

Community Center/Recreation Center Study

Submitted to:

Town of Scarborough, Maine

Larissa Crockett, Assistant Town Manager

Todd Souza, C.P.R.P., Community Services Director

Submitted by:

Marguerite Fleming

Spring 2019 Intern

Date of Submission:

Friday, May 17, 2019

Introduction

This report outlines the findings of a Spring 2019 Community/Recreation Center study aimed at assessing the processes and outcomes of local, regional, and national peer communities that have built municipal community/recreation centers. The study was undertaken to assist the Town of Scarborough, Maine Community Services Director, Town Manager, Town Council, and anticipated resident ad-hoc building committee in executing the initial stages of the development process for the Town's proposed municipal community/recreation center.

Methodology

This study employed survey research. Municipal parks and recreation department directors as well as recreation/community center directors were interviewed via phone over a period of fifteen weeks from January thru May 2019. The process of identifying peer communities for the study sample was conducted in multiple stages. Maine towns with municipal community/recreation centers were sent requests for interviews via email and phone. A Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) reference set of New England municipalities with populations ranging from 10,000-30,000 people, used by Scarborough for a prior budget survey, was employed to identify regional peer communities. Towns in the reference set with community/recreation centers were contacted. The population of U.S. cities 19,000-21,000 list from NYdatabases.com was used to identify national peer communities.¹ The list was narrowed to only include municipalities with community/recreation centers. The municipalities' U.S. Census Bureau QuickFacts were then compared with those of Scarborough with special attention paid to the "persons under 18 years," "persons 65 years and over," "Race and Hispanic origin," "median value of owner-occupied housing units, 2013-2017," and "median household income, 2013-2017" categories.

Several challenges arose during the process of selecting peer communities that should be acknowledged as they influenced the final sample. First, the identification process revealed that only a limited number of towns with populations of around 20,000 have full-service community centers. In New England especially, many centers' amenities were limited to multipurpose rooms and gymnasiums. The Town of Scarborough Assistant Town Manager and Community Services Director approved increasing the population cap to 40,000 to mitigate this challenge. 40,000 was deemed appropriate in consideration of Scarborough's day-time and regional populations. Additionally, several difficulties arose in the process of identifying national peer communities. First, the most used and reputable identification tool, the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago Peer Identification Tool only includes the larger Maine cities of Portland and Lewiston. It was also difficult to find peer communities with similar population and demographics to those of

¹ <http://rochester.nydatabases.com/database/population-us-cities>

Scarborough, particularly the age distribution, median income and median housing value categories. The age of centers, especially those of the Maine and GFOA reference set municipalities, also posed challenges including current directors not being able to provide historical information or centers no longer serving communities' needs. Finally, several identified peer communities did not respond to requests for interviews. The documents folder accompanying this report includes a "potential additional site visits list" of identified centers that were not included in the sample.

Ultimately, fifteen individuals representing fifteen Maine, New England, and national municipal community/recreation centers were interviewed for this study.

- Maine²
 - Chris Beaulieu, Director of Recreation and Parks-Sargent Family Community Center, Presque Isle (2017 pop. 9,078)
 - Lucky D'Ascanio, Director of Parks and Community Programs-Mason-Motz Activity Center, Falmouth (2012 pop. 22,285)
 - Anthony Johnson, Recreation Operations Manager-South Portland Community Center, South Portland (2017 pop. 25,483)
- New England
 - Rus Wilson, Recreation Director-Connie Bean Community Center and Spinnaker Point Recreation Center, Portsmouth, New Hampshire (2017 pop. 21,796)
 - Jon Straggas, Former General Manager-Beede Swim and Fitness Center, Concord, Massachusetts (2010 pop. 17,669)
 - Dennis DiPinto (administrative assistant-Jane Byrnes), Director of Parks and Recreation-Ridgefield Recreation Center, Ridgefield, Connecticut (2010 pop. 24,638)
 - Rick Maynard, Director of Parks, Recreation, and Seniors-Nathanael B. Greene Community Center, Guilford, Connecticut (2017 pop. 22,283)
 - Mary Thibeault, Recreation Supervisor II and Martin Sitler, Director, Vernon, CT Parks and Recreation (former Wethersfield administrator) -Wethersfield Community Center, Wethersfield, Connecticut (2017 pop. 26,195)
 - Craig Bowman, Director of Parks and Recreation-Rocky Hill Community Center, Rocky Hill, Connecticut (2017 pop. 20,105)
 - Curt Vincente, Director of Parks and Recreation-Mansfield Community Center, Mansfield, Connecticut (2010 pop. 26,543)
- National
 - Nate Lami, Recreation Center Coordinator-Fairhope Recreation Center & Municipal Pool, Fairhope, Alabama (2017 pop. 20,935)

