

## DRAFT FOR NOVEMBER 19 MEETING

TO: BERKELEY CITY COUNCIL

FROM: PARKS AND WATERFRONT COMMISSION

SUBJECT: RECOMMENDED ACTION ON T1 PHASE 2 PROJECTS

DATE:

### INTRODUCTION

After a series of focus group and larger area meetings, the Parks and Waterfront Commission has reached a consensus on a recommendation for projects that we recommend for funding under T1 Phase 2. We reached this recommendation after listening carefully and extensively to the public and after a series of discussions with city staff and our colleagues on the Public Works Commission. This recommendation was adopted by the full Parks and Waterfront Commission, on \_\_\_\_.

Our recommendation includes a specific list of recommendations for projects under T1, additional recommendations for projects that could be funded with the Parks Tax, and a program to develop project concepts for the future.

### BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION

The Parks and Waterfront Commission used a series of criteria, described below, to help establish these recommendations. The Commission recommendations were also based on input from the public in more than 35 public meetings and hundreds of emails, as well as public comment at Commission meetings. Recommendations were also based on input from staff regarding highest priority unfunded needs.

Recommendations were also informed by our previous efforts at recommending projects for Phase 1 of the T1 bonds, the Final Report of our Sustainability Subcommittee, from September 14, 2016, and the more recent recommendations of the Vision 2050 Task Force. Those efforts recommended that we consider:

- Plan to reduce water consumption
- Modify landscaping to enhance resiliency and reflect more frequent droughts
- Develop natural streetscapes that provide urban biodiversity
- Construct complete streets
- Increase the tree canopy to serve these purposes and reduce heating

Thus, part of our orientation in formulating this recommendation is to look to the future conditions of Berkeley, which will be hotter and dryer, as well as considering infrastructure that needs repair. Providing additional improvements in parts of the city that have fewer parks, and in areas that have received less funding over the past decade, and addressing racial equity played a major part in formulating the criteria described below in order to form a recommendation.

CRITERIA

The Parks and Waterfront Commission adopted the following criteria upon which to base project selection for T1 funding. These criteria were decided upon for Phase 1 based on input from the City Council, the Commission, and the community. Criteria were updated in 2020 for Phase 2 as described below.

- **Greatest Benefit:** Project provides impact to the greatest number of Berkeley residents. For Phase 2, additional consideration is given to creation of a memorable project to inspire a broad spectrum of residents.
- **Equity:** Consideration of geographic and demographic distribution of projects. For Phase 2, additional consideration of racial equity, gender equity, and equity among users of different age groups and income levels. In addition, our park system should reflect the fact that this was once all land occupied by Native Americans.
- **Health, safety, and resilience:** Project addresses public health and safety, such as improvements for disaster preparedness or emergency response.
- **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 that may lower long term cost. For Phase 2, additional consideration given to projects that support climate change resilience.
- **Project readiness:** Considering projects that are underway or already shovel-ready.
- **Leveraging other funds:** Project utilizes other funding sources.
- **Feasibility:** Consideration of
  - the ability to complete a project/sequencing: project does not have any known barriers that will substantially delay or prevent completion.
  - renovating infrastructure before end of useful life to avoid larger expense or closure of amenity.

While individual projects may not all meet all criteria, most projects should meet most criteria in order to merit recommendation by the Commission.

- PROJECTS THAT WE RECOMMEND BE FUNDED WITH T1 FUNDS

Projects listed below have been recommended for funding with T1 Phase 2 funds. For each project, the rationale, as determined by the criteria listed above, is provided.

Project	Cost	Rationale/Primary Criteria
MLK Jr. Youth Services Center	\$7,000,000	<p><b>Greatest Benefit:</b> Provides programs that have an impact on youth throughout their lives as testified in public comment.</p> <p><b>Equity:</b> Provides free programming to youth who are predominantly youth of color and low income.</p> <p><b>Health/Safety/Resilience:</b> Disaster preparedness of a community building. Health and safety of after-school programming is increasingly important in pandemic context.</p> <p><b>Sustainability/Durability:</b> Disaster preparedness/electrification/ efficient building systems for a community building that serves youth. Care and Shelter facility.</p>

