



CITY OF SAN MATEO

City Hall
330 W. 20th Avenue
San Mateo CA 94403
www.cityofsanmateo.org

Agenda Report

Agenda Number: 1

Section Name: STUDY SESSION

Account Number: 82-4681

File ID: 25-10490

TO: City Council
FROM: Alex Khojikian, City Manager
PREPARED BY: Public Works Department
MEETING DATE: October 20, 2025
SUBJECT:
Citywide Facilities Condition Assessment – Informational

RECOMMENDATION:

Receive an overview of the Citywide Comprehensive Facilities Condition Assessment and provide feedback and direction on next steps.

BACKGROUND:

The City owns and manages a diverse portfolio of over one hundred buildings, which vary significantly in type, age, size, and physical condition. To ensure responsible stewardship of these assets and optimize the use of available resources, the Facilities and Fleet Services Division of the Public Works Department established an initiative to develop a comprehensive, Citywide maintenance and capital improvement program. This initiative includes evaluating each facility on an individual basis, identifying physical deficiencies, and prioritizing needed repairs or upgrades using a systematic, data-driven approach.

In Fiscal Year 2024–25, the City retained ELS Architecture and Urban Design (ELS) to conduct property condition assessments across a portion of the City’s building inventory, with the primary goal to provide a clear understanding of each facility’s physical health and support long-term asset management decisions through accurate data.

ELS conducted evaluations using both destructive and non-destructive methods to observe and document the physical conditions of City facilities. Their scope of work included inspections of structural elements, roofing systems, and mechanical, electrical, and plumbing (MEP) infrastructure, as well as site-specific factors such as accessibility and general wear and tear. Each facility's assessment culminated in a detailed report that included:

- Identification of critical physical and design deficiencies
- Recommendations for modernization and capital improvement projects
- Preventative maintenance plans to prolong the useful life of building systems
- Probable cost estimates to address identified issues
- A prioritization framework to guide future budgeting and scheduling

The Assessment Process

The City initially identified ninety-seven (97) occupiable properties for evaluation. These ranged from large civic facilities to smaller assets such as restrooms within public parks. During the preliminary review, ELS and City staff determined that thirty-seven (37) of these properties would be excluded from the assessment for one or more of the following reasons:

- The facility is currently under construction or already undergoing an assessment
- The facility was recently constructed and shows no significant signs of deterioration
- The facility is too small or minor to justify a full condition assessment

Sixty (60) of the remaining facilities were divided into two groups:

- Group A: Detailed Assessments (10 buildings)
These facilities were identified as high priority due to their size, complexity, or observed condition. They underwent in-depth feasibility studies, which included complete structural reviews, comprehensive MEP assessments, and detailed examinations of site-specific issues such as water intrusion, age-related degradation, code compliance, and accessibility challenges. These detailed reports help guide decisions about major capital investments or potential facility overhauls. As part of this process, the City also provided outreach to facility leaseholders to inform and support their operational needs.
- Group B: Visual Assessments (50 buildings)
These buildings were suitable for a less intensive visual inspection, focusing on identifying surface-level deficiencies that could inform a rough order of magnitude (ROM) cost estimate for improvements. While not as exhaustive as Group A, these assessments provide sufficient data to support budgeting and medium-term planning.

The aforementioned thirty-seven (37) facilities constitute Group C.

Findings and Prioritization

To facilitate the budgeting and implementation of recommended improvements, ELS classified all identified building needs into three priority categories:

- Priority 1 – Immediate/Code-Required & Functionally Necessary Improvements
These items address immediate health and safety risks or critical functional deficiencies. They require prompt attention and are typically necessary to keep facilities operational and code compliant.
- Priority 2 – Recommended/Mid-Term Improvements
These issues are not immediately critical but are recommended to enhance operational efficiency, extend system life, or improve occupant experience. These may also include upgrades that, while not mandated, align with best practices or sustainability goals.
- Priority 3 – Long-Term/Discretionary Improvements
These items reflect desired enhancements that are not time sensitive. They may include aesthetic upgrades, non-essential modernization, or features that improve the user experience but are not critical to building function.

The ELS assessments estimate the construction costs, including escalation to 2030 (as an assumed mid-point of construction) and some markup/contingency. The grand total for all Priority 1, 2, and 3 improvements outlined in the assessment is \$243 million, with Priority 1 improvements totaling \$77 million, Priority 2 improvements totaling \$160 million, and Priority 3 improvements totaling \$6 million. It should be noted, however, that these numbers only reflect the cost of construction related to the known improvements and the current Building Code requirements. The true cost would need to include the soft costs for the project, such as design and construction management, as well as other improvements related to site design, utilities, and any subsequent updates to the Building Code. On several recent projects, the cost to fully deliver projects was as much as 50% more. Based on this, the cost of all Priority improvements could be as high as \$367 million.