² Wiscasset, Westbrook, and Brunswick were identified as towns having municipal community centers. The Wiscasset Community Center was not included in the study because the Town of Scarborough Community Services Director formerly managed the center. Staff members at the Westbrook Community did not respond to phone and email requests for interviews. After an initial discussion with the Brunswick Recreation Center director, it was determined that the center was not a good model as it was acquired through federal conveyance after the naval air station closed.

- David Ford, Recreation Manager-Don Umerley Civic Center, Rocky River, Ohio (2017 pop. 20,216)
- Kimberly Dasbach, Superintendent of Recreation- Bartlett Community Center, Bartlett, Illinois (2017 pop. 41,149)
- Paul Besterman, Director of Recreation and Leisure Services-Community & Recreation Center at Boyce Mayview Park, Upper St. Clair, Pennsylvania (2017 pop. 19,692)

Each of the directors was asked the following questions: (1) Community/recreation center size? (2) Community/recreation center amenities? (3) What was the philosophy/motivation for the community center? (4) What public process did the community use at different stages of the project? (5) Was a needs assessment conducted? If so, was it conducted internally or did the community contract an external firm? (6) Did the community include school department sports teams in the design? (7) Did the community consider public/private partnerships in the design? (8) Community/recreation center cost to build? (9) What funding structure/sources were used? (10) Community/recreation center operating cost? (11) Community/recreation center user fee structure? (12) Community resource or self-sustaining? (13) What elements of the process or outcome would the community like to have done differently?

Interview Findings

Community/Recreation Center Size

The fifteen centers range in size from 13,400 square feet to 130,000 square feet. Three centers are less than 25,000 square feet, five centers are between 30,000 and 38,000 square feet, and four centers are between 55,000 and 130,000 square feet.

Amenities

The study raised the important design distinction between community center and recreation center models. Four centers follow the community center model-Guilford, CT, Falmouth, ME, Rocky Hill, CT, and the Portsmouth, NH Connie Bean Center. The amenities at these centers are largely limited to small gymnasiums, multipurpose rooms, meeting rooms, classrooms and offices. After receiving feedback from the Scarborough Assistant Town Manager and Community Services Director, the criteria for identifying centers for the study sample was shifted to prioritize full-service centers.

All of the centers with the exception of the Beede Swim & Fitness Center feature a gymnasium space. Directors' discussed the functionality of having a regulation gymnasium with multiple courts. Specifically, "with an indoor regulation gym, you can run your whole basketball program in one facility" and having multiple courts allows for multiple sports to be played at once. Five of the centers have gymnasiums that can be subdivided into at least two basketball

courts. Seven of the centers also feature walking tracks. Additional gymnasium amenities include regulation volleyball courts, pickleball courts, racquetball courts, bocce ball courts, futsal (hard court) soccer goals, and bleacher seating.

Directors' responses also highlight the need for separate spaces for sports activities and for fitness activities. Nine of the centers have fitness spaces with cardio equipment. Several centers also include studio rooms for fitness classes and a few centers feature locker rooms and saunas. In discussing the decision not to include a fitness center in the Sargent Family Community Center, the Presque Isle, ME director asserted the important consideration of not wanting to compete with private gyms.

Eight of the centers include aquatic facilities. Directors discussed the functionality of indoor pools in that they can be used to train lifeguards and swim instructors in advance of the summer season as well as to provide year round swim instruction. Six of the centers feature multi-lane lap pools, three feature diving wells, and four feature therapy pools. Directors also conveyed the desirability of recreation pools. Four centers have indoor recreation pools with features such as zero entry pools, spray bays, slides, lazy rivers, and tumble buckets. Three centers have outdoor aquatic facilities with additional recreational amenities including sand-play areas, aquatic ziplines, lily pads, underwater benches, concession stands, lounge chairs, pavilions, and outdoor changing rooms.

Additional center amenities include senior, teen, and preschool rooms, game rooms, playgrounds, arts and crafts rooms, kitchens, offices, conference rooms, auditoriums, banquet halls, computer rooms, and sitting areas with free Wi-Fi-access.