		<b>Leveraging other funds:</b> \$1.4m FEMA grant application pending.
South Berkeley Senior Center	\$3,000,000	<p><b>Equity:</b> Benefits for seniors including people of color, low-income. Provides investment in historically under-invested South Berkeley community resources.</p> <p><b>Health/Safety/Resilience:</b> Programming to support public health among seniors. Seismic safety and resilience critical for disaster preparedness in a community building.</p> <p><b>Sustainability/Durability:</b> Ensure building durability in case of earthquake. Care and Shelter facility.</p>
African American Holistic Resource Center	\$7,000,000	<p><b>Equity:</b> Center with mission to eliminate inequities and provide culturally responsive services for African American community in Berkeley.</p> <p><b>Health/Safety/Resilience:</b> Center will address social determinants of health and mental health among African American community.</p> <p><b>Sustainability/Durability:</b> Project includes electrification, energy-efficient building systems.</p> <p><b>Leveraging Other Funds:</b> \$250k available for planning.</p>
Restrooms in the ROW (2)	\$1,350,000	<p><b>Greatest Benefit:</b> Benefit all in the community.</p> <p><b>Equity:</b> Support human dignity across economic inequities.</p> <p><b>Health/Safety/Resilience:</b> Support human health and public safety.</p> <p><b>Sustainability/Durability:</b> Reduce environmental impacts of human waste. Energy-efficient fixtures.</p> <p><b>Project Readiness:</b> Community process completed to identify sites and other priorities.</p> <p><b>Leveraging other funds:</b> Funds already supported study and community process.</p>
Cazadero Camp Dining Hall & ADA Improvements	\$400,000	<p><b>Greatest Benefit:</b> The unique nature of the opportunity provided by this camp owned by the City located in the redwoods can be considered as a 'memorable' project.</p> <p><b>Equity:</b> Cazadero camp provides a camp experience for a wide spectrum of Berkeley children, including benefits through BUSD's 5th grade music program. ADA improvements are critical to allow camp access for all children.</p> <p><b>Health/Safety/Resilience:</b> Dining hall improvements and ADA improvements are necessary to maintain a safe camp environment for Berkeley children.</p> <p><b>Leveraging other funds:</b> The camp tenant pays a significant portion of funds for facility maintenance, therefore T1 spending leverages private camp funding to maintain and improve the camp.</p>
Willard Clubhouse/ Restroom Replacement	\$7,000,000	<p><b>Greatest Benefit:</b> Willard park draws users from the surrounding neighborhood and, due to the after school and youth recreation programs provided, draws users from across the City.</p> <p><b>Equity:</b> The project supports racial and economic equity as the Clubhouse is a location for heavily used youth after-school programs. The project also supports geographic equity, as the southeast quadrant of the city contains fewer city parks and less park land than other quadrants of Berkeley.</p> <p><b>Health/Safety/Resilience:</b> Provision of a new restroom supports public health and safety.</p>

		<p><b>Project Readiness:</b> An extensive community process and conceptual design for the project has already been completed.</p> <p><b>Leveraging Other Funds:</b> Planning for this project was funded through T1 Phase 1, therefore completion of the project takes advantage of the funds already allocated.</p>
Tom Bates Restroom/ Community Space	\$2,900,000	<p><b>Greatest Benefit:</b> The Tom Bates fields draw users from across the City and therefore provides benefit to a high number of Berkeley residents.</p> <p><b>Health/Safety/Resilience:</b> Restrooms support public health, safety, and human dignity, as well as environmental health.</p> <p><b>Environmental Sustainability/Durability:</b> Restrooms support a clean environment. Building systems will be energy efficient.</p> <p><b>Project Readiness:</b> Public input, planning and conceptual design were completed in Phase 1.</p> <p><b>Leveraging Other Funds:</b> Phase 1 funds were allocated to planning and design, therefore completion of the project takes advantage of previously-allocated funds.</p>
Harrison Park Restroom Renovation	\$450,000	<p><b>Greatest Benefit:</b> Harrison Park has both a neighborhood draw as well as a citywide draw for users of the skate park and sports field, therefore facilities in this park have a wide public benefit.</p> <p><b>Health/Safety/Resilience:</b> Provision of restrooms support public health, environmental safety, and human dignity.</p> <p><b>Environmental Sustainability/Durability:</b> Energy efficient fixtures proposed.</p> <p><b>Project Readiness:</b> Public input received in citywide restroom study.</p>
Ohlone Park New Restroom	\$500,000	<p><b>Greatest Benefit:</b> Ohlone Park has both a neighborhood draw as well as a citywide draw for users of the sports field, dog park and bike/walking paths, including access to the North Berkeley BART station and the North Berkeley Senior Center, therefore facilities in this park have a wide public benefit.</p> <p><b>Health/Safety/Resilience:</b> Provision of restrooms support public health, environmental safety, and human dignity.</p> <p><b>Environmental Sustainability/Durability:</b> Energy efficient fixtures proposed.</p> <p><b>Project Readiness:</b> Public input received in citywide restroom study. Project supported by active volunteer group.</p>
Ohlone Park Lighting	\$700,000	<p><b>Greatest Benefit:</b> Ohlone Park draws use from neighboring residents, as well as citywide users who use the park for recreational purposes or to access North Berkeley BART or the North Berkeley Senior Center.</p> <p><b>Equity:</b> Park lighting, especially on well-traveled access paths, supports gender equity, facilitating safe access at nighttime. Lighting also facilitates equitable use among diverse age groups, including those seeking to access the North Berkeley Senior Center or adjacent public transit.</p> <p><b>Health/Safety/Resilience:</b> Adequate lighting promotes safe use of the park.</p>
Ohlone Park (Milvia) 2-5 playground, 5-12 playground, Garden Mural, Exercise Equipment	\$500,000	<p><b>Greatest Benefit:</b> Playgrounds in Ohlone Park draw neighborhood as well as citywide use. Garden mural provides cultural and artistic benefit to the many citywide residents who use or pass through the park and acknowledges cultural importance of the Ohlone people and history. Exercise equipment would benefit neighborhood and citywide users.</p> <p><b>Health/Safety/Resilience:</b> New playground equipment is critical to child safety. Exercise equipment provides a public health benefit, particularly in</p>