Attachment 1 provides a tabular summary of each of the 60 facilities evaluated and ELS's construction cost estimates for addressing the three categories of Priority improvements. The following sections summarize key findings at a subset of community-facing or operationally significant Group A and B facilities. The listing of rounds in the attachment refer to the assessment process groupings of investigation rounds.

Summary of Key Findings at Group A Facilities

Lakeshore Recreation Center - circa 1968

This facility has been used for childcare since 2008 and is showing significant deterioration and structural deficiencies that compromise its continued viability. The building's exterior has been heavily impacted by age and prolonged weather exposure, leading to damage in key wood components such as trellises, guardrails, fascia boards, trim, utility doors, and

siding. These elements show advanced signs of dry rot, warping, cracking, and peeling paint. In addition to surface-level issues, the building suffers from underlying structural deficiencies, including compromised framing in some areas and signs of foundational settling that may affect long-term stability and safety. The building relies on aging mechanical systems, single-pane windows, inadequate room signage, the absence of a fire suppression system, and original plumbing and lighting fixtures that fall short of current code requirements and the functional needs of a childcare facility. The Lakeshore Recreation Center is currently closed due to these conditions. Its operations have been temporarily relocated to Shoreview Recreation Center while staff determines this location's long-term viability.

Fire Station 27 – circa 1971

This station's issues stem from worn materials due to weather and age, including deteriorated terracotta roof fascia tiles, dry rot, cracked and worn wood fascia boards, and deteriorating wood exit doors and frames, with some exterior doors being hollow core wood. On the interior, there are cracked concrete floors, damaged wood casework and doors, single-pane aluminum windows, dated toilet and shower stalls, lack of access ladders, and inadequate signage. Additional work would involve strengthening structural components to ensure that this facility, given its level of significance, meets current Life Safety Structural Performance standards.

Marina and Hillsdale Branch Libraries – circa 1965

The concerns at the Hillsdale Library are related to exterior wood deterioration such as dry rot, cracking, and peeling paint due to age and weather exposure. Improvements such as replacing single-pane wood windows with dual-pane systems, updating original mechanical and plumbing systems over twenty years old, and upgrading all light fixtures to meet current Energy Code standards would enhance functionality and efficiency. Meanwhile, the Marina Library is currently under construction to address a range of structural deficiencies, including foundational upgrades and seismic reinforcements. These improvements are part of a broader effort to modernize the facility, ensure compliance with current building codes, and provide an accessible, and welcoming environment that better supports the needs of the community.

Shoreview Recreation Center – circa 1968

The facility is currently being used for childcare and has several structural and maintenance challenges, including a sinking structural slab, water intrusion from aging heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment or roof penetrations. External concerns are related to deteriorating wood, such as dry rot. Upgrades such as replacing wood single-pane windows with energy-efficient dual-pane systems, installing fire sprinklers, and updating outdated mechanical, plumbing, and lighting systems are recommended to improve efficiency and code compliance.

Central Park Recreation Center – circa 1965

This facility is used to provide meals and a community space for the senior population, programming in the evenings, special events and rentals. The building exhibits worn materials due to weather and age, including water intrusion, dry rot, and termite damage. Interior wear includes water intrusion and scratched wood floors from daily use. Recent roof improvements have been made to address some of these issues; however, upgrades such as replacing the HVAC system and replacing single-pane aluminum windows with dual-pane systems are needed to improve efficiency and bring the building up to current codes.

Beresford Recreation Center and Park Facilities (Garden Center, Rose Room, Change Building) - circa 1966 to 1975

The Beresford Recreation Center and its associated park facilities face a range of significant maintenance and structural challenges, including water intrusion, dry rot, termites, rodents, and building settlement that has impacted doors and foundational stability. The Beresford Garden Center and Rose Room, which are currently leased for private use, also present ongoing challenges due to their aging infrastructure and the limitations imposed by third-party lease arrangements, which complicate scheduling, usage, and maintenance responsibilities. Staff met with the third-party lease holders in advance of this Council meeting to inform them of the facility assessment findings.

Senior Center – circa 1988

The Senior Center is facing significant infrastructure issues that mirror many of the challenges at the Beresford Recreation Center. Much of its mechanical, electrical and plumbing (MEP) equipment is original and in need of replacement, while low lighting levels further limit the building's efficiency and usability. One particular concern is the ongoing structural settlement, estimated at approximately ¼ inch per year, which has required facilities staff to repeatedly grind down exterior concrete to keep egress doors operational.