Philosophy/Motivation for Centers

The most frequently cited motivation for the building the centers was to fill a community need. Directors discussed how towns' comprehensive plans identified the lack of a community center and the need for a multi-generational community resource. Several communities lacked specific amenities such as aquatic facilities, fitness centers, and meeting and event spaces. Additionally, directors indicated the need for dedicated senior and teen spaces and programming. Another commonly cited motivation was older centers that were in poor condition and/or no longer meeting communities' needs. More specific motivations included the presence of abandoned buildings that could be repurposed and existing facilities that could no longer be supported by private organizations. The Presque Isle, ME director cited the unique motivation of promoting community development. He described the center's importance to the City's downtown redevelopment efforts in that it reconnects the downtown to the riverfront and has incentivized redevelopment in nearby neighborhoods.

Public Processes

The public processes employed by peer communities during their center development processes is another area in which it was difficult to gather specific information due to directors' limited historical knowledge. The most frequently cited public process used by communities was the establishment of committees. Most communities established overarching community/recreation committees and then added additional sub-committees as projects progressed including design, construction, program, fee structure, fundraising, and public relations committees. Seven communities conducted needs assessments. Four of these communities conducted needs assessments internally. The other three communities hired external consulting firms. Additionally, three communities hired architectural firms to create conceptual designs for public review. Communities also held several rounds of public hearings, forums, focus groups, and meetings with key stakeholders. Two communities created visioning surveys and one community conducted informal polling. Seven communities used the referendum process to approve funding for their centers. Two communities-Concord, MA and Presque Isle, ME funded the majority of their centers' construction costs through private donations. Presque Isle's fundraising campaign included the hiring of a capital campaign consulting firm and a management analyst/intern as well as the establishment of a campaign committee. Finally, several communities engaged in public relations efforts such as posting frequent project updates and announcements on their websites and social media, sending mailers, and distributing press releases. Additionally, Presque Isle established a public relations committee. The documents folder accompanying this report includes links to websites for on-going center development projects.

Design Consideration of School Department Sports Teams and Public/Private Partnerships

The majority of the municipalities in the study sample did not include school sports teams in the design of their centers because their schools have adequate athletic facilities. The Bartlett, IL Park District uses school facilities after hours in addition to the space at its center. The Upper St. Clair, PA center director stated the additional reason for not including school sports teams in the design that, "the center was built for the community not for the school department." The Concord, MA, Fairhope, AL, South Portland, ME, and Mansfield, CT centers are regularly used by school sports teams. Three of the four centers' pools are used by high school swim teams. The Mansfield high school swim team's need for practice space helped generate support for the center. The use of the Mansfield center pool by swim teams also generates significant rental revenue. South Portland High School teams use the South Portland Community Center for practices and games. The City of South Portland does not charge the school department to use the community center. Along with being used for school athletics, the Fairhope center's color scheme includes Fairhope High School's colors and numerous youth and high school team

posters are hung throughout the facility. Additional points of note regarding the consideration of school athletics in center design processes are that Presque Isle took inventory of the school athletic facilities as a component of the needs assessment for its center, Portsmouth's Connie Bean Center is used jointly by middle school students and the community as it was funded in conjunction with a middle school construction project, and in expanding its center Rocky Hill, CT is considering creating an afterschool program. Additionally, directors noted that because of security concerns it is becoming increasingly difficult for community members to utilize school facilities.

Seven of the community/recreation centers in the study sample currently or have previously engaged in public/private partnerships. The most common forms of partnerships are renting space to private fitness instructors and physical therapists. Portsmouth's Spinnaker Point rents space to outside fitness instructors to provide fitness activities. The director stated that this arrangement is beneficial because it provides revenue and expertise. The Rocky River, OH center leases space to Cleveland Clinic for therapy for autistic children. The Bartlett, IL center originally leased space to a physical therapist and a massage therapist but these arrangements are no longer in place. The Concord, MA and Mansfield, CT centers both have agreements with aquatic therapists. The Concord center has a three year lease agreement with the monthly rate based on how many clients the therapist sees during the month. The Mansfield agreement is a non-monetary exchange with the therapists encouraging patients to continue using the center. The Concord center also rents the pool on weeknights and Saturday mornings to a competitive diving team and has made accommodations for surrounding communities when their aquatic facilities are under renovation. The Falmouth, ME center rents space to Falmouth Corner Preschool Co-Operative. Additionally, in designing the expansion of its center, Rocky Hill, CT is considering renting rooms to small businesses such as a driving school. The most frequently cited reason by directors for not considering public/private partnerships was the desire to preserve maximum use for residents.

