PARKS AND WATERFRONT COMMISSION

Regular Meeting
Wednesday, November 14, 2018, 7:00 P.M.
Frances Albrier Community Center
2800 Park Street, Berkeley, CA

Agenda

The Commissions may discuss any items listed on the agenda, but may take action only on items identified as Action.

1. Call to Order (Chair).
2. Roll Call (Secretary).
3. Announcements (Chair).
4. Approval of Agenda (Chair).
5. Approval Minutes for October 10, 2018 * (Chair).
6. Public Comment
7. Director’s Report (Ferris): Special Events; Parks Division; Waterfront Division (leases).
10. Action: Appoint a liaison to attend the City staff Traffic Circle Working Group meetings (Diehm).
11. Discussion: Draft Marina Parking Study and public comments * (Ferris).
   [see study and comments at: https://www.cityofberkeley.info/Parks_Rec_Waterfront/Marina/Waterfront_Parking_Study_Review.aspx]
12. Discussion: Update from subcommittee on parks capital projects (McKay).
13. Presentation: Measure T1 Infrastructure Bond Program – Bi-annual Report * (Ferris).
15. Discussion: Future Agenda Items: Commemorative Tree Donation Policy; Marina Parking Study and Community feedback, Traffic Circle Vegetation Maintenance Policy.
16. Information: Recent Council Reports. *
17. Information: Off Agenda Reports to Council: [see link: https://www.cityofberkeley.info/Clerk/Home/Off_Agenda_Memos_to_Mayor_and_City_Council.aspx]
   • October 2018 - West Campus Pool – Response to Council Referral.
   • November 2018 - Summer 2018 Recreation Program Highlights.
   • November 2018 - Waterfront / Marina Fund Update.
18. Information: Communications. *
   • Ltr, Traffic Circle Planting Policy: (C Woodcock)
   • Ltr, Waterfront Parking Plan (C Brasca; C Murdock; T Nemeth; J Love; P Kamen)
   • New Zero Waste Transfer Station Workshop flyer
   • Making Strides Special Event, Cesar Chavez Park, draft parking plan, 10/27/2018
20. Adjournment.
   * document is attached to agenda packet and on the commission website.
   ** document will be provided at the meeting.
ADA Disclaimer: This meeting is being held in a wheelchair accessible location. To request disability-related accommodations to participate in the meeting, including auxiliary aids or services, please contact the Disability Services specialist at 981-6418 (V) or 981-6347 (TDD) at least three business days before the meeting date. Please refrain from wearing scented products to this meeting.

SB343 Disclaimer: Any writings or documents provided to a majority of the Commission regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection at Parks Recreation & Waterfront Department Office at 2180 Milvia Street, Berkeley, CA.

Communications Disclaimer: Communications to Berkeley boards, commissions or committees are public record and will become part of the City’s electronic records, which are accessible through the City’s website. Please note: e-mail addresses, names, addresses, and other contact information are not required, but if included in any communication to a City board, commission or committee, will become part of the public record. All communications to the Commission should be received at least 10 days before the meeting date. If you do not want your e-mail address or any other contact information to be made public, you may deliver communications via U.S. Postal Service or in person to the secretary of the relevant board, commission or committee. If you do not want your contact information included in the public record, please do not include that information in your communication. Please contact the secretary to the commission or committee for further information.

Commission Information: The agenda packets for the Parks and Recreation Commission and the Waterfront Commission are available for review at www.cityofberkeley.info/commissions; the Berkeley Main Library and the Parks Recreation & Waterfront Department Office at 2180 Milvia Street –3rd Floor, during their normal business hours. If you have questions, call Commission Secretary, Roger Miller at 981-6704 at 2180 Milvia Street, Berkeley, CA 94704 or by email at rmiller@cityofberkeley.info.

MISSION STATEMENT – PARKS AND WATERFRONT: The Parks and Waterfront Commission shall be an advisory board and shall review the policies, projects, programs, planning efforts, activities, funding, and the physical condition of parks, pools, camps, recreation centers, the Marina, and public greenery, and shall advise the City Council on these matters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMISSION MEMBERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayor -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 1 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 2 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 5 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 7 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 8 -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2018 Commission Meeting Dates

Name of Commission:  **Parks and Waterfront Commission**  
Commission Secretary:  **Roger Miller**  
Location:  **Frances Albrier Community Center, 2800 Park St**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Meeting Day and Date (2nd Wednesday per month)</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>Wednesday, January 10</td>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Regular Mtg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Wednesday, February 14</td>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Regular Mtg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Wednesday, March 14</td>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Regular Mtg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Wednesday, April 11</td>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Regular Mtg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Wednesday, May 9</td>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Regular Mtg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Wednesday, June 13</td>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Regular Mtg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>No meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Wednesday, August 8</td>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Regular Mtg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Wednesday, September 12</td>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Regular Mtg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Wednesday, October 10</td>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Regular Mtg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Wednesday, November 14</td>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Regular Mtg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>No Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>Wednesday, January 9</td>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Regular Mtg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minutes – DRAFT
The Commissions may discuss any items listed on the agenda, but may take action only on items identified as Action.

1. Call to Order (Chair).
2. Roll Call (Secretary). Present: Brostrom; Diehm; Fogel; Kamen; Kaeczynska; Lee; McGrath; Absent: McKay.
3. Announcements (Chair). October 17, T1 subcommittee meeting (McGrath).
4. Approval of Agenda (Chair). (M/S/C: Kawczynska/Kamen/U): Ayes: Brostrom; Diehm, Fogel, Kamen; Kawczynska, Lee; McGrath; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: McKay.
5. Approval Minutes for September 12, 2018 * (Chair). (M/S/C: McGrath/Kawczynska/U): Ayes: Brostrom; Diehm, Fogel, Kamen; Kawczynska, Lee; McGrath; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: McKay.
6. Public Comment: Waterfront parking plan: David Fraser, Cal Sailing; Lynn Olinges, windsurfers; Heather Breaux, Cal Sailing; Leslie Buck, Cal Sailing; Eric Christianson, windsurfers; Mort Cohn, Cal Sailing; David Fawcett, Cal Sailing; Gene Golfo, Cal Sailing; Ben Lee, Cal Sailing; Robert Ofsevit, Cal Sailing; Dmitry Shusterian, Cal Sailing; Saul Shomsky, Cal Sailing; Toby Sorenson, Cal Sailing; Steve Sylvester, Roberto Gastelson, Cal Sailing.
7. Director’s Report (Ferris): Parks CIP Project List; Special Events; Waterfront Leases; Berkeley Marina Area Specific Plan (BMASP); Parks Division; Waterfront Division.
8. Discussion Item: East Bay Regional Park District – presentation on the upcoming November 6, 2018 general election Measure FF to extend the existing Measure CC $12 per year parcel tax to fund parks projects within the Measure CC zone which includes Berkeley *. Item presented by Jeff Rasmussen, EBRPD.
10. Action Item: Update on marina fiscal issues (Ferris), and send a communication to Council in support of a one-time funding request for the Berkeley Waterfront and authorize Commissioners Diehm and Lee to speak on behalf of the commission at Council * (M/S/C: McGrath/Kamen/U) Ayes: Brostrom; Diehm, Fogel, Kamen; Kawczynska, Lee; McGrath; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: McKay.
11. Discussion Item: Presentation on existing City Tree Planting Program and existing Parks Donation Policy (Ferris). Provided by Ian Kesterson, COB Forestry.
12. Action Item: Update from Urban Pollinator Habitat subcommittee and authorize the chair to share update at next Community Environmental Advisory Commission (CEAC) meeting (Diehm). (M/S/C: McGrath/Fogel/U) Ayes: Brostrom; Diehm, Fogel, Kamen; Kawczynska, Lee; McGrath; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: McKay.
13. Discussion Item: Update on Traffic Circle Vegetation Policy * (Diehm). Discussion held.
14. Future Agenda Items: Marina Parking Study and Community feedback, proposed new Marina parking fee;
15. Recent Council Reports. *

17. Communications. *
   • Golden Gate Audubon Annual Reports – Burrowing Owl Program (2015-16; 2017-18).
   • Ltr to Zero Waste Commission from Parks & Waterfront Commission, 9/12/2018.

18. Adjournment. (M/S/C: Lee/Fogel/U) Ayes: Brostrom; Diehm, Fogel, Kamen; Kawczynska, Lee; McGrath; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: McKay.

* document is attached to agenda packet and on the commission website.
** document will be provided at the meeting.

*Note: For handouts distributed at the meeting, please see the Draft Minutes for Sept 12, 2018, at the following link online:
http://www.ci.berkeley.ca.us/Clerk/Commissions/Commissions__Parks_and_Waterfront_Commission.aspx
(Remember to scroll to the bottom of the online page and click on the Draft Minutes for 09-12-2018).
## 2019 Commission Meeting Dates

**Name of Commission:** Parks and Waterfront Commission  
**Commission Secretary:** Roger Miller  
**Location:** Frances Albrier Community Center, 2800 Park St

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Meeting Day and Date (2nd Wednesday per month)</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>Wednesday, January 9</td>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Regular Mtg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Wednesday, February 13</td>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Regular Mtg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Wednesday, March 13</td>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Regular Mtg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Wednesday, April 10</td>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Regular Mtg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Wednesday, May 8</td>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Regular Mtg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Wednesday, June 12</td>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Regular Mtg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Wednesday, July 10</td>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Regular Mtg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>No meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Wednesday, September 11</td>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Regular Mtg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Wednesday, October 9</td>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Regular Mtg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Wednesday, November 13</td>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Regular Mtg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>No Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2020  
| January| Wednesday, January 8                         | 7:00 p.m. | Regular Mtg  |
Date: December 6, 2018

To: Parks & Waterfront and Public Works Commission

From: Scott Ferris, Director, Parks, Recreation & Waterfront
Phil Harrington, Director, Public Works

Subject: Bi-Annual Report on Measure T1 City Infrastructure Bond Program

SUMMARY
This is the next bi-annual report on the implementation of the $100 million Measure T1 bond program to renovate existing City facilities and infrastructure. On June 27, 2017, City Council approved a list of Phase 1 projects to be completed from FY 2018 - FY 2021. This report provides the City Council with an update on the technical and financial progress of the T1 bond team accomplishments from May 2018 through October 2018.

BACKGROUND
In November 2016, Berkeley voters approved Measure T11 – a $100 million dollar general obligation bond to repair, renovate, replace or reconstruct the City’s aging existing infrastructure, including facilities, streets, sidewalks, storm drains, and parks. Measure T1 passed with 86.5% of the vote.

City Council authorized the issuance of the infrastructure bond2 in order to help address significant and growing unfunded infrastructure needs. Bond funded capital projects will be implemented in addition to projects that are currently funded and proposed for funding in the City’s fiscal years 2018 – 2019 capital budget.

After the passage of Measure T1, the City Manager proposed a three phase implementation plan3 for the Measure T1 program and a list of proposed Phase 1 projects to be considered by the Council, the City’s commissions, and the general public.

---

1 See https://www.cityofberkeley.info/MeasureT1/
2 See https://www.cityofberkeley.info/uploadedFiles/Parks_Rec_Waterfront/Level_3_General/Resolution%20No%2067,795.pdf
3 See https://www.cityofberkeley.info/uploadedFiles/Parks_Rec_Waterfront/Level_3_General/Measure%20T1%20GO%20Bonds%20Recommendations.pdf
From December 2016 through June 2017, the City undertook a robust public process to gather input on the proposed projects. In addition to three Measure T1 Workshops for the general public, the Parks & Waterfront and Public Works Commissions invited and received input from the public and other City Commissions. They submitted a joint report to Council in June 2017 detailing their recommendations. The City Manager incorporated this input and submitted a final recommended list of projects. Council adopted this list and proposed plan for implementing Phase 1 of the T1 bond program on June 27, 2017.

DISCUSSION

PROJECTS-OVERVIEW

To date, all 34 of the identified Measure T1 projects have started. Since the bonds were sold in November of 2017, many of the construction projects have gone through the planning and design phase. In 2019, the majority of these 11 T1 projects will start construction. During the next 12 months, an estimated $21 million worth of projects will start construction. Additionally, four of the nine (design only) projects have made significant progress and the other five will make significant progress in the next six months. The City has authorized approximately 25 contracts and/or task orders and held 14 project specific public meetings.

PROJECT-SPECIFIC UPDATES

Attachment 1 provides a list of the 34 approved Phase 1 projects, including project description, budget, timeline, project manager, and status update. Below is a summary of projects that are currently underway:

- **City-Wide Restroom Needs Assessment:** The consultant is expected to start in January 2019. Staff posted a RFP in July 2018, but did not receive response from any potential vendors, which allowed staff to negotiate on the

---

4 See https://www.cityofberkeley.info/uploadedFiles/Parks_Rec_Waterfront/Level_3_General/Measure%20T1%20-%20Joint%20Commission%20Report%20-%20June%202017%20w%20attachments.pdf

5 See https://www.cityofberkeley.info/Clerk/City_Council/2017/06_June/Documents/2017-06-27_Item_49_Implementing_Phase_1.aspx

6 See https://www.cityofberkeley.info/uploadedFiles/Parks_Rec_Waterfront/Level_3_General/6-27-17%20Adopted%20list%20of%20projects.pdf

Phase 1 projects include a mix of types of projects:

- **Planning** projects will focus on public processes, feasibility studies and analyses that culminate in a preferred project plan and cost estimate. These projects will be ready for the design and construction phase when funding is identified.

- **Planning & Design** projects will include public process, design, permits and bid package, and are intended to produce shovelly projects for a later phase of T1 funding, grant funding, or other funding.

- **Planning, Design & Construction** projects will be entirely designed and built during Phase 1.
open market. Staff contacted two vendors and met with them to review their qualifications, similar projects completed and project plan. A vendor was selected and a contract was negotiated and will go to City Council in December.

- **Old City Hall/ Veteran’s Building/ Civic Center Park Conceptual Design:** Staff selected an architect and is in the process of getting a proposal for architectural services. A stakeholder kick-off meeting is scheduled for the third quarter of 2019.

- **Transfer Station Master Plan:** This project will be funded by the Zero Waste Fund. A Planning Consultant was selected and a contract was awarded. The next step will be a stakeholder charrette.

- **West Berkeley Service Center Planning and Conceptual Design:** Staff selected an architect and is in the process of getting a proposal for architectural services. A stakeholder kick-off meeting is scheduled for the third quarter of 2019.

- **Frances Albrier Community Center Planning and Design:** Staff is currently evaluating On-Call Architectural Services RFQ’s and expect to have contracts available to solicit RFP’s for work to start in early 2019.

- **Tom Bates Fields North Field House and Restroom Planning and Design:** Conceptual design is currently being further developed and will be shared with the public in winter 2018-19. Staff provided information regarding this project and received input from the community at a Field Users Meeting in April 2018.

- **Willard Clubhouse Planning and Design:** Staff is currently evaluating On-Call Architectural Services RFQ’s and expect to have contracts available to solicit RFP’s for work to start in early 2019.

- **Live Oak Community Center Seismic Upgrade and Renovation:** Conceptual design has been completed and staff will be holding a second public meeting once additional information from FEMA regarding the grant application is available. The initial FEMA grant was waitlisted, but now has been recommended for funding.

- **North Berkeley Senior Center (NBSC) Seismic Upgrade and Renovation:** Construction is anticipated to start in early 2019. The final design was submitted for permit review. The process for a public hearing started in September 2018 and the Zoning Adjustments Board (ZAB) hearing is expected by January 2019.
• **Strawberry Creek Park Restroom Replacement**: Conceptual designs are being prepared for further comments in spring 2019. Phase 1 improvements is funded by Parks Tax and PRW Capital Improvement Fund and began construction in September 2018. The restroom will be added to Phase 2 improvements, also funded by Parks Tax and PRW Capital Improvement Fund. A community meeting for Phase 2 improvements was held on May 19, 2018.

• **Mental Health Building Renovation**: The final design was submitted for permit review. Bidding is anticipated in December 2018 with construction to begin after contract execution.

• **Berkeley Health Clinic Electrical Improvements**: Staff will be using an On-Call Electrical Consultant for this work. The Consultant is working on a proposal for the scope of work.

• **Corporation Yard Roof and Electrical Upgrade**: A Due Diligence Study and cost estimate have been completed. The next step will be to identify the exact scope of improvements and complete the design.

• **Marina Corporation Yard Electrical Upgrade**: A Due Diligence Study and cost estimate have been completed. The next step will be to identify the exact scope of improvements and complete the design.

• **Public Safety Building Mechanical and HVAC Efficiency Improvements**: Coordination with IT is ongoing to develop the scope.

• **Aquatic Park Tide Tubes**: Staff will be using an On-Call Civil Engineering Consultant to solicit Requests for Proposals for this work.

• **Berkeley Municipal Pier Planning and Design**: Draft pier study and water side ferry study analysis is complete. Staff received a proposal for the land side analysis and an MOU is currently being developed with the Water Emergency Transport Authority (WETA) to coordinate scope and secure additional funding to include further study of ferry service to the Berkeley Marina for possible incorporation into the Municipal Pier.

• **Rose Garden Drainage**: Staff held pre-project permitting meeting with environmental agencies. Consultants are preparing permit applications, CEQA documents and preliminary plans. Construction is anticipated to start summer of 2019, pending receipt of environmental permits.
- **Rose Garden Pathways, Tennis Courts, and Pergola:** Construction is anticipated to start July 2019. Survey work is almost complete and Design Development is currently in progress. Work for the pathways and tennis courts has been bundled with Phase 2 of the Pergola Replacement and ADA renovation project. The goal is to leverage other funding sources, combine design effort, and consolidate construction time and park closures. Staff met with the LPC Subcommittee to resume coordination from previous Phase 1 work.

