



## PROCLAMATION CALLING A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BERKELEY CITY COUNCIL

In accordance with the authority in me vested, I do hereby call the Berkeley City Council in special session as follows:

**Tuesday, May 19, 2026  
4:00 PM**

SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD ROOM - 1231 ADDISON STREET, BERKELEY, CA 94702

ADENA ISHII, MAYOR

Councilmembers:

DISTRICT 1 – RASHI KESARWANI  
DISTRICT 2 – TERRY TAPLIN  
DISTRICT 3 – BEN BARTLETT  
DISTRICT 4 – IGOR TREGUB

DISTRICT 5 – SHOSHANA O'KEEFE  
DISTRICT 6 – BRENT BLACKABY  
DISTRICT 7 – CECILIA LUNAPARRA  
DISTRICT 8 – MARK HUMBERT

*This meeting will be conducted in a hybrid model with both in-person and virtual attendance. Attend this meeting remotely using [Zoom](#). To request to speak, use the "raise hand" function in Zoom. To join by phone: Dial **1-669-254-5252** or **1-833-568-8864 (Toll Free)** and enter **Meeting ID: 165 412 7930**. To provide public comment, Press \*9 and wait to be recognized by the Chair. To submit a written communication for the public record, email [council@berkeleyca.gov](mailto:council@berkeleyca.gov).*

*Live captioned broadcasts of Council meetings are available on B-TV (Channel 33) and via [internet video stream](#). All Council meetings are recorded.*

*This meeting will be conducted in accordance with the Brown Act, Government Code Section 54953. Any member of the public may attend this meeting, however, if you are feeling sick, please do not attend the meeting in person. The City Council may take action related to any subject listed on the Agenda.*

*Pursuant to the City Council Rules of Procedure and State Law, the presiding officer may remove, or cause the removal of, an individual for disrupting the meeting. Prior to removing an individual, the presiding officer shall warn the individual that their behavior is disrupting the meeting and that their failure to cease their behavior may result in their removal. The presiding officer may then remove the individual if they do not promptly cease their disruptive behavior. "Disrupting" means engaging in behavior during a meeting of a legislative body that actually disrupts, disturbs, impedes, or renders infeasible the orderly conduct of the meeting and includes, but is not limited to, a failure to comply with reasonable and lawful regulations adopted by a legislative body, or engaging in behavior that constitutes use of force or a true threat of force.*

**Government Code Section 84308 (Levine Act)** - Parties to a proceeding involving a license, permit, or other entitlement for use are required to disclose if they made contributions over \$500 within the prior 12 months to any City employee or officer. Parties and participants with a financial interest are prohibited from making more than \$500 in contributions to a decisionmaker for the 12 months after the final decision is rendered on the proceeding. The above contribution disclosures and restrictions do not apply when the proceeding is competitively bid, or involves a personnel or labor contract. For more information, see Government Code Section 84308.

## Preliminary Matters

### Roll Call:

## Action Calendar

*The public may comment on each item listed on the agenda for action. For items moved to the Action Calendar from the Consent Calendar or Information Calendar, persons who spoke on the item during the Consent Calendar public comment period may speak again during the Action Calendar public comment period on the item*

*The Presiding Officer will request that persons wishing to speak line up at the podium, or use the "raise hand" function in Zoom, to determine the number of persons interested in speaking at that time. If ten or fewer persons are interested in speaking on an individual agenda item, each speaker may speak for two minutes. If there are more than ten persons interested in speaking, the Presiding Officer may limit the public comment for all speakers to one minute per speaker. Speakers are permitted to yield their time to one other speaker, however no one speaker shall have more than four minutes. The Presiding Officer may, with the consent of persons representing both sides of an issue, allocate a block of time to each side to present their issue.*

*Action items may be reordered at the discretion of the Chair with the consent of Council.*

*The Presiding Officer may open and close an additional comment period for Action items on this agenda (excluding any public hearings, appeals, and/or quasi-judicial matters), at the start of the Action Calendar. Those who speak on an item during this comment period may not speak a second time when the item is taken up by Council.*

## Action Calendar – New Business

### 1. **Presentation and Discussion of Second Community Survey Results and Direction Regarding Potential Ballot Measures for the November 3, 2026, General Municipal Election**

**From: City Manager**

**Recommendation:** Review the results of the second community survey and provide direction to the City Manager and City Attorney regarding potential ballot measures for the November 3, 2026, General Municipal Election, including whether to:

1. Affirm the direction to prepare ballot language for a potential \$300 million General Obligation bond measure for the November 3, 2026, ballot to fund priority infrastructure investments;
2. Provide input on the list of infrastructure projects for the \$300 million General Obligation bond; and
3. Affirm the direction to prepare ballot language for a potential 0.5 percent increase in the City's sales and use tax for the November 3, 2026, ballot to address the City's projected General Fund structural deficit and support essential City services.

**Financial Implications:** See report

Contact: David White, City Manager's Office, (510) 981-7000

## Adjournment

I hereby request that the City Clerk of the City of Berkeley cause personal notice to be given to each member of the Berkeley City Council on the time and place of said meeting, forthwith.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the official seal of the City of Berkeley to be affixed on this 14<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2026.

/s/ Adena Ishii, Mayor

Public Notice – this Proclamation serves as the official agenda for this meeting.

ATTEST:



Mark Numainville, City Clerk

**NOTICE CONCERNING YOUR LEGAL RIGHTS:** *If you object to a decision by the City Council to approve or deny a use permit or variance for a project the following requirements and restrictions apply: 1) No lawsuit challenging a City decision to deny (Code Civ. Proc. §1094.6(b)) or approve (Gov. Code 65009(c)(5)) a use permit or variance may be filed more than 90 days after the date the Notice of Decision of the action of the City Council is mailed. Any lawsuit not filed within that 90-day period will be barred. 2) In any lawsuit that may be filed against a City Council decision to approve or deny a use permit or variance, the issues and evidence will be limited to those raised by you or someone else, orally or in writing, at a public hearing or prior to the close of the last public hearing on the project.*

Archived indexed video streams are available at: [berkeleyca.gov/council-agendas](https://berkeleyca.gov/council-agendas).  
Channel 33 rebroadcasts the following Wednesday at 9:00 a.m. and Sunday at 9:00 a.m.

Communications to the City Council 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 the City Council, will become part of the public record.** 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 to the City Clerk Department at 2180 Milvia Street. 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 City Clerk Department for further information.

Any writings or documents provided to a majority of the City Council regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection at the public counter at the City Clerk Department located on the first floor of City Hall located at 2180 Milvia Street, and through the City's online records portal: <https://records.cityofberkeley.info/>.

Agendas, agenda reports, and revised/supplemental material may be accessed via the online agenda for this meeting at: [berkeleyca.gov/council-agendas](https://berkeleyca.gov/council-agendas) and may be accessed at reference desks at the following locations:

City Clerk Department - 2180 Milvia Street, First Floor  
Tel: 510-981-6900, TDD: 510-981-6903, Fax: 510-981-6901  
Email: [clerk@berkeleyca.gov](mailto:clerk@berkeleyca.gov)

Libraries: Main – 2090 Kittredge Street,  
Claremont Branch – 2940 Benvenue, West Branch – 1125 University,  
North Branch – 1170 The Alameda, Tarea Hall Pittman South Branch – 1901 Russell

**COMMUNICATION ACCESS INFORMATION:**

This meeting is being held in a wheelchair accessible location.

To request a disability-related accommodation(s) to participate in the meeting, including auxiliary aids or services, please contact the Disability Services specialist at [ada@berkeleyca.gov](mailto:ada@berkeleyca.gov) or (510) 981-6418 (V) at least three business days before the meeting date.

Attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various scents, whether natural or manufactured, in products and materials. Please help the City respect these needs.

Captioning services are provided at the meeting, on B-TV, and on the Internet. In addition, assisted listening devices for the hearing impaired are available from the City Clerk prior to the meeting, and are to be returned before the end of the meeting.

If you have obtained interpretation services for your use during a City Council meeting and would like to request assistance, please contact the City Clerk Department at (510) 981-6900, [clerk@berkeleyca.gov](mailto:clerk@berkeleyca.gov), or in-person during the meeting.

Questions regarding public participation may be addressed to the City Clerk Department (510) 981-6900 or by email at [clerk@berkeleyca.gov](mailto:clerk@berkeleyca.gov).

## Communications

*Council rules limit action on Communications to referral to the City Manager and/or Boards and Commissions for investigation and/or recommendations. All communications submitted to Council are public record. Copies of individual communications are available for viewing at the City Clerk Department and through [Records Online](#).*

### **Item #1: Presentation and Discussion of Second Community Survey Results and Direction Regarding Potential Ballot Measures for the November 3, 2026, General Municipal Election**

1. Phil Allen
2. Larry and Mary Ann Wight
3. Susan Schwartz on behalf of Friend of Five Creeks
4. Emma Gobler
5. Lisa Cain
6. Nina
7. Katherine Schaaf
8. Susan Austin
9. Jeffrey J. Carter
10. Jan Ruchlis



Office of the City Manager

ACTION CALENDAR

May 19, 2026

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

From: Paul Buddenhagen, City Manager

Submitted by: Dave White, Deputy City Manager, City Manager's Office

Subject: Presentation and Discussion of Second Community Survey Results and Direction Regarding Potential Ballot Measures for the November 3, 2026, General Municipal Election

RECOMMENDATION

Review the results of the second community survey and provide direction to the City Manager and City Attorney regarding potential ballot measures for the November 3, 2026, General Municipal Election, including whether to:

1. Affirm the direction to prepare ballot language for a potential \$300 million General Obligation bond measure for the November 3, 2026, ballot to fund priority infrastructure investments;
2. Provide input on the list of infrastructure projects for the \$300 million General Obligation bond; and
3. Affirm the direction to prepare ballot language for a potential 0.5 percent increase in the City's sales and use tax for the November 3, 2026, ballot to address the City's projected General Fund structural deficit and support essential City services.

SUMMARY

This item presents the results of the City's second community survey related to potential revenue measures for the November 3, 2026, General Municipal Election and requests City Council direction on next steps for ballot measure development. This report builds on the March 17, 2026, City Council work session<sup>1</sup>, at which Council reviewed the results of the first community survey and provided direction regarding refinement of project priorities, project framing, and future survey testing.

<sup>1</sup> <https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/2026-03/2026-03-17%20Special%20Item%2001%20Presentation%20and%20Discussion.pdf>

The City's ballot measure exploration reflects a multi-step process intended to ensure that any potential measure placed before Berkeley voters is data-informed, community-informed, fiscally responsible, and aligned with the City's long-term infrastructure and service needs. The process has included:

- City Council direction regarding potential infrastructure and fiscal measures;
- Development of a preliminary project list across high-level investment categories;
- A statistically valid first community survey administered by Lake Research Partners;
- Broad community engagement through commissions, focus groups, joint district meetings, and a public website;
- Refinement of project priorities and project list cost assumptions; and
- A second community survey designed to test refined ballot language and messaging.

The first community survey administered from February 19–23, 2026, demonstrated that Berkeley voters are supportive of both a General Obligation bond measure and a sales and use tax increase. The survey also indicated that the strongest voter priorities are related to safety, climate resilience, accessibility, and visible infrastructure conditions, including 911 dispatch, fire stations, sidewalks, and resilient infrastructure (See Attachment 4).

Since the March 17, 2026 work session, staff have continued to refine the proposed infrastructure project list based on updated cost information, implementation feasibility, anticipated staffing needs and phasing, and the feedback received from the community engagement process.

Staff have also worked with Lake Research Partners to develop a second survey, which was fielded April 21–26, 2026 to test refined ballot language for a potential \$300 million General Obligation bond measure and a potential 0.5 percent increase in the City's sales and use tax and to understand voter support for these items in light of other revenue measures that may be on the November 2026 ballot (See Attachment 1).

The second survey results are summarized below.

- **Potential \$300 million General Obligation bond:** Results from the April 2026 survey indicated support for the measure was 69%, with 39% strongly supporting, 19% not so strongly supporting, and 10% leaning yes. Fifteen percent of voters were undecided, and 16% opposed the measure. This represents slightly lower support than the February 2026 survey, when 71% supported the measure, 12% opposed it, and 16% were undecided.
- **Durability of support for the GO bond:** After voters heard supporting and opposing statements, support for the \$300 million GO bond decreased to 64% in the April 2026 survey, with 37% strongly supporting, 20% opposing, and 15% undecided. This reflects a five-point decline in overall support after exposure to pro and con arguments. By comparison, support for the GO bond remained steady after similar statements in the February 2026 survey.
- **Potential 0.5 percent sales and use tax increase:** Results from the April 2026 survey indicated support for the sales tax measure was 52%, with 23% strongly supporting, 20% not so strongly supporting, and 9% leaning yes. Sixteen percent of voters were undecided, and 32% opposed the measure. This is a lower level of support in comparison to results from the February 2026 survey in which 60% of Berkeley voters supported the measure and 29% opposed it. Strong support also declined from 37% in February 2026 to 23% in the April 2026 survey.
- **Durability of support for the sales tax:** After voters heard supporting and opposing statements, support for the sales tax measure in the April 2026 survey increased to 56%, with 26% strongly supporting, 30% opposing, and 13% undecided.

Taken together, the second survey suggests that, in a more developed ballot environment that includes other potential revenue measures, both City measures show somewhat less support than they did in February 2026. The potential \$300 million General Obligation bond continues to show initial support above the two-thirds threshold required for passage, but support becomes more vulnerable after voters hear opposing arguments. The potential sales and use tax increase continues to show majority support, with some strengthening after voters hear supporting and opposing arguments.

This report also summarizes the City's engagement process and the priority themes received from community members and stakeholders. When considered together, the survey findings and community engagement input provide the basis for City Council to place a \$300 million General Obligation bond on the November 2026 ballot. A revised list of projects to be funded by the proposed infrastructure bond will be presented to City Council for review and feedback.

### FISCAL IMPACTS OF RECOMMENDATION

The community survey process, including up to two rounds of survey testing, is funded through an existing contract with Lake Research Partners with a not-to-exceed amount of \$100,000. No additional appropriation is required for the survey work.

If City Council directs staff to proceed with preparation of ballot language for a potential General Obligation bond measure and/or sales tax measure, additional staff time and City Attorney support will be required to finalize ballot language, supporting resolutions, tax rate statements, accountability provisions, and election materials in advance of the statutory deadline for submission to Alameda County.

A potential \$300 million General Obligation bond measure would provide one-time capital funding for eligible infrastructure projects and the staffing needed to deliver the proposed projects. The measure tested in the first and second survey estimated an average tax rate of approximately \$22.14 per \$100,000 of assessed value, assuming \$100 million is issued every five years commencing in 2027, and regular audits and independent oversight. While the bond would not fully address the City's long-term infrastructure needs, currently estimated to exceed \$1.5 billion, it would represent a significant and strategic investment to address high-priority infrastructure needs.

A potential 0.5 percent increase in the City's sales and use tax would provide ongoing General Fund revenue to support essential City services and help address the City's projected structural deficit. Based on prior estimates presented to City Council, increasing Berkeley's sales tax rate from 10.25 percent to 10.75 percent could generate approximately \$9 million to \$10 million annually for general governmental purposes. Such revenue could support core services, reduce pressure on service reductions, and partially address the City's projected General Fund deficit, which is estimated at \$31 million in FY 27 and \$29 million in FY 28. As outlined in the City's proposed Budget Balancing Plan, revenues from the sales and use tax measure would preserve positions and services in the Police, Fire, and Parks, Recreation and Waterfront Departments to avoid the closure of Fire Station 4, diminished capacity to respond to 9-1-1 calls for service and proactively address crime, and reductions in programs and services for youth and adults<sup>2</sup>.

### CURRENT SITUATION AND ITS EFFECTS

This project is a Strategic Plan Priority Project, advancing the City's goals to provide state-of-the-art, well-maintained infrastructure, amenities, and facilities and to create a resilient, safe, connected, and prepared city.

Berkeley faces significant unfunded capital infrastructure needs and a growing deferred maintenance backlog across public safety facilities, community-serving facilities, and

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/legislative-body-meeting-agendas/2026-04-16%20Agenda%20Packet%20-%20Budget.pdf> (Refer to Agenda Item 2).

critical infrastructure such as sidewalks, ADA accessibility improvements, seismic upgrades, and climate-resilient assets. Many City facilities and right-of-way assets were constructed decades ago and no longer meet current standards for accessibility, seismic safety, climate resilience, or modern service delivery. Annual capital allocations and existing funding sources are insufficient to address these needs at the scale and pace required, resulting in increased risk of facility failure, escalating repair costs, service disruptions, and inequitable conditions across neighborhoods. Current estimates indicate that Berkeley's long-term infrastructure needs exceed \$1.5 billion. While a bond measure of approximately \$300 million would not fully address these needs, it would represent a significant step toward stabilizing and modernizing critical civic infrastructure.

In addition to the City's capital needs, Berkeley is also managing ongoing fiscal pressures in several funds including, but not limited to, the General Fund, Marina Fund, Parking Funds, CIP Fund, and Building Maintenance Fund. These pressures have informed City Council's interest in understanding whether Berkeley voters may support a local sales and use tax increase to help sustain essential services. As discussed in prior Council materials, the proposed 0.5 percent sales tax increase would align Berkeley's total local sales tax rate with a number of neighboring Alameda County jurisdictions and could generate meaningful ongoing revenue to help address the City's structural fiscal gap.

At the December 2, 2025, work session<sup>3</sup>, City Council provided direction to staff to explore potential ballot measures for the November 2026 election, including:

- Community facilities and quality-of-life investments (e.g., parks, recreation centers, pools, and community centers);
- Public safety facilities (e.g., fire stations, emergency response and dispatch facilities); and
- Critical infrastructure and accessibility improvements (e.g., sidewalks, ADA compliance, seismic upgrades, and climate resilience).

That feedback informed the structure, categories, and framing of the first community survey instrument developed by Lake Research Partners in coordination with City staff.

On January 27, 2026<sup>4</sup>, City Council approved a referral to the City Manager to include, as part of the upcoming community survey for the November 2026 election, a question assessing the perspectives of likely Berkeley voters on a potential increase to the City's

---

<sup>3</sup> <https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/2025-12-02%20Special%20Item%2002%20Discussion%20Regarding%20Potential%20Ballot.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> <https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/2026-01/2026-01-27%20Item%2017%20Refer%20to%20the%20City%20Manager%20to%20include.pdf>

sales and use tax rate. More specifically, the referral requested that the survey test voter interest in increasing Berkeley's sales and use tax rate from 10.25 percent to 10.75 percent, consistent with rates adopted by several neighboring Alameda County jurisdictions. The item was framed in the context of generating resources to address the City's projected General Fund budget shortfall and ongoing fiscal challenges. The referral further emphasized that adding such a question to the survey would provide City Council with data to better understand resident perspectives on revenue options in parallel with feedback on infrastructure priorities, and to inform future policy discussions related to fiscal sustainability and potential ballot measure development.

### **Ballot Measure Considerations: Funding Mechanisms, Fiscal Impact, and Tax Context**

As part of City Council's consideration of potential revenue measures for the November 3, 2026, General Municipal Election, it is important to distinguish between the two funding mechanisms under discussion, the purposes they are designed to serve, and the implications each may have for Berkeley taxpayers and the City's long-term fiscal condition.

The proposed General Obligation bond measure and a potential sales and use tax increase would serve different, but potentially complementary, purposes. A General Obligation bond is an appropriate tool for financing major capital improvements to long-lived public assets, while an increase in the sales and use tax would provide ongoing revenue to support essential services and help address the City's projected General Fund structural deficit. For that reason, these two measures should not be viewed as interchangeable revenue tools, but rather as options that address different components of the City's overall fiscal and infrastructure needs.

**Sales and Use Tax Context**

Currently, the total sales tax rate in the City of Berkeley is 10.25 percent, consisting of a combination of state, county, and district or special taxes. Resources generated by the sales and use tax are distributed, as follows:

<b>Distribution of Sales Tax</b>	<b>Distribution Percentage</b>
State of California	5.75%
State Public Safety Fund / Proposition 172	0.50%
City of Berkeley	1.00%
Alameda County Transportation Commission	1.00%
Alameda County Essential Health Care Services	0.50%
Alameda County Children’s Health and Child Care	0.50%
Alameda County Transactions and Use Tax / ACTU	0.50%
Alameda County BART	0.50%
<b>Total Sales Tax</b>	<b>10.25%</b>

Source: City of Berkeley FY 25-26 Budget Book, pp. 77<sup>5</sup>

If Berkeley were to increase its sales tax rate from 10.25 percent to 10.75 percent, the City could generate additional annual sales tax revenue ranging from approximately \$9 million to \$10 million. These revenues could be used for general governmental purposes, including support for essential City services and mitigation of the City’s projected General Fund deficit. As outlined in the proposed Budget Balancing Plan that was presented to the City Council Budget and Finance Committee on April 16, 2026, resources from the sales and use tax measure would help reduce pressure on service reductions in core functions, including Police, Fire, and other community-serving operations. More specifically, revenues from the sales and use tax measures are proposed to preserve 33 positions and services in the Police, Fire, and Parks, Recreation and Waterfront.

In considering a potential sales tax measure, it is also relevant that Berkeley’s current sales tax rate is below that of several neighboring Alameda County jurisdictions. As previously noted in materials provided to City Council, eight cities in Alameda County currently have a tax rate higher than Berkeley’s 10.25 percent, including Alameda, Albany, Hayward, Newark, Oakland, San Leandro, and Union City at 10.75 percent, and Emeryville at 10.50 percent.

**Property Tax and GO Bond Context**

As part of its earlier work on potential ballot measures, staff also reviewed the City’s property-based taxes and assessments in comparison to neighboring jurisdictions, along with the role that existing and potential General Obligation bond debt plays in overall tax burden. When comparing property tax bills between Berkeley, Oakland, and

<sup>5</sup> <https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/FY-2025-2026-Proposed-Biennial-Budget.pdf>

Albany, the primary differences relate to taxes based on voter-approved GO bond debt, special taxes, assessments, and fee structures.

GO bond debt is voter-approved and may be issued by the City or a school district. Special taxes and assessments, by contrast, may be structured differently depending on the jurisdiction and the measure. Berkeley's special taxes are generally based on a tax rate multiplied by building square footage, while Oakland and Albany often rely more heavily on flat parcel-based formulas with land-use variations. These differences are important when considering overall taxpayer burden and public perception of a new measure.

### **Funding Mechanism: General Obligation Bond**

A General Obligation bond is a form of long-term borrowing used to finance capital improvements to real property such as buildings, roads, parks, and other public facilities. Under a GO bond structure, the repayment obligation is shared proportionally based on taxable assessed property value.

Key features of a General Obligation bond include:

- May be used only for capital improvements, not for ongoing operational costs;
- Requires two-thirds voter approval to pass;
- The principal and interest are paid through tax levies on taxable property;
- Bond repayment is based on assessed value; and
- Bonds are generally repaid over approximately 30 years.

Berkeley voters have approved multiple bond measures over time, and prior City analysis indicates that the City has generally maintained annual tax levies at levels below initial estimates for prior General Obligation bond authorizations. The City's current remaining bond debt service is projected to require an average tax of approximately \$30.79 per \$100,000 of assessed value over the next 30 years (2027-2056).

A potential \$300 million General Obligation bond measure would provide one-time capital funding for eligible infrastructure projects. The measure tested in the first and second community survey assumed an estimated average tax rate of approximately \$22.14 per \$100,000 of assessed value, with \$100 million issued every five years commencing in 2027, and regular audits and independent oversight. While the bond would not fully address the City's long-term infrastructure needs, currently estimated to exceed \$1.5 billion it would represent a significant and strategic investment in high-priority infrastructure needs.

Earlier staff analysis further indicated that a new \$300 million General Obligation bond, when combined with existing authorizations, could result in an average tax rate over time of approximately \$44.13 per \$100,000 of assessed value over the next 41 years, depending on issuance timing, interest rates, and assessed valuation growth assumptions.

### **Summary of Community Survey Results (April 2026)**

To ensure the City's ballot measure development process is grounded in statistically valid voter data, the City conducted an RFP that resulted in a contract with Lake Research Partners to design and administer up to two community surveys of likely Berkeley voters (Contract No: 32600095)<sup>4</sup>. The April 2026 survey tested voter priorities for a \$300 million General Obligation Bond for infrastructure, as well as a potential sales and use tax increase to reduce the City's projected deficit in the General Fund. The survey also tested these potential City measures in the context of other possible local and regional ballot measures that may appear before voters, including: a sales and use tax measure to support regional transit, a living wage proposal for Alameda County, a parcel tax to support the arts, an increase in the sugar-sweetened beverage tax, and a parcel tax to support a public bank. The findings below summarize key topline results from the April 21–26, 2026 survey and provide context for City Council discussion and direction on potential next steps. Comprehensive question-by-question results, including demographic and subgroup breakouts, are provided in Attachment 1.

### **Survey Fielding Window**

The community survey was conducted April 21–26, 2026, using live telephone interviews and text-to-online methodologies to reach a representative sample of likely November 2026 voters.

### **Survey Methodology**

- Field dates: April 21–26, 2026
- Sample size: 500 likely November 2026 voters
- Mode: Live telephone interviews and text-to-online
- Margin of error:  $\pm 4.4\%$  at the 95% confidence level
- Split samples: A/B testing to evaluate impacts of the order of the two proposed revenue measures.

The sample was stratified by age, gender, race, and region of the city to reflect the expected composition of likely voters.

**Survey Results for Potential Regional, County, and City Ballot Measures**

**REGIONAL TRANSIT.** This is a ballot measure that would provide funding for regional transit through an increased sales tax in the Bay Area. Shall the Public Transit Revenue Measure District be established, with jurisdiction extending throughout the boundaries of the Counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, San Mateo, and Santa Clara and the City and County of San Francisco, generating approximately \$980 million annually to sustain and improve transit and be funded by a 14-year regional transportation sales tax of 0.5% in each county except San Francisco, where the rate would be 1%? If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?

Response	Percent
Yes	79%
Undecided/DK	12%
No	9%
(Refused)	0%

**LIVING WAGE.** This is a ballot measure that would raise the minimum wage in Alameda County. Shall Alameda County’s municipal code be amended to gradually raise the minimum wage for all workers, including tipped workers, over a period of several years, until it reaches a living wage of \$30 an hour? If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?

Response	Percent
Yes	78%
Undecided/DK	8%
No	14%
(Refused)	0%

**ARTS.** This is a ballot measure that would provide funding for the arts in the City of Berkeley through a special parcel tax. Shall the City of Berkeley enact a special parcel tax of 7 cents per square foot of improvements, the proceeds of which shall be placed in the Arts Vitality Fund that must be used only for the purpose of providing additional funding for grant programs for Berkeley nonprofit performing arts organizations presenting live performances for the public, arts organizations, individual artists, and cultural and arts festivals in the City of Berkeley? If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?

Response	Percent
Yes	67%
Undecided/DK	11%
No	21%
(Refused)	0%

**SUGAR-SWEETENED BEVERAGES.** This is a ballot measure that would increase the current tax on sugar-sweetened beverages in the City of Berkeley. Shall an ordinance increasing a special tax to 2 cents per ounce on the distribution of high-calorie, sugary drinks (e.g., sodas, energy drinks, presweetened teas) and sweeteners used to sweeten such drinks, but exempting: (1) sweeteners (e.g., sugar, honey, syrups) typically used by consumers and distributed to grocery stores; (2) drinks and sweeteners distributed to very small retailers; (3) diet drinks, milk products, 100% juice, baby formula, alcohol, or drinks taken for medical reasons, be adopted? If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?

Response	Percent
Yes	69%
Undecided/DK	9%
No	23%
(Refused)	0%

**PUBLIC BANK.** This is a ballot measure that would support a public bank to fund Berkeley’s needs through a parcel tax. Shall a parcel tax of 6 cents per square foot of improvements for dwelling units and 9 cents per square foot of improvements for non-residential property be enacted for the purpose of funding long term investments for affordable housing, green energy and infrastructure, and small businesses, the revenue of which will go into a special fund to capitalize and support a public bank that includes Berkeley in its service area? If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?

Response	Percent
Yes	58%
Undecided/DK	18%
No	24%
(Refused)	0%

**\$300 MILLION GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND.** This is a ballot measure that would increase investments in Berkeley’s infrastructure through a general obligation bond. Shall the measure authorizing the issuance of \$300 million in general obligation bonds to fund improvements to fire stations, emergency response facilities, parks and recreation facilities, and other public buildings, and to increase climate change resiliency, subject to independent oversight and audits, be adopted? Average annual costs are approximately \$22.14 per \$100,000 assessed property value, with 100 million dollars issued every five years commencing in 2027. If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?

Response	Percent
Yes	69%
Undecided/DK	15%
(Refused)	0%

After hearing statements for and against the proposed General Obligation bond, support for the \$300 million bond decreased to 64%. This reflects a five-point decline in overall support.

**SALES AND USE TAX.** This is a ballot measure that would increase the sales tax in the City of Berkeley to help address the City’s projected budget deficit of approximately \$30 million. Shall the measure levying a 0.5% sales tax in Berkeley, increasing the total sales tax rate in the City to 10.75%, estimated to generate \$9 million to \$10 million annually, with proceeds placed into the General Fund for general City uses, including but not limited to sustaining fire, police and 911 dispatch services, youth and senior services, community programs, and homelessness response, until ended by the voters, with independent audits, be adopted?

Response	Percent
Yes	52%
Undecided/DK	16%
No	32%
(Refused)	0%

After voters heard supporting and opposing statements, support for the sales tax measure increased to 56%.

**Key Community Survey Findings:**

- In the context of a more developed November 2026 ballot environment, both potential City measures showed somewhat less support than they did in February 2026.
- Results from the April 2026 survey indicated support for the potential \$300 million GO bond was 69%, compared to 71% in February 2026.
- After voters heard supporting and opposing statements, support for the potential GO bond decreased to 64%, indicating greater vulnerability to opposition arguments than in the February 2026 survey.
- Results from the April 2026 survey indicated support for the potential 0.5 percent sales and use tax increase was 52%, compared to 60% in February.
- Strong support for the sales tax measure declined from 37% in February 2026 to 23% in April 2026, indicating softer baseline support.
- After voters heard supporting and opposing statements, support for the sales tax measure increased to 56% in April 2026, with opposition decreasing to 30% and undecided voters decreasing to 13%.

**Refined \$300 Million GO Bond Framework: Evaluation Methodology, Financial Assumptions, and Project List**

In response to council and community feedback, staff refined the proposed project list and updated supporting materials to more clearly reflect project costs, implementation considerations, and the methodology used to evaluate and organize projects within the proposed bond framework. That refined project list, Attachment 2, and evaluation approach are summarized below.

Since the March 17, 2026, work session, staff have refined the proposed infrastructure project list to better align the potential \$300 million General Obligation bond measure with voter priorities, community input, project readiness, and updated cost assumptions. The result is a more focused and implementation-oriented portfolio of potential investments.

**Evaluation Methodology**

To support this refinement, staff applied an explicit evaluation methodology designed to improve transparency and provide an understanding how projects were assessed. The methodology draws from the City's infrastructure evaluation rubric and related bond

selection concepts previously discussed by the Parks, Recreation and Waterfront Commission<sup>6</sup>. Projects were reviewed using a six-factor framework that considers:

1. Health, life, and safety impacts;
2. Infrastructure condition, accessibility, and resilience;
3. Community use and equity;
4. Climate resiliency and sustainability;
5. Deliverability and readiness; and
6. External funding potential.

Each project was assessed using a Low, Medium, or High rating scale, which was then translated into a weighted score to help compare projects more consistently across categories.

The scoring framework was designed to evaluate both the public benefit of a project and the City's ability to deliver it.

- Health, life, and safety considerations capture immediate risk reduction, such as seismic deficiencies, fire/life-safety issues, emergency response dependencies, unsafe access, and public health or sanitation concerns.
- Infrastructure condition, accessibility, and resilience considerations capture asset age, deferred maintenance, accessibility barriers, useful life extension, system replacement, and long-term liability reduction.
- Community use and equity considerations capture usage intensity, public access, service to underserved or historically underinvested communities, and whether the project addresses gaps in access to recreation, civic facilities, public space, or essential services.
- Green resiliency and sustainability considerations capture direct climate or environmental benefits, including sea-level-rise adaptation, shoreline protection, stormwater capture, heat mitigation, decarbonization, energy resilience, and other sustainability gains beyond ordinary modernization.
- Deliverability and readiness considerations capture whether a project has a defined scope, design progress, site control, permitting or environmental review progress, stakeholder alignment, and realistic near-term implementation potential.
- External funding potential captures whether bond funds could leverage grants, matching funds, partnerships, or other outside resources.

---

<sup>6</sup> <https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/2026-04/2026-04-14%20Item%2022%20Bond%20Measure%20Subcommittee%20%E2%80%94%20Final%20Report.pdf>

This methodology was intended to do more than identify projects with general merit. It was structured to distinguish between projects that address urgent risks, major infrastructure deficiencies, and meaningful equity or climate outcomes, versus projects whose benefits may be more limited, indirect, or longer-term. It also helped staff account for practical implementation factors, including whether a project is sufficiently defined to advance in a realistic timeframe and whether bond funding could be paired with outside grants or other leveraged resources. Importantly, the framework was used as a decision-support tool rather than a purely mechanical ranking exercise. Staff also considered City Council direction, geographic distribution, community feedback, updated costing, and the need to advance a project list that is understandable, deliverable, and aligned with the ballot measure narrative.

The methodology also includes important guardrails. Projects were not scored highly simply because they are popular, useful, or generally in poor condition. Similarly, projects were not scored highly under climate or sustainability criteria solely because they would include standard modernization, code compliance, or baseline efficiency improvements. Higher scores are intended to reflect direct, material, and well-supported outcomes, such as significant safety risk reduction, major asset replacement, meaningful ADA/accessibility improvements, clear climate adaptation benefits, strong equitable access benefits, project readiness, or realistic outside funding leverage.

### **Project Themes and Organization**

The proposed project list is organized into the following project themes used throughout the community engagement process:

- Community Facilities and Quality of Life;
- Public Safety; and
- Critical Infrastructure and Accessibility.

These themes helped communicate the purpose and public benefit of the proposed investments in a way that is understandable to community members and voters. Community Facilities and Quality of Life include parks, playgrounds, restrooms, aquatics, cultural centers, open space, and waterfront improvements. Public Safety includes fire station modernization and critical upgrades to emergency-response facilities. Critical Infrastructure and Accessibility include core systems and facilities that require seismic upgrades, ADA improvements, sidewalk repairs, and civic facility modernization.

**Current Working Financial Framework for the GO Bond**

The current working framework assumes \$300 million in total bond sales and approximately \$13 million in bond interest, for total projected revenue of approximately \$313 million.

The total project cost estimate reflects the current working list of capital projects organized by category (i.e., Community Facilities and Quality of Life, Public Safety, etc.). This amount includes planning-level cost assumptions and any escalation or cost projection adjustments needed to support a realistic bond program budget. The framework also includes approximately \$40.5 million in staffing and implementation-related costs, which are intended to support the resources necessary to administer and deliver a multi-year bond-funded capital program. These costs include salary and staffing costs, project delivery support, workstations, software, auditing, oversight, reporting, financial tracking, procurement support, construction management, and other related implementation costs needed to responsibly manage the bond program. These costs are intended to support bond program delivery and administration, not ongoing operations or routine maintenance.

<b>Current Working Financial Framework for the GO Bond</b>	
<b>Category</b>	<b>Amount</b>
<b>Sources of Funds</b>	
Total Bond Sales	\$300,000,000
Assumed Bond Interest	\$13,000,000
<b>Total Sources of Funds</b>	<b>\$313,000,000</b>
<b>Uses of Funds</b>	
Community Facilities and Quality of Life Project Costs	\$90,697,000
Public Safety Project Costs	\$106,665,849
Critical Infrastructure and Accessibility Project Costs	\$75,135,000
<b>Total Project Costs</b>	<b>\$272,500,000</b>
Staffing and Implementation Costs	\$40,500,000
<b>Total Uses of Funds</b>	<b>\$313,000,000</b>

Including resources for staffing and implementation is an important part of the proposed financial framework. A bond program of this scale requires dedicated capacity to move projects through planning, design, procurement, construction, compliance, reporting, audit, and closeout.

**Project List by Category**

**Community Facilities and Quality of Life**

Community Facilities and Quality of Life projects currently total approximately \$90.7 million. This category includes investments in safe, accessible, and resilient parks and

recreation facilities; modernized recreation and aquatic spaces; improved play areas, restrooms, and sports infrastructure; expanded park amenities; shoreline protection; sea-level-rise resilience; long-term public access; and infrastructure preservation.

Representative examples include:

Project	What It Illustrates
Frances Albrier Community Center	A major community recreation facility replacement that addresses seismic and modernization needs at a high-use public facility.
King Pool Infrastructure Improvements	A targeted aquatic facility investment that addresses aging infrastructure, improves safety and reliability, and extends the useful life of an important recreation asset.
Adeline Corridor Open Space	An equity-focused open space investment that expands park access in an area identified for new or improved public space.
Marina Boulevard Sea Level Rise and Bay Trail Improvements	A waterfront resilience and public access project that supports sea-level-rise adaptation, Bay Trail connectivity, and potential grant leverage.

Projects in this category are intended to improve the condition, usability, accessibility, and resilience of high-use public spaces that support recreation, community gathering, youth and family programming, waterfront access, and neighborhood quality of life.

**Public Safety**

Public Safety projects currently total approximately \$106.7 million. This category includes emergency response facilities, public safety infrastructure, long-term resilience, climate readiness, operational reliability, future-ready infrastructure, sustainable investment, emergency preparedness, essential services, community safety, and facility modernization. These projects also incorporate resilience and sustainability features, including photovoltaic solar, battery energy storage systems, and backup power to support critical emergency response functions. This is particularly important because emergency response facilities must remain operational during major incidents, power disruptions, wildfire smoke events, extreme heat, earthquakes, and other emergencies.

Representative examples include:

Project	What It Illustrates
Fire Station 4 Replacement	Replacement of an aging and undersized emergency response facility to support contemporary staffing, improve emergency medical response capacity to the northeast quadrant of the City, health and safety standards for first responders, and operational resilience.
Fire Station 6 Replacement	Replacement of a facility that no longer meets current and projected service demands, including modern apparatus, expanded staffing, and safe working conditions for responders.
Fire Training Center Replacement	A purpose-built training facility that supports modern fire, rescue, and emergency service training and education and will improve operational readiness and long-term emergency response capacity.

Projects in this category focus on replacing aging, undersized, and operationally constrained emergency response facilities that do not meet modern fire and emergency medical response, training, staffing, health and safety, or resilience needs.

**Critical Infrastructure and Accessibility**

Critical Infrastructure & Accessibility projects currently total approximately \$75.1 million. Investments in this category include citywide ADA improvements, sidewalk repairs, seismic upgrades, and modernization of aging civic and service facilities, including facilities that support essential public services and emergency response functions such as the Public Safety Building and 911 Dispatch Center. Collectively, these projects are intended to improve life safety, accessibility, resilience, facility reliability, and equitable access to public spaces and services.

Representative examples include:

Project	What It Illustrates
50/50 Sidewalk Program	A citywide accessibility and pedestrian safety investment that addresses cracked, uneven, and unsafe sidewalks while advancing ADA access.
ADA Barrier Removal Projects	A citywide compliance and access investment that removes barriers in public facilities and paths of travel for people with disabilities.
2100 Martin Luther King Jr. Avenue Public Safety Building Modernization	A critical facility modernization project that supports public safety operations, including critical improvements to the aging and undersized 911 Dispatch center, technology upgrades, HVAC, and wellness spaces.
Old City Hall / Maudelle Shirek Building Preservation and Renovation	A seismic and civic infrastructure investment that supports preservation, accessibility, and the potential return of civic and community-serving functions to a historic public building.

Taken together, projects in this category address some of the City’s most visible and liability-sensitive infrastructure needs, including sidewalks, ADA access, aging civic buildings, seismic risk, and public facilities that support essential services. This category also helps connect the bond framework to community priorities around accessibility, safety, reliable public services, and long-term stewardship of City-owned assets.

**Project Portfolio Summary and Next Steps**

The refined project list and evaluation methodology are intended to provide City Council with an understanding of how the proposed infrastructure bond framework has been organized, evaluated, and aligned with community priorities. The current working framework reflects a citywide portfolio of investments across parks and recreation facilities, public safety infrastructure, civic buildings, accessibility improvements, seismic resilience, waterfront protection, and other critical infrastructure needs. It also accounts for the staffing and implementation costs, oversight, auditing, and implementation resources necessary to responsibly deliver a multi-year bond-funded capital program.

Staff will continue to refine project scopes, cost assumptions, implementation timelines, financing assumptions, and accountability provisions as the ballot measure development process moves forward. This ongoing refinement will incorporate feedback from City Council, commissions, community members, and implementing departments to ensure that any potential measure placed before voters is understandable, fiscally responsible, deliverable, and responsive to Berkeley’s highest-priority infrastructure needs.

## Next Steps

If City Council directs staff to proceed, the following next steps and milestones would apply:

- In **June 2026**, staff would return to City Council with ballot language for the potential measure or measures identified through Council direction at the May 2026 meeting.
- If necessary, in **July 2026**, staff would return to City Council with revised draft ballot language.
- **August 7, 2026** is the last day to submit a local measure for placement on the November 3, 2026, ballot to the Alameda County Registrar of Voters.

Consistent with this timeline, staff would work with the City Attorney's Office to prepare and refine ballot language, finalize the proposed project list and related accountability provisions for any General Obligation bond measure, and incorporate the results of the second survey and community engagement process into the final ballot framing and supporting materials.

## BACKGROUND

The City's exploration of potential revenue measures for the November 3, 2026, General Municipal Election is grounded in a series of City Council actions, long-range planning frameworks, and sustained cross-departmental analysis intended to address Berkeley's long-standing and growing capital infrastructure needs.

On June 17, 2025<sup>7</sup>, City Council referred to the City Manager an item to assess the potential for a 2026 ballot measure to support capital improvements to Fire Department facilities. On September 30, 2025<sup>8</sup>, City Council subsequently referred an additional item to assess the potential for a 2026 ballot measure to support improvements to recreation and community facilities. These referrals reflected Council's recognition that critical public safety and community-serving facilities face aging infrastructure, increasing maintenance backlogs, and operational constraints that cannot be fully addressed through existing funding sources.

This work builds on the City's long-range infrastructure planning framework established through Vision 2050, which emerged from Measure R (2018). Measure R directed the Mayor to convene a panel of subject matter experts to guide the City toward a climate-smart, technologically advanced, integrated, and efficient infrastructure future. The City

<sup>7</sup> <https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/2025-06-17%20Item%2028%20Fire%20Facility%20Revenue%20Measures.pdf>

<sup>8</sup> <https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/2025-09-30%20Item%2011%20Recreation%20and%20Community%20Facility%20Improvement%20Measures.pdf>

Council accepted the Vision 2050 Framework in 2020<sup>9</sup>, and in 2025, the Mayor convened a Task Force to review and update the recommendations contained in the original Vision 2050 report. Updates to Vision 2050 were presented to the City Council on December 2, 2025.<sup>10</sup> Vision 2050 provides the overarching policy lens through which potential 2026 ballot measure projects are being evaluated, emphasizing equity, public health and safety, climate resilience, sustainability, and integrated systems planning.

On December 2, 2025, City Council reviewed staff's preliminary assessment of the City's significant unfunded infrastructure and deferred maintenance needs and provided direction to explore a potential General Obligation (GO) bond for the November 2026 ballot, with a funding capacity up to \$300 million. Staff noted that while a bond of this scale would not fully address the City's estimated infrastructure needs—currently exceeding \$1.5 billion—it would represent a meaningful step toward stabilizing and modernizing critical assets that directly support public safety, community well-being, accessibility, and climate resilience.

On January 27, 2026, City Council also directed staff to include a question in the voter survey regarding a potential 0.5 percent sales and use tax increase to help address the City's projected General Fund structural deficit and sustain essential City services.

Consistent with Council direction, staff developed a preliminary framework organizing potential bond projects into three high-level categories:

- Community Facilities and Quality of Life;
- Public Safety; and
- Critical Infrastructure and Accessibility.

