated in Phase 2 of this work as the Department determine the needs and focus for the Community Center.

Department Mission

The Department's mission was developed previously with a different director and staff and is planned to be updated with staff in the coming year to reflect the ongoing understanding of the purpose and focus of the department.

The Los Altos Recreation Department strives to enrich community members through active participation in lifelong learning, health and wellness, community involvement, and recreational activities.

Vision

Build a department to ensure its essential services enhance the quality of life in Los Altos through offerings that create community through people, parks and programs.

CPRS Statewide Vision: Creating Community in the 21st Century

To achieve this vision, there are nine missions that park and recreation programming and facilities should demonstrate:

- Strengthen community image and sense of place
- Support economic development
- Strengthen safety and security
- Promote health and wellness
- Foster human development
- Increase cultural unity
- Protect environmental resources
- Facilitate community problem solving
- Provide recreational experiences



Department Goals & Strategies

1. Expand the number and breadth of programs and events that are high quality, inclusive, and appealing to all populations, interests, and ages.

Strategies

- Ensure relevancy and success of programs with a policy and procedures to regularly evaluate, add, and discontinue programs.
- Increase the number of programs targeted to active adults, using new modalities and innovative approaches.
- Dedicate staff to develop and manage programs targeted at different populations, with particular attention to adults and teens - two underserved populations.
- Actively schedule and promote programs citywide, utilizing all city recreation facilities, parks, and expanding formal program spaces into the outdoors.

Measures of Success

- Increase in enrollment rate in programs and classes for youth, teens, young adults, adults, and seniors.
- Increase in the availability and success in programs for adults and teens.
- Consistent positive feedback from class participants and community members.
- Growth in community turnout at events (community members from both the North and South part of town have increased participation).
- Improvements to health and well-being through physical and social activity.
- Expansion of events and activities that celebrate Los Altos history and community traditions.

2. Increase community awareness and department relevance by supporting ongoing community engagement and involvement.

Strategies

- Identify Department staff roles and responsibilities to actively and consistently engage the community including appointing a community lead to foster feedback and involvement in a regular manner.



Los Altos Recreation and Community Services Organizational Review & Strategy

- Create clear metrics and data collection tools and processes to systematically evaluate and understand community satisfaction and needs. (Management Analyst)
- Institutionalize and establish formal partnerships with community organizations and neighboring communities, including Los Altos Hills to enhance programs and services.
- Develop procedures to better involve and leverage commissions and volunteers in the pursuit of the Department's mission.

Measures of Success

- Increase in partnerships and relationships with other organizations, resulting in an increase in cross-promotion and co-hosting of activities and events.
- Enhanced productivity of volunteers as advocates of the Department and as effective partners in service delivery.
- Improved utilization of Commissions as supporters and advisors to the Department.
- More opportunities for community members, individually or in groups (committees), to share ideas with better feedback and transparency about the development of programs, projects, and events.
- Significant increase in community awareness about available programs, facilities and opportunities to recreate.

3. Ensure that the City's recreation facilities and parks welcome the community, create a sense of place, model sustainable practices, and contribute to the City's character.

Strategies

- Initiate a comprehensive Parks and Recreation Master Plan for the City by the end of 2021.
- Work with City leadership to adopt regenerative, resilient and sustainable guidelines for all indoor recreation facilities and parks development, operation, and maintenance.
- Design and operate indoor and outdoor spaces with the customer in mind, providing ample seating and gathering areas that invite community members to linger, as well as amenities and places that offer comfort and enjoyment.
- Ensure that all recreation facilities, parks, and programmable spaces are optimized for community enjoyment and use.



Los Altos Recreation and Community Services Organizational Review & Strategy

- Work with other City and community operators to coordinate, promote and align civic center activities, rentals, and overall activation for the benefit of community members.

Measures of Success

- Use of all City recreation and park facilities are maximized.
- Facilities and parks are well maintained and function for their intended use.
- Users feel a sense of ownership and accountability in the responsiveness and care of City's facilities and parks.
- Facilities and parks welcome teens, seniors, adults and kids to hang out, to simply enjoy and experience – no program or fee required.
- Parks and recreation facilities are operated at the highest level of environmental sustainability.

4. Establish a department organization that fosters long-term employment, staff development opportunities, efficiency, and a customer-service oriented culture.

Strategies

- Restructure the Department to establish additional leadership and management positions and to allow for promotion and retention of employees.
- Foster a customer service culture with all Department staff, instilling the necessity to make facilities as welcoming as possible, and to ensure inclusivity in programs and events.
- Update department policies and procedures to clarify roles and responsibilities and reduce redundancy and gaps in services.
- Hold annual staff strategy and innovation gatherings to empower and inspire staff, support an inclusive team culture, and to provide a common understanding of goals and purpose.

Measures of Success

- Employees feel valued, have purpose, and opportunity to grow.
- Increase in work performance and department efficiencies.
- Increase in revenue and attendance
- Turnover rate is dramatically reduced.
- Overall sense of common vision and goals for the department.



5. Balance cost recovery goals with inclusivity, access, and community needs

Strategies

- Establish a class and rental fee schedule that is consistent, fair, and regularly evaluated to ensure effectiveness.
- Adopt a community scholarship fee program to enable all members of the community to access all programs and facilities equally.
- Create rental schedules for facilities that allow for low to no cost community access, with market rate slots to balance revenue generation and community access.
- Assess City recreation facilities, outdoor spaces, and parks to determine their highest and best use, considering how to serve community members throughout the city, and to offer a broad and balanced set of offerings. (*Connect to Parks & Recreation Master Plan Development*)
- Organize the Department so that it can ensure equitable and inclusive service to all (JEDI).

Measure of Success


- All community members have access and can participate in the City programs.
- Defined high revenue programs/rentals are optimized and result in increased revenues.
- Optimize low cost or no cost community organization access/scheduled time to facilities (tbd).
- Increase in outdoor space that is available for reservations and programs.



Organization Structure

Working with Department staff, informed by the comparable assessment and findings outlined in this document, the following restructuring of the Department is recommended. The new structure will bring the City more in line with its neighboring cities, help to retain staff, and allow the Department to successfully meet community priorities. It is anticipated that the full realization of this structure may take time and be phased as the Community Center is opened, and the strategies identified above are implemented. The new structure achieves several key objectives:

1. Adds a new Manager to enable higher levels of strategic management of the programs and events while providing a position for growth in the organization.
2. Enhances the current manager position to ensure optimization of facilities citywide, including the civic center, adds a Recreation Supervisor to manage operations and rentals in all of the City's facilities and parks to improve revenues, and provides dedicated management of the community center with a new Recreation Supervisor.
3. Provides needed administrative support with a new Executive Assistant in line with other departments and a Management Analyst to provide data analysis capabilities to monitor and track activities.



1. Commission Liaison role would fall to the Supervisor level and above – Youth Supervisor = Youth Commission, Adult Supervisor = Senior Commission, Recreation Manager = Library Commission, Director = P & R
 2. Events will be divided among staff



Los Altos Recreation and Community Services Organizational Review & Strategy

- An improved programming staff structure to enhance services and expand to all age groups.

Table 3 below provides additional details about each position, the anticipated roles and rationale for new or expanded positions.

Table 3. Staffing functions, roles and rationale

| Title | Function | New/Existing/Temp | Primary Role (summary) | Rationale for new staff or expanded role |
|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|
| Recreation & Community Services Director | Director | Existing | Strategic Vision, oversight and management of Department | |
| Recreation Manager | Programs | New | Manages the strategy and development of the recreation programs and events | Optimize programming and events; consistency in messaging and procedures; overall evaluation and setting measures of success; staying current and relevant with trends and market rates; public engagement and establishing partnerships; optimize revenue generation and service levels |
| Recreation Manager | Operations and LACC | Existing | Oversees Department operations and all buildings, parks and Civic Center optimization, coordination, and collaboration | Additional focus on Civic Center collaboration and coordination; oversight of new partnership with the Museum; optimize revenue generation and service levels |
| Executive Assistant | Administrative | New | Admin/clerical support to Recreation and Community Services Director and Management Analyst | Allows director and managers to be more efficient and focus on priorities; consistency with other City departments; volume of communication, community requests and PRAs, and coordination with PARC and high-profile projects and workplans |
| Management Analyst Fellow | Administrative | New, different funding source | Data/project analysis, research, management and public outreach | Specialized skills and experience specific to analytical work throughout the department, including development of strategies and monitoring priorities |
| Recreation Supervisor | Youth and Events | Existing | Event and program organizer and supervisor for Youth | |
| Recreation Supervisor | Adults, Seniors, & Events | New | Event and program organizer and supervisor for Adults and Seniors | Need for adult programming and events; coordination of consistent and all-encompassing senior offerings; liaison of commission specified to supervisor level; demographics of population; need for specialized marketing |
| Recreation Supervisor | Citywide Facilities and Parks | New | Optimizes the use of all of the City's recreation facilities and parks, | Support new collaboration and agreement with the Museum; increased revenue and exposure (bundling) |



Los Altos Recreation and Community Services Organizational Review & Strategy

| Title | Function | New/Existing/Temp | Primary Role (summary) | Rationale for new staff or expanded role |
|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | including the History Museum | |
| Recreation Supervisor | Community Center | New | Day to day management and oversight of the community center | Consistent management/leadership to ensure the new community center is customer service friendly and welcoming as a community destination; hub for information and referral; optimize usage |
| Recreation Coordinator | Marketing | Existing (combination of 2 PTE) | Supports the Department to engage the community, advertise programs, events, parks and facilities; coordinates community-wide campaigns; | Combines 2 part time positions to create 1 full time; employee recruitment and retention |
| Recreation Coordinator | Youth and Camps | Existing | Coordinates youth programs and summer camps and seasonal staff | |
| Recreation Coordinator | Sports and Teens | Existing | Coordinates teens and sports | |
| Recreation Coordinator | Seniors | Existing | Program and event manager for seniors | |
| Recreation Coordinator | Adults and Volunteers | New | Coordinates programs and events for adults and manages volunteers | Lack of programming/focus on adults; employee recruitment and retention |
| Recreation Coordinator | Facilities and Permits | Existing | Coordinates use of facilities, especially for events and coordinates the permits for the events | |
| Recreation Coordinator | Contract Classes | New | Manages contractors for contract classes, coordinating logistics, facilities and schedules | Consistency in process; maximize offerings; stay current with trends; monitor and evaluate offerings |
| Office Manager | Administrative | Existing | Supports staff and recreation center scheduling, logistics, and coordination | Change from Office Assistant II and enable a higher level of work and efficiency in the department. |
| Seasonal Temporary Staff | Varied | Existing | Supports staff in a variety of areas as needed | |
| Recreation Specialist | Recreation Center | Part-Time | | |
| Reception and Facility Attendants | Recreation Center | New/Part-time | Operate the main desk and support events and classes | Flexible hourly employees to support longer operating hours. Number and need to be determined. |
| Facility Attendants | Citywide | Part-Time | Support facility events | |



**Parks
Make
Life
Better!**

**Los Altos Recreation and Community Services
Organizational Review & Strategy**

Appendix

Overview

To understand the current state and various perspectives of individuals, community members, and leaders by the Los Altos Parks Recreation and Community Services Department, BluePoint Planning conducted a range of engagement activities including two surveys, six small group meetings, and six individual interviews with stakeholders. The first survey targeted an open-ended audience which mainly consisted of community members and individuals from organizations affiliated with the Recreation and Community Services Department (82 responses), and the second survey consisted of employed staff members (12 responses). Six small interest group meetings were held (consisting of 5-6 people each) to further understand audiences who had similar interests and concerns. Finally, six one-on-one interviews were conducted to understand the thoughts and concerns of community leaders. In summary, approximately 135 total respondents were engaged. The feedback echoed many of the same themes, but also provided additional information around a vision for the future of the Recreation and Community Services Department. Below is a summary of the input and key themes, with detailed responses for each activity provided on the following pages.

Primary Themes

There were a number of important themes, but the following comments were mentioned multiple times by a variety of respondents.

- Develop strategies to mitigate the perceived divide between northern and southern areas
- Revitalize existing programs, and create new programs that appeal to a wider variety of individuals (i.e. add more interesting classes for seniors and youth)
- Re-evaluate fee charges, budgetary restrictions, cost-recovery goal, and costs
- Retain and support excellent staff

The themes that were observed the most throughout all surveys and meetings revolved around the north and south divide of the town, the lack of interesting programs offered, and economic issues such as high fee charges and low budget constraints. While it is certain that the Recreation and Community Services Department cannot alleviate the north and south divide alone, perhaps it could provide community integration which in turn may reduce these concerns. Although the department does already offer a range of programs, the existing ones do not meet the interests of the general community; further investigation should be done to uncover the community's interests, so that each individual's needs can be accommodated. Additionally, high fee charges, and low budget constraints were frequently discussed; further evaluation of cost recovery and city funding will be required to mitigate economic concerns and strategies. Finally, the Department staff were widely hailed as excellent and critical to its success, while at the same time recognizing the need to do a better job of retaining staff and avoiding frequent turn over.

In addition to these main themes, other comments that apply to external operations as well as internal needs were articulated.

External Themes

- Uphold the vision of the Community Center being a positive place where all members of the community can interact and come together
- Online Registration and Advanced Registration must be implemented, as the current process is long and tedious
- Implement a better method of communication that can be easily accessed by the public (i.e. an events calendar, and increase informational emails)
- Expand partnerships and relationships with neighboring towns, school district, and community organizations
- Make the Recreation department in charge of oversight of the Civic Center to unite and expand events and coordination
- Consider COVID limitations while creating community social distancing events and online classes or programs to maintain community engagement
- Address (in partnership with other departments) accessibility and transportation issues related to parking, bikeability, and walkability to provide better connections and access to recreation services across town.