- **Citywide Irrigation System:** Installation of the system, testing, and training for the pilot sites are expected to be completed by April 2019 with full implementation anticipated in 2020. A RFP was released in December 2017, and proposals were received in January 2018. The vendor and City have been in negotiation of contract requirements and the contract is anticipated to be in place by December 2018.

- **Grove Park Field and Restroom Renovation:** A contract with an On-Call Landscape Architect was executed and survey and design is underway.

- **George Florence Park Play Equipment Upgrade:** A contract with an On-Call Landscape Architect was executed and survey and design is underway, with a public meeting on October 20, 2018.

- **San Pablo Park Play Equipment Upgrade and San Pablo Park Tennis Courts Renovation:** A contract with an On-Call Landscape Architect was executed and survey and design is underway. Staff have combined these projects to leverage the design process and consolidate construction timelines.

- **King School Park Green Infrastructure:** Project is not feasible.

- **Adeline Street and Hearst Avenue:** Construction is expected to begin in the summer of 2019. Design and coordination with utility partners has been completed. Coordination with the Transportation division for a protected bicycle lane is underway. Bidding is anticipated in early 2019.

- **Monterey Avenue and Ward Street:** Utility coordination is underway. Staff is evaluating options for green infrastructure on Ward Street. On-call Civil Engineering consultant to start design in early 2019.

- **2nd Street, Hopkins Street, and Bancroft Way:** Staff is performing preliminary studies and confirming scope of work. On-call Civil Engineering consultant to start design in early 2019.
• University Avenue (West Frontage Road to Marina Boulevard), Marina Boulevard and Spinnaker Way: Design contract was awarded for final design. Design is in progress. Staff is seeking additional funding for Marina Boulevard and Spinnaker Way.

KEY MILESTONES

Since the previous bi-annual update in May 2018, staff have completed the following:

• Hired a consultant to develop the Measure T1 Policies and Procedures Manual. Staff met with the consultant to review established policies and procedures and discuss best practices. The manual has been completed and was shared with both the Public Works (PW) and Parks & Waterfront (P&W) commissions.

• Presented a program and project update to the Measure T1 Joint Subcommittee on August 6, 2018.

• Met with the Measure T1 Joint Subcommittee to discuss issues regarding change management process and projected funding gap on October 17, 2018 and October 29, 2018.

• Presented the draft bi-annual update report and draft for feedback to PW commission on November 1, 2018 and P&W commissions on November 14, 2018.

• Advertised the Measure T1 website on Berkeleyside in order to create more awareness of the Measure T1 bond program. The banner advertisement ran from May 4, 2018 to June 30, 2018.

• Community Process/Input:
  • Continued to advertise and hold meetings and events to solicit input from the community. Meetings were held for the following projects:
    o May 19, 2018: Strawberry Creek Park
    o June 2, 2018: Berkley Rose Garden Pathways, Tennis Courts, and Pergola; Berkeley Rose Garden Drainage
    o June 9, 2018: San Pablo Park Play Equipment Upgrade and Tennis Court Renovations
    o October 20, 2018: George Florence Park

• Upcoming meetings and events include:
  o Live Oak Community Center (2nd meeting): January/February 2019
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- North Berkeley Senior Center Ground Breaking: February 2019
- Mental Health Building Ground Breaking: February 2019
- San Pablo Park Projects (2nd meeting): Spring 2019
- Grove Park (2nd meeting): Spring 2019
- Strawberry Creek Park (2nd meeting): Spring 2019
- Old City Hall/Veteran’s Building: Winter 2019
- West Berkeley Service Center: Winter 2019
- Frances Albrier Community Center (2nd Meeting): Winter 2019
- Willard Park: Winter 2019
- George Florence Park (2nd Meeting): Winter 2019

As a part of the community input process in planning for Phase 1, the Public Works and Parks, Recreation & Waterfront Commissions obtained feedback from multiple participating City commissions on projects for this phase. Since then, staff have returned to several of the Commissions, including the Civic Arts Commission, the Landmarks Preservation Commission, the Commission on Aging and the Children, Youth, and Recreation Commission, to provide updates and/or seek additional consultation on project-specific coordination.

- Continued to update the Measure T1 webpage to provide the Community with updates on the status of Phase 1 projects, community meetings and events.

- Continued the procurement of professional consulting services needed for T1 projects. Consultant services are being procured through existing City-wide On-Call Contracts, new City-wide On-Call Contracts, and through project-specific Requests for Qualifications or Requests for Proposals based on expertise required. Procurement is expected to be continuous as projects are developed.

  - Current On-Call Contracts include:
    - Architectural Services (reaching capacity)
    - Civil Engineering Services – Streets and Drainage
    - Electrical Engineering Services
    - Geotechnical Engineering Services
    - Landscape Architectural Services
    - Project Management/Construction Management Services (reaching capacity)
  
  - Upcoming On-Call Contracts include:
    - Architectural Services (New RFQ)
    - Project Management/Construction Management Services (New RFQ)

---

7 Children, Youth and Recreation Commission; Civic Arts Commission; Commission on Aging; Commission on Disability; Community Environmental Advisory Commission; Disaster and Fire Safety Commission; Energy Commission; Housing Advisory Commission; Landmarks Preservation Commission; Transportation Commission; and Zero Waste Commission
KEY ISSUES

As Phase 1 projects progress, the following issues will require ongoing monitoring and discussion.

1. **Funding Gap**: The funds available for T1 projects is $35 million due to bond sale limits. The current estimated program cost is $40,416,000, as calculated below, which leaves a funding gap of $5,416,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Cost</th>
<th>$</th>
<th>39,365,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reductions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Transaction Cost Not Incurred</td>
<td>(800,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Station Master Plan (Funded by Zero Waste)</td>
<td>(500,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-estimated contributions for Art</td>
<td>(49,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated additional escalation for construction cost</td>
<td>2,400,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revised Estimated Program Cost $ 40,416,000

This calculation includes estimated additional escalation for construction cost. The original escalation rate used for construction was 3% a year. Based on engineer estimates from multiple City projects and the national and local construction indices, the revised estimated escalation is 9% for FY19, 7% for FY20 and 6% for FY 21. Staff will have a more accurate approximation of the program funding gap by spring of 2019, when bids are received for the Live Oak Community Center, North Berkeley Senior Center, Mental Health Building, Adeline Street and Hearst Avenue projects.

Staff plans to implement all Council-approved projects, however project scopes will need to be re-evaluated to stay within budget. Options include reducing project scopes (for example, changing project scope from construction to design) or removing/postponing projects until additional funding is secured. Staff held two meetings with the Measure T1 Joint Subcommittee in October 2018 to discuss the funding gap issue, options to reduce this gap, and develop a change management process. These changes in scope will need to be identified by the

---

8 This limit is set by the terms of the bond program which requires that the upper limit of bond sales cannot exceed the total debt covered by the current 10-year average tax rate for a Berkeley resident.

9 On July 27, 2017, Council approved a list of projects for Phase 1 in the amount of **$37.365 million**. On January 23, 2018, Council authorized **$2 million** for the Mental Health Building Renovation project.

10 Calculation is based on the estimated construction cost of the following projects: North Berkeley Senior Center; Live Oak Community Center; Strawberry Creek Park Restroom; Rose Garden Drainage; Rose Garden Pergola, Pathways and Tennis Courts; Grove Park, Phase 2; George Florence Play Structure; San Pablo Park Tennis Courts; and San Pablo Park Play Area.
end of FY 19 and a project priority list will be established for Council to approve in June 2019.

2. **Environmental Sustainability:** Staff has met with the Office of Energy and Sustainable Development (OESD) for clarification regarding the City’s sustainability goals and to prioritize elements in major projects. Projects will be designed for current building codes, such as meeting the California Energy Code, and utilize more modern and sustainable technologies. Additional sustainability elements and improvements above baseline requirements may require additional funding which have not been identified.

**BOND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT**

**T1 Manual**

The T1 Management Team, comprised of PRW and PW management, will continue to manage the Measure T1 bond program. The Team continues to meet regularly to review the T1 budget, expenditures, project progress, and to prepare detailed reports for Council, Commissions and the community.

The City worked with a consultant to develop a Policies and Procedures manual for the Measure T1 program. The goal is for the Measure T1 Manual to provide clear, concise guidelines on the management of T1 funds. This work is expected to improve audit-readiness, improve understanding of policies and procedures by staff and the community, and will help prepare the City for future audit.

The manual includes the following:

- Program management structure and processes
- Program goals and performance metrics
- Project management guidelines
- Bond requirements and restrictions
- Expenditure control policies and procedures

**Financial Audit**

Staff plans to hire an external auditor in the next six months (FY 2019) to perform a financial audit on Measure T1 bond expenditures to ensure that expenses are in accordance with bond measure requirements. Audits are planned for every two years and staff expects to have approximately six financial audits during the life of Measure T1.
Expenditures to Date

As shown in Table 1, $1,653,080 of T1 funds have been expended to date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sub-Category/Project</th>
<th>Spent</th>
<th>Allocated</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff/Project Management</td>
<td>$ 839,900</td>
<td>$ 4,200,000</td>
<td>$ 3,360,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities, Equipment,</td>
<td>$ 137,005</td>
<td>$ 400,000</td>
<td>$ 262,995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies, Services</td>
<td>Facilities/Buildings</td>
<td>$ 300,974</td>
<td>$ 15,900,000</td>
<td>$ 15,599,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities/Buildings</td>
<td>$ 11,782</td>
<td>$ 900,000</td>
<td>$ 888,218</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects</td>
<td>Park Improvements</td>
<td>$ 359,216</td>
<td>$ 6,965,000</td>
<td>$ 6,605,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects</td>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>$ 4,203</td>
<td>$ 8,500,000</td>
<td>$ 8,495,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$ 1,653,080</td>
<td>$ 38,065,000</td>
<td>$ 36,411,920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Communication

Staff will continue to provide bi-annual updates to the Parks & Waterfront and Public Works Commissions and to City Council. Staff met with both commissions in November to review the bi-annual update and the Measure T1 Policies and Procedures Manual. Staff continues to use the City’s Measure T1 website to update the community on the bond program. This includes an updated story map, providing photos, mapping and summaries of each approved T1 project. Community members can visit the Measure T1 Phase 1 Project Updates page for project updates, community meeting dates, and quarterly updates. For questions or information about Measure T1, community members are encouraged to email T1@CityofBerkeley.info.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

Measure T1 provides potential opportunities to advance the City’s environmental sustainability goals. For example, facility upgrade projects can be designed to not only improve safety and address deferred improvements, but also to increase resource efficiency and access to clean energy.

---

11 Staff/Project Management costs include City staff to plan, manage, and supervise T1 projects; and a full-time analyst to provide direct administrative support for T1 projects. This does not include costs for other supervision and administration, such as other managers, departmental administrative staff, and other support functions like IT, Human Resources, and Finance.

12 Facilities, Equipment, Supplies, and Services includes the cost to lease T1’s share of office space on the 5th Floor of 1947 Center St., T1-related office furniture, computers, printers, office supplies, copier lease, staff trainings, communication materials, and audits.

13 Project costs will include all direct project expenses.

14 See https://www.cityofberkeley.info/MeasureT1/

15 See https://berkeley.maps.arcgis.com/apps/MapTour/index.html?appid=6a32f8ecb2924eabbb952bd59cb8b7fc

16 See https://www.cityofberkeley.info/MeasureT1Updates.aspx
FUNCTIONAL ART
In Resolution 67,795-N.S.\textsuperscript{17}, Council resolved that 1\% of bond proceeds shall be available for functional art integrated into Measure T1-funded projects. The bond proceeds for Phase 1 of Measure T1 was $35 million, resulting in a 1\% functional art contribution of $350,000. The total amount of $350,000 has been deducted from Phase 1 Measure T1 projects.

A Request for Qualifications (RFQ)\textsuperscript{18} was posted on September 11, 2018 seeking artists to create functional art at the North Berkeley Senior Center and San Pablo Park Tennis Courts and Play Area. A Selection Panel will establish a pool of most qualified candidates by November 2, 2018. These selected candidates will have the opportunity to develop a proposal which will be publicized for public comment in January 2019.

PLANNING FOR PHASE 2
Phase 1 is expected to run through June 2021. The planning and public process for Phase 2 is anticipated to start in July 2019, approximately two years before Council approves Phase 2 projects. Staff will collaborate with the PW and P&W commissions to plan the community input process.

CONTACT PERSONS
Scott Ferris, Parks, Recreation & Waterfront, 510-981-6700
Phil Harrington, Public Works, 510-981-6300

Attachments:
1: T1 Project Schedule, Funding and Project Management

\textsuperscript{17} See https://www.cityofberkeley.info/uploadedFiles/Parks_Rec_Waterfront/Level_3_-_General/Resolution%20No%2067,795.pdf
\textsuperscript{18} https://www.cityofberkeley.info/uploadedFiles/Finance/Level_3_-_General/18-11241-C%20%20RFQ%20for%20Functional%20Public%20Art%20for%20NBSC%20and%20SPP-FINAL.pdf
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPT</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>PROJECT TYPE</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TF 2019 PLANNING</th>
<th>TF 2019 CONTRACTUAL</th>
<th>TF 2021 TOTAL</th>
<th>PROJECT FUNDING</th>
<th>OTHER FUNDING</th>
<th>APPROPRIATE TOTAL FUNDING</th>
<th>PW</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>STATUS UPDATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DPR</td>
<td>Ohlone Restrooms - Design Needs Assessment</td>
<td>Conceptual</td>
<td>Reform methods and feasibility assessment of location for cultural landmarks, will include construction of Ohlone Park remodel.</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$1,795</td>
<td>$1,801,025</td>
<td>$1,802,820</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DRAFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPR</td>
<td>Old City Hall/ Infirmary Building/Civic Center Park</td>
<td>Conceptual</td>
<td>Structural and design management of possible conceptual design alternative, in concert with DPR Capital Plan. To help determine design for future park improvements and utilize these facilities to revitalize historic community benefit.</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$1,795</td>
<td>$1,796,493</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DRAFT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPR</td>
<td>Ohlone Station - Mission Rock</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Design</td>
<td>Developing a Concept Plan for reclamation of the City’s whale Transfer Station, including the existing serving center, and the building of a new facility that promotes recycling and provides education of local history.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPR</td>
<td>Mid-Bayview Service Center Planning and Conceptual Design</td>
<td>Conceptual</td>
<td>Structural and design management of possible conceptual design alternative, to help determine a direction for future capital improvements.</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$1,795</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DRAFT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPR</td>
<td>Ohlone All KEY Conceptual Planning &amp; Design</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Design</td>
<td>Evaluation of site conditions, facility and structural environment, and recreation programming to determine what improvements to move forward and to identify the center in Park and Recreation facility and far improved recreation organization and opportunity.</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$6,083</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DRAFT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPR</td>
<td>Bay Shores (Shore) Public Facility Reuse and Recreation</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Design</td>
<td>Evaluation of the needs for recreation and design, analysis of off and supporting structure (Parks and Recreation) and development of detailed design and construction documents.</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$2,975</td>
<td>$270,025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DRAFT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPR</td>
<td>Mid-Bayview Recreation Planning and Design</td>
<td>Conceptual</td>
<td>Planning and design to reposition or expand the Mid-Bayview</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$2,975</td>
<td>$270,025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DRAFT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPR</td>
<td>Sea Gull Community Center Interior Upgrades and Renovations</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>Structural and design management of possible conceptual design alternative, to help determine the future for the facility and far improved organization and operation.</td>
<td>$1,900,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$1,508,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DRAFT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPR</td>
<td>South Berkeley Service Center Interior Upgrades and Renovations</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>Structural and design management of possible conceptual design alternative, to help determine the future for the facility and far improved organization and operation.</td>
<td>$3,840,000</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$6,710,080</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DRAFT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPR</td>
<td>Strawberry Creek Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>Reuse, renovation and planning for Strawberry Creek Park.</td>
<td>$621,000</td>
<td>$5,655</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DRAFT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPR</td>
<td>Yosemite Park Plan for Recreation Planning and Design</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Design</td>
<td>Planning for safety and efficiency ray. A 5.25 mile Energy project with anticipated lifespan of over 40 years.</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$3,800</td>
<td>$1,875,000</td>
<td>$6,795,000</td>
<td>$6,772,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff have prepared approval for construction documents. The PDP plan has been submitted for approval, construction is anticipated in December 2019 with construction to begin after contract execution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPR</td>
<td>SYMPHONY HALL Kitasew Projects</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>Technical upgrades to stage oak bluffs, three joint boxes, Campbell, wiring, and wiring devices.</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>$175,110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DRAFT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPR</td>
<td>Genesee Park Kitasew Projects</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>Technical upgrades to stage oak bluffs, three joint boxes, Campbell, wiring, and wiring devices.</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>$175,110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DRAFT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPR</td>
<td>Shockley Park Refit and Electrical Upgrades</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>Refit and electrical improvements</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$10,700</td>
<td>$689,293</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DRAFT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPR</td>
<td>Marlin Marina Park Refit and Electrical Upgrades</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>Technical upgrades to main oak bluffs, three joint boxes, and wiring devices</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$10,700</td>
<td>$589,293</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DRAFT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPR</td>
<td>Pacifica Facility Plan for Recreation Planning and Design</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Design</td>
<td>Planning for safety and efficiency ray. A 5.25 mile Energy project with anticipated lifespan of over 40 years.</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$3,800</td>
<td>$1,875,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DRAFT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPR</td>
<td>Tacoma Park: The Tub</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Design</td>
<td>Refit design, acquiring regulatory permits and environmental documents, and preparation of construction documents for replacement of the collapsed bathtub serving the main oak bluffs with the city.</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$795,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DRAFT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPR</td>
<td>Yosemite Recreation</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Design</td>
<td>Refit design, acquiring regulatory permits and environmental documents, and preparation of construction documents for the structural repair to replace the pier for recreational use.</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$10,700</td>
<td>$789,293</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DRAFT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>DEPT</td>
<td>PROJECT NAME</td>
<td>PROJECT TYPE</td>
<td>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>T1 ORIGINAL FUNDING</td>
<td>T1 NET CONTRIBUTION*</td>
<td>T1 TOTAL PROJECT FUNDING</td>
<td>OTHER FUNDINGS</td>
<td>OPERATIONAL FUNDING</td>
<td>APPROXIMATE TOTAL FUNDING</td>
<td>PK</td>
<td>F05</td>
<td>F06</td>
<td>FY12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Berkeley Rose Garden Erasure</td>
<td>Planning, Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>Proposed improvements for Berkeley Rose Garden.</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$9,610</td>
<td>$790,390</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$790,390</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Berkeley Rose Garden Pathway, Tennis Courts</td>
<td>Planning, Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>Renovation of existing walkways and construction of new pathways to provide an accessible path to tennis courts.</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$13,200</td>
<td>$1,083,800</td>
<td>Parks Tax &amp; PW Capital Improvement Fund</td>
<td>$1,080,800</td>
<td>$2,378,217</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Bradley Irrigation System</td>
<td>Planning, Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>Upgrade irrigation system to provide individual programming and data monitoring capabilities. Subproject includes the replacement of irrigation control software and coordinates with the establishment of aerial/ground water control systems at Bradley Irrigation, which will conserve water and control costs.</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$8,013</td>
<td>$752,013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$752,013</td>
<td>BR/TP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Upper Park Field and Heliocen Lawn</td>
<td>Planning, Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>Improvements to the ballfield, dog park, site lighting and accessibility for safety and energy efficiency. Includes improvements to site drainage, partial reseeding of the upper park field.</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$11,900</td>
<td>$988,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$988,100</td>
<td>TI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Design/Fluor Mtc-Park (4) Park Upgrade</td>
<td>Planning, Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>Renovate age 3-5 play structures and age 9-12 play structures and complete ADA improvements.</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td>$7,120</td>
<td>$857,120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$857,120</td>
<td>TI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>1st Ave Park (5) Park (Age 5-3 Play Area)</td>
<td>Planning, Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>Renovate age 9-12 play structures and complete ADA improvements.</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$2,875</td>
<td>$502,875</td>
<td>PRW Capital Improvement Fund</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$502,875</td>
<td>WK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>West Oakland Park Reconstruction</td>
<td>Planning, Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>Reconstruction of recreation of the existing lighted tennis courts at San Pablo Park.</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$9,520</td>
<td>$790,480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$790,480</td>
<td>WK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>2nd Ave Parks (1) Rifle Range Field &amp; Boulevard, Complete Repl</td>
<td>Planning, Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>Replace artificial turf at existing fields to include organics, irrigation and upgraded turf.</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$6,728</td>
<td>$256,728</td>
<td>City Parks, Roads, Parks, User Fees.</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$256,728</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Lower Brates Bridge Infrastructure</td>
<td>Planning, Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>Install cables to reduce post and char. material. T1 will provide a box culvert to facilitate crossings, and improve quality &amp; surface.</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$13,688</td>
<td>$1,186,312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,186,312</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Federal &amp; Humboldt Avenue</td>
<td>Planning, Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>Complete streetscape projects to include median upgrades to sidewalks, sidewalks, storm drains, curbs, etc.</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td>$10,600</td>
<td>$860,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$860,600</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Marketway Avenue and West Berkeley Blvd</td>
<td>Planning, Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>Complete streetscape projects to include median upgrades to sidewalks, sidewalks, storm drains, curbs, etc.</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td>$10,600</td>
<td>$860,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$860,600</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>1st Ave, Humboldt Aven &amp; Shepherd Rd</td>
<td>Planning, Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>Complete streetscape projects to include median upgrades to sidewalks, sidewalks, storm drains, curbs, etc.</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td>$10,600</td>
<td>$860,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$860,600</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>3rd Ave, Humboldt Ave &amp; 23rd St</td>
<td>Planning, Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>Complete streetscape projects to include median upgrades to sidewalks, sidewalks, storm drains, curbs, etc.</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td>$10,600</td>
<td>$860,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$860,600</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>1st Ave, Humboldt Ave &amp; 25th St</td>
<td>Planning, Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>Complete streetscape projects to include median upgrades to sidewalks, sidewalks, storm drains, curbs, etc.</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td>$10,600</td>
<td>$860,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$860,600</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: The above requirements, 3% of bond proceeds is to be used for forecasted art. Phase 1 art contribution should be 1% of the $3 billion bond sale. The calculated art contribution is based on the initial estimated Phase 1 cost of $31 billion.**
City of Berkeley
Concurrent Meeting
Subcommittee on Measure T1 of the Public Works Commission and Subcommittee on parks capital projects of the Parks and Waterfront Commission