Projects within these categories were identified through a collaborative, cross-departmental process and evaluated using core City criteria as well as Vision 2050-aligned principles, including equity, public health and safety, climate resilience, sustainability, and opportunities to leverage external funding. Projects were also screened for readiness, feasibility, and deliverability to ensure that any potential ballot measure reflects projects that can be implemented within realistic timeframes and staffing capacity.

In parallel with the policy development and project framework, City Council directed staff to commence a robust community engagement and survey process to inform ballot measure development. To implement this direction, the City contracted with Lake Research Partners to design and administer a statistically valid community survey of

---

<sup>9</sup> <https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/Vision-2050-Framework.pdf>

<sup>10</sup> <https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/2025-12-02%20Special%20Item%2001%20Sharing%20the%20Final%20Report%20of%20the%20Mayor.pdf>

Berkeley voters (Contract No:32600095). The survey was fielded from February 19–23, 2026 using live phone and text-to-online methodologies and tested voter priorities and support for potential General Obligation Bond concepts across multiple funding levels, as well as an exploratory question regarding a potential sales tax increase to address the City's projected budget deficit.

On March 17, 2026, City Council held a special work session to review the results of the first community survey and discuss potential ballot measure considerations for the November 2026 election. At that meeting, Council provided direction to continue developing a potential \$300 million General Obligation bond measure to fund priority infrastructure investments, continue exploring a potential 0.5 percent sales and use tax increase to address the City's projected structural deficit and support essential services, and conduct a second voter survey to test refined ballot language for both measures in the context of the anticipated November 2026 ballot environment. Staff used this direction to further refine the project list, update project cost assumptions, and work with Lake Research Partners to develop the second community survey.

### **Community Engagement and Qualitative Feedback**

To complement the survey and ensure broader community input beyond likely voters, City staff implemented an expanded engagement strategy from January through March 2026 that included briefings and feedback sessions with the following:

- Six (6) City commissions (Environment and Climate Commission; Landmarks Commission; Commission on Disability; Disaster and Fire Safety Commission; Parks, Recreation and Waterfront Commission; and Transportation and Infrastructure Commission);
- Four (4) focus groups (Civic Recreation Users; residents interested in Capital Improvement Program priorities; Community Emergency Response Team groups; and Aquatic Parks stakeholders), and
- Joint community meetings organized by paired Council districts (Districts 5/6; 1/2; 3/8; and 4/7).

These engagements provided qualitative insight into community priorities, equity considerations, geographic differences in infrastructure conditions, concerns regarding affordability and cumulative tax burden, and expectations for oversight and transparency should a bond measure advance.

A website<sup>11</sup> has also been developed to provide information on the potential general obligation bond, the list of projects that could be funded by the proposed bond,

---

<sup>11</sup> <https://berkeleyca.gov/your-government/our-work/bond-revenue-measures/infrastructure-projects-potential-bond-measure>.

information about community meetings, and a mechanism for community members to provide their input on the proposed list of projects.

At a high level, feedback consistently highlighted strong interest in projects tied to life safety, emergency response, accessibility, climate resilience, and visible neighborhood infrastructure, such as fire facilities, dispatch modernization, sidewalks, ADA improvements, and select parks and community-serving facilities. Participants also emphasized the importance of geographic equity, particularly ensuring that historically underinvested areas and neighborhoods across Berkeley are meaningfully reflected in the proposed project list.

At the same time, community members raised recurring questions about the overall size and complexity of the proposed bond package, the need for clearer explanation of how projects were selected and prioritized, and the importance of demonstrating public benefit in a way that is understandable to voters. Feedback also reflected concern about affordability, cumulative tax burden, implementation capacity, and maintaining public trust through accountability and transparent reporting. Several participants encouraged the City to continue refining both the project list and the public-facing narrative so that the final package is focused and clearly aligned with Berkeley's highest-priority needs.

Overall, the qualitative engagement process suggests broad support for addressing Berkeley's infrastructure backlog, paired with a strong expectation that any proposed ballot measure be clearly prioritized, equitable in community benefit, and accompanied by an implementation and accountability framework.

Following this phase of Council direction, voter survey research, community engagement, and the March 17 work session, staff refined the proposed project list, updated cost assumptions, and worked with Lake Research Partners to conduct a second community survey testing refined ballot language and messaging. The current item returns to City Council for direction on whether to continue developing ballot language for a potential \$300 million General Obligation bond measure and a potential 0.5 percent sales and use tax increase for the November 3, 2026, General Municipal Election. This next step would allow staff to further refine the project list, accountability provisions, financing assumptions, and legal documents needed to return to Council with draft ballot language before the statutory filing deadline.

### ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY AND CLIMATE IMPACTS

Many of the infrastructure investments under consideration for a potential November 2026 ballot measure directly advance the City's environmental sustainability, climate resilience, and environmental justice goals. Modernizing aging public facilities provides opportunities to incorporate energy-efficient building systems, high-performance materials, and low-carbon construction practices consistent with [Berkeley's Climate Action Plan](#) policies.

Several of the proposed project categories and example projects also directly support climate adaptation and resilience objectives, including improvements to stormwater infrastructure, shoreline and waterfront protection, seismic upgrades to critical facilities, and retrofits that enhance emergency response capacity during climate-related emergencies such as extreme heat, wildfire smoke events, flooding, and power outages. Investments in public safety facilities and emergency communications infrastructure further strengthen the City's ability to respond to increasingly frequent and severe climate-driven hazards.

In addition, proposed investments in sidewalks, ADA accessibility, and pedestrian infrastructure advance sustainable transportation and public health outcomes by improving walkability and accessibility, reducing reliance on vehicle travel, and supporting safer, more connected neighborhoods. Enhancements to parks, recreation facilities, and community centers also contribute to urban greening, heat mitigation, and community resilience by providing cooling spaces and accessible public gathering areas during extreme weather events.

Project prioritization and implementation will continue to be guided by the Vision 2050 framework, which elevates climate resilience, sustainability, equity, and integrated infrastructure planning as core principles. As specific projects are refined, staff will incorporate climate risk screening and lifecycle sustainability considerations to ensure that public investments are durable, resilient to future climate conditions, and aligned with the City's long-term environmental and climate goals.

#### RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

City Council direction at this stage is necessary to ensure that any potential November 2026 ballot measure is aligned with Council policy priorities, informed by community input, and structured in a manner that is both feasible to implement and positioned for voter approval.

Providing direction now allows staff to finalize project categories, refine ballot language, prepare accountability provisions, and complete the legal and administrative steps necessary to return to City Council with final ballot language in time to meet statutory deadlines for the November 2026 election. Delaying direction could limit the City's ability to complete these steps, reduce flexibility in responding to survey and community feedback, and compress the timeline for thoughtful preparation of final ballot materials.

#### ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS CONSIDERED

City Council could choose to take no action at this time. However, this would significantly constrain the City's ability to refine project priorities, prepare ballot language, and advance one or more measures in a manner that meets the statutory deadlines for the November 2026 election. Delaying direction may also reduce the City's flexibility to incorporate the results of the second survey and the engagement process into the final design of any potential ballot measure.

Alternatively, City Council could direct staff to discontinue ballot measure development for the November 2026 election cycle. While this would avoid near-term ballot-related workload and costs, it would leave the City without a viable near-term strategy to address its most urgent infrastructure and deferred maintenance needs, and without an opportunity to seek voter authorization for new revenue to support essential services and address the structural deficit in the General Fund.

#### CONTACT PERSON

Dave White, Deputy City Manager, City Manager's Office, 510-981-7014  
Carianna Arredondo, Assistant to the City Manager, City Manager's Office, 510-981-6903

#### Attachments:

- 1: Results of 2026 Second Community Survey | Lake Research Partners
- 2: Refined Infrastructure Project List
- 3: December 02, 2025 Staff Report
- 4: March 17, 2026 Staff Report
- 5: Parks, Recreation & Waterfront Commission Report
- 6: Environment and Climate Commission Report



# CITY OF BERKELEY

## Findings from a community survey of 500 likely 2026 voters


April 21-26, 2026

David Mermin  
Emma Scotty

- Lake Research Partners designed and administered this survey, which was conducted by live telephone interview and text-to-online.
- The survey reached a total of 500 likely November 2026 election voters in Berkeley, California, sampled from the state voter file.
- The survey was conducted April 21-26, 2026.
- Data were weighted slightly by gender, region, age, race, party registration, homeownership, and education to reflect the expected demographic composition of likely November general election voters in Berkeley.
- The margin of error for the full sample is +/-4.4%.

# Demographics of Likely Voters in Berkeley

## GENDER




**55%**      **45%**




## AGE

Under 30	---	<b>20%</b>
30-39	---	<b>14%</b>
40-49	---	<b>15%</b>
50-64	---	<b>21%</b>
65+	---	<b>30%</b>

## EDUCATION

High School or Less	---	<b>2%</b>	
Post-H.S. / Some College	---	<b>22%</b>	
College Graduate	---	<b>38%</b>	<b>75%</b> College Grad or Post Grad
Post-Graduate	---	<b>37%</b>	

## PARTY REGISTRATION

	Democrat	<b>78%</b>
	Republican	<b>3%</b>
	NPP/Other	<b>19%</b>

## RACE

White	---	<b>67%</b>
Black	---	<b>9%</b>
Latino	---	<b>9%</b>
AAPI	---	<b>11%</b>
MENA	---	<b>2%</b>
Other	---	<b>2%</b>
DK/Ref	---	<b>1%</b>

## REGION

Hills (Districts 5,6,8)	---	<b>45%</b>
Central/South (3,4,7)	---	<b>27%</b>
West (1,2)	---	<b>28%</b>

## HOMEOWNER

Own	---	<b>54%</b>
Rent	---	<b>42%</b>
Oth	---	<b>3%</b>

## Key Findings – Overview

- **The GO bond and sales tax ballot measures have slightly lower support in this latest survey than in our February poll.** In a crowded ballot measure environment, voters are less enthusiastic about additional revenue measures.
  - **Nearly seven in ten vote Yes on the GO bond initial ballot (69%),** just above the two-thirds needed to pass.
  - **Support for the sales tax starts lower at 52%,** though still above the passage threshold of 50%.
- Additional positive and negative information dampens support for the GO bond slightly, while increasing support for the sales tax. **Both measures are in a position to pass if there is a solid campaign in support of each.**
- Other local and regional revenue measures tested also have strong support, though their inclusion on the 2026 ballot likely increases tax sensitivity for Berkeley voters.



## Key Findings – GO Bond

---

- **Sixty-nine percent of Berkeley voters would vote Yes on the GO bond measure** to increase investments in Berkeley’s infrastructure like fire stations, emergency response facilities, parks and recreation facilities, and other public buildings, and to increase climate change resiliency. Only 16% would vote No, and 15% are undecided.
  - **Initial support for the GO bond is slightly lower than it was in February (71% Yes).** Strong support also dropped slightly (from 42% to 39%). Consolidating soft support is important to ensuring passage.
  - **As we saw in the February survey, voters across demographics vote Yes at similar rates.** Women under 50 are most likely to vote Yes. Voters in West Berkeley, homeowners, and older men are relatively less likely to support the bond measure.
- **After hearing a statement in favor and a statement in opposition to the GO bond measure, support declines to 64%.** In this ballot environment after voters have heard about several different revenue measures, the opposition message claiming Berkeley taxpayers are getting soaked for tax increases has more resonance.
  - In the February poll without other measures, the opposition statement did not negatively impact support, which remained at 72%.

## Key Findings – Sales Tax

---

- On the initial ballot, **52% of Berkeley voters would vote Yes on a 0.5% sales tax** to help address the City’s projected budget deficit, 32% would vote No, and 16% are undecided. Support is somewhat soft, with only 23% who vote Yes strongly.
  - **Since our February survey, support for the sales tax has declined by 8 points** (from 60% Yes). The decline is disproportionately among younger men, older women, white voters, homeowners, and voters in Central/South Berkeley.
  - Women are more likely to support the sales tax than men, and voters under 50 are more supportive than voters over 50. Younger women are the most likely to vote Yes.
- Unlike the GO bond measure, **support for the sales tax increases by 4 points after hearing a statement in support and a statement in opposition to the measure, to 56%**. The statements convince over a third (35%) of undecided voters to vote Yes, though most remain undecided.
  - After statements, the sales tax ballot is closer to what it was after statements in February, down only 2 points (from 58% Yes). Support is still softer than in the February poll, with 26% voting Yes strongly, down from 36% on the February informed ballot.

## Key Findings – Ballot Order

---

- **In a test of order effect in which half of respondents heard the GO bond measure first and the other half heard the sales tax measure first, we see little impact on the ballot.**
  - Support for the GO bond starts off slightly higher among voters who heard the sales tax ballot first (70% Yes) compared to those who heard the GO bond first (67% Yes). However, there is more of a dropoff on the informed ballot among those who heard the sales tax first, which leaves the levels of support after messages the same regardless of ballot order (64% Yes).
  - On the sales tax ballot, those who heard the GO bond measure first are slightly more likely to vote Yes on the initial (53%) and informed (58%) ballots compared to those who heard the sales tax first (50% initial, 54% informed).

## Key Findings – Other Measures

---

- **The other local and regional ballot measures we tested before the GO bond and sales tax measures currently have majority support among Berkeley voters.**
  - The Bay Area regional transit measure has strong support in Berkeley, with 79% voting Yes.
  - The Alameda County living wage measure also tests strongly in Berkeley if it gets on the ballot – 78% say they would vote Yes.
  - The arts funding tax, though not as popular as the transit or minimum wage measures, is well above the 50% it needs to pass (67% Yes).
  - The sugar-sweetened beverage tax looks likely to pass, with over two-thirds who would Yes (69%).
  - The public bank measure has a majority voting Yes, but with lower support than the other measures at 58%.

# GO BOND



This is a ballot measure that would increase investments in Berkeley's infrastructure through a general obligation bond.


Shall the measure authorizing the issuance of \$300 million in general obligation bonds to fund improvements to fire stations, emergency response facilities, parks and recreation facilities, and other public buildings, and to increase climate change resiliency, subject to independent oversight and audits, be adopted?

Average annual costs are approximately \$22.14 per \$100,000 assessed property value, with 100 million dollars issued every five years commencing in 2027.

# Initial Ballot - GO Bond Measure

Nearly seven in ten Berkeley voters would vote Yes on the \$300m general obligation bond on the initial ballot, above the two-thirds threshold.

Support is largely consistent across demographics, but highest among younger women. Renters are slightly more likely to vote Yes than homeowners, and support is higher in the Hills and Central/South than the West.




	Yes - strongly	Yes	No	Und	Net
Total	39	69	16	15	+52
Men	38	66	19	14	+47
Women	40	71	14	15	+57
< 50	37	71	13	16	+58
50+	41	66	20	14	+47
Men < 50	34	67	16	17	+51
Women < 50	40	76	9	15	+67
Men 50+	44	65	24	11	+41
Women 50+	40	67	17	16	+50
White	40	68	17	14	+51
POC	38	70	13	17	+56
Non-College	37	65	19	15	+46
College	40	70	15	15	+55
Hills	41	70	16	13	+54
Central/South	37	71	12	16	+59
West	37	64	20	17	+44
Own	38	65	22	13	+44
Rent	40	72	9	19	+63

Q8: [GO BOND – \$300m] This is a ballot measure that would increase investments in Berkeley’s infrastructure through a general obligation bond. If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?: And is that Yes/No strongly or not so strongly?: Well, to which side do you lean?

# Initial Ballot GO Bond Measure – Timeseries

Compared to our February survey, which did not include the other measures that will be on the ballot, support for the GO bond measure in this survey is slightly lower. Older voters and white voters have lower support than previously, possibly due to tax sensitivity after hearing about other revenue measures that will also be on the ballot.



Q8. This is a ballot measure that would increase investments in Berkeley’s infrastructure through a general obligation bond.. If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?: And is that Yes/No strongly or not so strongly?: Well, to which side do you lean?

ALL RESPONDENTS

	Net (Yes-No)		Net Change
	Feb 2026	April 2026	
<b>Total</b>	<b>+59</b>	<b>+52</b>	<b>-7</b>
Men	+54	+47	-7
Women	+62	+57	-5
< 50	+55	+58	+4
50+	+62	+47	<b>-15</b>
Men < 50	+51	+51	0
Women < 50	+57	+67	+10
Men 50+	+57	+41	<b>-16</b>
Women 50+	+66	+50	<b>-16</b>
White	+65	+51	<b>-14</b>
POC	+46	+56	+10
Non-College	+58	+46	-12
College	+59	+55	-4
Hills	+59	+54	-4
Central /South	+63	+59	-4
West	+55	+44	-11
Own	+53	+44	-9
Rent	+65	+63	-2

## Text of Support/Oppose Statements – GO Bond Ballot Measure

---


*Supporters* say the City needs investments in fire services, parks, and building repairs to ensure safety and quality of life, and to save the city money by investing in cost-saving green energy. Building on past successes like repairing streets, improving parks, and increasing affordable housing, this bond will focus on replacing unsafe and undersized fire stations, revitalizing community and senior centers, improving parks and sidewalks, and preparing for sea-level rise and climate change. These investments will improve our quality of life, save the city money, and make us safer.

*Opponents* say that Berkeley taxpayers keep getting soaked for more and more increases with little to show for it. We funded streets, and the streets are still a mess. We funded housing, and housing costs and homelessness are worse than ever. We can't afford to pay more in taxes at a time when people are already struggling. We need to look more closely at this high-tax, high-cost city government, cut wasteful and unnecessary spending, and use existing funds efficiently.

# Informed Ballot - GO Bond Measure

After hearing statements in favor and against the bond measure, support drops slightly below the two-thirds threshold. For the measure to pass, supporters would need to hold on to the current Yes voters and win over some undecideds. Voters who were undecided initially remain largely undecided, but move more toward voting Yes than No.

At least a quarter of older men, non-college voters, and voters in West Berkeley vote No, while younger women are the most supportive.




	Yes - strongly	Yes	No	Und	Net
Total	37	64	20	15	+44
Men	39	63	23	13	+40
Women	36	65	18	17	+47
< 50	39	67	17	15	+50
50+	36	61	23	15	+37
Men < 50	39	63	22	14	+42
Women < 50	39	71	12	17	+59
Men 50+	39	62	25	12	+37
Women 50+	35	60	23	17	+38
White	38	63	20	16	+43
POC	38	66	19	14	+47
Non-College	38	56	28	15	+29
College	38	67	18	15	+49
Hills	41	66	19	14	+47
Central/South	32	66	17	17	+49
West	37	60	25	15	+34
Own	38	65	20	14	+44
Rent	37	65	19	17	+46
Initial Undecided	7	25	12	63	+13

Q10. Sometimes in a survey like this, people change their minds...If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?

# Informed Ballot GO Bond Measure – Timeseries

The GO bond measure is more vulnerable to opposition in the context of other measures on the ballot compared to our February survey. Older men, non-college voters, and voters in Central/South and West Berkeley have particularly reduced support on the informed ballot compared to February.



	Net (Yes-No)		Net Change
	Feb 2026	April 2026	
Total	+57	+44	-13
Men	+56	+40	-16
Women	+58	+47	-11
< 50	+63	+50	-13
50+	+51	+37	-15
Men < 50	+55	+42	-13
Women < 50	+69	+59	-10
Men 50+	+56	+37	-19
Women 50+	+47	+38	-9
White	+57	+43	-14
POC	+56	+47	-9
Non-College	+63	+29	-34
College	+55	+49	-6
Hills	+51	+47	-4
Central /South	+70	+49	-21
West	+54	+34	-20
Own	+50	+44	-6
Rent	+63	+46	-17

Q10. Sometimes in a survey like this, people change their minds...If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?

## GO Bond Target Profiles

**Voters who are undecided on the GO bond ballot measure are disproportionately renters, especially women, registered NPP/other party, in their 40s, Black, and have a 4-year degree.**

**Persuadable voters, who move toward voting Yes on the informed ballot or are undecided, are heavily female, especially white women, college-educated, and include a disproportionate number of homeowners in West Berkeley. Persuadables also include relatively more NPP/other voters, voters in their 40s, and older Black voters.**

Profile of GO Bond Undecided Voters – 15% of Electorate		
Demographic	% of Undecided	% of Electorate
Black	14	9
NPP/Other	25	19
40-49	20	15
Black 50+	10	5
4-year college	45	38
Rent	53	42
Rent women	32	23

Profile of GO Bond Persuadable Voters – 17% of Electorate		
Demographic	% of Persuadable	% of Electorate
Women	60	55
White women	41	36
NPP/Other	30	19
40-49	21	15
Black 50+	10	5
College women	52	43
Homeowner West	20	15



# SALES TAX


This is a ballot measure that would increase the sales tax in the City of Berkeley to help address the City's projected budget deficit of approximately \$30 million.

Shall the measure levying a 0.5% sales tax in Berkeley, increasing the total sales tax rate in the City to 10.75%, estimated to generate \$9 million to \$10 million annually, with proceeds placed into the General Fund for general City uses, including but not limited to sustaining fire, police and 911 dispatch services, youth and senior services, community programs, and homelessness response, until ended by the voters, with independent audits, be adopted?

# Initial Ballot - Sales Tax Measure

Support for the sales tax measure is lower and softer than support for the GO bond measure, though the number who would vote Yes still clears the 50% threshold.

As with the GO bond, the strongest supporters are younger women. Men and older voters are more likely to vote No. Homeowners are also more likely to vote No than renters.




	Yes - strongly	Yes	No	Und	Net
Total	23	52	32	16	+19
Men	23	48	38	14	+10
Women	23	55	28	17	+27
< 50	24	56	28	16	+28
50+	22	48	37	15	+11
Men < 50	22	46	38	15	+7
Women < 50	26	67	17	16	+50
Men 50+	23	50	37	12	+13
Women 50+	21	47	36	17	+10
White	24	52	33	15	+19
POC	20	53	30	16	+23
Non-College	25	57	30	12	+27
College	22	50	33	17	+17
Hills	23	52	31	16	+20
Central/South	21	50	33	17	+18
West	25	53	34	13	+19
Own	20	51	36	13	+15
Rent	28	54	26	19	+28

Q9: This is a ballot measure that would increase the sales tax in the City of Berkeley to help address the City's projected budget deficit of approximately \$30 million. If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?: And is that Yes/No strongly or not so strongly?: Well, to which side do you lean?

# Initial Ballot Sales Tax Measure – Timeseries

**Support for the sales tax is lower in this poll than in February. The biggest declines are among younger men and older women, white voters, those in Central/South Berkeley, and homeowners.**



	Net (Yes-No)		Net Change
	Feb 2026	April 2026	
Total	+31	+19	-12
Men	+22	+10	-12
Women	+39	+27	-12
< 50	+38	+28	-10
50+	+24	+11	-13
Men < 50	+24	+7	-17
Women < 50	+49	+50	+1
Men 50+	+19	+13	-6
Women 50+	+29	+10	-19
White	+35	+19	-16
POC	+24	+23	-1
Non-College	+42	+27	-15
College	+28	+17	-11
Hills	+27	+20	-7
Central /South	+37	+18	-19
West	+33	+19	-14
Own	+32	+15	-17
Rent	+31	+28	-3

Q9. This is a ballot measure that would increase the sales tax in the City of Berkeley to help address the City's projected budget deficit of approximately \$30 million. If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?: And is that Yes/No strongly or not so strongly?: Well, to which side do you lean?

## Text of Support/Oppose Statements – Sales Tax Ballot Measure

---


*Supporters* say the City must address its projected budget deficit to prevent layoffs of police officers and firefighters, the closure of a fire station, and the loss of vital youth services. This is a modest change to the sales tax, and it only brings Berkeley to the same tax rates as nearby cities like Oakland and Albany. It will fund essential services to make sure police and firefighters can continue to keep us safe and maintain the city's quality of life without putting a major burden on taxpayers.

*Opponents* say this tax hike is yet another burden on taxpayers without any new or improved services to show for it. Berkeley taxpayers simply can't afford all these tax increases, and we shouldn't be asked to pay more when nothing will change. Increasing the sales tax will increase the burden on low- and middle-class residents and local small businesses. The City should use its existing budget and avoid deficits instead of asking us for more money.

# Informed Ballot - Sales Tax Measure

After hearing statements in favor of and in opposition to the sales tax, support increases slightly to 56%. Majorities of voters across demographics vote Yes on the sales tax after hearing more.

Over a third of initial undecideds move toward voting Yes compared to only 10% who move towards No, though over half remain undecided.




	Yes - strongly	Yes	No	Und	Net
Total	26	56	30	13	+27
Men	27	54	32	12	+22
Women	25	58	27	14	+31
< 50	27	59	27	13	+32
50+	24	54	32	13	+22
Men < 50	27	56	31	12	+25
Women < 50	28	62	21	15	+41
Men 50+	27	52	33	13	+19
Women 50+	22	55	32	13	+24
White	28	57	28	14	+29
POC	22	56	31	13	+24
Non-College	27	54	29	16	+25
College	25	57	29	12	+28
Hills	28	58	27	12	+31
Central/South	23	55	33	13	+22
West	24	55	30	15	+25
Own	24	57	28	14	+29
Rent	29	58	30	12	+28
Initial Undecided	7	35	10	53	+24

Q11. Sometimes in a survey like this, people change their minds...If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?

# Informed Ballot Sales Tax Measure – Timeseries

The informed sales tax ballot after support and oppose statements is similar to the informed ballot in the February survey, but the intensity of support remains lower than it was in the previous survey.

White, non-college, and Central/South voters are less likely to vote Yes after hearing more about the measure than they were in February.



	Net (Yes-No)		Net Change
	Feb 2026	April 2026	
Total	+29	+27	-2
Men	+25	+22	-3
Women	+33	+31	-2
< 50	+36	+32	-4
50+	+23	+22	-1
Men < 50	+31	+25	-6
Women < 50	+40	+41	+1
Men 50+	+19	+19	0
Women 50+	+26	+24	-2
White	+37	+29	-8
POC	+14	+24	+10
Non-College	+33	+25	-8
College	+28	+28	0
Hills	+27	+31	+4
Central /South	+32	+22	-10
West	+30	+25	-5
Own	+32	+29	-3
Rent	+26	+28	+2

Q11. Sometimes in a survey like this, people change their minds...If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?

## Sales Tax Target Profiles

**Voters who are undecided on the sales tax are highly educated (with a graduate degree), college-educated women, women in the Hills, renters (especially those who are women), and NPP/other party voters.**

**Like the other undecided and persuadable targets, sales tax persuadable voters are more likely to be NPPs. They are disproportionately older women, postgraduate educated, college women, and homeowners, especially women.**


Profile of Sales Tax Undecided Voters – 16% of Electorate		
Demographic	% of Undecided	% of Electorate
Hills women	33	25
NPP/Other	24	19
Graduate degree	44	37
College women	52	43
Rent	51	42
Rent women	31	23

Profile of Sales Tax Persuadable Voters – 21% of Electorate		
Demographic	% of Persuadable	% of Electorate
NPP/Other	24	19
Women 50+	38	31
Graduate degree	47	37
College women	48	43
Homeowner	59	54
Homeowner women	37	31

# Ballot Order Effect

# GO Bond Measure by Ballot Order

**Ballot order has a minimal impact on GO bond support. The Yes vote on the informed ballot is the same regardless of order, though intensity is somewhat higher among those who heard the GO bond ballot first.**




% Yes	Heard GO Bond First		Heard Sales Tax First	
	Initial	Informed	Initial	Informed
<b>Total</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>64</b>
Men	67	65	65	60
Women	66	63	<b>75</b>	67
< 50	71	70	71	64
50+	62	58	70	63
Men < 50	<b>72</b>	68	62	59
Women < 50	71	73	<b>81</b>	70
Men 50+	62	62	68	62
Women 50+	63	56	71	64
White	68	62	69	64
POC	66	69	<b>74</b>	64
Non-College	64	57	66	55
College	68	67	72	67
Hills	73	<b>70</b>	67	62
Central/South	68	69	74	63
West	56	51	72	68
Own	64	65	67	64
Rent	68	64	<b>76</b>	65

Q8: [GO BOND – \$300m] This is a ballot measure that would increase investments in Berkeley’s infrastructure through a general obligation bond. If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?: And is that Yes/No strongly or not so strongly?: Well, to which side do you lean?

\*SPLIT SAMPLED

# Sales Tax Measure by Ballot Order

**For the sales tax measure, it is mildly beneficial for voters to hear the GO bond ballot first. Support on both the initial and informed ballot is slightly elevated among voters who heard the GO bond first, particularly among younger voters and in the Hills.**



% Yes	Heard GO Bond First		Heard Sales Tax First	
	Initial	Informed	Initial	Informed
<b>Total</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>54</b>
Men	52	60	43	49
Women	55	57	56	59
< 50	<b>60</b>	<b>65</b>	52	53
50+	47	52	49	56
Men < 50	52	<b>67</b>	39	45
Women < 50	<b>69</b>	62	<b>65</b>	62
Men 50+	51	51	49	53
Women 50+	45	53	49	57
White	54	58	49	57
POC	55	62	52	50
Non-College	59	56	55	52
College	52	60	48	55
Hills	57	<b>64</b>	47	53
Central/South	56	57	45	52
West	46	50	<b>60</b>	<b>60</b>
Own	52	58	49	56
Rent	54	61	54	55

Q8: [GO BOND – \$300m] This is a ballot measure that would increase investments in Berkeley’s infrastructure through a general obligation bond. If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?: And is that Yes/No strongly or not so strongly?: Well, to which side do you lean?


\*SPLIT SAMPLED

# OTHER MEASURES



# Regional Transit Measure


The Bay Area regional transit funding measure is widely popular in Berkeley, with almost eight-in-ten voting Yes. Young women and voters in the Hills are most supportive.



	Yes - strongly	Yes	No	Und	Net
<b>Total</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>+70</b>
Men	57	79	12	9	+67
Women	53	79	6	14	+72
< 50	57	81	8	10	+73
50+	53	76	10	14	+67
Men < 50	55	78	11	11	+66
Women < 50	60	<b>85</b>	5	9	+80
Men 50+	60	81	13	6	+67
Women 50+	49	74	7	18	+67
White	56	80	8	11	+72
POC	53	76	10	13	+66
Non-College	51	71	12	16	+59
College	56	82	8	10	+74
Hills	61	<b>87</b>	5	8	+82
Central/South	53	74	10	15	+64
West	48	70	13	16	+57
Own	55	79	9	11	+69
Rent	56	80	8	12	+72
GO Bond No	29	55	33	12	+22
GO Bond Und	38	61	5	33	+56
Sales Tax No	42	71	21	7	+50
Sales Tax Und	43	63	2	35	+61

Q3: This is a ballot measure that would provide funding for regional transit through an increased sales tax in the Bay Area. If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?: And is that Yes/No strongly or not so strongly?: Well, to which side do you lean?

**The Alameda County living wage measure also has widespread support, including over half of Berkeley voters who strongly support raising the minimum wage.**




	Yes - strongly	Yes	No	Und	Net
<b>Total</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>+64</b>
Men	51	74	19	8	+55
Women	59	81	10	8	+71
< 50	62	83	13	5	+70
50+	49	73	15	11	+58
Men < 50	54	75	19	5	+56
Women < 50	70	<b>91</b>	6	4	+85
Men 50+	48	72	18	10	+54
Women 50+	51	74	14	12	+60
White	52	77	13	10	+64
POC	63	80	16	4	+64
Non-College	59	81	17	2	+64
College	54	77	13	10	+64
Hills	57	77	15	9	+62
Central/South	55	<b>84</b>	9	7	+74
West	53	74	18	8	+56
Own	52	75	16	9	+59
Rent	60	81	12	7	+69
GO Bond No	27	45	43	12	+3
GO Bond Und	44	66	15	19	+50
Sales Tax No	47	65	28	7	+37
Sales Tax Und	51	74	9	17	+65

Q4: This is a ballot measure that would raise the minimum wage in Alameda County. If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?: And is that Yes/No strongly or not so strongly?: Well, to which side do you lean?

# Arts Tax Measure

**Two-thirds of Berkeley voters vote Yes on the arts funding ballot measure. This is particularly popular among younger women and renters. Those who vote No on the GO bond and sales tax measures are more likely to also vote No on the arts tax.**




Q5: This is a ballot measure that would provide funding for the arts in the City of Berkeley through a special parcel tax. If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?: And is that Yes/No strongly or not so strongly?: Well, to which side do you lean?

ALL RESPONDENTS

	Yes - strongly	Yes	No	Und	Net
<b>Total</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>+46</b>
Men	30	66	26	8	+40
Women	33	68	17	14	+51
< 50	32	72	19	9	+53
50+	30	63	23	14	+39
Men < 50	30	67	26	7	+41
Women < 50	34	<b>77</b>	11	12	+66
Men 50+	29	65	26	9	+38
Women 50+	31	61	22	16	+40
White	30	67	23	10	+44
POC	34	69	16	14	+53
Non-College	37	68	23	8	+45
College	29	67	21	13	+46
Hills	34	70	20	10	+50
Central/South	28	69	21	10	+48
West	29	61	23	15	+38
Own	29	62	24	14	+38
Rent	36	<b>75</b>	17	9	+58
GO Bond No	16	23	62	16	-39
GO Bond Und	29	61	13	24	+48
Sales Tax No	19	40	47	13	-6
Sales Tax Und	26	60	14	27	+46

# Sugar-Sweetened Beverages Tax Measure


The soda tax increase is also likely to pass, with 69% support and 45% strong support. As with the other local Berkeley measures, voters who vote No on the GO bond are more likely to vote No on this tax.



	Yes - strongly	Yes	No	Und	Net
<b>Total</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>+46</b>
Men	41	68	26	6	+42
Women	48	69	20	10	+49
< 50	44	68	21	11	+48
50+	46	69	25	6	+44
Men < 50	39	62	28	9	+34
Women < 50	49	<b>75</b>	12	13	+62
Men 50+	45	<b>75</b>	22	2	+53
Women 50+	47	65	26	9	+39
White	45	71	21	8	+49
POC	46	64	26	10	+39
Non-College	43	66	25	9	+41
College	46	70	22	9	+48
Hills	50	71	20	9	+51
Central/South	42	71	21	8	+50
West	40	62	29	9	+33
Own	46	71	20	9	+50
Rent	44	67	26	7	+42
GO Bond No	20	40	55	5	-16
GO Bond Und	31	53	24	23	+29
Sales Tax No	29	52	45	3	+7
Sales Tax Und	29	51	22	26	+29

Q6: This is a ballot measure that would increase the current tax on sugar-sweetened beverages in the City of Berkeley. If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?: And is that Yes/No strongly or not so strongly?: Well, to which side do you lean?

The public bank measure has the lowest support of the measures tested, aside from the sales tax (note that it was also tested after the previous measures, though before the GO bond and sales tax). It still has majority support at 58% Yes.



Q7: This is a ballot measure that would support a public bank to fund Berkeley's needs through a parcel tax. If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?: And is that Yes/No strongly or not so strongly?: Well, to which side do you lean?

ALL RESPONDENTS

	Yes - strongly	Yes	No	Und	Net
<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>+34</b>
Men	24	55	29	15	+26
Women	28	60	20	20	+40
< 50	29	66	18	15	+48
50+	23	49	29	21	+20
Men < 50	26	57	27	15	+29
Women < 50	34	<b>77</b>	8	15	+68
Men 50+	22	53	31	16	+22
Women 50+	24	47	28	24	+19
White	28	59	24	17	+34
POC	23	56	22	20	+34
Non-College	33	60	22	17	+38
College	24	57	24	18	+33
Hills	30	61	24	15	+36
Central/South	26	60	20	19	+40
West	22	51	27	22	+24
Own	23	52	27	21	+25
Rent	30	<b>65</b>	19	16	+46
GO Bond No	7	17	71	13	-54
GO Bond Und	8	36	22	40	+15
Sales Tax No	15	32	54	14	-22
Sales Tax Und	13	33	17	48	+16



Washington, DC | Berkeley, CA | New York, NY

[LakeResearch.com](http://LakeResearch.com)

202.776.9066

David Mermin

[dmermin@lakeresearch.com](mailto:dmermin@lakeresearch.com)

Emma Scotty

[escotty@lakeresearch.com](mailto:escotty@lakeresearch.com)

## Potential Bond Measure Projects

Item #	Project Name	Description	Estimated Costs
<b>Parks, Recreation and Waterfront Lead Projects   Community Facilities &amp; Quality of Life</b>			
Safe, accessible, resilient parks and facilities; modernized recreation and aquatic spaces; improved play areas, restrooms, and sports infrastructure; expanded park amenities; shoreline protection; sea-level-rise resilience; long-term public access and infrastructure preservation.			
1	Frances Albrier Community Center	<b>Community Recreation Facility Replacement.</b> Replaces the Frances Albrier Community Center, the only major City community facility — recreation, senior, or library — that has not been rebuilt or funded for required seismic upgrades. Located in San Pablo Park, this high-use facility is significantly undersized and requires modernization to better serve community needs. A conceptual plan for a new facility was completed through T1 Phase 1 in 2019.	\$ 36,850,000
2	King Pool (25 Meter) & Locker Room	<b>Aquatic Facility Replacement and Modernization.</b> Replaces concrete decking and piping at King Pool to address aging infrastructure, improve safety and reliability, and extend the useful life of the facility.	\$ 5,000,000
3	Adeline Corridor Open Space	<b>Equity-Focused Open Space Expansion.</b> Funds design and construction of four new or expanded open space areas within the Adeline Corridor Plan area south of Ashby Avenue, expanding park access in an equity-priority area. Federal resources have been secured for the design phase.	\$ 6,000,000
4	Cedar Rose Restroom	<b>High-Use Greenway Restroom Replacement.</b> Replaces the existing block restroom at Cedar Rose Park with a smart restroom and adds a high-volume restroom along the Ohlone Greenway to meet growing public demand.	\$ 570,000
5	Codornices Restroom	<b>High-Use Park Restroom Replacement.</b> Replaces the existing block restroom at Codornices Park with a smart restroom, providing a higher-volume, more secure restroom facility in one of Berkeley's most popular and well-used parks.	\$ 570,000
6	Harrison Park Restroom	<b>Sports Field and Skate Park Restroom Upgrade.</b> Modernizes the 26-year-old restroom serving Harrison Park's high-volume sports fields and skate park to improve accessibility, usability, and public convenience. Conceptual design was funded and completed through T1 Phase 2.	\$ 1,280,000
7	Waterfront Restroom	<b>Waterfront Restroom Replacement.</b> Replaces existing portable toilets on the south side of Spinnaker Way with a permanent smart restroom to better support waterfront visitors and public access.	\$ 790,000
9	Cedar Rose 2-5 Play Structure	<b>Play Area Modernization.</b> Upgrades the heavily used Cedar Rose 2–5 play area to meet current safety and accessibility standards. The 5–12 play structure is being completed with Parks Tax funding in 2027, and this project is fully designed.	\$ 2,650,000
10	Glendale LaLoma Park Improvements: Playgrounds, Parking, Paths	<b>Neighborhood Park Accessibility and Safety Improvements.</b> Improves Glendale La Loma Park with new play structures, parking lot upgrades, and safer, more accessible pathways throughout the multi-level park. The project is currently in conceptual design.	\$ 3,900,000
12	Harrison Field Conversion to Artificial Turf	<b>Sports Field Renovation and Capacity Expansion.</b> Replaces failing natural grass fields at Harrison Park with artificial turf using environmentally friendly cork infill. The project will increase field capacity, reduce maintenance needs, and support expanded year-round recreational use.	\$ 6,600,000
15	Waterfront Park Perimeter Pathway (60% funding)	<b>Waterfront Park Pathway Modernization.</b> Provides 60% of the funding needed for the Waterfront Park perimeter pathway project, which was designed in 2025 using State Coastal Conservancy grant funds. The remaining funding gap is anticipated to be addressed through additional grant funding or Parks Tax resources.	\$ 2,280,000
16	Marina Blvd Sea Level Rise and Bay Trail (50% funding)	<b>Sea-Level-Rise Resilience and Bay Trail Improvement.</b> Raises and renovates the Marina Boulevard pathway to Bay Trail standards, improving waterfront resilience and connecting the pathway from University Avenue to Waterfront Park. This funding would serve as a 50% match for a potential grant to complete the project. Design is currently funded by a State Coastal Conservancy grant.	\$ 1,900,000
17	Marina Docks Timber Pile Replacement	<b>Marina Infrastructure Stabilization.</b> Replaces the remaining timber piles in the Marina with concrete piles, stabilizing all docks and extending their useful life by 50 or more years. Conceptual design and permitting were completed in 2024.	\$ 3,000,000
18	Seawall Drive and Bay Trail from Adventure Playground to Pier (20% funding)	<b>Shoreline and Bay Trail Access Improvements.</b> Provides funding to help complete the Bay Trail connection from Adventure Playground to the Pier and advance Seawall Drive improvements. This funding would serve as a 20% match for a potential grant to complete the project.	\$ 5,250,000
19	South Cove Seawall	<b>Critical Seawall Replacement.</b> Replaces the South Cove seawall to prevent imminent failure that could close public access to South Cove. Conceptual design is currently in progress.	\$ 5,689,000
21	Dwight/ Telegraph Open Space Improvements	<b>Urban Open Space Expansion.</b> Expands and improves the Dwight/Telegraph open space following completion of the Telegraph Multimodal Plan, creating a more usable hardscape public space in a high-traffic urban corridor.	\$ 3,500,000
22	Sacramento Median Conversion to Native Plant Garden (Bancroft to University)	<b>Native Plant Median Conversion.</b> Converts three long blocks of the Sacramento Street median, from Bancroft Way to University Avenue, into a native plant garden. Work includes soil replacement, new irrigation, and installation of native plantings.	\$ 1,300,000
23	University Ave Median Conversion to Native Plant Garden (6th- 9th)	<b>Native Plant Median Conversion.</b> Converts four blocks of the University Avenue median, from 6th Street to 9th Street, into a native plant garden. Work includes soil replacement, new irrigation, and installation of native plantings.	\$ 268,000
25	Monkey Island / Garber Path improvements	<b>Park Access and Pathway Improvements.</b> Improves Monkey Island Park and the Garber Path right-of-way through ADA accessibility upgrades, potential park expansion, new stairs, landscaping, electrical improvements, and pathway enhancements.	\$ 3,300,000
<b>Total: Parks Recreation and Waterfront Projects</b>			<b>\$ 90,697,000</b>

