



PLAN OF ACTION

Each of the existing and proposed sites in Emeryville has an important role to play in creating the complete parks and recreation system envisioned by the community and documented in the General Plan. The keys to achieving this vision are preparation and flexibility. This chapter outlines how Emeryville can use these two strategies to make decisions that, while they do not necessarily follow a straight line, will make the best use of the opportunities presented over the long-term implementation of this Strategic Plan. Most of Emeryville's proposed park sites, along with most of the land in the city, are currently developed for other uses. The General Plan concept relies on the ongoing changes in the development and use of land in the city to reshape the community's access to open space and to take advantage of the benefits parks offer to residents, business owners, visitors and employees. Preparing for these projects will involve a careful balance of recognition and support of existing land uses along with an eye to the future as plans begin to form for redevelopment in key locations.

The decision to redevelop property rests primarily with the land owners. Therefore, the timing of some projects will be out of the City's control. An opportunity to advance the community's vision through an improvement at an existing park or the acquisition of an entirely new site may arise in a relatively short period of time and may pass just as quickly. In order to provide the flexibility needed to address these opportunities as they arise, this Strategic Plan includes a variety of tools to assist the community, elected officials and staff in determining how a new project fits within the community vision and available resources.



PRIORITIZING PROJECTS

The recommendations presented in this plan are intended to represent 20 years of development of the parks and recreation system in Emeryville. During this period, both time and financial resources will limit how much can be pursued at once. A key step in preparation is a clear understanding of the projects that the City is already actively pursuing, those that are held up by a key condition and the set of projects that are pending a decision by the City to move forward. Separating projects into these three basic categories focuses attention on where resources are currently tied up, emphasizes the projects that make up the next set to move forward, and provides a place to recognize the projects that are being monitored for future action. The three categories of projects and the current list of sites in each category are detailed in the following pages. This is not intended to be a static list, but rather a framework the City can use to keep track of the full spectrum of projects over the next 20 years. Projects can move between these lists and almost certainly, during the life of this plan, new projects will be added.

For the purposes of this breakdown, the improvements to each site are grouped together. In reality, the projects at a site will probably be broken down into phases taken one step at a time. The resources needed to move projects forward include capital and operating dollars along with project management capacity within Emeryville's City staff.

ACTIVE PROJECTS

Active projects are those currently somewhere between design and construction. These projects require community investment in staff time, consulting fees or capital resources. The current list of active projects is presented here along with a brief description of the status as of January 2011.

Joint School District-City Facility

- *In preliminary design by EUSD*
- *Major part of the successful November 2010 bond measure*

Horton Landing Park

- *Designed and ready for construction*

Park Avenue Plaza/Site I

- *Under construction*

Pixar Pedestrian Connection

- *Designed, under construction*

Emeryville Greenway North of 67th

- *In design by City of Berkeley*

Emeryville Greenway South of 59th

- *Under construction*

Emeryville Greenway

Stanford Avenue to Powell

- *In property negotiations*

Eastshore State Park

- *Finalizing agreement with East Bay Regional Park District for design south of Powell*

48th Street Community Garden

- *Grant application in review*

PENDING PROJECTS

Projects in the "Pending" category are ready to move forward to a next step but require a commitment of capital dollars and staff time to make this happen. The Pending projects are often identified projects that have not yet begun or projects that have completed some level of design and are awaiting resources for construction or implementation. The current identified list of Pending projects is presented along with a brief description of the anticipated next step.

Emeryville Marina Park

- *Add group picnic areas, improve pathway*

Davenport Park

- *Design-build renovation*

Doyle Hollis Expansion/Site I

- *Acquire properties as possible*

Temescal Creek Park

- *Improvements, opening up to Adeline*

Temescal Creek Greenway

East of San Pablo

- *Extend greenway from park west to San Pablo*

Temescal Creek Greenway/Site H

- *Design/develop*

Temescal Creek Greenway

San Pablo to Hollis along 53rd Street

- *Improve streetscape*

Stanford Avenue Park/Site F

- *Acquire Site*

Christie Avenue Park

- *Design/Redevelop*

Site A

- *Funding of pedestrian/bike bridge*

CONDITIONAL PROJECTS

Conditional projects are important to the long-term vision of the parks and recreation system but require a major trigger event that is outside of the City’s control before they can move forward. These project sites require monitoring to allow for quick action when a trigger event occurs. Examples of triggers would be the relocation of a large existing use or redevelopment proposal in an area identified for a future park site. For each Conditional project listed, a brief description of the critical trigger event is provided.