		<p>the current pandemic context when outdoor exercise is encouraged.</p> <p><b>Equity:</b> The very name of the park evokes the Native American heritage of the area, and the mural acknowledges the cultural importance of the Ohlone people. This park received no funding in phase 1.</p> <p><b>Project Readiness:</b> Conceptual design in progress.</p> <p><b>Leveraging Other Funds:</b> \$600k allocated from FY21 parks tax.</p>
John Hinkel Lower 2-12 playground, picnic, parking	\$400,000	<p><b>Health/Safety/Resilience:</b> New playground equipment is critical to child safety.</p> <p><b>Project Readiness:</b> Final design in progress.</p> <p><b>Leveraging Other Funds:</b> \$800k allocated from FY21 parks tax.</p>
Grove Park 2-5 playground, 5-12 playground	\$700,000	<p><b>Equity:</b> This project allocates funding to historically under-invested South Berkeley.</p> <p><b>Health/Safety/Resilience:</b> New playground equipment is critical to child safety.</p> <p><b>Leveraging Other Funds:</b> This project could be leveraged with a possible Proposition 68 State parks grant.</p>
Aquatic Park Tide Tubes Clean out, Phase 1B	\$500,000	<p><b>Environmental Sustainability/Durability:</b> Must sleeve the tubes to prevent further damage and remove dredged material to protect water quality. Improved water quality in the Aquatic Park lagoon, improved lagoon ecology.</p> <p><b>Project Readiness:</b> Final design complete.</p> <p><b>Leveraging Other Funds:</b> Possible planning grant for Measure AA funding from the Bay Restoration Authority.</p> <p><b>Feasibility:</b> Important infrastructure renovation before end of useful life to avoid larger expense or further environmental detriment to the lagoon.</p>
Civic Center Park - Turtle Garden	\$300,000	<p><b>Greatest Benefit:</b> The Turtle Garden is an important feature in Civic Center park, which is both the neighborhood park for the downtown area and an area that draws visitors from across the city. An enhanced Civic Center park therefore has a broad benefit to Berkeley residents.</p> <p><b>Equity:</b> Will honor the cultural heritage and ongoing contribution of the Ohlone people.</p> <p><b>Health/Safety/Resilience:</b> The current situation in the Turtle Garden fountain creates a public health risk.</p> <p><b>Project Readiness:</b> Conceptual design in progress.</p> <p><b>Feasibility:</b> Renovating this park feature will prevent immense and increasing ongoing maintenance costs that are created by the current context.</p>
King Pool tile and plaster	\$350,000	<p><b>Greatest Benefit:</b> The King pool is used and enjoyed by residents from across the city. Berkeley has limited pools, and maintaining the pools that we do have is critical to provide the benefit of public pools to Berkeley residents.</p> <p><b>Health/Safety/Resilience:</b> In the current pandemic context, outdoor exercise and recreation provided by pools is a benefit to public health.</p> <p><b>Feasibility:</b> This project competes an important renovation before the end of the useful life of the pool to avoid larger expense or pool closure.</p>
Marina Pilings Replacement	\$1,200,000	<p><b>Greatest Benefit:</b> The marina is a destination for many in the city and throughout the region, including those who do not own boats. It is essential to replace many of the original pilings before they fail catastrophically and damage tenants and jeopardize revenue.</p> <p><b>Health/Safety/Resilience:</b> Pilings replacement is necessary to maintain</p>