Potential Bond Measure Projects

Item #	Project Name	Description	Estimated Costs
<b>Public Works Lead Projects   Critical Infrastructure &amp; Accessibility</b>			
<b>Life-safety; seismic resilience; ADA accessibility; civic infrastructure; aging public buildings; essential services; long-term liability reduction; facility modernization; functional public spaces; equitable access; community well-being; reliable built environment.</b>			
21	<b>50/50 Sidewalk Program</b> (50 % funding)	<b>Sidewalk Accessibility and Safety Improvements.</b> Addresses the citywide backlog of cracked, uneven, and unsafe sidewalks while advancing ADA accessibility upgrades through the City’s shared-cost 50/50 sidewalk program. Under this program, 50% of eligible project costs are paid by individual property owners.	\$ 14,600,000
22	<b>ADA Barrier Removal Projects</b>	<b>Citywide ADA Accessibility Improvements.</b> Funds the backlog of accessibility improvements identified through the City’s ADA Transition Plan, including path-of-travel upgrades, restroom improvements, signage, and removal of facility access barriers.	\$ 4,530,000
23	<b>Animal Services Facility Modernization</b>	<b>Animal Services Facility Modernization.</b> Replaces or upgrades major building systems, including roofing, HVAC, drainage, electrical, and plumbing, while supporting programmatic improvements to improve operational efficiency and long-term facility performance.	\$ 3,650,000
24	<b>2636 MLK Jr. Ave. Berkeley Mental Health Services Building Annex Renovations (HHCS) (40% funding)</b>	<b>Behavioral Health Facility Replacement.</b> Provides 40% of the estimated \$8.0 million project cost for a new two-story mental health services building that will expand program capacity and fully replace the existing aging structure. The remaining project funding is through an awarded BHCIP State grant.	\$ 3,390,000
25	<b>South Berkeley Senior Center Improvements (HHCS)</b>	<b>Community Center Mechanical System Upgrade.</b> Replaces end-of-life HVAC and related mechanical components to ensure reliable operations at the senior center. This funding will be combined with \$5.5 million in T1 Phase 2 funding for seismic upgrades.	\$ 3,590,000
27b	<b>1947 Center Street- City Office's MLK Jr. Civic Center Elevator Replacement</b>	<b>Civic Office Building Modernization.</b> Replaces existing elevators and associated equipment, including machinery, controls, electrical systems, and related ancillary improvements, to improve reliability, safety, and accessibility.	\$ 8,300,000
28	<b>2180 Milvia Street - City Hall MLK Jr. Civic Center Building Modernization</b>	<b>City Hall Facility Modernization.</b> Replaces end-of-life mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems; addresses hazardous materials; and includes ADA improvements for the 89,000-square-foot civic building.	\$ 11,745,000
29	<b>2100 Martin Luther King Jr . Public Safety Building Modernization</b>	<b>Public Safety Facility Modernization.</b> Updates the 24-hour public safety building through programmatic, structural, and ADA improvements. The project includes renovation of the 911 Dispatch Center to support rising call volumes, modernize critical infrastructure, and create a safer, more efficient workspace. Improvements include expanding the operations floor, upgrading technology and HVAC systems, and adding training and wellness spaces to support operational readiness and staff retention.	\$ 18,430,000
30	<b>Old City Hall- Maudelle Shirek Bldg Preservation &amp; Renovation</b>	<b>Civic Building Seismic Upgrade.</b> Seismic upgrade for the Maudelle Shirek Building to return facility to public use. This project advances the broader Civic Center Vision and Design Concept Plan, which was developed through extensive community outreach beginning in 2019, adopted by Council in 2020 and 2023, and was underwritten by Measure T1 funding. Improvements will support the return of civic functions to the building, including meeting rooms and other community-serving spaces. The total seismic upgrade cost for this project is \$13,942,000. The estimated costs for this project represent a portion of \$5.4 million in matching grant funds shared between two Civic Center buildings; Old City Hall/Maudelle Shirek Bldg and Veterans Memorial Building.	\$ 3,600,000
31	<b>Veterans Memorial Building Preservation &amp; Renovation</b>	<b>Civic Building Seismic Upgrade.</b> Seismic upgrade for the Veterans Memorial Building to return facility to public use. This project advances the broader Civic Center Vision and Design Concept Plan, which was developed through extensive community outreach beginning in 2019, adopted by Council in 2020 and 2023, and was underwritten by Measure T1 funding. Improvements will support the return of civic functions to the building, including performance venues, exhibition, and community-use spaces for Berkeley’s cultural and artistic groups. The total seismic upgrade cost for this project is \$13,942,000. The estimated costs for this project represent a portion of \$5.4 million in matching grant funds shared between two Civic Center buildings; Old City Hall/Maudelle Shirek Bldg and Veterans Memorial Building.	\$ 1,800,000
32	<b>African American Holistic Resource Center</b>	<b>Community Resource Center Facility.</b> Provides funding to close an estimated \$1.5 million gap for the \$14 million T1-funded African American Holistic Resource Center project.	\$ 1,500,000
<b>Total: Public Works Lead Projects</b>			<b>\$ 75,135,000</b>

Potential Bond Measure Projects

Item #	Project Name	Description	Estimated Costs
<b>Fire Department Lead Projects   Public Safety</b>			
Emergency response facilities; public safety; long-term resilience; climate readiness; operational reliability; future-ready infrastructure; sustainable investment; emergency preparedness; essential services; community safety; facility modernization.			
33	<b>Fire Station 4 Replacement (1900 Marin)</b>	<b>Emergency Response Facility Replacement.</b> Station 4 is 66 years old, undersized for current and future operational needs, unable to safely support expanded staffing during high fire-danger days, and does not meet modern health and safety standards. It also cannot accommodate an ambulance, which is needed to support rising emergency medical call volume in this area of the city. Replacing the station would enable a cost-saving expansion into the adjacent roadway and avoid the higher cost of relocation. The project includes photovoltaic solar, battery energy storage systems, and backup power to support the facility’s critical emergency response function.	<b>\$ 56,151,000</b>
34	<b>Fire Station 6 Replacement (999 Cedar)</b>	<b>Emergency Response Facility Replacement.</b> Station 6 is more than 60 years old and too small to meet current and projected service demands. A full replacement is required to support expanded staffing, modern apparatus, and safe working conditions for firefighters. The project includes photovoltaic solar, battery energy storage systems, and backup power to support the facility’s critical emergency response function.	<b>\$ 20,383,000</b>
36	<b>Fire Training Center Replacement (Harrison at 8-9th)</b>	<b>Fire Training Facility Replacement.</b> The current training facility is undersized, located in a residential neighborhood, and unable to support essential training activities, scheduling needs, or parking demand, while creating significant quality-of-life impacts for nearby residents, including noise, odors, and parking challenges. A new, purpose-built training center is required to meet the operational needs of a modern fire department. The project includes photovoltaic solar and battery energy storage systems to support long-term energy resilience and sustainability.	<b>\$ 30,134,000</b>
<b>Total: Fire Department Projects</b>			<b>\$ 106,668,000</b>
<b>TOTAL BOND SALES</b>			<b>\$ 300,000,000</b>
<b>TOTAL BOND INTEREST</b>			<b>\$ 13,000,000</b>
<b>TOTAL REVENUE</b>			<b>\$ 313,000,000</b>
<b>TOTAL PROJECT COSTS</b>			<b>\$272,500,000</b>
<b>Project Manager Costs ( Salary, Workstations, Software, Auditing, supplies, etc.) over 12 years</b>			<b>\$ 40,500,000</b>
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>			<b>\$ 313,000,000</b>

Infrastructure + Evaluation Framework											
This framework combines the City's six-factor infrastructure rubric with the PRW Commission Bond selection concepts. Use Low / Medium / High ratings (1 / 2 / 3). Weighted score = (Rating + 3) × Weight.											
Criterion Code	Short Name	Weight	Primary intent	Evaluation question	What it captures	What it does not capture / guardrail	Illustrative indicators / evidence	Low (1)	Medium (2)	High (3)	Scoring note
HLS	Health, Life & Safety	20	Immediate risk reduction	Does the project materially reduce risk of physical harm or protect public well-being?	Life-safety hazards, emergency response, severe sanitation issues, major public health exposure, critical operational safety.	Do not inflate score solely because a project is useful, popular, or generally in poor condition. The question is severity and immediacy of risk to people.	Seismic deficiencies; structural failure risk; unsafe access; fire/life-safety issues; emergency operations dependency; sanitation gaps.	Minimal, indirect, or unclear safety / health impact.	Moderate or preventative safety / health benefit; risk exists but is not acute.	Directly addresses a significant safety hazard, urgent health issue, or critical operational risk.	Strongest criterion for fire, dispatch, seismic life-safety, hazardous conditions, and basic sanitation projects.
IAR	Infrastructure Condition, Accessibility & Resilience	20	Long-term infrastructure resilience, reduced liability, long-term costs, and economic resilience	Will the investment improve asset condition, accessibility, durability, or lifecycle performance and reduce liability and long-term costs? Does this project provide economic resilience?	Deferred maintenance, ADA access, system replacement, durability, long-term serviceability, resilience to operational and physical stressors; ability to generate revenue.	Do not use this criterion to score popularity or immediate health risk; that belongs in CUE or HLS. Climate-specific benefit may overlap but should only drive CRS when it is a major differentiator.	Asset age; failure trajectory; maintenance backlog; ADA barriers; useful life extension; replacement of obsolete systems; ability to generate revenue.	Limited lifecycle benefit; short-term fix; little improvement to condition or access.	Moderate repair / modernization that improves performance or access.	Major replacement or system upgrade that substantially extends useful life or addresses serious condition / ADA deficiencies.	Best used to capture the difference between reactive patching and durable capital improvement.
CUE	Community Use & Equity	20	Public benefit and access	Does the project deliver meaningful public use and equitable community benefit?	Usage intensity, community access, service to underserved or historically underinvested populations, inclusion benefits.	Do not rely on volume of users alone. A high-use project in a well-served area may still score Medium if equity benefit is weak.	High attendance/use; equity-priority geography; underserved population served; gap in access to recreation, services, or public space.	Limited or unclear community benefit; weak equity case.	General public benefit with some equity considerations, or strong use but less targeted equity value.	Clear and meaningful benefit to underserved / high need communities and/or major improvement to equitable access.	Where use and equity diverge, scorer should explain tradeoff in notes.
GRS	Green Resiliency & Sustainability	20	Direct climate benefit	Does the project materially reduce climate risk or produce meaningful sustainability gains above standard modernization?	Sea level rise adaptation, heat mitigation, electrification with measurable operational change, stormwater capture, decarbonization, climate hazard reduction, resilient backup power and critical service continuity.	Important guardrail: because sustainability features are likely woven into many projects, do not score High merely because a project will be modern, more efficient, or code compliant. High requires direct and material climate benefit.	Sea level rise adaptation; shoreline protection; tree canopy/heat island reduction; building electrification replacing fossil systems; stormwater green infrastructure; emissions reduction; improving preparedness/response capacity.	No meaningful climate benefit beyond ordinary modernization, or benefit is indirect / minimal.	Some sustainability or resilience benefit is likely, but secondary, partial, or not yet well documented.	Climate adaptation / decarbonization is a clear and material project outcome or core rationale.	Use the Climate Additionality Check on the scoring sheet to document whether climate value is direct vs baseline.
DR	Deliverability & Readiness	10	Implementation feasibility	Can the City move this project forward in a realistic timeframe?	Defined scope, design progress, permitting/environmental status, land control, matching funds, organizational capacity, stakeholder alignment.	Do not score based on desirability. A worthy project can still be low-readiness if key prerequisites are missing.	Existing design; conceptual plan; environmental review; permitting; site control; matching funds identified; project phase notes.	Early stage; major unknowns; unclear scope or approvals; unlikely to advance soon.	Partially developed; feasible but needs more coordination, approvals, or design.	Scope defined and major prerequisites substantially in place; near-term implementation feasible.	Useful for distinguishing shovel-near projects from aspirational projects.
EFP	External Funding Potential	10	Leverage of City dollars	Can the project attract grants, match funds, partnerships, or other outside resources?	Grant competitiveness, match-readiness, identified external funding source, partnership leverage.	Do not confuse "City has no other way to pay" with leverage. Lack of alternatives may be important context, but high EFP requires a realistic outside funding path.	Grant eligibility; identified program; local match requirement; pending State/Federal funds; partnership commitment.	Limited or no realistic external funding pathway.	Possible eligibility or moderate leverage potential, but uncertain or not yet developed.	Strongly positioned to unlock outside dollars or meet a specific matching opportunity.	Score based on realistic competitiveness, not hypothetical future grant hunting.

Rating Label	Meaning	Numeric Value (NV)	Weighted score formula	Priority bands
Low	Limited / weak / early / indirect	1	NV/3*Weight	Lower Priority: Below 50
Medium	Moderate / mixed / partial	2	NV/3*Weight	Medium Priority: 50-74
High	Strong / direct / material / well-supported	3	NV/3*Weight	High Priority: 75-100

Potential Infrastructure Project List | Scoring

Item #	District	Dept. Lead	Project Name	Description	Est. Cost (Prior)	Updated Costs	Staff Recommendation	Health, Life & Safety Rating	HLS Score	Inf. Condition, Accessibility & Resilience Rating	IAR Score	Community Use & Equity Rating	CUE Score	Climate / Sustainability Rating	CRS Score	Deliverability & Readiness Rating	DR Score	External Funding Potential Rating	EFP Score	Total Score	Priority Band
1	D2	PRW	Frances Albrier Community Center	<b>Community Recreation Facility Replacement.</b> Replaces the Frances Albrier Community Center, the only major City community facility — recreation, senior, or library — that has not been rebuilt or funded for required seismic upgrades. Located in San Pablo Park, this high-use facility is significantly undersized and requires modernization to better serve community needs. A conceptual plan for a new facility was completed through T1 Phase 1 in 2019.	\$ 30,000,000	\$33,500,000	\$ 33,500,000	3	20	3	20	3	20	1.3	8.6666667	2	6.666667	1	3.333333	78.66666667	High Priority
2	D5	PRW	King Pool (25 Meter) & Locker Room	<b>Full Replacement/Modernization.</b> Replaces existing locker rooms and builds new 25 Meter pool to replace existing 25 yard and dive pools. 25 Meter pool will double programmatic use of existing facility.	\$ 25,000,000	\$25,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	2	13.33333333	2.5	16.66667	2.5	16.66667	1	6.666667	2	6.666667	1	3.333333	63.33333333	Medium Priority
3	D3	PRW	Adeline Corridor Open Space	<b>Equity-Focused Open Space Expansion.</b> Funds design and construction of four new or expanded open space areas within the Adeline Corridor Plan area south of Ashby Avenue, expanding park access in an equity-priority area. Federal resources have been secured for the design phase.	\$ 6,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$ 6,000,000	1	6.66666667	2	13.33333	3	20	2.3	15.333333	2	6.666667	3	10	72	Medium Priority
4	D1	PRW	Cedar Rose Restroom	<b>High-Use Greenway Restroom Replacement.</b> Replaces the existing block restroom at Cedar Rose Park with a smart restroom and adds a high-volume restroom along the Ohlone Greenway to meet growing public demand.	\$ 500,000	500,000	\$ 500,000	2.5	16.66666667	2	13.33333	2.5	16.66667	1	6.666667	2	6.666667	0	0	60	Medium Priority
5	D6	PRW	Codornices Restroom	<b>High-Use Park Restroom Replacement.</b> Replaces the existing block restroom at Codornices Park with a smart restroom, providing a higher-volume, more secure restroom facility in one of Berkeley's most popular and well-used parks.	\$ 500,000	500,000	\$ 500,000	2	13.33333333	2	13.33333	2.5	16.66667	1	6.666667	2	6.666667	0	0	56.66666667	Medium Priority
6	D1	PRW	Harrison Park Restroom	<b>Sports Field and Skate Park Restroom Upgrade.</b> Modernizes the 26-year-old restroom serving Harrison Park's high-volume sports fields and skate park to improve accessibility, usability, and public convenience. Conceptual design was funded and completed through T1 Phase 2.	\$ 750,000	\$1,250,000	\$ 1,250,000	2	13.33333333	2.5	16.66667	3	20	1	6.666667	3	10	0	0	66.66666667	Medium Priority
7	D1	PRW	Waterfront Restroom	<b>Waterfront Restroom Replacement.</b> Replaces existing portable toilets on the south side of Spinnaker Way with a permanent smart restroom to better support waterfront visitors and public access.	\$ 750,000	\$750,000	\$ 750,000	2	13.33333333	2	13.33333	3	20	1	6.666667	2	6.666667	0	0	60	Medium Priority
8	D2	PRW	Aquatic Park: Dreamland Area (20% funding)	<b>Plan Implementation.</b> Advances the community-vetted Dreamland Area Plan completed in 2025 to support increased recreation and waterfront activation. This funding will augment other sources or serve as a grant match to complete funding of \$8M plan.	\$ 2,100,000	\$2,100,000	\$ -	1	6.66666667	2	13.33333	2.5	16.66667	2.5	16.66667	2.5	8.333333	3	10	71.66666667	Medium Priority
9	D1	PRW	Cedar Rose 2-5 Play Structure	<b>Play Area Modernization.</b> Upgrades the heavily used Cedar Rose 2-5 play area to meet current safety and accessibility standards. The 5-12 play structure is being completed with Parks Tax funding in 2027, and this project is fully designed.	\$ 2,500,000	\$2,500,000	\$ 2,500,000	2.5	16.66666667	2	13.33333	2.5	16.66667	1	6.666667	3	10	0	0	63.33333333	Medium Priority
10	D6	PRW	Glendale LaLoma Park Improvements: Playgrounds, Parking, Paths	<b>Neighborhood Park Accessibility and Safety Improvements.</b> Improves Glendale La Loma Park with new play structures, parking lot upgrades, and safer, more accessible pathways throughout the multi-level park. The project is currently in conceptual design.	\$ 3,500,000	\$3,700,000	\$ 3,700,000	3	20	3	20	2.5	16.66667	2	13.333333	3	10	1	3.333333	83.33333333	High Priority
11	Various	PRW	Dog Parks- City Wide	<b>New Facilities.</b> Adds 4-6 dog parks across Berkeley to address significant community demand. Community input will help determine potential locations.	\$ 2,500,000	\$2,500,000	\$ -	1.5	10	1	6.666667	1.5	10	1.5	10	3	10	0	0	46.66666667	Lower Priority
12	D2	PRW	Harrison Field Conversion to Artificial Turf	<b>Sports Field Renovation and Capacity Expansion.</b> Replaces failing natural grass fields at Harrison Park with artificial turf using environmentally friendly cork infill. The project will increase field capacity, reduce maintenance needs, and support expanded year-round recreational use.	\$ 6,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$ 6,000,000	1	6.66666667	3	20	3	20	2	13.333333	2	6.666667	0.5	1.666667	68.33333333	Medium Priority
13	D5	PRW	Live Oak Soccer, Basketball Courts and Lighting	<b>Facility Modernization.</b> Converts existing grass turf area to artificial turf with environmentally friendly cork "in-fill", levels basketball and volleyball courts, improves lighting, and makes area more usable year round.	\$ 3,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$ -	1.5	10	2.5	16.66667	1.5	10	1.5	10	1.5	5	2	6.666667	58.33333333	Medium Priority
14	D2	PRW	San Pablo Sports Field Irrigation and Drainage	<b>System Replacement.</b> Fixes failing irrigation and drainage at the City's most used sports fields.	\$ 1,600,000	\$1,600,000	\$ -	2	13.33333333	3	20	3	20	3	20	1.5	5	2.5	8.333333	86.66666667	High Priority
15	D1	PRW	Waterfront Perimeter Pathway	<b>Waterfront Park Pathway Modernization.</b> Provides 60% of the funding needed for the Waterfront Park perimeter pathway project, which was designed in 2025 using State Coastal Conservancy grant funds. The remaining funding gap is anticipated to be addressed through additional grant funding or Parks Tax resources.	\$ 2,250,000	\$2,250,000	\$ 2,250,000	3	20	3	20	3	20	1.5	10	3	10	3	10	90	High Priority
16	D2	PRW	Marina Blvd Sea Level Rise and Bay Trail	<b>Sea-Level-Rise Resilience and Bay Trail Improvement.</b> Raises and renovates the Marina Boulevard pathway to Bay Trail standards, improving waterfront resilience and connecting the pathway from University Avenue to Waterfront Park. This funding would serve as a 50% match for a potential grant to complete the project. Design is currently funded by a State Coastal Conservancy grant.	\$ 1,900,000	\$1,900,000	\$ 1,900,000	3	20	3	20	3	20	3	20	2	6.666667	3	10	96.66666667	High Priority
17	D2	PRW	Marina Docks Timber Pile Replacement - 130 piles	<b>Marina Infrastructure Stabilization.</b> Replaces the remaining timber piles in the Marina with concrete piles, stabilizing all docks and extending their useful life by 50 or more years. Conceptual design and permitting were completed in 2024.	\$ 6,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$ 3,000,000	2.5	16.66666667	3	20	1	6.666667	2	13.333333	3	10	0	0	66.66666667	Medium Priority

Item #	District	Dept. Lead	Project Name	Description	Est. Cost (Prior)	Updated Costs	Staff Recommendation	Health, Life & Safety Rating	HLS Score	Inf. Condition, Accessibility & Resilience Rating	IAR Score	Community Use & Equity Rating	CUE Score	Climate / Sustainability Rating	CRS Score	Deliverability & Readiness Rating	DR Score	External Funding Potential Rating	FFP Score	Total Score	Priority Band
18	D2	PRW	Seawall Drive and Bay Trail from Adventure Playground to Pier	<b>Shoreline and Bay Trail Access Improvements.</b> Provides funding to help complete the Bay Trail connection from Adventure Playground to the Pier and advance Seawall Drive improvements. This funding would serve as a 20% match for a potential grant to complete the project.	\$ 5,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	3	20	3	20	3	20	3	20	2	6.666667	3	10	96.6666667	High Priority
19	D2	PRW	South Cove Seawall	<b>Critical Seawall Replacement.</b> Replaces the South Cove seawall to prevent imminent failure that could close public access to South Cove. Conceptual design is currently in progress.	\$ 5,000,000	\$5,300,000	\$ 5,300,000	3	20	3	20	2	13.333333	3	20	2.5	8.333333	0	0	81.6666667	High Priority
20	D2	PRW	University Ave Sea Level Rise and Bike Park	<b>Shoreline Improvements.</b> Addresses Sea level Rise vulnerabilities from Frontage Road to Marina Blvd and constructs a Bike Park adjacent to University Ave in Marina. Funding will be used as a \$50% match for a potential grant	\$ 2,750,000	\$2,750,000	\$ -	2.5	16.6666667	2.5	16.66667	1	6.666667	2	13.333333	2	6.666667	2.5	8.333333	68.3333333	Medium Priority
21	D7	PRW	Dwight/ Telegraph Open Space Improvements	<b>Urban Open Space Expansion.</b> Expands and improves the Dwight/Telegraph open space following completion of the Telegraph Multimodal Plan, creating a more usable hardscape public space in a high-traffic urban corridor.		\$3,500,000	\$ 3,500,000	2.5	16.6666667	2	13.33333	2	13.333333	1.5	10	2	6.666667	2	6.666667	66.6666667	Medium Priority
22	D2	PRW	Sacramento Median Conversion to Native Plant Garden (Bancroft to University)	<b>Native Plant Median Conversion.</b> Converts three long blocks of the Sacramento Street median, from Bancroft Way to University Avenue, into a native plant garden. Work includes soil replacement, new irrigation, and installation of native plantings.		\$1,300,000	\$ 1,300,000	1	6.6666667	3	20	2	13.333333	3	20	1	3.333333	1	3.333333	66.6666667	Medium Priority
23	D1/D2	PRW	University Ave Median Conversion to Native Plant Garden (6th- 9th)	<b>Native Plant Median Conversion.</b> Converts four blocks of the University Avenue median, from 6th Street to 9th Street, into a native plant garden. Work includes soil replacement, new irrigation, and installation of native plantings.		\$260,000	\$ 260,000	0.5	3.33333333	3	20	2	13.333333	3	20	1	3.333333	1	3.333333	63.3333333	Medium Priority
24	D7	PRW	Piedmont Avenue Conversion to Native Plant Garden (dwight to Channing)	<b>Native Plant Conversion.</b> Converts three blocks into Native plant garden. Cost includes replacing soil, installing new irrigation and new plants.		\$500,000	\$ -	0.5	3.33333333	3	20	0	0	3	20	1	3.333333	1	3.333333	50	Medium Priority
25	D8	PRW	Monkey Island / Garber Path improvements	<b>Park Access and Pathway Improvements.</b> Improves Monkey Island Park and the Garber Path right-of-way through ADA accessibility upgrades, potential park expansion, new stairs, landscaping, electrical improvements, and pathway enhancements.		\$3,300,000	\$ 3,300,000	0.5	3.33333333	3	20	1.5	10	2	13.333333	1	3.333333	1	3.333333	53.3333333	Medium Priority
21	Various	PW	50/50 Sidewalk Program (50 % funding)	<b>Sidewalk Accessibility and Safety Improvements.</b> Addresses the citywide backlog of cracked, uneven, and unsafe sidewalks while advancing ADA accessibility upgrades through the City's shared-cost 50/50 sidewalk program. Under this program, 50% of eligible project costs are paid by individual property owners	\$ 14,000,000	\$14,600,000	\$ 14,600,000	0.5	3.33333333	3	20	3	20	2.5	16.666667	2	6.666667	1	3.333333	70	Medium Priority
22	Various	PW	ADA Barrier Removal Projects	<b>Citywide ADA Accessibility Improvements.</b> Funds the backlog of accessibility improvements identified through the City's ADA Transition Plan, including path-of-travel upgrades, restroom improvements, signage, and removal of facility access barriers	\$ 4,342,000	\$4,530,000	\$ 4,530,000	1	6.6666667	3	20	3	20	2.5	16.666667	1	3.333333	1	3.333333	70	Medium Priority
23	D2	PW	Animal Services Facility Modernization	<b>Animal Services Facility Modernization.</b> Replaces or upgrades major building systems, including roofing, HVAC, drainage, electrical, and plumbing, while supporting programmatic improvements to improve operational efficiency and long-term facility performance.	\$ 1,996,000	\$3,650,000	\$ 3,650,000	3	20	3	20	3	20	1	6.666667	2	6.666667	1	3.333333	76.6666667	High Priority
24	D3	PW	2636 Martin Luther King Jr. Avenue Berkeley Mental Health Services Building Annex Renovations (HHCS) (40% funding)	<b>Behavioral Health Facility Replacement.</b> Provides 40% of the estimated \$8.0 million project cost for a new two-story mental health services building that will expand program capacity and fully replace the existing aging structure. The remaining project funding is through an awarded BHCIP State grant.	\$ 3,250,000	\$3,390,000	\$ 3,390,000	3	20	3	20	3	20	1	6.666667	3	10	3	10	86.6666667	High Priority
25	D3	PW	South Berkeley Senior Center Improvements (HHCS)	<b>Community Center Mechanical System Upgrade.</b> Replaces end-of-life HVAC and related mechanical components to ensure reliable operations at the senior center. This funding will be combined with \$5.5 million in T1 Phase 2 funding for seismic upgrades.	\$ 3,900,000	\$3,590,000	\$ 3,590,000	1	6.6666667	3	20	3	20	2	13.333333	3	10	2	6.666667	76.6666667	High Priority
26	D1	PW	West Berkeley Family Wellness Center Modernization (HHCS)	<b>Facility Modernization.</b> Repairs and upgrades windows, flooring, HVAC, seismic components, electrical systems, and ADA features to address deferred maintenance.	\$ 6,500,000	\$15,120,000	\$ -	2	13.3333333	3	20	3	20	1	6.666667	1	3.333333	1	3.333333	66.6666667	Medium Priority
27	D4	PW	1947 Center Street- City Office's MLK Jr. Civic Center Elevator Replacement	<b>Facility Modernization.</b> Addresses seismic upgrades, HVAC, electrical, elevator replacement, hazardous materials abatement, and ADA improvements. Funding for window replacement is identified in T1 Phase 2.	\$ 18,306,000	\$24,660,000	\$ -	3	20	3	20	3	20	1	6.666667	1	3.333333	2	6.666667	76.6666667	High Priority
27b	D4	PW	1947 Center Street- City Office's MLK Jr. Civic Center Elevator Replacement	<b>Civic Office Building Modernization.</b> Replaces existing elevators and associated equipment, including machinery, controls, electrical systems, and related ancillary improvements, to improve reliability, safety, and accessibility.	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,300,000	3	20	3	20	3	20	1	6.666667	1	3.333333	1	3.333333	73.3333333	Medium Priority
28	D4	PW	2180 Milvia Street - City Hall MLK Jr. Civic Center Building Modernization	<b>City Hall Facility Modernization.</b> Replaces end-of-life mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems; addresses hazardous materials; and includes waterproofing and ADA improvements for the 89,000-square-foot civic building.	\$ 11,745,000	\$27,000,000	\$ 11,745,000	3	20	3	20	3	20	1	6.666667	1	3.333333	1	3.333333	73.3333333	Medium Priority
29	D4	PW	2100 Martin Luther King Jr Avenue Public Safety Building Modernization	<b>Public Safety Facility Modernization.</b> Updates the 24-hour public safety building through programmatic, structural, and ADA improvements. The project includes renovation of the 911 Dispatch Center to support rising call volumes, modernize critical infrastructure, and create a safer, more efficient workspace. Improvements include expanding the operations floor, upgrading technology and HVAC systems, and adding training and wellness spaces to support operational readiness and staff retention.	\$ 8,405,000	\$18,430,000	\$ 18,430,000	3	20	2	13.33333	2	13.333333	1	6.666667	1	3.333333	1	3.333333	60	Medium Priority

Item #	District	Dept. Lead	Project Name	Description	Est. Cost (Prior)	Updated Costs	Staff Recommendation	Health, Life & Safety Rating	HLS Score	Inf. Condition, Accessibility & Resilience Rating	IAR Score	Community Use & Equity Rating	CUE Score	Climate / Sustainability Rating	CRS Score	Deliverability & Readiness Rating	DR Score	External Funding Potential Rating	EFP Score	Total Score	Priority Band
30	D4	PW	Old City Hall- Maudelle Shirek Bldg Preservation & Renovation	<b>Historic Civic Building Seismic Upgrade.</b> Seismic upgrade for the Maudelle Shirek Building, part of the larger Civic Center Vision and Design Concept Plan, which was developed through extensive community outreach beginning in 2019 and partially advanced through Measure T1 funding. This project also includes a portion of approximately \$5.4 million in matching grant funds shared across the two Civic Center seismic projects. Improvements will support the return of civic functions to the building, including meeting rooms and other community-serving spaces. The total seismic upgrade cost for this project is \$13,942,000.	\$ 13,942,000	\$38,570,000	\$ 13,942,000	2	13.33333333	3	20	3	20	1	6.6666667	0.5	1.666667	2	6.666667	68.33333333	Medium Priority
31	D4	PW	Veterans Memorial Building Preservation & Renovation	<b>Historic Civic Building Seismic Upgrade.</b> Seismic upgrade for the Veterans Memorial Building, part of the larger Civic Center Vision and Design Concept Plan, which was developed through extensive community outreach beginning in 2019 and partially advanced through Measure T1 funding. This project also includes a portion of approximately \$5.4 million in matching grant funds shared across the two Civic Center seismic projects. Improvements will support assembly, exhibition, and community-use spaces for Berkeley's cultural and artistic groups and the public. The total seismic upgrade cost for this project is \$6,720,000.	\$ 6,720,000	\$28,150,000	\$ 6,720,000	2	13.33333333	3	20	3	20	1	6.6666667	0.5	1.666667	2	6.666667	68.33333333	Medium Priority
32	D3	PW	African American Holistic Resource Center	<b>Community Resource Center Facility.</b> Provides funding to close an estimated \$1.5 million gap for the \$14 million T1-funded African American Holistic Resource Center project.		\$1,500,000	\$ 1,500,000	2	13.33333333	3	20	3	20	3	20	3	10	3	10	93.33333333	High Priority
33	D5	FIRE	Fire Station 4 Replacement (1900 Marin)	<b>Emergency Response Facility Replacement.</b> Station 4 is 66 years old, undersized for current and future operational needs, and unable to safely support expanded staffing and a second ambulance unit. Replacement would also enable a cost-saving expansion into the adjacent roadway, avoiding the higher cost of relocation. The project includes photovoltaic solar and battery energy storage systems, with full backup power recommended due to the facility's critical emergency response function.	\$ 48,051,000	\$56,150,050	\$ 56,150,050	3	20	3	20	3	20	1.5	10	2	6.666667	0	0	76.66666667	High Priority
34	D1	FIRE	Fire Station 6 Replacement (999 Cedar)	<b>Emergency Response Facility Replacement.</b> Station 6 is at the end of its useful life and too small to meet projected service demands. A full replacement is required to support expanded staffing, modern apparatus, and safe working conditions for firefighters. The project includes photovoltaic solar and battery energy storage systems, with full backup power recommended due to the facility's critical emergency response function.	\$ 22,246,000	\$ 20,382,552	\$ 20,382,552	3	20	3	20	3	20	1.5	10	2	6.666667	0	0	76.66666667	High Priority
35	D4	FIRE	Fire/EMS/Police Dispatch Center Remodel (2100 MLK)	<b>Facility Modernization.</b> The 911 Dispatch Center requires renovation to handle rising call volumes, modernize critical infrastructure, and create a safer, and more efficient workspace. Improvements include expanding the operations floor, upgrading technology and HVAC systems, and adding training and wellness spaces to support operational readiness and staff retention.	\$ 3,979,000		\$ -	3	20	3	20	3	20	1.5	10	1.5	5	0	0	75	High Priority
36	D1	FIRE	Fire Training Center Replacement (Harrison at 8-9th)	<b>Fire Training Facility Replacement.</b> The current training facility is undersized, located in a residential neighborhood, and unable to support essential training activities, scheduling needs, or parking demands. A new, purpose-built training center is required to meet the operational needs of a modern fire department. The project includes photovoltaic solar and battery energy storage systems, with full backup power recommended due to the facility's critical public safety function.	\$ 28,000,000	\$ 30,133,247	\$ 30,133,247	3	20	3	20	2.5	16.666667	1.5	10	1.5	5	1	3.333333	75	High Priority



Office of the City Manager

ACTION CALENDAR

December 2, 2025

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

From: Paul Buddenhagen, City Manager

Submitted by: David White, Deputy City Manager  
Terrance Davis, Director of Public Works  
Scott Ferris, Director of Parks, Recreation, and Waterfront  
Henry Oyekanmi, Finance Director  
David Sprague, Fire Chief

Subject: Discussion Regarding Potential Ballot Measures for the November 3, 2026, General Municipal Election

RECOMMENDATION

Review staff recommendations, provide input and direction on project priorities, and discuss which infrastructure projects should be reflected in a community survey for potential inclusion in a bond measure.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to discuss services and/or capital infrastructure needs that the City Council may wish to consider funding through a revenue measure – or measures – on the November 2026 ballot.

On June 17, 2025, the City Council referred to the City Manager an item to assess the potential for a 2026 ballot measure to support capital improvements to fire department facilities<sup>1</sup>. Subsequent to that, on September 30, 2025, the City Council referred to the City Manager an item to assess the potential for a 2026 ballot measure to support the improvement of recreation and community facilities<sup>2</sup>. This report also builds on the work of Vision 2050, an initiative that resulted from the passage of Measure R in 2018. Measure R advised the Mayor to engage a panel of citizen experts to identify and guide implementation of a plan to bring climate smart, technologically advanced, integrated and efficient infrastructure to support a safe, vibrant and resilient future for Berkeley. The City Council accepted the Vision 2050 report<sup>3</sup> in 2020 and in 2025, the Mayor convened a Task Force of subject matter experts to review and update recommendations in the 2020 report. The City Council's discussion at this meeting will inform the development of a community survey to aid decision making in placing an item or items on the 2026 ballot.

<sup>1</sup> <https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/2025-06-17%20Item%2028%20Fire%20Facility%20Revenue%20Measures.pdf>.

<sup>2</sup> <https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/2025-09-30%20Item%2011%20Recreation%20and%20Community%20Facility%20Improvement%20Measures.pdf>.

<sup>3</sup> <https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/Vision-2050-Framework.pdf>.

Given the City's significant unfunded infrastructure and deferred maintenance needs that must be addressed over the coming decades and the lack of resources to invest in its infrastructure, staff recommend that the City Council provide direction to gauge voter interest for a General Obligation (GO) bond on the November 2026 ballot that could generate up to \$300 million. This work session provides the City Council an opportunity to review staff recommendations, provide input and direction on project priorities, and discuss which infrastructure projects should be reflected in a community survey for potential inclusion in a bond measure. The survey would be designed to gauge voter interest in a variety of infrastructure projects and varying levels of funding support. The City Council may also wish to provide staff with feedback on additional measures planned for the 2026 ballot that should be part of a community survey.

### CURRENT SITUATION AND ITS EFFECTS

#### **Ballot Measure Development**

In order to prepare for a possible community survey, the City Manager's Office is in the process of soliciting proposals from firms that are interested and qualified in performing a community survey for the City of Berkeley.

Should the City Council choose to move forward, the next steps in the community survey process are as follows:

- The survey would take place in winter / early spring of 2026 and at least 500 Berkeley voters would be surveyed.
- Staff and the vendor would present the results of the survey(s) to the City Council.
- Based on those results, the City Council would be able to discuss whether to narrow the focus of any measure(s) and could direct staff to develop specific measures for the community's consideration. A second survey would then be conducted to assess the more focused approach.
- Following a second survey, the City Council would decide upon a specific ballot measure or measures, if any, and direct the City Manager and City Attorney to develop ballot measure language for City Council consideration in June and July.

#### **Ballot Measure Considerations**

As part of this discussion, staff has provided a comparison of the City's property-based taxes and assessments with other neighboring jurisdictions, and information about other likely items on the November 2026 ballot.

**Property Tax Bill Comparison:** When comparing the property tax bills between Berkeley, Oakland, and Albany, the primary differences relate to taxes based on the General Obligation (GO) Bond debt and the jurisdiction's special taxes, assessments and fees.

GO Bond debt is voter-approved and can be issued by the City or a school district. Special taxes can be used to meet a broad variety of needs and can be based on different formulas. Berkeley's special taxes are generally based on a tax rate multiplied by the building square footage, while Oakland and Albany's special taxes are usually a flat amount per parcel with

some land-use variations. The table below illustrates tax differences between Berkeley, Oakland and Albany by comparing a single-family residence with an assessed value of \$550,000<sup>4</sup>, a \$7,000 homeowner’s exemption and 1,900 square feet.

**Summary of FY 2026 Property-Based Taxes and Assessments Comparison\***

AGENCY	Berkeley FY2026		Oakland FY2026		Albany FY2026	
	Rate	Amount	Rate	Amount	Rate	Amount
COUNTYWIDE AD VALOREM TAX	1.00%	\$ 5,500	1.00%	\$ 5,500	1.00%	\$ 5,500
Voter-Approved Ad Valorem Debt Service						
Voter-Approved Ad Valorem Debt Service (Combined)	0.2323%	\$ 1,279	0.2779%	\$ 1,529	0.3571%	\$ 1,965
<b>TOTAL ALL AD VALOREM TAXES</b>	<b>1.2323%</b>	<b>\$ 6,779</b>	<b>1.2779%</b>	<b>\$ 7,029</b>	<b>1.3571%</b>	<b>\$ 7,465</b>
Total City Special Taxes	\$1.05974	\$ 2,013	Flat	\$ 1,397	Flat	\$ 491
Total City Special Assessments		\$ 128	Flat	\$ 16	Flat	\$ 985
Total County Assessments/Charges		\$ 500	Flat	\$ 488	Flat	\$ 476
Total Unified School District Special Taxes	\$0.79159	\$ 1,504	Flat	\$ 435	Flat	\$ 591
<b>TOTAL CURRENT ANNUAL TAXES</b>		<b>\$ 10,924</b>		<b>\$ 9,365</b>		<b>\$ 10,008</b>

\*For the full table, see Attachment 1.

**Funding Mechanism**



A General Obligation (GO) Bond is a form of long-term borrowing to finance capital improvements to real property such as buildings, roads and school facilities. Under a GO Bond structure, all tax requirements are shared proportionally based on taxable assessed value.

Key features of a GO Bond are:

- May be used only for capital improvements, not for ongoing operational costs;
- Requires two-thirds voter approval to pass;
- The principal and interest are paid with the proceeds of tax levies made upon taxable property;
- Bonds are repaid by taxpayers based on their property’s assessed value; and
- Bonds are generally repaid over 30 years.


Berkeley voters have passed several bonds, and the charts below show historical and projected tax rates from all the bonds issued by the City dating back to 1993.

<sup>4</sup> Represents the median assessed value in the City of Berkeley.



The City has maintained the annual tax levy at levels below the initial estimates for each GO Bond authorization (since 1993). As shown in the graphs above, the current remaining bond debt service is projected to require an average tax of \$31/year (per \$100,000 in assessed value) over the next 30 years.

As depicted in the figure below, when combined with existing authorizations, a new GO Bond authorization for \$300 million, assuming \$100 million is issued every five years, is estimated to require an average tax rate over 40 years of 0.0441% or \$44 (per \$100,000 in assessed value).



Should the City Council place a \$300 million GO Bond on the 2026 ballot, the figure above indicates that the resulting projected average tax rate (assuming \$100 million is issued every five years commencing in 2027) when combined with existing authorizations (2027-2067) is less than the historical average tax rate from existing authorizations until they are anticipated to be paid off (1993-2056). Also notable is that the combined average tax rate for the new \$300 million GO bond plus existing authorizations is less than the tax rate in the late 1990's and early 2000's.

**2026 Ballot Measure Schedule**

To meet deadlines set by the Alameda County Registrar of Voters to place items on the November 3, 2026, ballot, the following timeline has been developed for the City Council's consideration.

December 2, 2025	City Council to discuss possible revenue measures and questions to be included
January 2026	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Launch community engagement</li> <li>• If necessary, City Council provides additional direction on proposed ballot measure(s) and options for funding mechanisms (January 27, 2026)</li> </ul>
February 2026	First survey development, including meetings with staff, survey to field
March 24, 2026	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presentation and Discussion of first Community Survey Results</li> <li>• City Council refines which issues deserve additional testing with more focused language.</li> </ul>
April 2026	Possible second survey
May 19, 2026	Presentation and Discussion of Second Community Survey Results and Direction About Next Steps
June 2026	Draft Ballot Language to City Council (from May 2026 direction)
July 2026	Revised Draft Ballot Language to City Council
July 28, 2026	Last City Council meeting before recess; Adopt Final Ballot Language and Resolutions placing measures on the ballot
August 7, 2026	Last Day to Place a Measure on the 2026 Ballot

Attachment 2 provides a more detailed calendar for the November 2026 election.

**BACKGROUND**

The City maintains an extensive portfolio of capital assets and infrastructure that contribute to the City's vibrancy and enhance the community's quality of life, including 215 miles of streets, 300 miles of sidewalks, 50 miles of paths and bicycle infrastructure; 50 acres of Marina harbor, 52 parks with play areas and public restrooms, four (4) community centers, three (3) resident camps and two (2) pools. Maintaining these assets is costly and requires significant resources and constant attention. Current resource allocations are inadequate to meet existing City infrastructure needs, let alone modernizing these assets. This leaves the community vulnerable to unplanned failure, a reduction in access to infrastructure and service interruptions. For community members, residents, workers, and businesses trying to go about their daily lives, this can translate to unsafe conditions, unexpected costs, and inequity between neighborhoods.

Over the years, voters have approved the following items to address community needs and priorities. The following is a partial list of items that have been approved:

- 2008: \$27 million Library Bond Measure to fund branch libraries.
- 2012: \$30 million infrastructure bond (Measure M) funded street paving and related green infrastructure throughout the City.
- 2014: Parks Tax Increase of 16.9% (Measure F) to ensure well maintained parks.
- 2016: \$100 million infrastructure bond (Measure T1) to fund critical improvements to numerous city facilities including, but not limited to the following:
  - North Berkeley Senior Center;
  - Adult Mental Health Services Center;
  - Berkeley Health Clinic;
  - Public Safety Building;
  - Live Oak Community Center;
  - Martin Luther King Youth Services Center;
  - Rose Garden Pergula, Tennis Courts and ADA needs;
  - Waterfront docks, pilings and streets;
  - Fire Stations 2 and 6;
  - Willard Clubhouse; and
  - Improvements to numerous parks, restrooms, playgrounds, streets, sidewalks, storm drains and green infrastructure.

The \$100 million in Measure T1 funding has been fully allocated, leveraging an additional \$80 million in grant and other funding resources, to produce over \$183 million in 76 community benefiting infrastructure projects. With the final issuance of these bonds planned for 2026, these funds will be fully spent by 2028 as numerous projects such as the Tom Bates Sports Complex, African American Holistic Resource Center and the South Berkeley Senior Center will commence soon.

A detailed overview of Measure T1 and all the improvements that have resulted from this bond can be found on the City's website - <https://berkeleyca.gov/your-government/our-work/bond-revenue-measures/measure-t1>.

- 2018: \$135 million affordable housing bond (Measure O) as well as an increase in property transfer tax on the top 1/3 of properties (Measure P) to increase the supply of affordable housing and services for people who are homeless.

Since the adoption of Measure O, the City has allocated approximately \$238.1 million to build more than 1,421 units of affordable housing. This includes \$129 million from Measure O, \$7.3 million from Measure P, \$28.2 million from Measure U1, and \$56.7 million from the City's Housing Trust Fund. These commitments helped to leverage infrastructure improvement funding through the state, including \$11.1 million from the Infill Infrastructure Grant program, and \$79.8 million (for infrastructure and housing) from the Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Grant program.

Resources generated by Measure P have enabled the City to support a variety of programs and services to address homelessness. In addition, resources generated by Measure P have been leveraged to support a significant expansion of housing opportunities that enabled the City to achieve a 45% decrease in unsheltered homelessness. In 2024, Berkeley voters adopted Measure W, which removed the sunset associated with Measure P and increased the tax rates.