Subject: Measure T1 Bond Program Discussion
Date: October 29, 2018
Time: 1:00 – 3:00 PM
Location: 2180 Milvia Street, Berkeley, CA 94704, Cyprus Room (1st Floor)

MEETING AGENDA

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

2. Comments from the Public (3 minutes each speaker)

3. Discussion
   a. Introduction (5 Minutes)
   b. T1 Project Prioritization Discussion (90 minutes)
   c. Summary and Next Steps (5 Minutes)

4. Adjournment
RESOLUTION NO. 67,666—N.S.

GUIDELINES FOR PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND CITY COUNCIL DECISIONS IN DETERMINING SPENDING PRIORITIES AND ALLOCATIONS FOR REVENUE FROM A $100 MILLION INFRASTRUCTURE AND FACILITIES BOND

WHEREAS, the City Council in Resolution No. 67,522—N.S. authorized a bond measure be placed on the November ballot that would allow issuance of $100,000,000 in general obligation bonds to “renovate the City’s aging infrastructure and facilities, including sidewalks, storm drains, parks, streets, senior and recreation centers, and other important City facilities and buildings”; and

WHEREAS, reports presented to the Council in recent years have established the rehabilitation needs of parks and public works infrastructure in excess of $300 million; and

WHEREAS, those needs are large and cannot all be addressed at once, but an effort to begin repairing and modernizing our infrastructure in a sustainable manner is desperately needed; and

WHEREAS, many of the infrastructure projects in Berkeley date back to the Works Project Administration more than 70 years ago, which funded more than 30 Berkeley projects including road projects, improvements to Berkeley High and other Berkeley schools, the Berkeley Marina, and the Berkeley Rose Garden, as well as Codornices, Frances Albrier, Indian Rock, James Kenney, John Hinkel and Live Oak Parks; and

WHEREAS, aging infrastructure is a critical national and local Issue, and the provision of reliable sustainable and efficient infrastructure allows the City to operate effectively and for its citizens and businesses to thrive; and

WHEREAS, the national political parties are promoting infrastructure rehabilitation and the creation of jobs such that having shovel-ready projects in Berkeley will maximize the opportunity to augment local funding with matching State and Federal funds; and

WHEREAS, it is fiscally prudent to lock in the current very low interest rates on Bonds; and

WHEREAS, City Council decisions on allocation of bond revenues would be aided by established guidelines for making recommendations to the Council that assure maximum opportunity for public input, enable citizen oversight to ensure that bond funds are used appropriately, provide Berkeley with improved and resilient infrastructure and park facilities that reflect Berkeley’s changing demographics and needs, and assure equitable distribution of improvements among its citizens.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Berkeley that if the measure passes, the Council intends to employ the following measures to maximize accountability, fiscal responsibility and public input:
• There will be citizen oversight for use of the bonds. The affected commissions will hold public meetings and prepare recommendations to the Council as part of the budgetary process.

• Evaluation criteria for allocation of the $100 million bond revenues will include consideration of Berkeley's changing demographics, equity across the City and resilience needs, including water quality and green infrastructure mandates and other sustainability objectives. In making recommendations the committees shall consider finishing projects that are underway and have impact on the greatest number of Berkeley residents.

• The bond proceeds need to be used for long lasting capital projects and not for maintenance work. The projects should use durable, sustainable technologies, so that these capital investments lower future maintenance costs.

• The Public Works Department, the Parks, Recreation and Waterfront Department, the Health, Housing and Community Services Department and the Office of Energy and Sustainable Development shall develop program plans to address aging infrastructure improvement needs beyond the $100 million infrastructure bond. Those plans will identify the priority of improvements and funding sources. Development of the plans will involve the affected commissions and the public.

The foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Berkeley City Council on September 13, 2016 by the following vote:

Ayes: Arreguin, Capitelli, Droste, Maio, Moore, Wengraf, Worthington and Bates.

Noes: None.

Absent: Anderson.  

[Signature]
Tom Bates, Mayor

Attest: Mark Numainville, City Clerk
Council Consent Items

3. Opposing the Repeal of the Affordable Care Act
From: Mayor Arreguin and Councilmember Hahn
Recommendation: Adopt a Resolution opposing the repeal or roll back of the Affordable Care Act. Send a copy of the Resolution to President Donald Trump, U.S. Senators Dianne Feinstein and Kamala Harris, and Congresswoman Barbara Lee.
Financial Implications: None
Contact: Jesse Arreguin, Mayor, 981-7100
Action: Councilmembers Droste and Davila added as co-sponsor. Adopted Resolution No. 67,828–N.S.

4. Public Process for Implementation of Measure T1
From: Mayor Arreguin
Recommendation: Direct the City Manager to establish a delineated and robust public process for the implementation of Measure T1 that would include two (2) Lead Commissions (Public Works and Parks), affected commissions, and the public based on the following guidelines: 1. A minimum of three joint meetings for the general public and participating commissions to provide input on criteria and projects. Public meetings should be held in workshop format, to allow citizens to engage with commissions and staff to provide input on criteria and project priorities. Staff and commissions will engage in robust public outreach, including online forums to gather comments from residents. 2. An agreement from all participants of project ranking criteria that would include, but not be limited to: complexity (“shovel ready” to master plan), safety, environmental impact, equity in outcomes and impact across all city neighborhoods, cost/matching fund/grant availability, and resiliency. 3. A program-based development approach to maximize the benefit of phasing larger projects or multiple project implementation. 4. Opportunity to review staff recommendations and suggest modifications based on matching criteria and public input. 5. Development of a long-term plan for projects that will extend beyond the funding capacity of T1, including possible future funding mechanisms. 6. An ongoing oversight and reporting process including timelines for financial reassessment. The proposed public process would supplement the City Manager’s proposed timeline for implementation of Measure T1.
Financial Implications: Staff time
Contact: Jesse Arreguin, Mayor, 981-7100
Action: Moved to Action Calendar. 1 speaker. M/S/C (Worthington/Wengraf) to approve the recommendation as revised in Supplemental Reports Packet #1.
Vote: All Ayes.
DRAFT- Measure T1 Project Prioritization

### Conceptual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>West Berkeley Service Center</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Citywide Restroom Assessment</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Willard Park</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Veteran’s Building</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Old City Hall</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planning and Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Frances Albrier Community Center</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Tom Bates Fieldhouse/Restroom</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Aquatic Park Tide Tubes</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Municipal Pier</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>North Berkeley Senior Center</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>$6,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Live Oak</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>$4,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Berkeley Mental Health</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Rose Garden Drainage</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Rose Garden Tennis, Pathways</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>San Pablo Play</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Strawberry Creek Park Restroom</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Grove Park</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>George Florence Play</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>San Pablo Tennis</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Streets and GI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>University Ave, Marina Blvd, Spinnaker</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Adeline and Hearst</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Ward</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Hopkins</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Bancroft</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>King School Park (Not feasible)</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Citywide Safety Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Corporation Yard</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Marina Corporation Yard</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Berkeley Health Clinic</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Public Safety Building</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Criteria*</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Greatest Benefit: Project provides impact to the greatest number of Berkeley Residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Equity: Criteria applied after looking at full list of projects. Consideration of geographic and demographic distribution of projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Health, safety, resilience: Project addresses public health and safety, such as improvements for disaster preparedness, emergency response or increases resiliency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Environmental Sustainability/Durability: Project which improves water quality, have elements of green infrastructure, or also include energy, climate, or other zero waste goals. Project uses durable elements or technologies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Creating project readiness/Sequencing: Criteria applied after looking at full list of projects. Consideration of sequencing projects to ensure that the bond requirement of spending 85% of proceeds by the third year is met. Create shovel-ready projects for future funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Leveraging other funds: Project utilizes other funding sources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Projects excluded from this list:
- Citywide Irrigation (in contract)
- Tom Bates Synthetic Turf (completed)
- Transfer Station (alternate funding source found)

*From Council Consent Item #4 (January 31, 2017) and Resolution 67,666-N.S.
### T1 Project Prioritization

**Commission Agenda Item 13. T1 program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>DEPT</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>PROJECT TYPE</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>T1 ORIGINAL AMOUNT ($)</th>
<th>T1 AMOUNT CONTRIBUTED ($)</th>
<th>T1 TOTAL PROJECT AMOUNT ($)</th>
<th>OTHER FUNDING</th>
<th>OTHER FUNDING AMOUNT</th>
<th>APPROPRIATE FUNDING</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY30</th>
<th>FY35</th>
<th>FY40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Ohlone Bike Path</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Design</td>
<td>Ongoing efforts to define various project components, provide cost estimates, and develop a budget for the project.</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$39,210</td>
<td>$339,210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Marina Park Pier Planning &amp; Design</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Design</td>
<td>Preparation of final design documents and permits to support construction of a new pier.</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>$15,389</td>
<td>$915,389</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Ohlone Bike Path</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Design</td>
<td>Detailed design and permitting required for the construction of a new bike path.</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$39,210</td>
<td>$339,210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Marina Pier Planning &amp; Design</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Design</td>
<td>Preparation of final design documents and permits to support construction of a new pier.</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>$15,389</td>
<td>$915,389</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Ohlone Bike Path</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Design</td>
<td>Ongoing efforts to define various project components, provide cost estimates, and develop a budget for the project.</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$39,210</td>
<td>$339,210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Marina Pier Planning &amp; Design</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Design</td>
<td>Preparation of final design documents and permits to support construction of a new pier.</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>$15,389</td>
<td>$915,389</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Notes:**

- Community Facilities/BUILDINGS: $15,900,000 $189,210 $15,710,790 $7,671,143 $23,381,933
- Community Facilities/BUILDINGS: $300,000 $3,570 $296,430 $296,430
- Community Facilities/BUILDINGS: $150,000 $1,785 $148,215 $148,215
- Community Facilities/BUILDINGS: $750,000 $8,925 $741,075 $741,075
- Community Facilities/BUILDINGS: $250,000 $2,975 $247,025 $247,025
- Community Facilities/BUILDINGS: $1,000,000 $10,710 $999,290 $999,290
- Community Facilities/BUILDINGS: $4,796,143 $6,772,343
- Community Facilities/BUILDINGS: $2,000,000 $23,800 $1,976,200
- Community Facilities/BUILDINGS: $500,000 $845,835
- Community Facilities/BUILDINGS: $6,772,343
- Community Facilities/BUILDINGS: $889,290
- Community Facilities/BUILDINGS: $900,000
- Community Facilities/BUILDINGS: $1,976,200
- Community Facilities/BUILDINGS: $889,290
- Community Facilities/BUILDINGS: $900,000
- Community Facilities/BUILDINGS: $1,976,200
- Community Facilities/BUILDINGS: $889,290

*Regular Meeting November 14, 2018*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/DEPT</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>PROJECT TYPE</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TOTAL FUNDING</th>
<th>FUNDING (K)</th>
<th>FUNDING CONTRIBUTION (K)</th>
<th>FUNDING AMOUNT</th>
<th>APPROVED FUNDING</th>
<th>PNP/FFA</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,2,6,6</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>Planning, Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>Improvements to Edlemon Creek to repair erosion damage at the obstructions at East of Rose Garden site.</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$9,140</td>
<td>$790,860</td>
<td>$790,860</td>
<td>$790,860</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,6,6</td>
<td>RW</td>
<td>Planning, Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>Removal of existing site infrastructure and construction of new pathways to provide an accessible path of travel to the center of the park. Reconstruction of portions of all of the tennis courts for safety.</td>
<td>$1,310,000</td>
<td>$14,060</td>
<td>$1,295,940</td>
<td>$1,295,940</td>
<td>$1,295,940</td>
<td>$1,276,216</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>RW</td>
<td>Planning, Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>Current irrigation system require individual programming and daily monitoring by City staff. The project includes the replacement of Irrigation Control Software and Controllers and the establishment of remote software tools to control irrigation systems, which will ensure water and energy costs.</td>
<td>$770,000</td>
<td>$8,025</td>
<td>$762,975</td>
<td>$762,975</td>
<td>$762,975</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,1</td>
<td>RW</td>
<td>Planning, Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>Improvements to the half-pipe, slope, site lighting and accessibility for safety and energy savings, including improvements to the drainage and/or removal of the existing footing.</td>
<td>$1,310,000</td>
<td>$11,960</td>
<td>$1,298,040</td>
<td>$1,298,040</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,6,6</td>
<td>RW</td>
<td>Planning, Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>Remove age 3-6 play structures and age 6-12 play structures and complete 80% improvements.</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$7,180</td>
<td>$792,820</td>
<td>$792,820</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,3,5</td>
<td>RW</td>
<td>Planning, Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>Revise age 3-12 play structures and complete 80% improvements.</td>
<td>$710,000</td>
<td>$7,975</td>
<td>$702,025</td>
<td>$702,025</td>
<td>$702,025</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>RW</td>
<td>Planning, Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>Reconstruction/revocation of the existing light/tennis courts at the public park.</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$63,120</td>
<td>$736,880</td>
<td>$736,880</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>RW</td>
<td>Planning, Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>Replacing existing light fixtures including lights, shade and upgrades and/or improvements.</td>
<td>$191,000</td>
<td>$7,135</td>
<td>$183,865</td>
<td>$183,865</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INFRASTRUCTURE-CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/DEPT</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>PROJECT TYPE</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TOTAL FUNDING</th>
<th>FUNDING (K)</th>
<th>FUNDING CONTRIBUTION (K)</th>
<th>FUNDING AMOUNT</th>
<th>APPROVED FUNDING</th>
<th>PNP/FFA</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,2,6,6</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>Planning, Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>Replacement to reduce peak stormwater flows and to provide the urban infrastructure system.</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$11,171</td>
<td>$2,988,829</td>
<td>$2,988,829</td>
<td>$2,988,829</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,2,6</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>Planning, Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>Recreation: investment in new projects to improve drainage conditions in public areas, storm drains, landscaped areas and infrastructure.</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$112,600</td>
<td>$1,987,400</td>
<td>$1,987,400</td>
<td>$1,987,400</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,2,6</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>Planning, Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>Installation of new stormwater swales, storm drains, and/or bio-retention areas.</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$112,600</td>
<td>$1,987,400</td>
<td>$1,987,400</td>
<td>$1,987,400</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>Planning, Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>Planning, Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$63,120</td>
<td>$736,880</td>
<td>$736,880</td>
<td>$736,880</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,2,6,6,6</td>
<td>RW</td>
<td>Planning, Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>Design and implementation of a new drainage system and pavement reconstruction.</td>
<td>$3,900,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$3,840,000</td>
<td>$3,840,000</td>
<td>$3,840,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INFRASTRUCTURE-ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/DEPT</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>PROJECT TYPE</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TOTAL FUNDING</th>
<th>FUNDING (K)</th>
<th>FUNDING CONTRIBUTION (K)</th>
<th>FUNDING AMOUNT</th>
<th>APPROVED FUNDING</th>
<th>PNP/FFA</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,2,6,6,6</td>
<td>RW</td>
<td>Planning, Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>Planning, Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>$3,900,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$3,840,000</td>
<td>$3,840,000</td>
<td>$3,840,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INFRASTRUCTURE-ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS**