Internal Themes

- Clarify the roles of each employee, and whom they respond to
- Improve onboarding of new employees
- Consider offering more benefits to reduce turnover rate (i.e. offer training resources for new employees, and provide a competitive salary)
- Need to restructure the department to offer more promotional opportunities and efficiencies in operation

Opportunities

- Capitalize on the excitement of the new community center (i.e. increase awareness through social media)
- Increase Partnerships to draw on positive aspects of other organizations (i.e. YMCA, Los Altos School District, Foothill College, Public Library, other cities)
- Establish regular evaluations from both the community and staff
- Evaluate past successful programs and events, and consider reintroducing them
- Schedule Community Events that integrate both the northern and southern areas of the town
- Consider adding more programs and classes that revolve around fitness, health, and education (i.e. active classes, healthy cooking classes, etc.)
- Increase maintenance and cleanliness of all facilities
- Build on Downtown street closures and consider how recreation can help to activate the streets

External Survey

Overview

To gather the general community's thoughts towards the Recreation and Community Services Department, and the introduction of the new community center, BluePoint Planning conducted a survey geared towards a broad community audience. There were 82 respondents to the survey which was available for over 3 weeks. The following is a summary of the main themes and key points found in the responses.

Respondent Characteristics

Question 1

Organization, Department, or Affiliation

Respondents were asked to state their organization, department, or affiliation with the Recreation and Community Services Department. Approximately 58% of the respondents were affiliated with a public organization, 12% were affiliated with a Private organization, 7% represented Educational Services organizations, 15% of the respondents were Individuals, and 8.2% of respondents were affiliated with the Los Altos Recreation and Community Services Department.

Question 2

Respondent Employment

To better understand the specific perspective coming from each respondent, respondents were asked to state their position or job title. The most common job titles were "President", "Director", "Instructor", "Manager", "Director", "Executive", "Teacher", "Chair", "Volunteer", "Coordinator", "Analyst", and "Commissioner".

Question 3

Respondent Coordination with the Department

63% of respondents reported communication with the Department on a weekly to monthly basis.

Question 4

Department Impact on Respondent's work

Respondents were asked, "To what extent does the Recreation and Community Services Department work impact yours?". Data reflected that the respondent's work is impacted by Recreation and Community Services sometime. Approximately 53% of the respondents revealed that their work is sometimes impacted by the department, 38% of the respondents reported that their work is substantially impacted by the department, and 7% of the respondents revealed that their work is unimpacted by the department.


Los Altos Recreation and Community Services
Organizational Assessment

Question 5

When asked to rate the Recreation and Community Services' job at fulfilling its role for the City of Los Altos, nearly half of the respondents rated them as "Great" (47%), a third as "Good" (37%). Approximately 14% of the respondents rated the Department as "Ok", and "Poor". This data supports the idea that, in general, the Department of Recreation and Community Services has been fulfilling its role for the City of Los Altos.

Overall, how well do you think the Recreation & Community Services Department fulfills its role for the City of Los Altos?

Answered: 79 Skipped: 3



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|----------------|-----------|-----------|
| Great | 46.84% | 37 |
| Good | 36.71% | 29 |
| Ok | 11.39% | 9 |
| Poor | 2.53% | 2 |
| Not at all | 0.00% | 0 |
| TOTAL | | 79 |

What could the Department do to improve success?

Question 6

When asked, "What could the Department do to improve success?", respondents were given a list of suggestions which they proceeded to rank.

Top Suggestions

- Create new approaches to providing services (25%)

Organizational Assessment

- Increased engagement in the community (25%)
- Nothing they are doing a great job (21%)
- Offer new programs (17%)
- Updated Rental Policies and Procedures (17%)
- Communication and/or marketing (17%)

Additionally, most comments from the selection “Other” expressed dissatisfaction with high fees, desire for better maintenance of facilities and increased partnerships, transportation issues, dissatisfaction with disorganization of the staff and lack of communication and reiterated the lack of interesting programs for seniors.

| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|---|------------------|----|
| Stronger ties and more engagement with other city departments | 13.33% | 10 |
| Better coordination internally | 12.00% | 9 |
| Increased engagement with the community | 25.33% | 19 |
| More staff | 10.67% | 8 |
| Updated Rental Policies and Procedures | 17.33% | 13 |
| Nothing, they are doing a great job | 21.33% | 16 |
| Updated User Fees and Policies | 14.67% | 11 |
| Offer new programs | 17.33% | 13 |
| Create new approaches to providing services | 25.33% | 19 |
| Communication and/or marketing | 17.33% | 13 |
| Other (please explain) | Responses 45.33% | 34 |
| Total Respondents: 75 | | |

How can the department coordinate better with the community and organizations?

Question 7

Approximately (38.7%) of the respondents believe that the communication level is satisfactory as is; however, a third of respondents (29.3%) would like regular information sharing. A quarter of respondents (25.33%) of respondents chose “other” and their comments reflected a common desire for access to an events calendar and more information.

| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|---|------------------|----|
| Regular meetings | 9.33% | 7 |
| Regular information sharing | 29.33% | 22 |
| Emails | 20.00% | 15 |
| Establish written protocols for coordination and working together | 22.67% | 17 |
| Not Necessary | 38.67% | 29 |
| Other (please specify) | Responses 25.33% | 19 |
| Total Respondents: 75 | | |


Los Altos Recreation and Community Services
Organizational Assessment

Question 8.

When asked, “What is the most important thing for the Recreation & Community Services Department to do in the coming 1-3 years?”, a third (31%) of respondents answered, “Address recreation needs across the Community, not just at the new Center”, a quarter (24.3%) of respondents suggested, “Focus on making the New Community Center success in the community”, and 13% of respondents answered, “Make sure that services are provided equitably across the City”.

What is the most important thing for the Recreation & Community Services Department to do in the coming 1-3 years?

Answered: 74 Skipped: 8



| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES |
|---|-----------|
| Focus on making the New Community Center a success in the community | 24.32% 18 |
| Address recreation needs across the Community, not just at the new Center | 31.08% 23 |
| Make sure that services are provided equitably across the City | 13.51% 10 |
| Increase cost recovery rates of programs and offerings | 2.70% 2 |
| Expand program offerings | 2.70% 2 |
| Make Los Altos a leader in Parks and Recreation | 4.05% 3 |
| Ensure that the Department can retain good staff | 6.76% 5 |
| Other (please specify) Responses | 14.86% 11 |
| TOTAL | 74 |

Comments for “Other” reflected a desire for

- System wide change
- More basketball facilities

Organizational Assessment

- Improved quality of the fields
- More fields
- Cooperation between Recreation and Community Services Department and the School District
- Integration of the Civic Center campus with the Community Center
- More gyms
- More attention towards local bands

Additional Feedback Highlights

Question 9

The respondents were asked if they had any additional feedback that they wanted to provide. The following gives a summary of those additional thoughts and comments.

- Increase custodial services, maintenance, and guidelines
- Decrease fees, as high fees discourage community involvement and accessibility (especially among seniors and students)
- Publicize information, and partner with outside organizations
- Increase marketing
- Foster an environment where part time employees feel they are part of the team
- Support youth sports and volunteer organizations to allow for greater participation
- Create more interesting programs and classes
- Revitalize programs (with COVID, the creation of programs that allow for engagement without risk is essential)
- Link Civic Center campus with Community Center
- Enable advanced online registration/applications
- Increase musical performances from local bands
- Increase Senior Outreach, and increase marketing

Staff Member Survey

Overview

A 16-question survey was sent to the Los Altos Recreation Staff to gather feedback on how they perceived the Department, and their team. General questions included ranking and open-ended styles. The following provides a summary of the themes and key points that were discussed.

SWOT Highlights

Question 1. Internal Strengths

- **Team-oriented Culture**
- **Customer service oriented**
- **Openness and Flexibility**
- Aware of the community
- Resilient
- Creative
- Experience from staff that have worked for other recreation departments
- Positive and supportive attitude
- Connected with the community
- Supervisors check-in with their staff weekly
- Employees take initiative

Question 2. Internal Weaknesses

- **High Turnover**
- **Organizational flow and structure do not work**
- **Low pay, low budget, lack of FTEs**
- Lack and change of policies
- Ambiguity around which specific roles correspond to each position
- Inexperienced younger staff
- Addressing the need for progress in the community
- Limited staff functions (i.e. front desk staff cannot do customers refunds, approval from upper management slow)
- Lack of diversity
- Small department
- Minimal community roots in the department, which causes disconnect with community traditions
- Lack of guidance (and resources) on projects
- Facility attendants do not aid facility renters
- Over-Communication -- unnecessary emails and "chatter"
- Fear of starting new events and low preparedness if the event setup changes
- Lack of employee training
- Lack of recreation specialists to help support daily operations

Los Altos Recreation and Community Services
Organizational Assessment

- Hour limit for part-time employees

Question 3. External Opportunities

- **Capitalize on the excitement of a new community center**
- **Participate in partnerships**
- **Conduct Regular Evaluations**
- **Schedule more Community Events!**
- Youth engagement
- New offerings
- High unemployment may help with retention
- Virtual/online programs and classes
- Local Business Collaborations
- Collaborate with already established successful events
- Play a larger role in the City's E.O.C
- Create new programs that take physical distancing into consideration
- Offer recreational activities to Veterans
- Create playgrounds for all abilities/walking paths with equipment
- Create private party rental package
- Lack of disaster preparedness

Question 4. External Threats

- **COVID-19 limitations**
- **Equitable accessibility and city fee policy**
- **Competing programs and efforts from other cities and providers**
- **Ability to retain staff without promotional opportunities**
- Not seen as an essential service
- Lack of quality and interesting programs
- Traffic and commute
- Child care vs programs
- City not having funds to pay for free programs
- High Cost of living
- Aging infrastructure
- Community hesitant to accept change
- Lack of disaster preparedness

Question 5

When Respondents were asked if they felt like they were a part of a team, 100% of respondents answered "Yes".


Understanding Roles

Question 6

- When respondents were asked about their understanding of others' roles, 9 of the 12 respondents felt that "Most Times" department members understood their roles and expectations, and 3 feel this "Sometimes"

On a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 the lowest, do you feel like people in the department understand their roles and what is expected of them?

Answered: 12 Skipped: 0



Question 7


When respondents were asked about their understanding of their own roles, 8 respondents felt that they understand their role in the department "Most times", 3 felt that they "absolutely" understand their roles and expectations, and 1 felt they "sometimes understood their role and expectations.

Los Altos Recreation and Community Services

Organizational Assessment

On a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 the lowest, do you feel like you understand your own role?

Answered: 12 Skipped: 0



It is evident that there is a fair amount of ambiguity around the specific roles that pertain to each employee. In order to have a structured work environment, roles need to be clarified.


Staff Support

Question 8

A supportive team environment is crucial for every workplace! When asked about how supported in their day-to-day work (resources, management colleagues, etc.), staff members felt, 8 people felt supported “All the time”, 7 felt that they were “Sometimes” supported, and 4 felt that “Most Times” they are supported.

On a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being the lowest, rate how well you feel you are supported in your day-to-day work. (resources, management, colleagues, etc.)

Answered: 12 Skipped: 0




Use of Strengths

Question 9

When the staff was asked about if they felt their skills were being utilized to the fullest extent, 7 people responded that “Most Times” their strengths were being used, and 4 people felt that “Sometimes” their strengths were being used. Comments reflected dissatisfaction in the work they were producing due to limitations such as strict budget, high turnover rate, and the desire to perform better in a different position.

On a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being the lowest, do you believe your strengths are being used well in the Department?

Answered: 12 Skipped: 0



Changes to Increase Work Performance

Question 10

Following the evaluation of their work strengths, employees were asked what specific changes would help them perform to the best of their ability. The list below reflects their suggestions.

- Re-organize staff structure so that there is a direct supervisor
- Redefine tasks for each staff member to increase the awareness of each employee
- Consider expanding the budget
- Create guidelines for assignments to erase general confusion
- Change software so that technical issues are limited
- Clarify the difference of roles between Recreation and MSC (Parks and Facilities)
- Consider contracting for certain services when employees are not qualified
- Offer healthy snacks in the office
- Create an alternating work schedule, and telecommuting after SIP in order to increase frequent communication while eliminating the hassle of meeting in person each week
- Remain in one location
- Train new employees and provide them with resources to learn their role as efficiently as possible
- Host one large event at a time

Enhancements that would make the department more effective

Question 11

Of nine enhancements listed, employees ranked enhancements they believed would make the department more effective. “Providing more opportunities for advancement” was the leading answer, “Increasing the number of full-time employees” followed, and “Developing new organizational structure” was third. Overall, the data reflects employees’ general desire for all listed enhancements to be enacted.

| ANSWER CHOICES | RESPONSES | |
|--|-----------|---|
| ▼ Provide more opportunities for advancement | 75.00% | 9 |
| ▼ Increase the number of full-time employees | 58.33% | 7 |
| ▼ Have clear goals to measure our success | 41.67% | 5 |
| ▼ Increase awareness and support from other departments | 33.33% | 4 |
| ▼ Develop better job descriptions and roles and responsibilities | 33.33% | 4 |
| ▼ Develop a new organizational structure to support optimum operations | 50.00% | 6 |
| ▼ Increase feedback from management | 0.00% | 0 |
| ▼ Develop better policies and procedures for operations | 41.67% | 5 |
| ▼ Increase consistency in our operations for all our facilities and programs | 41.67% | 5 |
| Total Respondents: 12 | | |

The Community Center’s Impact on the Department

Question 12

Staff members were asked what how they believed the community center will impact the Department. The following reflects their thoughts.