Attachments 3 and 4 provide additional information on Measures O and P and how those resources have been deployed.

- 2020: Measure FF, a parcel tax (current rate is \$0.12990 per square foot of taxable improvements) that provides funding for fire services, emergency response, 9-1-1 communication, hazard mitigation, and wildfire prevention.
- 2024: Measure FF, a parcel tax (\$0.17 per square foot of improvements for dwelling units and \$0.25 for non-residential properties) that generates resources for the repair, repaving and reconstruction of streets, sidewalks and pedestrian paths, safety improvements to streets, sidewalks and pedestrian paths, and environmental enhancements to sidewalks and pedestrian paths.
- 2024: Measure Y that increased the parcel tax for parks to \$0.2652 per square foot of taxable improvements to maintain and invest in parks and include on-going funding for Waterfront Parks including Cesar Chavez Park.
- 2024: Measure X, a parcel tax (\$0.06 per square foot of improvements for dwelling units and \$0.09 for non-residential properties) that provides resources for library services.

While marking important progress, the measures outlined above have not been enough to address the City's unfunded infrastructure needs that are estimated to be greater than \$1 billion. For this reason, staff recommend that the City Council survey registered voters on their support for a General Obligation Bond on the November 2026 ballot that could generate resources up to \$300 million for infrastructure. While a GO bond of this size will not address all the City's needs, it will enable the City to begin to address critical infrastructure projects that not only enhance quality of life but ensure an effective public safety response and accelerate the City's path toward sustainability and resilience as envisioned in the Vision 2050 Framework.

Attachment 5 consists of a summary of proposed projects for a potential 2026 revenue measure. Projects were identified through a collaborative, cross-departmental process to ensure they represent community priorities and are consistent with Vision 2050 and other guiding plans. Projects were evaluated based on core criteria including:

- Health, life, and safety needs;
- Critical infrastructure condition and accessibility;
- Community use and equity;
- Geographic distribution; and

- Potential to leverage external or matching funds.

In addition to the above, projects were evaluated using criteria recommended by the Vision 2050 framework. The Vision 2050 criteria is consistent with the core criteria listed, and also includes elements such as equity, public health and safety, climate resiliency and sustainability as core values for infrastructure development. The projects that are outlined in Attachment 5 were analyzed for readiness, feasibility, and opportunities to reduce costs through grant offsets or matching contributions, refining the list to approximately \$100 million for each of the categories outlined below:

- Community Facilities and Quality of Life;
- Public Safety; and
- Critical Infrastructure and Accessibility.

The cost estimates in Attachment 5 reflect 2025–2026 values, with escalation anticipated in later phases.

### **Community Facilities and Quality of Life Category**

The range of proposed projects address aging facilities or upgrades to existing facilities that will greatly enhance the community's quality of life. Some of the projects in this category include:

- Revitalization of the Frances Albrier Community Center;
- Replacement of the King Pool and locker room;
- Installation of artificial turf at Harrison Field;
- Renovation of existing restroom facilities and construction of new restroom facilities where they are needed; and
- Increasing the number of dog parks throughout the City.

### **Public Safety Category**

The list of proposed projects largely centers on the replacement of Fire Stations, which is detailed in a comprehensive Fire Facilities Master Plan, completed in 2023, along with much needed improvements to the City's emergency communications center and Fire training facility. Most of Berkeley's fire stations were built in the 1960s, with seismic upgrades completed in the 1990s. However, the City's Fire Stations no longer meet current health, safety, or operational standards. The City has conceptual designs for all its fire stations and has determined that all but one, Fire Station 1 (2442 8<sup>th</sup> Street), can be renovated or replaced on existing City-owned land.

It is essential that the replacement of the City's fire stations begin as soon as possible as the City only has the capacity to manage one firehouse remodel/rebuild at a time and each will take three to five years to complete. The highest operational need for the Fire Department is to remodel or replace the following:

- Fire Station 4 (1900 Marin Ave.) which has a projected cost of \$48 million;
- The Fire, Emergency Medical Services (EMS) and Community Emergency Response (CERT) Training Center (997 Cedar Street) which has a projected cost of \$28 million;

- The City's Emergency Communications Center (Dispatch) (2100 MLK Jr. Way) at a projected cost of \$4 million; and
- Fire Station 6 (999 Cedar Street) which has a projected cost of \$22 million.

### **Critical Infrastructure and Accessibility Category**

The list of proposed projects builds on a variety of assessments performed over the years to determine deferred infrastructure investments and identify replacement costs for assets. These assessments include an evaluation of City buildings and right of way, the growing backlog of sidewalk repairs to be addressed through the City's 50/50 Sidewalk Repair Program<sup>5</sup> that exceeds existing city resources, and the adopted Self Evaluation and Transition Plan that identified a total of \$48 million in projects for sidewalks and facilities to meet accessibility requirements. Some of the projects in this category include:

- Fully funding the repair of all sidewalks in the City's 50/50 Sidewalk Repair Program;
- Seismic upgrades to the Veterans Building and Maudelle Shirek Building to support a safe, vibrant and thriving civic and cultural arts center;
- Modernization and upgrades to facilities such as the West Berkeley Family Wellness Center, Animal Services Facility, South Berkeley Senior Center, Public Safety Building, and 1947 Center Street; and
- Projects to enhance American with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessibility at various city facilities.

In addition to feedback from the City Council and the results of the community survey and community engagement, additional factors that will be deployed to refine the preliminary list of proposed projects for a potential November 2026 revenue measure includes an analysis of the City's bonding capacity, deliverability, phasing, and staff capacity.

### **ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY**

Many of the infrastructure needs identified for potential inclusion in a 2026 revenue measure present opportunities to advance the City's climate and sustainability goals. Modernizing aging public facilities enables the City to incorporate energy-efficient building systems and high-performance materials consistent with Berkeley's Climate Action Plan. In addition, several projects support stormwater management, sea-level rise adaptation, and climate-resilient design, aligning with the Vision 2050 Framework and broader sustainability efforts.

### **POSSIBLE FUTURE ACTION**

The City Council could consider funding mechanisms to support infrastructure or service needs. While city staff are in the process of soliciting proposals and selecting a firm to implement a community survey, the feedback received from the City Council will be used to inform the development of the survey instrument. Once the survey has been implemented, city staff will return to City Council to provide the results of the survey to determine if an additional community survey is necessary and to receive feedback that is needed to develop any potential revenue measure(s) for the November 2026 ballot.

<sup>5</sup> <https://berkeleyca.gov/city-services/streets-sidewalks-sewers-and-utilities/sidewalk-repair>.

Discussion Regarding Potential Ballot Measures for  
the November 3, 2026, General Municipal Election.

ACTION CALENDAR  
December 2, 2025

### FISCAL IMPACTS OF POSSIBLE FUTURE ACTION

The cost of the two community surveys is expected to not exceed \$100,000.

### CONTACT PERSON

David White, Deputy City Manager, 981-7014

### Attachments:

- 1: FY 26 Comparison of Property-Based Taxes & Assessments - Berkeley, Oakland, and Albany
- 2: November 2026 Election Calendar
- 3: Measure P Update (<https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/2025-03-28%20Measure%20P%20and%20Impact%20on%20Homeless%20Services%20in%20Berkeley.pdf>)
- 4: Measure O Update (<https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/2025-2-06%20Measure%20O%20Update.pdf>)
- 5: Proposed Infrastructure Projects for November 2026 revenue measure

## Attachment 1

## FY 2026 Comparison of Property-Based Taxes & Assessments Berkeley, Oakland, and Albany

Ad Valorem Taxes: Berkeley, Oakland, and Albany properties are all equally subject to the 1% countywide ad valorem tax based on assessed value, as well as the ad valorem debt service imposed by the Peralta Community College, Bay Area Rapid Transit, and East Bay Regional Park. In FY 2026 these combined taxes represent \$5,874 for a home with a \$550,000 assessed value in each city.

City General Obligation (GO) Bonds: Berkeley, Oakland, and Albany have each approved City GO bond debts, which is based upon the assessed value of properties. In FY 2026, Berkeley's cumulative GO bond tax is \$270 which is significantly lower than Oakland's cumulative GO bond tax at \$660 and Albany's GO bond tax at \$685.

Special Taxes: Each of these cities has its own set of voter-approved special taxes and other assessments; however, Oakland and Albany do not use the same taxation basis as the City of Berkeley. For instance, while most of Berkeley's special taxes are based on a tax rate multiplied by the building square footage, those in Oakland and Albany are usually a standard flat rate amount per parcel with some variation in the flat rate based upon land use. In all three cities, most of the voter approved special taxes allow for an annual cost of living adjustment based either on the annual Bay Area Consumer Price Index (CPI) or the Statewide Personal Income Growth (PIG) rate. Berkeley's Emergency Services for the Severely Disabled Tax, Library Taxes, Fire Protection/Emergency Response Taxes, Safe Street Tax, and Parks/Landscape Maintenance Tax use the higher of the two.

There are several significant differences in the special taxes imposed by Berkeley, Oakland, and Albany. For example, Berkeley's Library Taxes are at \$680 which is significantly higher than Oakland's library tax at \$319<sup>1</sup> or Albany's library and library supplemental tax at \$285.

Another significant difference is in school taxes. Each city has approved School GO bond debt and special school taxes. Berkeley Unified School District's combined GO bond and special school taxes total \$2,139, Albany Unified School District's GO and special school tax is significantly lower than Berkeley's at \$1,491, and Oakland Unified School District's GO and special school tax is even lower at \$930.

County and other agency assessments (such as County Service Area (CSA) Vector Control, AC Transit, East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD), East Bay Trail LLD and East Bay Regional Parks (EBRP)) are parcel-based, flat rate assessments based on land use. And, with some limited exceptions<sup>2</sup>, apply equally to all property in these three cities. There are a few other variations billed on property tax statements.

<sup>1</sup> Parcels located in the Rockridge Community Facility District (CFD) 1 pay an additional tax of \$25 annually.

<sup>2</sup> Albany is not subject to the additional Mosquito Abatement fee and is not included in the CSA Lead Abatement program. Oakland properties pay higher CSA Vector Control assessments than Berkeley or Albany.

The table on the following page summarizes the comparison of total FY 2026 annual property taxes and assessments for Berkeley, Oakland, and Albany using an 'average' single family property that is 1,900 square feet with an assessed value of \$550,000 and a homeowner's exemption of \$7,000.

FY 2026 Property Based Taxes and Assessments Comparison

Single Family Home \$550,000 Assessed Value (AV) and 1,900 Square Feet

AGENCY	Berkeley FY2026		Oakland FY2026		Albany FY2026	
	Rate	Amount	Rate	Amount	Rate	Amount
<b>COUNTYWIDE AD VALOREM TAX</b>	<b>1.00%</b>	<b>\$ 5,500</b>	<b>1.00%</b>	<b>\$ 5,500</b>	<b>1.00%</b>	<b>\$ 5,500</b>
<b><u>Voter-Approved Ad Valorem Debt Service</u></b>						
County Wide GO Bond	0.0084%	\$ 46	0.0084%	\$ 46	0.0084%	\$ 46
City GO Bond	0.0490%	\$ 270	0.1200%	\$ 660	0.1245%	\$ 685
Unified School District GO Bonds	0.1154%	\$ 635	0.0900%	\$ 495	0.1647%	\$ 906
Peralta Community College	0.0432%	\$ 238	0.0432%	\$ 238	0.0432%	\$ 238
Bay Area Rapid Transit	0.0152%	\$ 84	0.0152%	\$ 84	0.0152%	\$ 84
East Bay Regional Park	0.0011%	\$ 6	0.0011%	\$ 6	0.0011%	\$ 6
<b><u>Voter-Approved Ad Valorem Debt Service (Combined)</u></b>	<b>0.2323%</b>	<b>\$ 1,279</b>	<b>0.2779%</b>	<b>\$ 1,529</b>	<b>0.3571%</b>	<b>\$ 1,965</b>
<b>TOTAL ALL AD VALOREM TAXES</b>	<b>1.2323%</b>	<b>\$ 6,779</b>	<b>1.2779%</b>	<b>\$ 7,029</b>	<b>1.3571%</b>	<b>\$ 7,465</b>
<b><u>City Voter-Approved Special Taxes</u></b>	<b>Rate X BSF</b>	<b>1,900</b>		<b>1,900</b>		<b>1,900</b>
Landscape/Park						
Oakland: City Landscape	\$0.26520	\$ 504	parcel/unit	\$ 144	parcel/unit	\$ 76
Albany: City Landscape 88-1						
Street / Sidewalk Repair (Safe Streets Measure FF of 2024)	\$0.17000	\$ 323			\$ 0.017	\$ 32
Albany Sidewalk Tax						
Library Tax/Services						
Oakland: City Library	\$0.35800	\$ 680	parcel/unit	\$ 319	parcel/unit	\$ 98
Albany: Serv & Supplemental						
Paramedic Supplemental						
Oakland: Emg Medical and Paramedic Supplement	\$0.04740	\$ 90	parcel/unit	\$ 67	parcel/unit	\$ 285
Albany: EMS/ALS (Measure K) & Paramedic Supplement						
Emergency Services for the Severely Disabled	\$0.02229	\$ 42				
Fire/Emergency Response (Measure GG)	\$0.06695	\$ 127				
Fire, Emergency Svcs & Wildfire Prev Tax (Measure FF of 2020)	\$0.12990	\$ 247				
Parks and Homelessness Tax (Measure Q of 2020)			parcel/unit	\$ 258		
Police and Violence Reduction Parcel Tax Measure NN of 2024			parcel/unit	\$ 264		
Education Parcel Tax (Measure AA)			parcel/unit	\$ 198		
Oakland Zoo (Measure Y of 2022)			parcel/unit	\$ 147		
<b>Total City Special Taxes</b>	<b>\$1.05974</b>	<b>\$ 2,013</b>	parcel/unit	<b>\$ 1,397</b>	parcel/unit	<b>\$ 491</b>
<b><u>City Assessments</u></b>						
City Street Lighting	\$0.01080	\$ 21				
2018 Street Light	parcel/unit	\$ 19				
Clean Storm Water (3,000 sqft lot area)						
Oakland Flood Benefit12	Formula	\$ 27	parcel/unit	\$ 16	parcel/unit	\$ 206
Albany Street/Storm Drains & Clean Storm Water						
2018 Storm Water	Formula	\$ 61				
Albany City Sewer Service					parcel/unit	\$ 638
Albany Emergency Svcs Tax (Measure K of 2022)					\$ 0.0740	\$ 141
<b>Total City Special Assessments</b>		<b>\$ 128</b>		<b>\$ 16</b>		<b>\$ 985</b>
BUSD: Educator Recruitment Measure E of 2020	\$0.14509	\$ 276				
BUSD Special Taxes (Measure H of 2024)						
Oakland Measure N	\$0.54000	\$ 1,026	parcel/unit	\$ 120		
BUSD: School Maintenance (Measure H of 2020)						
Oakland Measures G & G1	\$0.10650	\$ 202	parcel/unit	\$ 315	parcel/unit	\$ 591
Albany Measure J						
<b>Total Unified School District Special Taxes</b>	<b>\$0.79159</b>	<b>\$ 1,504</b>	parcel/unit	<b>\$ 435</b>	parcel/unit	<b>\$ 591</b>
<b><u>County/Agency Assessments &amp; Fixed Charges</u></b>						
Mosquito Abatement	parcel/unit	\$ 2	parcel/unit	\$ 3	parcel/unit	\$ 2
Mosquito Assess 2	parcel/unit	\$ 3	parcel/unit	\$ 4	parcel/unit	\$ 3
CSA Paramedic	parcel/unit	\$ 41	parcel/unit	\$ 83	parcel/unit	\$ 41
CSA Vector Control	parcel/unit	\$ 6	parcel/unit	\$ 14	parcel/unit	\$ 6
CSA Vector Control B	parcel/unit	\$ 7	parcel/unit	\$ 10	parcel/unit	\$ 7
CSA Lead Abatement	parcel/unit	\$ 10	parcel/unit	\$ 20		
AC Transit (Measure VV)	parcel/unit	\$ 96	parcel/unit	\$ 96	parcel/unit	\$ 96
EBMUD Wet weather	parcel/unit	\$ 250	parcel/unit	\$ 160	parcel/unit	\$ 160
East Bay Trail LLD	parcel/unit	\$ 5	parcel/unit	\$ 5	parcel/unit	\$ 5
SFBRA Measure AA	parcel/unit	\$ 12	parcel/unit	\$ 12	parcel/unit	\$ 12
Hazardous Waste Program	parcel/unit	\$ 8	parcel/unit	\$ 16	parcel/unit	\$ 8
EBRP Park Safety/M	parcel/unit	\$ 12	parcel/unit	\$ 17	parcel/unit	\$ 12
Peralta CCD Measure B	parcel/unit	\$ 48	parcel/unit	\$ 48	parcel/unit	\$ 48
Albany Open Space Tax					parcel/unit	\$ 76
<b>Total County Assessments/Charges</b>		<b>\$ 500</b>		<b>\$ 488</b>		<b>\$ 476</b>
<b>TOTAL CURRENT ANNUAL TAXES</b>	parcel/unit	<b>\$ 10,924</b>	parcel/unit	<b>\$ 9,365</b>	parcel/unit	<b>\$ 10,008</b>

## Attachment 2

**CITY OF BERKELEY - GENERAL ELECTION CALENDAR  
November 3, 2026**

**Offices to be Elected: City Auditor, City Council Districts 1, 4, 7, 8  
Rent Board (5 seats); School Board (3 seats)**

<u>DAYS PRIOR TO ELECTION</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>ACTION TAKEN</u>
		Public Financing payments are made on the Thursday following the Tuesday submission of matching funds requests.
Fixed Date	April 30, 2026	Each committee that makes expenditures in excess of \$270 in support of or in opposition to a measure must file campaign statements for quarterly reporting period (1/1/26 - 3/31/26) BMC § 2.12.271
180	May 7, 2026	Suggested Last Day to file initiative petitions. Qualified petitions received after this date will be accepted, but may not be on the November ballot.
158 103	May 29, 2026 July 23, 2026	Signature In-Lieu of Filing Fee - Candidates may collect signatures during this period to offset the \$150 filing fee. Valid signatures are worth \$1 each. Charter Art. III, Sec. 6.1, BMC §2.16.020
<b>113</b>	<b>July 13, 2026</b>	<b>FILING PERIOD OPENS - CANDIDATE NOMINATION PAPERS</b>
103	July 23, 2026	Deadline to file Signature In-Lieu petitions with City Clerk.
Fixed Date	July 31, 2026	Semi-Annual Campaign Statements due. (1/1/26 - 6/30/26)
90	August 5, 2026	Independent Expenditure Disclosure Period Begins. (\$1000+)
90	August 5, 2026	Late Contribution Disclosure Period Begins. (\$1000+)
88	August 7, 2026	Deadline to deliver resolution placing a measure on the ballot to Registrar and request election consolidation.
<b>88</b>	<b>August 7, 2026</b>	<b>FILING PERIOD CLOSES - CANDIDATE NOMINATION PAPERS</b>
87 83	August 8, 2026 August 12, 2026	<b>Candidate filing period extended</b> if an incumbent eligible for re-election does not file nomination documents by the 8/7/25 deadline. Incumbents cannot file during the extended period. EC §10225
82	August 13, 2026	Secretary of State to conduct Random Alpha Draw for candidate name order on ballot. EC §13111
81	August 14, 2026	Primary ballot measure argument filing deadline (12:00 p.m.).
74	August 21, 2026	Rebuttal ballot measure argument filing deadline (12:00 p.m.).
57 14	September 7, 2026 October 20, 2026	Filing Period - Candidate Nomination Papers for Write-in Candidates.
40 21	September 24, 2026 October 13, 2026	Voter Information Guide mailing period.
40	September 24, 2026	First Pre-Election Campaign Statement due.
29	October 5, 2026	Voting period opens. Ballots mailed to all voters starting 29 days before Election Day.

**CITY OF BERKELEY - GENERAL ELECTION CALENDAR  
November 3, 2026**

<u>DAYS PRIOR TO ELECTION</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>ACTION TAKEN</u>
16	October 18, 2026	48-Hour Late Contribution Reporting Period begins for contributions of \$100 - \$999 (FPPC Form 497) BMC §2.12.295
15	October 19, 2026	Last Day to Register to Vote for the 11/3/2026 election
14	October 20, 2026	Close of write-in candidate filing period at 5:00 p.m.
12	October 22, 2026	Second Pre-Election Campaign Statement due.
7	October 27, 2026	Campaign contributions list published online and at designated locations in the final seven days before Election Day. BMC §2.12.065
<b>Election Day</b>	<b>November 3, 2026</b>	<b>Election Day - EC §1000; Charter Art. III, Section 4. Polls open at 7:00 a.m. and close at 8:00 p.m.</b>
<u>DAYS AFTER THE ELECTION</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>ACTION TAKEN</u>
15	November 18, 2026	All campaign signs must be removed fifteen days after the Election (BMC §§ 20.08.240, 20.44.030)
Fixed Date	December 1, 2026	Taking office date for newly elected officials (actual swearing in at later date). Charter Art. V , Sections 14, 14.1, 15, 16.
30	December 3, 2026	Last day for County to certify election results to City. EC §15372
30	December 3, 2026	Last day to submit matching funds requests (public financing) BMC §2.12.505.J
35	December 8, 2026	Council to certify election results. EC §§9217, 10262, 10263; Charter Art. III, Sec. 10
60	January 2, 2027	All unspent funds held by Public Financing candidate committees must be repaid to the Fair Elections Fund no later than 60 days after the election BMC 2.12.505(H)
Fixed Date	January 15, 2027	\$50 fee due to Secretary of State for open campaign committees
Fixed Date	February 1, 2027	Semi-Annual Campaign Statement due. (January 31 is a Sunday, deadline moved to next business day)
Fixed Date	March 31, 2027	Campaign funds become surplus (defeated candidate or candidate that withdrew). Surplus funds may not be used for a future election.
		EC: Election Code; GC: Government Code; BMC: Berkeley Municipal Code Updated 1/24/2025

## Attachment 3



Office of the City Manager

March 28, 2025

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council  
From: Paul Buddenhagen, City Manager  
Subject: Measure P and Impact on Homeless Services in Berkeley

This memo gives an overview of the City's implementation thus far of Measure P and provides the Council with a broad overview of the history, expenditures, and accomplishments of the Measure to date.

Measure P is a 2018 ballot measure approving a real property transfer tax that has provided, on average, \$11 million<sup>1</sup> in funding annually for general municipal purposes including navigation centers, physical and mental health supports, rehousing and other services for unhoused people living in Berkeley. As this report demonstrates, the funds had a significant impact on homeless services in the City of Berkeley.

Measure P went into effect on January 1, 2019 and, unless re-authorized by voters, was set to sunset on January 1, 2029. However, with the passage of Measure W in November 2024, the expiration date was removed, and certain tax thresholds for high-value properties were changed.

The City seeks to house people who are unhoused. The primary driver of homelessness is a lack of affordable housing, yet there are also tools and strategies that can help guide some unsheltered people into safer conditions and housing. Measure P has expanded those tools and strategies.

The City addresses unsheltered homelessness and encampments both by coordinating services and shelter for those on the street as well as ensuring safe, clean, and accessible public spaces for all. This interdepartmental work, led by the Homeless Response Team in Neighborhood Services, is a direct result of an allocation of Measure P made by the City Council in 2021.

---

<sup>1</sup> Revenues—which have ranged from ~\$6.5M to ~\$20M—fluctuate greatly with market conditions.

Measure P and Impact on Homeless Services in Berkeley  
March 28, 2025  
Page 2

This funding supports the staffing, labor, equipment, and other resources across several departments that participate in its work. These include Public Works, Parks, Recreation & Waterfront and the City Manager's Office.

This Measure P allocation has also allowed the Homeless Response Team to leverage over \$15 million in State resources dedicated to encampments, including the third round of Encampment Resolution Funding, announced by the State on October 4, 2024. This enabled the City to triple its inventory of non-congregate shelter beds and nearly double the shelter acceptance rate of people leaving encampments, especially during an encampment closure.


As a result, over the period of time that Measure P has been in place, we have also seen a sharp decline in the number of unsheltered people in Berkeley, even compared to our immediate neighbors in Alameda County.

### Priorities for funding

The City uses Measure P funding to:

- establish new permanent housing for formerly homeless people
- address immediate street conditions and hygiene at encampments
- prevent households from becoming homeless
- provide emergency shelter and temporary accommodations for those on the street.

*Homelessness services fund sources, FY 2024*



Importantly, Measure P is not the City's only funding for homeless services. While a significant source of funding, Measure P also leverages millions of dollars in other local, State and Federal resources. In FY2024, the City spent approximately \$35M on

Measure P and Impact on Homeless Services in Berkeley  
 March 28, 2025  
 Page 3

homelessness, with Measure P accounting for approximately 66 percent of that total (see graph on the right). State funds accounted for an additional 18 percent, while federal funds accounted for 4 percent more. Other local funds (City of Berkeley General Fund) account for an additional 12 percent.

**BALLOT MEASURE**


Measure P provides \$11 million of funding on average from real property transfer taxes to pay for homeless services. Berkeley voters passed Measure P in November 2018 with 72.4% approval. The original ballot question read:

Shall ordinance raising funds for general municipal purposes such as navigation centers, mental health support, rehousing and other services for the homeless, including homeless seniors and youth; increasing the real property transfer tax for ten years from 1.5% to 2.5% for property sales and transfers over \$1,500,000, adjusted annually to capture the top approximately 33% of transfers; generating an estimated \$6,000,000 - \$8,000,000 annually; and establishing Homeless Services Panel of Experts to recommend homeless services, be adopted?

**PROGRESS ON HOMELESS SERVICES PROJECTS**

**Emergency Shelter**

Measure P currently funds five projects that provide shelter beds and supportive services for adults seeking to move out of encampments and off the streets. Services include, but are not limited to, housing navigation, job training placement and medical/legal assistance. The City anticipates spending \$4.8 million in Measure P funding on the following emergency shelter services through June 2025:




See below for a short description of each program:

- **Dorothy Day House - Berkeley Emergency Storm Shelter (BESS):** Operating out of 2134 Martin Luther King Way (Old City Hall) 24 hours a day from December 1 to April 30 to provide relief from inclement weather or other natural events.
- **Dorothy Day House - Emergency Shelter:** Operating out of the Veterans Building on 1931 Center Street, this is a low-barrier, permanent, congregate shelter that offers services 24/7. Meals are provided three times daily and there is a locker program on-site.
- **Dorothy Day House - Beyond Horizon:** is a non-congregate shelter that provides 27 motel rooms to encampment residents through a master lease with the Berkeley Inn at 1720 San Pablo Avenue. This non-congregate shelter has been integral in addressing homeless encampments by providing low-barrier private rooms to individuals referred by the Homeless Response Team.
- **Bay Area Community Services - STAIR Center:** run by Bay Area Community Services, has 45 beds, though they are currently planning a renovation to convert the space from congregate shelter beds to non-congregate through installing pallet shelters which will result in a slight reduction of beds. The Pathway STAIR Center budget includes housing navigation services and rapid rehousing funds to help people move into permanent housing.
- **Insight Housing - Campus Motel:** is a non-congregate shelter that provides 23 motel rooms to encampment residents through a master lease with the Campus Motel at 1619 University Avenue. This non-congregate shelter has been integral in addressing the needs of our hardest to serve encampment residents by providing low-barrier private rooms to individuals referred by the Homeless Response Team. While this program is initially being paid for through the state's Encampment Resolution Funding 2 Program, Measure P will be used as leverage beginning in FY26.

#### Immediate street conditions and hygiene

Measure P funds currently support six projects aimed at addressing immediate street conditions and hygiene. These projects address the immediate needs of persons currently living on the streets or in vehicles. The projects provide a range of services, including mental health crisis response, outreach workers, and portable toilets. The City anticipates spending \$3.4 million in Measure P funding on the following services through June 2025:

Measure P and Impact on Homeless Services in Berkeley  
 March 28, 2025  
 Page 5



See below for a short description of each program:


- Bay Area Community Services - Coordinated Entry System, Housing Resource Center, and Shallow Subsidies Programs:** The North County Housing Resource Center and Coordinated Entry System is the systematic approach designed by our community to ensure the highest needs unsheltered individuals in Berkeley receive necessary services and interventions to promptly end their homelessness. Coordinated Entry resources include problem solving with participants to utilize all resources available to them, assessing participants for vulnerabilities to make appropriate referrals to programs that match individual needs, and housing navigation to assist clients matched to housing resources with leasing up in their unit. The Shallow Subsidy program targets low-cost housing subsidies to individuals that need minimal support to live independently but cannot afford market rate rent in Berkeley’s expensive and competitive real estate market.
- Berkeley Fire Department - 5150 Response and Transport:** Provides emergency medical transport services to individuals that are experiencing a mental health crisis.
- City Manager’s Office - Homeless Response Team:** The team’s primary objective is to help guide the more than 400 people who are living on the streets of Berkeley on any given night toward housing and safety. The team’s outreach workers use motivational interviewing through compassionate conversation, assistance with navigating nonprofit and government resources, and patient problem solving. The team builds relationships, informs people of available resources, provides immediate necessities, and links to supportive services. On September 24, 2024 the team was also approved by Alameda County to directly

assess people on the streets, provide immediate housing interventions and add qualified people to the County’s housing queue in real-time. Previously, the team had to rely on nonprofit providers for these assessments – a slower, indirect process that often led to missed housing opportunities. Provides street outreach workers and supportive staff to address the immediate street conditions and needs of people who are living unsheltered. Even if people living in encampments are not interested in available shelter, the team uses Council policies to mitigate immediate health and safety threats to encampment residents and the community at large.

- **LifeLong Medical Care – Street Outreach:** Provides direct medical care to clients living on the streets. The team also provides housing navigation, services referrals, and case management. Participants are among the over 400 identified unsheltered households living on the streets of Berkeley on any given night.
- **City of Berkeley - Portable Toilets:** The City of Berkeley also provides portable toilets throughout the city to ensure our unhoused residents have the dignity of an appropriate place to use the bathroom.
- **Downtown Business Association - Homeless Outreach Worker:** Provides immediate necessities and supportive services to unsheltered people living in the Downtown area. Participants are among the over 400 identified unsheltered households living on the streets of Berkeley on any given night.

### Permanent Housing

Measure P currently funds one permanent housing project for individuals/families. This project provides immediate housing and supportive services for single adults that were formerly homeless. Services provided include housing retention services and mental health treatment. The City anticipates spending \$61,000 in Measure P funding on the following permanent housing project in fiscal year 2025:



Measure P and Impact on Homeless Services in Berkeley  
 March 28, 2025  
 Page 7

See below for a short description of the program:

**LifeLong Medical Care – Maudelle Shirek Affordable Housing:** This project is also part of the NPLH program. The Measure P funding provides the supportive services necessary for these 12 units at the site which serves both adults and families with children.

### Homekey Housing


In addition to this project, Measure P contributes one-time funding for two additional permanent supportive housing projects as part of the match requirement for State Homekey funding. The City’s Measure P contributions to these projects (over \$15M) leveraged external Homekey funding (over \$30M) on a 2:1 basis. The two projects are listed below:

**Bay Area Community Services – Project Homekey Golden Bear Inn:** This project received \$7.3 million in Measure P funding in FY22 to acquire the Golden Bear Inn as a new permanent supportive housing site with 44 units for formerly homeless adults.

**Housing Consortium of the East Bay – Project Homekey Rodeway Inn:** This project will receive \$8.5 million in local funding, likely including Measure P, to acquire the Rodeway Inn as a new permanent supportive housing site with 43 units for formerly homeless adults.

### Staffing/Infrastructure

Measure P funds also support key infrastructure necessary to maintain and support homeless services. This category includes city staff working directly on homelessness programming, training, and evaluation. The City anticipates spending less than a million dollars of Measure P funding on the following costs through June 2025:



Measure P and Impact on Homeless Services in Berkeley  
March 28, 2025  
Page 8

See below for a short description of each program/position:

**Health, Housing and Community Services - Community Services' Specialist:** Works with the program supervisor, other City departments and public agencies, boards and commissions, and the private sector in developing a comprehensive and integrated approach to homeless programs.

**Health, Housing and Community Services - Senior Management Analyst:** Assists in developing policy, procedure, and budgets for Measure P funded projects. Supervises work including fiscal and program analysis and oversight of contract and grant compliance requirements.

**City Manager's Office - Homeless Service Coordinator:** Provides administrative support to the Homeless Services Panel of Experts and assists in coordinating Berkeley's homeless services providers including the Homeless Response Team.

#### Leveraging Outside Funding to Reduce Unsheltered Homelessness




In 2021, the Berkeley City Council endorsed the All Home Regional Action Plan, a Bay Area-wide strategic homelessness plan that called for a 75% reduction in street homelessness by focusing on investments to bring people inside and off the streets, and then find permanent solutions for them. Since then, the City has used Measure P to implement that plan, and the source has leveraged roughly \$35M in State funding in 3 years by being used as a matching source to:

- Bring in roughly \$5M in State Encampment Resolution Funds to open 23 motel-based, non-congregate shelter beds at the Super 8. The addition of non-congregate shelter to Berkeley's portfolio has nearly doubled our shelter acceptance rate (from 43% to 79%) among unsheltered people living in encampments.
- Bring in over \$30M in State Homekey funding to open 85 units of new permanent supportive housing at two former motels.

The city's local efforts to fund homelessness programs, alongside the City's use of Measure P to robustly leverage new State funding opportunities, has contributed to a measurable decrease in homelessness in our city.

Berkeley, in partnership with the Alameda County Continuum of Care, conducts a Point-in-Time Count every two years which provides a snapshot of who is experiencing homelessness on any given night in our community. The most recent count was conducted in January 2024 and showed a major 45% reduction in Berkeley's unsheltered homeless population and an increase of 57% in our sheltered population from the previous count in 2022. This continued a downward trend in homelessness observed in Berkeley between 2019 and 2022 as well.

Measure P and Impact on Homeless Services in Berkeley  
 March 28, 2025  
 Page 9




As shown in the graphs above, Berkeley’s 45% reduction in unsheltered homelessness occurred while other major cities in the county continued to trend upwards. Hayward saw a 4% increase in their unsheltered population and Oakland saw an increase of 10%.

Overall, as seen in the graph below, the county’s homeless population dropped 3% from 9,747 in 2022 to 9,450 in 2024. We also saw a 19% increase of sheltered homelessness, going from 2,612 in 2022 to 3,107 in 2024. Meanwhile, unsheltered homelessness across the county dropped 11%, going from 7,135 in 2022 to 6,343 in 2024. Unsheltered homelessness remains the majority’s experience as 67% of the population experiencing homelessness in 2024 were unsheltered. Berkeley is getting closer to closing this gap, as only 52% of the population experiencing homelessness in 2024 were unsheltered.

Measure P and Impact on Homeless Services in Berkeley  
 March 28, 2025  
 Page 10


### Alameda County



Berkeley’s investment of Measure P funding to permanent housing, immediate street conditions, prevention, and emergency shelter, all contributed to ensuring that the number of people experiencing homelessness in our community continues to decrease over time.

#### Funds expended to date


The following chart shows the amount of funding spent in each spending category since Measure P began funding projects in FY 2020:



Since FY 2020, \$58.3 million has been spent in Measure P funding in the above categories listed. The FY 25 budget allocated an additional \$10.9 million in Measure P revenue for a total of \$69.2 million spent by the end of this fiscal year.

If current projections remain the same, Measure P will have a 2.2 million-dollar deficit by the end of FY 2026. Without additional revenue or program cuts, this deficit will grow to \$19.8 million by the time the Measure sunsets in FY2029. The below chart shows the Measure P revenue that has been collected to-date as well as the projections moving through the measure’s sunset:

Measure P and Impact on Homeless Services in Berkeley  
 March 28, 2025  
 Page 11



If interest rates, which greatly affect real estate market activity, decline in the coming years, these projections may change as revenues may come in stronger than forecasted. Alternatively, if the economy enters a recession, real estate activity may slow and deficit projections may worsen.

### MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT

The measure also established the Homeless Services Panel of Experts. The Panel was developed to make recommendations on how and to what extent the City should establish and/or fund programs to end or prevent homelessness in Berkeley and provide humane services and support. The panel is composed of members that have expertise in at least one of the following areas:

1. Development, administration, provision and/or evaluation of homeless programs in a government or non-profit capacity,
2. Current or past lived experience with homelessness,
3. Researching the causes, impacts and solutions to homelessness,
4. State and/or local homeless policy, funding or programs,
5. Federal homeless policy and funding administration such as the Continuum of Care Program,
6. Development and financing of affordable housing for formerly homeless persons, and
7. Provision of mental health and/or substance use programs for homeless persons.

The Homeless Services Panel of Experts meets the first Wednesday of each month except for August and December. Members of the public who are interested in learning more about Measure P funds as they are allocated and expended can consult the Homeless Services Panel of Experts' meeting agendas and materials online, and/or attend the Commission meetings.

Council will review and act on the additional funding required to reduce and address the impacts of homelessness and will undoubtedly continue to rely on Measure P as a source for such efforts until the measure sunsets in 2029.

Measure P and Impact on Homeless Services in Berkeley  
March 28, 2025  
Page 12

Information about Measure P can be found in the [Bond and Revenue Measures](#)<sup>2</sup> section of [berkeleyca.gov](#). Members of the public interested in learning more about the allocation and expenditure of Measure P funds can also consult the [Homeless Services Panel of Experts](#)<sup>3</sup>, refer to their meeting agendas and documents, and/or attend their meetings.

Attachment:

- Spreadsheet of Measure P projects

cc: David White, Deputy City Manager  
Peter Radu, Assistant to the City Manager, Neighborhood Services  
Scott Gilman, Director, Health, Housing and Community Services  
Josh Jacobs, Homeless Services Coordinator, Neighborhood Services  
Sharon Friedrichsen, Budget Director  
Matthai Chakko, Communications Director/Assistant to the City Manager  
Mark Numainville, City Clerk  
Jenny Wong, City Auditor  
Farimah Brown, City Attorney

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://berkeleyca.gov/your-government/our-work/bond-revenue-measures>

<sup>3</sup> <https://berkeleyca.gov/your-government/boards-commissions/homeless-services-panel-experts>

**TRANSFER TAX -- MEASURE P PROGRAM BUDGET-----DRAFT**

TRANSFER TAX -- MEASURE P PROGRAM BUDGET-----DRAFT							
	Category of Spending	FY 2024 Preliminary Estimate	FY 2025 Estimate	FY 2026 Estimate	FY 2027 Estimate	FY 2028 Estimate	FY 2029 Estimate
<b>Revenues</b>							
<i>Beginning Fund Balance</i>		\$ 19,887,422	\$ 5,583,073	\$ 2,603,208	\$ (1,231,027)	\$ (10,099,726)	\$ (14,409,877)
<i>Measure P Revenues*</i>		\$ 6,500,000	\$ 6,199,580	\$ 6,509,559	\$ 6,835,037	\$ 7,176,789	\$ 3,588,395
<b>Total Revenues and Balance of Funds</b>		\$ 26,387,422	\$ 11,782,653	\$ 9,112,767	\$ 5,604,011	\$ (2,922,937)	\$ (10,821,482)
<b>LESS: Total Expenses</b>		\$ 20,804,349	\$ 9,179,445	\$ 10,343,794	\$ 15,703,736	\$ 11,486,940	\$ 11,968,445
<i>Personnel Costs (1)</i>		\$ 530,359	\$ 780,206	\$ 842,623	\$ 666,353	\$ 719,661	\$ 777,234
CMO: Homeless Services Coordinator	Staffing/Infrastructure	\$ 202,899	\$ 219,131	\$ 236,661	\$ 255,594	\$ 276,042	\$ 298,125
HHCS: Community Services Specialist II	Staffing/Infrastructure	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
HHCS: 50% Senior Management Analyst	Staffing/Infrastructure	\$ 116,560	\$ 125,885	\$ 135,956	\$ 146,832	\$ 158,579	\$ 171,265
HHCS: 2 Year Limited Term Community Services Specialist II	Staffing/Infrastructure	\$ 17,459	\$ 226,274	\$ 244,376	\$ 263,926	\$ 285,040	\$ 307,843
<i>Non-Personnel Costs/ Program Expenses</i>		\$ 20,273,990	\$ 8,399,239	\$ 9,501,171	\$ 15,037,384	\$ 10,767,279	\$ 11,191,211
Fire: 5150 Response & Transport - Measure P portion of contract	Immediate Street Conditions and Hygiene	\$ 1,321,605	\$ 814,302	\$ 814,302	\$ 814,302	\$ 814,302	\$ 1,321,605
Dorothy Day House Shelter	Emergency Shelter	\$ 566,000	\$ 566,000	\$ 566,000	\$ 580,150	\$ 594,654	\$ 609,520
Dorothy Day House Drop In	Immediate Street Conditions and Hygiene	\$ 182,000	\$ -	\$ -			\$ 205,916
BACS Pathways STAIR Center	Emergency Shelter	\$ 2,499,525	\$ 2,002,768	\$ 2,002,768	\$ 2,002,768	\$ 2,002,768	\$ 2,499,530
BACS Coordinated Entry System (BACS HRC & Shallow Subsidies)	Immediate Street Conditions and Hygiene	\$ 829,498	\$ 1,235,411	\$ 1,235,411	\$ 1,235,411	\$ 1,235,411	\$ 1,235,411
BACS Permanent Housing Subsidies / Shallow Subsidies	Permanent Housing	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -			\$ 1,600,000
No Place Like Home - Scattered Unit Supportive Services	Permanent Housing	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		\$ 105,000	\$ 105,000
No Place Like Home - Scattered Unit Supportive Services		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 138,800	\$ 138,800	\$ 43,800
LifeLong Medical - Maudelle Shirek Affordable Housing (NPLH)		\$ 15,300	\$ 61,200	\$ 61,200	\$ 61,200	\$ 61,200	\$ 61,200
Insight Housing Hope Center (NPLH)	Permanent Housing	\$ 95,000	\$ -	\$ -			\$ 95,000
Insight Housing - Men's Housing Program	Emergency Shelter	\$ 170,502	\$ -	\$ -			\$ 170,502
BDIC Locker Program	Immediate Street Conditions and Hygiene	\$ 50,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
LifeLong Medical - Street Medicine	Immediate Street Conditions and Hygiene	\$ 525,001	\$ 525,000	\$ 525,000	\$ 525,000	\$ 525,000	\$ 525,000
YSA Tiny Home	Emergency Shelter	\$ 78,000	\$ -	\$ -			
DBA- Homeless Outreach Worker	Immediate Street Conditions and Hygiene	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000
Downtown Streets Team	Immediate Street Conditions and Hygiene	\$ 225,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 225,000	\$ 225,000	\$ 225,000
Shelter at 742 Grayson Street	Emergency Shelter	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Shelter at 1720 San Pablo Ave Lease	Emergency Shelter	\$ 908,796	\$ 935,160	\$ 962,315	\$ 990,284	\$ -	\$ -
Dorothy Day House Berkeley Emergency Storm Shelter (Winter Shelter)	Emergency Shelter	\$ 350,000	\$ 350,000	\$ 358,750	\$ 367,719	\$ 376,912	\$ 386,335
Dorothy Day House - Inclement Weather Shelter	Emergency Shelter	\$ 412,185	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

Dorothy Day House Beyond Horizon - 1720 San Pablo Avenue - Supportive Services	Emergency Shelter	\$ 950,000	\$ 950,000	\$ 950,000	\$ 950,000	\$ -	\$ -
1367 University Avenue Step Up Housing Project*	Permanent Housing	\$ -	0	1,066,027	1,092,678	1,119,995	1,147,995
Russell Street Residence Acquisition	Permanent Housing	\$ 4,500,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
HHCS: Square One Hotel Vouchers	Emergency Shelter		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Training and Evaluation	Staffing/Infrastructure	\$ 133,334	\$ 133,334	\$ 133,334	\$ 133,334	\$ 133,334	\$ 133,334
Homeless Response Team	Immediate Street Conditions and Hygiene	\$ 920,085	\$ 690,064	\$ 690,064	\$ 690,064	\$ 690,064	\$ 690,064
Berkeley Relief Fund	Homelessness Prevention	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Portable Toilets	Immediate Street Conditions and Hygiene	\$ 96,000	\$ 96,000	\$ 96,000	\$ 96,000	\$ 96,000	\$ 96,000
Old City Hall Sprinkler system	Emergency Shelter	\$ 400,000	\$ -	\$ -			
Reimagining Public Safety-Expand Downtown Streets Teams as placement for low-level violations	Immediate Street Conditions and Hygiene	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Expand the scope of services for the Downtown Streets Team to address the need for enhanced services around commercial and industrial areas in the Gilman District twice weekly	Immediate Street Conditions and Hygiene	\$ 50,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Reimagining Public Safety: Funding to organizations for Respite from Gender/Domestic Violence	Emergency Shelter	\$ 220,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
701 Harrison Transition - Site Security	Emergency Shelter	\$ 88,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Encampment Resolution Fund 2 Awarded Grant Match- Super 8	Emergency Shelter	\$ -	\$ -	\$0	\$ 2,527,538	\$ -	\$ -
HCEB Contract- Interim Housing at Rodeway Inn		\$ 1,925,256	\$ -	\$ -			
Encampment Resolution Fund 3 Tentative Grant Match		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,567,136	\$ 2,608,840	
<b>Fiscal Year Surplus (Shortfall)</b>		<b>\$ (14,304,349)</b>	<b>\$ (2,979,865)</b>	<b>\$ (3,834,235)</b>	<b>\$ (8,868,699)</b>	<b>\$ (4,310,151)</b>	<b>\$ (8,380,051)</b>
<b>Ending Fund Balance</b>		<b>\$ 5,583,073</b>	<b>\$ 2,603,208</b>	<b>\$ (1,231,027)</b>	<b>\$ (10,099,726)</b>	<b>\$ (14,409,877)</b>	<b>\$ (22,789,927)</b>

Notes:

(1) Personnel Costs from FY 2025 to FY 2029 assumes an 8 percent increase for increased pension costs

## **Attachment 4**



Office of the City Manager

February 6, 2025

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council  
From: Paul Buddenhagen, City Manager  
Re: Measure O Update

This memo gives an overview of the City's implementation thus far of Measure O, a 2018 ballot measure dedicated to increasing affordable housing.