- **Criteria:**
  1. Greatest Benefit
  2. Equity
  3. Health, safety, resilience
  4. Environmental Sustainability/ Durability
  5. Creating project readiness/ Sequencing

---

*From Council Consent Item #4 (January 31, 2018) and Resolution 67,666-N.S.
DRAFT- Measure T1 Project Prioritization / Potential Savings

### Conceptual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Cost.</th>
<th>Savings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A West Berkeley Service Center</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Citywide Restroom Assessment</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Willard Park</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Veteran’s Building</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Old City Hall</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planning and Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Cost.</th>
<th>Savings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Frances Albrier Community Center</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>($350,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Tom Bates Fieldhouse/Restroom</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>($200,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Aquatic Park Tide Tubes</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Municipal Pier</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$2,250,000</td>
<td>($550,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend
- **A** Highest Priority
- **D** Lowest Priority

*Projects excluded from this list:
- Citywide Irrigation (in contract)
- Tom Bates Synthetic Turf (completed)
- Transfer Station (alternate funding source found)

### Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Cost.</th>
<th>Savings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A North Berkeley Senior Center</td>
<td>$6,800,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Live Oak</td>
<td>$4,900,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Berkeley Mental Health</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Rose Garden Drainage</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Rose Garden Tennis, Pathways</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B San Pablo Play</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Strawberry Creek Park Restroom</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>(245,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Grove Park</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>(700,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D George Florence Play</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>(420,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D San Pablo Tennis</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>(560,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$18,700,000</td>
<td>(1,925,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Streets and GI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Cost.</th>
<th>Savings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A University Ave, Marina Blvd, Spinnaker</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Adeline and Hearst ($2.9m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Monterey ($1.3m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Ward ($200k)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 2nd ($250k)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Hopkins ($250k)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Bancroft ($100k)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King School Park (Not feasible)</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>(1,200,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$9,700,000</td>
<td>(1,200,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Citywide Safety Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Cost.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B Corporation Yard ($530k)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Marina Corporation Yard ($550k)</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Berkeley Health Clinic ($10k)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Public Safety Building ($10k)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$900,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Potential Savings: ($3,675,000)

A. WETA possibly supplementing landslide study. Cost for study estimated to be 860k. Savings will be $900k - 54k - WETA supplement.

B. Potential savings from excluding construction cost (Original*70%)

**Approach**

1. All projects will get at least conceptual design and cost estimate
2. Anything with a C or D rating in Construction is reduced to Planning and Design
3. Any with a B rating in Planning/Design will be reduced to Conceptual, except for Aquatic Park project. Need full amount to get cost estimate.
4. Eliminating King School Park because it is not feasible
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1. Purpose and Scope

The purpose of this Manual is to provide clear and concise guidelines on the management of T1 funds. This manual is intended to document program goals and performance metrics, program management structure and processes, project management guidelines, bond requirements and restrictions, and expenditure control policies and procedures. This Manual is expected to improve the understanding of policies and procedures by staff and the community, and help prepare the City for future audits.

This Manual is intended to be updated to reflect needed clarifications or current best practices. The responsibility for keeping the Manual current and sensitive to Program requirements belongs to the T1 Management Team.

2. Program Description

The following section provides background on the Measure T1 program, an overview of the implementation schedule, a brief description of general requirements, restrictions, and limitations.

2.1. Background

In May 2016, City Council resolved to place a General Obligation (GO) bond to fund the repair, renovation, replacement, or reconstruction of the City’s existing infrastructure and facilities before the voters at the following November General Municipal Election (Resolution No. 67,522-N.S.). The resolution identified the significant need to fund necessary improvements so that the public can continue to benefit from the use of City infrastructure and facilities. The City’s existing funds and funding sources are inadequate to pay for the necessary improvements.

2.1.1. Existing City Infrastructure and Facilities

The Departments of Public Works (PW) and Parks, Recreation & Waterfront (PRW) are jointly responsible for managing, maintaining, and upgrading an extensive portfolio of community-serving capital assets and infrastructure.

PW operates, maintains, and manages 56 facilities, including fire stations; senior centers; police stations, buildings dedicated to the delivery of health services; facilities that support City government operations and other City-owned property such as public garages. PW is also responsible for maintaining other City infrastructure such as: approximately 325 retaining walls, bridges, tunnels, culverts...
and other miscellaneous non-building structures within the public right of way and easements; 254 miles of public sanitary sewer mains and 130 miles of public sewer laterals; 300 miles of concrete sidewalks; a storm drain system containing 78 miles of underground pipes, manholes, catch basins, and cross drains; and 216 miles of City streets and related facilities such as traffic signals and street lights.

PRW operates, maintains and manages 52 parks, 5 community centers, 2 pools, 3 resident camps, and approximately 15 sports fields, 49 sports courts, 63 play areas, 36 picnic areas, 33,000 street and park trees, 124 street medians, 263 street irrigation systems, and 29 restrooms and out buildings. PRW is also responsible for maintaining related infrastructure such as water and irrigation systems, sewer laterals, storm drain systems, electric conduits and lighting, trails, pathways, and parking lots. In addition, PRW operates and maintains the Berkeley Waterfront and resident camps and its related facilities, such as docks, piers, parking lots, trails, 1,000 boat berths and other infrastructure and buildings, including the Nature Center, Adventure Playground, office buildings, and restaurants.

The City’s existing infrastructure and facilities provide important and critical services to the public. These facilities and services require significant resources to repair and maintain for ongoing public benefit.

2.1.2. Bond Inception and Authorization

In November 2016, a proposed $100 million dollar GO bond to repair, renovate, replace, or reconstruct the City’s aging, infrastructure and facilities, including sidewalks, storm drains, parks, streets, senior and recreation centers, and other important City facilities and buildings was placed before Berkeley voters as Measure T1. Measure T1 passed with 86.5% of the vote, and the People of the City of Berkeley authorized the City of Berkeley to incur bonded debt and issue a GO bond, (Resolution No. 67,795-N.S.). In June 2017, City Council adopted the first set of projects for implementation in phase 1 of Measure T1 to help address the significant and growing unfunded infrastructure needs. The total estimated amount for phase 1 projects was $37,365,000, (Resolution No. 68,076-N.S.). These bond-funded capital projects were added to the City’s overall Capital Improvement Program.
In October 2017, City Council authorized the first sale of GO bonds, which totaled $35 Million for phase 1, (Resolution No. 68,199-N.S.). The GO bonds were sold in November 2017.

2.2. Program Phasing Schedule

Measure T1 projects are anticipated to be performed in three phases spanning a total of 12 years. This will enable the City to evenly distribute workload over time and allow significant time for public input. Each phase will include a robust public project selection process, City Council review and approval of projects, and a bond sale.

Figure 1, Measure T1 Program Schedule including Key Phases and Milestones

2.3. Requirements, Limitations, and Restrictions¹

The City is empowered under Article 4.5 of Chapter 3 of Part 1 of Division 2 of Title 5 of the Government Code of the State of California (the “Bond Law”) to issue general obligation bonds that are authorized by two-thirds of the electors voting on the proposition. The bonds are payable as to both principal and interest from the proceeds

¹ Unless otherwise noted, source is: City of Berkeley, Report to Council, “Recommendations for allocating and managing Measure T1 General Obligation Bond funds”, Office of the City Manager, December 22, 2016
of the levy of ad valorem taxes on all property subject to such taxes in the City.
(Resolution No. 68,199- N.S.)

2.3.1. Projects and Goals
As stated in the bond language (Resolution No. 67,522-N.S.), the proceeds of the bonds sold shall be used to fund the improvements and functional art integrated into the improvements. Improvements are defined as the City’s existing infrastructure and facilities that are in need of significant repair, renovation, replacement, or reconstruction so that the public can continue to benefit from them.

Existing infrastructure critical to protecting public safety and welfare, and enabling the residents of Berkeley to have a high quality of life include, but are not limited to:

- Streets and sidewalks which provide for transportation and accessibility for both the general public and public safety personnel
- Storm drains and green infrastructure projects which protect the public from flooding and improve the quality of runoff into San Francisco Bay
- Senior Centers which provide important services for the City’s seniors, including educational courses, activities, social support, and meals. In emergencies, Senior Centers can also serve as local care and shelter facilities for all members of the community
- Parks and recreation community centers and facilities which provide recreational, educational and social opportunities, and support for children and families. In emergencies, Community Centers can also serve as local care and shelter facilities for all members of the community
- The City’s public buildings and other facilities, which are both important cultural resources in themselves and provide public services to the residents of Berkeley

In Resolution 67,795-N.S., Council resolved that 1% of bond proceeds shall be available for functional art integrated into T1-funded improvements, as and to the extent determined by City Council.
2.3.2. Expenditure Timing Requirement

Under federal tax law, for each Measure T1 phase, the City must have a reasonable expectation of spending at least 85% of bond proceeds within 3 years of the sale. If 85% is not spent, there are two consequences:

- The unspent project funds must be yield-restricted, i.e. invested at a rate that generates less than the bond yield; and
- If the City’s bonds are audited, and the Federal Internal Revenue Service (IRS) determines that the City did not have a reasonable expectation at the time bonds were sold, that it could spend 85% within three years, then the IRS could conclude that interest on the bonds is taxable, which could require a payment by the City to the IRS.

2.3.3. Staffing and Overhead Costs and Limitations

Bond proceeds may be used for labor (staff costs) to work on projects, and associated facility costs (such as rent and utilities), equipment, services and supply costs, but not for purely “community process” efforts. For example, a bond-funded project manager is not prohibited from talking to residents or attending meetings, but funds should not be used to hire consultants to facilitate general public outreach. Bond funds may be used to pay administrative costs (including staff time) directly related to bond-funded projects.

2.3.4. Private Activity Bond Limitation

Bond proceeds are not to be used as to cause the Bonds to satisfy the private business tests of Section 141(b) of the Federal Tax Code or the private loan financing test of Section 141(c) of the Federal Tax Code.

2.3.5. Leased Property Restriction

Bond proceeds may only be spent for the improvement of real property with “municipal improvements” as defined in BMC Section 7.64.020. Expenditures are limited to property owned or leased by the City. Thus, bond funds may not be spent to improve real property that is not owned or under a long-term lease by the City. For example, properties owned by the school district that are not under a long-term lease with the City are not eligible.
2.4. Program Projects
Eligible projects are selected as described in Section 4.2 Project Selection. The project selection process includes staff analysis and recommendation, commission review, community input, and City Council approval. See Section 4.5 Program Change Management for policies and procedures regarding changes to the list of approved projects.

2.5. Program Project Schedules
Approved T1 Projects are scheduled over each phase of Measure T1 to balance workload and effort into the City’s established capital improvement program. The length of the planning, design, and construction phases of each project are taken into consideration to estimate the life of each project. The construction phase is scheduled to minimize disruption to the public as City services and facilities are removed from service to undergo renovations. Projects are scheduled with the expectation of spending at least 85% of the total bond amount within 3 years of the sale of the bond.

3. Program Management Team Organization
The following section provides a general overview of the T1 Program Management Team.

3.1. T1 Management Team
The T1 Management Team is responsible for implementing the projects funded through Measure T1, including project planning, resourcing, and management. The T1 Management Team is comprised of the PW and PRW Directors, Deputy Directors, the Manager of Engineering, Fiscal Managers, and Supervising Civil Engineers. This team is supported by the T1 Assistant Management Analyst. Responsibilities include meeting regularly to review the Measure T1 budget, expenditures, project progress, and to prepare detailed reports for Council, Commissions and the community about how Measure T1 funds are being expended.
### 3.2. T1 Financial Team

The T1 Financial Team is a subset of the T1 Management Team consisting of the T1 Assistant Management Analyst, Fiscal Managers, and also includes Analysts from the Public Works and the Parks, Recreation and Waterfront Departments. This team meets regularly regarding the overall program budget, expenditures, and administration of the bond program.

### 3.3. T1 Project Management Staff

T1 Project Management Staff consists of various staff from within the Public Works and the Parks, Recreation & Waterfront Departments. Full-time equivalent (FTE) employees will be allocated to manage Measure T1 projects based on personnel expertise and project timelines. The FTEs are comprised of the Supervising Civil Engineers, Associate Civil Engineers, Assistant Engineers, Inspectors, and others who are directly responsible for managing or facilitating Measure T1 projects.

Five FTEs were allocated to the Measure T1 Program in total, currently spread across 11 staff in the PW and PRW departments. The T1 Assistant Management Analyst position

---

2 Bi-Annual Update on Measure T1 City Infrastructure Bond, pg. 4, November 7, 2017
accounts for one FTE. The number of staff allocated to Measure T1 may change over time as the number of active and planned projects change, including during the onset and outset of subsequent phases.

As with all Measure T1-related costs, staff charges to Measure T1 will be based on actual time worked on Measure T1 projects. Labor costs for all other administration, such as Directors, Deputy Directors, other managers, departmental payroll, purchasing, budget staff, and other City-wide support services like IT, Human Resources, and Finance are not billed to Measure T1.

4. Program Management

The following section describes the processes and methods for managing the Measure T1 Program, including financial and technical controls, coordination, and communication.

4.1. Budgeting

The purpose of this section is to define how the T1 Management Team will develop budgets for Measure T1 costs. The $100 Million total funds will be allocated to projects in three phases. The budgets for each phase are created in the following sequence:

1. The Finance Department and Bond Counsel determines the total budget for the phase based on bond sales. The bond sales limit “is set by the terms of the bond program, which requires that the upper limit of bond sales cannot exceed the total debt covered by the current 10 year average tax rate for a Berkeley resident”\(^3\). The limit is determined at the time of sale for each phase of the program.

2. Per Resolution 67,795-N.S., Council resolved that 1% of bond proceeds shall be available for functional art integrated into Measure T1-funded improvements. These proceeds are set aside before the T1 Management Team allocates the available budget to projects, staffing, facilities, equipment, supplies, and services based on the results of the project selection process (see Section 4.2).

\(^3\) Measure T1 Bi-Annual Update Report, November 7, 2017, Page 5-6
4.2. Project Selection and Prioritization

The purpose of this section is to document the process by which projects are selected and prioritized for the Measure T1 Program. This process is carried out separately for each phase as described in the Program Phasing Schedule in Section 2.2. The project selection and prioritization process for each phase is expected to be extensive and has an expected overall timeframe of two years. This process takes into account the Bond requirements and considerations, City Council guidance, and community input. Going forward, project prioritization should be performed during the initial project selection phase to facilitate responsiveness to change during project implementation considering bond timing requirements. The following criteria are considered as projects are selected and prioritized for each phase.

Table 1, Measure T1 Project Selection and Prioritization Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>➤ Greatest Benefit</td>
<td>Project provides impact to the greatest number of Berkeley residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➤ Equity</td>
<td><strong>Criteria applied after looking at full list of projects.</strong> Consideration of geographic and demographic distribution of projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➤ Health, safety resilience</td>
<td>Project addresses public health and safety, such as improvements for disaster preparedness, emergency response, or increases resiliency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➤ Environmental Sustainability/Durability</td>
<td>Project which improves water quality, have elements of green infrastructure, or also include energy, climate, or other zero waste goals. Project uses durable elements or technologies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➤ Creating project readiness/Sequencing</td>
<td><strong>Criteria applied after looking at full list of projects.</strong> Consideration of sequencing projects to ensure that the bond requirement of spending 85% bond proceeds by the third year is met. Create shovel-ready projects for future funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➤ Leveraging other funds</td>
<td>Project utilizes other funding sources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result of the project selection process is a set of projects that meets criteria listed above to the extent possible, has been vetted by the community and commissions, and approved by City Council.