Positives

- Provide Community Pride
- Encourage Inclusivity
- Motivate and inspire staff
- Grow recreation department
- Provide creativity
- Increase revenue from rental fees
- Provide more recreational opportunities

Considerations

Staffing

- Increase of staff needs
- Increase of communication difficulties amongst staff
- Requires adaptation to functions of a larger space

Organizational Assessment

- Increase of stress to keep programs with a limited budget
- Adds pressure to increase programs
- Decrease of revenue from classroom rental space

Programming/ Community

- Increase of public expectations
- Large exercise classes will be impacted

Immediate Goals

Question 13

- Create new systematic, organizational strategy (i.e. focus on policies, increasing staff, and employee retention rate)
- Plan an employee retreat
- Fill coordinator vacancy
- Collaborate with partners
- Shift to a new recreation software
- Increase focus on training staff in online communication and efficiency
- Increase general safety
- Strategize staying connected with the community and marketing (especially important during SIP to maintain community interest)
- Improve maintenance procedures for facility, gym, and field rentals
- Update community needs assessment
- Establish contract classes for youth, teens, and adults

Question 14

Long-Term Goals

- Increase employee longevity
- Keep Seniors, Teens, and Youth engaged
- Increase collaborations with local businesses, nonprofits, and community organizations
- Consistently create new programs that align with the desires of the community
- Maintain health and safety of community members (i.e. aid community members in both their physical mental health)
- Improve CIT and Internship programs which would further provide youth engagement
- Become a City of Los Altos essential service

Revenue Goals and Community Center

- Establish cost recovery target
- Streamline commissions

Organizational Assessment

- Strategize how to best utilize the community center and maintain those strategies
- Retaining large budget amounts for program refinement
- Increase revenue through expanding offerings

Question 15

Measures of Success

- Increase revenue, staff retention, participation, adherence to strategy and Master Plans
- Increase the amount of general fund money allocated to recreation
- Increase staff and community feedback
- Grow program variety and social media (event turn-out, social media, followers, email subscribers, and post “likes”)

Stakeholder Interviews

Overview

To better understand the perspective of community leaders, BluePoint Planning conducted a series of one on one interviews with stakeholders associated with the Los Altos Recreation Department. Interviews were conducted with Jan Pepper, Claudia Coleman, Ms. J Logan, Anita Enander, Marie Backs, Neysa Fligor. The following is a summary of those conversations and key points discussed. Please note that these discussions reflect opinions, and, in some cases, assertions may not be factually correct, but in truth, are a perception of the individual or group.

Highlighted Needs

- Promote increased funding for the recreation program
- Clarify fund allocation and dispersion
- Consider parking restraints and lack of accessibility
- Strategize to enable more compromise among community members and organizations
- Increase measures to address inaccessibility (i.e. walkability, transportation)
- Allocate space for all recreation activities of interest
- Promote the addition of new public parks
- Break the divide between northern and southern areas of the town

Key Opportunities

- Optimize lobby space, and overall space of the community space (i.e. multipurpose spaces that offer flexibility)
- Consider competing needs from various organizations, and implement systematic scheduling such that each affiliated organization can define their needs
- Clarify the goals of the Community Center, and what the COVID goals of the recreation program are
- Create infrastructure to determine the general fund dispersion
- Reflect on the successful programs and failed programs to enrich current programs and bring back past successful ones
- Allow Community Center to serve as a disaster location in case of an emergency
- Promote environmentally sustainable measures

Immediate Goals

- Supplement activities, rather than compete with schools or other organizations (make up for what they lack)
- Create goals around target audiences (i.e. implement programs that keep the target audience engaged)
- Keep successful programs intact, while seeking out new programs

Organizational Assessment

- Create advanced online enrollment/registration
- Define the Community Center -as an institution or dynamic gathering spot
- Ensure the space of the Community Center is as functional and multipurpose as possible
- Consider the addition of intergenerational activities
- Create community events while taking into account COVID
- Develop more programs that revolve around health and activity
- Optimize utilization of Grant Park

Measures of Success

- Create an efficient space where people are excited to spend time
- Ensure members of the community feel proud of the Community
- Address all interests of the community through a wider variety of classes
- Functionality throughout indoor space and outdoor space

Cost Recovery for the Community Center

- Set a cost-recovery goal, and create the infrastructure to maintain that goal
- Make classes that are high in demand or require more expertise a higher cost, so that it may balance the total cost; additionally, this would provide data regarding what the highest cost an individual is willing to pay for a class
- Maintain fee structure, but reconsider fees
- Keep community programs (where there are no fees)

North and South Areas

- Use the community center to attract teens, rather than Downtown, which is a popular spot for youth
- Consider Grant Park as a location that could collaborate with the Senior Center
- Consider promoting walkability and transportation programs within the city

Other Considerations

- Monitor goals and measures of success frequently
- Maintain frequent communication and conversation with the community
- Think about maximizing space while social distancing
- Do not separate the department from the community
- Increase retention of community members and staff
- Maintain room fee structure
- Increase work with Los Altos Hills (i.e. align with their programs and practices to generate more funds)

Small Groups Meetings

Overview

BluePoint Planning held six virtual online, hour and a half, small group meetings to gather further community feedback. The six groups included a "Senior Group", "Community Group", "Internal Departments", "Sports Group", "Non-Profits", "Business Group", and contained 5-8 people per meeting. The planning process was presented, and the attendees were asked to give their insights as it pertained to Issues and Challenges, Opportunities and Trends, as well as other important feedback. The following is a summary of those conversations and key points that were brought forth and discussed.

Seniors and Teens

- Create intergenerational activities to encourage interaction between youth and seniors
- Ensure quality food and beverages at the new Community center, as it will draw out youth and seniors
- Introduce a system where community members may suggest programs of interest, and staff implements those suggestions
- Evaluate the community's interest, as many individuals feel their interests are not met among current programs
- Consider adding a wider variety of active and inactive programs for both seniors and teens to optimize socialization
- Consider implementing a technology class for seniors, or anyone curious to know more about operating technology
- Expand outdoor programming and classes
- Plan events to promote community events/engagement while keeping COVID limitations in mind (COVID)
- Consider adding more classes and programs with high educational value
- Introduce the idea that Shoup Park could host the teen center
- Introduce the idea that the Community Center could host the senior program
- Promote "Club 55", and create other clubs similar to its nature
- Create a safe space for youth and seniors to spend time
- Allow youth and seniors to suggest classes and programs
- Encourage teens to volunteer for senior programs: manage reservations, hand out equipment, open and close the facility
- Partner with the youth commission, senior events, Los Altos Hills, and the library

North and South Areas

- Ensure the southern facilities see increased attention with the new center in the north
- Create events that bring both the northern areas and southern areas together
- Create a transportation system for the community members who cannot easily get to the community center (i.e. vans, shuttles, carpooling)

Organizational Assessment

- Strategize how to reduce the divide between the north and south areas

Highlighted Community Needs

- Allocate space within parks for relaxation, along with allocating space for recreation
- Consider adding a fitness center in an underutilized area
- Clean and maintain facilities frequently

Access and Connections

- Understand and plan around the competing needs from various organizations (i.e. scheduling and intention needs to be defined for each organization that wishes to use space)
- Address transportation issues (i.e. implement a shuttle system)
- Increase partnership/relationships with non-profits to enhance and add more programs and classes

Programs/Events

- Expand outdoor programming within the Civic Center itself (the rec department could potentially be a hub for organizing the activities)
- Increase communication
- Promote virtual recreation programs, and schedule social distancing events
- Increase access to technology to expand knowledge among the senior community
- Increase music and gathering opportunities (i.e. musicians and speakers)
- Enable the potential for pop up activities (i.e. agile and pursued in the moment - not overly planned)
- Introduce events that involve food, music, and exercise
- Implement programs with higher educational value

Spaces

- Considering closing one of the streets downtown
- Showcase the new facility, and promote updating other facilities
- Allocate space for relaxation, and busier spaces for gathering
- Create more amenities for seniors
- Consider Foothill Park in Palo Alto as a possible joint use opportunity (i.e. an active space for the community)

Other

- Ensure southern facilities receive attention
- Add restrooms to any future gyms/ facilities
- Consider turf fields for the little league to aid with field maintenance
- Create a more transparent budget, with allocations for each location
- Look at best practices from other communities
- COVID-19 safety and health elements

Organizational Assessment

- Consider installing water filling stations that do not require touch or contact

Funding/Fees

- Re-evaluate programs that pay for themselves and other fees
- Create a more transparent budget (i.e. publicize dispersion of funds)
- Consider expanding volunteer opportunities (i.e. teens need volunteering hours, and their involvement would increase intergenerational activities)

Awareness/Promotion

- Expand volunteer network
- Encourage the community to write on recreation blog (i.e. provides more awareness through social media, and allows members to give suggestions, or ideas)
- Cross-promote and collaborate with other organizations (i.e. library, school district)



Overview

The following provides a brief summary of key similarities and differences in the Parks, Parks and Recreation Departments, fee and prices, and other amenities existing in cities that are comparable to Los Altos in size, location and relative population. A detailed report about each city is also provided. These figures are based on research of city's budgets, online activity guides and have been analyzed to compare a wide variety of elements as consistently as possible. However, each city has different ways of reporting budget information, setting fees, etc. that may result in some anomalies. Therefore, this information should be considered an order of magnitude analysis to help in better understanding how Los Altos compares rather than a definitive assessment of each comparable city's operations.

Summary and Effectiveness Similarities

The following is a snapshot of the eight cities, including Los Altos that were analyzed. Costs are difficult to provide a clear apples to apples comparison as many of the neighboring cities operate both their parks and the recreation function. Revenues are a more easily evaluated metric, and Los Altos is similar in most respects except for Belmont who has over 2 times the revenue. Cost recovery differences are also very stark with Los Altos having a very high one. This should be further analyzed by adding the cost of parks maintenance to get a more realistic picture. Los Altos has the lowest levels of park acreage or open space. In regards for developed parks, Los Altos has the lowest ratio of park land for 1000 residents except for Belmont who does not have as much developed parks but does have a substantial amount of open space.

| Population | Density/ Sq. Mile | # Parks | Acres of Parks | Acres of Open Space | # Rec. Facilities | Acres of Parks/1,000 Residents | Operating Budget | Revenues | Est. Cost Recovery |
|--------------------|----------------------|---------|-------------------|------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|-------------|-----------------------|
| Belmont | | | | | | | | | |
| 26,503 | 5,724 | 14 | 31 | 335 | 6 | 1.17 | \$8,463,977 | \$5,058,379 | 59.76% |
| Burlingame | | | | | | | | | |
| 29,618 | 4,890 | 14 | 55 | 42.5 | 1 | 1.86 | \$9,843,886 | \$2,898,000 | 29.44% |
| Foster City | | | | | | | | | |
| 31,806 | 1,603 | 23 | 109 | 51 | 1 | 3.43 | \$9,140,214 | \$2,141,049 | 23.42% |
| Los Altos | | | | | | | | | |
| 29,762 | 4,588 | 11 | 45.45 | n/a | 6 | 1.53 | \$2,384,730 | \$2,176,000 | 91.25% |
| Menlo Park | | | | | | | | | |
| 32,792 | 1,883 | 14 | 59.5 | 172.5 | 7 | 1.81 | \$10,200,000 | \$5,514,323 | 54.06% |
| San Carlos | | | | | | | | | |
| 29,166 | 5,264 | 16 | 62 | 73 | 3 | 2.13 | \$3,710,300 | \$2,264,800 | 61.04% |
| Saratoga | | | | | | | | | |
| 30,627 | 2,473 | 17 | 87 | 250+ | 4 | 2.84 | \$1,387,250 | \$1,001,300 | 72.18% |

Note that Saratoga and Los Gatos have a joint parks and recreation district that provides services to the community.



Demographics and Operational Information

| Name of City | Population | Median Age | Median Income | Num. Parks | Operating Budget | Revenues | Recreation FTEs | Acres of Parks |
|--------------------|------------|------------|---------------|------------|------------------|-------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Belmont | 26,503 | 40.40 | \$106,000 | 14 | 8,463,977 | \$5,058,379 | 14 | 31 |
| Burlingame | 29,618 | 40.40 | \$90,000 | 14 | \$9,843,886 | \$2,898,000 | 13 | 55 |
| Foster City | 31,806 | 40.70 | \$114,000 | 23 | \$9,140,214 | 2141049 | 36.5 | 109 |
| Los Altos | 29,762 | 46.20 | \$157,000 | 11 | \$2,384,730 | \$2,176,000 | 8 | 45.45 |
| Menlo Park | 32,792 | 38.3 | \$115,000 | 14 | \$10,200,000 | \$5514323 | 52.5 | 59.5 |
| San Carlos | 29,166 | 42.50 | \$125,000 | 16 | 3,710,300 | \$2,264,800 | 10 | 62 |
| Saratoga | 30,627 | 47.70 | \$167,000 | 17 | \$1,387,250 | \$1,001,300 | 6 | 87 |

Demographic Similarities

Demographically, Los Altos shares similar populations of people “Under 14” and “Teenagers 15 to 19” as Burlington, Foster City, Menlo Park, San Carlos and Saratoga; all cities share a similar population of “Middle Age 35 to 65”; San Carlos, and Los Altos share a similar population of “Young Adults 20 to 34”; Foster City, and Los Altos share a similar population of “Older Adults over 65”; Los Altos is extremely similar to Saratoga’s age distribution population, and is uniquely similar in median income, single family households, and multifamily households.

Operational Comparison

Los Altos’ Recreation and Community Services Department operating budget is theoretically most comparable to Menlo Park, which likewise does not have a combined Parks Services and Recreation Department. That being said, Menlo Park has 45 more recreational employees, and a cost recovery of 54% (one of the lowest), compared to Los Altos’ 91% cost recovery. Furthermore, Los Altos maintains the second smallest amount of Recreation FTEs (The amount of Park FTEs and Recreation FTEs have been accounted for to help visualize facility maintenance spending). Lastly, Los Altos has the second smallest operating budget of all the observed cities.