		public safety. <b>Project Readiness:</b> Design currently underway. <b>Leveraging Other Funds:</b> A successful marina supports added revenue by reducing the vacancy rate and increasing demand.
D and E Dock Replacement	\$500,000	<b>Greatest Benefit:</b> Improvements to the utility of the docks provide benefit to marina users and to those from throughout the city who visit as a destination. <b>Leveraging Other Funds:</b> This project would leverage a \$5.5 million State loan. A successful marina supports added revenue by reducing the vacancy rate and increasing demand. <b>Project Readiness:</b> Design currently underway.
K Dock Restroom Renovation	\$400,000	<b>Greatest Benefit:</b> Improvements to the utility of the docks provide a wide and important benefit. <b>Health/Safety/Resilience:</b> Provision of restrooms support public health, environmental safety, and human dignity.
Cesar Chavez Park Restroom (on Spinnaker)	\$350,000	<b>Greatest Benefit:</b> Cesar Chavez Park is an incredibly unique park that allows all Berkeley residents to take advantage of limited shoreline land for recreational use, and as such, improvements to the utility of the park provide a wide benefit. <b>Health/Safety/Resilience:</b> Provision of restrooms support public health, environmental safety, and human dignity. <b>Leveraging Other Funds:</b> Utility hook-ups as part of Marina Streets project

- PROJECTS THAT WE RECOMMEND BE FUNDED WITH PARKS TAX THROUGH THE BUDGET PROCESS

The ongoing theme of all public outreach associated with the T1 process is that there are many more worthy projects than can be funded through the T1 Phase 2 funding pool. However, City staff is currently planning to make many of the improvements sought by the public in their comments, using the parks tax and the city's allocation of capital funds. The following spreadsheet shows the planned expenditures for FY21 and FY222, and the proposed expenditures for FY23. Public processes will be required before a site for the BMX Park and new pickleball courts can be funded.

It is important for the Council and the public to see the important work that will continue on non-T1 projects.

**Parks Tax /General Fund (1.4M) Capital Budget**

(note: does not include Waterfront and Camps CIP needs)

Project Name	Proposed	Proposed
	FY22 + FY21 carryover	FY23
Aquatic Park Rowing Club Parking Lot & East Pathway	\$519,460	
Aquatic Park Dreamland- Planning and Design		\$200,000
Bicycle BMX Park (Site TBA) Planning and Design	\$150,000	
Gilman Fields JPA Cities Fee	\$15,000	\$15,000
Glendale- Laloma Age 2-5 Play Structure		\$450,000

Grove Park Sports Field/Play Structures*	\$500,000	
John Hinkel Hut - Planning and Design	\$150,000	
Ohlone Age 2-5, 5-12, Mural Garden**	\$600,000	
Pickleball Courts (site TBA)	\$225,000	
Skate Park Fencing	\$150,000	
Tree Planting- South/West Berkeley	\$75,000	\$75,000
West Campus Pool Filters		\$150,000
West Campus Tile/Plaster Replacement		\$350,000
Carryover		
<b>Total Funding</b>	<b>\$2,384,460</b>	<b>\$1,240,000</b>

\* Additional T1 Phase 1 Funds in Project

\*\*Additional T1 Phase 2 Funding Proposed

# Additional WW Grant Funding in Project

^ Inclusive of Insurance Funding

- PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE
  - GREENING BERKELEY

We received extensive public comment that, where possible, pavement should be removed and landscaping should be added to provide benefits to flood control, pollinators, water quality, and the urban heat island. This recommendation is consistent with the recommendations of the Vision 2050 report that recommended planting additional trees in the flatter portions of Berkeley. It is also consistent with the “Adopt-a-Spot” program that the Council referred to the Commission to develop a recommendation. There are a number of streets such as Sacramento Street where landscaping could be modified over time to have higher habitat value, and possibly to create community gathering spots. There are other streets that may have more pavement than is now needed, particularly those that once carried Red Cars, and others where bollards have restricted through-traffic. These opportunities should be considered in the context of understanding which neighborhoods do and do not have park access within a walkable distance, and prioritize greening in areas that fill in the gaps where parks are not currently walkable.

These recommendations, considered as a whole, offer an innovative approach to infrastructure in Berkeley over the long term. Reducing areas of pavement where feasible, increasing our tree canopy, and the habitat value of new plantings are at the heart of previous efforts on sustainability and the Vision 2050 report. However, we believe that more work is needed to identify the specific projects and funding mechanisms. For example, while using Sacramento Street to slow water flow has great appeal, it is not clear how such a project can be implemented without damaging the existing trees, or what underground utilities may pose challenges in pursuing this concept. Therefore, we intend to establish a subcommittee to consider these issues, along with the direction we have received from East Bay Municipal Utility District to reduce water consumption in our parks and avoid irrigation of turf in street medians. This effort is one of the first steps we must take to bring the recommendations of the Vision 2050 report into fruition. The recommendation from the Public Works Commission includes \$150,000 for removing street diversion bollards and replacing them with planting areas as a pilot for the larger, long term effort.