---

4 City of Berkeley City Council Consent Item #4, January 31, 2017 and Resolution 67,666-N.S., September 13, 2016
Step 1: Staff Analysis (6 months)

The T1 Management Team will provide cost estimates of potential projects to provide to the commissions and community during the public process to facilitate discussions to determine the support, wants, needs, and priorities of the public for implementation in Measure T1. In addition, the T1 Management Team accepts feedback at any time through the T1 website and email address.

The PW and PRW departments have reported significant unfunded infrastructure and facility needs. Based on these reports and any public input received, the T1 Management Team will prepare a list of priority projects. The list shall be organized by infrastructure type and in conjunction with the City’s overall capital improvement programs. The T1 Management Team will solicit preliminary input from City commissions and other City departments to provide a broad list of project options. At a minimum, the T1 Management Team will provide the following information about each project, if applicable:

- Name
- Infrastructure Type
- Brief Scope
• Phase (conceptual, design, construction)
• Cost Estimate
• Timeframe

Conceptual projects will focus on public processes, feasibility studies and analyses that culminate in a preferred project plan and cost estimate. These projects will be ready for the design and construction phase when funding is identified. Design projects will include public process, design, permits and bid package, and are intended to produce shovel-ready projects for a later phase of T1 funding, grant funding, or other funding. Construction projects will be entirely designed and built.

The initial list of projects is expected to represent a cost significantly greater than the Measure T1 funding available. However, the list will represent a set of options from which all stakeholders can select a final set of recommended options.

Step 2: Community Input Process and Analysis (12 months)
City staff along with PW and P&W Commissions will jointly facilitate a robust community engagement process that will include the public and participating commissions. Their recommendations will be submitted to City Council. The purpose of this process is:

• To receive input on project priorities from a wide range of community members.
• To receive input on how best to balance the wide range of projects needs that are eligible to be funded by Measure T1.
• To receive input on how best to equitably distribute the benefits of Measure T1.

The process is as follows:

2a. Commissions Review – The PW and P&W Commissions serve as the lead commission for the Measure T1 Program. They will meet to review the initial set of projects from Step 1 and finalize the community input approach. These meetings will launch the community engagement process that will include additional commissions. The Commissions will jointly document the process used to engage the community in the final report to City Council.

2b. Staff and Commission Collaboration – Staff works with the lead commissions to develop a proposed project list.
2c. Participating Commissions Input – The lead Commissions (PW and P&W) will seek input from other participating commissions in order to make an informed decision about the proposed projects. Participating commissions can provide feedback by sending a commission representative to one of the lead commissions, delegating City staff who attended their commission meetings to provide their comments to one of the lead commissions, or providing written comments to the lead commissions.

The following commissions participated in the Measure T1 Phase 1 Input Process: Children, Youth, and Recreation Commission; Civic Arts Commission; Commission on Aging; Commission on Disability, Community Environmental Advisory Commission; Disaster & Fire Safety Commission; and Energy Commission; Housing Advisory Commission; Landmarks Preservation Commission Transportation Commission; and the Zero Waste Commission;

Other interested commissions are invited to provide input through the two lead commissions.

2c. Public Meetings
The lead Commissions and staff will facilitate community meetings organized by the specific type of infrastructure – for example, facilities, streets, green infrastructure, and parks. The community input gathered at these meetings, as well as submitted via email (T1@cityofberkeley.info) will be compiled by staff for consideration by commission and staff developing the final list of recommended projects to be presented to City Council.

2d. Staff and Commissions Review
The lead Commissions and staff will review input gathered from the community and finalize a proposed list of projects.

2e. Preparation of Staff and Commissions Recommendations to City Council
After collecting the full set of community input, the PW and P&W Commissions will jointly prepare a report to City Council describing:

- Overview of the selection process, including the community engagement process
- Recommendations for projects to be included
- Brief justifications for each selection organized by type of project
• Prioritization of selected projects
• Recommendations

Staff may prepare a separate companion report.

**Step 3: City Council Review**
City Council will consider the proposed projects and adopt a resolution approving a final list of projects.

**4.3. Project Sequencing**
Under federal tax law, 85% of bond funds must be spent in three years. Projects are sequenced to meet this requirement. The purpose of this section is to describe the process for sequencing the projects for each phase. The key factors that determine project sequencing include, but are not limited to:

- Grants and alternate funding timeline requirements - Projects that receive grant funds will have additional requirements that may require additional deadlines, reporting, and coordination.
- Reducing construction impacts to residents – The goal is to deliver construction projects in a sequence that reduces overall disruptions to City services.
- Coordination with outside agencies – Some projects may require coordination and permitting with regional agencies such as East Bay Municipal Utility District, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), East Bay Regional Parks District, and/or the San Francisco Bay Conservation, and Development Commission.
- Coordination with other City Departments – Some projects may require coordination, permit, review, or approval from other City departments or City entities, such as Civic Arts, Landmarks, Building and Planning Department, IT, etc.
- Construction timeline – Some projects may have specific timelines for construction, such as work needed during dry weather or low tide.

The T1 Management Team will assess the project timelines as projects are developed over the course of the selection process according to the key factors listed above.
4.4. Program Controls

The purpose of this section is to document a set of program controls that enable the T1 Management Team and the public to track progress of the program and make informed course corrections as conditions change over the course of program implementation.

4.4.1. Program Performance Tracking

Key performance indicators are useful for progress reporting as well as improving performance over time. These indicators will describe how the T1 Team can monitor progress against targets at the program level. Clearly presenting the progress achieved by using Measure T1 funds is important to demonstrate the value of the program to the public.

4.4.1.1. Program Schedule Report

The T1 Management Team coordinates with the public as needed in order to deliver projects within the Program Schedule. Staff may prepare a program-level schedule displayed in six-month increments. The T1 Management Team updates City Council by including the schedule in its bi-annual reports and a brief discussion of relevant issues that arise.

4.4.1.2. Program Performance Indicators (Expenditures)

The T1 Administrative Team will meet monthly to review program/project budgets and expenditures against projected expenditures. These reviews will include tracking the initial program/project budget, current year expenditures, current year encumbrances, and planned expenditures for each of the remaining years of the phase to calculate the projected expenditures for the full phase. They will also include information such as available and spent bond funds and City Council approved amounts to track the projected expenditures against these amounts.

Table 2, Measure T1 Key Program Performance Indicators

| Year to date expenditures against budget | Year to date encumbrances against budget | Planned expenditures against budget | Percent projects complete | Project to life expenditures and encumbrances against budget |
4.4.2. Project Estimating Guidelines

It is important to define how cost estimates are developed for projects. Cost estimates become more precise as a project shifts from conceptual planning, to design, and then to construction.

4.4.2.1. Conceptual Planning Phase Estimates

The Project Manager prepares project cost estimates at the initial phase of a project. The cost estimates are based on recent projects of a similar nature and modified for anticipated changes in the costs such as inflation. The project contingency percentage at this stage of development can be up to 50% of the overall project cost.

4.4.2.2. Design Phase Estimates

Project Managers may contract with a Design Consultant who will prepare a detailed cost estimate based on the developing parameters of the design. The cost estimate is reviewed by the Project Manager and Supervising Civil Engineer. The Design Consultant typically prepares a cost estimate at each submittal (such as 35%, 65%, 95% and Final). The project contingency percentage declines as design is developed and can be reduced to as low as 10% at final design stage. Final design stage cost estimates are used to finalize base bid scopes and identify additive alternates to the project.

4.4.2.3. Bid Estimates and Construction Bid Results

Construction Bid Documents are planned to include both base bid minimum scope and additive alternates to meet the identified project budget. When construction bids are received, the construction bids shall be reviewed by the T1 Management Team to confirm the Construction Budget and to make a recommendation for the amount of Construction Contingency (typically up to 20% of construction). If the Construction Bids received differ from the identified project budget, see Change Management procedures for alternative courses of action.

4.4.3. Procurement

Procurements that relate to Measure T1 must follow the City’s Purchasing Manual and procurement standards and guidelines\(^5\), summarized below.

---
\(^5\) City of Berkeley Purchasing Manual, 2015
4.4.3.1. Facility, Equipment, Services, and Supplies (FESS)

The T1 Assistant Management Analyst will submit purchase orders for items that relate to the management and administration of Measure T1. These costs will be assigned to the Measure T1 FESS budget code. The FESS budget is prepared for each phase and is reviewed annually.

4.4.3.2. Consultant Selection and Contracting Process

Projects that are in the concept and design phase are typically carried out through On-Call contracting arrangements. Architectural, engineering, and construction management work is typically (though not exclusively) carried out through on-call contracts.

On-Call contracts are solicited through a Request for Qualifications (RFQ). Project-specific proposals are then submitted and approved by task order. Due to the time constraints of each phase, T1 staff will use these on-call consultants to expedite the contract process whenever possible.

Project-specific Requests for Qualifications or Requests for Proposals may be used for projects requiring specific expertise.

4.4.3.3. Construction Procurement Process

Purchases above $25,000 require a formal Request for Proposal (“RFP”)/Invitation for Bid (“IFB”) process and will be awarded to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder per the California Public Contract Code (look up reference). The City Manager has the authority to approve construction projects with a value under $200,000. Projects with a value greater than $200,000 require City Council approval.

If the construction bid is within the project budget, the proposal shall be reviewed for completeness, responsiveness, price, contractor’s experience and qualifications, and if applicable, will then be brought to City Council for approval to award the contract.

4.4.4. Cost Accounting

The T1 Administrative Team maintains records for the Measure T1 program budget and costs as shown below.
4.4.4.1. Labor Costs

Approximately five full-time equivalent (FTE) staff-hours have been assigned to support the implementation of Measure T1. This includes one full-time (FTE) Assistant Management Analyst. The remaining staff time equivalent to four FTE’s are allocated to the Parks, Recreation and Waterfront and Public Works staff that directly manage Measure T1 projects. The FTE and percentage of total time allocated to each individual supporting Measure T1 projects are estimated on an annual basis. The T1 Administrative Team monitors and updates staff FTE if necessary to ensure that the departments are within their four FTE budget. Labor costs for the T1 Management Team, including the T1 Administrative Team, will not be billed to Measure T1. Project staff time allocations are done through the City’s standard procedures process. See specific guidance below:

Direct Project Management Time Allocations
Applies to: All Project Managers
The amount of time that staff allocate on their timecard is based on the proportion of time each one works on a Measure T1 project. For project-specific work (i.e. direct project management), all time is coded to a specific Measure T1 project code.

For example, if a Project Manager is directly managing a T1 project and has a project update meeting with a construction contractor and are directly managing that project, they would code their time to that project’s Measure T1 project code.

Unallocated Staff Time
Applies to: All T1 Staff
Unallocated staff time refers to staff time that is not charged to a project code due to general office activities, meetings, trainings, and time off.

In the City’s financial system, an employee’s payroll default is based on the proportion of time the employee is estimated to work on certain projects. This default is used to ensure that unallocated staff time, such as leave time, is charged based on the employee’s work allocation.
For example, an employee is anticipated to spend 30% of their time on projects funded by Measure T1 and 70% on projects funded by other sources. When the employee uses their vacation or sick time, this leave time will be charged at 30% to Measure T1 and 70% to the other funding sources.

**Supervision/ Administration/ Planning**

For non-specific Measure T1 project work, such as Measure T1 meetings and supervision of Project Managers, staff time should be project coded to the assigned project code for supervision/administration/planning.

For example, if a Supervising Civil Engineer has a meeting on a Measure T1 project that they are not the Project Manager of, they should charge their supervision time to the assigned project code for supervision/administration/planning. The project manager of that Measure T1 project should code their time to the assigned Measure T1 project code.

The T1 Assistant Management Analyst will always code their time to the assigned supervision/administration/planning project code because the position is providing general support to the overall Measure T1 program.

**4.4.4.2. Project Costs**

Project costs are organized according to the individual project budgets that are assigned to a specific project code. This work is largely carried out by contracts (see Section 5 for more details on contract management related to Measure T1 projects).

**4.4.4.3. Other Costs**

Facility (rent and utilities), equipment, and supply costs associated with carrying out Measure T1 projects are set in the budget for each phase. Professional Services, training, and travel costs associated with carrying out Measure T1 projects are budgeted in each phase. All of these costs are billed to the assigned Measure T1 project code.
4.5. Program Change Management

The T1 Management Team is responsible for ensuring the completion of all Council-approved Measure T1 projects within budget, i.e. the value of bonds sold. This involves monitoring scope, cost, project schedules, and schedule for all projects and making adjustments to ensure that the approved projects are completed.

As the Measure T1 Bond Program progresses, situations may arise where the initial priority list established at the Program Project Selection Phase (Section 4.2) may need to be re-evaluated and revised. Once the T1 Management Team is aware that they will not be able to complete the list of projects, the team will discuss and evaluate next steps.

T1 staff has the ability to make changes at the project-level as long as it does not affect the program level. For example, staff can reallocate underspent funds from one project to another as long as it does not affect the construction of another project or reduce planning and design project scopes to conceptual.

When changes need to be made at the program-level, such as adding/removing a project or changing the project’s level of completion, staff will review these options with the Lead Commissions and seek Council’s approval to revise the approved list (Section 4.5.2). This process is intended to ensure that any change to the approved Measure T1 project list is made with community input, Commission oversight, and Council approval.

4.5.1. Reprioritization of Projects

This process of reprioritizing projects start with staff evaluating options, then discussion with Lead Commissions. This is important because it can start the community process early enough to prevent delays in spending bond program funds.

The T1 Management Team will prepare and present the revised options for reprioritizing the project list to the Lead Commissions for review and comment. These options will be based on the Measure T1 project selection considerations (See section 4.2).

The Lead Commissions will engage and seek input from the community as well as other Commissions, as appropriate, and provide feedback to the T1 Management Team.

This process revises priorities, but does not change the Measure T1 project list.
4.5.2. Making Changes to the Measure T1 Project List

Council approval is needed to make any change to the Measure T1 project list. Changes could include adding a project, removing a project, or changing the level of completion from a construction project to a planning or design project.

The process for making a change to the project list is summarized in the graphic below.

![Diagram of process for making a change to the Measure T1 Project List]

**Figure 4. Process for making a change to the Measure T1 Project List**

The T1 Management Team will either receive or initiate requests to make a change to the T1 Project List. The process will then be as follows:

1. The T1 Management Team will prepare and present one or more options for changing the project list or project scopes to the Lead Commissions for review and comment.
2. The Lead Commissions should gather public input in order to discuss and make an informed recommendation through a joint report to City Council for action.
3. City Council will take an action on the proposed changes.

4.6. Document Control

To establish the methods for maintaining a set of records that relate to planning, managing, and carrying out Measure T1 activities. The T1 Assistant Management Analyst has overall responsibility for maintaining the document control system.
4.6.1. Filing

Measure T1 records should be retained in accordance with the City’s Records Management Program. Program documents will be stored in a central server location. Project specific files are stored in a central server location separate from the Measure T1 program documents.

The Measure T1 Program folder organization includes folders for the Planning and Community Process, Administration, Bond Information, Budget & Planning, commission documents, and projects. (See section 4.2).

The T1 Assistant Management Analyst is responsible for keeping the folders up to date after T1 Management Team meetings, T1 Administrative Team meetings, Commission Meetings, and all reports to City Council.

Project specific files include bids, notices of award, notices to proceed, contract agreements, insurance, change orders, progress payments, retention, acceptance, as-builts, recordation, release of retention, reports, specifications, and other records. Project Managers are responsible for keeping the project folders up to date. Supervising Civil Engineers are responsible for verifying adequate record keeping.

4.7. Communications

The purpose of this section is to document how staff shall communicate internally, with the community, Commissions, and City Council in terms of receiving input and communicating Measure T1’s progress.

4.7.1. Communication with the Community

- **Website** - The Measure T1 webpage is the community’s primary means of communication for information and updates on Measure T1. The webpage contains background information on the bond program, a story map showing Measure T1 project locations and pictures, project updates, and details on meetings or events pertaining to the Measure T1 program.

- **Community Meetings** - Community meetings will be held to collect input from the community regarding Measure T1 projects. These meetings are communicated to the community via the following channels:
- Measure T1 website under “Community Meetings and Events Schedule,”
- The City of Berkeley’s community calendar,
- Distributing mailers to residents within a minimum 300 foot radius from the project site,
- Notifying Councilmembers about projects in their districts,
- Meeting notices posted around the project site and other related sites,
- Public posting to one or more news media websites.

- **Quarterly Reporting** - The T1 Management Team is responsible for preparing summary updates on a quarterly basis. The report is prepared digitally and posted on the Measure T1 webpage.

- **Email and Written Communications** - Measure T1 staff are responsible for replying to email and written communications it receives related to Measure T1. Emails and written communications shall be saved and stored in accordance with the City’s Records Management Program. For questions, comments or general information, community members can contact T1@CityofBerkeley.info.

- **Signage** - Signs indicating “Your T1 Bond Dollars at Work” will be posted at project sites during construction.

### 4.7.2. Communication Amongst Staff

- **Meetings** - Meetings are held internally to monitor, evaluate, and report program progress against expected results. These include:
  - Project Status Meetings – PW and PRW project managers meet regularly with their Supervising Civil Engineer to monitor scope, schedule, and project budget(s).
  - T1 Program Meetings – The T1 Management Team meet monthly to monitor any changes that influence the overall program.
  - T1 Administrative Meetings – The T1 Administrative Team meet monthly to monitor expenditures, program/project budgets, and address any purchasing or budget/fiscal issues that arise.
4.7.3. Communication to Commissions

- **Measure T1 Joint Subcommittee Meetings** - The Measure T1 Joint Subcommittee consists of PW and P&W commission members. Staff will meet with the Measure T1 Joint Subcommittee as needed.

- **Commission Meetings**
  - Planning: Staff will work with the lead commissions to plan the Measure T1 bond program phases.
  - Bi-Annual Report: Staff will meet with the lead commissions during their regularly scheduled commission meetings to review the bi-annual update report before submitting the report to City Council.
  - Project-specific Coordination: Staff will meet with lead and/or participating commissions during their regularly scheduled commission meetings to provide updates and/or seek additional consultation on project-specific coordination.