Program and Rental Fee Similarities and Differences

| Program Fees | | | | | | Rental Fees | | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------|----------------|--------------------|-----------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Youth Resident | Youth Non Resident | Adult Resident | Adult Non Resident | Senior Resident | Senior Non Resident | Available for Rent | Large Rooms | Meeting Rooms | Picnic Area Rental | Other Outdoor Rentals |
| Belmont | | | | | | | | | | |
| \$15-43 | \$17-48 | \$7-11 | \$8-13 | \$7-11 | \$8-13 | 9 spaces | \$135-275 | \$50-90 per hour | \$99-180 | \$30-75 |
| Burlingame | | | | | | | | | | |
| \$12-86 | \$14-104 | \$8-45 | \$10-52 | \$6-37 | \$8-45 | 9 Rooms | \$148-293 | \$114-\$160 per hour | \$102-357 | \$18-50 |
| Foster City | | | | | | | | | | |
| \$13-27 | \$13-27 | \$7-26 | \$7-26 | Free-\$14 | Free-\$14 | 13 rooms | \$125-300 | \$40-180 | \$75-225 | \$10-35 |
| Los Altos | | | | | | | | | | |
| \$13-45 | \$15-54 | \$3-33 | \$3-39 | Free- \$20 | Free- \$25 | 25 spaces | \$110-138 | \$56-138 per hour | \$199-249 | \$25-56 |
| Menlo Park | | | | | | | | | | |
| \$13-34 | \$18-46 | \$8-74 | \$8-99 | Free-\$3 | Free-\$3 | 28 spaces | \$75-200 | \$55-100 per hour | \$10-18 | \$10-100 |
| San Carlos | | | | | | | | | | |
| \$17-38 | \$19-41 | \$10-41 | \$12-41 | Free-\$41 | Free-\$41 | 2 spaces | \$150-200 | n/a | \$15 | \$15-30 |
| Saratoga | | | | | | | | | | |
| \$15-25 | \$15-25 | \$9-55 | \$9-55 | \$9-55 | \$9 | 10 spaces | \$175-200 | \$75- 200 | \$15/hour | \$15/hour |

Los Altos has the second highest maximum fee for the “Youth Resident, Youth Non-Resident, and Adult Resident” program fee behind Burlingame. Regarding rental fees, Los Altos has the second highest “Other Outdoor Rental” minimum, behind Belmont, and the third highest maximum “Other Outdoor Rental” fee behind Menlo Park and Belmont. There may be a benefit of further assessing each fee level to determine what is best for Los Altos in light of a desire for a high cost recovery rate.

Attachment D



GODBE RESEARCH
Gain Insight

CITY OF LOS ALTOS

2020 Community Center Survey

Topline Report

Los Altos Residents: n=1,055

Non-Residents: n=155

20 minutes

Hybrid Voter/Resident Sample

October 15, 2020

www.godberesearch.com

Northern California and Corporate Offices
1220 Howard Avenue, Suite 250
Burlingame, CA 94010

Nevada
59 Damonte Ranch Parkway, Suite B309
Reno, NV 89521

METHODOLOGY

Sample Universe:

- 22,498 Los Altos Residents Adults 18+ (based on 2018 American Community Survey)
- Non-Residents Adults 18+ (unknown)

Sample Size:

- n=1,055 Los Altos Voters and Residents Adults 18+ (weighted to Adults 18+ from 2018 ACS data)
- n=155 Non-Residents

Los Altos Residents Adults 18+ Data Collection Methodology:

- n=47 Landline
- n=8 Cell
- n=862 Online from text invitation
- n=138 Online from email invitation

Non-Residents Adults 18+ Data Collection Methodology:

- n=137 Online from text invitation
- n=18 Online from email invitation

Margin of Error:

- Los Altos Residents Adults 18+ \pm 2.95%
- Non-Residents Adults 18+ (n/a)

Interview Dates: September 28 to October 4, 2020

OVERALL PERCEPTIONS OF LIVING IN LOS ALTOS

| | | Los Altos Residents 18+ | | | Non-Resident Users 18+ | | |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------------|-------|-----------|------------------------|-------|-----------|
| | | Column N % | Count | Σ or Mean | Column N % | Count | Σ or Mean |
| 1A. The State of California | Very favorable | 24.0% | 254 | | 25.8% | 40 | |
| | Somewhat favorable | 46.9% | 494 | | 47.7% | 74 | |
| | Somewhat unfavorable | 12.0% | 126 | | 12.3% | 19 | |
| | Very unfavorable | 13.0% | 138 | | 9.7% | 15 | |
| | DK/NA | 4.1% | 43 | | 4.5% | 7 | |
| | Total Favorable | 70.9% | | | 73.5% | | |
| | Total Unfavorable | 25.0% | | | 21.9% | | |
| | Ratio Fav to Unfav | 2.8 | | | 3.4 | | |
| 1B. Santa Clara County | Very favorable | 32.6% | 344 | | 19.4% | 30 | |
| | Somewhat favorable | 40.5% | 427 | | 49.0% | 76 | |
| | Somewhat unfavorable | 10.7% | 113 | | 12.9% | 20 | |
| | Very unfavorable | 8.1% | 85 | | 12.9% | 20 | |
| | DK/NA | 8.2% | 86 | | 5.8% | 9 | |
| | Total Favorable | 73.1% | | | 68.4% | | |
| | Total Unfavorable | 18.7% | | | 25.8% | | |
| | Ratio Fav to Unfav | 3.9 | | | 2.7 | | |
| 1C. The City of Los Altos | Very favorable | 21.9% | 231 | | | | |
| | Somewhat favorable | 40.2% | 424 | | | | |
| | Somewhat unfavorable | 10.1% | 107 | | | | |
| | Very unfavorable | 4.8% | 50 | | | | |
| | DK/NA | 23.0% | 242 | | | | |
| | Total Favorable | 62.1% | | | | | |
| | Total Unfavorable | 14.9% | | | | | |
| | Ratio Fav to Unfav | 4.2 | | | | | |
| 2. Generally speaking, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the overall quality of life in Los Altos? | Very satisfied | 50.7% | 535 | | | | |
| | Somewhat satisfied | 36.6% | 386 | | | | |
| | Somewhat dissatisfied | 8.9% | 94 | | | | |
| | Very dissatisfied | 2.5% | 26 | | | | |
| | DK/NA | 1.2% | 13 | | | | |
| | Total Satisfied | 87.4% | | | | | |
| | Total Dissatisfied | 11.4% | | | | | |
| | Ratio Sat to Dissat | 7.6 | | | | | |
| 3. Overall, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the job the City of Los Altos is doing to provide City services? | Very satisfied | 28.7% | 303 | | | | |
| | Somewhat satisfied | 46.4% | 490 | | | | |
| | Somewhat dissatisfied | 14.0% | 147 | | | | |
| | Very dissatisfied | 3.8% | 40 | | | | |
| | DK/NA | 7.1% | 75 | | | | |
| | Total Favorable | 75.1% | | | | | |
| | Total Unfavorable | 17.8% | | | | | |
| | Ratio Fav to Unfav | 4.2 | | | | | |

| | | Los Altos Residents 18+ | | | Non-Resident Users 18+ | | |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------------|-------|-----------|------------------------|-------|-----------|
| | | Column N % | Count | Σ or Mean | Column N % | Count | Σ or Mean |
| 4A Parks Are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the City's provision of this facility or service? | Very satisfied | 33.0% | 348 | | 32.3% | 50 | |
| | Somewhat satisfied | 47.2% | 498 | | 52.3% | 81 | |
| | Somewhat dissatisfied | 11.0% | 116 | | 8.4% | 13 | |
| | Very dissatisfied | 3.8% | 40 | | 1.9% | 3 | |
| | DK/NA | 5.1% | 53 | | 5.2% | 8 | |
| | Total Satisfied | 80.2% | | | 84.5% | | |
| | Total Dissatisfied | 14.8% | | | 10.3% | | |
| | Ratio Sat to Dissat | 5.4 | | | 8.2 | | |
| 4B Recreation facilities Are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the City's provision of this facility or service? | Very satisfied | 13.1% | 138 | | 20.6% | 32 | |
| | Somewhat satisfied | 37.4% | 395 | | 35.5% | 55 | |
| | Somewhat dissatisfied | 15.7% | 166 | | 15.5% | 24 | |
| | Very dissatisfied | 6.5% | 69 | | 5.2% | 8 | |
| | DK/NA | 27.2% | 287 | | 23.2% | 36 | |
| | Total Satisfied | 50.5% | | | 56.1% | | |
| | Total Dissatisfied | 22.3% | | | 20.6% | | |
| | Ratio Sat to Dissat | 2.3 | | | 2.7 | | |
| 4C Recreation programs Are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the City's provision of this facility or service? | Very satisfied | 14.5% | 153 | | 22.6% | 35 | |
| | Somewhat satisfied | 33.6% | 354 | | 43.2% | 67 | |
| | Somewhat dissatisfied | 11.3% | 120 | | 11.0% | 17 | |
| | Very dissatisfied | 3.9% | 41 | | 3.9% | 6 | |
| | DK/NA | 36.6% | 387 | | 19.4% | 30 | |
| | Total Satisfied | 48.1% | | | 65.8% | | |
| | Total Dissatisfied | 15.2% | | | 14.8% | | |
| | Ratio Sat to Dissat | 3.2 | | | 4.4 | | |
| 4D Outdoor sports programs Are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the City's provision of this facility or service? | Very satisfied | 10.5% | 111 | | 12.3% | 19 | |
| | Somewhat satisfied | 25.8% | 272 | | 32.9% | 51 | |
| | Somewhat dissatisfied | 10.3% | 109 | | 11.6% | 18 | |
| | Very dissatisfied | 5.1% | 53 | | 4.5% | 7 | |
| | DK/NA | 48.3% | 509 | | 38.7% | 60 | |
| | Total Satisfied | 36.3% | | | 45.2% | | |
| | Total Dissatisfied | 15.4% | | | 16.1% | | |
| | Ratio Sat to Dissat | 2.4 | | | 2.8 | | |

RECREATION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

| | | Los Altos Residents 18+ | | | Non-Resident Users 18+ | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|-------|-----------|------------------------|-------|-----------|
| | | Column N % | Count | Σ or Mean | Column N % | Count | Σ or Mean |
| 5. In general, what would you most like to do during your leisure time? | Walking / hiking | 76.4% | 806 | | 78.1% | 121 | |
| | Spend time with family/friends | 70.2% | 741 | | 71.0% | 110 | |
| | Going to a local park / enjoying nature | 67.0% | 707 | | 72.9% | 113 | |
| | Cultural activities, such as theater, musical or art performances | 47.0% | 496 | | 52.9% | 82 | |
| | Fitness | 41.3% | 436 | | 41.9% | 65 | |
| | Indoor and outdoor sports or athletic activities | 38.2% | 403 | | 48.4% | 75 | |
| | Home projects / DIY | 31.4% | 331 | | 33.5% | 52 | |
| | Gardening projects | 29.0% | 306 | | 35.5% | 55 | |
| | Volunteering / community service | 27.3% | 288 | | 32.3% | 50 | |
| | Cooking / baking | 26.7% | 282 | | 26.5% | 41 | |
| | Community events | 26.6% | 280 | | 34.8% | 54 | |
| | Picnics | 26.2% | 276 | | 32.3% | 50 | |
| | Movies in the park | 24.6% | 260 | | 34.2% | 53 | |
| | Arts and crafts | 20.8% | 220 | | 32.3% | 50 | |
| | Self-help / wellness | 18.2% | 192 | | 22.6% | 35 | |
| | Online gaming | 6.7% | 71 | | 5.2% | 8 | |
| | Other | 8.7% | 92 | | 3.9% | 6 | |
| | Not sure / DK/NA | 0.9% | 10 | | 1.3% | 2 | |
| 6. How often would you participate in these activities in Los Altos? | More than once a week | 43.1% | 451 | | 37.9% | 58 | |
| | Once a week | 19.4% | 202 | | 11.8% | 18 | |
| | A few times a month | 21.3% | 223 | | 26.1% | 40 | |
| | Once a month | 5.0% | 53 | | 5.2% | 8 | |
| | A few times a year | 5.7% | 59 | | 13.1% | 20 | |
| | Once a year | 0.2% | 2 | | 2.0% | 3 | |
| | Less than once a year | 1.1% | 11 | | 0.0% | 0 | |
| | Never | 1.5% | 15 | | 0.7% | 1 | |
| DK/NA | 2.8% | 29 | | 3.3% | 5 | | |
| 7. How often would you participate in these activities outside of Los Altos? | More than once a week | 28.9% | 302 | | 36.6% | 56 | |
| | Once a week | 15.7% | 164 | | 11.1% | 17 | |
| | A few times a month | 25.9% | 270 | | 28.8% | 44 | |
| | Once a month | 9.7% | 101 | | 9.8% | 15 | |
| | A few times a year | 11.7% | 122 | | 9.2% | 14 | |
| | Once a year | 0.9% | 10 | | 1.3% | 2 | |
| | Less than once a year | 1.0% | 10 | | 0.0% | 0 | |
| | Never | 2.4% | 25 | | 1.3% | 2 | |
| DK/NA | 3.8% | 40 | | 2.0% | 3 | | |

| | | Los Altos Residents 18+ | | | Non-Resident Users 18+ | | |
|--|------------------------------|-------------------------|-------|-----------|------------------------|-------|-----------|
| | | Column N % | Count | Σ or Mean | Column N % | Count | Σ or Mean |
| 8. How wil the COVID-19 crisis change how you use Los Altos parks and recreation facilities after the crisis ends? | More in-person programs | 21.8% | 230 | | 25.2% | 39 | |
| | More activities with groups | 20.9% | 220 | | 21.3% | 33 | |
| | More activities by myself | 19.9% | 210 | | 15.5% | 24 | |
| | Fewer in-person programs | 13.6% | 144 | | 12.9% | 20 | |
| | Fewer activities with groups | 12.6% | 132 | | 7.7% | 12 | |
| | More virtual programs | 11.5% | 122 | | 14.8% | 23 | |
| | Fewer virtual programs | 5.6% | 59 | | 6.5% | 10 | |
| | Fewer activities by myself | 3.7% | 39 | | 5.8% | 9 | |
| | Won't Change | 33.0% | 348 | | 34.8% | 54 | |
| | Other | 1.6% | 17 | | 1.9% | 3 | |
| | Not sure / DK/NA | 8.8% | 93 | | 7.1% | 11 | |

