



Parks and Waterfront  
Commission

INFORMATION CALENDAR

April 14, 2026

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council  
From: Parks, Recreation, and Waterfront Commission  
Submitted by: Carrie Rybczynski, Vice-Chair, Park, Recreation and Waterfront  
Commission  
Subject: Bond Measure Subcommittee — Final Report

INTRODUCTION

The Parks, Recreation, and Waterfront (PRW) Commission is responsible for reviewing and advising the City Council on the policies, projects, planning efforts, activities, funding, and the physical condition of parks, pools, camps, recreation centers, the Marina, and public greenery.

CURRENT SITUATION AND ITS EFFECTS

Over the past two months, the PRW subcommittee on the 2026 bond measure has participated in the community process for the 2026 bond measure and has produced a report that evaluates the proposed bond program. In addition, the PRW subcommittee on potential dog park locations has produced a report with preliminary recommendations.

At its regular meeting on March 11, 2026, the Parks, Recreation, and Waterfront Commission took action to send the two reports to Council as an Information Item: M/S/C: Stewart/Nash/U) Ayes: Muszynski; Nash; Philips; Rybczynski; Stewart. Noes: None; Absent: None.

Attachments:

- 1: Bond Measure Subcommittee — Final Report
- 2: PRWC Dog Park Subcommittee Recommendations

## Parks, Recreation, and Waterfront Commission

### Bond Measure Subcommittee — Final Report

**Prepared by:** Leigh Stewart, Mary Muszynski, Ben Nash

**Date:** March 11, 2026

**To:** Parks, Recreation, and Waterfront Commission, for transmittal to City Council

---

#### 1. Summary

Berkeley has approximately \$1.65 billion in unfunded capital liabilities, including roughly \$340 million for Parks, Recreation, and Waterfront alone.<sup>[^1]</sup> Construction costs continue to rise. A \$300 million infrastructure bond is the right response — and the city has done serious work to get it right.

The City contracted with a professional survey company to conduct a 500-resident poll, held community meetings, consulted six commissions, and convened four focus groups with targeted constituencies. The \$300 million figure polled at 72% support — stronger, notably, than \$200 million.<sup>[^2]</sup> The defined-project-list approach directly addresses what went wrong with Measure L, which failed at 59% in 2022 after being criticized as too large, too vague, and too bundled.<sup>[^3]</sup> There is appetite for this.

This report focuses on the 20 PRW projects (\$107.6 million) and offers five recommendations: clarify the pool strategy, improve selection transparency, strengthen climate framing, reconsider the Civic Center allocation, and address the Southeast Berkeley gap.

The commission enthusiastically supports this bond — the need, the process, and the great majority of the project list. We want it to pass. The recommendations below are offered in that spirit — we believe addressing them will strengthen the bond and improve its chances with voters.

#### 2. PRW Project Review

The subcommittee has reviewed all 20 PRW projects through meetings with the PRW Director, community outreach sessions, subcommittee discussion, and review of the December 2 staff report and supporting materials. Below is our assessment of each project.

##### Community Facilities

**Frances Albrier Community Center — \$30M.** This is a major community facility serving West Berkeley. Based on resident feedback and commissioner input, this is one of the strongest items on the list.

**King Pool & Locker Room Replacement — \$25M.** The pool itself is needed — King is an

outdated 1960s facility. However, the subcommittee has concerns about the pool strategy that go beyond this single line item. The city does not own the land at King; it sits on BUSD property. The question is not just whether to upgrade King, but whether the city's overall pool plan is resilient — particularly given the risk of leaving the flats with no pool at all. See Section 3A.

### **Shoreline & Sea Level Rise**

**South Cove Seawall — \$5M.** Critical infrastructure. As the PRW Director noted in discussions with the subcommittee, if this seawall fails — which he described as a real risk given its condition — the entire landmass where the sailing clubs operate becomes unusable, and the city would have to fund repairs later at higher cost.<sup>[4]</sup> The shoreline projects are well-positioned for state and federal matching grants. Measure T1 demonstrated this model: \$100 million in bond funds leveraged an additional \$80 million in grants, producing over \$183 million in total infrastructure investment.<sup>[1]</sup>

**University Ave / Seawall Dr / Bay Trail / Plaza — \$5M.** Supports climate resilience and sea level rise adaptation. Highly competitive for existing state grants.