Measure O has thus far guided \$109M toward an array of projects that will create at least 1,000 new affordable apartments and 44 shelter beds. This includes five completed projects, one project under construction, and a healthy pipeline of new construction projects in various stages of predevelopment and planning. Due to the robust Housing Trust Fund project pipeline, the City is on track to nearly double the number of restricted affordable units in its portfolio since 2018, largely thanks to the impact of Measure O. This powerful expansion of City investment in affordable housing will help low- and middle-income households in Berkeley.

Building permanent affordable housing is complex, challenging and takes significant time. Affordable housing financing in California requires nonprofit developers to braid together funding from multiple sources. County, state, and federal sources usually require committed local funding – making the City's investment a critical first step for most of these multi-year developments. City staff also use these funds to help project sponsors leverage funding from outside sources. None of this would be possible without highly skilled, creative staff who navigate a labyrinth of regulations, government agencies and nonprofits. Guided by our work, every Measure O dollar multiplies more than 4x.

Permanent affordable housing is just one of the City's strategies to address the statewide housing crisis, which is at an extreme in the Bay Area. Measure O helps create a more inclusive Berkeley, expanding affordability for neighborhoods across the City and making them available to a broader group of people.

## BALLOT MEASURE

Measure O provides \$135 million of funding from bond revenue to pay for affordable housing projects. Berkeley voters passed Measure O in November 2018 with 77.5% approval. The original ballot question read:

Shall the measure to issue \$135 million in bonds to create and preserve affordable housing for low-income households, working families, and individuals including teachers, seniors, veterans, the homeless, and persons with disabilities; subject to citizen oversight and independent audits, be adopted?

## PROGRESS ON AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROJECTS

Affordable housing projects funded by Measure O are providing housing for low- and middle-income members of the Berkeley community.

### Completed Projects

Five projects are complete, creating 240 new units of affordable housing and modern shelter space with 44 beds.

[Jordan Court](https://berkeleyca.gov/your-government/our-work/capital-projects/jordan-court)<sup>1</sup> opened in North Berkeley in spring of 2022. This project created 34 affordable studio units for low-income seniors, with 12 set aside for formerly homeless seniors. Jordan Court serves households earning between 20% and 60% of the area median income (AMI). (Measure O funding: \$3.5 million, fully disbursed)

[Berkeley Way](https://berkeleyca.gov/your-government/our-work/capital-projects/berkeley-food-and-housing-project-bfhp-hope-center)<sup>2</sup> opened in Downtown Berkeley in October 2022, and includes three sub-projects that received \$13,820,423 in Measure O funding:

- The Hope Center homeless shelter has 32 beds for homeless individuals and 12 transition beds for homeless veterans. (Measure O funding: \$6.9 million, including \$6.7 million in loans already disbursed.)
- The Hope Center permanent supportive housing has 53 apartments for people with disabilities or other special needs who would benefit from support services. This project serves households earning up to 30% AMI. (Measure O funding: \$6.7 million, with all but \$10,000 disbursed)
- The Berkeley Way Apartments has 89 units of affordable housing, consisting of studios, one- and two-bedroom apartments for households earning between 50-60% AMI. (Measure O funding: \$179,000, with all but \$18,000 disbursed)

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://berkeleyca.gov/your-government/our-work/capital-projects/jordan-court>

<sup>2</sup> <https://berkeleyca.gov/your-government/our-work/capital-projects/berkeley-food-and-housing-project-bfhp-hope-center>

[The Grinnell<sup>3</sup>](#) (formerly known as Blake Apartments) in West Berkeley was completed in June 2024 and has 63 units of housing, consisting of studios and one- and two-bedroom apartments. The Grinnell serves households earning between 30-60% AMI. (Measure O funding: \$7.3 million, fully disbursed)

### **In Progress Projects**

Two additional projects are in progress (either under construction or in predevelopment with site acquisition completed) and will create 141 units of affordable housing:

[Maudelle Miller Shirek Community<sup>4</sup>](#) in South Berkeley will have 87 units of housing, consisting of studios as well as one-, two-, and three-bedroom apartments. The units will be affordable to households earning between 20-80% AMI. The project is under construction, with anticipated completion in Fall 2024. (Measure O funding: \$12.9 million, including \$11.2 million disbursed)

[1740 San Pablo<sup>5</sup>](#) in West Berkeley will have 54 affordable homes for families earning between 30% and 60% AMI, including three units reserved for artist households. (Measure O funding \$7.5 million, including \$6.1 million disbursed)

### **Projects in Predevelopment**

Several projects have Measure O funding reserved but construction has not yet begun:

[Berkeley Unified School District \(BUSD\) Workforce Housing Development<sup>6</sup>](#) will have 110 apartments affordable to households earning between 30% and 120% AMI, with leasing preference for BUSD employees. Construction start is anticipated in 2025. (Measure O funding: \$24.5 million)

City Council reserved \$40 million in Measure O funding to support the development of affordable housing at the Ashby and North Berkeley BART (NBB) sites. Ashby is still in the planning stages; the selected nonprofit affordable housing developer(s) will have access to up to \$20 million in Measure O.

The City and BART partnered to select a team of developers for NBB, three of which are nonprofit affordable housing developers. The \$26.5 million City subsidy (including \$20 million in Measure O) will be split between the following projects:

- NBB BRIDGE Phase 1 Project will have 120 units of family housing, serving incomes between 30% and 70% AMI.
- NBB EBALDC Project will have 45 units of family housing (up to 70% AMI),

---

<sup>3</sup> <https://berkeleyca.gov/your-government/our-work/capital-projects/grinnell>

<sup>4</sup> <https://berkeleyca.gov/your-government/our-work/capital-projects/maudelle-miller-shirek-community>

<sup>5</sup> <https://berkeleyca.gov/your-government/our-work/capital-projects/1740-san-pablo-avenue>

<sup>6</sup> <https://berkeleyca.gov/your-government/our-work/capital-projects/berkeley-unified-school-district-busd-workforce-housing>

plus 15 units of permanent supportive housing (up to 30% AMI).

- NBB BRIDGE Insight PSH Project will have 85 units of permanent supportive housing (up to 30% AMI) serving formerly homeless households.

A fourth NBB affordable project will be subsidized by the market rate developer partnering on the site development.

Additionally, Council approved funding reservations for the following projects that will likely include some Measure O funds. The final mix of funding sources will be determined prior to loan closing, based on available funding at that time.

- Supportive Housing in People's Park
- St. Paul Terrace
- Ephesian Legacy Court

Net Measure O funds received by the City to date are \$76,682,000. All of these funds have been committed or reserved for projects. The City will issue the remaining \$57 million when there is debt capacity and developments are ready for the funding. The next issuance is anticipated in 2025.

## **POLICIES GUIDE FUNDING**

The City has made Measure O dollars available through the Housing Trust Fund Program, which is subject to Council-approved Guidelines as well as administrative criteria and funding source restrictions. These Guidelines have been in place since 1990 and are updated from time to time. The most recent update was adopted by Resolution No. 69-683-N.S. on January 19, 2021.<sup>7</sup> In addition to staff's work on housing developments, the City's Housing Advisory Commission, made up of community members appointed by Councilmembers and the Mayor, reviews projects and makes recommendations to the full City Council about expenditure of the City's affordable housing dollars.

Development of affordable housing is traditionally divided into several phases:

- **Predevelopment:** Project sponsors design the development, engage with the community, apply for financing from multiple sources, obtain a use permit, apply for a building permit, then finally enter into financing agreements and pay for the building permit. Permits and financing are finalized.
- **Construction:** Staff continue to monitor the developments, disburse City funds, and help resolve issues that may arise.
- **Lease-up:** This phase starts about 6 months before Construction finishes. Sponsors begin the Lease-Up phase by clarifying all tenant screening

---

<sup>7</sup> <https://berkeleyca.gov/community-recreation/affordable-housing-berkeley/housing-trust-fund>

criteria, marketing the housing through community partners, accepting applications, screening tenants, preparing lease and when the building is complete, working with tenants as they move in.

- **Operations:** The development is occupied and leasing up apartments when someone moves out. Staff monitor Operations for 55 years.

The City's affordable housing development funds are most often reserved early in the predevelopment process. This allows project sponsors to successfully compete for state and federal funds.

Typically, the City executes a loan agreement once all permits are ready to issue and full financing has been secured, a process which usually takes years. At times City funds are loaned at site acquisition. As a result, funds may be reserved or committed for years before they are expended. Please see *Attachment 1: Affordable Housing* for details on the Measure O-funded projects, including income ranges served, total City funds, project type, and status.

*Measure O has a powerful role. For every dollar in Measure O funding, project sponsors have been able to secure \$4.20 in outside funding from state, regional or private sources.*

## FUNDS EXPENDED TO DATE

Once Measure O funds are committed to a project, they are typically disbursed on a monthly (or less frequent) schedule when the project sponsor has incurred eligible project expenses as well as satisfied various conditions of the loan agreement. The project sponsor submits an invoice along with documentation of each expense, which is reviewed and approved by multiple City staff before funds are released.

As of 8/12/2024 the City had disbursed \$41,585,898 in Measure O funds through seven development loans as detailed in the attached table. Five are complete (Berkeley Hope Center, Berkeley Hope Center Permanent Supportive Housing, BRIDGE Berkeley Way, Jordan Court, and The Grinnell), one is under construction (Maudelle Miller Shirek Community), and site acquisition has been completed for 1740 San Pablo. These represent a total of 240 units and 44 shelter beds completed with Measure O support to date, 87 units currently in construction, and 54 units in predevelopment.

Additionally, \$143,347 was disbursed to support external legal services for the Berkeley Way projects. The total Measure O funds expended for all purposes is \$41,729,245.

## MANAGEMENT AND OVERSIGHT

The Department of Health, Housing, and Community Services manages the affordable housing projects funded by Measure O. Funds are distributed through the Housing Trust Fund, which pools funds for affordable housing construction from a variety of sources and makes them available to developers through one single application process.

The Housing Advisory Commission and City Council review and approve projects to receive Measure O funding. Oversight was previously provided by the Measure O Bond Oversight Committee, which met 10 times from April 2019 - March 2021.

The commission's role is to review requests for funding, make funding recommendations to Council and receive information about the status of funding reservations and commitments. Neither commission produced its own report assessing the status of Measure O.

The City's Finance Department contracted with an outside auditor to audit Measure O expenditures as required by the ballot measure. The first fiscal year including Measure O expenditures ended on June 30, 2021 and was the first year to be audited. The draft audit was completed on September 20, 2023 and had no findings.

Information about Measure O can be found in the [Bond and Revenue Measures and the Capital Projects](#)<sup>8</sup> sections of [berkeleyca.gov](#).<sup>9</sup> Members of the public interested in learning more about the allocation and expenditure of Measure O funds can also consult the [Housing Advisory Commission](#), refer to their meeting agendas and documents, or attend their meetings.<sup>10</sup>

Attachment: Spreadsheet of Measure O projects

cc: Tasha Tervalon, Interim Deputy City Manager  
 Sharon Friedrichsen, Interim Deputy City Manager/Budget Manager  
 Scott Gilman, Director, Health, Housing, and Community Services  
 Margot Ernst, Manager, Housing and Community Services  
 Henry Oyekanmi, Director, Finance Department  
 Matthai Chakko, Assistant to the City Manager  
 Mark Numainville, City Clerk  
 Jenny Wong, City Auditor  
 Farimah Brown, City Attorney

---

<sup>8</sup> <https://berkeleyca.gov/your-government/our-work/capital-projects>

<sup>9</sup> <https://berkeleyca.gov/your-government/our-work/bond-revenue-measures>

<sup>10</sup> <https://berkeleyca.gov/your-government/boards-commissions/housing-advisory-commission>

City of Berkeley  
**Affordable Housing Projects Supported by Measure O**  
 Total Authorized Bonds = \$135M

Project Name	Project Address	Development Partner	Description	Units <sup>1</sup>	Affordability	Total Measure O Funds Committed or Reserved <sup>2</sup>	Measure O Disbursements Through June 2024	Total City Funds Reserved	Projected Sources of Funds <sup>3</sup>	Project Status
<b>Projects with Measure O Commitments and Reservations</b>										
<a href="#">BRIDGE Berkeley Way</a>	2012 Berkeley Way	BRIDGE Housing	89 affordable homes and services for low- and very low- income families.	89	50-60% AMI	\$179,494	\$161,544	\$2,774,925	Measure O, HTF	Completed
<a href="#">Berkeley Hope Center</a>	2012 Berkeley Way	Insight Housing / BRIDGE Housing	32-bed homeless shelter, 12 transitional beds for homeless veterans, a community kitchen and wrap-around services for mental health, substance abuse, job training and social activities.	44	0-30% AMI	\$6,909,837	\$6,652,191	\$16,964,507	Berkeley's Housing Trust Fund (HTF), Measure U1 <sup>4</sup> (U1), Measure O	Completed
<a href="#">Berkeley Hope Center Permanent Supportive Housing</a>	2012 Berkeley Way	Insight Housing / BRIDGE Housing	53 permanent supportive housing apartments.	53	0-30% AMI	\$6,731,092	\$6,721,092	\$7,727,630	Measure O, HTF	Completed
<a href="#">Jordan Court</a>	1601 Oxford Street	Satellite Affordable Housing Associates (SAHA)	34 affordable studio units for seniors. 12 units will also be set aside for formerly homeless households.	35	20-60% AMI	\$3,501,884	\$3,501,884	\$6,026,927	HTF, Measure O	Completed
<a href="#">The Grinnell (formerly Blake Apartments)</a>	2527 San Pablo Avenue	SAHA	62 affordable apartments for families and individuals. 12 units are prioritized for people with an intellectual or developmental disability.	63	30-60% AMI	\$7,266,032	\$7,266,032	\$12,000,000	Measure O, U1, State Local Housing Trust Fund (LHTF)	Completed
<a href="#">Maudelle Miller Shirek Community</a>	2001 Ashby Avenue	Resources for Community Development (RCD)	86 apartments for families and individuals. 12 units will also be set aside for formerly homeless households.	87	20-80% AMI	\$12,932,000	\$11,225,017	\$17,000,000	Measure O, U1, LHTF	Under Construction
1740 San Pablo Avenue	1740 San Pablo Avenue	BRIDGE Housing	53 new affordable homes for families. 3 units will be set aside for artist households.	54	30-60% AMI	\$7,500,000	\$6,058,137	\$7,500,000	Measure O	Predevelopment
<a href="#">Berkeley Unified School District (BUSD) Workforce Housing Development</a>	1701 San Pablo Avenue	BUSD/SAHA/Abode	109 affordable apartments. Employees of BUSD and their households will have a leasing preference.	110	30-120% AMI	\$24,500,000	-	\$24,500,000	Measure O	Predevelopment
NBB BRIDGE Phase 1	North Berkeley BART Site	BRIDGE Housing	119 affordable apartments for families and individuals.	120	30-70% AMI	\$20,000,000	-	\$11,563,636	Measure O, HTF	Predevelopment
NBB EBALDC Project	North Berkeley BART Site	East Bay Asian Local Development Corporation (EBALDC)	59 affordable homes, including family housing and 15 units of permanent supportive housing	60	0-70% AMI		-	\$5,926,364	Measure O, HTF	Predevelopment
NBB BRIDGE Insight PSH Project	North Berkeley BART Site	BRIDGE Housing + Insight Housing	85 permanent supportive housing apartments	85	0-30% AMI		-	\$9,010,000	Measure O, HTF	Predevelopment
<a href="#">Ashby BART Projects</a>	Ashby BART Site	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	\$20,000,000	-	\$26,500,000	Measure O, HTF	Planning
<b>Measure O Impact</b>				<b>&gt;800</b>	<b>New Units</b>	<b>\$109,520,339</b>	<b>\$41,585,897.62</b>	<b>\$147,493,989</b>		
<b>Projects with City Funding Reservations</b>										
<a href="#">Supportive Housing at People's Park</a>	2556 Haste Street	TBD	118 affordable units with 62 units set aside for formerly homeless households.	119	10-50% AMI	FR <sup>5</sup>	-	\$14,359,593	TBD	Planning
<a href="#">St. Paul Terrace</a>	2024 Ashby Avenue	Community Housing Development Corporation (CHDC)	49 affordable units, including 11 studios, 6 one-bedrooms and 17 two-bedrooms, and 15 three-bedrooms.	50	30-60% AMI	FR <sup>5</sup>	-	\$12,250,000	TBD	Predevelopment
<a href="#">Ephesian Legacy Court</a>	1708 Harmon Avenue	CHDC	79 one-bedroom units.	80	30-60% AMI	FR <sup>5</sup>	-	\$18,087,701	TBD	Predevelopment
				<b>249</b>	<b>New Units</b>			<b>\$44,697,294</b>		

<sup>1</sup> total units, including managers' units

<sup>2</sup> committed = in contract, and reserved = set aside for a particular project

<sup>3</sup> the final mix of funds is determined at loan closing

<sup>4</sup> General Funds generated pursuant to Measure U1

<sup>5</sup> FR = Funding Reservation that the City Council has approved from currently available affordable housing funds. Final mix of funding to be determined at development loan closing.

## **Attachment 5**

Department	Project Count	Estimated Costs	Project Summary
PRW	19	\$ 107,600,003	This portfolio of park, facility, sports field, and shoreline improvements advances community well-being by delivering safe, accessible, and resilient public spaces across Berkeley. The projects modernize aging community and aquatic facilities, improve play areas and restrooms, expand high-demand park amenities, upgrade sports infrastructure, and address critical shoreline and sea-level-rise vulnerabilities to protect public access and essential infrastructure for the long term.
PW	8	\$ 97,445,061	This set of facility, seismic, and accessibility projects strengthens the City's civic infrastructure by addressing life-safety risks, modernizing aging public buildings, and ensuring essential services remain resilient, functional, and accessible for decades to come. Together, these investments reduce long-term liability, improve ADA compliance, and advance a safer, more reliable built environment that supports community well-being and equitable access to public services.
FIRE	4	\$ 102,272,678	These projects modernize essential emergency response facilities, strengthening the City's long-term resilience and ability to protect public safety amid evolving climate and operational demands. Together, they advance a future-ready infrastructure system that harmonizes with the community's broader goals for safety, reliability, and sustainable investment.
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>\$ 307,317,742</b>	

**Bond Measure Proposed Projects**  
**Total Recommended Projects:** 19  
**Total Amount:** \$102,272,678

**Project Summary:** This portfolio of park, facility, sports field, and shoreline improvements advances community well-being by delivering safe, accessible, and resilient public spaces across Berkeley. The projects modernize aging community and aquatic facilities, improve play areas and restrooms, expand high-demand park amenities, upgrade sports infrastructure, and address critical shoreline and sea-level-rise vulnerabilities to protect public access and essential infrastructure for the long term.

PRW

Item #	Projects	Description/ Justification	Percentage of full funding needed	Category	Est. Cost	Conceptual Design done?	Potential additional funding source	Immediate safety consideration	Council District	Dept Priority
1	Frances Albrier Community Center (no pool)	<b>Facility Modernization.</b> The only major community center not rebuilt or seismically upgraded; San Pablo Park's high use requires a modern, appropriately sized facility.	<b>100% of project cost needed.</b> Limited eligibility for FEMA and sustainable energy grants; small support possible from Parks Tax.	Community Facilities	\$ 30,000,000.00	Yes	Parks Tax; FEMA grant for seismic	Yes	2	High
2	Aquatic Park: Dreamland Area	<b>Plan Implementation.</b> Advances the community-vetted Dreamland Area Plan to support increased recreation and waterfront activation.	<b>25% of project cost needed.</b> Eligible for State grant funds; requires a 25% local match if development funding is not secured.	Park Amenities	\$ 2,100,000.00	Yes	Parks Tax; Prop 4 grant; Developer Funds	No	2	High
3	Cedar Rose 2-5 Play Structure	<b>Facility Modernization.</b> Upgrades the heavily used 2-5 play area to current safety and accessibility standards.	<b>100% of project cost needed.</b> May be partially supplemented with limited Parks Tax funds.	Park Amenities	\$ 2,500,000.00	Yes	Parks Tax	No	1	High
4	Cedar Rose Restroom	<b>New Restroom .</b> Adds a high-volume restroom along the Ohlone Greenway to meet growing demand.	<b>100% of project cost needed.</b> May be partially supplemented with limited Parks Tax funds.	Park Amenities	\$ 500,000.00	No	Parks Tax	No	1	Medium
5	Codornices Restroom	<b>Facility Modernization.</b> Replaces the aging, high-use hills restroom with a permanent Smart Restroom facility.	<b>100% of project cost needed.</b> May be partially supplemented with limited Parks Tax funds.	Park Amenities	\$ 500,000.00	No	Parks Tax	No	6	Medium
6	Dog Park - City Wide	<b>New Facilities.</b> Adds 4-6 dog parks across Berkeley to address significant community demand.	<b>50% of project cost needed.</b> Good candidate for grants and potential Parks Tax support.	Park Amenities	\$ 2,500,000.00	No	Parks Tax	No	All	High
7	Glendale LaLoma Park Improvements: Playgrounds, Parking Lot, Pathways	<b>Facility Modernization.</b> Improves play structures, parking lot, and pathways for safety and ADA access.	<b>100% of project cost needed.</b> Site not grant eligible	Park Amenities	\$ 3,500,000.00	Yes	Parks Tax	No	6	High
8	Harrison Field Conversion to Artificial Turf	<b>Full Conversion.</b> Replaces failing natural fields with artificial turf to double field capacity and reduce maintenance.	<b>100% of project cost needed.</b> May be supplemented with limited Parks Tax and small state grants.	Sports Facilities	\$ 6,000,000.00	No	Parks Tax	No	2	High
9	Harrison Park Restroom	<b>Facility Modernization.</b> Advances restroom improvements designed under T1 Phase 2.	<b>100% of project cost needed.</b> May be partially supplemented with limited Parks Tax funds.	Park Amenities	\$ 750,000.00	Yes	Parks Tax	No	1	High
10	King Pool (25 Meter) & Locker Room Replacement	<b>Facility Modernization.</b> Rebuilds locker rooms and replaces existing pools with a modern, competition-capable 25-meter facility.	<b>100% of project cost needed.</b> Difficult to secure grants for pool facilities; Parks Tax cannot be used.	Community Facilities	\$ 25,000,000.00	Yes	None	No	5	High
11	Live Oak Soccer and Basketball Courts and Lighting	<b>Facility Modernization.</b> Levels basketball courts, converts soccer practice field to turf, and improves lighting.	<b>66% of project cost needed.</b> Remaining costs may be funded with Parks Tax.	Sports Facilities	\$ 3,000,000.00	No	Parks Tax	No	5	Medium
12	San Pablo Sports Field Irrigation and Drainage	<b>System Replacement.</b> Fixes failing irrigation and drainage at the City's most used sports fields.	<b>100% of project cost needed.</b> Maintenance-focused project; not eligible for grants.	Sports Facilities	\$ 1,600,000.00	No	Parks Tax	No	2	Medium
13	Cesar Chavez Park Restroom and Pathway	<b>New Restroom + Pathway Renovation.</b> Improves access and replaces aging facilities at a high-use waterfront park.	<b>60% of project cost needed.</b> Eligible for Parks Tax support.	Park Amenities	\$ 3,000,000.00	Yes	Parks Tax, State Coastal Conservancy (SSC) grant eligible	No	1	Medium

**Bond Measure Proposed Projects**  
**Total Recommended Projects: 19**  
**Total Amount: \$102,272,678**

**Project Summary:** This portfolio of park, facility, sports field, and shoreline improvements advances community well-being by delivering safe, accessible, and resilient public spaces across Berkeley. The projects modernize aging community and aquatic facilities, improve play areas and restrooms, expand high-demand park amenities, upgrade sports infrastructure, and address critical shoreline and sea-level-rise vulnerabilities to protect public access and essential infrastructure for the long term.

PRW

Item #	Projects	Description/ Justification	Percentage of full funding needed	Category	Est. Cost	Conceptual Design done?	Potential additional funding source	Immediate safety consideration	Council District	Dept Priority
14	Marina Docks Timber Pile Replacement - 130 piles	<b>Infrastructure Stabilization.</b> Replaces remaining timber piles to extend Marina dock life for 50+ years.	<b>100% of project cost needed.</b> Not eligible for grants or Parks Tax.	Shoreline & Sea Level Rise Projects	\$ 6,000,000.00	Yes	None	No	2	Medium
15	Marina Blvd Sea Level Rise and Bay Trail	<b>Sea Level Rise Adaptation.</b> Protects shoreline pathways and roadway segments.	<b>50% of project cost needed.</b> The sea level rise portion of the project is grant-eligible.	Shoreline & Sea Level Rise Projects	\$ 1,900,000.00	Yes	Federal and State grant eligible	No	1 and 2	High
16	University Ave Sea Level Rise- Bike Park on University Avenue	<b>Sea Level Rise Adaptation.</b> Addresses vulnerabilities at the Bike Park.	<b>50% of project cost needed.</b> The sea level rise portion of the project is grant-eligible.	Shoreline & Sea Level Rise Projects	\$ 2,750,000.00	Yes	Prop 4 and SSC grant eligible	No	2	High
17	South Cove Seawall Replacement	<b>Full Replacement.</b> Prevents imminent seawall failure that would close public access to South Cove.	<b>100% of project cost needed.</b> Minimal grant eligibility due to maintenance scope; not eligible for Parks Tax.	Shoreline & Sea Level Rise Projects	\$ 5,000,000.00	Yes	SSC grant eligible	Yes	2	High
18	Univ Ave / Seawall Dr / Bay Trail / Plaza	<b>Shoreline Improvements.</b> Advances CEQA/NEPA-ready shoreline upgrades funded by multiple partner sources.	<b>20% of project cost needed.</b> Requires local matching funds to unlock potential state and regional shoreline resilience grants.	Shoreline & Sea Level Rise Projects	\$ 5,000,000.00	Yes	SSC grant eligible, Measure FF, future 199 Seawall tenant	No	2	High
22	Adeline Corridor Open Space	<b>New Open Space.</b> Aligns with the Adeline Corridor Plan to expand park access in an equity-priority area.	<b>100% of project cost needed.</b> Portions of the project are grant-eligible, though transportation elements are a stronger fit for competitive grant program	Park Amenities	\$ 6,000,000.00	Yes	Misc. Transportation grants	No	3	High
<b>Total - Recommended PRW Projects</b>					<b>\$ 107,600,002.50</b>					

Total Recommended Projects: 11  
 Total Amount: \$97,445,061

**Project Summary:** This set of facility, seismic, and accessibility projects strengthens the City's civic infrastructure by addressing life-safety risks, modernizing aging public buildings, and ensuring essential services remain resilient, functional, and accessible for decades to come. Together, these investments reduce long-term liability, improve ADA compliance, and advance a safer, more reliable built environment that supports community well-being and equitable access to public services.

Public Works

Item #	Projects	Description/Justification	Percentage of Full Funding Needed	Category	Est. Cost	Conceptual Design done?	Potential additional funding source	Immediate safety consideration	Council District	Dept Priority
23	Veterans Memorial Bldg (VMB) Ph 1 Renovation - Seismic Upgrades	<b>Seismic Upgrade.</b> Strengthens the historic 1928 Veterans Memorial Building as the first phase of the Civic Center restoration effort; the building lacks seismic integrity and has not received structural reinforcement since 1993.	<b>20%–100% of project cost needed.</b> FEMA grant application (2025) requested \$21M; if awarded, a \$6M City match is required. No other City funding available.	Facilities	\$ 13,941,742	Yes	FEMA Grant pending	Yes	4	High
24	Maudelle Shirek Bldg (MSB) Ph 1 Renovation - Seismic Upgrades	<b>Seismic Upgrade.</b> Improves seismic performance of the historic 1909 building, which predates seismic codes and is structurally deficient, posing significant life-safety risk; work brings the facility to Damage Control Plus standards.	<b>20%–100% of project cost needed.</b> FEMA grant application (2025) requested \$21M; if awarded, a \$6M City match is required. No other City funding available.	Facilities	\$ 6,719,513	Yes	FEMA Grant pending	Yes	4	High
25	Berkeley Mental Health Services Building Renovations	<b>Facility Replacement.</b> Constructs a new two-story mental health services building to expand program capacity and replace aging structures with significant deferred maintenance.	<b>40-50% of project cost needed.</b> Pending grant is not secured. \$1.7M in cash match has been identified with exiting funding for the project.	Facilities	\$ 3,249,900	Yes	Grant pending	No	3	Medium
26	50/50 Sidewalk Program	<b>Sidewalk Repairs (ADA).</b> Funds backlog of sidewalk safety and accessibility repairs through the City's shared-cost 50/50 program to address cracked and uneven sidewalks citywide.	<b>50%–100% of program cost needed.</b> Measure FF may support the City's share beginning FY27, but annual availability is limited to approximately \$3M citywide.	Pedestrian/ADA	\$ 14,000,000	Backlog	Measure BB; Measure FF; State Gas Tax	Yes	Various	Medium
27	MLK Civic Center Annex Modernization (1947 Center)	<b>Facility Modernization.</b> Addresses deferred maintenance through seismic upgrades, HVAC, electrical, elevator replacement, hazardous materials abatement, and ADA improvements.	<b>100% of project cost needed.</b> City lacks alternative funding sources or immediate grant opportunities.	Facilities	\$ 18,306,000	Yes	None	Yes	4	Medium
28	MLK Civic Center Building Modernization (2180 Milvia)	<b>Facility Modernization.</b> Replaces end-of-life mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems, addresses hazardous materials, and includes waterproofing and ADA improvements for the 89,000 sq. ft. civic building. Need exterior envelope waterproofing. ADA Improvements are included.	<b>100% of project cost needed.</b> Deferred maintenance remains unfunded; no dedicated funding source beyond baseline corrective maintenance.	Facilities	\$ 11,745,040	Assessment	None	No	1	Medium
29	Animal Services Facility Modernization	<b>Facility Modernization.</b> Repairs roofing, HVAC, drainage, electrical, plumbing, and interior finishes to address deferred maintenance and improve operational efficiency.	<b>100% of project cost needed.</b> City lacks alternative funding sources or immediate grant opportunities.	Facilities	\$ 1,995,400	Yes	None	No	2	Medium

Total Recommended Projects: 11  
 Total Amount: \$97,445,061

**Project Summary:** This set of facility, seismic, and accessibility projects strengthens the City's civic infrastructure by addressing life-safety risks, modernizing aging public buildings, and ensuring essential services remain resilient, functional, and accessible for decades to come. Together, these investments reduce long-term liability, improve ADA compliance, and advance a safer, more reliable built environment that supports community well-being and equitable access to public services.

Public Works

Item #	Projects	Description/Justification	Percentage of Full Funding Needed	Category	Est. Cost	Conceptual Design done?	Potential additional funding source	Immediate safety consideration	Council District	Dept Priority
30	Public Safety Building Modernization	<b>Facility Modernization.</b> Updates the 24-hour essential services building by repairing roof leaks, improving interior finishes, replacing doors and hardware, and completing accessibility upgrades.	<b>100% of project cost needed.</b> City lacks alternative funding sources or immediate grant opportunities.	Facilities	\$ 8,404,398	No	None	No	4	Medium
31	West Berkeley Family Wellness Center Modernization	<b>Facility Modernization.</b> Repairs and upgrades windows, flooring, HVAC, seismic components, electrical systems, and ADA features to address deferred maintenance.	<b>100% of project cost needed.</b> City lacks alternative funding sources or immediate grant opportunities; scope not included in current T1 improvements.	Facilities	\$ 6,500,000	No	None	No	1	High
32	South Berkeley Senior Center Improvements	<b>Mechanical System Upgrade.</b> Replaces end-of-life HVAC and related mechanical components to ensure reliable operations at the senior center.	<b>100% of project cost needed.</b> City lacks alternative funding sources or immediate grant opportunities; scope not included in current T1 improvements.	Facilities	\$ 3,900,000	Yes	None	No	3	High
33	ADA Self Evaluation Barrier Removal Projects	<b>ADA Barrier Removal.</b> Funds backlog of accessibility improvements required under the ADA Transition Plan to address path-of-travel, restroom, signage, and facility access barriers.	<b>100% of project cost needed.</b> City lacks alternative funding sources or immediate grant opportunities.	Pedestrian/Accessibility	\$ 4,341,534	Backlog	None	No	Various	Medium
33a	Fire Department Warehouse	45 items, including: Ramps, Doors, Signage, and Restrooms.	<b>100% of project cost needed.</b> City lacks alternative funding sources or immediate grant opportunities.	Pedestrian/Accessibility	\$ 63,400	Backlog	Funded annual in CIP for \$250,000/year total for program	No	2	Medium
33b	Fire Station #1	51 items, including: Parking, Curb Ramps, Path of Travel, Doors, Signage, Restrooms, Break/Conference Room, Accessible Showers, and Reach Ranges.	<b>100% of project cost needed.</b> City lacks alternative funding sources or immediate grant opportunities.	Pedestrian/Accessibility	\$ 49,000	Backlog	Funded annual in CIP for \$250,000/year total for program	No	2	Medium

Total Recommended Projects: 11  
 Total Amount: \$97,445,061

**Project Summary:** This set of facility, seismic, and accessibility projects strengthens the City's civic infrastructure by addressing life-safety risks, modernizing aging public buildings, and ensuring essential services remain resilient, functional, and accessible for decades to come. Together, these investments reduce long-term liability, improve ADA compliance, and advance a safer, more reliable built environment that supports community well-being and equitable access to public services.

Public Works

Item #	Projects	Description/Justification	Percentage of Full Funding Needed	Category	Est. Cost	Conceptual Design done?	Potential additional funding source	Immediate safety consideration	Council District	Dept Priority
33c	Fire Station #2	56 items, including: Parking, Path of Travel, Doors, Signage, Restrooms, Drinking Fountains, and Reach Ranges.	<b>100% of project cost needed.</b> City lacks alternative funding sources or immediate grant opportunities.	Pedestrian/Accessibility	\$ 74,000	Backlog	Funded annual in CIP for \$250,000/year total for program	No	4	Medium
33d	Fire Station #3	36 items, including: Path of Travel, Doors, Signage, and Restrooms.	<b>100% of project cost needed.</b> City lacks alternative funding sources or immediate grant opportunities.	Pedestrian/Accessibility	\$ 64,000	Backlog	Funded annual in CIP for \$250,000/year total for program	No	8	Medium
33e	Fire Station #5	50 items, including: Path of Travel, Stairs, Doors, Signage, Restrooms, and Benches.	<b>100% of project cost needed.</b> City lacks alternative funding sources or immediate grant opportunities.	Pedestrian/Accessibility	\$ 112,000	Backlog	Funded annual in CIP for \$250,000/year total for program	No	3	Medium
33f	Fire Station #7	69 items, including: Parking, Path of Travel, Elevators, Stairs, Doors, Signage, Restrooms, Break/Conference Room, and Accessible Showers.	<b>100% of project cost needed.</b> City lacks alternative funding sources or immediate grant opportunities.	Pedestrian/Accessibility	\$ 136,500	Backlog	Funded annual in CIP for \$250,000/year total for program	No	6	Medium
33g	Aquatic Park	378 items, including: Parking, Curb Ramps, Path of Travel, Ramps, Stairs, Doors, Signage, Restrooms, Drinking Fountains, Outdoor Sports Areas, Play Area, Sinks, Picnic Areas, Reach Ranges, Benches, Fitting/Dressing Rooms, Fishing Piers, and Trails.	<b>100% of project cost needed.</b> City lacks alternative funding sources or immediate grant opportunities.	Pedestrian/Accessibility	\$ 753,000	Backlog	Funded annual in CIP for \$250,000/year total for program	No	2	Medium
33h	Berkeley Yacht Club	278 items, including: Curb Ramps, Path of Travel, Stairs, Doors, Counters, Signage, Restrooms, Food Service Tables, Break/Conference Room, Picnic Areas, Accessible Showers, and Laundry Rooms.	<b>100% of project cost needed.</b> City lacks alternative funding sources or immediate grant opportunities.	Pedestrian/Accessibility	\$ 604,000	Backlog	Funded annual in CIP for \$250,000/year total for program	No	1	Medium
33i	Center Street Garage and Commercial Space	191 items, including: Parking, Path of Travel, Elevators, Stairs, Doors, Signage, Restrooms, Drinking Fountains, and Reach Ranges.	<b>100% of project cost needed.</b> City lacks alternative funding sources or immediate grant opportunities.	Pedestrian/Accessibility	\$ 365,000	Backlog	Funded annual in CIP for \$250,000/year total for program	No	1	Medium
33j	Cultural Arts Center & Theater	131 items, including: Parking, Curb Ramps, Path of Travel, Stairs, Doors, Counters, Signage, Restrooms, Drinking Fountains, Assembly Areas, Break/Conference Room, and Sinks.	<b>100% of project cost needed.</b> City lacks alternative funding sources or immediate grant opportunities.	Pedestrian/Accessibility	\$ 200,000	Backlog	Funded annual in CIP for \$250,000/year total for program	No	3	Medium
33k	MLK Jr. Civic Center Park	120 items including: Path of Travel, Stairs, Doors, Counters, Signage, Restrooms.	<b>100% of project cost needed.</b> City lacks alternative funding sources or immediate grant opportunities.	Pedestrian/Accessibility	\$ 149,668	Backlog	Funded annual in CIP for \$250,000/year total for program	No	1	Medium

**Total Recommended Projects:** 11  
**Total Amount:** \$97,445,061

**Project Summary:** This set of facility, seismic, and accessibility projects strengthens the City's civic infrastructure by addressing life-safety risks, modernizing aging public buildings, and ensuring essential services remain resilient, functional, and accessible for decades to come. Together, these investments reduce long-term liability, improve ADA compliance, and advance a safer, more reliable built environment that supports community well-being and equitable access to public services.

Public Works

Item #	Projects	Description/Justification	Percentage of Full Funding Needed	Category	Est. Cost	Conceptual Design done?	Potential additional funding source	Immediate safety consideration	Council District	Dept Priority
33l	<b>Veterans Memorial Hall</b>	145 items, including: Path of Travel, Stairs, Doors, Counters, Signage, Restrooms, Drinking Fountains, Assembly Areas, Break/Conference Room, and Sinks.	<b>100% of project cost needed.</b> City lacks alternative funding sources or immediate grant opportunities.	Pedestrian/Accessibility	\$ 1,297,211	Backlog	Funded annual in CIP for \$250,000/year total for program	No	1	Medium
33m	<b>Rent Stabilization Board Office</b>	131 items, including Path of Travel, Stairs, Doors, Counters, Signage, Restrooms, Drinking Fountains, Assembly Areas, Break/Conference Room, and Sinks.	<b>100% of project cost needed.</b> City lacks alternative funding sources or immediate grant opportunities.	Pedestrian/Accessibility	\$ 473,755	Backlog	Funded annual in CIP for \$250,000/year total for program	No	1	Medium
<b>Total - Recommended PW Projects</b>					<b>\$ 97,445,061</b>					

**Bond Measure Proposed Projects**  
**Total Recommended Projects: 4**  
**Total Amount: \$102,272,678**

**Project Summary:** These projects modernize essential emergency response facilities, strengthening the City's long-term resilience and ability to protect public safety amid evolving climate and operational demands. Together, they advance a future-ready infrastructure system that harmonizes with the community's broader goals for safety, reliability, and sustainable investment.

Fire

Item #	Projects	Description/Justification	Percentage of full funding needed	Category	Est. Cost	Conceptual Design done?	Potential additional funding source	Immediate safety consideration	Council District	Dept Priority
35	Fire Station 4 Replacement (1900 Marin)	<b>Facility Modernization.</b> Station 4 is at end of life, undersized for current and future operational needs, and unable to safely support expanded staffing and a second ambulance unit. Replacement also enables a cost-saving expansion into the adjacent roadway, avoiding the higher cost of relocation.	<b>100% of project cost needed.</b> Grant opportunities for fire station replacement are extremely limited; full bond funding would be required.	Facilities	\$48,050,297.94	Yes	No	Yes	5	High
36	Fire Station 6 Replacement (999 Cedar)	<b>Facility Modernization.</b> Station 6 is at end of life and too small to meet projected service demands. A full replacement is required to support expanded staffing, modern apparatus, and safe working conditions for firefighters.	<b>100% of project cost needed.</b> Grant opportunities for fire station replacement are extremely limited; full bond funding would be required.	Facilities	\$22,243,520.43	Yes	No	Yes	1	High
37	Fire/EMS/Police Dispatch Center Remodel (2100 MLK)	<b>Facility Modernization.</b> The 911 Dispatch Center requires renovation to handle rising call volumes, modernize critical infrastructure, and create a safer, efficient workspace. Improvements include expanding the operations floor, upgrading technology and HVAC systems, and adding training and wellness spaces to support operational readiness and staff retention.	<b>100% of project cost needed.</b> Dispatch center renovation is not eligible for significant state or federal grant funding; bond funding is necessary.	Facilities	\$3,978,860.00	Yes	No	Yes	1	High
38	Fire Training Center Replacement (Harrison x 8-9th)	<b>Facility Modernization.</b> The current training facility is undersized, located in a residential neighborhood, and unable to support essential training activities, scheduling needs, or parking demands. A new, purpose-built training center is required to meet the operational needs of a modern fire department.	<b>100% of project cost needed.</b> Grant opportunities for fire station replacement are extremely limited; full bond funding would be required.	Facilities	\$28,000,000.00	Partial	No	Yes	1	High
<b>Total - Recommended Fire Projects</b>					<b>\$102,272,678.37</b>					



Office of the City Manager

ACTION CALENDAR

March 17, 2026

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

From: Paul Buddenhagen, City Manager

Submitted by: Dave White, Deputy City Manager, City Manager's Office

Subject: Presentation and Discussion of Community Survey Results and Direction Regarding Potential Ballot Measures for the November 3, 2026, General Municipal Election

RECOMMENDATION

Review the results of the community survey and provide direction to the City Manager and City Attorney regarding potential ballot measures for the November 3, 2026, General Municipal Election, including whether to:

1. Direct the City Manager and City Attorney to prepare draft ballot language for a potential \$300 million General Obligation bond measure for the November 3, 2026, ballot to fund priority infrastructure investments, consistent with the results of the community survey and input received from the City Council at the March 17, 2026, work session;
2. Direct the City Manager and City Attorney to prepare draft ballot language for a potential 0.5 percent increase in the City's sales and use tax for the November 3, 2026, ballot to address the City's projected General Fund structural deficit and support essential City services; and
3. Authorize the City Manager to conduct a second community survey of likely Berkeley voters to test refined ballot language for a potential \$300 million General Obligation bond and a 0.5 percent increase in the sales and use tax in the context of the anticipated November 2026 ballot environment.