COMMUNITY CENTER

| | | Los Altos Residents 18+ | | | Non-Resident Users 18+ | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|-------|-----------|------------------------|-------|-----------|
| | | Column N % | Count | Σ or Mean | Column N % | Count | Σ or Mean |
| 9. As you may know, the City of Los Altos is working on a new Community Center. Before taking this survey, had you seen, heard or read about the plan to build a new Community Center in Los Altos? | Yes, have seen, heard or read about the plan to build a new Community Center | 69.0% | 728 | | 56.8% | 88 | |
| | No, have not seen, heard or read about the plan to build a new Community Center | 28.9% | 305 | | 39.4% | 61 | |
| | DK/NA | 2.1% | 22 | | 3.9% | 6 | |
| 10. Here's a list of recreation facilities that will be included in the new Los Altos Community Center. For each of the items below would you and your family be extremely likely to use it, very likely to use it, somewhat likely to use it, not too likely to use it, or not at all likely to use that type of recreation facility? | | | | | | | |
| 10A. Large community room with patio | Extremely likely to use | 4.9% | 52 | 18.3% | 8.4% | 13 | 21.3% |
| | Very likely to use | 13.4% | 142 | | 12.9% | 20 | |
| | Somewhat likely to use | 30.4% | 320 | | 36.1% | 56 | |
| | Not too likely to use | 26.7% | 282 | | 26.5% | 41 | |
| | Not at all likely to use | 20.1% | 212 | | 11.0% | 17 | |
| | DK/NA | 4.4% | 47 | | 5.2% | 8 | |
| 10B. Multipurpose rooms | Extremely likely to use | 5.8% | 61 | 17.0% | 3.9% | 6 | 18.7% |
| | Very likely to use | 11.2% | 118 | | 14.8% | 23 | |
| | Somewhat likely to use | 31.0% | 327 | | 38.1% | 59 | |
| | Not too likely to use | 24.6% | 260 | | 25.8% | 40 | |
| | Not at all likely to use | 21.1% | 223 | | 11.6% | 18 | |
| | DK/NA | 6.3% | 66 | | 5.8% | 9 | |
| 10C. Small meeting rooms | Extremely likely to use | 2.5% | 26 | 10.8% | 4.5% | 7 | 16.1% |
| | Very likely to use | 8.4% | 88 | | 11.6% | 18 | |
| | Somewhat likely to use | 26.1% | 276 | | 25.2% | 39 | |
| | Not too likely to use | 28.1% | 296 | | 32.9% | 51 | |
| | Not at all likely to use | 30.8% | 325 | | 19.4% | 30 | |
| | DK/NA | 4.1% | 43 | | 6.5% | 10 | |
| 10D. Preschool-age room | Extremely likely to use | 3.7% | 39 | 8.5% | 5.8% | 9 | 7.7% |
| | Very likely to use | 4.8% | 51 | | 1.9% | 3 | |
| | Somewhat likely to use | 4.1% | 43 | | 9.0% | 14 | |
| | Not too likely to use | 9.3% | 98 | | 11.6% | 18 | |
| | Not at all likely to use | 75.5% | 797 | | 68.4% | 106 | |
| | DK/NA | 2.6% | 27 | | 3.2% | 5 | |
| 10E. Teen lounge with patio | Extremely likely to use | 2.8% | 29 | 10.1% | 5.2% | 8 | 16.1% |
| | Very likely to use | 7.3% | 77 | | 11.0% | 17 | |
| | Somewhat likely to use | 12.9% | 136 | | 20.0% | 31 | |
| | Not too likely to use | 15.5% | 164 | | 13.5% | 21 | |
| | Not at all likely to use | 58.9% | 621 | | 44.5% | 69 | |
| | DK/NA | 2.6% | 28 | | 5.8% | 9 | |
| 10F. Arts and crafts room | Extremely likely to use | 4.2% | 44 | 13.1% | 10.3% | 16 | 25.8% |
| | Very likely to use | 9.0% | 95 | | 15.5% | 24 | |
| | Somewhat likely to use | 27.3% | 288 | | 27.7% | 43 | |
| | Not too likely to use | 28.5% | 300 | | 18.7% | 29 | |
| | Not at all likely to use | 27.4% | 289 | | 21.3% | 33 | |
| | DK/NA | 3.7% | 39 | | 6.5% | 10 | |

| | | Los Altos Residents 18+ | | | Non-Resident Users 18+ | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------|-----------|------------------------|-------|-----------|
| | | Column N % | Count | Σ or Mean | Column N % | Count | Σ or Mean |
| 10G. Dance and fitness room | Extremely likely to use | 6.5% | 68 | 18.7% | 7.1% | 11 | 28.4% |
| | Very likely to use | 12.3% | 129 | | 21.3% | 33 | |
| | Somewhat likely to use | 31.4% | 331 | | 32.9% | 51 | |
| | Not too likely to use | 22.5% | 237 | | 18.1% | 28 | |
| | Not at all likely to use | 23.6% | 249 | | 18.7% | 29 | |
| | DK/NA | 3.8% | 40 | | 1.9% | 3 | |
| 10H. Bocce courts | Extremely likely to use | 6.5% | 69 | 16.7% | 7.7% | 12 | 18.1% |
| | Very likely to use | 10.1% | 107 | | 10.3% | 16 | |
| | Somewhat likely to use | 25.8% | 272 | | 29.7% | 46 | |
| | Not too likely to use | 23.0% | 243 | | 18.1% | 28 | |
| | Not at all likely to use | 30.9% | 326 | | 26.5% | 41 | |
| | DK/NA | 3.6% | 38 | | 7.7% | 12 | |
| 10I. Large lobby with seating areas | Extremely likely to use | 5.7% | 60 | 14.0% | 7.1% | 11 | 16.8% |
| | Very likely to use | 8.3% | 87 | | 9.7% | 15 | |
| | Somewhat likely to use | 25.2% | 266 | | 31.6% | 49 | |
| | Not too likely to use | 29.4% | 310 | | 25.2% | 39 | |
| | Not at all likely to use | 26.2% | 276 | | 18.7% | 29 | |
| | DK/NA | 5.3% | 56 | | 7.7% | 12 | |
| 10J. Courtyard with seating areas | Extremely likely to use | 10.6% | 112 | 28.9% | 9.0% | 14 | 40.0% |
| | Very likely to use | 18.3% | 193 | | 31.0% | 48 | |
| | Somewhat likely to use | 37.0% | 390 | | 34.2% | 53 | |
| | Not too likely to use | 18.6% | 196 | | 15.5% | 24 | |
| | Not at all likely to use | 12.9% | 136 | | 6.5% | 10 | |
| | DK/NA | 2.7% | 28 | | 3.9% | 6 | |
| 10K. Playground | Extremely likely to use | 9.9% | 104 | 22.3% | 16.1% | 25 | 29.7% |
| | Very likely to use | 12.4% | 131 | | 13.5% | 21 | |
| | Somewhat likely to use | 17.6% | 186 | | 21.3% | 33 | |
| | Not too likely to use | 18.5% | 195 | | 14.2% | 22 | |
| | Not at all likely to use | 39.3% | 415 | | 31.0% | 48 | |
| | DK/NA | 2.3% | 24 | | 3.9% | 6 | |
| 10L. Adults 50+ lounge with patio | Extremely likely to use | 6.9% | 72 | 17.2% | 10.3% | 16 | 19.4% |
| | Very likely to use | 10.3% | 109 | | 9.0% | 14 | |
| | Somewhat likely to use | 21.6% | 228 | | 25.8% | 40 | |
| | Not too likely to use | 21.0% | 221 | | 20.0% | 31 | |
| | Not at all likely to use | 37.3% | 394 | | 32.3% | 50 | |
| | DK/NA | 2.9% | 31 | | 2.6% | 4 | |
| 10M. Cafe | Extremely likely to use | 15.3% | 161 | 36.4% | 16.8% | 26 | 49.0% |
| | Very likely to use | 21.1% | 223 | | 32.3% | 50 | |
| | Somewhat likely to use | 35.3% | 372 | | 34.2% | 53 | |
| | Not too likely to use | 16.3% | 172 | | 11.0% | 17 | |
| | Not at all likely to use | 10.0% | 105 | | 3.9% | 6 | |
| | DK/NA | 2.1% | 22 | | 1.9% | 3 | |

| | | Los Altos Residents 18+ | | | Non-Resident Users 18+ | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------|-----------|------------------------|-------|-----------|
| | | Column N % | Count | Σ or Mean | Column N % | Count | Σ or Mean |
| 10N. Basketball court | Extremely likely to use | 5.8% | 61 | 15.6% | 8.4% | 13 | 18.7% |
| | Very likely to use | 9.8% | 103 | | 10.3% | 16 | |
| | Somewhat likely to use | 19.3% | 203 | | 21.3% | 33 | |
| | Not too likely to use | 20.9% | 221 | | 15.5% | 24 | |
| | Not at all likely to use | 42.3% | 446 | | 40.0% | 62 | |
| | DK/NA | 1.9% | 20 | | 4.5% | 7 | |
| 10O. Pickleball court | Extremely likely to use | 4.9% | 51 | 12.6% | 8.4% | 13 | 14.8% |
| | Very likely to use | 7.7% | 81 | | 6.5% | 10 | |
| | Somewhat likely to use | 17.8% | 187 | | 20.0% | 31 | |
| | Not too likely to use | 21.6% | 228 | | 23.2% | 36 | |
| | Not at all likely to use | 40.5% | 428 | | 30.3% | 47 | |
| | DK/NA | 7.5% | 79 | | 11.6% | 18 | |
| Q10. RANKED BY INTENSITY SCORE | | | | | | | |
| 10M. Cafe | | | | 2.16 | | | 2.48 |
| 10J. Courtyard with seating areas | | | | 1.95 | | | 2.21 |
| 10A. Large community room with patio | | | | 1.54 | | | 1.80 |
| 10G. Dance and fitness room | | | | 1.54 | | | 1.80 |
| 10B. Multipurpose rooms | | | | 1.53 | | | 1.72 |
| 10H. Bocce courts | | | | 1.36 | | | 1.51 |
| 10I. Large lobby with seating areas | | | | 1.34 | | | 1.58 |
| 10K. Playground | | | | 1.33 | | | 1.68 |
| 10F. Arts and crafts room | | | | 1.32 | | | 1.73 |
| 10L. Adults 50+ lounge with patio | | | | 1.26 | | | 1.44 |
| 10C. Small meeting rooms | | | | 1.20 | | | 1.46 |
| 10N. Basketball court | | | | 1.14 | | | 1.28 |
| 10O. Pickleball court | | | | 1.08 | | | 1.31 |
| 10E. Teen lounge with patio | | | | 0.76 | | | 1.14 |
| 10D. Preschool-age room | | | | 0.48 | | | 0.61 |

| | | Los Altos Residents 18+ | | | Non-Resident Users 18+ | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|-------|-----------|------------------------|-------|-----------|
| | | Column N % | Count | Σ or Mean | Column N % | Count | Σ or Mean |
| 11. Which of these facilities would make you and your family most likely to drop by or hang out at the new community center? | Cafe / Food and drinks | 16.2% | 171 | | 14.2% | 22 | |
| | Courtyard / Outside area / Lobby | 7.1% | 75 | | 5.2% | 8 | |
| | Swimming Pool | 6.6% | 69 | | 6.5% | 10 | |
| | Fitness center / Weightlifting /Exercise room | 6.1% | 64 | | 8.4% | 13 | |
| | Playground / Children's area | 6.1% | 64 | | 9.0% | 14 | |
| | Arts and Music lessons / showcases | 5.3% | 55 | | 6.5% | 10 | |
| | Basketball court / Sports field | 5.2% | 55 | | 5.2% | 8 | |
| | Bocce | 4.4% | 47 | | 3.9% | 6 | |
| | Community events / Clubs | 3.9% | 41 | | 3.2% | 5 | |
| | Tennis / Pickle ball | 3.8% | 40 | | 6.5% | 10 | |
| | Park / Dog park | 2.4% | 25 | | 3.9% | 6 | |
| | Educational / Lectures / Classes | 2.2% | 24 | | 3.2% | 5 | |
| | Dancing activities | 2.2% | 23 | | 3.2% | 5 | |
| | Senior center / Senior activities | 1.3% | 14 | | 1.3% | 2 | |
| | Teen activities | 1.3% | 13 | | 0.6% | 1 | |
| | Movies / Entertainment | 1.0% | 11 | | 1.3% | 2 | |
| | Social games / Card games / Board games | 0.8% | 9 | | 0.0% | 0 | |
| | Teen center / hangout | 0.6% | 6 | | 1.9% | 3 | |
| | Library | 0.4% | 4 | | 0.0% | 0 | |
| | Library improvement | 0.1% | 1 | | 0.0% | 0 | |
| All / Anything | 0.2% | 2 | | 0.0% | 0 | | |
| None | 6.4% | 68 | | 3.9% | 6 | | |
| Other | 0.4% | 5 | | 0.0% | 0 | | |
| Don't Know / Not sure | 30.8% | 325 | | 26.5% | 41 | | |
| 12. Here's a list of recreation programs that will be offered in the new Los Altos Community Center. For each of the items below would you and your family be extremely likely to use it, very likely to use it, somewhat likely to use it, not too likely to use it, or not at all likely to use that type of recreation program? | | | | | | | |
| 12A. Senior programs | Extremely likely to use | 3.2% | 34 | 13.0% | 4.5% | 7 | 14.8% |
| | Very likely to use | 9.8% | 103 | | 10.3% | 16 | |
| | Somewhat likely to use | 18.8% | 199 | | 14.8% | 23 | |
| | Not too likely to use | 19.3% | 204 | | 21.9% | 34 | |
| | Not at all likely to use | 46.6% | 491 | | 45.2% | 70 | |
| | DK/NA | 2.2% | 24 | | 3.2% | 5 | |
| 12B. Senior lunch programs | Extremely likely to use | 2.5% | 26 | 5.5% | 3.9% | 6 | 7.1% |
| | Very likely to use | 3.0% | 31 | | 3.2% | 5 | |
| | Somewhat likely to use | 8.8% | 93 | | 8.4% | 13 | |
| | Not too likely to use | 20.0% | 211 | | 20.0% | 31 | |
| | Not at all likely to use | 63.9% | 675 | | 60.6% | 94 | |
| | DK/NA | 1.8% | 19 | | 3.9% | 6 | |
| 12C. Community events | Extremely likely to use | 6.4% | 68 | 27.1% | 5.2% | 8 | 32.9% |
| | Very likely to use | 20.7% | 218 | | 27.7% | 43 | |
| | Somewhat likely to use | 45.9% | 484 | | 44.5% | 69 | |
| | Not too likely to use | 13.9% | 147 | | 14.2% | 22 | |
| | Not at all likely to use | 9.9% | 104 | | 5.2% | 8 | |
| | DK/NA | 3.2% | 33 | | 3.2% | 5 | |