**Marina Docks Timber Pile Replacement — \$6M.** Critical for maintaining the marina as a revenue source for the Waterfront. This is a deferred maintenance that is not eligible for known grants or Parks Tax — it can only be funded through general fund or bond or the Marina Fund.<sup>[5]</sup>

**Marina Blvd Sea Level Rise & Bay Trail — \$1.9M.** Climate resilience infrastructure that protects access to the north side of the Waterfront, Cesar Chavez Park, and prevents SLR damage to important commercial tenants (Doubletree, Marine Center, and berth slips). Highly competitive for existing state grants.

**University Ave Sea Level Rise – Bike Park — \$2.75M.** Supports climate goals and adds a new Bike Park (on newly-vacant land) and has gone through an extensive community planning process . Highly competitive for existing state grants.

### **Park Amenities & Open Space**

**Adeline Corridor Open Space — \$6M.** One of the strongest items on the list. South Berkeley is projected for significant residential growth and needs more green space as a matter of equity. In a landlocked city, opportunities to create new open space are rare — this is one of them. Per the PRW Director, a \$825,000 federal earmark has already been secured for design.<sup>[4]</sup>

**Glendale-La Loma Park Improvements — \$3.5M.** Safety and ADA improvements to playgrounds, parking lot, and pathways.<sup>[5]</sup> Playstructure is close to 50 years old, needs replacement. Play structures are consistently among the highest-demand categories in community feedback, particularly popular with families.

**Cesar Chavez Park Restroom & Pathway — \$3M.** This is a high-use waterfront park and it urgently needs a proper bathroom. The pathway has deteriorated significantly and does not meet current ADA accessible codes, and needs replacement. Only 60% of the project cost comes from the bond; the project is highly competitive for State Coastal Conservancy grants.<sup>[5]</sup>

**Cedar Rose Play Structure — \$2.5M.** The play structure has not been replaced in almost three decades. Play structures are extremely popular with families — high-use, high-visibility

improvements that generate broad support.

**Aquatic Park Dreamland Area — \$2.1M.** One of the best returns on bond investment. The full Dreamland project totals \$8.4 million — including a bioswale, parking, restroom, and an expanded play area roughly 175% the size of the current one.<sup>[4]</sup> The bond's \$2.1 million serves as the 25% local match with over \$6 million likely from a local developer.<sup>[5]</sup> Very popular with families.

**Dog Parks (4–6 sites citywide) — \$2.5M.** Dogs using regular parks creates significant conflict among residents. Dedicated dog parks are a relatively inexpensive way to address a real and widespread problem, and distributing sites citywide means broad benefit.

**Restrooms: Cedar Rose (\$500K), Codornices (\$500K), Harrison (\$750K) — \$1.75M total.** Overdue bathroom replacements at well-used parks.<sup>[5]</sup> Public restrooms are a critical basic service.

### **Sports Facilities**

**Harrison Field Turf Conversion — \$6M.** Strong community support. Harrison is a heavily used field; conversion to artificial turf would roughly double usable field capacity and significantly reduce maintenance and irrigation costs — and may increase revenue as well. Berkeley used to have a reputation for having the best sports fields in the region. It's important to keep investing here.

**Live Oak Soccer/Basketball/Lighting — \$3M.** Needed modernization at a well-used facility — re-levels uneven basketball courts, converts soccer field to turf, and adds lighting.<sup>[5]</sup> Popular with families and youth sports. 66% of the project cost comes from the bond; the remainder may be funded with Parks Tax.<sup>[5]</sup>

**San Pablo Sports Field Irrigation & Drainage — \$1.6M.** Critical system upgrade. Will significantly reduce maintenance and irrigation costs and allow this very popular, heavily used park to serve even more residents.

## **3. Recommendations**

### **A. The pool strategy needs more work**

The bond proposes upgrading King Pool for \$25 million. Upgrading our existing pools is reasonable — but the current plan doesn't account for the fact that the city doesn't control any of its pool sites, and that creates real risk.

Both remaining city-operated pool sites — King and West Campus — sit on BUSD land.<sup>[6]</sup> The city does not own any pool site. Willard has already been lost; BUSD reclaimed the site in 2010. West Campus has only four years remaining on its lease, and BUSD could choose not to renew — as it did with Willard. King has 24 years on its lease, but the City Attorney requires a minimum 25-year lease for bond-funded construction, meaning the lease would need to be renegotiated before bond funds could be spent.<sup>[4]</sup>

The Frances Albrier Community Center Replacement Project included an option for a 25-meter community pool with play elements.<sup>[4]</sup> It is the only potential pool site where the city owns the land outright.