4.7.4. Communication to City Council

**Bi-Annual Reporting** - The T1 Management Team is responsible for preparing Bi-Annual reports to City Council. The report is prepared in digital format and is delivered to City Council for review four weeks before the City Council meeting. The T1 Management Team presents the report to the City Council. These reports are also posted to the Measure T1 Webpage.

The report may include program status updates, community engagement, project status updates, coordination, important issues, bond program management, grants, and planning activities.

5. Project Management

The purpose of this section is to provide a general overview of the processes and procedures that apply to projects that are funded by Measure T1 funds. As with all capital improvement projects that fall under the responsibility of PW and PRW, existing City project management guidelines should be followed by the T1 Project Management Staff. The overall goal of project management is to complete projects on schedule, on budget, in accordance with industry standards and best practices, and meet local, state, and federal requirements.
5.1. Project Roles and Responsibilities

The management of each Measure T1 project is directed by qualified PW and PRW T1 Project Management Staff as discussed in Section 3. These responsibilities include schedule control, finance control, coordination with entities in and outside the City, public outreach, and technical oversight of the design and construction work. Supervising Civil Engineers have the responsibility to supervise project managers.

### Project Manager Responsibilities

- Managing project from initial planning through project close-out
- Setting up project resources, budgets, and schedules
- Managing design professionals and consultants providing professional services and project-specific expertise
- Facilitating project meetings and coordination
- Monitoring project scope and requirements
- Reporting schedule or budget variances
- Managing contract changes as required

### Supervising Civil Engineer Responsibilities

- Supervising Project Managers and their work
- Providing technical and administrative resources for Measure T1 projects
- Providing administrative and management control

### Manager of Engineering

- Overall responsibility for capital improvement project implementation
- Acts as the City Engineer, the City’s final licensed civil engineer authority

5.2. Project Control

The controls and the methods for managing the scope, scheduling, and budget of projects funded Measure T1 include:

5.2.1. Scope Control

Scope of projects are developed based on the project’s purpose, building code requirements, permit requirements, public benefits, community feedback, and overall cost and value. Project Managers are responsible for reviewing all

---

6 California Licensed Professional Engineers and other design professionals are on staff to ensure that proper design procedures and methods are used on T1 projects

7 These procedures are primarily sourced from the Project Management Manual, Revision 3 (2014), Department of Public Works.
feedback, project requirements, and implementing each project consistent with established best practices and appropriate planning and design standards. Project Managers also review scope changes for cost and schedule impacts.

### 5.2.2. Schedule Control

A project schedule, includes all phases of the project from planning, design, permitting, and through construction (if applicable) will be prepared at the preliminary design stage and updated regularly. The project schedule is maintained by the Project Managers and reviewed regularly by the Supervising Civil Engineers. Project Managers also review schedule changes for impacts to cost.

### 5.2.3. Cost Control

Project budgets include the total project costs including indirect costs such as staff costs, consultant fees, design fees, surveys, reports, printing, and advertising. Other direct costs may include permits, inspections, and construction (including labor, materials, and equipment). Costs for each project are developed at scheduled milestones using standard best practices adjusted for inflation and current bidding climates. The budgets for each project will be monitored by each Project Manager and reviewed regularly by the Supervising Civil Engineers.

### 5.2.4. Contract Control

Contract documents are prepared using standard forms and general conditions developed by the City, including the Public Works Department, the Parks, Recreation & Waterfront Department, the Finance Department, the City Attorney’s Office, and the City Manager’s Office. T1 Project Management Staff are responsible for preparing the project descriptions for Requests for Qualifications and Requests for Proposals, including Invitations to Bid, the Bidding Schedule, Construction Special Provisions, and any other related work. Project Managers are responsible for supervising design and construction contracts. This includes the procedures for progress payments, additional work/change orders, testing, inspection procedures, and acceptance of work.

### 5.3. Project Change Management

Managing changes to a project’s scope, schedule, or budget is performed by the assigned T1 Project Management Staff. The Project Manager is responsible for providing
regular scope, schedule, and cost updates to their Supervising Civil Engineer. The Supervising Civil Engineer and Project Manager evaluate project changes and determine appropriate courses of action if needed. If the Supervising Civil Engineer determines that project changes have program-level impacts, the impacts are discussed with the T1 Management Team and the Program Change Management procedures should be followed (See Section 4.5).

5.3.1. Planning and Design Changes
Project costs are developed at project milestones. During the planning and design phases, the Project Manager and Supervising Civil Engineers have the expertise and discretion to adjust the project scope or schedule. The intent is to align the projected costs with the project’s budget, taking into account the project’s goals and requirements. Changes in scope or schedule may be escalated to the T1 Management Team for review and discussion when appropriate.

5.3.2. Construction Contingency
T1 Project Management staff generally employ a construction contingency of up to 20% for each project in the construction phase based on the complexity of the project. Construction contingency funds are monitored in individual project budgets along with the full project budget. Project Managers use the project’s available construction contingency to fund approved changes to the project as a Construction Change Order (See Section 5.3.3).

5.3.3. Construction Change Orders
Project changes during construction are managed through the City’s standard change order process for capital improvement projects. If the proposed Change Order exceeds the project’s available construction contingency or may impact the overall project budget, the change is then directed to the T1 Management Team for review, discussion, and approval. If the change impacts the overall Measure T1 Program, changes shall be reviewed under Section 4.5 Program Change Management.

Change Orders must be authorized by the PW or PRW Department Director prior to the commencement of work.

5.3.4. Project Closeout
Projects are closed out according to the City’s standard practices for capital improvement projects. All outstanding change orders and all claims are settled
and processed. All project files, including as-built drawings, specifications, project manual, warranties, etc. are filed for storage in accordance with the City’s Records Management Program. Any unused Measure T1 funds are liquidated and returned to the Measure T1 Program. Funds shall return to the Program to be utilized under Section 4.5 Program Change Management.

5.4. Community Engagement and Communications

The purpose of this section is to describe the community engagement process for projects funded by Measure T1. A combination of methods are employed to ensure the results of the project provide the greatest public value. This includes a combination of community input opportunities and outreach efforts that communicate the status and progress of projects. The level of outreach efforts can vary depending on the scope and complexity of each project.

A number of community input opportunities and events can be held over the life of Measure T1 projects. Interested parties and members of the public are encouraged to participate. Measure T1 staff collect contact information of attendees at each event, maintain contact lists for each project and provide additional notifications to the general public. The notification process may include the following:

1. Post fliers in public spaces at the project location and posted at the site of the event.
2. Send mailers that include information about the project to addresses within a minimum 300 foot radius of the project site.
3. Send mailers directly to known contacts of interested parties.
4. Send fliers to the City Council representative(s) nearest the project’s location.
5. Post information about the project and events to the Measure T1 webpage and a local news media (such as Berkeleyside).

Measure T1 staff compiles all feedback. When applicable, changes are incorporated into the project, see Section 5.2 Project Control.

5.4.1. Community Engagement Plan

At the Community engagement meeting(s) an overview of the area impacted by the project, the project scope, and the general schedule may be shared. Input from the community meetings enables project staff to shape the project design and implementation in a way that best responds to community needs.
5.4.2. Community Engagement Plan for Each Project Phase

The community engagement process will span the life of the project across the conceptual planning, design, and construction phases, and can vary with the complexity of the specific project.

**Conceptual Phase** – At least one session can be held with the community. At this conceptual stage of the project, the purpose is to elicit public preferences and priorities, to inform the public of the preliminary scope and scale of the project, and to start a contact list for the duration of the project. This session will also inform the community about the community engagement process for the project, including other anticipated sessions and the different opportunities and methods to provide feedback to the Measure T1 staff.

**Design Phase** – At the design stage, more detailed information regarding design decisions, project costs, and construction scheduling will be shared.

**Construction Phase** – At the construction stage, a groundbreaking ceremony may be planned. Flyers and mailers are sent to the community and posted on the Measure T1 website and include; basic construction hours, contact
information, and any anticipated service disruptions that will occur. Signage is also posted at the project site. At the conclusion of construction, a Re-opening Ceremony may be planned.

5.4.3. Project Updates
Measure T1 staff will provide regular updates on the status of each project. The public is encouraged to check the webpage frequently for the latest information on all active projects.
To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

From: Dee Williams-Ridley, City Manager

Submitted by: Scott Ferris, Director, Parks, Recreation & Waterfront (PRW) Department

Subject: Parks, Recreation & Waterfront Department Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) Update

SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to provide an update on funded improvements and currently unfunded needs in the City’s parks, medians, waterfront and resident camps infrastructure.

CURRENT SITUATION AND ITS EFFECTS

Current CIP Funding

PRW’s capital funding is made up of Recurring Capital1 from the Parks Tax, General Fund, Marina Fund and the Camps Fund. This $1.65 M, along with bond funds from Measure WW2 and Measure T13, are being used to address our most critical needs. Measure F4, the Parks Tax increase approved by Berkeley voters in 2014 has increased parks tax yearly capital by $750,000, from $250,000 to $1,000,000, since FY2016. Additionally, Measure F provides a yearly $450,000 for minor maintenance projects.

Current CIP/Major Maintenance Projects

The following PRW capital projects have been completed in the last 18 Months:

- Parks – Bahia Child Care Center – Seismic Upgrade, Siding Replacement, and ADA upgrades
- Parks – Becky Temko Totlot – Play Area Renovations and ADA upgrades
- Parks – Tom Bates Fields – Artificial Turf Field Replacement – (Partial funding from T1)
- Parks – Grove Park – Basketball and Tennis Court Replacements and ADA upgrades
- Parks – James Kenney Community Center – Seismic Upgrade, Siding Replacement, and ADA upgrades
- Parks – MLK Civic Center Park – Repairs to benches, light poles, pathways, plaza, turf, and tree pruning
- Parks – Rose Garden – Phase 1 (Trellis Replacement, ADA improvements)

---

1 https://www.cityofberkeley.info/Parks_Rec_Waterfront/Home/CIP_Capital_Projects_Recurring_Funding_Allocation.aspx
2 https://www.cityofberkeley.info/WorkArea/linkit.aspx?LinkIdentifier=id&ItemID=119940
3 https://www.cityofberkeley.info/MeasureT1/
4 https://www.cityofberkeley.info/WorkArea/linkit.aspx?LinkIdentifier=id&ItemID=128423&libID=127066
• Parks – Skate Park – Safety Improvements and Technical Upgrades
• Parks – Willard Park – Pathways and Tot lot Renovation and ADA upgrades
• Pools – King – Boiler Replacement
• Pools – West Campus – Boiler Replacement
• Camps – Berkeley Tuolumne Camp – Environmental Clearance Process (the Administrative Draft Environmental Assessment (ADEIR) and Initial Study / Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND)
• Camps – Cazadero Camp – Landslide Repair
• Camps – Echo Lake Camp – South Bathhouse Septic Repair
• Waterfront – Bait Shop Siding and Structural Beam Replacement
• Waterfront – Launch Ramp Parking Lot Gate and Barrier Installation
• Waterfront – South Cove Parking Lot and Restroom Renovation
• Waterfront – University Avenue Conceptual Design

Project currently under construction:
• Parks – Citywide Irrigation Controller Replacement (T1)
• Parks – Glendale La Loma Park – Basketball Court Reconstruction
• Parks – San Pablo Park – Restroom Building Renovation
• Parks – Strawberry Creek Park Phase 1 – Courts Replacement and ADA upgrades
• Waterfront – Southern Marina Landscaping Improvements and Tree Plantings (200)
• Waterfront – Cesar Chavez Park – Replacement of shoreline protective riprap rock at eastern side of Cesar Chavez Park

Projects that will be under construction in the next 12 months:
• Parks – Aquatic Park – Rowing Club Parking Lot and Dock Area Renovation
• Parks – Aquatic Park – South Pathways Renovation
• Parks – Harrison Park – Grass Turf Renovation
• Parks – James Kenney Park – Picnic and Play Equipment Renovation and ADA upgrades
• Parks – John Hinkel Park Upper – ADA Pathway and Picnic Area Renovation
• Parks – Live Oak Community Center – Seismic Upgrades and Deferred Maintenance (T1)
• Parks – Ohlone Park – Basketball Court Renovation
• Parks – Rose Garden – Phase 2 – Trellis Reconstruction and Site Improvements (Partial funding from T1)
• Camps – Berkeley Tuolumne Camp – Hazardous Tree Removal
• Camps – Cazadero Camp – Jensen Dormitory Replacement
• Camps – Echo Lake Camp – Accessibility Improvements
• Waterfront – Bay Trail Extension Segment 3 Renovation
• Waterfront – Marina Corporation Yard Electrical Upgrades (T1)
• Waterfront – South Cove Small Boat Dock Replacement and New Accessible Ramp

Projects in the planning or design phase:
• Parks – Frances Albrier Community Center – Seismic Upgrade and Deferred Maintenance Planning and Design (T1)
• Parks – George Florence Park – Play Equipment Replacement Design (T1)
• Parks – Grove Park – Dugout and Field Renovation Design (T1)
• Parks – John Hinkel Park Lower – ADA Pathways and Play Structures Replacement
• Parks – San Pablo Park – Play Equipment Replacement and Tennis Court renovations (Partial funding from T1)
• Parks – Strawberry Creek Park Phase 2 – Park Renovations Design (Partial funding from T1)
• Parks – Tom Bates Regional Sports Complex – North Youth Soccer Field House and Restroom Planning and Design (T1)
• Camps – Berkeley Tuolumne Camp – Detailed Design
• Waterfront – Berkeley Pier – Ferry Analysis and Conceptual Design
• City Wide – Restroom Study (T1)
• Waterfront – Sea Level Rise Study
• Waterfront – University Avenue Design

A full list of over 50 funded projects is contained in the Currently Funded Projects List. More detailed information about each project is provided in the PRW Detailed Project Summary.

Current Minor Maintenance Projects
The passage of Measure F in 2014 established a yearly minor maintenance allocation of $450,000. This allocation is used to fund small maintenance contracts or in-house maintenance projects such as court resurfacing, painting, and sports field renovations. FY2019 projects include, but are not limited to, court resurfacing at Cedar Rose Park, Greg Brown Park, Codornices Park, San Pablo Park, Willard Park, and Strawberry Creek Park; turf renovations at six (6) sports fields and two (2) infields; several extra-large hazardous tree removals; the painting/roofing of 235 University and 199 Seawall; and new gates at Harrison and Aquatic Park. A complete list of projects completed since FY2016 and being undertaken through FY2019 can be found at the following link: Minor Maintenance Projects.

DISCUSSION
The City of Berkeley has amazing recreation assets, resident camps, skate parks, dog parks, rock parks, community centers, theaters, pools, clubhouses, nature centers, lagoons, Adventure Playground, bay trail, concrete slides, neighborhood parks, and destination parks. For many years, the PRW Department’s capital and major maintenance programs have been underfunded, which has accelerated the deterioration of our parks, park buildings, waterfront, and resident camps. In many cases, this has required emergency repairs at a greater cost than would be if regular maintenance had been done. Recent funding sources have helped to address some of these needs. The 2008 East Bay Regional Park District Measure WW Parks Bond Program (“Measure WW”), the 2014 voter-approved increase in the Parks Tax by 17% (“Measure F”), and the 2016 voter-approved Infrastructure bond program (“Measure T1”) have provided significant resources to start to reverse this trend.

However, staffing levels to maintain these resources still remain low. Between 2003 and 2014, Parks maintenance staff were decreased by over 25% and the annual funds to maintain

---

existing infrastructure were reduced to highly deficient levels. In that time, some of our more highly visible amenities such as the John Hinkel Clubhouse, Willard Pool, Rose Garden Trellis, and the Berkeley Pier were closed. With the passage of Measure F in 2014, we have been able to avoid future staff reductions.

**Waterfront**

As documented in multiple reports over the last year, there is a diminishing ability to pay for the pressing capital needs in the Waterfront. The Marina Fund, which is the City’s mechanism for managing all Waterfront revenues and expenditures, is projected to be insolvent by 2020. Revenues steeply declined in the last 2 years as a result of safety and security concerns and failing infrastructure. Since then, the City has worked across multiple fronts to improve security and infrastructure at the Waterfront to prevent further losses of boaters and customers. Those efforts are beginning to pay off, with lease and berth rental revenue beginning to stabilize. However, there remains a nearly $1 million structural deficit, which means the fund will need major restructuring or outside funding to maintain current operations.

Starting in FY 2020, the Marina Fund will allocate $500,000 for capital and maintenance projects. Yet, there is more than $106.837 million in unfunded needs in Waterfront streets, parking lots, docks, electrical systems, underground utilities, bathrooms, buildings, and the Berkeley Pier (see Exhibit A).

Of this, staff have identified $11.5 million in immediate capital needs, (see Table 1), which is work that needs to be done to address safety concerns and prevent further declines in Marina revenue. These immediate needs include replacement of unusable pilings and finger docks; improvements to the Marina’s basic amenities – electrical systems, restrooms and parking lots – whose poor conditions have been cited as reasons for boaters leaving Berkeley; and repairs to the existing shoreline protective riprap rock to restore eroded areas of the Marina and forestall more significant erosion.

In addition, these immediate unfunded needs include $1.2 million for a Berkeley Marina Area Specific Plan. On October 10th, 2018, the City released a Request for Proposals for a specific plan for the Berkeley Marina Area, and a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) that complies with the California Environmental Quality Act. Proposals and cost estimates for this work are due back on Tuesday, November 27th. The goal of the Berkeley Marina Area Specific Plan (BMASP) is to provide a vision and a plan for achieving a financially self-sustainable, publicly-owned marina area with infrastructure and amenities to support current and future community needs, while adapting to climate changes and promoting environmental stewardship. The project will include extensive opportunities for community input.