Some funding for this program can come from the Parks Tax and the Clean Water Fund over time if a program is developed.

**B. WE RECOMMEND CONTINUED WORK ON THE FOLLOWING PROJECTS THAT ARE HIGH PRIORITY BUT EXCEED THE RESOURCES AVAILABLE UNDER T1 PHASE 2**

- Frances Albrier/San Pablo Park Community Center and Pool
- Replace Berkeley Pier either as a City project or cooperatively with a new ferry service
- Renovate King Pool
- Comprehensive enhancement of Aquatic Park, including making it more resilient to sea level rise, improving pathways on the west side, enhancing wildlife habitat, and developing new areas for active recreation.
- Develop a vision for how Berkeley can adapt to sea level rise and still retain access to its waterfront.

Many on our Commission were strongly in support of investing in Frances Albrier Center to create an inspirational community center, and those who participated in the planning effort were strongly in favor of the vision they created, which included a community pool. As a community in which we witnessed a reduction from three pools to two, we fear that many children in our city will not have an opportunity to learn to swim. We have already seen the climate warm, and people have begun to swim in the bay, some swimming nearly daily, so the need for a new pool is apparent. We intend to pursue future investment in Frances Albrier Center with a community pool, as recommended by the community through the recent public process.

We also heard strong support for rebuilding the Berkeley Pier, and a willingness to consider sharing a new pier with a new Ferry facility with the Water Emergency Transit Authority. Reconstruction of the pier by Berkeley acting alone is clearly beyond the funding available in T1, and the City has begun to update its specific plan for the Berkeley Marina. We don't anticipate that project reaching construction for several years, but we plan to continue that work.

King Pool remains an important facility, and we believe it is more important to renovate it with a comprehensive project rather than make a series of small repairs that would only extend its useful life for a limited period. That being said, the single small repair proposed as part of Measure T1 Phase 2 funding allocations is critical in the immediate term to extend the life of the pool as we prepare for a more comprehensive renovation.

Aquatic Park is one of Berkeley's largest parks, and has benefited from the rehabilitation of the tide tubes, improvements on the North end, and volunteer efforts like those of Untrash East Bay. We considered reconstruction of the Dreamland playground, but decided not to recommend that because the existing structure is unique in Berkeley, and should not receive a basic replacement treatment, but rather an innovative revisioning and new playground construction in coordination with broader park improvements. Therefore the Commission and staff agreed to make \$200,000 in Parks Tax funding available for planning and design at Dreamland. This planning phase will allow the community to participate in a vision for the park. The City has applied for grants from the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority, and we anticipate that the City will eventually receive such grants. We also understand that reconstruction of the Ashby interchange will involve elimination of the on-ramp at Potter, providing an opportunity to make changes at the southern end of the lagoon and improve

habitat, circulation and flood risk. We think patience and further work in developing a more comprehensive vision for Aquatic Park will be rewarded by allowing us to improve the park as a signature park and habitat that will be resilient for decades.

While it is clear that the funds in T1 will not allow construction of any of these projects at this time, it is vital that city staff, city Commissions, and the interested public continue to refine these ideas. We remain hopeful that a new Congress will see the need to invest in infrastructure as a way to respond to the economic damage done by the pandemic. We want to make sure that Berkeley is well positioned to move forward with one of these projects if Federal or State funding is made available.

- MAINTENANCE

Members of the Parks and Waterfront and Public Works Commission and the public are concerned that the projects that will be built using T1 funds must be properly maintained over time to fulfill their promise to the people of the City. The restrooms proposed within parks replace existing port-a-potties, and will save those costs and make maintaining clean facilities easier and cheaper. However, we have also concurred in the staff recommendation for two restrooms in the right of way. In these areas, the city also maintains port-a-potties, so the increased costs of maintaining new restrooms will be partially offset by reducing those costs. City staff has estimated that maintaining these new facilities will cost approximately \$180,000 per year. We certainly think those costs are warranted for the water quality and quality of life benefits of reducing human waste in our city. To make sure that these costs are properly budgeted, and to carry out one of the recommendations of the Vision 2050 report, we recommend that the City evolve its budgetary approach to public facilities to include asset management for all facilities that require maintenance over time. We recommend that asset management become an element of the city's budget process.