| | | Los Altos Residents 18+ | | | Non-Resident Users 18+ | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------|-----------|------------------------|-------|-----------|
| | | Column N % | Count | Σ or Mean | Column N % | Count | Σ or Mean |
| 12D. Special interest classes | Extremely likely to use | 4.6% | 49 | 18.5% | 5.8% | 9 | 25.2% |
| | Very likely to use | 13.9% | 146 | | 19.4% | 30 | |
| | Somewhat likely to use | 42.1% | 444 | | 41.3% | 64 | |
| | Not too likely to use | 17.7% | 186 | | 15.5% | 24 | |
| | Not at all likely to use | 14.1% | 149 | | 9.0% | 14 | |
| | DK/NA | 7.5% | 80 | | 9.0% | 14 | |
| 12E. Club meetings | Extremely likely to use | 3.1% | 33 | 10.4% | 1.9% | 3 | 10.3% |
| | Very likely to use | 7.4% | 78 | | 8.4% | 13 | |
| | Somewhat likely to use | 25.9% | 273 | | 29.0% | 45 | |
| | Not too likely to use | 26.5% | 280 | | 27.7% | 43 | |
| | Not at all likely to use | 31.4% | 331 | | 24.5% | 38 | |
| | DK/NA | 5.8% | 61 | | 8.4% | 13 | |
| 12F. Dance and fitness classes | Extremely likely to use | 6.5% | 68 | 19.9% | 10.3% | 16 | 28.4% |
| | Very likely to use | 13.4% | 141 | | 18.1% | 28 | |
| | Somewhat likely to use | 32.9% | 347 | | 32.9% | 51 | |
| | Not too likely to use | 19.2% | 203 | | 12.3% | 19 | |
| | Not at all likely to use | 25.2% | 266 | | 25.2% | 39 | |
| | DK/NA | 2.8% | 30 | | 1.3% | 2 | |
| 12G. Preschool-age programs | Extremely likely to use | 4.2% | 44 | 8.2% | 6.5% | 10 | 9.0% |
| | Very likely to use | 4.1% | 43 | | 2.6% | 4 | |
| | Somewhat likely to use | 3.9% | 42 | | 7.1% | 11 | |
| | Not too likely to use | 7.1% | 75 | | 8.4% | 13 | |
| | Not at all likely to use | 78.5% | 828 | | 71.0% | 110 | |
| | DK/NA | 2.2% | 24 | | 4.5% | 7 | |
| 12H. Teen programs | Extremely likely to use | 1.7% | 18 | 7.2% | 5.2% | 8 | 14.8% |
| | Very likely to use | 5.6% | 59 | | 9.7% | 15 | |
| | Somewhat likely to use | 14.7% | 155 | | 19.4% | 30 | |
| | Not too likely to use | 12.9% | 136 | | 14.8% | 23 | |
| | Not at all likely to use | 62.5% | 659 | | 46.5% | 72 | |
| | DK/NA | 2.7% | 29 | | 4.5% | 7 | |
| 12I. Cultural activities | Extremely likely to use | 7.1% | 75 | 26.0% | 7.1% | 11 | 23.9% |
| | Very likely to use | 19.0% | 200 | | 16.8% | 26 | |
| | Somewhat likely to use | 38.5% | 407 | | 45.2% | 70 | |
| | Not too likely to use | 18.3% | 193 | | 14.8% | 23 | |
| | Not at all likely to use | 15.0% | 158 | | 12.3% | 19 | |
| | DK/NA | 2.2% | 23 | | 3.9% | 6 | |
| 12J. Lectures and continuing education | Extremely likely to use | 8.1% | 86 | 28.8% | 8.4% | 13 | 31.6% |
| | Very likely to use | 20.6% | 218 | | 23.2% | 36 | |
| | Somewhat likely to use | 39.0% | 411 | | 40.0% | 62 | |
| | Not too likely to use | 16.2% | 171 | | 15.5% | 24 | |
| | Not at all likely to use | 13.7% | 144 | | 7.7% | 12 | |
| | DK/NA | 2.5% | 26 | | 5.2% | 8 | |
| 12K. Study groups | Extremely likely to use | 1.1% | 11 | 7.0% | 1.9% | 3 | 7.7% |
| | Very likely to use | 5.9% | 63 | | 5.8% | 9 | |
| | Somewhat likely to use | 18.4% | 194 | | 18.1% | 28 | |
| | Not too likely to use | 25.8% | 272 | | 31.6% | 49 | |
| | Not at all likely to use | 44.6% | 471 | | 36.8% | 57 | |
| | DK/NA | 4.2% | 44 | | 5.8% | 9 | |

| | | Los Altos Residents 18+ | | | Non-Resident Users 18+ | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------|-----------|------------------------|-------|-----------|
| | | Column N % | Count | Σ or Mean | Column N % | Count | Σ or Mean |
| 12L. Arts and crafts programs | Extremely likely to use | 4.7% | 50 | 17.2% | 11.0% | 17 | 26.5% |
| | Very likely to use | 12.5% | 132 | | 15.5% | 24 | |
| | Somewhat likely to use | 30.5% | 322 | | 27.7% | 43 | |
| | Not too likely to use | 20.7% | 219 | | 21.9% | 34 | |
| | Not at all likely to use | 27.9% | 294 | | 21.3% | 33 | |
| | DK/NA | 3.6% | 38 | | 2.6% | 4 | |
| 12M. Cooking classes | Extremely likely to use | 5.9% | 63 | 21.3% | 5.8% | 9 | 23.9% |
| | Very likely to use | 15.4% | 162 | | 18.1% | 28 | |
| | Somewhat likely to use | 33.4% | 352 | | 38.7% | 60 | |
| | Not too likely to use | 20.9% | 220 | | 19.4% | 30 | |
| | Not at all likely to use | 22.5% | 237 | | 15.5% | 24 | |
| | DK/NA | 2.0% | 21 | | 2.6% | 4 | |
| 12N. Active adult programs | Extremely likely to use | 4.9% | 52 | 18.2% | 9.7% | 15 | 27.1% |
| | Very likely to use | 13.3% | 140 | | 17.4% | 27 | |
| | Somewhat likely to use | 32.6% | 344 | | 34.8% | 54 | |
| | Not too likely to use | 21.6% | 228 | | 14.2% | 22 | |
| | Not at all likely to use | 23.2% | 245 | | 18.1% | 28 | |
| | DK/NA | 4.4% | 47 | | 5.8% | 9 | |
| 12O. Home improvement / DIY programs | Extremely likely to use | 4.4% | 47 | 16.4% | 2.6% | 4 | 18.1% |
| | Very likely to use | 12.0% | 126 | | 15.5% | 24 | |
| | Somewhat likely to use | 35.8% | 378 | | 36.1% | 56 | |
| | Not too likely to use | 20.6% | 217 | | 27.7% | 43 | |
| | Not at all likely to use | 23.4% | 247 | | 14.2% | 22 | |
| | DK/NA | 3.7% | 39 | | 3.9% | 6 | |
| Q12. RANKED BY INTENSITY SCORE | | | | | | | |
| 12C. Community events | | | | 2.00 | | | 2.14 |
| 12J. Lectures and continuing education | | | | 1.93 | | | 2.10 |
| 12I. Cultural activities | | | | 1.84 | | | 1.91 |
| 12D. Special interest classes | | | | 1.75 | | | 1.97 |
| 12M. Cooking classes | | | | 1.61 | | | 1.79 |
| 12F. Dance and fitness classes | | | | 1.56 | | | 1.76 |
| 12N. Active adult programs | | | | 1.53 | | | 1.86 |
| 12O. Home improvement / DIY programs | | | | 1.52 | | | 1.63 |
| 12L. Arts and crafts programs | | | | 1.43 | | | 1.72 |
| 12E. Club meetings | | | | 1.20 | | | 1.30 |
| 12A. Senior programs | | | | 1.02 | | | 1.04 |
| 12K. Study groups | | | | 0.88 | | | 0.99 |
| 12H. Teen programs | | | | 0.68 | | | 1.08 |
| 12B. Senior lunch programs | | | | 0.58 | | | 0.64 |
| 12G. Preschool-age programs | | | | 0.45 | | | 0.59 |

| | Los Altos Residents 18+ | | | Non-Resident Users 18+ | | |
|--|--|-------|-----------|------------------------|-------|-----------|
| | Column N % | Count | Σ or Mean | Column N % | Count | Σ or Mean |
| 13. What type of program would make you and your family most likely to drop by or hang out at the new community center? | Educational / Lectures / Classes | 13.1% | 138 | | 11.0% | 17 |
| | Arts and Music showcasing | 10.0% | 105 | | 9.0% | 14 |
| | Fitness / Exercise | 6.1% | 65 | | 7.7% | 12 |
| | Cooking / Cafe / Wine tasting | 6.0% | 64 | | 5.2% | 8 |
| | Community events / Clubs | 5.0% | 52 | | 3.2% | 5 |
| | Cultural events / activites | 4.8% | 51 | | 6.5% | 10 |
| | Kid friendly | 3.5% | 37 | | 3.2% | 5 |
| | Dance | 3.3% | 35 | | 3.9% | 6 |
| | Swimming Pool / Skatepark | 2.5% | 26 | | 2.6% | 4 |
| | Sports | 2.4% | 25 | | 1.9% | 3 |
| | Social games / Card games | 2.2% | 24 | | 0.6% | 1 |
| | Senior friendly | 1.9% | 20 | | 0.6% | 1 |
| | Teen activities | 1.7% | 18 | | 3.9% | 6 |
| | Outside / Hiking | 1.2% | 13 | | 2.6% | 4 |
| | Family friendly | 0.7% | 8 | | 1.9% | 3 |
| | Movies / Entertainment | 0.6% | 6 | | 1.9% | 3 |
| | Park / Dog park | 0.5% | 5 | | 1.9% | 3 |
| | Library improvement | 0.0% | 0 | | 0.0% | 0 |
| | All / Anything | 0.5% | 5 | | 0.0% | 0 |
| | None | 6.0% | 63 | | 3.2% | 5 |
| Other | 0.6% | 6 | | 0.0% | 0 | |
| Don't Know / Not sure | 41.3% | 436 | | 40.6% | 63 | |
| 14. What type of dance or fitness program would you and your family be most interested in? (n=204) | Stretching / Yoga / Aerobics / Pilates | 43.0% | 88 | | 38.1% | 16 |
| | Mixed fitness / Zumba | 18.6% | 38 | | 11.9% | 5 |
| | Jazzercise / Salsa | 14.8% | 30 | | 7.1% | 3 |
| | Ballet / Ballroom | 12.4% | 25 | | 9.5% | 4 |
| | General Exercise / Fitness | 8.0% | 16 | | 7.1% | 3 |
| | Specfic cultural dances | 3.2% | 6 | | 4.8% | 2 |
| | Line dancing | 1.8% | 4 | | 0.0% | 0 |
| | Tai Chi | 1.4% | 3 | | 0.0% | 0 |
| | Tap | 1.0% | 2 | | 2.4% | 1 |
| | Bollywood | 1.0% | 2 | | 0.0% | 0 |
| | Senior friendly | 0.5% | 1 | | 2.4% | 1 |
| | Hip hop | 0.5% | 1 | | 0.0% | 0 |
| | All / Anything | 3.2% | 6 | | 2.4% | 1 |
| | None | 2.0% | 4 | | 0.0% | 0 |
| | Other | 0.0% | 0 | | 7.1% | 3 |
| | Don't Know / Not sure | 8.1% | 17 | | 11.9% | 5 |