Joinville Swim Center – circa 1968

A structural analysis at the swim center indicates that the facility is vulnerable to significant damage in a seismic event, with recommended retrofits needed to address these concerns. The facility's mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems are outdated and have exceeded their useful life, necessitating major replacements with energy-efficient alternatives. The pool systems are also non-compliant with current building codes where both pools are commingled, plumbing velocities exceed code limits, and significant leaks are present. Notably, there is an untraceable leak beneath the pool, which may indicate underlying structural failure, and further investigation could compromise the shell, rendering the pool unusable for the immediate future. Remedying these issues require full replacement of mechanical and chemical systems, replastering, deck and gutter replacement, new piping, and ADA-accessible entry features.

Martin Luther King Community and Swim Center (MLK) – circa 1968

The recreation center needs upgrades to meet current building, accessibility, safety, and operational standards, presenting an opportunity to incorporate a Resilience Center that better serves the community. Significant deficiencies have been identified throughout the center, including non-compliant locker rooms lacking accessible fixtures, outdated mechanical and electrical systems, aging structural components with seismic vulnerabilities, and non-compliance with the most current ADA and California Building Code standards in the pool areas. The pool systems are problematic where the main and training pools are commingled, plumbing systems are undersized, filtration and circulation equipment are beyond their lifespan, and turnover rates are non-compliant. A complete renovation is recommended, including reconfiguring locker rooms, expanding the pool equipment room by 525 square feet, upgrading mechanical, electrical, and plumbing (MEP) systems to all-electric, and replacing both pools' infrastructure and deck.

Trinta Park Restroom Building – circa 1976

The building's heavily painted exterior shows significant wear, with damaged doors, deteriorated door frames, broken planters, worn aluminum windows, and aging roof shingles. Water intrusion is a concern in restrooms, where the interior slab is lower than the exterior paving at doorways. Inside, restrooms have severely worn and damaged concrete floors, while entryways and the concession stand show signs of dirt buildup. In the concession area, cabinets and countertops are damaged and misaligned, and the existing wood service doors require replacement. The original mechanical systems and plumbing fixtures exist beyond their useful lifespan.

Summary of Key Findings at Group B Facilities

Central Park Tennis Garage – circa 1964

This concrete facility features one hundred and twenty underground parking spaces with tennis and pickleball courts on the roof. Recent inspections revealed substantial structural issues, including girder damage, column cracking, spalling, and significant movement at the perimeter piers, primarily due to decades of moisture exposure. In 2024, improvements were made beneath the tennis courts, concrete repairs were carried out throughout the structure, and eleven structural posts were installed at the garage level to preserve the structure for the short-term.

Central Parking Garage – circa 1964

The assessment of the parking garage identifies significant maintenance needs, including cleaning and repainting, repairing damage to stucco finishes and brick veneer panels, replacing rusted doors and frames, and addressing damaged signage. Water intrusion in stairwells, the lack of accessible pedestrian ramps, and malfunctioning floor drains should be addressed. Structural concerns such as cracked concrete on parking levels and ramps, rusted metal structures at ramps and stairs, and deteriorated metal guardrails further underscore the urgency of repairs. In 2025, improvements were made to the existing roof membrane to maintain its integrity for the short-term.

2nd& El Camino Garage – circa 1973

The five-and-a-half-story parking garage includes approximately 300 parking stalls, two stair towers, and an elevator. Several deficiencies have been identified, including gaps in railings, inadequate vehicular impact protection, deteriorating stair conditions, concrete spalling, poor drainage, and a lack of comprehensive waterproofing throughout the structure. Recent structural repairs, combined with planned ongoing maintenance, are expected to extend the service life of the garage until 2034. The elevator controls upgrade project in 2025 ensures improved reliability, enhanced user safety, and compliance with current accessibility and building code standards.

City Hall – circa 1954

The facility has a number of issues including inadequate MEP systems, inefficient space distribution, conflicting building systems, an inadequately sized backup generator, lack of fire suppression in parts of the building, and an outdated fire alarm system. Proposed improvements include relocating staff from leased office space within City Plaza to City Hall and optimizing space for greater efficiency. However, given these challenges and the facility's limitations, there remains a long-term interest in relocating City Hall to a centralized, downtown location.

Corporation Yard – circa 1942

A comprehensive inspection of multiple municipal facilities including the Streets Department, Sewer Department, Field Maintenance and Sign Shops, shelter structures, and various office and break areas, revealed widespread maintenance needs impacting both daily operations and emergency readiness. These issues include deteriorating exterior materials, as well as interior concerns like outdated or non-compliant ADA features, ventilation deficiencies, and damaged structural components. Functional, but aging facilities such as restrooms, locker rooms, break areas, and offices require cleaning, repainting, flooring repairs, door and window replacements, and updated signage to meet code requirements. The condition of these facilities directly affects staff efficiency, safety, and the City's ability to respond swiftly during emergencies, underscoring the critical importance of these buildings to overall operations.