SUMMARY

This item presents the results of the City's first community survey related to potential revenue measures for the November 3, 2026, General Municipal Election and requests City Council direction on next steps for ballot measure development.

The survey was administered by Lake Research Partners from February 19–23, 2026 and tested voter priorities and support for a potential General Obligation (GO) bond at varying funding levels, as well as voter sentiment regarding a potential increase to the

sales and use tax to address the City's projected General Fund budget deficit that is currently estimated at approximately \$27million<sup>1</sup>.

This survey effort builds on City Council policy guidance provided at the December 2, 2025, worksession regarding priority infrastructure categories and funding concepts. In parallel with the statistically valid voter survey, City staff are soliciting feedback on potential City Council supported projects from focus groups, commissions, and joint community meetings across Council districts.

City Council direction provided at this meeting will guide staff's next steps, including refinement of project categories, preparation of potential ballot language, and the design of a second, more targeted survey to test refined ballot language with likely voters.

**Key findings from the survey include:**

- Improved voter sentiment about Berkeley's direction. In February 2026, 56% of likely voters said Berkeley is headed in the *right direction* (up from 47% in May 2024), representing the highest "right direction" result since 2016.
- Initial support, exceeding the required 2/3rds threshold, for infrastructure investment through a bond measure. A potential \$300 million bond measure received 71% support, while a potential \$200 million bond received 70% support, indicating little difference in voter support between the two funding levels.
- Support remained even after exposure to opposing arguments. When voters were presented with both supportive and opposing statements, support for the \$300M bond remained at approximately 72%, suggesting durable voter support.
- There was majority support for a sales and use tax increase to address the City's budget deficit. Approximately 60% of voters initially supported the proposed 0.5% sales and use tax increase, declining slightly to 58% after exposure to pro and con arguments, remaining above the simple majority threshold required for approval.
- Top voter priorities include infrastructure resilience, safety, and accessibility. The most frequently identified priorities included climate resilience infrastructure (35%), sidewalk and accessibility improvements (31%), and stormwater upgrades (24%).

---

<sup>1</sup> Represents the City's current projected deficit after an update to the City's projected revenues that were presented to the Budget and Finance Policy Committee on February 26, 2026. The estimated deficit will be further refined to reflect resource needs of other funds that are experiencing deficits and resource constraints (i.e., Off Street Parking Fund, Internal Service fund for 1947 Center Street) and the results of ongoing labor negotiations.

- Individually ranked projects that are important include:
  - Renovating the 911 dispatch center to handle higher call volumes and modernize critical infrastructure;
  - Improving safety and accessibility by repairing cracked and uneven sidewalks and upgrading curb ramps citywide; and
  - Making fire stations citywide safer and more energy efficient by replacing fire stations that are no longer able to meet demands with new stations that run on green energy.

These findings provide an initial indication that Berkeley voters are receptive to infrastructure investment and generating resources to address the City's deficit, while also highlighting the importance of project prioritization and clear ballot language.

#### FISCAL IMPACTS OF RECOMMENDATION

The community survey process, including up to two rounds of survey testing, is funded through an existing contract with Lake Research Partners with a not-to-exceed amount of \$100,000. No additional appropriation is required for the survey work. Any future fiscal impacts associated with potential ballot measures will be presented to City Council as part of ballot language development and implementation planning.

#### CURRENT SITUATION AND ITS EFFECTS

This project is a Strategic Plan Priority Project, advancing the City's goals to provide state-of-the-art, well-maintained infrastructure, amenities, and facilities and to create a resilient, safe, connected, and prepared city.

Berkeley faces significant unfunded capital infrastructure needs and a growing deferred maintenance backlog across public safety facilities, community-serving facilities, and critical infrastructure such as sidewalks, ADA accessibility improvements, seismic upgrades, and climate-resilient assets. Many City facilities and right-of-way assets were constructed decades ago and no longer meet current standards for accessibility, seismic safety, climate resilience, or modern service delivery. Annual capital allocations and existing funding sources are insufficient to address these needs at the scale and pace required, resulting in increased risk of facility failure, escalating repair costs, service disruptions, and inequitable conditions across neighborhoods. Current estimates indicate that Berkeley's long-term infrastructure needs exceed \$1.5 billion. While a bond measure of approximately \$300 million would not fully address these needs, it would represent a significant step toward stabilizing and modernizing critical civic infrastructure.

At the December 2, 2025, worksession<sup>2</sup>, City Council provided direction to staff to explore potential ballot measure concepts for the November 2026 election, including:

- Public safety facilities (e.g., fire stations, emergency response and dispatch facilities);
- Community facilities and quality-of-life investments (e.g., parks, recreation centers, pools, and community centers); and
- Critical infrastructure and accessibility improvements (e.g., sidewalks, ADA compliance, seismic upgrades, and climate resilience).

That feedback informed the structure, categories, and framing of the community survey instrument developed by Lake Research Partners in coordination with City staff.

On January 27, 2026, City Council approved a referral to the City Manager to include, as part of the upcoming community survey for the November 2026 election, a question assessing the perspectives of likely Berkeley voters on a potential increase to the City's sales and use tax rate<sup>3</sup>. More specifically, the referral requested that the survey test voter interest in increasing Berkeley's sales and use tax rate from 10.25 percent to 10.75 percent, consistent with rates adopted by several neighboring Alameda County jurisdictions. The item was framed in the context of generating resources to address the City's projected General Fund budget shortfall and ongoing fiscal challenges. The referral further emphasized that adding such a question to the survey would provide City Council with data to better understand resident perspectives on revenue options in parallel with feedback on infrastructure priorities, and to inform future policy discussions related to fiscal sustainability and potential ballot measure development.

### **Summary of Community Survey Results (February 2026)**

To ensure the City's ballot measure development process is grounded in statistically valid voter data, the City conducted an RFP which resulted in a contract with Lake Research Partners to design and administer up to two community surveys of Berkeley voters (Contract No: 32600095)<sup>4</sup>. The survey tested voter priorities related to infrastructure investment and funding mechanisms, including General Obligation Bonds at multiple funding levels and an exploratory question regarding a potential sales and use tax increase to reduce the City's projected deficit in the General Fund. The findings below summarize key topline results from the February 19–23, 2026 survey and provide context for City Council discussion and direction on potential next steps.

<sup>2</sup> <https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/2025-12-02%20Special%20Item%2002%20Discussion%20Regarding%20Potential%20Ballot.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> <https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/2026-01/2026-01-27%20Item%2017%20Refer%20to%20the%20City%20Manager%20to%20include.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> <https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/2026-01/2026-01-20%20Item%2002%20Ratification%20of%20City%20Manager%20Action.pdf>

Comprehensive question-by-question results, including demographic and subgroup breakouts, are provided in Attachment 1.

**Survey Fielding Window:**

The community survey was conducted February 19–23, 2026, using live telephone interviews and text-to-online methodologies to reach a representative sample of likely November 2026 voters.

**Survey Methodology:**

- Field dates: February 19–23, 2026
- Sample size: 500 likely November 2026 voters
- Mode: Live telephone interviews and text-to-online
- Margin of error: ± 4.4% at the 95% confidence level
- Split samples: A/B testing of funding levels and message framing to evaluate voter support under different scenarios.

The sample was stratified by age, gender, race, and region of the city to reflect the expected composition of likely voters.

**Voter Attitudes about Berkeley:**

Respondents were asked whether they believe the City of Berkeley is generally headed in the right direction or on the wrong track.

<b>Q3. Would you say that the city of Berkeley is generally headed in the right direction or the wrong direction?</b>	
<b>Response</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Right Direction	56%
Wrong Direction	22%
(Don't know)	23%

A majority of likely voters believe Berkeley is heading in the right direction.

**Job Performance of the City:**

Respondents were also asked to rate the job the City of Berkeley is doing providing services to residents.

<b>Q4. How would you rate the job the City of Berkeley is doing in providing services to its residents — excellent, good, fair, or poor?</b>	
<b>Response</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Excellent	11%
Good	45%
Just Fair	32%
Poor	7%
(Don't know)	5%

<b>Combined Rating</b>	
<b>Response</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Excellent/Good	56%
Just Fair/Poor	39%

Overall perceptions of City service delivery are positive, with a majority (56%) rating services as excellent or good.

**Top Issues and Highest Priorities for Voters**

<b>Q5. Now I'm going to read some different issues that have been identified as important needs in the city of Berkeley. If you had to choose, which one or two of the following would be the highest priority for you personally in the city of Berkeley?</b>	
<b>Response</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Safeguarding critical infrastructure from the threats of climate change, including flooding and wildfires	35%
Increasing Berkeley's safety and accessibility by improving sidewalks, curb ramps, and pathways	31%
Reducing pollution flowing to the Bay and flood risk by upgrading storm drains and installing green infrastructure	24%
Improving parks, playgrounds, recreation facilities, dog parks, and community centers	23%
Replacing public safety facilities such as fire stations and emergency response buildings that are at the end of their useful life	22%

Improving the Berkeley waterfront and shoreline by protecting waterfront parks and repairing docks	15%
Advancing the Berkeley Civic Center Vision by restoring and modernizing historic buildings for community, arts, and civic use	11%
None	5%
Don't know	4%
Refused	1%

**Survey Results for Potential Ballot Measures**

<p><b>Q6.</b> This is a ballot measure that would provide funding through a general obligation bond. Shall the City of Berkeley enact a measure to provide funding to replace aging fire stations and emergency response facilities, repair parks and recreation facilities, promote climate change resiliency, and invest in public buildings and infrastructure to create safer, more resilient community spaces by issuing bonds of 300 million dollars, at an average rate of 22 dollars and 14 cents per 100 thousand dollars of assessed property value, with 100 million dollars issued every five years commencing in 2027, and requiring regular audits and independent oversight?</p> <p>If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?</p>	
<b>Response</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Yes - strongly	42%
Yes - not so strongly	31%
Lean yes	14%
Undecided/DK	16%
Lean no	3%
No - not so strongly	6%
No - strongly	11%
(Refused)	1%
Total Yes	71%
Total No	12%

**Q7.** This is a ballot measure that would provide funding through a general obligation bond. Shall the City of Berkeley enact a measure to provide funding to replace aging fire stations and emergency response facilities, repair parks and recreation facilities, promote climate change resiliency, and invest in public buildings and infrastructure to create safer, more resilient community spaces by issuing bonds of 200 million dollars, at an average rate of 18 dollars and 47 cents per 100 thousand dollars of assessed property value, with 100 million dollars issued every five years commencing in 2027, and requiring regular audits and independent oversight?

If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?

<b>Response</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Yes - strongly	36%
Yes - not so strongly	17%
Lean yes	18%
Undecided/DK	15%
Lean no	2%
No - not so strongly	3%
No - strongly	9%
(Refused)	0%
<b>Total Yes</b>	<b>70%</b>
<b>Total No</b>	<b>14%</b>

<b>6/7. Combined Initial GO Bond</b>	
<b>Response</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Yes - strongly	39%
Yes - not so strongly	16%
Lean yes	16%
Undecided/DK	16%
Lean no	2%
No - not so strongly	3%
No - strongly	8%
(Refused)	1%
<b>Total Yes</b>	<b>70%</b>
<b>Total No</b>	<b>13%</b>

**Q8.** This is a ballot measure that would increase the sales tax in the City of Berkeley to help address the City’s projected budget deficit of \$32 million. Shall the City of Berkeley measure to increase funding for essential city services, such as 9-1-1 emergency response; neighborhood police services; fire prevention/protection; youth and senior services; community cultural programs; attracting/ retaining small businesses; and funding for individuals and families experiencing homelessness, by adopting a ½ percent sales tax, providing about \$9,000,000 to \$10,000,000 yearly for general governmental use until ended by voters, with independent audits and all funds staying local, be adopted?

If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?

<b>Response</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Yes - strongly	37%
Yes - not so strongly	15%
Lean yes	8%
Undecided/DK	11%
Lean no	5%
No - not so strongly	5%
No - strongly	10%
(Refused)	0%
Total Yes	60%
Total No	29%

**Q12.** Now I am going to read you a list of different types of projects the City of Berkeley is considering. For each one, please tell me how important it is to you for the City to invest in. Is that extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all?

<b>Sorted by “Extremely important”</b>	<b>Percent</b>
12u.Renovate 911 dispatch	29%
D12t.Replace fire stations	27%
12p.Repair sidewalks	27%
D12f.Upgrade park restrooms	24%
C12s.Repair fire stations	22%
C12b.Earthquake protections for buildings	18%
12l.Protect Waterfront paths	18%
D12r.Repair public buildings - w/ Civic Center	18%
12o.Mental health building	17%
C12q.Repair public buildings	17%

12a.Repair/rebuild community centers	15%
12d.Safe/accessible playgrounds	15%
D12c.Earthquake protections - specific buildings	14%
C12e.Add park restrooms	13%
12h.Repair park paths/parking lots	12%
12n.South Berkeley green space	12%
12j.Repair recreational facilities	11%
12m.Repair seawall	11%
12i.Sports fields irrigation	9%
12k.Repair Marina's docks	8%
12g.New dog parks	4%

**Key Community Survey Findings:**

- Voters report generally positive attitudes about the City's direction and services (56% right direction; 56% excellent/good job performance).
- Top infrastructure priorities are climate resilience (35%), sidewalk/accessibility (31%), and stormwater/green infrastructure (24%).
- Initial GO bond support at both tested levels: \$300M (71% yes) and \$200M (70% yes).
- After hearing pro/con arguments, GO bond support remains above two-thirds when combined (67% yes).
- Sales tax support is majority: 60% initially, 58% after pro/con arguments.
- Project importance ratings place the highest "extremely important" emphasis on 911 dispatch modernization (29%), fire station replacement (27%), and sidewalk repair (27%).

**Next Steps**

The following provides a high level overview of next steps and key milestones:

- In the event City Council is supportive of advancing the proposed GO bond and increase in the sales and use tax, then city staff would work to refine ballot language based on input received from City Council and the results of the first community survey.
- If City Council is supportive of advancing a second community survey, city staff would work with Lake Research Partners to implement the second community

survey in April 2026 with results presented to City Council in late April / early May 2026.

- Based on the results of the first and second (if administered) community survey(s) and the input received from the broad community engagement campaign that is underway, a refined project list for the proposed GO bond would be presented to the City Council. The refined project list will also reflect additional cost estimating and resources needed to implement the GO bond.
- Based on City Council direction, final ballot language would be presented to the City Council in July 2026 to meet statutory deadlines that require any measure to be placed on the ballot be submitted to Alameda County by August 7, 2026.

### BACKGROUND

The City's exploration of potential revenue measures for the November 3, 2026, General Municipal Election is grounded in a series of City Council actions, long-range planning frameworks, and sustained cross-departmental analysis intended to address Berkeley's long-standing and growing capital infrastructure needs.

On June 17, 2025, City Council referred to the City Manager an item to assess the potential for a 2026 ballot measure to support capital improvements to Fire Department facilities. On September 30, 2025, City Council subsequently referred an additional item to assess the potential for a 2026 ballot measure to support improvements to recreation and community facilities. These referrals reflected Council's recognition that critical public safety and community-serving facilities face aging infrastructure, increasing maintenance backlogs, and operational constraints that cannot be fully addressed through existing funding sources.

This work builds on the City's long-range infrastructure planning framework established through Vision 2050, which emerged from Measure R (2018). Measure R directed the Mayor to convene a panel of subject matter experts to guide the City toward a climate-smart, technologically advanced, integrated, and efficient infrastructure future. The City Council accepted the Vision 2050 Framework in 2020, and in 2025, the Mayor convened a Task Force to review and update the recommendations contained in the original Vision 2050 report. Vision 2050 provides the overarching policy lens through which potential 2026 ballot measure projects are being evaluated, emphasizing equity, public health and safety, climate resilience, sustainability, and integrated systems planning.

At the December 2, 2025, City Council worksession, Council reviewed staff's preliminary assessment of the City's significant unfunded infrastructure and deferred maintenance needs and provided initial policy guidance to explore a potential General Obligation (GO) bond for the November 2026 ballot, with a funding capacity of up to approximately \$300 million. Staff noted that while a bond of this scale would not fully address the City's estimated infrastructure needs—currently exceeding \$1.5 billion—it

would represent a meaningful step toward stabilizing and modernizing critical assets that directly support public safety, community well-being, accessibility, and climate resilience.

Consistent with Council direction, staff developed a preliminary framework organizing potential bond projects into three high-level categories:

- (1) Community Facilities and Quality of Life;
- (2) Public Safety; and
- (3) Critical Infrastructure and Accessibility.

Projects within these categories were identified through a collaborative, cross-departmental process and evaluated using core City criteria as well as Vision 2050-aligned principles, including equity, public health and safety, climate resilience, sustainability, and opportunities to leverage external funding. Projects were also screened for readiness, feasibility, and deliverability to ensure that any potential ballot measure reflects projects that can be implemented within realistic timeframes and staffing capacity.

In parallel with the policy development and project framework, City Council directed staff to commence a robust community engagement and survey process to inform ballot measure development. To implement this direction, the City contracted with Lake Research Partners to design and administer a statistically valid community survey of Berkeley voters (Contract No:32600095). The survey was fielded from February 19–23, 2026 using live phone and text-to-online methodologies and tested voter priorities and support for potential General Obligation Bond concepts across multiple funding levels, as well as an exploratory question regarding a potential sales tax increase to address the City's projected budget deficit.

To complement the survey and ensure broader community input beyond likely voters, City staff implemented an expanded engagement strategy from January through March 2026 that included briefings and feedback sessions with the following:

- Six (6) City commissions (Environment and Climate Commission; Landmarks Commission; Commission on Disability; Disaster and Fire Safety Commission; Parks, Recreation and Waterfront Commission; and Transportation and Infrastructure Commission);
- Four (4) focus groups (Civic Recreation Users; residents interested in Capital Improvement Program priorities; Community Emergency Response Team groups; and Aquatic Parks stakeholders), and

- Joint community meetings organized by paired Council districts (Districts 5/6; 1/2; 3/8; and 4/7).

These engagements provided qualitative insight into community priorities, equity considerations, geographic differences in infrastructure conditions, concerns regarding affordability and cumulative tax burden, and expectations for oversight and transparency should a bond measure advance.

A website<sup>5</sup> has also been developed to provide information on the potential general obligation bond, the list of projects that could be funded by the proposed bond, information about community meetings, and a mechanism for community members to provide their input on the proposed list of projects.

### ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY AND CLIMATE IMPACTS

Many of the infrastructure investments under consideration for a potential November 2026 ballot measure directly advance the City's environmental sustainability, climate resilience, and environmental justice goals. Modernizing aging public facilities provides opportunities to incorporate energy-efficient building systems, high-performance materials, and low-carbon construction practices consistent with [Berkeley's Climate Action Plan](#) policies.

Several of the proposed project categories and example projects also directly support climate adaptation and resilience objectives, including improvements to stormwater infrastructure, shoreline and waterfront protection, seismic upgrades to critical facilities, and retrofits that enhance emergency response capacity during climate-related emergencies such as extreme heat, wildfire smoke events, flooding, and power outages. Investments in public safety facilities and emergency communications infrastructure further strengthen the City's ability to respond to increasingly frequent and severe climate-driven hazards.

In addition, proposed investments in sidewalks, ADA accessibility, and pedestrian infrastructure advance sustainable transportation and public health outcomes by improving walkability and accessibility, reducing reliance on vehicle travel, and supporting safer, more connected neighborhoods. Enhancements to parks, recreation facilities, and community centers also contribute to urban greening, heat mitigation, and community resilience by providing cooling spaces and accessible public gathering areas during extreme weather events.

Project prioritization and implementation will continue to be guided by the Vision 2050 framework, which elevates climate resilience, sustainability, equity, and integrated infrastructure planning as core principles. As specific projects are refined, staff will incorporate climate risk screening and lifecycle sustainability considerations to ensure

---

<sup>5</sup> <https://berkeleyca.gov/your-government/our-work/bond-revenue-measures/infrastructure-projects-potential-bond-measure>.

that public investments are durable, resilient to future climate conditions, and aligned with the City's long-term environmental and climate goals.

#### RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

City Council direction at this stage is necessary to ensure that any potential November 2026 ballot measure is aligned with Council policy priorities, informed by community input, and structured in a manner that is both feasible to implement and positioned for voter approval.

Providing direction now allows staff to refine project categories, develop ballot language, and conduct additional survey testing if authorized. Delaying direction could limit the City's ability to complete these steps in time to meet statutory deadlines for the November 2026 election.

#### ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS CONSIDERED

City Council could choose to take no action at this time. However, this approach would significantly constrain the City's ability to conduct additional survey testing, refine project priorities, and develop ballot language in a manner that meets the statutory deadlines for the November 2026 election. Delaying direction may also reduce the City's flexibility to respond to community feedback, incorporate equity and geographic considerations into project selection, and ensure that any potential ballot measure is fully vetted prior to Council consideration later in 2026.

Alternatively, City Council could direct staff to discontinue ballot measure development for the November 2026 election cycle. While this would avoid near-term ballot-related costs and workload, it would leave the City without a viable funding strategy to address its most urgent infrastructure and deferred maintenance needs, as well as the structural deficit in the General Fund.

#### CONTACT PERSON

Carianna Arredondo, Assistant to the City Manager, City Manager's Office, 510-981-6903

#### Attachments:

- 1: Results of 2026 Community Survey | Lake Research Partners
- 2: Proposed Infrastructure Project List Presentation

# CITY OF BERKELEY

## Findings from a community survey of 500 likely 2026 voters

February 19-23, 2026

David Mermin  
Emma Scotty


## Methodology

---

- Lake Research Partners designed and administered this survey, which was conducted by live telephone interview and text-to-online.
- The survey reached a total of 500 likely November 2026 election voters in Berkeley, California, sampled from the state voter file.
- The survey was conducted February 19-23, 2026.
- Data were weighted slightly by gender, region, age, race, party registration, homeownership, and education to reflect the expected demographic composition of likely November general election voters in Berkeley.
- The margin of error for the full sample is +/-4.4%.

# Demographics of Likely Voters in Berkeley

## GENDER



55% 45%

## AGE

Under 30	---	19%
30-39	---	15%
40-49	---	15%
50-64	---	21%
65+	---	31%

## EDUCATION

High School or Less	---	3%	
Post-H.S. / Some College	---	21%	
College Graduate	---	37%	76% College Grad or Post Grad
Post-Graduate	---	39%	

## PARTY REGISTRATION

	Democrat	79%
	Republican	3%
	NPP/Other	19%

## RACE

White	---	67%
Black	---	9%
Latino	---	9%
AAPI	---	11%
MENA	---	2%
Other	---	2%
DK/Ref	---	1%

## REGION

Hills (Districts 5,6,8)	---	45%
Central/South (3,4,7)	---	27%
West (1,2)	---	28%

## HOMEOWNER

Own	---	54%
Rent	---	43%
Oth	---	3%

## YEARS IN BERKELEY

Less than 2	---	5%	10 to 20	---	23%
2 to 5	---	13%	20 or more	---	36%
5 to 10	---	12%	Entire life	---	10%

## IDEOLOGY

Progressive	---	41%
Liberal	---	36%
Moderate	---	17%
Conservative	---	4%

## Key Findings – Overview

- **Both the GO bond and sales tax ballot measures are in a good position to pass in Berkeley this November.** Support for both measures currently surpasses the needed thresholds, though communication about the measures would be helpful to ensure passage.
  - **The GO bond has 70% support on the initial ballot,** above the two-thirds needed to pass. Having a higher \$300m amount on the ballot does not negatively impact support.
  - **The sales tax has slightly lower support at 60%,** but since it only needs 50% support, passage looks likely.
- **Berkeley voters are generally satisfied with the City** and majorities say the City is going in the right direction and is doing a good or excellent job providing services.
- **Voters are focused on priorities related to safety** – like protecting infrastructure from climate change, 911 dispatch and fire stations, improving earthquake protections, and repairing sidewalks.



## Key Findings – GO Bond

---

- **Seven in ten voters (70%) would vote Yes** to enact a measure to provide funding to replace aging fire stations and emergency response facilities, repair parks and recreation facilities, promote climate change resiliency, and invest in public buildings and infrastructure to create safer, more resilient community spaces by issuing bonds. Only 13% would vote No and 16% are undecided.
  - **Voters across demographics vote Yes at fairly similar margins**, though the highest support comes from voters who identify as progressive, those in the Central/South area, and people who have lived in Berkeley for 10-20 years.
- We tested two different versions of the bond measure – one at \$300m and one at \$200m. **Support is statistically the same between the two versions, indicating that there is no reason to not put the higher \$300m amount on the ballot.** In fact, support is slightly stronger in intensity and holds up to opposition more for the \$300m bond.
- **After hearing one statement in support and one in opposition to the bond measure, support remains right at the two-thirds mark**, with 67% Yes, 18% No, and 14% undecided.
  - After the statements, the \$300m version has higher support (72% Yes, 15% No, 13% undecided) than the \$200m (63% Yes, 22% No, 15% undecided). **The higher \$300m bond does not hurt support and in fact may help the bond hold up under pressure.**

## Key Findings – Sales Tax

---

- **A ½ percent sales tax to address the City’s budget deficit is slightly less popular than the bond measure, but in an even better position to pass since it only needs 50% support.** Six in ten Berkeley voters (60%) would vote Yes on the sales tax, 29% would vote No, and 11% are undecided.
  - Similar to the GO bond, support for the sales tax is highest in the Central/South region, and it also has higher support among younger women, liberals, and voters who have lived in Berkeley for over 20 years. **Majorities across all major demographics would vote Yes on the sales tax.**
- **Support for the sales tax remains largely steady after statements in favor and against the measure (58% Yes, 29% No, 13% undecided).**

## Key Findings – Context

---

- **A majority of Berkeley voters (56%) say the City is going in the right direction, while only 22% say wrong direction.** This is an improvement since the last survey in 2024, when 49% said right direction and 29% wrong direction.
- **The same number (56%) say the City is doing a good or excellent job at providing services to residents,** although intensity is low, with 11% who say excellent and 45% who say good. The City’s job rating has improved slightly but remains largely consistent with past surveys.
- While Berkeley voters have a mix of issues that they prioritize, **the top issues are *safeguarding critical infrastructure from the threats of climate change, including flooding and wildfires (35%) and increasing Berkeley’s safety and accessibility by improving sidewalks, curb ramps, and pathways (31%)***. Issues related to pollution and flood risk (24%), parks and recreation facilities (23%), and public safety facilities (22%) are also strong priorities. Advancing the Civic Center Vision is the lowest on the list at 11%.

## Key Findings – Project Priorities

---


- **The top tier of projects that voters prioritize tend to focus on safety.** These include **renovating the 911 dispatch center** (29% extremely important, 66% extremely/very important), **repairing sidewalks** (27% extremely important, 65% extremely/very important), **replacing fire stations** (27% extremely important, 56% extremely/very important), **upgrading park restrooms** (24% extremely important, 62% extremely/very important), and **repairing fire stations** (22% extremely important, 57% extremely/very important).
- While not the highest priority, voters do place importance on improving earthquake protections and repairing public buildings. Including the Civic Center buildings in a list of other public buildings does not hurt the importance of repairs; voters do not want this to be the focus of funding, but including Civic Center in a list of other buildings for repairs does not have a negative impact. However, specifying Old City Hall and the Veterans Building is less effective than more generally talking about earthquake protections.
- The lowest priorities tested are new dog parks, Marina docks, and sports field irrigation. Projects for public safety, especially emergency and fire services, cracked sidewalks, and earthquake protections, are higher priorities for Berkeley voters.



# CONTEXT

# City Direction

A majority of Berkeley voters think the City is headed in the right direction, while under a quarter say it's going in the wrong direction. Younger women, progressives and liberals, and those who have lived in Berkeley for 10-20 years are the most optimistic.




	Right Direction	Wrong Direction	DK	Net
<b>Total</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>+34</b>
Men	55	21	24	+33
Women	57	22	22	+35
< 50	57	17	26	+40
50+	55	26	20	+29
Men < 50	51	20	29	+31
Women < 50	<b>61</b>	15	24	+46
Men 50+	58	22	20	+36
Women 50+	52	28	20	+24
White	58	24	18	+34
POC	51	16	32	+35
Non-College	51	18	31	+33
College	57	23	20	+34
Progressive	<b>60</b>	13	26	+47
Liberal	<b>61</b>	22	16	+39
Mod/Cons	39	35	26	+4
Hills	57	24	18	+33
Central /South	59	22	19	+37
West	50	17	33	+33
Own	56	24	21	+32
Rent	55	20	25	+35
Under 10 years	56	15	29	+41
10-20 years	<b>62</b>	15	23	+47
20 or more years	53	29	18	+24

Q3: Would you say that the city of Berkeley is generally headed in the right direction or the wrong direction?

ALL RESPONDENTS

# City Direction – Timeseries


**Voters' rating of the City's direction has improved since 2024 and has reached the highest level since 2016.**



[T] Do you feel that the City of Berkeley is generally headed in the right direction or do you feel things are headed in the wrong direction?

# City Services Approval

A majority of voters also positively rate the City of Berkeley’s job providing services to residents, though only 11% say it is doing an excellent job. Liberals and 10-20 year residents are most likely to give the City a positive job rating.




	Excellent/ Good	Just Fair/Poor	DK	Net
Total	56	39	5	+17
Men	56	40	4	+15
Women	56	38	6	+18
< 50	56	38	6	+18
50+	56	40	4	+15
Men < 50	51	43	6	+8
Women < 50	59	34	6	+25
Men 50+	59	38	3	+21
Women 50+	53	42	5	+10
White	58	38	4	+20
POC	51	42	7	+9
Non-College	49	47	4	+3
College	58	37	5	+21
Progressive	55	40	5	+15
Liberal	63	34	4	+29
Mod/Cons	48	46	6	+3
Hills	57	39	4	+18
Central /South	56	38	6	+18
West	54	41	5	+13
Own	58	38	4	+19
Rent	53	40	6	+13
Under 10 years	54	40	6	+13
10-20 years	61	34	4	+27
20 or more years	55	41	4	+14

Q4: How would you rate the job the City of Berkeley is doing in providing services to its residents — excellent, good, fair, or poor?

# City Services Approval – Timeseries

Ratings have improved slightly since 2024, but the City’s job rating is generally consistent with recent years.




[T] How would you rate the job the City of Berkeley is doing in providing services to its residents — excellent, good, fair, or poor?

# Issues

The top issues that voters choose as their highest priorities are related to safety – protecting infrastructure from the threats of climate change and increasing safety and accessibility by improving sidewalks.

A second tier of priorities includes reducing pollution and flood risk by upgrading storm drains, improving parks and recreation, and replacing public safety facilities.



Q5: Now I’m going to read some different issues that have been identified as important needs in the city of Berkeley. If you had to choose, which one or two of the following would be the highest priority for you personally in the city of Berkeley?

ALL RESPONDENTS

# Issues by Demographics (1)

Safeguarding critical infrastructure from climate change is especially important to women and younger voters, particularly younger women, and this is also the top priority across regions. Men, especially younger men, are most concerned with fixing sidewalks, curb ramps, and paths.

	Total	Gender		Age		Gender/Age				Region			Race	
		M	W	< 50	50+	M < 50	W < 50	M 50+	W 50+	Hills	Central /South	West	White	POC
Safeguarding critical infrastructure	35	29	<b>40</b>	<b>40</b>	30	35	<b>45</b>	24	35	35	38	31	35	33
Improving sidewalks, curb ramps, and pathways	31	<b>35</b>	28	34	28	<b>40</b>	30	31	26	31	32	30	30	33
Reducing pollution/ upgrading storm drains	24	22	25	21	26	19	23	25	27	28	18	23	23	24
Improving parks and recreation	23	24	23	27	20	25	29	22	17	20	25	28	25	21
Replacing public safety facilities	22	23	21	20	23	23	18	23	23	25	16	21	23	20
Improving the Berkeley waterfront and shoreline	15	18	13	13	17	13	13	23	12	10	14	25	17	12
Advancing the Berkeley Civic Center Vision	11	13	9	11	11	12	10	14	8	9	15	9	11	9
None	5	5	6	5	6	5	5	4	7	7	4	5	4	8

Q5: Now I'm going to read some different issues that have been identified as important needs in the city of Berkeley. If you had to choose, which one or two of the following would be the highest priority for you personally in the city of Berkeley?

## Issues by Demographics (2)

Voters who are undecided about the GO bond measure are particularly concerned with upgrading storm drains to reduce pollution, while those undecided on the sales tax most prioritize safeguarding critical infrastructure. This is also the top priority for Yes voters, while No voters are more concerned with sidewalks.

	Total	Education		Home ownership		Years in Berkeley			Combined bond ballot			Sales tax ballot		
		Non-Coll	Coll+	Own	Rent	<10	10-20	20+	Yes	No	Und	Yes	No	Und
Safeguarding critical infrastructure	35	29	37	36	34	39	38	30	<b>40</b>	21	24	<b>39</b>	25	<b>41</b>
Improving sidewalks, curb ramps, and pathways	31	33	30	26	<b>37</b>	27	34	32	32	35	23	30	34	27
Reducing pollution/ upgrading storm drains	24	19	25	26	21	21	26	24	24	13	<b>32</b>	26	22	17
Improving parks and recreation	23	22	24	24	22	28	23	21	23	18	27	24	23	20
Replacing public safety facilities	22	19	23	25	19	17	19	26	22	15	25	21	21	28
Improving the Berkeley waterfront and shoreline	15	22	13	13	17	11	17	17	15	18	12	15	16	12
Advancing the Berkeley Civic Center Vision	11	16	9	9	13	13	14	8	11	9	9	11	12	3
None	5	3	6	8	3	7	3	5	2	27	3	2	12	9

Q5: Now I'm going to read some different issues that have been identified as important needs in the city of Berkeley. If you had to choose, which one or two of the following would be the highest priority for you personally in the city of Berkeley?

# GO BOND



## Text of GO Bond Ballot Measure

---


**[GO BOND \$300m]** Shall the City of Berkeley enact a measure to provide funding to replace aging fire stations and emergency response facilities, repair parks and recreation facilities, promote climate change resiliency, and invest in public buildings and infrastructure to create safer, more resilient community spaces by issuing bonds of 300 million dollars, at an average rate of 22 dollars and 14 cents per 100 thousand dollars of assessed property value, with 100 million dollars issued every five years commencing in 2027, and requiring regular audits and independent oversight?

**[GO BOND \$200m]** Shall the City of Berkeley enact a measure to provide funding to replace aging fire stations and emergency response facilities, repair parks and recreation facilities, promote climate change resiliency, and invest in public buildings and infrastructure to create safer, more resilient community spaces by issuing bonds of 200 million dollars, at an average rate of 18 dollars and 47 cents per 100 thousand dollars of assessed property value, with 100 million dollars issued every five years commencing in 2027, and requiring regular audits and independent oversight?

# Initial Ballot GO Bond Measure COMBINED

By nearly seven to one, Berkeley voters would vote Yes on a measure providing funding through a general obligation bond to invest in fire stations and emergency response facilities, parks and recreation facilities, climate change resiliency, and public buildings and infrastructure, just above the two-thirds threshold needed for the measure to pass.

Regionally, the highest support is in the Central/South region of the city. Progressives and voters who have lived in Berkeley for 10-20 years are also particularly supportive.




	Yes	No	U/D/R	Net
<b>Total</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>+57</b>
Men	70	15	15	+55
Women	71	12	17	+59
< 50	72	12	16	+61
50+	69	14	17	+54
Men < 50	72	14	14	+57
Women < 50	73	10	17	+63
Men 50+	69	15	17	+54
Women 50+	69	14	18	+55
White	74	12	14	+62
POC	64	15	21	+49
Non-College	73	5	22	+68
College	70	16	15	+54
Progressive	<b>78</b>	6	16	+73
Liberal	73	10	16	+63
Mod/Cons	52	30	18	+22
Hills	71	13	15	+58
Central /South	<b>75</b>	10	14	+65
West	65	15	20	+50
Own	67	19	14	+48
Rent	74	6	19	+68
Under 10 years	67	12	20	+55
10-20 years	<b>76</b>	11	13	+65
20 or more years	70	15	15	+56
Right direction	79	7	14	+72
Wrong track	60	30	10	+30

Q6/Q7. This is a ballot measure that would provide funding through a general obligation bond. If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?: And is that Yes/No strongly or not so strongly?: Well, to which side do you lean?

# Initial Ballot GO Bond Measure - \$300m vs \$200m

We tested two separate versions of the bond measure with different amounts and found that having the larger \$300 million amount on the ballot does not impact support. In fact, the strong Yes vote is slightly higher for \$300m than \$200m.

Older women and liberal voters are more likely to vote Yes on \$300m, while younger voters, progressives, and those who have lived in Berkeley for 10-20 years are more likely to vote Yes on the lower \$200m version.



	\$300 million		\$200 million	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Total	71	12	70	14
Men	70	16	70	14
Women	71	9	71	15
< 50	69	15	76	9
50+	72	10	65	19
Men < 50	72	21	72	8
Women < 50	67	10	79	10
Men 50+	68	11	69	19
Women 50+	75	9	62	19
White	76	11	72	13
POC	61	15	67	16
Progressive	75	5	82	7
Liberal	76	13	71	8
Mod/Cons	56	22	48	38
Hills	71	13	71	14
Central /South	74	11	77	10
West	67	12	63	18
Own	69	16	65	21
Rent	72	7	76	5
Under 10 years	70	13	65	12
10-20 years	71	12	81	10
20 or more years	71	11	69	18

Q6/Q7. This is a ballot measure that would provide funding through a general obligation bond. If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?: And is that Yes/No strongly or not so strongly?: Well, to which side do you lean?

## Text of Support/Oppose Statements – GO Bond Ballot Measure

---


*Supporters* say the City needs investments in fire services, parks, and building repairs to ensure safety and quality of life, and to save the city money by investing in cost-saving green energy. Building on past successes like repairing streets and increasing affordable housing, this bond will focus on replacing unsafe and undersized fire stations, revitalizing community and senior centers, improving parks and sidewalks, and preparing for sea-level rise and climate change. These investments will improve our quality of life, save the city money, and make us safer.

*Opponents* say that Berkeley taxpayers keep getting soaked for more and more increases with little to show for it. We funded streets, and the streets are still a mess. We funded housing, and housing costs and homelessness are worse than ever. We can't afford to pay more in taxes at a time when people are already struggling. We need to look more closely at this high-tax, high-cost city government, cut wasteful and unnecessary spending, and use existing funds efficiently.

# Informed Ballot GO Bond Measure COMBINED

After balanced statements in support and in opposition to the bond measure, support decreases slightly but remains right at the passage threshold.

Moderate and conservative voters are the most likely to vote No, while three quarters of progressives still vote Yes. Regionally, support remains lowest in the West.




	Yes	No	U/D/R	Net
<b>Total</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>+49</b>
Men	68	19	13	+49
Women	67	18	15	+49
< 50	71	15	14	+56
50+	64	22	15	+42
Men < 50	71	17	12	+54
Women < 50	71	13	15	+58
Men 50+	65	21	14	+45
Women 50+	62	22	16	+40
White	71	17	12	+54
POC	60	20	19	+40
Non-College	66	9	25	+56
College	68	21	11	+47
Progressive	<b>74</b>	11	15	+63
Liberal	69	16	15	+54
Mod/Cons	52	<b>36</b>	12	+17
Hills	68	19	13	+48
Central /South	73	12	15	+61
West	62	23	16	+39
Own	66	24	10	+42
Rent	69	12	19	+57
Under 10 years	62	15	23	+47
10-20 years	<b>74</b>	17	9	+56
20 or more years	68	21	11	+47
Initial Undecided	29	18	52	+11

Q9/Q10. Q10: Next you will hear two statements made by people who support or oppose the general obligation bond measure described earlier. Sometimes in a survey like this, people change their minds. Shall the City of Berkeley enact a measure issuing bonds of 200 million dollars, at rates of [] per 100 thousand dollars of assessed property value, with 100 million dollars issued every five years commencing in 2027, and requiring regular audits and independent oversight?

# Informed Ballot GO Bond Measure - \$300m vs \$200m

The \$300m bond holds up better to stress testing, with the Yes vote 9 points higher than Yes on \$200m. Younger women and voters in the Central/South region who heard the \$300m amount are particularly supportive.

Among moderate/conservative voters and in the West, opposition is higher among those who heard the \$200m version.



	\$300 million		\$200 million	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Total	72	15	63	22
Men	72	16	64	21
Women	72	14	62	22
< 50	75	12	67	17
50+	69	17	58	26
Men < 50	73	18	69	16
Women < 50	77	8	66	19
Men 50+	71	15	60	26
Women 50+	67	20	57	25
White	72	15	69	19
POC	70	14	51	27
Progressive	76	7	73	16
Liberal	76	15	63	16
Mod/Cons	59	30	46	42
Hills	70	19	65	20
Central /South	80	10	65	14
West	67	13	56	32
Own	69	19	63	29
Rent	74	11	63	13
Under 10 years	69	13	55	17
10-20 years	73	13	74	22
20 or more years	72	17	63	25

Q9/Q10. Q10: Next you will hear two statements made by people who support or oppose the general obligation bond measure described earlier. Sometimes in a survey like this, people change their minds. Shall the City of Berkeley enact a measure issuing bonds of 200 million dollars, at rates of [] per 100 thousand dollars of assessed property value, with 100 million dollars issued every five years commencing in 2027, and requiring regular audits and independent oversight?

# GO Bond Target Profiles

**Voters who are undecided on the bond measure are slightly more likely to be NPP voters, renters, and live in West Berkeley than the overall electorate. They are also more likely to have some college education, lived in Berkeley for under 10 years, and be people of color, especially men. Persuadable voters are similarly likely to be renters, lived in Berkeley for less than 10 years, have some college education, and also include moderates, younger women, college-educated women, and Black voters.**

Profile of GO Bond Undecided Voters – 16% of Electorate		
Demographic	% of Undecided	% of Electorate
NPP/Other	24	19
65-69	17	8
Some college	27	16
Non-college men	20	12
Under 10 years in Berkeley	37	30
People of color	41	32
Men of color	19	13
Rent	51	43
Rent West	20	13
West	36	28

Profile of GO Bond Persuadable Voters – 16% of Electorate		
Demographic	% of Persuadable	% of Electorate
Moderate	23	17
Women < 50	34	27
Some college	29	16
Non-college men	23	12
College+ women	49	43
Under 10 years in Berkeley	40	30
Black	15	9
Black men	11	4
People of color < 50	28	19
Rent	51	43




# SALES TAX

**[SALES TAX]** Shall the City of Berkeley measure to increase funding for essential city services, such as 9-1-1 emergency response; neighborhood police services; fire prevention/protection; youth and senior services; community cultural programs; attracting/ retaining small businesses; and funding for individuals and families experiencing homelessness, by adopting a ½ percent sales tax, providing about \$9,000,000 to \$10,000,000 yearly for general governmental use until ended by voters, with independent audits and all funds staying local, be adopted?

# Initial Ballot Sales Tax Measure

Passage of the ½ percent sales tax to address the City’s budget deficit also looks promising. While it has lower initial support than the bond measure, support is well above the 50% threshold for passage. Demographics with the highest support for the sales tax include women under 50, liberal voters, Central/South voters, and 20+ year residents of Berkeley. Even half of voters who say the city is going in the wrong direction would vote Yes.