Stanford Avenue Park/Site E

– *Approved design, awaiting developer action*

Emeryville Greenway

Horton Landing to Park Avenue

– *Redevelopment proposal*

Site 2

– *Relocation of existing use*

Site 3

– *Relocation of existing use*

Site B

– *Redevelopment in area*

Site C

– *Redevelopment in area*

Site D

– *Redevelopment proposal*

Site G

– *Redevelopment proposal*

Site J

– *Redevelopment in area*

Site K

– *Redevelopment proposal*

Site L

– *Relocation of Anna Yates Elementary or Recreation Center*





DECISION MAKING CRITERIA

When a project is considered for moving from either the Conditional or Pending categories to Active, the details of the project should be evaluated against a set of criteria via discussions about how this project contributes to the community's parks and recreation system. These criteria are also intended to be used as a discussion starter for each project that emerges following the completion of this Strategic Plan. The recommended criteria described below have been developed from the community input with Ad Hoc Committee input after this group's review of the planning analysis. The following criteria, presented in no particular order, are briefly described with a hypothetical example of how each might be applied.

CAPITAL AND MAINTENANCE RESOURCES AVAILABILITY

Before moving forward with a project, Emeryville should identify resources, not only to build the facility, but also to establish a commitment of additional maintenance resources in line with the type of facilities added. These resources could include a mix of city and other resources such as developer contributions, sponsorships, volunteer labor or private ownership.

A project would rise on the list if a developer is prepared to build the park at no cost to the City; however, the maintenance resources should also be identified prior to moving forward.

PROPERTY AVAILABILITY

The availability or relative difficulty of acquiring an appropriate park site adds complexity to the decision and is closely related to having adequate resources. In some situations, the land will be available because it is a condition of approval of a redevelopment. In others, the City may need to purchase the land on the open market, a process that can introduce additional cost. While all land is scarce in Emeryville, large parcels are especially rare. The City should seize opportunities to acquire spaces for large parks. An additional factor in land availability is the condition of a site once it is acquired. Because of Emeryville's industrial past, reused land may need remediation before it is available for park use.



SERVING IDENTIFIED ACTIVITY AND LOCATION NEEDS

Projects should include facilities that serve the community's needs as identified in the Strategic Plan needs analysis. Potential new park locations have been identified in the General Plan to provide local access to all residents. In addition, each park and potential park site has been identified for a set of uses not only to serve the immediate area but to fill gaps in the opportunities offered across the system. Projects that add new park locations, particularly the major park sites, and those that add to the recreation activities offered in the community should have priority.

COMPLETING GREENWAYS

The Emeryville Greenway is one of the most valued resources in the parks and recreation system. Along with the proposed Temescal Creek Greenway these corridors form critical community links and connect multiple parks and recreation sites to each other. Sites that make up a part of these corridors and projects to develop or contribute to them should be higher priority.

AVAILABILITY OF PARTNERSHIPS

Corporate and community partnerships will be critical to the further development of Emeryville's park system. Projects with one (or more) identified community partners who will assist in the development or maintenance (or both) should take precedence.

ENHANCING/MAINTAINING EXISTING RESOURCES

Emeryville has built up an investment in park sites and facilities that should be protected through scheduled capital replacement and improvements as recommended. Projects that address issues or enhance capacity on existing sites should move up the priority list.



CAPITAL PROJECT COSTS

The cost of design, construction, renovation and the addition of features within a park or across an entire system can play a major role in decisions about how and when to initiate a project. The final cost of a project is only known at completion, as changes and unexpected costs are a reality of taking a project from the conceptual level of this Strategic Plan to a built park or feature. At this level, the costs described are “planning level” costs meant to provide a reasonable approximation of what a project would cost from start to finish if it were completed today. In order to generate a cost for each park site and the improvement of the system as a whole, this Strategic Plan includes a cost model that is based on a series of assumptions. These assumptions build up a project cost from a cost of land acquisition, design and site development. Where specific features are identified in the site program beyond basic site development, an additional cost is added into the project based on recent construction bidding.