Park Restrooms

As part of an ongoing, multi-phase Capital Improvement Program (CIP) to enhance park restrooms, the City has completed five of ten planned phases to date. Recent improvements span across various parks, focusing on repairing and refinishing worn wood surfaces, replacing corroded or damaged fixtures, and ensuring ADA compliance through updated signage and accessibility features. Upcoming phases include upgrades to the restrooms at Harborview Park, Ryder Park, Seal Point Park, Mariners Island Park, Fiesta Meadows Park, Beresford Park Change Building, Laurelwood Park, Paddock Park, and Bay Meadows Park. The City continues to implement these phased improvements to modernize and maintain restroom facilities in alignment with long-term park infrastructure goals.

Potential Approaches for Improvements

In Spring 2025 the City Council established a Capital Reserve fund of \$25 million which was set aside from City General Fund Reserves for infrastructure projects, which can be used for all City infrastructure, including streets, utilities, and City owned facilities. The following approaches to addressing the overall facility needs consider ways in which those funds can

be strategically deployed.

Approach 1 – Status Quo

Otherwise known as “deferred maintenance,” this involves continuing with routine maintenance using currently budgeted funds to address a limited number of Group A - Priority 1 items without resolving underlying deficiencies. In general, the City has been allocating approximately \$4 million per year from the General Fund for the overall Capital Improvement Program, some of which typically goes to facility needs. While helpful for addressing critical issues, over time, this practice can lead to accelerated facility deterioration, and structural failures, safety risks, and ultimately, facility closures and higher costs.

Approach 2 – Extend Useful Life of Priority Facilities

This approach goes beyond the Status Quo approach to address Priority deficiencies identified through the Facility Assessments at key City facilities with like-for-like improvements. Some portion of the City’s \$25 million capital reserve could be directed toward a prioritized subset of City facilities to extend their useful lives.

Recognizing the City does not have sufficient resources to address all facility needs in all Priority Categories, this approach would target City investment toward specific facilities to initiate pre-construction activities (further investigation, planning, and design). Additional funding would ultimately be required to fully improve these facilities, such as through additional capital reserve funds, securing external grants or philanthropic sources, or through a future revenue measure.

Approach 3 – Strategic Redevelopment of Priority Facilities

This approach, similar to Approach 2, focuses on addressing Priority deficiencies at key City facilities, but includes assessing the feasibility of redeveloping certain existing facilities to create new, purpose-built spaces that more effectively meet current and anticipated needs of the community. Some portion of the City’s \$25 million capital reserve may serve as seed funding to support this strategy, complementing existing grant sources and enhancing the City’s ability to secure additional funding. The following facilities are identified for potential redevelopment consideration.

- **Lakeshore Recreation Center:** Addressing critical issues at the Lakeshore Recreation Center could restore the building's usability, constructing a purpose-built childcare facility may offer greater long-term value through improved functionality and cost efficiency. The City already received \$1.8 million in 2025 for childcare improvements and have funds from the childcare development fee to support this effort.
- **MLK Center:** Supplemental funding supports existing Council-appropriated funds and federal grant funding to advance the visioning and development of a resiliency center. The City appropriated \$200,000 in December 2024 to start a community engagement and visioning process and received an \$850,000 federal earmark in 2024 (expires in 2032) toward this goal.
- **Fire Station 27:** Redevelopment of Fire Station 27 is ultimately necessary to create a modern facility that meets current and future needs, enhances safety and efficiency, and complies with modern codes.
- **Joinville Swim Center:** Current challenges provide an opportunity to assess the future of this facility, including options for restoration or expansion, potential property redevelopment, and the possible consolidation of services with the nearby Shoreview Recreation Center.

Approach 4 – Citywide Operational/Programmatic Assessment

This approach incorporates further analysis of certain City facilities in terms of condition, functional utilization, and future needs, with the objective of identifying opportunities for consolidation. The findings would inform recommendations regarding potential facility closures and the possible disposition of underutilized properties or the redevelopment and utilization of existing properties. Some portion of the Capital Reserve could be directed toward initiating these additional studies to provide further information to support future Council direction. For example:

- The close proximity and complementary programming of the Senior Center, Beresford Recreation Center and Garden Center present a strategic opportunity to consolidate the locations into a single, modernized multigenerational facility. Seniors primarily use the Senior Center during the day, while Beresford serves children

and youth in the afternoons and evenings. By integrating these services into one purpose-built facility with adaptable spaces, the City can better meet the diverse needs of its community, improve operational efficiency, reduce long-term maintenance costs, and maximize the use of shared amenities throughout the day.