If West Campus is lost, the city could end up with only one pool — at King, in Northeast Berkeley, the area that already has the highest park density in the city. The flats would have no pool at all.

If the city is confident that both leases will be secure for the long term, then upgrading King is reasonable. But even in that case, the city should seriously consider building a pool at San Pablo Park. It would put aquatic infrastructure on city-owned land, and its location near Southeast Berkeley adds particular value — SE has the fewest city park facilities of any quadrant and zero PRW projects on the current bond list.

If there is any doubt about whether West Campus will be available for the next decade, then a pool at San Pablo Park is essential. Staff estimates suggest the cost difference between replacing King and building new at San Pablo would not justify the risk of depending entirely on BUSD's continued cooperation.

The PRW Director has had preliminary conversations with the BUSD superintendent, who indicated that the district has no current plans for the King or West Campus sites and is willing to discuss sale, trade, or longer leases.<sup>[4]</sup> This is encouraging, but informal — it is not a binding commitment, and the history with Willard shows how quickly circumstances can change.

The city should have more confidence in its pool site agreements before going to voters. In particular, the commission urges Council to assess the long-term viability of the West Campus lease, given that losing it would leave King as the city's only pool.

## **B. The selection process needs more transparency**

The December 2 staff report lists five selection criteria: health, life, and safety needs; critical infrastructure condition and accessibility; community use and equity; geographic distribution; and potential to leverage external or matching funds.<sup>[1]</sup> These are good criteria. The problem is that the staff report does not document how the criteria were applied — no scoring, no weighting, no documented analysis of how individual projects were evaluated against each criterion. The PRW Director confirmed in discussions with the subcommittee that there was no formal scoring system.<sup>[4]</sup>

This matters because when multiple reasonable criteria point in different directions — as they inevitably do — the lack of a transparent process makes it impossible to understand why certain trade-offs were made. Southeast Berkeley is one example — see Section 3E.

The commission recommends that Council document how the selection criteria were balanced or applied.

## **C. Climate framing is an opportunity**

Many projects on the list have significant climate benefits — electrification, sea level rise protection, resilient infrastructure — but these are not being communicated to voters.

Polling shows that environmental and climate infrastructure is among the most popular categories with residents, while waterfront projects poll poorly.<sup>[2]</sup> But waterfront projects *are* climate projects — the seawall, the Bay Trail, the sea level rise adaptation work. This is a communication gap that may be leaving support on the table.

The seawall is the clearest example: if it fails, the city loses an entire recreation area, disproportionately affecting users of low-cost activities like sailing and windsurfing — and then has to pay to fix it anyway, at higher cost. That's climate resilience, equity, and fiscal responsibility in one project.

Several shoreline projects in the bond list are also consistent with the regional shoreline adaptation planning now required by the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, reinforcing their importance as long term climate resilience infrastructure.

Finally, many facility projects also involve electrification and gas removal. These climate benefits are real but invisible in the current framing.

The commission recommends that the city make the climate benefits of these projects visible to voters. This does not change the project list — it changes how the list is presented, and it aligns with what polls best.

#### **D. Civic Center improvements are difficult to justify**

Old City Hall and Veterans Memorial Building are included in the bond for seismic work. The commission has significant concerns about this allocation.

Community reaction to these projects has been consistently tepid to negative — met with skepticism at the Willard community meeting and across focus groups and commission consultations. These are closed buildings that are not currently serving the public.

The bond covers seismic work only. But seismic investment in closed buildings creates an implicit commitment to full rehabilitation, which would cost hundreds of millions more.<sup>[4]</sup> This is not just a one-time expense — it is the first installment on a much larger obligation.

Berkeley has \$1.65 billion in unfunded capital liabilities. PRW alone has a \$340 million backlog.<sup>[1]</sup> With that much deferred maintenance on active-use facilities — pools, playgrounds, parks that residents use every day — it is hard to see why seismic work on closed buildings should take priority.

These are Public Works projects, not PRW. But they share a ballot, and they affect whether the bond reaches the two-thirds threshold it needs. Voters who see money going to buildings they don't use may be harder to persuade on the rest of the bond.

The commission recommends that Council either provide a substantially stronger public justification for these projects — one that explains why they should take priority given the scale of unfunded needs elsewhere — or consider reallocating those funds to higher-impact items.