SUMMARY OF CAPITAL COST MODEL



The capital cost model is divided into two sections, existing and proposed parks. For each site, the recommendations of this Strategic Plan are translated into categories of improvement projects, indicated with an “x” or a number of facilities. While all of the existing and proposed sites addressed in the recommendations are listed in the cost model, the cost of improvements to the Child Development Center, Site 3 and the City’s commitment of redevelopment funds to the joint School District/City facility are removed from the totals discussed below. The Child Development Center improvements are related to the educational facility more than the parks and recreation uses, Site 3 is considered an alternate with Site 2 with somewhat less likelihood of moving forward before Site 2, and the commitment to the joint School District/City facility is moving independently of this process. The snapshot of the model in Appendix C does include these projects for reference.

In the case of new sites or sites that are recommended for redevelopment, two levels of design are indicated. The first is a site design, indicated as SD in the model, which is the lesser level of design effort for small sites or redesigns and that requires less public input and review. For the largest of the sites, especially

the major city parks (sites 1-3), a larger master plan effort will be required to address the wider variety of program elements and issues for these key parks.

Two other categories of improvements needing additional explanation are site acquisition and site development. Site acquisition is the largest single item in the cost model, a cost which may or may not be a direct project cost to the City as developers may contribute the land as part of a redevelopment project. It is important to consider acquisition cost but also to be aware of where this cost is likely to be necessary. Site development is the cost of building a park's basic features and is applied as a per acre cost. This amount includes the landscaping, paving, utility installation and lighting and trees, making up a large part of the development of any park. The remaining features are the improvements recommended for addition to existing parks or as features of new parks. New improvements are assumed to be fully compliant with regulations and guidelines of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and will address shortcomings of existing sites wherever possible.

The total planning level cost of the recommendations (less the Child Development Center, Site 3 and the joint School District/City facility) are broken down in Table 2, below.

TABLE 2: TOTAL PLANNING LEVEL COST BREAKDOWN			
	EXISTING PARKS	PROPOSED PARKS	TOTAL
SITE ACQUISITION	\$0	\$121,513,172	\$121,513,172
PLANNING AND SITE DEVELOPMENT	\$1,234,858	\$7,109,855	\$8,344,713
IMPROVEMENTS	\$4,776,829	\$10,202,624	\$14,979,453
% FOR ART AND CONTINGENCY*	\$987,428	\$21,056,535	\$22,043,963
TOTAL PLANNING LEVEL COST	\$6,999,116	\$159,882,185	\$166,881,301

*Note: Percent for Art and Contingency are calculated as a percentage of the total project cost, including land acquisition.

There are many ways to consider this overall total. First, most of the proposed park sites are contingent on actions outside of the total planning level cost, \$121.5 million dollars is tied to site acquisition, with an additional \$22 million in % for Art and contingency resulting, in part from these acquisitions. In addition, the long time horizon of this plan will spread the cost over 20 years or more as the City takes advantage of opportunities that arise. If all \$167 million in projects were

completed over 20 years, and the City had to pay for all of the new park land, the average year would require 8.35 million dollars in combined investment in the parks and recreation system. For comparison the City spent just over \$10 million on acquiring and building Doyle Hollis Park.

The figures presented here represent the best planning level estimate as of the completion of this plan and allow preparation based on reasonable cost figures. The model as a tool also provides flexibility. A key feature of this model is the ability to adjust the assumptions as conditions change to maintain the relevancy and accuracy of the project and system construction costs. The model can also be used to break down the costs of improvements within a subset of the park system. The model has been provided in spreadsheet form for future use, in addition to a snapshot of the model provided in Appendix C.

OPERATIONS COSTS

The ability to sustain maintenance and operations of the park system is a critical issue in Emeryville and will continue to be a key consideration throughout the implementation of this plan. The criteria described previously focus decision making about new park sites around the ability to add resources to cover the increase in operating costs as the park system expands to meet the needs of Emeryville's residents, employees and visitors. To assist in this discussion, the cost model also includes a planning level estimate of the additional operations costs involved in adding parks and features to the system.