- On the east side of the City, the future of Shoreview Recreation Center should be considered in coordination with the nearby Joinville Swim Center to ensure a cohesive and cost-effective strategy. Joinville is facing significant deficiencies, including potential structural failure of the pool and non-compliance with current codes. When combined with the demand for recreation space in the east and central districts, such as Shoreview and MLK, the scale of investment required presents an opportunity to reimagine both Joinville and Shoreview as modern, code-compliant, and resilient community assets. A comprehensive study of both sites will help guide their transformation into long-term, high-quality facilities that meet evolving community needs.
- To support long-term strategic planning that aligns community needs with downtown development objectives, a comprehensive downtown parking garage assessment that incorporates the best-use study findings for the Central Park Tennis Garage and the rehabilitated 2nd and El Camino Real Garage (which has an extended life after recent significant structural improvements but will ultimately need significant additional investment), the aging Central Parking Garage discussed above, as well as the Transit Center Garage, Main Street Garage, and Kiku Garage. The goal would be to evaluate options for redevelopment, replacement, or alternative uses to ensure the parking infrastructure effectively meets future community and development needs in conjunction with developing the Downtown Area Plan.
- **Corporation Yard:** Given the size of the Corporation Yard, there is potential for it to be redeveloped in a more efficient manner that improves operational and emergency response functions with a portion of the property dedicated for other uses. To evaluate these and other options, a best-use study is underway for the Corporation Yard.

Funding Needs and Options

As described above, the overall need for addressing all Priority issues identified at Group A and B facilities ranges from \$113 million in construction costs alone to \$170 million with soft costs or \$243 million to \$367 million with Group C included. This far exceeds the City's available resources to address in any reasonable timeframe. The City's current maintenance program addresses critical facility issues, but conditions are such that certain facilities, such as Lakeshore Recreation Center, are facing closure. The vast majority of the City's facilities detailed above were constructed prior to 1970, meaning they are 55-plus years old and reaching the end of their useful lives without significant reinvestment.

General Fund Support: The City currently allocates approximately \$4 million annually from the General Fund to capital projects, including facility projects. This level of investment allows for the bare minimum maintenance and upgrade program. Staff has increased their efforts to address more significant facility upgrade needs, such as recent roof replacements, but is only able to address the most critical life/safety needs to keep facilities operational.

Capital Reserve: As discussed previously, Council did establish a \$25 million Capital Reserve that is a source of funding to address a portion of the overall needs. Staff recommends this be viewed as a source of funding that can serve as a "down payment" on required improvements. If Council supports use of a portion of the Capital Reserve toward any of the above approaches for priority facilities, staff will bring subsequent recommendations for Council consideration as part of the next five-year Capital Improvement Program (e.g., how much money directed to which facility for what purpose) this upcoming spring.

Revenue Sources: The City has certain revenue sources that can also support facility upgrades, including park impact fees

(variable depending on development) and parking revenue (not enough to address facility upgrade costs such as what is needed at parking garages). Ultimately, the City will likely need to pursue a dedicated revenue measure such as a General Obligation Bond to address its overall facility needs, as was previously discussed with Council in August 2025 and for which opinion research results will be presented to the City Council in January 2026.

Grant Opportunities: Staff, in coordination with the City’s grant writing consultant California Public Policy Group (CPPG), has reviewed several potential funding sources to support the City’s efforts to address facility improvement and modernization needs. All of the opportunities will require the City to strategically leverage existing capital improvement reserve funds to compete for external funding opportunities.

Several state and federal programs could support high-priority projects, particularly those addressing life-safety, resiliency, and community service needs. Projects such as Fire Station 27, the corporation yard, and the transformation of MLK into a resiliency center align well with current federal and state grant priorities. Facilities supporting childcare, such as the Lakeshore Recreation Center, would be good to request for federal earmarks. Emergency and resiliency centers, like MLK, would be an excellent choice for earmarks as well, although more would likely need to be done to develop projects further before the cost and viability are better understood.

Other opportunities include exploring low-interest loan programs through the Federal I-Bank for general facility improvements, potential climate bond community resilience center funding, state earmarks depending on the future fiscal climate, and partnerships through economic-development grants where permanent job creation or federal agency co-location can be demonstrated. CPPG and City advocates will continue to monitor emerging programs and coordinate with staff to develop viable opportunities.

In regard to City staffing resources, to deliver the City’s capital project needs, the City hired a consulting firm who is currently conducting an organizational assessment of the City’s Public Works Capital Improvement Project Division to provide recommendations on how best to approach staffing resources and streamlined processes to help efficiently and effectively deliver on future capital projects. Staff will share the recommendations with the City Council once the Organizational Assessment is finalized and complete.