Cost to Build/Funding Sources/Operating Cost

The below chart lists the year completed, construction cost, funding sources used, and current operating cost for each center. Some of the information was not provided or is not available because recently hired directors did not know historical information, several centers are additions or renovations to previously constructed buildings, and/or centers' operating costs could not be broken out from Parks and Recreation Department budgets. Individual centers' construction and operating budgets are included in the documents folder accompanying this report.

Center Name	Year Completed	Cost	Funding Sources	Operating Cost
Bartlett Community Center Aquatic center renovation	1998	\$18 million \$6 million	Bond	Could not be broken out
Beede Swim and Fitness Center	2006	\$11 million	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parks and Recreation Department was holding previously donated funds. • Alfred Sawyer Trust-\$6 million • Beede Family-\$1 million • Additional donations 	FY20-\$2,471,594
Community & Recreation Center at Boyce Mayview Park	2009	\$16 million	30 year bond	\$5 million
Connie Bean Community Center (Renovation-created center within middle school)	2012	\$2.2 million	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$512,700-bond premiums from sale of bond related to a middle school construction project • Remainder-unassigned fund balance 	FY19-\$362,691
Don Umerley Civic Center	2001 2007-42,000 square foot addition	addition-\$8.4 million	bond	Could not be broken out
Fairhope Recreation Center & Municipal Pool (Expansion)	2009	\$2,275,000 (recreation center was added to existing pool and gym)	General obligation bond	Not provided
Mansfield Community Center	2003	\$7,675,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$400,000 school renovation appropriation 	Most of department budget is for the center, FY18-\$2.4

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$4,715,000-State payment in lieu of public university property tax revenue • \$2.5 million bond • \$340,114 donations 	million
Mason-Motz Activity Center (Renovation-old school)	2015	\$996,000 (Added heating and HVAC and separated two attached buildings)	Not provided	FY18 Department Total-\$511,500 (38% is for community center and programming)
Nathanael B. Greene Community Center	1993	\$1.7 million	20 year bond	Could not be broken out
Ridgefield Recreation Center	2002	\$14-\$15 million	Part of \$90 million appropriation- also used to convert the old recreation center back into an elementary school and to fund renovations at several schools	FY18-\$2,600,000
Rocky Hill Community Center	unknown	Currently working on 9,650 square foot addition-\$10,500,000	expansion-bond	Could not be broken out
Sargent Family Community Center	2017	\$10 million	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Debt Service (25 years at 4%)-\$5,250,000 • Federal Brownfield Grant Funds • Sale of old center building-4245,000 • Private Donations-\$3.5 million 	Not provided
South Portland Community Center (Expansion)	2000	\$4,200,000 (community center was an addition to existing pool built in 1978)	Part of a \$6,700,000 bond issue that also included purchase and development of Wainwright Recreation Complex	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FY18 pool-\$356,385 (general fund) • FY18 center-\$786,934 (general fund) • Enterprise funds for programming (self-sustaining)

Spinnaker Point Recreation Center (Renovation)	2001	\$750,000 (added gym, additional lockers, bathrooms, and a multipurpose room)	Municipally appropriated through capital improvements budget	FY19-\$273,378
Wethersfield Community Center (Renovation-old school)	1978	cosmetic improvements, added air conditioning and commercial kitchen	Federal funds	Could not be broken out. Department budget was \$431,301 in FY18
9/11 Memorial Sports Center Addition		Added gym, fitness room, and meeting room with wireless internet access, laptop computers and a Smart Board.	The Richard M. Keane Foundation and additional \$60,000 in grant funds	