| | | Los Altos Residents 18+ | | | Non-Resident Users 18+ | | |
|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------|-------|-----------|------------------------|-------|-----------|
| | | Column N % | Count | Σ or Mean | Column N % | Count | Σ or Mean |
| 15. What type of teen program would you and your family be most interested in? (n=76) | Game room / Social games | 15.1% | 12 | | 17.4% | 4 | |
| | Hangout spot | 14.7% | 11 | | 13.0% | 3 | |
| | Theatre / Movies | 13.6% | 10 | | 4.3% | 1 | |
| | Concerts / Dance parties | 11.5% | 9 | | 4.3% | 1 | |
| | Sports | 11.3% | 9 | | 13.0% | 3 | |
| | Educational / College prep | 11.2% | 9 | | 26.1% | 6 | |
| | Art center | 3.6% | 3 | | 0.0% | 0 | |
| | Outdoor activities | 2.8% | 2 | | 0.0% | 0 | |
| | Fitness | 1.6% | 1 | | 4.3% | 1 | |
| | All / Anything | 6.7% | 5 | | 0.0% | 0 | |
| | None | 1.4% | 1 | | 0.0% | 0 | |
| | Other | 0.0% | 0 | | 0.0% | 0 | |
| | Don't Know / Not sure | 24.7% | 19 | | 34.8% | 8 | |
| 16. What type of arts and craft program would you be most interested in? (n=182) | Painting / Watercolor / Oil | 28.6% | 52 | | 36.6% | 15 | |
| | Sewing / Knitting | 13.8% | 25 | | 4.9% | 2 | |
| | Ceramics | 10.5% | 19 | | 9.8% | 4 | |
| | Crafts | 7.2% | 13 | | 2.4% | 1 | |
| | Art classes / General Art | 5.9% | 11 | | 4.9% | 2 | |
| | Youth classes | 5.5% | 10 | | 4.9% | 2 | |
| | Drawing | 5.0% | 9 | | 2.4% | 1 | |
| | Digital art | 3.4% | 6 | | 0.0% | 0 | |
| | Jewelry | 2.1% | 4 | | 4.9% | 2 | |
| | Exhibits / Showcase | 1.4% | 2 | | 0.0% | 0 | |
| | Metal working / Home projects | 1.2% | 2 | | 0.0% | 0 | |
| | Photography | 0.9% | 2 | | 0.0% | 0 | |
| | Floral | 0.3% | 1 | | 2.4% | 1 | |
| | Adult only classes | 0.0% | 0 | | 4.9% | 2 | |
| | All / Anything | 7.2% | 13 | | 9.8% | 4 | |
| | None | 0.0% | 0 | | 0.0% | 0 | |
| | Other | 3.6% | 6 | | 0.0% | 0 | |
| | Don't Know / Not sure | 18.1% | 33 | | 31.7% | 13 | |

| | | Los Altos Residents 18+ | | | Non-Resident Users 18+ | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|-------|-----------|------------------------|-------|-----------|
| | | Column N % | Count | Σ or Mean | Column N % | Count | Σ or Mean |
| 17. What type of active adult program would you and your family be most interested in? (n=192) | Exercise / Aerobics / Fitness | 19.5% | 37 | | 26.2% | 11 | |
| | Educational | 12.9% | 25 | | 7.1% | 3 | |
| | Hiking | 9.7% | 19 | | 9.5% | 4 | |
| | Tennis / Bocce / Pickleball / Ping Pong | 9.0% | 17 | | 9.5% | 4 | |
| | Dancing | 5.2% | 10 | | 4.8% | 2 | |
| | Outdoor hobby | 3.6% | 7 | | 7.1% | 3 | |
| | Board games / Game night | 3.5% | 7 | | 0.0% | 0 | |
| | Musical / Orchestra | 3.0% | 6 | | 0.0% | 0 | |
| | Cooking | 2.1% | 4 | | 2.4% | 1 | |
| | Elder / Senior care | 1.8% | 3 | | 0.0% | 0 | |
| | Social events | 1.5% | 3 | | 2.4% | 1 | |
| | Indoor sports | 1.4% | 3 | | 0.0% | 0 | |
| | Arts and crafts | 1.1% | 2 | | 0.0% | 0 | |
| | Swap meet / Rummage sale | 0.0% | 0 | | 0.0% | 0 | |
| | All / Anything | 1.5% | 3 | | 0.0% | 0 | |
| | None | 1.6% | 3 | | 0.0% | 0 | |
| Other | 0.0% | 0 | | 0.0% | 0 | | |
| Don't Know / Not sure | 36.3% | 69 | | 40.5% | 17 | | |
| 18. Given the depth, breadth and quality of the Los Altos recreation programs, do you think the fees: | Could be higher, if programs were better | 9.0% | 95 | | 7.1% | 11 | |
| | Are about right | 33.4% | 352 | | 55.5% | 86 | |
| | Are too much | 7.9% | 83 | | 10.3% | 16 | |
| | Never attended a Los Altos recreation program | 30.3% | 320 | | 12.9% | 20 | |
| | DK/NA | 19.5% | 205 | | 14.2% | 22 | |
| 19. Would you be extremely likely, very likely, somewhat likely, not too likely, or not at all likely to reserve space at the new community center for a business function or event, a birthday party, wedding reception, or other family event? | Extremely likely | 4.5% | 47 | | 4.5% | 7 | |
| | Very likely | 10.0% | 105 | | 12.3% | 19 | |
| | Somewhat likely | 27.8% | 293 | | 33.5% | 52 | |
| | Not too likely | 27.9% | 294 | | 28.4% | 44 | |
| | Not at all likely | 21.4% | 226 | | 15.5% | 24 | |
| | DK/NA | 8.4% | 89 | | 5.8% | 9 | |
| 20. What kind of event you would be interested in reserving space at the community center | Birthday party | 76.1% | 36 | | 85.7% | 6 | |
| | Other family event | 74.0% | 35 | | 42.9% | 3 | |
| | Anniversary | 27.4% | 13 | | 42.9% | 3 | |
| | Speaker series | 26.5% | 12 | | 0.0% | 0 | |
| | Business function | 22.5% | 11 | | 28.6% | 2 | |
| | Service club meeting | 21.5% | 10 | | 28.6% | 2 | |
| | Wedding reception | 16.6% | 8 | | 28.6% | 2 | |
| | Training sessions | 15.1% | 7 | | 0.0% | 0 | |
| | Bar mitzvah / bat mitzvah | 2.0% | 1 | | 0.0% | 0 | |
| | Other | 12.8% | 6 | | 14.3% | 1 | |
| Not sure / DK/NA | 0.0% | 0 | | 0.0% | 0 | | |

| | | Los Altos Residents 18+ | | | Non-Resident Users 18+ | | |
|--|-------------------|-------------------------|-------|-----------|------------------------|-------|-----------|
| | | Column N % | Count | Σ or Mean | Column N % | Count | Σ or Mean |
| 21. What day of the week would you be most likely to visit the new community center? | Monday | 1.5% | 15 | | 2.6% | 4 | |
| | Tuesday | 3.1% | 33 | | 3.2% | 5 | |
| | Wednesday | 7.9% | 83 | | 4.5% | 7 | |
| | Thursday | 3.9% | 41 | | 6.5% | 10 | |
| | Friday | 3.1% | 32 | | 6.5% | 10 | |
| | Saturday | 25.2% | 266 | | 27.1% | 42 | |
| | Sunday | 7.8% | 83 | | 9.0% | 14 | |
| | Won't Use | 10.3% | 109 | | 4.5% | 7 | |
| | DK/NA | 37.2% | 393 | | 36.1% | 56 | |
| 22. What hours of the day or evening would you be most likely to visit the new community center? | 6 am to 8 am | 0.7% | 7 | | 0.6% | 1 | |
| | 8 am to 10 am | 3.9% | 42 | | 3.2% | 5 | |
| | 10 am to noon | 15.0% | 159 | | 16.8% | 26 | |
| | noon to 2 pm | 6.9% | 73 | | 8.4% | 13 | |
| | 2 pm to 4 pm | 11.4% | 120 | | 16.1% | 25 | |
| | 4 pm to 6 pm | 9.7% | 102 | | 8.4% | 13 | |
| | 6 pm to 8 pm | 7.5% | 79 | | 12.9% | 20 | |
| | 8 pm to 10 pm | 3.2% | 34 | | 4.5% | 7 | |
| | 10 pm to midnight | 0.7% | 7 | | 0.0% | 0 | |
| | Won't Use | 11.0% | 116 | | 2.6% | 4 | |
| | DK/NA | 30.0% | 316 | | 26.5% | 41 | |

PARK OF FACILITY PREFERENCES

| | | Los Altos Residents 18+ | | | Non-Resident Users 18+ | | |
|---|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------|-----------|------------------------|-------|-----------|
| | | Column N % | Count | Σ or Mean | Column N % | Count | Σ or Mean |
| 23. Which Los Altos parks or facilities would you and the members of your household want to use for these activities? | Shoup Park | 21.1% | 223 | | 31.6% | 49 | |
| | Grant Park | 15.7% | 166 | | 9.7% | 15 | |
| | Redwood Grove Nature Preserve | 10.6% | 112 | | 16.1% | 25 | |
| | Grant Park Community Center | 10.6% | 112 | | 7.7% | 12 | |
| | Shoup Park Garden House | 9.0% | 94 | | 18.1% | 28 | |
| | Egan Gym | 8.2% | 86 | | 4.5% | 7 | |
| | Heritage Oaks Park | 7.5% | 79 | | 6.5% | 10 | |
| | Lincoln Park | 7.3% | 77 | | 5.2% | 8 | |
| | Blach Gym | 5.7% | 60 | | 8.4% | 13 | |
| | Hillview Soccer / Baseball Field | 5.6% | 59 | | 9.0% | 14 | |
| | McKenzie Park | 5.5% | 58 | | 5.8% | 9 | |
| | Los Altos Youth Center (LAYC) | 5.4% | 57 | | 6.5% | 10 | |
| | Marymeade Park | 5.3% | 55 | | 1.9% | 3 | |
| | Rosita Park | 4.7% | 49 | | 2.6% | 4 | |
| | Montclair Park | 3.3% | 35 | | 0.6% | 1 | |
| | San Antonio Club | 1.4% | 15 | | 0.6% | 1 | |
| | Village Park | 0.6% | 6 | | 1.3% | 2 | |
| | Won't use | 6.4% | 68 | | 2.6% | 4 | |
| | Other | 1.3% | 14 | | 0.6% | 1 | |
| | Not sure / DK/NA | 21.0% | 222 | | 23.2% | 36 | |

DEMOGRAPHICS (ASKED OF RESPONDENT)

| | | Los Altos Residents 18+ | | | Non-Resident Users 18+ | | |
|---|---|-------------------------|-------|-----------|------------------------|-------|-----------|
| | | Column N % | Count | Σ or Mean | Column N % | Count | Σ or Mean |
| A. How many years have you lived in the City of Los Altos? | Less than 1 year | 2.4% | 26 | | 8.4% | 13 | |
| | 1 to 3 years | 11.3% | 119 | | 6.5% | 10 | |
| | 4 to 9 years | 16.4% | 173 | | 15.5% | 24 | |
| | 10 to 15 years | 15.2% | 160 | | 18.1% | 28 | |
| | 16 to 25 years | 22.3% | 235 | | 18.1% | 28 | |
| | 26 years or more | 32.1% | 338 | | 18.7% | 29 | |
| | DK/NA | 0.3% | 3 | | 14.8% | 23 | |
| B. Do any children under the age of 18 live in your household? | Yes | 41.2% | 435 | | 60.0% | 93 | |
| | No | 58.6% | 618 | | 38.7% | 60 | |
| | DK/NA | 0.2% | 2 | | 1.3% | 2 | |
| C. What are the ages of the children living in your household? | 0 to 4 years | 26.2% | 114 | | 17.2% | 16 | |
| | 5 to 11 years | 43.7% | 190 | | 54.8% | 51 | |
| | 12 to 13 years | 25.5% | 111 | | 29.0% | 27 | |
| | 14 to 17 years | 46.9% | 204 | | 47.3% | 44 | |
| | DK/NA | 0.0% | 0 | | 0.0% | 0 | |
| D. Gender | Male | 47.5% | 501 | | 29.7% | 46 | |
| | Female | 52.3% | 552 | | 70.3% | 109 | |
| | Unknown | 0.2% | 2 | | 0.0% | 0 | |
| E. What is your age: | 18-29 years | 10.0% | 105 | | 2.6% | 4 | |
| | 30-39 years | 11.8% | 124 | | 6.5% | 10 | |
| | 40-49 years | 18.7% | 197 | | 31.6% | 49 | |
| | 50-64 years | 31.1% | 328 | | 39.4% | 61 | |
| | 65+ years | 26.4% | 278 | | 14.8% | 23 | |
| | REFUSED | 2.1% | 22 | | 5.2% | 8 | |
| F. Do you own or rent your home? | Own | 82.7% | 873 | | 79.4% | 123 | |
| | Rent | 16.2% | 171 | | 18.7% | 29 | |
| | DK/NA | 1.1% | 11 | | 1.9% | 3 | |
| G. What ethnic group do you consider yourself a part of or feel closest to? [SINGLE RESPONSE ONLY. IF THE RESPONDENT HESITATES, READ THE LIST]: | African American or Black | 0.4% | 4 | | 0.6% | 1 | |
| | America Indian or Alaska Native | 0.2% | 2 | | 0.0% | 0 | |
| | Asian - Chinese | 11.9% | 125 | | 9.7% | 15 | |
| | Asian - Filipino | 1.1% | 11 | | 0.0% | 0 | |
| | Asian - Indian | 7.0% | 74 | | 2.6% | 4 | |
| | Asian - Japanese | 1.7% | 18 | | 0.6% | 1 | |
| | Asian - Korean | 2.2% | 23 | | 0.6% | 1 | |
| | Asian - Laotian | 0.0% | 0 | | 0.0% | 0 | |
| | Asian - Vietnamese | 0.7% | 7 | | 1.9% | 3 | |
| | Asian - Other | 2.7% | 28 | | 3.2% | 5 | |
| | Caucasian or White | 59.7% | 630 | | 67.1% | 104 | |
| | Latino or Hispanic | 3.5% | 37 | | 1.9% | 3 | |
| | Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 0.2% | 2 | | 0.0% | 0 | |
| | Two or more races | 4.5% | 47 | | 4.5% | 7 | |
| | Other (Please specify:) | 2.0% | 21 | | 1.3% | 2 | |
| DK/NA | 2.2% | 24 | | 5.8% | 9 | | |