	Yes	No	U/D/R	Net
<b>Total</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>+31</b>
Men	55	33	12	+22
Women	64	25	12	+39
< 50	63	25	12	+38
50+	57	32	11	+24
Men < 50	55	31	14	+24
Women < 50	<b>69</b>	20	11	+49
Men 50+	54	35	10	+19
Women 50+	58	30	12	+29
White	62	27	11	+35
POC	55	32	13	+24
Non-College	63	21	15	+42
College	59	31	11	+28
Progressive	58	30	12	+28
Liberal	<b>66</b>	21	13	+46
Mod/Cons	52	39	9	+13
Hills	56	30	14	+27
Central /South	<b>65</b>	28	6	+37
West	60	27	13	+33
Own	61	29	10	+32
Rent	58	27	15	+31
Under 10 years	54	29	17	+25
10-20 years	58	32	10	+26
20 or more years	<b>65</b>	26	9	+38
Right direction	<b>67</b>	22	11	+45
Wrong track	51	41	9	+10

Q8: This is a ballot measure that would increase the sales tax in the City of Berkeley to help address the City’s projected budget deficit of \$32 million. If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided? And is that Yes/No strongly or not so strongly?: Well, to which side do you lean?

## Text of Support/Oppose Statements – Sales Tax Ballot Measure


---

*Supporters* say the City must address its projected budget deficit to prevent layoffs of police officers and firefighters, the closure of a fire station, and the loss of vital youth and homeless services. This is a modest change to the sales tax, and it only brings Berkeley to the same tax rates as nearby cities like Oakland and Albany. It will fund essential services to make sure police and firefighters can continue to keep us safe and maintain the city's quality of life without putting a major burden on taxpayers.

*Opponents* say this tax hike is yet another burden on taxpayers without any new or improved services to show for it. Berkeley taxpayers simply can't afford all these tax increases, and we shouldn't be asked to pay more when nothing will change. Increasing the sales tax will increase the burden on low- and middle-class residents and local small businesses. The City should use its existing budget and avoid deficits instead of asking us for more money.

# Informed Ballot Sales Tax Measure

**After pro and con messaging, a solid majority continues to vote Yes on the sales tax measure, and opposition remains unchanged. Younger women, liberals, and 20+ year residents remain the strongest supporters.**



	Yes	No	U/D/R	Net
<b>Total</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>+29</b>
Men	56	31	13	+25
Women	60	27	13	+33
< 50	62	26	12	+36
50+	55	32	14	+23
Men < 50	58	27	15	+31
Women < 50	<b>65</b>	25	10	+40
Men 50+	54	35	11	+19
Women 50+	55	29	16	+26
White	62	25	13	+37
POC	50	36	14	+14
Non-College	57	24	19	+33
College	58	30	11	+28
Progressive	57	31	13	+26
Liberal	<b>64</b>	20	16	+43
Mod/Cons	53	39	8	+14
Hills	56	28	16	+27
Central /South	60	28	11	+32
West	60	30	10	+30
Own	60	28	12	+32
Rent	55	29	16	+26
Under 10 years	55	27	17	+28
10-20 years	54	35	11	+18
20 or more years	<b>63</b>	26	11	+37
Initial undecided	23	12	65	+11

Q11: Next you will [hear/see] two statements made by people who support or oppose the sales tax measure described earlier. Sometimes in a survey like this, people change their minds. Shall the measure adopting a ½ percent sales tax, providing about \$9,000,000 to \$10,000,000 yearly for general governmental use until ended by voters, with independent audits and all funds staying local, be adopted?

# Sales Tax Target Profiles

Undecided voters on the sales tax are heavily progressive/liberal men, non-college men, and men of color while persuadables are more likely to be Democratic and progressive/liberal men, younger men, non-college men, and renter men. Similar to the bond targets, both undecideds and persuadables have disproportionately lived in Berkeley for under 10 years. Both are also concentrated in the Berkeley Hills, particularly renters in the Hills.

Profile of Sales Tax Undecided Voters – 11% of Electorate		
Demographic	% of Undecided	% of Electorate
Democrat < 50	42	36
Progressive/liberal men	43	34
Some college	27	16
Non-college men	20	12
Under 10 years in Berkeley	43	30
Men of color	19	13
Rent	52	43
Rent Hills	28	15
Hills	54	45
Hills women	30	24

Profile of Sales Tax Persuadable Voters – 15% of Electorate		
Demographic	% of Persuadable	% of Electorate
Democratic men	41	33
Democrat < 50	42	36
Progressive/liberal men	42	34
Men < 50	29	21
Some college	26	16
Grad school	46	39
Non-college men	23	12
Under 10 years in Berkeley	40	30
Rent men	32	20
Rent Hills	28	15
Hills	55	45

# PRIORITIES



## Text of Priority Items – Top Tier

**[Renovate 911 dispatch]** Renovate the 911 dispatch center to handle higher call volumes and modernize critical infrastructure

**[Replace fire stations\*]** Make fire stations citywide safer and more energy efficient by replacing fire stations that are no longer able to meet demands with new stations run on green energy

**[Repair sidewalks]** Improve safety and accessibility by repairing cracked and uneven sidewalks and upgrading curb ramps citywide

**[Upgrade park restrooms\*]** Upgrade deteriorating public restrooms at Berkeley parks

**[Repair fire stations\*]** Make fire stations citywide safer and more energy efficient by conducting essential repairs and adding green energy capacity

**[Earthquake protections for buildings\*]** Improve earthquake protections and address safety concerns to fully re-open historic city buildings

**[Protect Waterfront paths]** Protect paths and roads on Berkeley's Waterfront from flooding due to sea level rise

**[Repair public buildings – w/ Civic Center\*]** Repair public buildings such as the Public Safety Building, the Animal Services Facility, South Berkeley Senior Center, and Civic Center Buildings to improve their energy efficiency and safety

**[Mental health building]** Expand mental health service capacity by replacing crumbling offices with a new energy efficient mental health services building

**[Repair public buildings\*]** Repair public buildings such as the Public Safety Building, the Animal Services Facility, and South Berkeley Senior Center to improve their energy efficiency and safety

## Text of Priority Items – Lower Tier

**[Repair /rebuild community centers]** Repair and rebuild community centers that are out of date, energy inefficient, too small, or vulnerable to earthquakes

**[Safe/accessible playgrounds]** Make playgrounds safer and more accessible

**[Earthquake protections – specific buildings\*]** Improve earthquake protections and address safety concerns to fully re-open historic city buildings such as Old City Hall and the Veterans Building

**[Add park restrooms\*]** Add public restrooms to Berkeley parks

**[Repair park paths /parking lots]** Improve safety and accessibility in the City's parks by repairing park pathways and parking lots

**[South Berkeley green space]** Expanding accessible green open space in South Berkeley

**[Repair recreational facilities]** Repair and modernize aged public recreational facilities like pools, soccer fields, and basketball courts

**[Repair seawall]** Rebuild the failing seawall that threatens public access to South Cove


**[Sports fields irrigation]** Fix failing irrigation and drainage at the City's most used sports fields

**[Repair Marina's docks]** Repair Marina's docks to extend their lifespan 50-plus years

**[New dog parks]** Build additional dog parks across the City to meet growing demand

# Priority Items

Of potential projects that the measures could fund, the top priorities for voters are renovating the 911 dispatch center, replacing outdated fire stations, and repairing sidewalks. The lowest priorities are new dog parks, repairing Marina docks, and sports fields irrigation.



Extremely important      Very important


Q12: Now I am going to read you a list of different types of projects the City of Berkeley is considering. For each one, please tell me how important it is to you for the City to invest in.

\*SPLIT SAMPLED

# Priority Items – Park and Fire Language Tests

Upgrading deteriorating park restrooms is a higher priority than adding new park restrooms.

Fire stations are a top priority, and voters do not shy away from replacing rather than repairing fire stations – replacing fire stations has slightly higher intensity as a priority than repairing.




Extremely important Very important

Q12: Now I am going to read you a list of different types of projects the City of Berkeley is considering. For each one, please tell me how important it is to you for the City to invest in.

\*SPLIT SAMPLED

# Priority Items – Building Repair Language Tests

While including the examples of Old City Hall and the Veterans Building brings down the salience of improving earthquake protections and building safety, adding Civic Center Buildings to a list of other public buildings for repair does not have an impact. Neither example should be a focal point – talking about buildings in the broader context and emphasizing safety is most effective.



■ Extremely important
 ■ Very important

Q12: Now I am going to read you a list of different types of projects the City of Berkeley is considering. For each one, please tell me how important it is to you for the City to invest in.

\*SPLIT SAMPLED

# Priority Items by Demographics (1) – Top Tier

The public safety projects (911 dispatch center and fire stations) are top priorities across demographics. Replacing fire stations is especially important to younger women and voters in Central/South.

Extremely important	Total	Gender		Age		Gender/Age				Region			Race	
		M	W	< 50	50+	M < 50	W < 50	M 50+	W 50+	Hills	C/S	West	White	POC
Renovate 911 dispatch	29	26	31	26	32	21	29	30	33	31	33	22	29	28
Replace fire stations*	27	25	28	32	22	28	<b>34</b>	22	22	26	<b>34</b>	22	26	29
Repair sidewalks	27	24	28	24	29	20	28	28	29	26	26	28	26	29
Upgrade park restrooms*	24	23	25	22	26	21	23	26	26	24	25	23	23	26
Repair fire stations*	22	22	21	18	25	19	17	24	26	27	20	14	22	21
Earthquake protections for buildings*	18	17	19	18	18	18	17	16	21	17	19	19	16	21
Protect Waterfront paths	18	14	22	16	19	14	18	14	25	19	16	19	17	19
Repair public buildings – w/ Civic Center*	18	12	23	17	18	16	18	8	27	19	17	17	17	20
Mental health building	17	16	18	17	17	14	19	18	17	17	17	18	15	21
Repair public buildings*	17	14	19	15	18	12	18	16	21	21	10	16	16	16

Q12: Now I am going to read you a list of different types of projects the City of Berkeley is considering. For each one, please tell me how important it is to you for the City to invest in.

\*SPLIT SAMPLED

## Priority Items by Demographics (2) – Top Tier

Yes voters are particularly energized by the 911 dispatch, fire stations, and sidewalks. Upgrading park restrooms is the top priority for renters and voters who have mixed responses across the ballots.

Extremely important	Total	Education		Home ownership		Years in Berkeley			Combined bond ballot		Sales tax ballot		Ballot target	
		Non-Coll	Coll+	Own	Rent	<10	10-20	20+	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes all	Mixed
Renovate 911 dispatch	29	29	29	28	30	28	24	32	34	12	35	18	39	23
Replace fire stations*	27	29	26	27	26	21	30	29	29	12	32	15	33	25
Repair sidewalks	27	28	26	26	29	20	26	32	29	18	34	14	33	23
Upgrade park restrooms*	24	31	22	18	<b>32</b>	27	21	24	27	21	26	22	20	<b>30</b>
Repair fire stations*	22	20	22	26	15	12	19	29	27	0	28	8	35	13
Earthquake protections for buildings*	18	16	19	18	19	14	17	21	23	2	25	6	26	13
Protect Waterfront paths	18	22	17	19	17	11	23	20	22	9	23	10	22	16
Repair public buildings – w/ Civic Center*	18	21	17	14	22	17	22	16	18	5	22	10	19	19
Mental health building	17	17	17	14	21	20	14	17	20	3	23	8	24	13
Repair public buildings*	17	16	17	18	16	15	15	19	21	3	25	1	27	10

Q12: Now I am going to read you a list of different types of projects the City of Berkeley is considering. For each one, please tell me how important it is to you for the City to invest in.

\*SPLIT SAMPLED

# Priority Items by Demographics (1) – Lower Tier

The lower tier priorities are generally lower to voters across demographics.

Extremely important	Total	Gender		Age		Gender/Age				Region			Race	
		M	W	< 50	50+	M < 50	W < 50	M 50+	W 50+	Hills	C/S	West	White	POC
Repair/rebuild community centers	15	13	18	17	14	13	21	13	15	14	22	11	14	18
Safe/accessible playgrounds	15	13	16	13	17	13	13	13	20	16	12	16	14	17
Earthquake protections – specific buildings*	14	13	16	12	16	13	12	13	19	15	17	12	14	16
Repair park paths/parking lots	12	8	16	12	13	7	15	9	16	9	17	13	11	14
South Berkeley green space	12	10	14	10	14	9	11	11	17	12	15	9	12	13
Repair recreational facilities	11	10	12	8	15	6	10	14	15	10	14	12	11	12
Repair seawall	11	9	13	9	13	10	9	8	17	10	13	12	10	14
Sports fields irrigation	9	9	9	7	11	8	7	10	12	8	6	14	9	9
Repair Marina’s docks	8	6	9	6	9	6	7	7	11	6	7	11	8	8
New dog parks	4	5	3	4	4	4	4	7	3	4	7	3	4	5

Q12: Now I am going to read you a list of different types of projects the City of Berkeley is considering. For each one, please tell me how important it is to you for the City to invest in.

## Priority Items by Demographics (2) – Lower Tier

**Building new dog parks and repairing Marina’s docks are relatively low priorities even for voters who vote Yes on both the bond and sales tax.**

Extremely important	Total	Education		Home ownership		Years in Berkeley			Combined bond ballot		Sales tax ballot		Ballot target	
		Non-Coll	Coll+	Own	Rent	<10	10-20	20+	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes all	Mixed
Repair/rebuild community centers	15	15	16	14	17	14	17	15	18	7	19	4	19	14
Safe/accessible playgrounds	15	15	15	13	16	13	14	16	18	4	19	5	19	12
Earthquake protections – specific buildings*	14	15	14	13	17	13	13	16	18	6	18	8	21	11
Add park restrooms*	13	16	12	9	18	15	14	10	14	5	14	10	11	15
Repair park paths/parking lots	12	16	11	13	11	8	11	16	16	4	17	5	17	9
South Berkeley green space	12	11	13	13	11	9	10	15	14	4	15	8	16	10
Repair recreational facilities	11	11	11	9	15	12	7	13	13	4	14	7	14	11
Repair seawall	11	10	12	11	11	12	8	12	13	8	13	9	15	8
Sports fields irrigation	9	10	9	8	12	8	10	10	11	4	11	6	10	9
Repair Marina’s docks	8	8	8	6	10	6	9	8	8	8	9	6	8	8
New dog parks	4	4	4	4	5	5	7	2	4	1	6	2	6	3

Q12: Now I am going to read you a list of different types of projects the City of Berkeley is considering. For each one, please tell me how important it is to you for the City to invest in.



Washington, DC | Berkeley, CA | New York, NY

[LakeResearch.com](http://LakeResearch.com)

202.776.9066

David Mermin

[dmermin@lakeresearch.com](mailto:dmermin@lakeresearch.com)

Emma Scotty

[escotty@lakeresearch.com](mailto:escotty@lakeresearch.com)

City of Berkeley Voter Survey  
Live Phone and Text to Online  
February 19-23 2026

N=500 Likely November 2026 General Election Voters

Splits: A/B, C/D

	TOTAL	HILLS	CENTRAL /SOUTH	WEST
Weighted N=	500	225	135	140
Unweighted N=	500	220	144	136

Region

Council District 5,6,8 .....	45	100	0	0
Council District 3,4,7 .....	27	0	100	0
Council District 1,2 .....	28	0	0	100

Party registration

Democrat .....	79	83	70	80
Republican .....	3	3	1	4
NPP /Other .....	19	15	28	16
NPP .....	15	14	22	10
Other.....	4	1	6	6

**Q1.** Before we begin, I need to know if I have reached you on a cell phone, and if so, are you in a place where you can talk safely?

Yes, cell and can talk safely .....	50	46	48	58
Yes, cell and cannot talk safely ... <b>[CALL BACK]</b>				
No, not on cell, but own one.....	2	4	1	1
No, not on cell, and do not own one.....	0	0	0	0
(Don't know/refused)..... <b>[TERMINATE]</b>				
Text to online .....	48	50	51	41

**Q2.** Although it is some time from now, what are the chances of you voting in the November 2026 general election for Governor, Congress, and other offices? Are you almost certain to vote, will you probably vote, are the chances about 50-50, are you probably not going to vote, or are you definitely not going to vote?

Almost certain to vote.....	97	96	97	97
Probably will vote .....	3	4	3	3
50-50 .....	<b>[TERMINATE]</b>			
Probably not.....	<b>[TERMINATE]</b>			
Definitely not .....	<b>[TERMINATE]</b>			
Don't know .....	<b>[TERMINATE]</b>			

	TOTAL	HILLS	CENTRAL /SOUTH	WEST
Weighted N=	500	225	135	140
Unweighted N=	500	220	144	136

**Q3. [T]** Would you say that the city of Berkeley is generally headed in the right direction or the wrong direction?

Right Direction .....	56	57	59	50
Wrong Direction .....	22	24	22	17
(Don't know).....	23	18	19	33

**Q4. [T]** How would you rate the job the City of Berkeley is doing in providing services to its residents — excellent, good, fair, or poor?

Excellent .....	11	11	13	8
Good.....	45	46	42	45
Fair .....	32	32	31	33
Poor.....	7	7	7	8
(Don't know).....	5	4	6	5
Excellent /Good.....	56	57	56	54
Fair /Poor .....	39	39	38	41

	TOTAL	HILLS	CENTRAL /SOUTH	WEST
Weighted N=	500	225	135	140
Unweighted N=	500	220	144	136

**Q5. [T\*]** Now I'm going to read some different issues that have been identified as important needs in the city of Berkeley. If you had to choose, which one or two of the following would be the highest priority for you personally in the city of Berkeley? **[RANDOMIZE]**  
**[ACCEPT UP TO TWO RESPONSES]**

Safeguarding critical infrastructure from the threats of climate change, including flooding and wildfires.....	35	35	38	31
Increasing Berkeley's safety and accessibility by improving sidewalks, curb ramps, and pathways .....	31	31	32	30
Reducing pollution flowing to the Bay and flood risk by upgrading storm drains and installing green infrastructure.....	24	28	18	23
Improving parks, playgrounds, recreation facilities, dog parks, and community centers .....	23	20	25	28
Replacing public safety facilities such as fire stations and emergency response buildings that are at the end of their useful life.....	22	25	16	21
Improving the Berkeley waterfront and shoreline by protecting waterfront parks and repairing docks.....	15	10	14	25
Advancing the Berkeley Civic Center Vision by restoring and modernizing historic buildings for community, arts, and civic use.....	11	9	15	9
None .....	5	7	4	5
Don't know .....	4	4	4	4
Refused .....	1	1	0	1

	TOTAL	HILLS	CENTRAL /SOUTH	WEST
Weighted N=	500	225	135	140
Unweighted N=	500	220	144	136

**The City of Berkeley is considering asking voters to approve a measure on the November 2026 ballot that would increase investments in Berkeley’s infrastructure.**

**Next you will [hear/see] a few different versions of ballot measures that may appear on the ballot in Berkeley this November. Here is the first measure.**

**Q6. SSA: [GO BOND – \$300m]** This is a ballot measure that would provide funding through a general obligation bond.

Shall the City of Berkeley enact a measure to provide funding to replace aging fire stations and emergency response facilities, repair parks and recreation facilities, promote climate change resiliency, and invest in public buildings and infrastructure to create safer, more resilient community spaces by issuing bonds of 300 million dollars, at an average rate of 22 dollars and 14 cents per 100 thousand dollars of assessed property value, with 100 million dollars issued every five years commencing in 2027, and requiring regular audits and independent oversight?

If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?

**[IF YES/NO]:** And is that Yes/No strongly or not so strongly?

**[IF UNDECIDED]:** Well, to which side do you lean?

Yes - strongly .....	42	47	38	36
Yes - not so strongly .....	15	10	25	14
Lean yes .....	14	14	11	17
Undecided/DK.....	16	14	15	21
Lean no.....	3	3	5	1
No - not so strongly.....	3	4	3	2
No - strongly .....	6	6	3	9
(Refused).....	1	2	0	0
Yes .....	71	71	74	67
No .....	12	13	11	12

	TOTAL	HILLS	CENTRAL /SOUTH	WEST
Weighted N=	500	225	135	140
Unweighted N=	500	220	144	136

**Q7. SSB: [GO BOND – \$200m]** This is a ballot measure that would provide funding through a general obligation bond.

Shall the City of Berkeley enact a measure to provide funding to replace aging fire stations and emergency response facilities, repair parks and recreation facilities, promote climate change resiliency, and invest in public buildings and infrastructure to create safer, more resilient community spaces by issuing bonds of 200 million dollars, at an average rate of 18 dollars and 47 cents per 100 thousand dollars of assessed property value, with 100 million dollars issued every five years commencing in 2027, and requiring regular audits and independent oversight?

If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?

**[IF YES/NO]:** And is that Yes/No strongly or not so strongly?

**[IF UNDECIDED]:** Well, to which side do you lean?

Yes - strongly .....	36	39	36	32
Yes - not so strongly .....	17	21	11	15
Lean yes .....	18	12	30	16
Undecided/DK.....	15	15	13	19
Lean no.....	2	3	3	0
No - not so strongly.....	3	2	3	5
No - strongly .....	9	10	4	13
(Refused).....	0	0	1	0
Yes .....	70	71	77	63
No .....	14	14	10	18

6/7. Combined initial Go Bond

Yes - strongly .....	39	43	37	34
Yes - not so strongly .....	16	16	18	15
Lean yes .....	16	13	20	16
Undecided/DK.....	16	14	14	20
Lean no.....	2	3	4	0
No - not so strongly.....	3	3	3	3
No - strongly .....	8	8	3	11
(Refused).....	1	1	0	0
Yes .....	70	71	75	65
No .....	13	13	10	15

	TOTAL	HILLS	CENTRAL /SOUTH	WEST
Weighted N=	500	225	135	140
Unweighted N=	500	220	144	136

***Now here is a different measure that could be on the ballot this year.***

**Q8. [SALES TAX]** This is a ballot measure that would increase the sales tax in the City of Berkeley to help address the City’s projected budget deficit of \$32 million.

Shall the City of Berkeley measure to increase funding for essential city services, such as 9-1-1 emergency response; neighborhood police services; fire prevention/protection; youth and senior services; community cultural programs; attracting/ retaining small businesses; and funding for individuals and families experiencing homelessness, by adopting a ½ percent sales tax, providing about \$9,000,000 to \$10,000,000 yearly for general governmental use until ended by voters, with independent audits and all funds staying local, be adopted?

If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?

**[IF YES/NO]:** And is that Yes/No strongly or not so strongly?

**[IF UNDECIDED]:** Well, to which side do you lean?

Yes - strongly .....	37	33	42	37
Yes - not so strongly .....	15	14	16	15
Lean yes .....	8	8	7	8
Undecided/DK.....	11	14	6	13
Lean no.....	5	4	6	5
No - not so strongly.....	5	6	7	2
No - strongly .....	18	19	15	19
(Refused).....	0	1	0	0
Yes .....	60	56	65	60
No .....	29	30	28	27

	TOTAL	HILLS	CENTRAL /SOUTH	WEST
Weighted N=	500	225	135	140
Unweighted N=	500	220	144	136

**Q9. SSA: [GO BOND – 300m]** Next you will [hear/see] two statements made by people who support or oppose the general obligation bond measure described earlier: **[ROTATE STATEMENTS]**

*Supporters* say the City needs investments in fire services, parks, and building repairs to ensure safety and quality of life, and to save the city money by investing in cost-saving green energy. Building on past successes like repairing streets and increasing affordable housing, this bond will focus on replacing unsafe and undersized fire stations, revitalizing community and senior centers, improving parks and sidewalks, and preparing for sea-level rise and climate change. These investments will improve our quality of life, save the city money, and make us safer. **[87 words]**

*Opponents* say that Berkeley taxpayers keep getting soaked for more and more increases with little to show for it. We funded streets, and the streets are still a mess. We funded housing, and housing costs and homelessness are worse than ever. We can't afford to pay more in taxes at a time when people are already struggling. We need to look more closely at this high-tax, high-cost city government, cut wasteful and unnecessary spending, and use existing funds efficiently. **[79 words]**

Sometimes in a survey like this, people change their minds.

Shall the City of Berkeley enact a measure issuing bonds of 300 million dollars, at rates of 22 dollars and 14 cents per 100 thousand dollars of assessed property value, with 100 million dollars issued every five years commencing in 2027, and requiring regular audits and independent oversight?

If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?

**[IF YES/NO]:** And is that Yes/No strongly or not so strongly?

**[IF UNDECIDED]:** Well, to which side do you lean?

Yes - strongly .....	43	45	44	38
Yes - not so strongly .....	20	18	31	15
Lean yes .....	9	7	5	14
Undecided/DK.....	13	11	10	20
Lean no.....	3	5	2	1
No - not so strongly.....	3	5	2	2
No - strongly .....	9	10	5	10
(Refused).....	0	0	0	0
Yes .....	72	70	80	67
No .....	15	19	10	13

	TOTAL	HILLS	CENTRAL /SOUTH	WEST
Weighted N=	500	225	135	140
Unweighted N=	500	220	144	136

**Q10. SSB: [GO BOND – 200m]** Next you will [hear/see] two statements made by people who support or oppose the general obligation bond measure described earlier: **[ROTATE STATEMENTS]**

*Supporters* say the City needs investments in fire services, parks, and building repairs to ensure safety and quality of life, and to save the city money by investing in cost-saving green energy. Building on past successes like repairing streets and increasing affordable housing, this bond will focus on replacing unsafe and undersized fire stations, revitalizing community and senior centers, improving parks and sidewalks, and preparing for sea-level rise and climate change. These investments will improve our quality of life, save the city money, and make us safer. **[87 words]**

*Opponents* say that Berkeley taxpayers keep getting soaked for more and more increases with little to show for it. We funded streets, and the streets are still a mess. We funded housing, and housing costs and homelessness are worse than ever. We can't afford to pay more in taxes at a time when people are already struggling. We need to look more closely at this high-tax, high-cost city government, cut wasteful and unnecessary spending, and use existing funds efficiently. **[79 words]**

Sometimes in a survey like this, people change their minds.

Shall the City of Berkeley enact a measure issuing bonds of 200 million dollars, at rates of 18 dollars and 47 cents per 100 thousand dollars of assessed property value, with 100 million dollars issued every five years commencing in 2027, and requiring regular audits and independent oversight?

If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?

**[IF YES/NO]:** And is that Yes/No strongly or not so strongly?

**[IF UNDECIDED]:** Well, to which side do you lean?

Yes - strongly .....	32	31	36	28
Yes - not so strongly .....	17	20	12	16
Lean yes .....	15	15	18	12
Undecided/DK.....	15	15	20	11
Lean no.....	4	2	4	8
No - not so strongly.....	4	5	3	4
No - strongly .....	13	12	7	21
(Refused).....	1	0	1	1
Yes .....	63	65	65	56
No .....	22	20	14	32

	TOTAL	HILLS	CENTRAL /SOUTH	WEST
Weighted N=	500	225	135	140
Unweighted N=	500	220	144	136

9/10.Combined Go Bond engaged debate

Yes - strongly .....	37	38	40	33
Yes - not so strongly .....	18	19	21	15
Lean yes .....	12	11	11	13
Undecided/DK.....	14	13	15	15
Lean no.....	4	3	3	4
No - not so strongly.....	4	5	3	3
No - strongly .....	11	11	6	16
(Refused).....	0	0	0	1
Yes .....	67	68	73	62
No .....	18	19	12	23

	TOTAL	HILLS	CENTRAL /SOUTH	WEST
Weighted N=	500	225	135	140
Unweighted N=	500	220	144	136

**Q11. [SALES TAX]** Next you will [hear/see] two statements made by people who support or oppose the sales tax measure described earlier: **[ROTATE STATEMENTS]**

*Supporters* say the City must address its projected budget deficit to prevent layoffs of police officers and firefighters, the closure of a fire station, and the loss of vital youth and homeless services. This is a modest change to the sales tax, and it only brings Berkeley to the same tax rates as nearby cities like Oakland and Albany. It will fund essential services to make sure police and firefighters can continue to keep us safe and maintain the city’s quality of life without putting a major burden on taxpayers. **[90 words]**

*Opponents* say this tax hike is yet another burden on taxpayers without any new or improved services to show for it. Berkeley taxpayers simply can’t afford all these tax increases, and we shouldn’t be asked to pay more when nothing will change. Increasing the sales tax will increase the burden on low- and middle-class residents and local small businesses. The City should use its existing budget and avoid deficits instead of asking us for more money. **[76 words]**

Sometimes in a survey like this, people change their minds.

Shall the measure adopting a ½ percent sales tax, providing about \$9,000,000 to \$10,000,000 yearly for general governmental use until ended by voters, with independent audits and all funds staying local, be adopted?

If the election were held today, would you vote Yes or No on this measure, or are you undecided?

**[IF YES/NO]:** And is that Yes/No strongly or not so strongly?

**[IF UNDECIDED]:** Well, to which side do you lean?

Yes - strongly .....	36	34	39	35
Yes - not so strongly .....	15	14	16	14
Lean yes .....	8	7	6	11
Undecided/DK.....	13	16	11	10
Lean no.....	4	2	7	3
No - not so strongly.....	6	6	6	8
No - strongly .....	19	20	15	20
(Refused).....	0	1	0	0
Yes .....	58	56	60	60
No .....	29	28	28	30

	TOTAL	HILLS	CENTRAL /SOUTH	WEST
Weighted N=	500	225	135	140
Unweighted N=	500	220	144	136

**Q12.** Now I am going to read you a list of different types of projects the City of Berkeley is considering. For each one, please tell me how important it is to you for the City to invest in. Is that extremely important, very important, moderately important, slightly important, or not important at all? **{ROTATE LIST}**

**Sorted by “Extremely important”**

12u.Renovate 911 dispatch.....	29	31	33	22
D12t.Replace fire stations .....	27	26	34	22
12p.Repair sidewalks .....	27	26	26	28
D12f.Upgrade park restrooms .....	24	24	25	23
C12s.Repair fire stations.....	22	27	20	14
C12b.Earthquake protections for buildings.....	18	17	19	19
12l.Protect Waterfront paths.....	18	19	16	19
D12r.Repair public buildings - w/ Civic Center .....	18	19	17	17
12o.Mental health building .....	17	17	17	18
C12q.Repair public buildings.....	17	21	10	16
12a.Repair/rebuild community centers .....	15	14	22	11
12d.Safe/accessible playgrounds.....	15	16	12	16
D12c.Earthquake protections - specific buildings .....	14	15	17	12
C12e.Add park restrooms .....	13	11	9	19
12h.Repair park paths/parking lots.....	12	9	17	13
12n.South Berkeley green space .....	12	12	15	9
12j.Repair recreational facilities .....	11	10	14	12
12m.Repair seawall .....	11	10	13	12
12i.Sports fields irrigation.....	9	8	6	14
12k.Repair Marina's docks .....	8	6	7	11
12g.New dog parks .....	4	4	7	3

	TOTAL	HILLS	CENTRAL /SOUTH	WEST
Weighted N=	500	225	135	140
Unweighted N=	500	220	144	136

a. **[Repair /rebuild community centers]** Repair and rebuild community centers that are out of date, energy inefficient, too small, or vulnerable to earthquakes

Extremely important .....	15	14	22	11
Very important.....	39	41	41	33
Moderately important .....	29	26	27	36
Slightly important .....	10	9	6	14
Not important at all.....	6	8	4	5
(Don't know).....	1	1	0	1
Important.....	54	55	63	44
Not important .....	45	44	36	55

b. **SSC: [Earthquake protections for buildings]** Improve earthquake protections and address safety concerns to fully re-open historic city buildings

Extremely important .....	18	17	19	19
Very important.....	35	37	36	31
Moderately important .....	28	26	27	31
Slightly important .....	11	11	12	9
Not important at all.....	8	9	5	8
(Don't know).....	1	0	1	3
Important.....	53	54	55	50
Not important .....	46	46	44	48

c. **SSD: [Earthquake protections – specific buildings]** Improve earthquake protections and address safety concerns to fully re-open historic city buildings such as Old City Hall and the Veterans Building

Extremely important .....	14	15	17	12
Very important.....	27	27	29	25
Moderately important .....	32	35	27	33
Slightly important .....	17	16	20	15
Not important at all.....	9	7	7	14
(Don't know).....	1	0	0	1
Important.....	41	41	46	37
Not important .....	58	58	54	62

d. **[Safe/accessible playgrounds]** Make playgrounds safer and more accessible

Extremely important .....	15	16	12	16
Very important.....	35	40	31	29
Moderately important .....	31	29	36	28
Slightly important .....	12	9	12	17
Not important at all.....	7	6	6	8
(Don't know).....	1	1	2	2
Important.....	50	56	43	45
Not important .....	49	43	55	53

	TOTAL	HILLS	CENTRAL /SOUTH	WEST
Weighted N=	500	225	135	140
Unweighted N=	500	220	144	136

e. **SSC: [Add park restrooms]** Add public restrooms to Berkeley parks

Extremely important .....	13	11	9	19
Very important.....	41	39	47	39
Moderately important .....	29	29	28	29
Slightly important .....	10	11	10	7
Not important at all.....	7	10	4	6
(Don't know).....	1	1	1	0
Important.....	53	49	56	58
Not important .....	46	50	43	42

f. **SSD: [Upgrade park restrooms]** Upgrade deteriorating public restrooms at Berkeley parks

Extremely important .....	24	24	25	23
Very important.....	38	35	43	40
Moderately important .....	26	29	19	29
Slightly important .....	8	8	12	5
Not important at all.....	3	4	2	3
(Don't know).....	0	0	0	0
Important.....	62	59	68	63
Not important .....	38	41	32	37

g. **[New dog parks]** Build additional dog parks across the City to meet growing demand

Extremely important .....	4	4	7	3
Very important.....	16	15	18	18
Moderately important .....	27	26	27	29
Slightly important .....	22	21	27	20
Not important at all.....	29	34	21	28
(Don't know).....	1	1	1	2
Important.....	21	18	24	21
Not important .....	78	80	75	77

h. **[Repair park paths /parking lots]** Improve safety and accessibility in the City's parks by repairing park pathways and parking lots

Extremely important .....	12	9	17	13
Very important.....	33	32	31	36
Moderately important .....	32	36	32	26
Slightly important .....	14	14	14	15
Not important at all.....	8	8	6	9
(Don't know).....	1	1	0	1
Important.....	45	41	48	49
Not important .....	54	58	51	50

	TOTAL	HILLS	CENTRAL /SOUTH	WEST
Weighted N=	500	225	135	140
Unweighted N=	500	220	144	136

i. **[Sports fields irrigation]** Fix failing irrigation and drainage at the City’s most used sports fields

Extremely important .....	9	8	6	14
Very important.....	24	24	27	22
Moderately important .....	40	43	42	32
Slightly important .....	20	18	16	28
Not important at all.....	5	5	7	2
(Don't know).....	2	1	2	2
Important.....	33	32	33	36
Not important .....	65	66	65	63

j. **[Repair recreational facilities]** Repair and modernize aged public recreational facilities like pools, soccer fields, and basketball courts

Extremely important .....	11	10	14	12
Very important.....	32	30	35	32
Moderately important .....	35	38	32	34
Slightly important .....	16	18	12	18
Not important at all.....	4	4	6	2
(Don't know).....	2	1	2	3
Important.....	43	40	49	43
Not important .....	55	59	49	54

k. **[Repair Marina’s docks]** Repair Marina’s docks to extend their lifespan 50-plus years

Extremely important .....	8	6	7	11
Very important.....	24	26	24	20
Moderately important .....	38	39	38	36
Slightly important .....	20	17	24	21
Not important at all.....	8	8	7	10
(Don't know).....	3	4	1	2
Important.....	32	32	31	32
Not important .....	66	64	68	66

l. **[Protect Waterfront paths]** Protect paths and roads on Berkeley’s Waterfront from flooding due to sea level rise

Extremely important .....	18	19	16	19
Very important.....	34	33	34	36
Moderately important .....	28	29	28	25
Slightly important .....	11	11	15	8
Not important at all.....	7	8	5	7
(Don't know).....	2	1	2	5
Important.....	52	51	49	56
Not important .....	46	48	49	40

	TOTAL	HILLS	CENTRAL /SOUTH	WEST
Weighted N=	500	225	135	140
Unweighted N=	500	220	144	136

m. **[Repair seawall]** Rebuild the failing seawall that threatens public access to South Cove

Extremely important .....	11	10	13	12
Very important.....	31	32	34	27
Moderately important .....	29	29	28	29
Slightly important .....	16	15	15	17
Not important at all.....	6	7	2	7
(Don't know).....	8	7	9	7
Important.....	42	42	46	39
Not important .....	50	51	45	53

n. **[South Berkeley green space]** Expanding accessible green open space in South Berkeley

Extremely important .....	12	12	15	9
Very important.....	36	37	34	35
Moderately important .....	29	29	29	28
Slightly important .....	12	10	14	15
Not important at all.....	9	11	5	10
(Don't know).....	2	1	2	2
Important.....	48	49	50	44
Not important .....	50	50	48	53

o. **[Mental health building]** Expand mental health service capacity by replacing crumbling offices with a new energy efficient mental health services building

Extremely important .....	17	17	17	18
Very important.....	40	38	41	44
Moderately important .....	24	25	26	22
Slightly important .....	8	10	8	6
Not important at all.....	8	8	6	8
(Don't know).....	3	3	2	3
Important.....	58	54	58	62
Not important .....	40	43	40	35

p. **[Repair sidewalks]** Improve safety and accessibility by repairing cracked and uneven sidewalks and upgrading curb ramps citywide

Extremely important .....	27	26	26	28
Very important.....	38	38	42	34
Moderately important .....	26	28	24	26
Slightly important .....	5	4	5	8
Not important at all.....	4	5	2	3
(Don't know).....	1	0	0	2
Important.....	65	64	68	62
Not important .....	35	36	31	37

	TOTAL	HILLS	CENTRAL /SOUTH	WEST
Weighted N=	500	225	135	140
Unweighted N=	500	220	144	136

q. **SSC: [Repair public buildings]** Repair public buildings such as the Public Safety Building, the Animal Services Facility, and South Berkeley Senior Center to improve their energy efficiency and safety

Extremely important .....	17	21	10	16
Very important.....	31	29	40	27
Moderately important .....	33	31	30	40
Slightly important .....	10	9	14	10
Not important at all.....	7	10	4	6
(Don't know).....	1	0	3	1
Important.....	48	50	49	43
Not important .....	51	50	47	56

r. **SSD: [Repair public buildings – w/ Civic Center]** Repair public buildings such as the Public Safety Building, the Animal Services Facility, South Berkeley Senior Center, and Civic Center Buildings to improve their energy efficiency and safety

Extremely important .....	18	19	17	17
Very important.....	30	29	29	30
Moderately important .....	35	31	45	32
Slightly important .....	10	14	4	10
Not important at all.....	5	5	4	8
(Don't know).....	1	2	0	1
Important.....	47	48	47	47
Not important .....	51	50	53	51

	TOTAL	HILLS	CENTRAL /SOUTH	WEST
Weighted N=	500	225	135	140
Unweighted N=	500	220	144	136

s. **SSC: [Repair fire stations]** Make fire stations citywide safer and more energy efficient by conducting essential repairs and adding green energy capacity

Extremely important .....	22	27	20	14
Very important.....	36	39	36	30
Moderately important .....	27	23	28	33
Slightly important .....	6	4	8	8
Not important at all.....	10	7	7	15
(Don't know).....	0	0	1	0
Important.....	57	66	56	44
Not important .....	43	34	43	56

t. **SSD: [Replace fire stations]** Make fire stations citywide safer and more energy efficient by replacing fire stations that are no longer able to meet demands with new stations run on green energy

Extremely important .....	27	26	34	22
Very important.....	29	28	30	30
Moderately important .....	27	29	22	29
Slightly important .....	12	10	13	13
Not important at all.....	4	6	1	3
(Don't know).....	1	1	0	3
Important.....	56	54	64	52
Not important .....	42	45	36	45

u. **[Renovate 911 dispatch]** Renovate the 911 dispatch center to handle higher call volumes and modernize critical infrastructure

Extremely important .....	29	31	33	22
Very important.....	37	35	38	40
Moderately important .....	23	25	17	27
Slightly important .....	5	3	9	3
Not important at all.....	5	5	2	7
(Don't know).....	1	2	1	0
Important.....	66	66	71	62
Not important .....	33	32	28	38

	TOTAL	HILLS	CENTRAL /SOUTH	WEST
Weighted N=	500	225	135	140
Unweighted N=	500	220	144	136

**Finally, I would like to ask you a few questions for statistical purposes only.**

**Q13. [T] How long have you lived in Berkeley? [DO NOT READ, RECORD WITHIN RANGE]**

Less than two years .....	5	3	8	5
Two to less than five years.....	13	12	18	10
Five to less than ten years .....	12	11	15	11
Ten to less than twenty years.....	23	26	18	23
Twenty years or more .....	36	35	32	43
All your life .....	10	13	8	9
(Don't know/refused).....	0	1	0	0

**Q14. [T] What best describes your gender? [SELECT ALL THAT APPLY]**

Man.....	45	47	46	40
Woman .....	55	53	54	60
Nonbinary .....	0	0	0	0
Prefer to self-describe/other .....	0	0	0	0
(Refused).....	0	0	0	0

**Q15. [T] Just to make sure we have a representative sample, could you please tell me whether or not you are from a Latino, Hispanic, or Spanish-speaking background?**

**Q16. [T] [ASK ALL] And please tell me which one, or more than one, of these racial or ethnic groups you identify with?**

**[TEXT] Which one, or more than one, of these racial or ethnic groups do you identify with?**

**[RANDOMIZE/READ CHOICES/ACCEPT MULTIPLE RESPONSES]**

**[IF "OTHER" OR "BIRACIAL" OR "MULTI-RACIAL" PROMPT:] Which two or three of these do you identify with the most?**

White or Caucasian.....	67	71	59	69
Black or African American .....	9	11	6	9
Latino/Latina or Hispanic.....	9	5	14	10
Asian American or Pacific Islander.....	11	9	17	8
Native or Indigenous American .....	0	0	0	0
Middle Eastern or North African .....	2	1	2	2
(Other) .....	2	1	2	3
(Don't know/refused).....	1	1	1	1

	TOTAL	HILLS	CENTRAL /SOUTH	WEST
Weighted N=	500	225	135	140
Unweighted N=	500	220	144	136

**Q17. [T]** In terms of local politics, do you consider yourself progressive, liberal, moderate, or conservative?

Progressive.....	41	36	44	47
Liberal.....	36	38	33	36
Moderate.....	17	20	20	11
Conservative.....	4	4	2	5
(Don't know).....	1	1	1	1
(Refused).....	1	1	1	1

**Q18. [T]** What is the last year of schooling that you have completed?

1 - 11th Grade.....	0	0	0	0
High School Graduate.....	3	2	6	3
Vocational or technical school.....	0	0	0	0
Some college but no degree.....	16	12	16	22
Associate degree.....	5	3	4	7
4-year college graduate or bachelor's degree.....	37	42	46	22
Graduate School or advanced degree.....	39	41	28	46
(Refused).....	0	0	0	0
Non-college.....	24	17	26	33
College graduate.....	76	83	74	67

**Q19. [T]** Do you own your own home or do you rent?

Own.....	54	64	41	50
Rent.....	43	33	56	48
(Other - unsheltered, live in dorm, with parents, etc).....	3	3	3	2
(Don't know/refused).....	0	0	0	0

	TOTAL	HILLS	CENTRAL /SOUTH	WEST
Weighted N=	500	225	135	140
Unweighted N=	500	220	144	136

Age

18-24 years.....	12	12	16	7
25-29 years.....	7	5	13	4
30-34 years.....	6	4	11	6
35-39 years.....	9	4	7	17
40-44 years.....	6	6	6	6
45-49 years.....	9	5	8	16
50-54 years.....	7	8	4	7
55-59 years.....	6	9	4	3
60-64 years.....	8	9	3	10
65-69 years.....	8	10	7	6
70-74 years.....	6	8	5	5
Over 74 years.....	17	19	16	13
(Don't know /Refused).....	0	0	0	0
Under 30.....	19	17	29	10
30 - 39.....	15	8	18	23
40 - 49.....	15	11	14	22
50 - 64.....	21	27	11	21
65 & over.....	31	37	27	24



## Berkeley's Infrastructure: Needs and Community Priorities

The goal is to **receive feedback on the City's proposed infrastructure project list** for a potential \$300M GO Bond.

- **Berkeley's Infrastructure Needs**
- **Past Investments & Current Conditions**
- **Draft Project Portfolio**
- **Community Input & Discussion**

### Agenda



Above Image: Berkeley & East Bay Cityscape.




When infrastructure fails, the impacts don't stay in one place.