#### **E. Southeast Berkeley deserves a closer look**

Southeast Berkeley had the fewest city park facilities of any quadrant.<sup>[7]</sup> BMC 6.42.020.C establishes a standard of two acres of parks and open space per 1,000 residents, with areas below that standard designated as high priority for investment. The *Equitable Future* report (2016), produced by this commission, documents the SE deficit in detail.<sup>[7]</sup> It is not referenced in the staff report.

The word "southeast" does not appear anywhere in the 50-page staff report.<sup>[^1]</sup> Neither does "quadrant." No census tract analysis was performed. "Geographic distribution" appears exactly once — as a criterion name — with no supporting analysis.

The result is zero PRW projects in the quadrant with the fewest city park facilities. This is also consistent with a pattern: Measure T1 was similarly light on Southeast Berkeley improvements. This may reflect legitimate trade-offs against other criteria — but without a transparent process, there is no way to know.

The commission recommends that Council specifically address the SE quadrant omission and explain how geographic distribution was weighed against other criteria in the selection process.

#### 4. Conclusion

This bond is necessary and well-structured. The commission is enthusiastic about the vast majority of the PRW project list and believes this bond can and should pass. The recommendations above are intended to make it stronger — to close gaps in the pool strategy, improve transparency, sharpen the climate case, address geographic equity, and ensure every dollar on the ballot can be defended to voters. We urge Council to address these items before the bond goes to voters.

---

#### Sources

[^1]: City of Berkeley, "Discussion Regarding Potential Ballot Measures for the November 3, 2026, General Municipal Election," Staff Report, December 2, 2025.

[^2]: Polling results presented by PRW Director to subcommittee, March 3, 2026. Results not yet public at time of writing; expected to be presented to Council March 17.

[^3]: Ballotpedia, "Berkeley, California, Measure L, Housing and Infrastructure Bond Measure (November 2022)." 26,545 yes (59.42%) / 18,130 no (40.58%).

[^4]: PRW Director Scott Ferris, in discussions with the subcommittee (January–March 2026).

[^5]: City of Berkeley, "Discussion Regarding Potential Ballot Measures — Supplemental," December 2, 2025. (Attachment 5, corrected project details.)

[^6]: City of Berkeley, *Citywide Pools Master Plan*, 2009, p. 7: "These are all pool venues currently operated by City of Berkeley and located on BUSD property."

[^7]: Parks & Waterfront Commission Subcommittee on Planning, *Berkeley Parks Planning for an Equitable Future*, July 2016.

[^8]: City of Berkeley, *Frances Albrier Community Center Replacement Project — Executive Summary with Attachments*, Siegel and Strain Architects, 2019. Design goals include "net-zero and all-electric strategies"; existing gas equipment flagged as conflicting with the city's all-electric goal.

## Addendum A: Selection Criteria Analysis — PRW Bond Projects

The December 2 staff report lists five core criteria used to evaluate projects for the bond, plus additional criteria from the Vision 2050 framework.<sup>[1]</sup> No definitions are provided in the report. The following definitions are inferred from project descriptions, the bond's category structure, and city context. Each PRW project is then assessed against these criteria.

### Criteria Definitions

**1. Health, Life, and Safety (HLS)** Does this project protect the public from physical harm? Seismic hazards, structural failure, ADA non-compliance, lack of basic sanitation. Across the full bond, the paradigm case is fire stations — not just because the buildings are aging, but because without functional fire infrastructure, the city's ability to protect residents is compromised. For parks: seawall failure risk, safety hazards at aging facilities, missing restrooms.

**2. Critical Infrastructure Condition and Accessibility (CICA)** How deteriorated is the asset, and can the public actually use it? This covers the deferred maintenance backlog — assets that are failing or approaching failure — and the rising cost of maintaining them in their current state. The "accessibility" piece includes ADA compliance and the \$48M backlog identified in the city's Self-Evaluation and Transition Plan. Distinct from HLS: this is about asset condition and cost trajectory, not immediate danger to people.

**3. Community Use and Equity (CUE)** How many people does this serve, and does it reach underserved populations? This criterion blends two things: raw usage volume and distributional fairness. These can pull in opposite directions — a heavily used Northeast Berkeley facility scores high on use but low on equity if NE already has the highest park density. Bundling them as a single criterion means the trade-off between the two is never made explicit.

**4. Potential to Leverage External or Matching Funds (LEV)** Can this bond dollar unlock additional dollars? Grant eligibility and matching fund ratios — where bond funds serve as local match to access state or federal grants. The inverse also matters: some projects (marina docks, King Pool) have no alternative funding path, meaning the bond is the only option.