---

If these critical capital improvements are made within the next two years, it is anticipated that berther and commercial lease revenues will increase, and the Marina Fund will stabilize and be solvent by FY23.

Table 1 – Immediate Unfunded Capital Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One-Time Waterfront needs</th>
<th>Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley Marina Area Specific Plan*</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*$150k funded in existing FY18-19 budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finger Dock &amp; Piling Replacement</td>
<td>$3,350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F &amp; G Parking Lot &amp; Restroom Replacement</td>
<td>$1,150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Parking Lot, Restroom, &amp; Electrical at O Dock, plus Electrical at K Dock</td>
<td>$2,860,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lot at J &amp; K Dock Renovation</td>
<td>$1,005,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restroom Upgrades**</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**$175k funded in FY18-19 budget. Amount will be decreased if restroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>replacements are funded.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline Stabilization</td>
<td>$1,640,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$11,530,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to these projects, the City has applied for a $5 million loan from the Department of Boating & Waterways to rebuild D&E Docks, which hold 88 boat slips. These docks are more than 50 years old, and have far outlived their useful life. Staff learned that the State did not allocate funding for loans to public marinas in the FY19 State budget. Our application will be considered for funding in the next fiscal year.

**Camps**

In August of 2013, the California Rim Fire destroyed Berkeley Tuolumne Family Camp (BTC). The fire was declared a federal disaster, which means the Camp rebuilding qualifies for funding from the Federal Emergency Management Authority (FEMA) and the California Office of Emergency Services (CAL OES). While FEMA and CAL OES will contribute a portion of the funding, it is anticipated that the City’s insurance policy will cover a more significant portion of the rebuild costs. The estimate for the total project is approximately $60M, which includes the necessary staff, design, permitting, and construction costs. On April 4, 2017, the City Council funded the estimated City cost share of $3.3 M (which includes the City’s required FEMA grant matching funds).

In early 2017, the City completed the conceptual plan of the BTC Rebuild. This three-year process included approvals from state and federal agencies as well as input from the Berkeley community. On October 17, 2017, the City Council approved a $4.3 M design contract with the architecture firm of Siegel & Strain. Siegel & Strain’s first task was the development of an ‘As-Was plus Code’ design and cost estimate for the Camp (which shows the Camp as it existed before the Fire, plus current building code required upgrades). The subsequent ‘Basis of Design’ report establishes the City’s proposed reconstruction project, which applies both value
engineering and programmatic updates to the As-Was plus Code scope of work. These two
documents serve as significant milestones for ongoing insurance negotiations, as well as for
the FEMA / CAL OES funding process. Monthly meetings with Insurance, FEMA, and CAL
OES representatives to determine coverage and funding are ongoing. It is anticipated that
construction will begin in 2020 and be completed in 2022.

In compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the City published a
Notice of Intent to Adopt an Initial Study / Mitigate Negative Declaration for the BTC Project in
October, 2018. Simultaneously, the City coordinated the publication of the Environmental
Assessment (EA) in compliance with the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) on
behalf of the United States Forest Service (USFS). The public review periods for both CEQA
and NEPA documents has now closed, and the City is in the process of responding to
comments and finalizing these documents. It is anticipated that Council will consider adoption
of the Final Initial Study / Mitigated Negative Declaration at the January 22, 2019 Council
meeting.

In April of 2016, a landslide occurred at the City-owned Cazadero Performing Arts Music
Camp, which caused irreparable damage to the existing Jensen dormitory structure. The cost
to rebuild the damaged dormitory and fix the landslide, which includes the repair of Austin
Creek Road, is estimated at approximately $2M, the bulk of which is expected to be covered
by insurance. In 2016, the City completed an emergency removal of fifteen large hazardous
trees in the slide area that threatened existing structures and also demolished the damaged
Jensen Dormitory. In 2017, the landslide was permanently repaired. The City is in the
process of conducting a competitive process for the detailed design of the Jensen Dormitory,
with construction expected in FY2020.

During the summer of 2018, the City completed the Echo Lake Camp leach field system
renovation. In October 2018, the City completed the conceptual design for the Echo Lake
campwide ADA improvements. The detailed design for these improvements is currently
underway, with construction of phase one of the project anticipated in FY2020 (the phase one
project budget is approximately $600,000).

Parks, Medians and Open Space

In 2010, the City conducted a public process to allocate $4,876,584 from the EBRPD Measure
WW parks bond program to sixteen parks improvement projects. From that original list of 16
projects, 14 have been completed. Most recently, the Becky Temko Play Equipment
Renovation was completed in August 2018, and the following final two projects will be
completed within the next twelve months: the John Hinkel Park Upper Play Equipment ADA
Project (currently in design), and the James Kenney Park Play Equipment Renovation
(currently in final design).

Also in FY2019, the design of the Rose Garden Phase 2 project will be completed using $1.1
million in Parks Tax funds. Construction is anticipated to start in Summer 2019. This project
will complete the remaining 80% of the trellis structure and the ADA access improvements to
the trellis. The Parks Tax is also funding the Glendale LaLoma Basketball Court Renovation
(in construction), the San Pablo Park Restroom Renovation (upcoming construction), and the
final design of the Ohlone Park Basketball Court and Picnic Area Renovation and Strawberry
Creek Park Phase 2 improvements. Additionally, the John Hinkel Park Upper Picnic Area
Renovation Project, funded by insurance, will be submitted to the Building Department for permit approval.

The Measure T1 Phase One projects include the Live Oak Community Center Renovation, the San Pablo Park Tennis Courts Renovation, the San Pablo Park 5-12 year old Play Area Renovation, the Rose Garden Tennis Courts and Pathways renovation, the George Florence Park 2-5 and 5-12 year old Play Area Renovations, and the Grove Park Ballfield Renovation.

BACKGROUND

Summary of facilities and infrastructure inventory
The Parks, Recreation & Waterfront Department (PRW) is responsible for managing, maintaining, and upgrading an extensive portfolio of community-serving parks and parks facilities: 52 parks, 4 community centers, 1 clubhouse, 2 pools, 15 sports fields, 49 sports courts, 63 play areas, 35 picnic areas, 35,000 street and park trees, 152 landscaped street medians and triangles, 263 irrigation systems, and 29 restrooms and out buildings. In addition, PRW operates and maintains the Berkeley Waterfront and its related facilities, including the marina basin with boat docking facilities and restrooms for over 1,000 rentable boat slips; parking lots; parks and trails; the Adventure Playground and Shorebird Nature Center; City-owned commercial buildings at 199 Seawall Drive and 125-127 University Ave and numerous commercial leases, as well as other infrastructure. In addition, the City operates or owns three large Residential Summer Family camps in remote areas that contain numerous buildings and infrastructure that support over 800 overnight guests per day.

Prior Council communications
Capital and major maintenance needs have been presented to Council in a number of recent reports:

In an Off-Agenda memo on October 5, 2018, the City Manager provided Council with a detailed update on the Berkeley Tuolumne Camp Project.

In an Off-Agenda memo on April 12, 2017, the City Manager provided Council with a detailed update on the Waterfront and Marina Fund, describing financial concerns related to safety and infrastructure challenges.

At a Worksession on April 4, 2017, Parks, Recreation & Waterfront and Public Works provided an overview of current capital projects and unfunded needs.

At a Worksession on November 7, 2017, Parks, Recreation & Waterfront and Public Works provided an overview of current capital projects and unfunded needs; as well as a bi-annual report on the Measure T1 City Infrastructure Bond Program.

---

9 https://www.cityofberkeley.info/uploadedFiles/Clerk/Level_3_-_General/Berkeley%20Tuolumne%20Camp%20100518.pdf
10 https://www.cityofberkeley.info/uploadedFiles/Clerk/Level_3_-_General/Marina%20Fund%20Update%20041218.pdf
At a Worksession on October 18, 2016, Parks, Recreation & Waterfront and Public Works provided an overview of current capital projects and unfunded needs.\textsuperscript{14}

In an April 5, 2016 off-agenda report, Parks, Recreation & Waterfront detailed capital and major maintenance projects and unfunded needs.\textsuperscript{15}

A January 19, 2016 report to Council on City care and shelter sites described $16.8M in needs at senior centers and community centers for seismic upgrade & deferred maintenance repairs.\textsuperscript{16}

The Council-adopted FY16-FY17 Capital Improvement Program provides an overview of planned projects and unfunded needs.\textsuperscript{17}

On March 24, 2015, two worksession reports, Parks, Recreation & Waterfront and Public Works, presented capital improvement and major maintenance needs and 5-year plans.\textsuperscript{18}

\textit{Capital & Major Maintenance Prioritization Process}

Project prioritization occurs in the following way: 1) staff prioritizes needs according to the following criteria: protect life safety; fix and maintain existing infrastructure; provide community-wide benefits; promote geographic and racial equity; and leverage existing funds; 2) Commissions and the public provide feedback; and 3) Council approves the proposed work plan for capital projects during the biennial budget process.

\textbf{ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY}

The City aims to provide safe, green, accessible and efficient facilities and infrastructure. Staff evaluates the environmental impacts of all proposed projects and seeks to integrate energy and water efficiency improvements in all capital and major maintenance projects.

\textbf{CONTACT PERSONS}

Scott Ferris, Parks, Recreation & Waterfront, 510-981-6700
Christina Erickson, Parks, Recreation & Waterfront, 510-981-6703

Attachment:

Exhibit A: Waterfront Unfunded Capital & Major Maintenance Needs

\textsuperscript{15} http://www.cityofberkeley.info/uploadedFiles/Clerk/Level_3_-_General/Parks%20CIP%20Plan%20FY16-FY19%20040516.pdf
\textsuperscript{16} http://www.ci.berkeley.ca.us/WorkArea/linkit.aspx?LinkIdentifier=id&ItemID=114427
\textsuperscript{17} http://www.ci.berkeley.ca.us/uploadedFiles/Manager/Budget/FY%202015%20and%20FY%202016%20CIP%20Book.pdf
### Waterfront Unfunded Capital & Major Maintenance Needs

**(for existing facilities & infrastructure as of Oct 2018)**

Note: No new facilities are proposed on this list.

Immediate needs are highlighted in yellow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Funding Identified?</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waterfront</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley Marina Area Specific Plan</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$150,000 funded in FY18-19</td>
<td>1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waterfront Pier and Docks (Ranked in order of priority)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finger Dock Replacements</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td>$100,000 funded in FY18-19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piling Replacement</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Upgrade - O Dock</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Upgrade - K Dock</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dock Replacement / Reconfiguration (D-E)</td>
<td>$7,500,000</td>
<td>Applied for a $5M DBAW Loan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Channel Dredging</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dock Replacement- J, K, L, M, N, O</td>
<td>$40,000,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley Pier Renovation</td>
<td>$25,000,000</td>
<td>Design/planning in T1 Phase 1</td>
<td>1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waterfront Pathways, Shoreline and Buildings (Priority ranked)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina Restrooms Upgrades -7 (K) (Est. until replaced)</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$175,000 funded in FY18-19</td>
<td>1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline Stabilization</td>
<td>$1,640,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina Restrooms - Replacement of DE, FG, K, LM and O (est. $500k/each)</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cesar Chavez Park Perimeter Path/Amenities</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontage Road Bay Trail Slurry Seal (Microsurfacing)</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina-Admin Building (K)</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125-127 University Improvements</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorebird Nature Center-classroom (K)</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waterfront Parking Lots (Ranked in order of priority)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F &amp; G Parking Lot - Pavement, Drainage and ADA</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Parking Lot - Pavement, Drainage and ADA</td>
<td>$960,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J &amp; K Parking Lot - Pavement Rehab, Drainage and ADA</td>
<td>$1,005,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skates/N Lot Pavement, Drainage and ADA</td>
<td>$1,380,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch Ramp Lots Pavement Rehab, Drainage and ADA</td>
<td>$1,927,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L &amp; M Lot - Lot Pavement Rehab, Drainage and ADA</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lordships Lot Pavement, Drainage and ADA</td>
<td>$2,380,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina Blvd Off-Street Parking Area</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina Area Trash Enclosures / Code Upgrades</td>
<td>$480,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waterfront Streets (Ranked in order of priority)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spinnaker Way Drainage &amp; Pavement Improvements</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina Blvd</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Avenue (Marina Blvd to Seawall Dr)</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seawall Drive</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Waterfront Projects Total** | **$106,837,000** | | |
PARKS AND WATERFRONT COMMISSION

RECENT COUNCIL REPORTS

The following council reports are available for review at the Parks Recreation & Waterfront Department administrative desk, 2180 Milvia Street, 3rd floor, or can be accessed from the City Council Website by using the following URL's:

November 15, 2018 – Special Meeting (Worksession)

2. Parks, Recreation & Waterfront Department Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) Update

November 13, 2018 – Regular Meeting

23. Clarifying Jurisdiction of Ohlone Greenway

24. Budget Referral: Increasing Safety at San Pablo Park

October 30, 2018 – Regular Meeting


22. Clarifying Jurisdiction of Ohlone Greenway
    Revised materials (Supp 2)

23. Budget Referral: Increasing Safety at San Pablo Park
Dear Public Works Deputy Director Brozyna,

Since I can only attend the beginning of the meeting Tuesday, I write with several comments. The city’s new plan to take over maintenance of all traffic circles raises deep concerns. Neighborhood volunteers planted the circles to enhance their neighborhood and provide the multiple benefits of greenery and trees in our cityscape. To propose to cut down the trees that have matured in some of them and store carbon for us, without a careful analysis of the driver’s siteline in each, is rash and irresponsible. Trees are a very important part of our environment, not just aesthetically but for our physical and mental health and the health of our natural environment.

Most importantly, a policy that treats all traffic circle plantings in the same way, without regard to the sitelines through each one, is terribly wasteful. It seems clear the city should first create a volunteer team under the leadership of a Public Works staff person, to do an inventory and document the character of each of the traffic circles. I began doing this myself last month and found a great range of plantings. In only one did I find that the tree blocked the view. In several the view across the circle was partially blocked by bushes or, as below at Delaware and 10th, by agave cactus which can readily be trimmed back. The two palm trees enhance the area and certainly do not interfere with the site lines across the circle.
Below is another handsome mature tree at Stuart and Ellsworth whose trunk does not block the drivers’ views. It would be a great loss to the neighborhood and all those who drive through it to cut down this tree.

Nor does the legal settlement require that such a tree be cut.* Instead the dated 2012 planting policy needs to reexamined, to give precedence to native plants and to include trees that can be pruned so their branches spread above drivers' eye level.
I hope much more thoughtful and informed attention will be given to Berkeley's traffic circles policy before actions are taken.

Sincerely,

Charlene M. Woodcock
2355 Virginia Street
Berkeley 94709

* 2. Agreement by City of Berkeley
The City agrees to remove all trees from traffic circles in the City of Berkeley or ensure the traffic circles are maintained to ensure vegetation complies with the current planting policy
To the Parks & Waterfront Commission, care of Roger Miller,

We are Berkeley Yacht Club (BYC) members and frequent users of the club and the Marina facilities. We cannot attend the public meeting tomorrow, so we would like to provide our feedback in written form, so that it may be added to the record.

**We are strongly opposed to the current plan** on the following basis:

1. The proposed plan does not provide any parking provision for BYC members, especially those without boats at the Marina but who still use regularly the BYC facilities. Instead it would cause additional cost to BYC members and / or require impractical time-consuming visits to the Marina office at every visit.
2. The proposed plan does not allow for parking by crews of BYC member boats (many of whom are not BYC members but participate actively in BYC activities at the club and on the water) and other participants to BYC events. This would cause additional cost to those individuals and / or require impractical time-consuming visits to the Marina office at every visit.
3. The proposed plan would add cost to the Marina (as per the consultant own findings) which would ultimately result in higher cost for all Marina tenants (boat slip owners and BYC itself) and the City of Berkeley.

**We are instead in support of the alternative plan presented in great detail by Paul Kamen** (attached and also found at [https://people.well.com/user/pk/waterfront/Parking.pdf](https://people.well.com/user/pk/waterfront/Parking.pdf)) which we think would achieve the same objectives of the proposed plan with lower cost to the Marina and with better provisions for BYC members and other BYC affiliates.

Thank you in advance for your consideration. We hope you will take the time to adjust your plan according to Paul's thoughtful recommendations.

Best regards,

-Claudio Brasca & Jo-Anne Ting

CC:
Paul Kamen
Chuck Bullett, Commodore, Berkeley Yatch Club
Linda Maio, Councilperson District 1
Scott Ferris, Heads the Parks, Recreation and Waterfront Department
Ali Endress, Waterfront Manager

Claudio M. E. Brasca
Member, Berkeley Yacht Club
688 Alvarado Rd, Berkeley, CA 94705

Mobile: +1 617 821 4252
Email: brasca@alum.mit.edu
Dear Roger Miller,

We are slip holders and live aboard berthers in the Berkeley Marina, as well as members of the Berkeley Yacht Club.

We cannot attend the meeting about Parking regulations tomorrow night as we are not in the country. However we wish to register some concerns with the proposal as drafted, as well as support the suggestions that are being made by Paul Kamen to address some of these concerns.

The plan as drafted does not take into account the fact that boating trips are almost never less than 4 hours long, and often start at times that staff are not available to issue temporary permits, which means that guests of Berkeley slip holders would often be in violation of the proposed 4-hour limit. Therefore we oppose this method of

We also object to the idea that parking enforcement is the job of Marina staff, which seems to be taken for granted in the report. The City of Berkeley has a parking enforcement staff already in place, and they should be tasked with any additional work to regulate the parking in the Marina. We are, after all, within the city limits.