User Fee Structure

Centers generate revenue through membership fees, program fees, renting rooms, gym, track, and pool fees, and providing childcare. Individual centers’ membership fees, program costs, room rental pricing, childcare pricing, and membership agreements are included in the documents folder accompanying this report. For facilities rentals, commonly used pricing strategies include higher prices for non-residents, non-profit rates, special event and business packages, and the use of security deposits. The majority of the survey sample centers charge programming fees. Common structures for program fees include higher fees for non-residents and priority registration for registrations as well as senior citizen rates and fee discounts for center members. Some centers allow residents to use gyms and walking tracks for free while charging small fees for non-residents. The centers with aquatic facilities offer daily and annual/seasonal passes with different rates for members/non-members, age categories, and single/couples/families. The Bartlett, IL center offers early-bird, regular, and mid-season pool passes as well as twilight rates. Centers provide several different membership options depending on the level of amenities accessible, resident/non-resident, single/couple, and age categories. Additional rate offerings include free one year memberships for veterans, nanny/caretaker rates, neighboring town rates, business owner rates, and business benefits package partnerships. As the Portsmouth, NH Spinnaker Point Recreation Center is located within in a condominium complex, condominium owners receive two free memberships. Additionally, several centers offer trial membership options such as single day, ten visit, one month, and guest passes. The Rocky Hill, CT and South Portland centers also offer financial aid. Use of a few centers is restricted to certain populations. Portsmouth restricts access to the Connie Bean Center to youth

and Spinnaker Point to individuals 18 years and older. Spinnaker Point and the Rocky River, OH center both originally limited membership to residents but have since expanded to non-residents to increase fee revenue.

Community Resource or Self-Sustaining

Most of the centers operate as community resources in that they do not rely solely upon fee revenue for funding. Two of the centers are fully self-sustaining. The Beede Swim and Fitness Center is operated as a self-supported enterprise fund which is financed solely through membership and program fees. The Community & Recreation Center at Boyce Mayview Park is self-sustaining, generating approximately \$6 million in annual revenues. Three centers are primarily self-sustaining. The Mansfield Community Center is self-supporting with the exception of some staff positions and programming that receive general fund support. The Ridgefield Recreation Center is “substantially self-supporting.” Finally, the Bartlett Community Center membership fees sustain “a larger portion” of the center operating cost resulting in “very little” taxpayer funding needed.

Directors’ responses to the community resource or self-sustaining question and media articles revealed the importance of maintaining fee affordability and market competitiveness while adjusting for economic fluctuations. Several communities conducted pricing studies as a component of the design processes for their centers and many also conduct fee increase reviews annually or every few years. In adjusting fees, the Beede Center aims to avoid “shock increases” and to “encourage a use of the facility that is appropriate for its capacity.” In 2017, after several years of declines in family and couple memberships, the center introduced shorter term membership options, eliminated the non-resident rate, reduced the joining fee, and switched to requiring monthly recurring billing.

Elements of the Process or Outcome that Would Have Done Differently

The most frequently cited outcome that directors would have done differently is providing increased parking spaces as centers’ parking lots become full during peak times. Directors also stated that their communities are outgrowing their centers’ available programming space. Several directors specifically discussed their desires to have regulation/multi-court gymnasiums and larger fitness centers with separate studio spaces. A third frequently mentioned challenge is inadequate storage and office space. The Directors discussed how, while necessary, storage and office space are often minimized during design processes as they are not appealing features to residents. A fourth set of outcome challenges were related to centers’ locker rooms. The Ridgefield, CT and Rocky River, OH directors stated a need for larger locker rooms, the Upper St. Clair, PA center operations audit cited the unacceptability of the locker rooms’ original

carpeted floors, and the Wethersfield director desires to upgrade the center's bathrooms. Fifth, several directors discussed issues related to flow. The Rocky River and Bartlett, IL centers' front desk configurations allow patrons to bypass checking-in. Sixth, several directors discussed aquatic facility issues such as the need for larger lap pools and/or leisure pools and filtration systems improvements. An article on the Concord, MA center discussed the lack of pool deck space for families to gather and socialize.³ A seventh set of outcomes that directors would have done differently involve center technology. The Rocky Hill, CT director desires for the expansion of the Rocky Hill Community Center to include technology upgrades. The Wethersfield, CT center director described how the center's outdated technology has impeded renovation projects as the required technology upgrades expand projects' scale. Conversely, the Presque Isle, ME director stated that the Sargent Family Community Center's technology is more state of the art than was needed. For example, the center lighting is computerized and only one technician in the entire state is able to adjust it. Additional center specific challenges noted by directors include the underestimation of custodian costs and the desires for a turf field, batting facility, bleachers, larger kitchen, heating/cooling improvements, as well as improved signage. A comprehensive recreation needs study commissioned by Portsmouth, NH stated that one multi-generational center would better serve the community's needs than the two existing centers.