### Berkeley relies on interconnected systems:

- Pathways and sidewalks connect daily life
- Community spaces support health and belonging
- Public safety facilities protect lives
- Waterfront and climate infrastructure protects neighborhoods

A citywide approach helps **prevent closures, service loss, and higher costs.**

3



### What We Maintain (abridged version):


- 42,000 trees;
- 300+ miles of sidewalks;
- 215 miles of streets;
- 53 miles of bicycle infrastructure;
- 54 parks;
- 95 buildings;
- 63 play areas;
- 38 public restrooms;
- 5 community centers;
- 3 resident camps; and
- 2 pools...**and more!**

Much of this infrastructure is **75+ years old.**

### Current estimates:

- **\$1.65–\$2B** in unfunded infrastructure and deferred maintenance citywide.

4




# How Does the City Fund Infrastructure?

<b>Permanent / Ongoing</b>	<b>One-Time / Volatile</b>	<b>Restricted by Use</b>	<b>Voter-Approved</b>	<b>External</b>
<b>General Fund</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>~\$2.4M per year</li> <li>~\$9.9M for Streets</li> </ul>	<b>One-Time Revenues</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Property Transfer Tax (&gt;\$16M)</li> <li>Interest Income (1/3 above \$6M)</li> </ul>	<b>Restricted Revenues</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Streets</li> <li>Sewer</li> <li>Stormwater</li> <li>Streetlights</li> <li>Marina</li> </ul>	<b>Local Measures</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parcel Taxes (Parks, Measure FF – 2020 &amp; 2024)</li> <li>Bonds (Measures M &amp; TI)</li> </ul>	<b>Grants</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Federal</li> <li>State</li> <li>Private</li> </ul> <p style="color: red; font-weight: bold;">TI \$100M bond + leveraged \$83M grants = \$183M total</p>

Annual funding is **not enough** to address infrastructure and deferred maintenance. Reliance on **one-time, restricted, and voter-approved sources** makes long-term planning difficult.

5

Current funding covers just **~2%** of need, leaving a **98%** structural shortfall.



\* \$38.9M reflects General Fund, one-time, and restricted revenues, Measure FF & TI Spend down Projections not included in this amount.

*NOTE AMOUNTS ARE ESTIMATES	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029
Available Funding	\$40,998,776.00	\$37,727,476.00	\$36,664,976.00
Anticipated FF Funds	\$15,000,000.00	\$15,000,000.00	\$15,000,000.00
Projected TI Spend down	\$12,001,652.00	\$7,649,576.00	\$0.00
Capital & Maint. Need	\$1,831,954,652.58	\$1,868,593,745.63	\$1,905,965,620.54

6




## Infrastructure Funding Gaps






Above Image: City of Berkeley Capital Projects Team

# When Infrastructure Investment Is Delayed

## Asset Impacts

-  Infrastructure wears down faster
-  Safety and access risks increase
-  Service disruptions are more common

## Cost Impacts

-  Construction costs continue to rise
-  Funding supports fewer projects
-  Delays lead to higher long-term costs

**Delaying investment leads to *greater risks* and *higher long-term costs***

7

# Past Investments (Measure TI Highlights)



Berkeley Rose Garden



Willard Clubhouse



Telegraph Public Restroom



Sidewalk Improvements



North Berkeley Senior Center



Marina Roadway



Adult Mental Health Center



Park Improvements  
e.g. San Pablo Park

8

# Potential *Future* Project Investments



Crosswalk Improvements to Major Intersections



Repair and Improvements to Veterans Building



Repair and Improvements to Marina Docks Timber



Improvements to Playgrounds e.g. Glendale La Loma Park



More ADA Parking Spaces e.g. Strawberry Creek Park



Repair and Improvements to Maudelle Shirek (Old City Hall)



Repair and Improvements to Berkeley Waterfront Bay Trail



Repair and Improvements to Public Safety Facilities

9

Past Investments & Current Conditions



**Capital investments support *people, programs, and services* — not just buildings.**

## Expanded & Reliable Services

- New and improved programs
- Spaces that support reliable services

## Improved Safety

- Seismic and facility improvements
- Safer buildings and emergency readiness


## Improved Access & Capacity

- ADA upgrades and modernized spaces
- Facilities serve more people

## Environmental Sustainability & Resilience

- Green and stormwater improvements
- Energy-efficient systems and lower long-term costs

# Infrastructure ROI



**Above Images:** Maudelle Shirek Building current state (top) & Interior Rendering with repair and expansion (bottom)

10

## How projects\* were evaluated and prioritized:

### Community use and equity

- *Is there equitable community benefit?*

### Geographic balance

- *Are projects fairly distributed across districts?*

### Public health and safety

- *Does the project improve safety or well-being?*

### Infrastructure resilience

- *Will the investment deliver long-term value?*

### Deliverability and readiness

- *Is the project ready to move forward?*

### External funding potential

- *Can the project leverage grants or other funding?*

\*Applied within a **\$100M per-category cap** (\$300M total).

11

## Project Portfolio



Above Images: Veterans Building Current State (top) & Interior Rendering with repair and programming possibilities (bottom)

## Community Facilities & Quality of Life

Parks, playgrounds, restrooms, aquatics, dog parks, cultural centers and waterfront improvements.

### Public Safety

Fire station modernization and critical upgrades to essential emergency-response facilities.

### Critical Infrastructure & Accessibility

Core systems and facilities that require seismic upgrades or repairs – Civic Center (i.e., Maudelle Shirek Building) improvements, ADA, 50/50 program sidewalk projects.

12

## Project Themes



Draft Project Portfolio



## Lead Projects

### ➤ Modernization of high-use community hubs

- Frances Albrier Community Center
- King Pool & Locker Room
- Harrison Field
- Live Oak Courts & Lighting
- San Pablo Sports Field
- Citywide Dog Parks – 4-6 Sites
- Park Upgrades:  
 Codornices Park • Glendale La Loma Park • Harrison Park •  
 Cedar Rose Park • Cesar Chavez Park

## Community Facilities



**Above Images:** Glendale La Loma Park older play equipment and sand surfacing (bottom) alongside San Pablo Park with recent playground and safety improvements (top).

Draft Project Portfolio



13

## Proposed Project List | Community Facilities Highlight



**Before:** Aging Facility, Current State of Frances Albrier Community Center (FACC)



**After:** Modern Community & Resilience Center, Concept Design of FACC (Siegel & Strain Architects)

### Frances Albrier Community Center

#### Category

- Community Facilities • Climate Resiliency • ADA

#### Bond Allocation

- \$30M (100% of project)

#### Why This Project

- Only major community center not rebuilt or seismically upgraded.
- High-use facility at San Pablo Park needs modernization.
- New center will support daily programs and serve as a community resilience hub in emergencies.

#### Readiness

- Concept design complete; construction ~36 months after funding

14



# Proposed Project List | Community Facilities Highlight



**Before:** Example of open cinderblock restroom at Codornices Park (left) and temporary restrooms at Cesar Chavez Park (right)



**After:** Example of permanent restroom (concept rendering from Exeloo Corporation)

## Park Restrooms

*Cedar Rose, Codornices, Harrison, and Cesar Chavez Parks*

### Category

- Quality of Life Improvements • Accessibility

### Bond Allocation

- \$500k - \$750k each (100% of project; potential Parks Tax support)

### Why This Project

- Replaces aging restrooms with smart restroom facilities.
- Improves safety, accessibility, and growing demand.

### Readiness

- Construction could begin ~12 months after funding



## Lead Projects

### ➤ Neighborhood parks, open space, waterfront access, and climate resilience

- Adeline Corridor Open Space
- Aquatic Park – Dreamland Area Improvements
- Cesar Chavez Park – Pathway
- Marina Docks – Timber Pile Replacement
- Sea Level Rise – Bay Trail/Marina Blvd
- Sea Level Rise – University Ave Bike Park
- South Cove Seawall Replacement
- University Ave / Seawall Dr / Bay Trail / Plaza


## Quality of Life



**Above Images:** Bay Trail showing pavement damage (bottom left) alongside sections that have received recent improvements (top right).



## Proposed Project List | Quality of Life Highlight



**Before:** Aging Playground



**After:** Improved Waterfront Play Area, Concept Design of Dreamland (RRM Design Group)

### *Aquatic Park – Dreamland Area*

**Category**

- Community & Park Amenities • Accessibility

**Bond Allocation**

- \$2.1M (25% match; leverages grants & Parks Tax)

**Why This Project**

- Implements a community-approved plan to improve a heavily used waterfront play area.
- Upgrades playgrounds, drainage, picnic areas, restrooms, and parking.

**Readiness**

- Concept design complete; construction ~18 months after funding



## Proposed Project List | Quality of Life Highlight



**Before:** Decayed timber piles



**After:** New long-life concrete piles

### *Marina Docks Timber Replacement*

**Category**

- Climate Resiliency • Revenue-Generating Asset

**Bond Allocation**

- \$6M (100% of project)

**Why This Project**

- Replaces failed timber piles that damage docks and private boats, taking marina slips out of service.
- Builds on Phase I to replace remaining at-risk piles with durable concrete piles designed to last 50+ years and withstand sea level rise.

**Readiness**

- Near shovel-ready; construction could begin ~12–15 months after funding



# Proposed Project List | Quality of Life Highlight



**Before:** Corroded, deteriorating seawall



**After:** New, resilient seawall with sheet pile wall and enforcement structures

## South Cove Sailing Basin Seawall Replacement

### Category

- Climate Resiliency • Recreation Amenities

### Bond Allocation

- \$5M (100% of project; limited grant eligibility)

### Why This Project

- Prevents failure of a corroded seawall that supports boat hoists and the Bay Trail at South Cove.
- Protects public access and marina operations from closure due to structural failure.

### Readiness

- Preliminary studies underway; construction could begin ~36 months after funding



## Lead Projects

- **911 Dispatch Center:** 2100 MLK Jr. Way
  - Expansion and modernization
- **Fire Station 4:** 1900 Marin Ave
  - Full replacement, expansion
- **Fire Station 6:** 999 Cedar Street
  - Remodel, potential move to new Fire HQ
- **Fire Training Center:** 997 Cedar Street
  - Relocate and modernize training center


## Public Safety



**Above Images:** Water damage from roof leaks at PSB (top left) and failing HVAC at Fire Station 5 (bottom right).



# Proposed Project List | Public Safety Highlight



**Before:** Constrained, outdated dispatch workspace



**After:** Modernized, efficient 911 operations center (concept rendering)

## Dispatch Center Improvements

**Category**

- Public Safety Infrastructure

**Bond Allocation**

- \$4M (100% of project)

**Why This Project**

- Modernizes the 911 Dispatch Center to handle rising call volumes and aging infrastructure.
- Expands the operations floor and upgrades technology, HVAC, training, and wellness spaces to support readiness and staff retention.

**Readiness**

- Needs assessment complete; ready for design



# Proposed Project List | Public Safety Highlight



**Before:** Constrained, outdated training site, including water damage (right image)



**After:** Concept Drawing of a purpose-built modern fire training center

## Fire Training Center Replacement

**Category**

- Facilities • Public Safety Infrastructure

**Bond Allocation**

- \$28M (100% of project; limited grant eligibility)

**Why This Project**

- The current fire training facility is undersized, outdated, and located in a residential area.
- A new, purpose-built training center is needed to support modern training, scheduling, and parking needs for the Fire Department.

**Readiness**

- Early planning complete; construction timeline dependent on full funding



# Proposed Project List | Public Safety Highlight



Training center in a residential neighborhood, undersized and does not support the modern mission

Exercise equipment is typically set up adjacent to apparatus and personal protective equipment (or PPE) that off-gas diesel fumes and known carcinogens



Apparatus are parked inches away from roll up doors, creating narrow spaces for personnel to circulate



Towers, once necessary for drying cotton hoses, are now obsolete



23

Past Investments & Current Conditions



## Lead Projects

- **Upgrades of two buildings to advance the Civic Center Vision and Implementation Plan**
  - Maudelle Shirek Building (2134 MLK Jr.)
  - Veterans Memorial Building (1931 Center)
- **Modernization of high use civic facilities**
  - MLK Jr. Civic Center Building (2180 Milvia)
  - Public Safety Center (2100 MLK Jr.)
  - Berkeley Animal Shelter (1 Bolivar Dr.)
  - MLK Jr. Civic Center Annex (1947 Center)

## Critical Infrastructure




Above Images: Exterior facades of deferred maintenance at Maudelle Shirek (Old City Hall) Building.

24

Draft Project Portfolio



# Proposed Project List | Critical Infrastructure Highlight



**Before:** Seismically vulnerable historic Old City Hall



**After:** Civic building for public use, with ADA upgrades; Concept rendering

## Maudelle Shirek Building (Old City Hall)

### Category

- Facilities • Quality of Life • Climate Resiliency • ADA • Community Amenities

### Bond Allocation

- \$6.7M (20%–100% of total project cost)

### Why This Project


- Seismically upgrades Berkeley's first landmark that predates modern codes and is currently closed to the public due to safety risks.
- Restores the building for civic use with accessible hearing rooms, meeting spaces, and community uses.

### Readiness

- Concept design complete; FEMA grant pending



# Proposed Project List | Critical Infrastructure Highlight



**Before:** Seismically unsafe, underutilized historic building



**After:** Stabilized facility ready for arts and community use

## Veterans Memorial Building

### Category

- Facilities • Historic Preservation • Quality of Life • Community Amenities

### Bond Allocation

- \$13.9M (20%–100% of total project cost)

### Why This Project

- Strengthens a historic building currently closed for assemblies due to seismic safety concerns.
- Future use as a community arts and cultural center with performance, rehearsal, gallery and gathering spaces for Berkeley's cultural and artistic groups.

### Readiness

- Concept design complete; FEMA grant pending



## Lead Projects

- **Citywide ADA accessibility improvements**
  - Remove sidewalk trip hazards
  - Fix crosswalk mobility barriers
  - Upgrade non-compliant curb ramps
- **Fund 50/50 Program Sidewalk Projects**
  - Repair lifted and damaged sidewalks
  - Prevent future hazards

# Accessibility



**Above Images:** Examples of changes in level (elevations) on sidewalks that require improvements

Draft Project Portfolio



27

## Proposed Project List | Accessibility Highlight

### ADA Barrier Removal Projects

#### Category

- Pedestrian / Accessibility • Facilities

#### Bond Allocation

- \$4.3M (100% of project; no alternative funding sources)

#### Why This Project

- Addresses a Citywide backlog of ADA accessibility barriers identified in the ADA Transition Plan.
- Funds upgrades to paths of travel, restrooms, signage, and building access to improve compliance and access for people with disabilities.

#### Readiness

- Projects identified; implementation can begin as funding becomes available



**Before:** On-street accessible parking with blocked sidewalk access, creating barriers for wheelchair users and pedestrians.



**After:** Accessible parking with clear sidewalk access (PROWAG-compliant).

28



# Proposed Project List | Accessibility Highlight



**Before:** Damaged sidewalks and long repair waitlist



**After:** Safer, accessible sidewalks delivered faster citywide

## 50/50 Sidewalk Program

### Category

- Pedestrian Safety • Accessibility

### Bond Allocation

- \$14M (50% of Bond Funding Requested for Sidewalk Repair Backlog)

### Why This Project


- Advances public safety and ADA compliance by reducing the City's sidewalk repair backlog.
- Scales up the existing cost-share program to accelerate repairs citywide.

### Readiness


- Ongoing program; shovel-ready and ready to scale immediately



# Illustrative Timeline



## We're asking for input on:



31

# Input & Discussion



Scan the QR Code to visit our website and stay connected!

Community Input & Discussion 

## Funding Measure: General Obligation (GO) Bond

What a GO Bond Is	What it Funds	Examples
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Requires two-thirds voter approval</b></li> <li>• Long-term financing for capital projects</li> <li>• Repaid through property taxes</li> <li>• Typically repaid over ~30 years</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Capital only (no operating costs)</b></li> <li>• Facility modernization and replacement</li> <li>• Safety and climate-resilience projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Buildings &amp; facilities</li> <li>• Streets &amp; transportation safety</li> <li>• Parks, pools, and recreation</li> <li>• Stormwater and waterfront projects</li> </ul>

32

# Appendix A: Proposed Project List (Comprehensive)



## Proposed Project List | Highlights



Before: Current station



After: Modern station (concept design)

### Fire Station No. 4 Replacement

**Category**

- Fire Facilities • Public Safety Infrastructure

**Bond Allocation**

- \$48M (100% of project)

**Why This Project**

- Replaces an undersized 1960-era station no longer able to support current staffing or operational needs.
- Supports expanded staffing and future ambulance service recommended by the CityGate Standards of Coverage Study.

**Readiness**

- Conceptual layout complete; recommended option is full replacement on expanded site



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Current station



**After:** Modern station (concept design)

## *Fire Station No. 6 Improvements*

**Category**

- Fire Facilities • Public Safety Infrastructure

**Bond Allocation**

- \$22M (100% of project)

**Why This Project**


- Upgrades a 1960s-era station that no longer meets current staffing and operational needs.
- Supports an additional firefighter per shift with updated sleeping, turnout storage, office, and fitness space.

**Readiness**


- Conceptual layout complete; renovation & expansion recommended



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Constrained, outdated dispatch workspace



**After:** Modernized, efficient 911 operations center (concept rendering)

## *Dispatch Center Improvements*

**Category**

- Public Safety Infrastructure

**Bond Allocation**

- \$4M (100% of project)

**Why This Project**

- Modernizes the 911 Dispatch Center to handle rising call volumes and aging infrastructure.
- Expands the operations floor and upgrades technology, HVAC, training, and wellness spaces to support readiness and staff retention.

**Readiness**

- Needs assessment complete; ready for design



# Proposed Project List | Public Safety Highlight



**Before:** Constrained, outdated training site, including water damage (right image)



**After:** Concept Drawing of a purpose-built modern fire training center

## Fire Training Center Replacement

### Category

- Facilities • Public Safety Infrastructure

### Bond Allocation

- \$28M (100% of project; limited grant eligibility)

### Why This Project

- The current fire training facility is undersized, outdated, and located in a residential area.
- A new, purpose-built training center is needed to support modern training, scheduling, and parking needs for the Fire Department.

### Readiness

- Early planning complete; construction timeline dependent on full funding



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Aging Facility, Current State of Frances Albrier Community Center (FACC)



**After:** Modern Community & Resilience Center, Concept Design (Siegel & Strain Architects)

## Frances Albrier Community Center

### Category

- Community Facilities • Climate Resiliency • ADA

### Bond Allocation

- \$30M (100% of project)

### Why This Project


- Only major community center not rebuilt or seismically upgraded.
- High-use facility at San Pablo Park needs modernization.
- New center will support daily programs and serve as a community resilience hub in emergencies.

### Readiness

- Concept design complete; construction ~36 months after funding



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Aging pool and locker rooms



**After:** Modern 25m pool and updated facilities

## King Pool (& Locker Room) Improvements

### Category

- Community Facilities • Accessibility

### Bond Allocation

- \$25M (100% of project)

### Why This Project

- Replaces aging pools and locker rooms with a modern, competition-capable 25-meter facility.
- Improves safety, accessibility, and long-term usability for community and youth programs.

### Readiness

- Construction could begin ~24 months after funding



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



## Adeline Corridor Open Space

### Category

- Quality of Life Improvements • Accessibility

### Bond Allocation

- \$6M (100% of project)

### Why This Project

- Funds design and construction of 4 new or expanded Open Space areas within the Adeline Corridor Plan south of Ashby Avenue to expand park access in an equity priority area.

### Readiness

- Construction could begin ~24 months after funding



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Example of open cinderblock restroom at Codornices Park (left) and temporary restrooms at Cesar Chavez Park (right)



**After:** Example of permanent restroom (concept rendering from Exeloo Corporation)

## Park Restrooms

*Cedar Rose, Codornices, Harrison, and Cesar Chavez Parks*

**Category**

- Quality of Life Improvements • Accessibility

**Bond Allocation**

- \$500k - \$750k each (100% of project; potential Parks Tax support)

**Why This Project**


- Replaces aging restrooms with smart restroom facilities.
- Improves safety, accessibility, and growing demand.

**Readiness**

- Construction could begin ~12 months after funding



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Aging Playground



**After:** Improved Waterfront Play Area, Concept Design of Dreamland (RRM Design Group)

## Aquatic Park – Dreamland Area

**Category**

- Community & Park Amenities • Accessibility

**Bond Allocation**

- \$2.1M (20% match; leverages grants & Parks Tax)

**Why This Project**

- Implements a community-approved plan to improve a heavily used waterfront play area.
- Upgrades playgrounds, drainage, picnic areas, restrooms, and parking.

**Readiness**

- Concept design complete; construction ~18 months after funding



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



Before: Existing Condition of Park and Play Structure



After: Modern, Updated Play Area, Concept Design (Base Landscape Architecture)

## Cedar Rose Park – 2–5 Play Structure

### Category

- Park Amenities • Accessibility

### Bond Allocation

- \$2.5M (100% of project; potential Parks Tax support)

### Why This Project

- Modernizes the heavily used 2–5 play area to meet current safety and ADA accessibility standards.
- Improves play structure, paths, site furnishings, fencing, and overall access.

### Readiness

- Concept design complete; construction ~12 months after funding



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



Before: Existing park conditions



After: Concept design of upgraded park (RRM Design Group)

## Glendale LaLoma Park Improvements

### Category

- Park Amenities • Accessibility

### Bond Allocation

- \$3.5M (100% of project; potential Parks Tax)

### Why This Project

- Modernizes play areas, parking, and pathways to improve safety and ADA access.
- Reimagines the 2–5 and 5–12 play areas, site furnishings, and circulation.

### Readiness


- Concept design in progress; construction ~18 months after funding



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Limited, off-leash, dog areas – César Chávez Park pictured (Photo Credit: Beth LaBerge/KQED)



**After:** New, accessible dog parks across Berkeley (example pictured Ohlone Dog Park)

## Dog Parks – City Wide

### Category

- Park Amenities • Accessibility

### Bond Allocation

- \$2.5M (100% of project; potential Parks Tax support)

### Why This Project

- Adds 4–6 new dog parks citywide to meet strong community demand.
- Includes fencing, seating, utilities, signage, and ADA improvements.

### Readiness

- Construction could begin ~12 months after funding



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Existing field conditions



**After:** Example of Synthetic Turf System with Cork Infill

## Harrison Field: Conversion to Artificial Turf

### Category

- Sports Facilities • Accessibility

### Bond Allocation

- \$6M (100% of project; potential Parks Tax)

### Why This Project

- Replaces failing natural turf to double field capacity and reduce maintenance closures.
- Supports more reliable, year-round field use.

### Readiness

- Construction could begin ~24 months after funding



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Aerial view of Live Oak – Uneven courts and limited lighting



**After:** Example of improved courts, turf field, and upgraded lighting, (concept rendering)

## Live Oak Park Improvements

### Category

- Sports Facilities • Accessibility

### Bond Allocation

- \$3M (66% of project; potential Parks Tax)

### Why This Project


- Levels basketball courts, converts the soccer practice field to turf, and upgrades lighting.
- Improves safety, field quality, and evening access for community use.

### Readiness

- Construction could begin ~24 months after funding



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Current conditions of pathway perimeters for Cesar Chavez Park

## Cesar Chavez Park Improvements

### Category

- Recreation Amenities • Accessibility

### Bond Allocation

- \$3M (60% of project; potential Parks Tax and/or State Coastal Conservancy (SCC) grant)

### Why This Project

- Repairs the 1.5-mile perimeter path to address deteriorated pavement and drainage issues.

### Readiness

- Near shovel-ready; construction ~24 months after funding



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Flood-prone trails and eroding pathways

## *Marina Blvd Shoreline Resiliency & Public Access*

**Category**

- Climate Resiliency • Accessibility • Recreation Amenities

**Bond Allocation**

- \$1.9M (50% of project; climate scope grant-eligible)

**Why This Project**

- Rebuilds failing, narrow trail segments to safely serve high volumes of walkers and cyclists.
- Addresses shoreline erosion and frequent flooding at Virginia Street Extension that cuts off access to Cesar Chavez Park during king tides.

**Readiness**

- Preliminary design and environmental review funded; construction ~24–30 months after funding



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Decayed timber piles



**After:** New long-life concrete piles

## *Marina Docks Timber Replacement*

**Category**

- Climate Resiliency • Revenue-Generating Asset

**Bond Allocation**

- \$6M (100% of project)

**Why This Project**

- Replaces failed timber piles that damage docks and private boats, taking marina slips out of service.
- Builds on Phase I to replace remaining at-risk piles with durable concrete piles designed to last 50+ years and withstand sea level rise.

**Readiness**

- Near shovel-ready; construction could begin ~12–15 months after funding



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Corroded, deteriorating seawall



**After:** Example of Bay Trail Improvements at Berkeley Marina

## Seawall Drive Bay Trail Improvements

### Category

- Climate Resiliency • Recreation Amenities

### Bond Allocation

- \$5M (100% of project; limited grant eligibility)

### Why This Project

- Prevents failure of a corroded seawall that supports boat hoists and the Bay Trail at South Cove.
- Protects public access and marina operations from closure due to structural failure.

### Readiness

- Preliminary studies underway; construction could begin ~36 months after funding

52

Proposed Project List | Highlights



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Corroded, deteriorating seawall



**After:** New, resilient seawall with sheet pile wall and enforcement structures

## South Cove Sailing Basin Seawall Replacement

### Category

- Climate Resiliency • Recreation Amenities

### Bond Allocation

- \$5M (100% of project; limited grant eligibility)

### Why This Project

- Prevents failure of a corroded seawall that supports boat hoists and the Bay Trail at South Cove.
- Protects public access and marina operations from closure due to structural failure.

### Readiness

- Preliminary studies underway; construction could begin ~36 months after funding

53


Proposed Project List | Highlights



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Flood-prone trail



**After:** Resilient shoreline protection and bike park (concept design)

## University Avenue

### Sea Level Rise Protection & Bike Park

**Category**

- Climate Resiliency • Recreation Amenities

**Bond Allocation**

- \$2.75M (50% of project; climate scope grant-eligible)

**Why This Project**

- Protects University Avenue from flooding and storm surge that threaten critical roadway access, utilities, and nearby wetlands.
- Activates newly converted open space with a community-designed bike park.

**Readiness**

- Construction could begin ~36 months after funding



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Damaged sidewalks and long repair waitlist



**After:** Safer, accessible sidewalks delivered faster citywide

## 50/50 Sidewalk Program

**Category**

- Pedestrian Safety • Accessibility

**Bond Allocation**

- \$14M (50% of Bond Funding Requested for Sidewalk Repair Backlog)

**Why This Project**

- Advances public safety and ADA compliance by reducing the City's sidewalk repair backlog.
- Scales up the existing cost-share program to accelerate repairs citywide.

**Readiness**

- Ongoing program; shovel-ready and ready to scale immediately



# Proposed Project List | Highlights

## ADA Barrier Removal Projects

### Category

- Pedestrian / Accessibility • Facilities

### Bond Allocation

- \$4.3M (100% of project; no alternative funding sources)

### Why This Project

- Addresses a Citywide backlog of ADA accessibility barriers identified in the ADA Transition Plan.
- Funds upgrades to paths of travel, restrooms, signage, and building access to improve compliance and access for people with disabilities.

### Readiness

- Projects identified; implementation can begin as funding becomes available



**Before:** On-street accessible parking with blocked sidewalk access, creating barriers for wheelchair users and pedestrians.



**After:** Accessible parking with clear sidewalk access (PROWAG-compliant).



# Proposed Project List | Highlights

## Berkeley Mental Health – Facility Improvements

### Category

- Health Facilities/ Critical Infrastructure • Accessibility

### Bond Allocation

- \$3.25M (City share; ~40% of \$8M total, pending State grant)

### Why This Project

- Replaces an aging, inaccessible building with a certifiable mental health facility to expand outpatient services.
- Adds treatment rooms and group space to nearly double capacity for Medi-Cal beneficiaries and vulnerable residents.

### Readiness

- Schematic design complete; State grant decision expected Summer 2026



**Before:** Aging, inaccessible facility with limited capacity



**After:** Safer, new clinic with expanded treatment and group space (concept rendering)



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Current exterior and interior of Berkeley Animal Shelter

## *Animal Services Facility Modernization*

### Category

- Facilities • Quality of Life • Climate Resiliency • ADA • Community Amenities

### Bond Allocation

- \$2M (100% of total project cost)

### Why This Project

- Replaces roof, HVAC, drainage, electrical, and plumbing systems and includes programmatic updates to improve operational efficiency and animal care conditions at the Dona Springs Animal Shelter.

### Readiness

- HVAC and roofing assessment reports completed; construction could begin ~24 months after funding is secured

58

Proposed Project List | Highlights



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Existing boiler and water heating system (electric heat pump replacement underway in 2026). South Berkeley Senior Center exterior.

## *South Berkeley Senior Center Improvements*

### Category

- Facilities • Quality of Life • Climate Resiliency • ADA • Community Amenities

### Bond Allocation

- \$3.9M (100% of total project cost; combined with \$5.5M Measure T1 Phase 2 seismic retrofit project)

### Why This Project

- Replaces end-of-life HVAC systems to ensure reliable cooling, improve energy efficiency, and support continued operations at the South Berkeley Senior Center.

### Readiness

- Permitting underway for the T1 seismic project; Construction could begin ~18 months after funding.

59

Proposed Project List | Highlights



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Current exterior of West Berkeley Family Wellness Center

## West Berkeley Family Wellness Center Modernization

### Category

- Facilities • Quality of Life • Climate Resiliency • ADA • Community Amenities

### Bond Allocation

- \$6.5M (100% of total project cost)

### Why This Project

- Repairs aging building systems and upgrades HVAC, electrical, seismic, and ADA features to modernize the West Berkeley Family Wellness Center and improve safety, accessibility, and service delivery.

### Readiness

- Preliminary facility assessment completed. Construction could begin ~42 months after funding.



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Current exterior and interior of 1947 Center Street

## City Offices & Permit Center (1947 Center) Improvements

### Category

- Facilities • Historic Preservation • Climate Resiliency • ADA • Community Services

### Bond Allocation

- \$18.3M (100% of total project cost)

### Why This Project


- Modernizes aging building systems, including seismic, HVAC, electrical, elevator, and ADA upgrades, to improve safety, accessibility, and reliability for a major City services hub.

### Readiness

- Building system assessments completed; Construction could begin ~36 months after funding.



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Current exterior and interior of 2180 Milvia, subject to leaks

## *City Hall (2180 Milvia) Improvements*

### Category

- Facilities • Quality of Life • Climate Resiliency • ADA • Community Amenities

### Bond Allocation

- \$11.7M (100% of total project cost)

### Why This Project

- Replaces end-of-life mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems and addresses hazardous materials, waterproofing, and ADA upgrades at Berkeley City Hall.

### Readiness

- Building system assessments completed; construction could begin ~36 months after funding.

62

Proposed Project List | Highlights



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Current exterior and interior of Public Safety Building (2100 MLK)

## *Public Safety Building (2100 MLK) Improvements*

### Category

- Facilities • Public Safety • Climate Resiliency • ADA • Essential Services

### Bond Allocation

- \$8.4M (100% of total project cost)

### Why This Project

- Modernizes building systems and internal spaces at the Public Safety Building to support reliable 24-hour emergency services, including HVAC, electrical, roofing, security, and ADA upgrades.

### Readiness


- Building system assessments underway; construction could begin ~36 months after funding.

63

Proposed Project List | Highlights



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Seismically vulnerable historic Old City Hall



**After:** Civic building for public use, with ADA upgrades; Concept rendering

## *Maudelle Shirek Building (Old City Hall)*

### Category

- Facilities • Historic Preservation • Climate Resiliency • ADA • Community Amenities

### Bond Allocation

- \$6.7M (20%–100% of total project cost)

### Why This Project

- Seismically upgrades Berkeley's first landmark that predates modern codes and is currently closed to the public due to safety risks.
- Restores the building for civic use with accessible hearing rooms, meeting spaces, and community uses.

### Readiness


- Concept design complete; FEMA grant pending

64

Proposed Project List | Highlights



# Proposed Project List | Highlights



**Before:** Seismically unsafe, underutilized historic building



**After:** Stabilized facility ready for arts and community use

## *Veterans Memorial Building*

### Category

- Facilities • Historic Preservation • Quality of Life • Community Amenities

### Bond Allocation

- \$13.9M (20%–100% of total project cost)

### Why This Project

- Strengthens a historic building currently closed for assemblies due to seismic safety concerns.
- Future use as a community arts and cultural center with performance, rehearsal, gallery and gathering spaces for Berkeley's cultural and artistic groups.

### Readiness

- Concept design complete; FEMA grant pending

65

Proposed Project List | Highlights







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

2180 Milvia Street, Berkeley, CA 94704 • Tel: (510) 981-7000 • TDD: (510) 981-6903 • Fax: (510) 981-7099  
 E-Mail: [manager@CityofBerkeley.info](mailto:manager@CityofBerkeley.info) Website: <http://www.CityofBerkeley.info/Manager>

## 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 — modernizati on, but not documente d
--------------------	-----	---	--	--	--

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

<b>Project</b>	<b>HLS</b>	<b>CICA</b>	<b>CUE</b>	<b>LEV</b>	<b>CRS</b>
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 Conservanc y grants <sup>[^5]</sup>	Low
Cedar Rose Play \$2.5M	Low	Moderate — heavily used play area needs safety/acces sibility 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







Environment & Climate Commission

CONSENT CALENDAR  
May 19, 2026

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council  
 From: Berkeley Environment and Climate Commission (ECC)  
 Submitted by: Alison LaBonte, Chairperson, ECC  
 Subject: Affirming All-Electric Standards for the 2026 Infrastructure Bond Measure and City Capital Projects

RECOMMENDATION

The Berkeley Environment and Climate Commission recommends that the City Council adopt a resolution to:

- Adopt a formal policy prohibiting the installation of new natural gas infrastructure (hereafter referred to as “gas”) or the replacement of existing gas equipment with new gas equipment in any project funded by the proposed 2026 General Obligation Bond Measure;
- Include explicit all-electric construction and retrofit language in the bond measure itself; and
- Direct staff to apply this no-new-gas standard as a condition of all City capital spending, beyond bond-funded projects, thus affirming that public funds shall not be used to install new gas infrastructure in any municipal facility.

FISCAL IMPACTS OF RECOMMENDATION

All-electric construction is increasingly cost-competitive with gas-dependent construction. Electric systems eliminate ongoing gas utility costs, reduce long-term maintenance burdens, and position City facilities to benefit from falling costs of electric technologies. Any potential upfront cost differential is outweighed by the quantifiable benefits to public health, lifecycle savings, and avoided climate risk. No new appropriation is required to implement this policy direction.

CURRENT SITUATION AND ITS EFFECTS

The City of Berkeley is preparing a proposed \$300 million General Obligation Bond Measure for the November 2026 ballot. The measure proposes to fund major capital projects across three categories: Parks, Recreation, and Waterfront; General Facilities and Buildings; and Fire Department facilities.

This bond measure represents one of the largest single investments in municipal infrastructure in Berkeley's recent history — and one of the most significant opportunities to permanently align City capital spending with Berkeley's climate

commitments. Many of the proposed projects involve ground-up construction or comprehensive building renovations, making them ideal candidates for all-electric design at little or no additional cost.

Despite Berkeley's status as a national leader in building electrification policy, passing a first-in-the-nation ban on natural gas in new construction in 2019, there are no longer any laws prohibiting natural gas use in buildings, and no explicit electrification requirement has been proposed for the bond measure. While the 2024 ruling by the Ninth Circuit in opposition to Berkeley's natural gas ban, and recent changes in state law limit changes to the building code, no restrictions exist on how a municipality chooses to direct its own spending. Other Bay Area cities, such as San Francisco, enacted all electric requirements applying to city buildings before proceeding to more expansive requirements that remain in force to this day. Without such a requirement, bond-funded projects could default to gas equipment for heating, cooking, water heating, or other building systems, locking in fossil fuel infrastructure for decades and undermining the City's climate goals.

This is a strategic planning priority, advancing Berkeley's goal to be a global leader in addressing climate change, advancing environmental justice, and protecting the environment.

At the March 25, 2026 meeting, the commission took the following action:

Action: M/S/C (Ranney/Binns) to approve the substantive content of the report to Council, regarding the inclusion of building electrification in relation to the potential City of Berkeley \$300M General Obligation Bond for the November 2026 Ballot and municipal capital projects, as revised at the March 25, 2026 meeting, with additional minor edits to ensure consistency and clarity throughout.

Vote: Ayes - Ranney, La Bonte, Tahara, Mahmoudian, Kesselman, Binns, Brown, Athanasiou, Syed; Noes - None; Abstain - None; Absent - McGuire.

### BACKGROUND

The proposed 2026 bond measure applies to existing and new municipal buildings, which is a domain where the City has full discretion over construction standards. The City is free to ensure that its own facilities reflect its stated climate values, and has a rare opportunity to do so on a large scale.

The list of proposed projects span a wide range of building types and uses. Where projects involve full replacement or substantial renovation, such as community centers, fire stations, the Fire Training Center, and multiple civic buildings, all-electric design is achievable with current technology and at competitive cost. For projects involving more limited scope (e.g., mechanical system upgrades), a no-new-gas standard would at minimum prevent the installation of new gas-fired equipment where electric alternatives

are available. The City should also strongly consider reducing reliance on other fossil fuel infrastructure where suitable alternatives exist, such as solar and storage for backup power.

Furthermore, the proposed bond measure explicitly lists "energy-efficient systems and lower long-term costs" and "environmental sustainability and resilience" among its stated values in evaluating and prioritizing projects. Codifying an all-electric requirement in the bond measure language is a direct and concrete expression of those values and a fulfillment of the measure's own stated goals. Such a requirement, both applying to projects funded by the bond measure and all future city projects, would implement crucial components of the Berkeley Existing Buildings Electrification Strategy, adopted by Council in 2021<sup>1</sup>.

The public is supportive. Council polling of the measure revealed that the top infrastructure priority for Berkeley residents was climate resilience, with 35% of residents listing it as one of their top two priorities<sup>2</sup>.

### ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY AND CLIMATE IMPACTS

Natural gas combustion in buildings is a significant source of greenhouse gas emissions and indoor air pollution. Installing new or replacement gas infrastructure in bond-funded municipal buildings would:

- Lock in fossil fuel dependency in City-owned facilities for 20–40 years, well beyond Berkeley's 2045 carbon neutrality target;
- Undermine Berkeley's credibility as a climate leader and signal to the public that the City's electrification commitments do not apply to its own operations; and
- Expose building occupants, including community members (especially the more vulnerable young and elderly), fire fighters, and City employees, to the known indoor air quality risks associated with gas combustion appliances, which approach \$1 billion annually across the Bay Area<sup>3</sup>.

Conversely, requiring all-electric construction across bond-funded projects (and all City capital spending) would meaningfully reduce municipal emissions, improve indoor air quality in public facilities, demonstrate institutional leadership, and create durable, future-proof infrastructure aligned with California's clean energy grid trajectory.

<sup>1</sup> <https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/2022-01/Berkeley-Existing-Buildings-Electrification-Strategy.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> <https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/city-council-meetings/2026-03-17%20Special%20Agenda%20Packet%20-%20Council.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> [https://www.baaqmd.gov/~/\\_media/dotgov/files/rules/reg-9-rule-4-nitrogen-oxides-from-fan-type-residential-central-furnaces/2021-amendments/documents/20230127\\_factsheet\\_rg09040906-pdf.pdf?rev=29d5bd3e4204460298a2ca1f02ac9214&sc\\_lang=en](https://www.baaqmd.gov/~/_media/dotgov/files/rules/reg-9-rule-4-nitrogen-oxides-from-fan-type-residential-central-furnaces/2021-amendments/documents/20230127_factsheet_rg09040906-pdf.pdf?rev=29d5bd3e4204460298a2ca1f02ac9214&sc_lang=en)

RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

1. The bond measure is the right vehicle. Because the bond measure will govern how hundreds of millions of dollars are spent on City facilities over the next decade, it is the ideal place to enshrine an electrification requirement. Including it in the measure language increases public accountability and provides another reason for Berkeley voters to support it.
2. City polling indicates that the public is highly supportive of climate and green infrastructure goals.
3. There is no technical barrier. All-electric construction is viable across every project type in the proposed portfolio. Several of the proposed projects have already completed conceptual design; the Commission encourages the City to verify and update those designs to reflect an all-electric standard where they have not already done so.
4. The City's own spending is within its control. Berkeley can and should hold its own buildings to the highest electrification and emissions standards to improve the health of its residents and that of the environment.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS CONSIDERED

n/a

CITY MANAGER

The City Manager concurs with the content and recommendations of the Commission's Report, recognizing that this has been the City of Berkeley's typical practice since 2020, when the since-repealed Prohibition on Natural Gas Infrastructure in New Buildings became effective.

In addition, to improve regional air quality and reduce the amount of NO<sub>x</sub> and particulate matter emissions, the Bay Area Air District has adopted zero NO<sub>x</sub> emissions standards for natural gas fired furnaces and water heaters (Rules 9-4 and 9-6). These rules begin implementation on Jan 1, 2027 (for water heaters under 75,000 BTU/hr, typically residential size) and will impact commercial furnaces on Jan 1, 2029, and commercial water heaters (75,000 – 2M BTU/hr) on Jan 1, 2031. Electric heat pumps will comply with these regulations, applicable to all sales and installations in the Bay Area, in both replacements in existing construction and in new construction.

Although electrification is now standard practice and will increasingly be required throughout the Bay Area for water and space heating, the City Manager notes that there may be limited instances in which exceptions to the electrification of municipal facilities during new construction or the replacement of existing gas equipment may be needed. For example, electrical and/or physical constraints of an existing municipal facility or local grid capacity may limit or eliminate safe, effective electrical replacement options for gas systems at time of replacement. Among the infrastructure projects currently

under consideration for funding through the potential bond measure, the King Pool may require a gas alternative.

If such an exception would be sought due to technical infeasibility, the City Manager would come to City Council for approval of a gas alternative.

CONTACT PERSON

Alison LaBonte, Chairperson, ECC

Attachments:

1. Resolution

RESOLUTION NO. ##,###-N.S.

**Affirming All-Electric Standards for the 2026 Infrastructure Bond Measure and City Capital Projects**

WHEREAS, installing new or replacement natural gas infrastructure in bond-funded municipal buildings would lock in fossil fuel dependency in City-owned facilities for 20–40 years, well beyond Berkeley's 2045 carbon neutrality target; and

WHEREAS, installing new or replacement gas infrastructure in bond-funded municipal buildings would undermine Berkeley's credibility as a climate leader and signal to the public that the City's electrification commitments do not apply to its own operations; and

WHEREAS, installing new or replacement gas infrastructure in bond-funded municipal buildings would expose building occupants, including community members (especially the more vulnerable young and elderly), fire fighters, and City employees, to the known indoor air quality risks associated with gas combustion appliances, which approach \$1 billion annually across the Bay Area; and


WHEREAS, requiring all-electric construction across bond-funded projects and all City capital spending would meaningfully reduce municipal emissions, improve indoor air quality in public facilities, demonstrate institutional leadership, and create durable, future-proof infrastructure aligned with California's clean energy grid trajectory.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Berkeley that the City of Berkeley will adopt a formal policy prohibiting the installation of new natural gas infrastructure (hereafter referred to as “gas”) or the replacement of existing gas equipment with new gas equipment in any project funded by the proposed 2026 General Obligation Bond Measure;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that that the City of Berkeley will include explicit all-electric construction and retrofit language in the bond measure itself; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Council of the City of Berkeley will direct staff to apply this no-new-gas standard as a condition of all City capital spending, beyond bond-funded projects, thus affirming that public funds shall not be used to install new gas infrastructure in any municipal facility.





All communications submitted to the City Council are public record. Communications are not published directly to the City's website. Copies of individual communications are available for viewing at the City Clerk Department and through Records Online.

**City Clerk Department**

2180 Milvia Street  
Berkeley, CA 94704  
(510) 981-6900

**Records Online**

<https://records.cityofberkeley.info/>

To search for communications associated with a particular City Council meeting using Records Online:

1. Select Search Type = “Public – Communication Query (Keywords)”
2. From Date: Enter the date of the Council meeting
3. To Date: Enter the date of the Council meeting (this may match the From Date field)
4. Click the “Search” button
5. Communication packets matching the entered criteria will be returned
6. Click the desired file in the Results column to view the document as a PDF