SUMMARY OF OPERATIONS COST MODEL

As with the capital costs, the operations model is built from a series of assumptions about the basic level of maintenance with additional resources added for special facilities or especially intensive use. The operations model is also divided into existing and proposed parks. The basic level of maintenance was derived from actual data including the City's CIP tracking system (the best available source for City staff and materials costs figures), contract maintenance expenditures and utilities. The basic level of service represents all of the maintenance practices currently performed by City staff, including trash collection, mowing, landscape maintenance, tree and shrub pruning, weeding, sweeping surfaces, graffiti removal and routine repairs to furnishings and equipment as well as the supplies and utilities necessary for these tasks. The cost figures developed for this model are intended to apply to either City staff or contracted services (including the supervision time required for contract maintenance work). In addition to these basic maintenance tasks, certain park facilities require additional attention and resources to ensure that they function properly and are attractive assets. Within the existing system, the primary example of this type of feature is a restroom which requires regular cleaning and additional maintenance attention. The model builds in budget bonuses for each of the following facilities to recognize the added maintenance needs:

- *Restroom*
- *Multi-use sports field*
- *Group picnic area*
- *Dog park*
- *Interactive water feature*

In addition to specific facilities, two bonuses are included to recognize special significance of some sites from a maintenance perspective. The first of these is called safety emphasis and is intended to recognize that some sites, due to their location and lack of visibility, are more susceptible to vandalism and other illicit activities. While good site selection and design would ideally reduce these concerns, some sites will still require additional monitoring and maintenance. The second situation-based bonus is called intensive use and is meant to capture the additional maintenance time resulting from the extremely heavy use of the City's most popular sites.

For each existing site, the appropriate selection has been made to reflect where the City is responsible for basic maintenance and the facilities present that require budget bonuses. The total maintenance requirement for existing parks based on the current assumptions of the model equals \$998,624 annually. This captures new sites such as Horton Landing and the Pixar Pedestrian Connection as well as the cost of maintaining hardscape park areas (such as courts and trails) not currently accounted separately in the City's labor tracking system.

The proposed site operations costs represent the amount that should be allocated to maintenance as a result of new projects. These numbers vary widely by site depending on the size and complexity of the program. Based on current operating assumptions, the cost to maintain the park system when fully developed will total just under \$2.2 million annually, excluding Site 3 and with no cost associated with the joint School District/City facility. This total is just over twice the current requirement. However, even more than capital costs, the operating cost assumptions will need updating regularly to maintain their relevancy over the life of the plan.

FUNDING STRATEGIES

There is no one way that the Emeryville parks and recreation system will be funded. Each project will bring a series of opportunities and challenges that will impact the timing and methods of funding. Many, if not most, of the projects will benefit from the types of resources that have built the system thus far, including direct purchases and development using the City's general funds, redevelopment





funding, and contributions of land and facility space or funding from property developments. The community has taken a large step in the right direction by clearly identifying its vision for the parks and recreation system in the General Plan. However, the most difficult challenge is still ahead. As the City implements the vision laid out in the General Plan, maintenance and operations of the parks and recreation system will increase with the system expansion. Addressing the maintenance and operations needs of the park system will be critical to moving forward in a responsible way. Four over-arching funding strategies are presented below with examples of specific measures that will address both the capital and operating needs of Emeryville's parks and recreation system. The strategies are not mutually exclusive and are designed to be flexible and responsive to the needs of the City as opportunities arise. Ultimately decisions about the application of these recommended strategies will be the responsibility of the City Council and the implementation will rely on staff as well as community partners.

PARTNERING FOR SUCCESS

The improvements planned for Emeryville's parks and recreation system will have a powerful effect on quality of life for existing and future residents. However, there are a wide variety of other audiences and organizations that will benefit from improved access to open space and a more attractive city. Some examples of how the benefits of parks and recreation impact the community include:

- *The draw of a high quality park will bring residents and visitors, increasing foot traffic for established and new businesses.*
- *Access to nearby plazas, parks and trails will attract companies who recognize the value of these amenities to their employees.*
- *Parks with historic, artistic and educational points of interest will benefit local public and private educational institutions by providing outdoor classrooms and inspiration.*
- *Access to safe and interesting places to play and quality recreation programming reduces juvenile crime.*
- *Well-maintained parks increase nearby property values and make housing units easier to sell.*

Communities that understand these benefits and how they accrue are places full of potential partnerships to help build and maintain a high quality park system.

