



**City of Berkeley  
Concurrent Meeting of the Parks, Recreation & Waterfront and  
Public Works Commissions**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**Subject:** Measure T1 Bond Program: Phase 2 Kickoff  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 29, 2020  
**Time:** 7:00pm – 9:30pm  
**Location:** 1947 Center Street, Berkeley, CA 94704, Basement Floor Meeting Room

**MEETING AGENDA**

1. **Call to Order:** 7:00pm (McGrath).  
**Roll call.**  
**Parks and Waterfront Commission:** Present: Cox; Diehm; Kawczynska; McGrath; Raghavan; Woznia; Absent: Kamen; Skjerping.  
**Public Works Commission:** Present: Brennan; Krpata; Schueler; Freiberg; Erbe; Humbert; Absent: Hitchen; Constantine; Nesbitt.
2. **Comments from the Public** (1 Minute each Speaker): Brenda Buxton, 1600 Curtis St paving; Martin Nicolaus, Cesar Chavez Park; Joan Hamilton, 1600 Curtis St paving; Janice Schroeder, 1600 Curtis St Paving; Bruce Hamilton, 1600 Curtis St paving; Karl Britto, 1600 Curtis St paving; Caryn Graves, Curtis St paving; Ruth Bird, Curtis St paving.
3. **Discussion**
  - a. **Introduction** (5 Minutes). (Scott Ferris).
  - b. **Phase 1 Review** (10 minutes)
    - i. Project Updates – Handout – was reviewed.
    - ii. Financial Status – Handout – was reviewed.
    - iii. Audit Status – was reviewed.
  - c. **Phase 2 Public Process Timeline Review** (10 minutes) – Handout – was reviewed.
    - i. T1 Subcommittee Meetings (July – Sept 2019) – was reviewed.
    - ii. Council Off – Agenda Memo (Dec 2019) – Handout – was reviewed.
  - d. **Phase 2 Public Process Kickoff Meeting** (90 minutes) (Ferris).
    - i. **Story Maps FY 2014-2021 Funded & Completed Projects** – was reviewed.
    - ii. **Phase 2 Project Considerations** – was reviewed.
      1. **Council Approved Criteria & Bond Criteria** – was reviewed.
      2. **Bond Parameters** – was reviewed.
        1. **Remaining T1 Bond Amount** – was reviewed.
        2. **Allocation Options** – was reviewed.
          - i. Bond Size – was reviewed.
          - ii. Timing – was reviewed.
    - iii. **Initial Phase 2 Projects**
      1. **Staff Identified Projects** – was reviewed.
        1. **Format** – was reviewed.
        2. **Estimates** – was reviewed.
      2. **Initial Commission Input/Feedback**
        1. **Other Projects** – was reviewed.
        2. **Comment on Staff Identified Projects** – was reviewed.

**Commissioner comments:**

- a) Erbe: Can staff provide a ranking and rationale for the current list of projects?
- b) Humbert: Also would like a staff ranking of projects.

- c) Shueler: Can proposed projects be linked to the City's Strategic Plan? For a forty year bond program, projects with a 20 year lifespan might not be suitable; We should limit the number of very small block-by-block oriented projects, and should look at overall Citywide needs as a priority.
- d) Kawczynska: There is a need for more clarity on the public process; How is the information about projects and process distributed to the public? How will public feedback be received? What will be done with the public feedback?
- e) Raghavan: Is the presentation on the T1 Phase 2 program and the list of projects available as public information?
- f) Diehm: Can staff show how the Phase I projects feed into Phase II? Can staff provide a ranking of projects in general categories such as LOW; MEDIUM; HIGH? Can there be a summary of all public feedback on the Phase II proposals? Also need to set proper expectations for the public (e.g., this shouldn't be an open wish list of new projects because there is a large list of existing unfunded needs).
- g) Freiberg: The Phase II process needs more transparency than was done for Phase I; How will public feedback be tabulated? What is the structure for public feedback? How will the ranking of projects be structured? E.g., lifespan; incremental O&M; project price and execution risk?; Phase I felt like a grab bag; Phase II needs backup to justify project selection.
- h) Brennan: Can staff create scenarios of project rankings to show how rankings can change if certain criteria are emphasized?
- i) McGrath: Am worried about backlash if the initial list of projects shown to the public is too big; Agree that criteria should be laid out like in Phase I (e.g., a rating sheet); Agree that maintenance projects should not be done with bond funds unless a facility has totally failed, e.g., the tide tubes; Geographic lines are being drawn too harshly; Like the idea of LOW-MEDIUM-HIGH categories for projects.
- j) Wozniak: Agree that a list of projects totaling \$750 million is too large for the public to digest; Also agree with general categories e.g., LOW-MEDIUM-HIGH; or \$1M-\$5M to \$10-\$20M etc.; We need to find visible projects to generate public support for this and future infrastructure bond programs.
- k) Krpata: What is our definition of Equity, e.g., geographic, demographic (youth/poverty); previous spending? For example, In Phase I, Districts 1 and 2 received most funds for facilities projects, and District 7 received nothing; The list of project needs throughout the City does not correspond with district boundaries.
- l) Cox: The photo of the Phase I project at Adeline St shows that the new sidewalk and truncated domes are not installed correctly (staff to look into this); Need to work on project rankings; Need to view certain projects as Citywide assets; we should not spread funding too thin, rather spend more per project to get higher quality outcomes; Would it be more efficient to have a professional consultant run the public process? Neighbors in the Thousand Oaks area do not have a high awareness of the T1 Phase 2 process.

- e. **Lead Commissions Attendance in Public Process** (10 minutes) Handout – was reviewed.
  - i. 20 Neighborhood Meetings (1 PRW/PW Commissioner each) – signups – was reviewed.
  - ii. 5 Large Community Meetings (Full Commission attendance) – was reviewed.
- f. **Summary and Next Steps** (5 Minutes) – was reviewed.

4. **Adjournment** at 9:50pm. (M/S/C: Topher/Jackie/U):

**Note:** To view the presentation and handouts provided at the meeting, please go to the **Minutes** for the meeting of **01-29-2020** on the commission website.

// end of file //