**5. Climate Resiliency and Sustainability (CRS)** Does this project protect against climate impacts or advance decarbonization? Sea level rise adaptation, electrification, gas removal, stormwater management. For parks, this is strongest in the shoreline projects. Many facility rehabs likely include electrification as part of modernization, but this is not documented in current project descriptions.

**Geographic Distribution** is omitted from the per-project analysis below. It is a portfolio-level criterion — applied to the overall project list rather than scored per project. The staff report lists it as a criterion but provides no supporting analysis. See Sections 3B and 3E of this report for a full discussion.

## Per-Project Assessment

### Shoreline & Sea Level Rise

Project	HLS	CICA	CUE	LEV	CRS
South Cove Seawall \$5M	Yes — "imminent failure," immediate safety	Yes — full replacement	Moderate — low-cost recreation, equity angle	Yes — 20% match unlocks state/federal grants	Yes
Univ Ave / Seawall Dr / Bay Trail \$5M	Low — proactive adaptation	Moderate	Yes — major public trail, high traffic	Yes — 20% match, grant-eligible	Yes
Marina Timber Piles \$6M	Moderate — structural	Yes — timber piles, 50+ yr fix	Moderate — marina users, but revenue source	No — not eligible for grants <sup>[^5]</sup>	Moderate
Marina Blvd Sea Level Rise \$1.9M	Low — proactive adaptation	Moderate	Yes — Bay Trail connection, high traffic	Yes — 50% match, grant-eligible	Yes
Univ Ave Bike Park \$2.75M	Low — proactive adaptation	Moderate	Yes — Bump track elements for youth	Yes — 50% match, grant-eligible	Yes

### Community Facilities

Project	HLS	CICA	CUE	LEV	CRS
Albrier \$30M	Moderate — seismic; only major community center not rebuilt or upgraded; emergency shelter	Yes — dramatically undersized, aging	Yes — high-use facility, West Berkeley (equity)	Low — limited eligibility for FEMA/sustainable energy grants <sup>[^5]</sup>	Yes — conceptual design targets net-zero and all-electric; includes heat pumps, 216 kW solar array <sup>[^8]</sup>

King Pool \$25M	Low	Yes — 1960s facility, full replacement	Yes on use (doubles programmatic capacity), weak on equity (NE has highest park density)	No — difficult to secure grants for pool facilities <sup>[^5]</sup>	Likely — modernization, but not documented
--------------------	-----	--	--	---	--

**Park Amenities & Open Space**

Project	HLS	CICA	CUE	LEV	CRS
Adeline Corridor \$6M	Low — new construction	No — new construction	Yes — equity-priority area, South Berkeley growth, rare new open space	Moderate — federal earmark for design secured <sup>[^4]</sup>	High - new green space in urban area reduces Urban Heat Island, new trees absorb CO2
Glendale-La Loma Play \$3.5M	Moderate — safety/ADA	Yes — aging, ADA access	Yes — play structures, families	Low	Low
Cesar Chavez Pathway and Restroom \$3M	Moderate — basic sanitation (portable toilets)	Yes — pathways deteriorating, do not meet ADA codes	Yes — high-use waterfront park	Yes — 60% bond, highly competitive for State Coastal Conservancy grants <sup>[^5]</sup>	Low
Cedar Rose Play \$2.5M	Low	Moderate — heavily used play area needs safety/accessibility upgrade	Yes — families, high-visibility	Low	Low

Dreamland \$2.1M	Low	Moderate	Yes — expanded play area	Yes — 25% local match, with \$6M+ likely from additional sources <sup>[^5]</sup>	Moderate — bioswale
Dog Parks \$2.5M	Low	No — new construction	Yes — citywide, addresses significant community demand	Low	Low
Restrooms \$1.75M	Moderate — public health, basic sanitation	Yes — aging/overdue	Yes — well-used parks	Low	Low

**Sports Facilities**

Project	HLS	CICA	CUE	LEV	CRS
Harrison Turf \$6M	Low	Yes — failing natural fields	Yes — heavily used, doubles capacity	Low	Moderate — water savings
Live Oak \$3M	Low	Moderate — modernization	Yes — families, youth sports	Low	Low — water savings from turf
San Pablo Irrigation and Drainage \$1.6M	Low	Yes — failing irrigation/drainage, most used sports fields in the city	Yes — most used sports fields	No — not eligible for grants <sup>[^5]</sup>	Low

## PRWC Dog Park Subcommittee Recommendations

### Executive Summary

Between October and November 2025, Dog Park Subcommittee members visited several locations identified by the Parks, Recreation, and Waterfront Department (PRWD) as potential dog park locations. Our reviews and recommendations are below. All locations have existing parks; based on PRWD guidance, Subcommittee members recommend converting a portion of the following parks to dog parks.