Property developers, property owners, homeowners' associations, neighborhood associations, local businesses, major employers, employee groups, schools, neighboring cities and public safety organizations are all strong potential partners for the enhancement of the park system.

It is important to note that while effective partnerships can bring considerable resources, the City must commit some staff time and possibly other resources to establish and maintain partnerships in the community. With each project, the City should identify and actively pursue long-term partnerships that include contributions to the ongoing upkeep of a new park or facility.

MAXIMIZING CAPITAL DOLLARS

This strategy is about not only finding additional capital resources beyond those drawn from the General Fund, but also making the most of each dollar applied to capital projects across City services. The combination of new dollars and finding ways to leverage additional parks and recreation improvements from other City projects and through matching funds will help the City move through the project list. Appendix D provides a listing of potential funding sources including tax measures, fees and grant programs. The majority of funding options are limited to capital projects only and many are tied to specific types of projects. In addition to the summary in Appendix D, several opportunities are discussed in more detail here due to their potential and local significance. Grants are considered separately as an independent strategy.

Redevelopment Funds

With the exception of Marina Park, all existing and proposed park sites are covered by two redevelopment

project areas: the 1976 Project Area and the Shellmound Project Area. Prior to 2007, a large portion of the capital improvements in parks, including much of the greenway, was purchased with bond funds to be repaid through property value increases in these districts. All of the projects recommended in this plan have the potential to increase property values and be a net gain to the tax rolls over time, but the major city park projects are likely to have the most potential to fulfill redevelopment objectives. Parks and recreation projects are only one of a variety of competing uses for redevelopment funding. Positioning of park projects as serving multiple benefits will be helpful in securing redevelopment funding in the future.

Impact Fees

Prior to this Strategic Plan, the City hired a consultant to conduct a General Government and Park Facilities Fee Study (Muni Financial 2008). The purpose of this study was to establish the maximum allowable fee based on AB 1600, the authorizing legislation. The result of this study was a potential fee of \$20,330 per single family unit and \$18,711 per multi-family unit with an additional non-residential fee ranging from \$11.25 per square foot to \$4.32 per square foot. This fee was calculated based on an estimate of \$131 million dollars in total improvements needed to the park system, almost identical to the total developed independently in the cost model for this plan. Of this total, the fee study identifies \$91.7 million dollars of land acquisition and development that is attributable to new population growth, and therefore can be the basis of an impact fee. A comparison of fees charged by cities in Alameda and Contra Costa County shows this potential fee to be much higher than adopted

fees in nearby communities, the highest of which were \$14,500 per single family unit and \$12,430 per multi-family unit. Similarly in the few communities charging for nonresidential impact where the highest rates were \$2.73 and \$1.54 per square foot. Currently, neither of Emeryville's neighbor cities charge an impact fee for park facilities.

Emeryville's small size, high land value and impressive ratio of jobs to residents make the impact of further growth large on a per-unit cost basis. However, charging the full impact directly to a developer, and by extension new homeowners, can be seen as prohibitively expensive. With the high fee justified by the 2008 study, the City can decide, as many cities do, to adopt a lower fee to cover some of the attributed impact. With the large number of housing units expected to be built in Emeryville, even a more modest contribution per unit would go a long way toward overcoming the high cost of park land to expand the system.

Quimby Fees

A second avenue for addressing the impact of new development is the fee allowed by the Quimby Act, which is collected in lieu of park land dedication at the time of property subdivision. While Emeryville does not have large tracts of land to be subdivided, the Quimby Act fees would apply to subdivision for redevelopment projects such as condominium housing. Many California communities use one or both of impact fees and Quimby fees. Quimby Act fees are a popular option because of their lower standard of documentation (no nexus study is required) and

the ability to set a minimum standard of 3.0 acres per thousand population even if the existing level of service is lower. Emeryville could establish a Quimby Act fee up to the value of 3 acres of land per 1,000 people with minimal process.