DEMOGRAPHICS (FROM VOTER SAMPLE)

| | | Los Altos Residents 18+ | | | Non-Resident Users 18+ | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------|-----------|------------------------|-------|-----------|
| | | Column N % | Count | Σ or Mean | Column N % | Count | Σ or Mean |
| H. Gender | Male | 47.1% | 467 | | | | |
| | Female | 51.5% | 510 | | | | |
| | Unknown | 1.4% | 14 | | | | |
| I. Age | 18-29 | 11.8% | 117 | | | | |
| | 30-39 | 12.1% | 119 | | | | |
| | 40-49 | 15.9% | 157 | | | | |
| | 50-64 | 32.5% | 322 | | | | |
| | 65+ | 27.5% | 273 | | | | |
| | Not coded | 0.2% | 2 | | | | |
| J. Broad Ethnic Groupings | East and South Asian | 23.7% | 234 | | | | |
| | European | 58.5% | 579 | | | | |
| | Hispanic and Portuguese | 2.8% | 28 | | | | |
| | Likely African-American | 0.2% | 2 | | | | |
| | Other | 4.4% | 44 | | | | |
| | Unknown | 10.4% | 103 | | | | |
| K. Marital Status | Single or Unknown | 39.0% | 386 | | | | |
| | Married | 41.4% | 410 | | | | |
| | Non-Traditional | 19.6% | 194 | | | | |
| L. Homeownership Status | Owner | 63.7% | 631 | | | | |
| | Renter | 13.5% | 134 | | | | |
| | Unknown | 22.8% | 225 | | | | |
| M. Estimated Income Range | \$1,000-\$14,999 | 0.7% | 7 | | | | |
| | \$15,000-\$24,999 | 0.0% | 0 | | | | |
| | \$25,000-\$34,999 | 0.8% | 8 | | | | |
| | \$35,000-\$49,999 | 0.6% | 6 | | | | |
| | \$50,000-\$74,999 | 1.2% | 12 | | | | |
| | \$75,000-\$99,999 | 2.9% | 29 | | | | |
| | \$100,000-\$124,999 | 1.5% | 15 | | | | |
| | \$125,000-\$149,999 | 1.7% | 17 | | | | |
| | \$150,000-\$174,999 | 4.2% | 41 | | | | |
| | \$175,000-\$199,999 | 3.5% | 35 | | | | |
| | \$200,000-\$249,999 | 50.8% | 503 | | | | |
| | \$250,000 and up | 31.6% | 313 | | | | |
| | Unknown | 0.5% | 5 | | | | |
| N. Estimated Home Value Range | \$0K to \$19K | 0.0% | 0 | | | | |
| | \$20K to \$49K | 0.0% | 0 | | | | |
| | \$50K to \$99K | 0.0% | 0 | | | | |
| | \$100K to \$149K | 0.0% | 0 | | | | |
| | \$150K to \$174K | 0.0% | 0 | | | | |
| | \$175K to \$199K | 0.0% | 0 | | | | |
| | \$200K to \$249K | 0.0% | 0 | | | | |
| | \$250K to \$299K | 0.0% | 0 | | | | |
| | \$300K to \$399K | 0.0% | 0 | | | | |
| | \$400K to \$499K | 0.0% | 0 | | | | |
| | \$500K to \$749K | 0.4% | 4 | | | | |
| | \$750K to \$999K | 0.7% | 7 | | | | |
| | \$1000K to 1M and over | 98.7% | 977 | | | | |
| Unknown | 0.3% | 3 | | | | | |

| | | Los Altos Residents 18+ | | | Non-Resident Users 18+ | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------|-----------|------------------------|-------|-----------|
| | | Column N % | Count | Σ or Mean | Column N % | Count | Σ or Mean |
| O. Social Economic Ladder | 8.00 | 2.2% | 21 | | | | |
| | 9.00 | 97.3% | 964 | | | | |
| | Unknown | 0.5% | 5 | | | | |
| P. Individual Party | American Independent | 2.2% | 21 | | | | |
| | Democratic | 53.7% | 531 | | | | |
| | Green | 0.0% | 0 | | | | |
| | Libertarian | 0.7% | 7 | | | | |
| | Natural Law | 0.0% | 0 | | | | |
| | Non-Partisan | 26.2% | 260 | | | | |
| | Other | 0.0% | 0 | | | | |
| | Peace and Freedom | 0.0% | 0 | | | | |
| | Reform | 0.0% | 0 | | | | |
| | Republican | 17.2% | 171 | | | | |
| | Unknown | 0.0% | 0 | | | | |
| | No data | 0.0% | 0 | | | | |
| | Q. Household Party Tyoe | Dem | 35.6% | 352 | | | |
| Dem&Ind | | 24.2% | 240 | | | | |
| Dem&Rep | | 7.2% | 71 | | | | |
| Dem&Rep&Ind | | 2.2% | 22 | | | | |
| Ind | | 14.4% | 143 | | | | |
| Rep | | 9.3% | 92 | | | | |
| Rep&Ind | | 7.1% | 70 | | | | |
| No data | | 0.0% | 0 | | | | |
| R. Household Gender Composition | Mixed Gender Household | 76.4% | 756 | | | | |
| | Female Only Household | 11.7% | 115 | | | | |
| | Male Only Household | 9.5% | 94 | | | | |
| | Cannot Determine | 2.5% | 25 | | | | |
| | No data | 0.0% | 0 | | | | |
| S. Registration Date | 2017 to present | 59.8% | 592 | | | | |
| | 2013-2016 | 8.4% | 83 | | | | |
| | 2009-2012 | 4.8% | 48 | | | | |
| | 2005-2008 | 4.0% | 39 | | | | |
| | 2001-2004 | 6.6% | 66 | | | | |
| | 1997-2000 | 3.7% | 36 | | | | |
| | 1993-1996 | 3.0% | 30 | | | | |
| | 1981-1992 | 6.1% | 61 | | | | |
| | 1980 or before | 3.6% | 36 | | | | |
| | Not coded | 0.0% | 0 | | | | |
| T. Voting Frequency | .00 | 9.4% | 93 | | | | |
| | 1.00 | 4.2% | 42 | | | | |
| | 2.00 | 7.4% | 73 | | | | |
| | 3.00 | 9.5% | 95 | | | | |
| | 4.00 | 9.7% | 96 | | | | |
| | 5.00 | 10.2% | 101 | | | | |
| | 6.00 | 12.7% | 126 | | | | |
| | 7.00 | 13.9% | 138 | | | | |
| | 8.00 | 23.0% | 228 | | | | |

| | | Los Altos Residents 18+ | | | Non-Resident Users 18+ | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|-------|-----------|------------------------|-------|-----------|
| | | Column N % | Count | Σ or Mean | Column N % | Count | Σ or Mean |
| U. Voting History | | see detailed crosstabs | | | | | |
| V. Household Voter Count | 1.00 | 17.7% | 175 | | | | |
| | 2.00 | 49.3% | 488 | | | | |
| | 3.00 | 22.0% | 218 | | | | |
| | 4.00 | 9.7% | 96 | | | | |
| | 5.00 | 1.2% | 12 | | | | |
| | 6.00 | 0.1% | 1 | | | | |
| | No data | 0.0% | 0 | | | | |
| W. Permanent Absentee Voter | Military | 0.4% | 4 | | | | |
| | Permanent US | 88.6% | 877 | | | | |
| | Unknown | 11.0% | 109 | | | | |



GODBE RESEARCH
Gain Insight



City of Los Altos: 2020 Community Center Survey

October 2020

The City of Los Altos commissioned Godbe Research to conduct a survey of local voters and adult residents ages 18+ with the following research objectives:

- Gauge overall satisfaction with living in Los Altos and the City's provision of services;
- Gauge satisfaction with the City's provision of parks and recreation facilities, programs, and services;
- Understand preferences for leisure activities and potential participation in those activities after the Covid crisis ends;
- Gauge awareness of the City's development of a new community center;
- Prioritize recreation facilities, activities and programs to be included in the new center, as well as preferred days and times of use;
- Assess interest in reserving space in the new community center for an event or function; and
- Identify any differences in opinion due to demographic and/or voter behavioral characteristics.

- Data Collection
 - Los Altos Residents Adults 18+
Landline (47), cell phone (8), text to online (862), and email to online (138) interviewing
 - Non-Residents Adults 18+
Text to online (137) and email to online (18) interviewing
- Universe
 - 22,498 Los Altos adult residents ages 18+ (based on 2018 American Community Survey)
 - Non-residents ages 18 years and older
- Fielding Dates
 - September 28 through October 4, 2020
- Interview Length
 - 20 minutes
- Sample Size
 - n=1,055 Los Altos Voters and Residents Adults 18+ (weighted to Adults 18+ from 2018 ACS data)
 - n=155 Non-Residents
- Margin of Error
 - ± 2.95% Los Altos Residents Adults 18+
 - n/a Non-Residents Adults 18+




GODBE RESEARCH
Gain Insight



Key Findings


Q1. Favorability Rating of How Agencies are Addressing Coronavirus

Los Altos Adult Residents 18+




Q2. Satisfaction With Quality of Life

Los Altos Adult Residents 18+




Q3. Satisfaction With City's Provision of Services

Los Altos Adult Residents 18+




Q4. Satisfaction With City Facilities or Services

Los Altos Adult Residents 18+




Q5. Preferred Leisure Activities I

Los Altos Adult Residents 18+




Q5. Preferred Leisure Activities II

Los Altos Adult Residents 18+




Q6. Frequency of Participating in Preferred Leisure Activities in Los Altos

Los Altos Adult Residents 18+




Q7. Frequency of Participating in Preferred Leisure Activities Outside Los Altos


Los Altos Adult Residents 18+




Q8. How Covid-19 Crisis Will Change Use of City Parks & Recreation Facilities After the Crisis Ends



Q9. Seen, Heard or Read About Plan to Build New Community Center in Los Altos




Q10. Likelihood to Use Recreation Facilities in New Los Altos Community Center I




Note: The above rating questions have been abbreviated for charting purposes, and responses were recoded to calculate mean scores: Extremely Likely = +4, "Very Likely" = +3, "Somewhat Likely" = +2, "Not Too Likely" = +1, and "Not At All Likely" = 0.

Q10. Likelihood to Use Recreation Facilities in New Los Altos Community Center II




Note: The above rating questions have been abbreviated for charting purposes, and responses were recoded to calculate mean scores: Extremely Likely = +4, "Very Likely" = +3, "Somewhat Likely" = +2, "Not Too Likely" = +1, and "Not At All Likely" = 0.

Q11. Facilities Most Likely to Drop By or Hang Out at New Community Center I




Note: Items that were mentioned by less than 2 percent of the respondents have been added to the "Other" category for charting purposes.

Q11. Facilities Most Likely to Drop By or Hang Out at New Community Center II




Note: Items that were mentioned by less than 2 percent of the respondents have been added to the "Other" category for charting purposes.

Q12. Likelihood to Use Recreation Programs in New Los Altos Community Center I




Note: The above rating questions have been abbreviated for charting purposes, and responses were recoded to calculate mean scores: "Extremely Likely" = +4, "Very Likely" = +3, "Somewhat Likely" = +2, "Not Too Likely" = +1, and "Not At All Likely" = 0.

Q12. Likelihood to Use Recreation Programs in New Los Altos Community Center II




Note: The above rating questions have been abbreviated for charting purposes, and responses were recorded to calculate mean scores: "Extremely Likely" = +4, "Very Likely" = +3, "Somewhat Likely" = +2, "Not Too Likely" = +1, and "Not At All Likely" = 0.

Q13. Programs Most Likely to Encourage Dropping By or Hanging Out at New Community Center I




Q13. Programs Most Likely to Encourage Dropping By or Hanging Out at New Community Center II




Note: Items that were mentioned by less than 2 percent of the respondents have been added to the "Other" category for charting purposes.

Q14. Preferences for Dance or Fitness Programs




Note: Items that were mentioned by less than 2 percent of the respondents have been added to the "Other" category for charting purposes.

Q15. Preferences for Teen Programs




Note: Items that were mentioned by less than 2 percent of the respondents have been added to the "Other" category for charting purposes.


Q16. Preferences for Arts and Crafts Programs




Q17. Preferences for Active Adult Programs




Q18. Opinion on Los Altos Recreation Program Fees




Q19. Likelihood of Reserving Space at New Community Center for Function or Event




Q20. Preferences for Event Type to Reserve Space at Community Center




Q21. Day of the Week Most Likely to Visit New Community Center




Q22. Time of Day Most Likely to Visit New Community Center



Q23. Parks/Facilities Preferred to Use for Activities I



Q23. Parks/Facilities Preferred to Use for Activities II



Note: Items that were mentioned by less than 2 percent of the respondents have been added to the "Other" category for charting purposes.




GODBE RESEARCH
Gain Insight




Additional Demographic Information
(Asked of Respondent)

QA. Length of Residence in Los Altos


Los Altos Adult Residents 18+




QB. Children in Household




QC. Age of Children in Household




QD. Gender




QE. Age




QF. Home Ownership



QG. Ethnicity I



QG. Ethnicity II





GODBE RESEARCH
Gain Insight



www.godberesearch.com

California and Corporate Offices
1220 Howard Avenue, Suite 250
Burlingame, CA 94010

Nevada Office
59 Damonte Ranch Parkway, Suite B309
Reno, NV 89521