In terms of process, the Presque Isle director described how he would like to have conducted the process by which the resident versus non-resident program rates were determined differently. Presque Isle wanted the four surrounding communities included in the school district to contribute towards funding the center but there was a rupture in the negotiation process due to miscommunication and complicated paperwork. Presque Isle decided to institute a higher non-resident rate which has negatively impacted usage by residents of the surrounding towns. Finally, directors responses to the question of what processes or outcomes they would like to change as well as centers' cut back lists highlighted the caution that value engineering can result in future space limitations.

Other Findings

An important topic given Scarborough's increasing 65 years and older population that arose during the study is the question of whether and to what extent to include senior citizen programming in community/recreation center design. The Presque Isle, ME, Guilford, CT, Falmouth, ME, South Portland, ME, Wethersfield, CT, and Rocky Hill, CT centers include dedicated spaces for seniors. The Presque Isle senior center is 1,400 square feet and includes a television, billiards table, seating, a full kitchen, and game tables. The multi-purpose space/gymnasium at the Guilford center also serves as a senior center and includes a full kitchen.

³ <https://concord.wickedlocal.com/article/20160310/NEWS/160319709>

The center originally had a senior lounge that has since been converted into a multigenerational game room. The Wethersfield center has a four room senior center. The Falmouth center has a senior room and the South Portland center has a senior wing. Rocky Hill's senior center is a major component of its center expansion and Portsmouth, NH is currently building a new senior center.

The interviews revealed challenges with balancing senior residents' desired center amenities and unique needs with those of the rest of the community. The Guilford center director described criticism during the center design process that it would be a "Taj Mahal for seniors." However, he believes that it has become as center for everyone and that the intergenerational nature of the shared multipurpose space works well. The former Wethersfield center director similarly stated that senior residents lobbied intensely during the public outreach process for a dedicated senior center but that the town was able to strike a balance. The Rocky Hill center expansion arose as a result of a 2017 senior survey and a groundswell of senior residents who desired a dedicated senior center. While the project was expanded to a community center addition during the public engagement process, managing the expectations of a group of senior residents who continue to push for a dedicated senior space has proven difficult. A National Recreation and Park Association article describes necessary compromises that must be made in providing senior spaces,

Any new senior center under consideration today must be versatile to justify its use. Since older adults will use the facility mostly during weekdays, it can be rented for other uses...The other alternative in this scenario is to add on to an existing community center or just incorporate older adult activities into the community center...A bit of creative scheduling is required to accommodate everyone, but since most older adult use is during the weekday morning to afternoon time, it does have less of an impact on total members.⁴

A second finding identified over the course of the study is the importance of post-completion marketing efforts especially for the self-supporting centers. The Mansfield, CT and Upper St. Clair, PA centers and likely others contracted firms to develop marketing plans and the Bartlett, IL Park District Recreation Department employs a marketing manager. The process of identifying centers for the study sample and researching selected centers also highlighted the effectiveness of informative and easy to navigate websites. Example websites are included in the documents folder accompany this report. Best practice website features include comprehensive lists of amenities, program, membership, and facilities rental information, facility hours, staff contact information (including emails), information on the center's history, and virtual tour videos.

⁴ <https://www.nrpa.org/parks-recreation-magazine/2018/january/senior-center-vs.-community-center/>

Conclusion

This report has described the findings of a survey research study conducted over fifteen weeks from January thru May 2019 aimed at assessing the processes and outcomes of local regional, and national peer communities that have built municipal community/recreation centers. Interviews were conducted with fifteen community/recreation center directors and parks and recreation department directors representing fifteen municipal community/recreation centers. The report has outlined the directors' responses to the thirteen interview questions as well as additional topics identified over the course of the study.

Key findings include:

- Most peer communities were motivated to build community/recreation centers by an identified community need
- Majority of peer communities established committees to oversee center development processes
- Design differences between community and recreation centers
- Value of space maximization and multi-use spaces
- Functionality of regulation gymnasiums, separate fitness spaces, and indoor pools
- Majority of peer communities did not include school departments in center design processes but many have engaged in public/private partnerships
- Majority of centers were at least partially funded through bonds
- Most centers offer different membership and program rates based on the level of accessible amenities and resident/non-resident, age, and marital/family status
- The majority of centers are not self-sustaining
- Top three outcomes that directors would like to have done differently:
 - Increased parking
 - Increased programing space
 - Increased storage and office space
- Importance of balancing senior residents' needs with those of the larger community in conceptualizing center design
- Importance of marketing efforts

It is hoped that this report will assist in informing the initial stages of the development process for the Town of Scarborough, Maine's proposed community/recreation center.