The City Council may, by ordinance, require the dedication of land or impose a requirement of the payment of fees (or a combination of both). The ordinance must provide definite standards for determining the dedication amount, based on an adopted plan and in direct proportion to the new development.

Maximizing Other Capital Projects

In addition to the improvements to the parks and recreation system, Emeryville has also identified a wide variety of transportation, utility and public facility projects that will require large investments during the same time period as the implementation of this plan. The City should be actively considering the potential of non-park projects to contribute to the goals of the General Plan in regards to parks. For example, utility work at or around an existing park site could be considered part of a matching contribution for a grant project (if it would have to happen for the granted project to move forward). Utility or transportation projects in the vicinity of either greenway should be examined for opportunities to make improvements or complete connections.

Targeting Grant Applications

Grant programs are a popular method for raising capital dollars for parks and recreation projects. The perception is often that this is money that is simply

given away to help communities make improvements to their park systems. Most grant programs have become extremely competitive and require significant local investment in the project to match funding by the granting agency. In order to make the best use of limited staff resources, Emeryville should be very strategic about the grant applications it pursues. Managing a grant application should be considered along with how many other projects a particular staff person is handling before the City commits to the pursuit. Further, a grant opportunity by itself is not necessarily enough to justify moving forward on a project. The City must identify not only the matching capital resources and staff to manage the project, but also the ongoing operational support and maintenance for the project after it is completed.



BUILDING COMMUNITY SUPPORT

The best, long-term funding source for parks and recreation in Emeryville, and one that has the potential for both capital and operating funds, is the strong support of the community. This support will take more than just residents: business and land owners in the city will also need to contribute. To build this kind of support Emeryville must continue to actively involve its citizens and take every opportunity to communicate the many and varied benefits that the community enjoys as a result of the parks and open spaces in which they have invested. This community support can manifest in several ways, including community partnerships (as described above), political support, financial support and stronger ownership and stewardship of the park system.

Political Support

There will be many occasions in the future where a park project will be the subject of a difficult City Council decision about directing limited resources in one direction or another. A strong constituency of park users empowered by the adopted vision of the City for the parks and recreation system will be able and willing to speak to not only the importance but also the benefit of investing in and maintaining the park system.

Financial Support

Ultimately, the solutions to the need for ongoing operations funding for parks



require the consent of the citizens or property owners to agree that the issue is important enough to tax themselves. Taxing measures are usually unpopular even in the best of times and require clear communication about the advantages offered as a result of the additional funding. With multiple needs for major projects in many areas, the City of Emeryville faces a significant challenge in presenting a clear case for why a specific funding source is needed and how it fits into the big picture of City services.

The City's most recent request failed to sell property owners in the city on a Landscape and Lighting Assessment District (LLAD) to increase the dedicated resources for upkeep of existing and new parks in the system. This funding mechanism is specific to California and provides the unique opportunity to fund both operations and capital perpetually. While this assessment did not pass, the City should continue to consider this mechanism for the long-term and target property owners for outreach about the benefits the park system offers them.

Other funding measures will require the broad support of voters within Emeryville. Building support with voters is often focused on identifying the key features of the existing or future park system that capture the public's attention. Some of the key messages that were gathered during this process include an interest in an increase in the variety of features and the assurance that projects can be maintained once they are built.

Additional financial support can come in the form of donations, volunteer labor and in-kind contributions of services. These resources are very valuable in construction and renovation projects, but for long term stewardship, these resources may not be available for on-going maintenance and repairs at all park sites and facilities. In addition, these sources are not guaranteed. However, even when the coordination of volunteers may seem more expensive or difficult than simply hiring the work out, the City should also factor in the value of building ownership in the park system through hands-on work in a park or giving directly to a project goal.

CONCLUSION

This document will serve as an implementation companion to the important ideas of the Emeryville General Plan for the entire 20-year planning horizon. As stated previously, this is not intended to be a fixed road map, but rather a guide to provide information to the active citizen, to provide guidance for City staff, to generate ideas within the development community and to build support for parks and recreation amongst the decision makers in Emeryville. The tools within, and provided alongside this plan document will help the community make timely decisions about an ever-changing landscape of opportunities while staying true to the vision of a fully featured park system.