Future Study Sessions

Several of the forthcoming best-use studies are intended to be used to help analyze certain facilities and will warrant discussions on improving operational efficiency and reducing long-term maintenance costs. Potential focused study session topics include:

- **Downtown Parking Garages and City Hall:** Evaluate the long-term role of downtown parking structures within the context of urban development, evolving transportation needs, and land use planning. Explore options for modernizing or relocating City Hall to better support civic operations, enhance accessibility, and improve space utilization.
- **Aquatic and Recreation Centers:** Develop a comprehensive strategy for sustaining and modernizing the City’s aquatic infrastructure to meet safety standards, programming needs, and community expectations. Reassess the City’s portfolio of recreation centers to better align facility offerings with evolving community needs, demographic trends, and geographic equity.
- **Corporation Yard:** Assess the long-term viability and operational efficiency of the City’s Corporation Yard, which houses essential maintenance and emergency response functions.

Next Steps

Staff requests City Council feedback on:

- Does Council have a preference for pursuing one or more (or a blend) of the proposed approaches (1-4) to

pursuing facility improvements?

- Does Council agree with staff's proposal to schedule future study sessions regarding downtown parking and City Hall, Aquatic and Recreation Centers, and the City's corporation yard?

BUDGET IMPACT:

There is no direct budget impact for this study session; however, the overall needs total in the \$116-\$367 million range depending on level of Priority issues being addressed, for which the City does not have adequate funds to cover. There could be additional cost if the City Council decides to pursue new facilities. In addition, the longer improvements are deferred, the more expensive improvements will be and more likely facilities may need to be shut down. Ultimately, a future dedicated revenue measure, such as a General Obligation Bond, is likely necessary to address the comprehensive facility upgrade needs throughout the City.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:

This council action in receiving an informational update on the status of City facilities and providing feedback is exempt from CEQA, because it involves only planning or feasibility studies for possible future actions which the City has not approved, adopted, or funded. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15262.)

NOTICE PROVIDED

All meeting noticing requirements were met.

ATTACHMENTS

[Att1 – Facilities Condition Assessment Construction Costs Summary](#)

STAFF CONTACT

Matt Fabry, Public Works Director
mfabry@cityofsanmateo.org
(650) 522-7309

James O'Connell, Deputy Public Works Director
joconnell@cityofsanmateo.org
(650) 522-7304

Steve Wu, Facilities & Fleet Services Manager
swu@cityofsanmateo.org
(650) 522-7345

San Mateo Facilities Assessment Cost by Priority

Building	Area	Total Estimated Construction Costs														
		Priority 1					Priority 2					Priority 3				
		Direct Costs Including Markups	MOC*	Escalation to MOC	Escalation Cost	Direct Costs Including Markups and Escalation	Direct Costs Including Markups	MOC*	Escalation to MOC	Escalation Cost	Direct Costs Including Markups and Escalation	Direct Costs Including Markups	MOC*	Escalation to MOC	Escalation Cost	Direct Costs Including Markups and Escalation
Group A Round 1																
1 Senior Center	14,100	\$4,454,014	2030	32.61%	\$1,452,510	\$5,906,524	\$525,073	2030	32.61%	\$171,233	\$696,305					
2 Beresford Recreation Center	15,616	\$4,991,342	2030	32.61%	\$1,627,739	\$6,619,081	\$1,457,232	2030	32.61%	\$475,222	\$1,932,453					
Group A Round 2																
3 Central Park Recreation Center	7,450	\$2,618,812	2030	32.61%	\$854,027	\$3,472,839	\$1,749,063	2030	32.61%	\$570,391	\$2,319,455	\$83,842	2030	32.61%	\$27,342	\$111,184
4 Fire Station 27	5,763	\$2,604,901	2030	32.61%	\$849,491	\$3,454,393	\$1,449,429	2030	32.61%	\$472,677	\$1,922,106	\$310,197	2030	32.61%	\$101,159	\$411,356
5 Transit Bridge	500						\$103,449	2030	32.61%	\$33,736	\$137,184	\$109,552	2030	32.61%	\$35,726	\$145,278
Group A Round 3																
6 Lakeshore Recreation Center	3,675	\$2,235,920	2030	32.61%	\$729,162	\$2,965,082	\$694,681	2030	32.61%	\$226,544	\$921,226	\$1,265,879	2030	32.61%	\$412,819	\$1,678,698
7 Hillsdale Library	5,575	\$1,454,203	2030	32.61%	\$474,234	\$1,928,437	\$630,534	2030	32.61%	\$205,625	\$836,159	\$542,342	2030	32.61%	\$176,864	\$719,206
Group A Round 4																
8 Shoreview Recreation Center	5,370	\$2,517,832	2030	32.61%	\$821,097	\$3,338,928	\$566,368	2030	32.61%	\$184,700	\$751,067	\$705,865	2030	32.61%	\$230,191	\$936,056
9 Police Substation - Norfolk	2,900	\$1,295,890	2030	32.61%	\$422,606	\$1,718,495	\$673,968	2030	32.61%	\$219,789	\$893,757	\$201,404	2030	32.61%	\$65,680	\$267,085
10 Trinta Park	1,300	\$961,020	2030	32.61%	\$313,401	\$1,274,421	\$370,359	2030	32.61%	\$120,779	\$491,138	\$57,278	2030	32.61%	\$18,679	\$75,957
Swim Facilities																
Joinville Swim Center	4,360	\$6,267,000	2030	32.61%	\$2,043,747	\$8,310,747	\$1,599,545	2030	32.61%	\$521,632	\$2,121,177					
MLK Community and Swim Center	23,789	\$11,639,000	2030	32.61%	\$3,795,624	\$15,434,624	\$1,024,625	2030	32.61%	\$334,143	\$1,358,768					
Total		\$41,039,934				\$54,423,572	\$10,844,325				\$14,380,795	\$3,276,358				\$4,344,820