As far as ferry commuters and fishing clients taking prime spots in the morning, we believe that restricting parking to permit holders in the K, L and M lots in the early morning hours, until 9am, would be sufficient. The other users will learn to park across the street, where much more parking is available. Although we support other elements of Mr. Kamen’s alternatives, we don’t believe that charging them a parking fee for the day is warranted or needed in order to distribute their cars into spots that don’t conflict with other uses, and avoids the problem of distinguishing between ferry commuters and clients of the fishing boats.

The issue of security and protection from continuing break-ins, is not adequately addressed in the draft proposal. We aren’t sure what it will take, but a camera recording all license plates of cars entering and exiting the Marina area would probably be a good start.

Better signage is always a good idea, but let’s wait until we have a set of regulations that actually work.

Thanks to everyone who are doing their best to address the complexities of multiple stakeholders.

Jon Love and Satay Robinson
May I add.

If the issue is all day parking by ferry users, why not make the ferry businesses apply some of their profits to the construction of parking facilities, perhaps east of the freeway, and shuttle services if necessary. Why put the burden of their business activities on the rest of us. They are getting the profits and we are not. Let them pay, not us.

CRAIG MURDOCK

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

On Tue, Oct 23, 2018 at 4:32 PM, Miller, Roger <RMiller@cityofberkeley.info> wrote:

Received.

To the Parks and Waterfront Commission, City of Berkeley:

The "consultant" engaged to make recommendations concerning parking facilities at the Berkeley Marina betrays the fact that he did not speak with the various users of the Marina facilities. He has certainly not addressed the variety of activities that take place at the Berkeley Yacht Club (BYC) and at the Marina.

Of particular concern to me is the impact of the proposed changes on members and guests of Berkeley Yacht Club and the holders of marina slips and their guests as well as on citizens generally.

The Berkeley Yacht Club (BYC) is open to guests from 6:00 a.m. to midnight during the week and from 6:00 a.m. to 2:00 a.m. on weekends. Some guests use the club during the day from 6:00 a.m. on to meet friends and
To the Parks and Waterfront Commission, City of Berkeley:

The "consultant" engaged to make recommendations concerning parking facilities at the Berkeley Marina betrays the fact that he did not speak with the various users of the Marina facilities. He has certainly not addressed the variety of activities that take place at the Berkeley Yacht Club (BYC) and at the Marina.

Of particular concern to me is the impact of the proposed changes on members and guests of Berkeley Yacht Club and the holders of marina slips and their guests as well as on citizens generally.

The Berkeley Yacht Club (BYC) is open to guests from 6:00 a.m. to midnight during the week and from 6:00 a.m. to 2:00 a.m. on weekends. Some guests use the club during the day from 6:00 a.m. on to meet friends and guests and to engage in various leisure activities. Parking restrictions at the parking lot next to the BYC will curtail such use and will make club membership itself less attractive.

Many people are guests of slip holders, for sailing either for the day or for overnight trips, or as daytime or overnight guests on boats moored at the piers. These guests must leave their vehicles in the BYC or slip holders' lots for the duration of such trips and stays.

In addition, the BYC facilities are rented several times each week for various purposes from meetings of groups of Berkeley city employees and civic organizations to businesses, to wedding receptions, to funeral memorials. Parking restrictions will make the BYC less attractive for such purposes or will eliminate such uses entirely.

Besides this, many people park their cars at the Marina while walking their dogs or running or taking constitutional strolls, often at early morning hours -- I have seen joggers as early as 4:30 a.m. -- or in the afternoons and evenings.

Moreover, there are employees of the BYC, of slip holders, and of the businesses at the Marina, in addition to customers of Marina businesses, who must use the Marina parking facilities.

I should hope that the Parks and Waterfront Commission would recognize that the Marina is a public park that ought to be attractive to a wide variety of users and ought not a device to extract money from already over-taxed citizens attempting to enjoy simple pleasures or to use the BYC facilities that they have already paid for by their quarterly dues.

There are no problems with parking at the Marina at present that would require or justify disrupting the lives and activities those who use the BYC and Marina facilities or imposing additional burdens on them.

Putting it more directly, IF IT AIN'T BROKE, DON'T FX IT!

CRAIG MURDOCK  Berkeley CA 94709
Post Office Box 9433  (415) 235-5114
To the Parks & Waterfront Commission, care of Roger Miller.

I am a Berkeley Yacht Club (BYC) member and frequent users of the club and the Marina facilities. I cannot attend the public meeting tomorrow, so would like to provide my feedback in written form, so that it may be added to the record.

**I am strongly opposed to the current plan** on the following basis:

1. The proposed plan does not provide any parking provision for BYC members, especially those without boats at the Marina but who still use regularly the BYC facilities. Instead it would cause additional cost to BYC members and / or require impractical time-consuming visits to the Marina office at every visit.
2. The proposed plan does not allow for parking by crews of BYC member boats (many of whom are not BYC members but participate actively in BYC activities at the club and on the water) and other participants to BYC events. This would cause additional cost to those individuals and / or require impractical time-consuming visits to the Marina office at every visit.
3. The proposed plan would add cost to the Marina (as per the consultant own findings) which would ultimately result in higher cost for all Marina tenants (boat slip owners and BYC itself) and the City of Berkeley.

**I instead support the alternative plan presented in great detail by Paul Kamen** (attached and also found at https://people.well.com/user/pk/waterfront/Parking.pdf) which I think would achieve the same objectives of the proposed plan with lower cost to the Marina and with better provisions for BYC members and other BYC affiliates.

Thank you in advance for your consideration. I hope you will take the time to adjust your plan according to Paul's thoughtful recommendations.

Best regards,

Tom Nemeth
Berkeley Marina Parking Policy

Facts and Recommendations

by Paul Kamen, Naval Architect, P.E.
Vice-Chair, Berkeley Parks & Waterfront Commission
510-540-7968   pk@well.com

Cal Sailing Club member since 1973
Berkeley Marina berther (O-Dock) since 1977
Berkeley Yacht Club member since 1984
Berkeley Waterfront Commission member beginning 1999 (six terms as Chair)
Berkeley Racing Canoe Center member since 2002

Current Conditions:

- The Marina Fund (isolated from Berkeley's General Fund under the terms of the 1913 land grant) derives the majority of its revenue from berther fees. Berth occupancy is at or near a historic low, at approximately 80%. This has resulted in a serious revenue shortfall. Any parking policies that are perceived as having negative effects on convenient access for boat-owners, their crew and their guests, will compound the current difficulties in marketing the Berkeley Marina and exacerbate the revenue shortfall.

- The Berkeley Marina includes numerous parking areas in close proximity, serving multiple user groups. Any restriction placed on any one parking area causes immediate spill-over into adjacent areas. For example, permit requirements now in place for parking areas serving docks B through I have resulted in a sharp increase in both all-day and long-term parking in the currently unregulated lots serving L-M and O docks.

- Boat berthers seldom sail their boats without guests or crew. These marina users generally come by car and generally need to park in close proximity to the docks on which their host’s boat is berthed. They often have significant personal gear or other equipment to carry from car to dock (dock carts are provided, but their use is local to the docks and associated parking lots). Duration of a day trip on a boat is virtually always significantly longer than four hours.

- Berkeley Yacht Club and the Cal Sailing Club have large numbers of members or guests who normally visit these facilities for periods longer than
four hours. Berkeley Yacht Club in particular hosts special events involving large numbers of non-members who require close-in parking for periods longer than four hours. These rental events are a significant revenue source for BYC and are necessary for the club's financial viability. Cal Sailing Club conducts regular Open House events in which large numbers of non-member visitors have the opportunity to sail a small boat on the Bay. Marina staff is not in a position to issue temporary parking permits to large numbers of CSC and BYC guests and event participants, and implementation of app-based permitting is still a long way off.

- Berkeley Racing Canoe Center conducts regular community outreach dragon boat paddling excursions for schools, youth groups, camps, and various other charitable organizations. Each excursion might involve 20 to 40 additional vehicles requiring parking close to M-Dock.

- A large part of the current perception of a parking shortage is a result of privatization and compartmentalization of parking areas, restricting flexibility and restricting shared use. For example, high parking fees charged by Doubletree has resulted in additional parking load and reduced public access to parking for Cesar Chavez Park on high-demand weekends, while the Doubletree lot remains well below capacity. Skates on the Bay has also attempted to privatize the lot across Seawall Drive from the restaurant, which had a serious negative effect on access to parking areas serving BYC and BRCC. Fortunately this policy by the restaurant was very short-lived.

**Recommendations:**

- **Shared use is critical.** Any viable parking plan must allow for multiple user groups at different times of day and different days of the week. For example, the parking area across from Skates is vital as an overflow lot for Berkeley Racing Canoe Center during Saturday morning peak parking demand, which can top out at approximately 100 cars. This is a very low demand period for the restaurant. The lot across from Skates is also an important overflow for events at Berkeley Yacht Club. When parking demand for Skates and BYC events overlap, M-Dock berther and guest demand is usually very low and this becomes the most viable overflow lot.

- **Free flow of cars** between O-Dock, Skates and L-M Docks should be restored by removing barriers placed between L-M and Skates, and removing the barrier to the south entrance for O-Dock. The three lots
together have proven to be more than adequate for nearly all demand peaks (with the exception of festival events, which have always been handled differently).

- **Accommodate berthers, their guests and their crew.** To continue to support the needs of the boat berthers who provide the majority of Marina Fund revenue, berther parking permits should only be required for early morning parking on weekdays, e.g. 5-9 AM on weekdays.

- **Support public service.** To continue to support the public-serving activities of various non-profit boating-related organizations, berther parking permits should only be required for early morning parking on weekdays, e.g. 5-9 AM on weekdays.

- **Ferry passengers** should have the option of paying for all-day use on entry to designated ferry passenger parking areas, e.g. South Cove lots or Marina Blvd parking. This is probably the best mechanism for controlling the parking areas used by ferry passengers and minimizing interference with maritime users and waterfront park visitors. (Arguably, fish boat charter passengers, as core maritime users, should not be subject to the same all-day fee. This could be accomplished by including a one-day parking pass with the charter boat fee.)

- **Uniform parking permit policy.** All berther parking areas, including the lot across from Skates and including the South Cove lots, should be permit-required only from 5-9 AM. This is compatible with the current City proposal for ferry parking and will facilitate simplified enforcement. It will capture the significant number of abusers who park multiple (often non-operable) vehicles in berther parking areas. It will capture illegal overnight vehicle campers. Under this policy it will still be necessary for guests and crew of private boats leaving before 9 AM to obtain a temporary permit, but this is a small portion of boat use and can be handled by the Marina Office pending implementation of an app-based system.

- **Exceptions only as needed.** Uniform area-wide parking and permit policy is important. This minimizes spill-over by people attempting to avoid restrictions or fees, simplifies visitor comprehension and facilitates enforcement. However certain exceptions are called for:
  
  - **Trailer parking.** The fee for trailer parking, charged via a machine-dispensed permit on site, should continue. This is actually
a user fee for the launch ramp but it's captured via trailer parking. The non-trailer section of the launch ramp lot should default to the 5-9 AM permit requirement with no other restrictions, similar to other berther lots. This discourages use by hotel guests but allows the non-trailer area of this lot to continue to serve an important function as overflow for the Berkeley Marine Center boatyard and the OCSC sailing school.

- **Cesar Chavez Park.** Time limits (possibly two hours or longer) applicable during park peak use hours (possibly sunrise to sunset) will protect access for park visitors and prevent abuse. These restrictions should apply to the circle at the west end of Spinnaker Way and possibly to street parking alongside the park. User groups, especially the off-leash advocates (as the primary organized voice of CC Park users) should be consulted for preferred details.

- **Restaurants.** Limited two-hour carve-outs for restaurants are appropriate: For Hana Japan, continue the current designation of a limited number of two-hour spaces at J-K, and possibly add some at L-M docks. Two-hour restriction should be limited to 4-10 PM so that the spaces are available for other users during restaurant off-peak hours. L-M dock two-hour 4-10 PM public parking could double with space reserved for City employees during marina office business hours. For Skates, a portion of the lot across Seawall Drive could be two-hour limit, but only a portion of the lot and only applicable 4-10 PM so that space is still available for overflow from L-M and O-Dock lots. Alternatively, if the 2-hour restaurant carve-outs are applicable at all times, then non-permit holders will have a short-term early morning parking option in those lots, supporting visits to marina parks and paths other than those in or near Cesar Chavez Park.

- **Waterfront Security:** Car break-ins and waterfront security in general is best addressed by a marina entry kiosk near Frontage Road, preferably with an automated license plate reader. The gate would be up during daytime hours; access would only be restricted very late at night, requiring a hotel room key or a dock gate key. There appears to be consensus among City staff that this is the best approach to waterfront security, and implementation should proceed.
• **More on ferry passenger parking policy**

There are a number of ways to effectively control parking by ferry passengers. Signage pointing to recommended parking areas is useful for directing first-time or occasional passengers, but regular commuters soon learn the ropes with respect to enforcement patterns and will park for convenience unless subject to a strong price signal backed up by at least occasional random enforcement.

Towards this end, differential pricing structures, fine tuned to produce the desired distribution of parking load by ferry passengers, will result in the most efficient utilization of the shared resource with minimum disruption of other maritime and recreational activities. Maintaining uniform rules across all marina parking areas is desirable. However the price for a Day Permit (or a 5-9 AM permit, which for ferry commuters amounts to the same thing) can be varied by parking area.

To simplify compliance and to minimize burden on Marina staff, parking paystation devices similar to those currently in use throughout the city probably offer the most cost-effective and flexible pricing tool.

On most weekdays there is room in the South Cove and L-M lots, and possibly in the J-K lot, for a limited number of ferry passengers to park without disrupting access to other activities. The Day Permit for these lots can and should be priced fairly high.

Day Permits for less convenient parking, including the lot across from Skates and the F-G-H-I lot, could be priced lower.

The unpaved area on the east side of Marina Blvd, currently signed as preferred ferry parking, can be priced much lower. This area can accommodate a large number of cars with minimal interference to other waterfront activities. But free 24-hour parking should be avoided. A 5-9 AM or Day Permit should still be required in this area to prevent long-term vehicle storage and overnight occupancy.

Under this scheme it would not be necessary to validate whether a parking space is used by a ferry passenger or by any other marina visitor during the 5-9 AM hours, as long as the daily fee for that lot is paid. It is unlikely that users other than ferry or fish boat passengers would have any interest in paying a fee to park there. Early morning Ceasar Chavez park visitors or restaurant breakfast customers would presumably take advantage of the various 2-hour or 4-hour
carve-outs. Slipholders and business employees would display annual permits and never need to use the paystations.

If it is considered desirable to charge charter fish boat passengers a different rate for close-in parking, a Day Permit at a different rate could be issued along with the charter fish boat ticket.

Guests and crew of slipholders arriving early for private boating would still be required to obtain a temporary Day Permit from the Marina office, but this use pattern is minimal on weekdays and does not represent any new requirement compared to other proposals.

One alternate proposal calls for an attendant at a single entrance to the South Cove parking areas, allowing ferry passengers to purchase the Day Permit from the attendant. However this requires staffing over the four hour 5-9 AM interval on weekdays, costing approximately half an FTE (full-time employee equivalence). This does not seem to be an economical alternative compared to paystations. Plus it could only serve one parking area, reducing the flexibility to incentivize ferry passengers to use various other lots within available capacity on weekdays.

Another option is to issue Day Permits along with the ferry ticket purchase. This might be feasible if the majority of ferry tickets are purchased online. Similar to the paystation system, this payment method allows differential pricing depending on the lot used, so the price signal can be adjusted to produce the desired distribution of parking lot load. It avoids the initial cost of installing the paystations and might be the most reasonable approach for a pilot program.

The downside is that for unreserved walk-up ferry passengers, it would require temporary K-Dock parking and then driving back to the parking area, or walking from parking space to ferry and back again to place the permit. For commuters, "time is of the essence," so this works only if the large majority of commuters are not purchasing tickets on-site.

Feedback is appreciated. email Paul Kamen, pk@well.com
To the Parks and Waterfront Commission:

The Zero Waste Division is hosting public/stakeholder listening sessions to solicit input regarding a complete redesign of the nearly 8-acre City-owned/operated Transfer Station located at 2nd & Gilman. They will use the input received to develop prospective designs for a new Zero Waste Transfer Station.

If you think your Commissioners might be interested in learning more about the project/providing input, please inform them of the two upcoming public comment opportunities (see flyer attached).

Thanks,

Heidi

Heidi Obermeit
Recycling Program Manager (& Zero Waste Commission Secretary)
City of Berkeley, Department of Public Works
Zero Waste Division
1201 Second Street
Berkeley, CA 94710
Phone: (510) 981-6357  Fax: (510) 981-6360
Website: www.CityofBerkeley.info
Email: hobermeit@cityofberkeley.info
Help design a Transfer Station that reduces waste sent to landfills

**New Zero Waste Transfer Station Workshop**

The City of Berkeley is looking to completely redesign our transfer station, the hub where the City sorts and transfers garbage, recyclables, compost and other materials. We need your help.

We’re hosting workshops to get input about how to develop the nearly 8-acre West Berkeley site. We’ll use that input to come up with prospective designs.

The eventual goal of a new site is simple: reducing what’s trucked to the landfill by recovering more of what can be re-used or recycled.

Please join us at the upcoming scheduled public input listening sessions:

- **November 7th** 1:30 pm to 3:30 pm  
  Berkeley Central Library, 3rd Floor Community Room, 2090 Kittredge Street
- **November 28th** 6 pm to 9 pm  
  South Berkeley Senior Center, 2939 Ellis Street

For more information or to send suggestions in writing, contact Greg Apa, Solid Waste & Recycling Manager, (510) 981-6359 or [gapa@cityofberkeley.info](mailto:gapa@cityofberkeley.info).