### Subcommittee Mission

Berkeley is a city that values equity, public health, and community engagement. As dog ownership rises and urban density increases, the demand for off-leash recreation areas has outpaced available space. Berkeley currently only has 2 dog parks; the first one, Ohlone Dog Park, was established in 1979 and was one of the first in the nation. Then, in 1998, the 17-acre Off Leash Area in Cesar Chavez Park started a trial period, and in 2000, it was formally authorized as a designated Off-Leash Area. This proposal urges the City of Berkeley to prioritize the creation and expansion of dedicated dog parks/dog play areas to support public health, safety, and neighborhood vitality.

### The Need for More Dog Parks

Currently, Berkeley has limited off-leash dog areas, which are often overcrowded or located far from many residential neighborhoods, such as Cesar Chavez Park. This shortage can create tension in shared-use parks, encourage off-leash activity in inappropriate areas, and diminish the quality of life for both dog owners and non-dog owners alike.

### Dog Park Site Recommendations

1. King School Park
2. Glendale La Loma Park
3. Berkeley Way Mini Park
4. San Pablo Park
5. Aquatic Park

## King School Park

Staff-provided description of proposed dog area: West side of King Park (small)

Address: 1700 Hopkins Street

Neighborhood: Hopkins

District: 5

Councilmember: Shoshana O'Keefe

Approx. Park Acreage: 1.72 acres | 74,920 sq. ft.

Topography: Flat

Ground Surface: Grass

### Site Conditions

Fencing Feasibility: Good ease of enclosure with low fencing (too low for dogs) existing along two edges, so within existing paths. A new dog fence system is needed. Though there is room for this, and possibly a planted setback strip along the main path and sidewalk edges.

Water Source: Existing fountain or irrigation tap likely

Drainage: No signs of ponding or erosion; slight slope toward Hopkins; relatively flat and elevated above sidewalk and path.

Shade / Trees: Existing street and park trees around perimeter, sunny.

Ground Cover Condition: Natural turf is not well-maintained. A minimal scope could support DG or gravel.

Potential Conflicts: Proximity to picnic and play areas.

Neighborhood Receptivity: Observed dog activity on leash.

Other notes

- Community input is needed. This is a well-used park throughout the day. It's not clear how much this lawn area is used. It was empty while the rest of the park was active. The area size would support split small and large dog areas or one big area.

### Photos



King West looking from the sidewalk at Hopkins



King West toward the play area

## Glendale La Loma Park

Staff-provided description of proposed dog area: Second level of Glendale, La Loma Park (medium-sized park)

Address: 1300 Glendale Ave

District: 6 Councilmember: Brent Blackaby

Approx. Park Acreage: 5.61 acres | 244,400 sq. ft.

Topography: Sloped - Terraced

Ground Surface: Grass

### Site Context

Surrounding Land Uses: Residential

Access: Street frontage, street parking, ADA access, neighborhood

Visibility & Safety: Slope interrupts sightlines from the lower terrace, but “eyes on the park” from neighbors overlooking spaces.

Fencing Feasibility: Good.

Water Source: unknown

Drainage: No signs of ponding or erosion; minimal to steep slopes.

Shade / Trees: Mostly sunny. Some shade from surrounding trees.

Ground Cover Condition: Natural grass turf not well-maintained. Possibly not irrigated.

Potential Conflicts: Proximity to homes for noise.

Neighborhood Receptivity: Unknown.

### Photos – Glendale La Loma Park



Berkeley Way Mini Park

Photos





## San Pablo North of Ballpark

### Site Conditions

Existing park: Yes

Surrounding neighborhood: Yes

Flat land: partly

Ground material: Grass

Other notes

- Two halves of this grassy strip are separated by a walking path that leads from the sidewalk to the park
- One half has a slope (closer to the baseball dugout)
- Lots of dogs play at this park

### Photos





## Aquatic Park

### Site conditions

Existing park: Yes

Surrounding neighborhood: No

Flat land: Partly

Ground material: Dirt and grass

Other notes

- Existing water fountain (not flowing) with ground level dog bowl.
- The open space next to the parking lot and train tracks is pretty flat with a slight grade and a few trees as you walk further along the path.
- Mostly small hills, but the pictured section is flat.

### Photos