San Mateo Facilities Assessment Cost by Priority

Building	Area	Total Estimated Construction Costs														
		Priority 1					Priority 2					Priority 3				
		Direct Costs Including Markups	MOC*	Escalation to MOC	Escalation Cost	Direct Costs Including Markups and Escalation	Direct Costs Including Markups	MOC*	Escalation to MOC	Escalation Cost	Direct Costs Including Markups and Escalation	Direct Costs Including Markups	MOC*	Escalation to MOC	Escalation Cost	Direct Costs Including Markups and Escalation
Group B Round 1																
11-20 Central Park	10,775	\$1,793,407	2030	32.77%	\$587,674	\$2,381,080	\$964,206	2030	32.77%	\$315,956	\$1,280,162					
21 Martin Luther King Park	625	\$94,790	2030	32.77%	\$31,061	\$125,851	\$52,022	2030	32.77%	\$17,047	\$69,069					
22 Harborview Park	675	\$152,800	2030	32.77%	\$50,070	\$202,871	\$52,274	2030	32.77%	\$17,129	\$69,403					
23 Ryder Park	675	\$197,372	2030	32.77%	\$64,676	\$262,048	\$54,394	2030	32.77%	\$17,824	\$72,219					
24-27 Seal Point Park	2,750	\$511,797	2030	32.77%	\$167,709	\$679,506	\$125,267	2030	32.77%	\$41,048	\$166,316					
28 Joinville	1,400	\$57,579	2030	32.77%	\$18,868	\$76,446	\$73,383	2030	32.77%	\$24,047	\$97,429					
29-31 Aquatic Park - Boat House and Restrooms	3,675	\$843,742	2030	32.77%	\$276,482	\$1,120,224	\$172,001	2030	32.77%	\$56,362	\$228,363					
32 Mariners Island Park	225	\$73,383	2030	32.77%	\$24,047	\$97,429	\$21,971	2030	32.77%	\$7,200	\$29,171					
33 Los Prados Park	1,100	\$194,592	2030	32.77%	\$63,765	\$258,356	\$4,501	2030	32.77%	\$1,475	\$5,976					
34 Bay Meadows Park	200	\$74,649	2030	32.77%	\$24,461	\$99,111	\$16,692	2030	32.77%	\$5,470	\$22,162					
35 Fiesta Meadows Park	225	\$104,593	2030	32.77%	\$34,274	\$138,866	\$42,417	2030	32.77%	\$13,899	\$56,316					
36 Indian Springs Park	625	\$87,390	2030	32.77%	\$28,636	\$116,026	\$2,670	2030	32.77%	\$875	\$3,545					
37 Laurelwood park	900	\$172,300	2030	32.77%	\$56,460	\$228,760	\$52,380	2030	32.77%	\$17,164	\$69,545					
Group B Round 2																
38 Golf Course Restroom 3rd Hole	200	\$95,861	2030	32.77%	\$31,412	\$127,274	\$43,676	2030	32.77%	\$14,312	\$57,988					
39 Golf Course Restroom & Concession 9th Hole	700	\$178,900	2030	32.77%	\$58,623	\$237,524	\$104,577	2030	32.77%	\$34,268	\$138,845					
40 Gold Course Maintenance Shed	5,400	\$362,815	2030	32.77%	\$118,889	\$481,705	\$821,267	2030	32.77%	\$269,117	\$1,090,384	\$23,192	2030	32.77%	\$7,600	\$30,792
41 Old Fire Station 25	3,600	\$436,722	2030	32.77%	\$143,107	\$579,829	\$676,279	2030	32.77%	\$221,607	\$897,887	\$161,123	2030	32.77%	\$52,798	\$213,921
42 Fire Station 23 Hose Tower	1,600	\$9,881	2030	32.77%	\$3,238	\$13,119	\$197,472	2030	32.77%	\$64,709	\$262,181	\$58,004	2030	32.77%	\$19,007	\$77,012
43 Lakeshore Restrooms	875	\$44,266	2030	32.77%	\$14,505	\$58,772	\$112,628	2030	32.77%	\$36,907	\$149,535	\$36,924	2030	32.77%	\$12,099	\$49,024
44 Corp Yard - Mobile Admin / Compliance	1,920	\$280,408	2030	32.77%	\$91,886	\$372,294	\$167,487	2030	32.77%	\$54,883	\$222,371					
45 Corp Yard - Facilities Warehouse	7,600	\$470,043	2030	32.77%	\$154,026	\$624,070	\$596,651	2030	32.77%	\$195,514	\$792,166					
46 Corp Yard - Parks Shelter	4,000	\$407,216	2030	32.77%	\$133,439	\$540,655	\$171,598	2030	32.77%	\$56,230	\$227,828	\$4,967	2030	32.77%	\$1,628	\$6,595
47 Corp Yard - Parks Warehouse	5,000	\$319,808	2030	32.77%	\$104,797	\$424,605	\$429,077	2030	32.77%	\$140,602	\$569,680					
48 Corp Yard - Street Shelter	4,000	\$516,247	2030	32.77%	\$169,167	\$685,414	\$220,281	2030	32.77%	\$72,183	\$292,464					
49 Corp Yard - Sign Shop	2,475	\$164,936	2030	32.77%	\$54,047	\$218,984	\$176,653	2030	32.77%	\$57,887	\$234,539					
50 Corp Yard - Admin / Auto / Carpenters	12,075	\$951,869	2030	32.77%	\$311,914	\$1,263,783	\$1,432,811	2030	32.77%	\$469,512	\$1,902,322					
Group B Round 3																
51 Central Parking Garage	149,200	\$6,126,223	2030	32.77%	\$2,007,475	\$8,133,698	\$3,545,799	2030	32.77%	\$1,161,907	\$4,707,706					
52 Beresford Restroom Bocce	264	\$111,337	2030	32.77%	\$36,483	\$147,820	\$23,227	2030	32.77%	\$7,611	\$30,838					
53 Beresford Restroom	264	\$129,091	2030	32.77%	\$42,301	\$171,392	\$35,548	2030	32.77%	\$11,649	\$47,196					
54 Beresford Picnic Shelter	1,500	\$45,316	2030	32.77%	\$14,849	\$60,165	\$90,952	2030	32.77%	\$29,804	\$120,756					
55 Beresford Garden Center	3,450	\$1,239,261	2030	32.77%	\$406,088	\$1,645,349	\$692,586	2030	32.77%	\$226,951	\$919,537	\$436,193	2030	32.77%	\$142,934	\$579,127
56 Beresford Rose Room	1,600	\$392,552	2030	32.77%	\$128,634	\$521,185	\$204,917	2030	32.77%	\$67,148	\$272,066	\$183,819	2030	32.77%	\$60,235	\$244,054
57 Beresford Change Building	3,850	\$408,750	2030	32.77%	\$133,942	\$542,692	\$293,032	2030	32.77%	\$96,022	\$389,054	\$120,766	2030	32.77%	\$39,573	\$160,340
58 Shoreview Picnic Shelter	900	\$11,443	2030	32.77%	\$3,750	\$15,193	\$48,499	2030	32.77%	\$15,892	\$64,391					
59 Shoreview Shed	216	\$3,296	2030	32.77%	\$1,080	\$4,376	\$47,833	2030	32.77%	\$15,674	\$63,508					
60 City Hall	38,652	\$4,928,130	2030	32.77%	\$1,614,877	\$6,543,007	\$6,570,840	2031	32.77%	\$2,153,264	\$8,724,104	\$4,928,130	2030	32.77%	\$1,614,948	\$6,543,149
Total	273,191.00	\$21,992,767				\$29,199,481	\$18,337,870				\$24,347,022	\$5,953,120			\$7,904,013	
Group C Facilities - 36 Total							\$82,164,830	\$109,090,244								

San Mateo Facilities Assessment Cost by Priority

Building	Area	Total Estimated Construction Costs														
		Priority 1				Priority 2				Priority 3						
		Direct Costs Including Markups	MOC*	Escalation to MOC	Escalation Cost	Direct Costs Including Markups and Escalation	Direct Costs Including Markups	MOC*	Escalation to MOC	Escalation Cost	Direct Costs Including Markups and Escalation	Direct Costs Including Markups	MOC*	Escalation to MOC	Escalation Cost	Direct Costs Including Markups and Escalation
Grand Total		\$63,032,701				\$83,623,053	\$111,347,025					\$147,818,061	\$9,229,478			\$12,248,833

Notes

- MOC* - Mid Point of Construction
- Years Range from 2025 - 2030. These can be changed depending on the expected year of construction
- Escalation Reflected At Time of Submittal

Total, All Projects - No Escalation **\$183,609,204**

Total, All Projects - Escalated to 2030 **\$243,689,946**