

CONCLUSION

The Bay Area is experiencing a new era of professional concern for the environmental aspects of life. The quality of that life will be dependent, to a very large degree, on the recreational opportunities open to the residents of this area.

Providing recreation for an urban area is a challenging task that requires long-term transportation planning, an understanding of urban park needs, functional and coordinated vegetative management programs, interpretive park planning, organizational efficiency, communication and maintenance, and the continued development of future park areas. This report sought to provide a guide for planning and management options for recreational life in the East Bay area. The methodology of this report was twofold. First, the problems and procedures of the East Bay Regional Park District were examined in the context of the preceding criteria. Second, potential solutions to planning and management problems were formulated to assist the District in providing a wide variety of recreational opportunities.

All participants of this study were impressed by the strong commitment, genuine interest and excellent attitude of District personnel. We wish to express our appreciation for the hours that were freely given by park staff in the course of this project. The District has done a superlative job in providing varied recreational opportunities in response to the diverse needs of the District residents. The planning and management of the interpretive and special programs (e.g., use and access by handicapped persons) is also indicative of successful operation. The long-range planning effort (especially regarding the shoreline parks) received our special endorsement. Finally we were pleased with the institutional direction provided by the Master Plan. However, in the course of our field research we perceived a general lack of cohesiveness and coordination among District staff regarding information about specific projects and issues. Data from field work suggest an inconsistency between official policy in the Vegetation Management Plan and actual field application. We were also disturbed by the poor communication among the District, the general public and public agencies. The District is especially remiss regarding public awareness of park opportunities and locations. While we acknowledge that these planning and management problems are symptomatic of any large bureaucracy, we feel that they must be overcome to provide high quality recreation.

The District should be congratulated for its perseverance and diligent effort in the provision of park areas in the face of political and economic difficulties. To date, the acquisition policies have been excellent, and we have every reason to expect that the creative energies and capabilities of the District will be applied to the continued development of the existing parks.

We hope that this report will provide usable suggestions as we enter this new age of environmental concern and awareness.

Phase I - \$490,000
1/2 mill / section (8-10 secs.)

Ms. Lynn E. Brenner
Mngr, Parks Design Sect,
City of Berkeley

Jim

financing!

Berkeley further Ahead!

Complicated process - basically unforeseen end.

2. Describe what's actually happened so far ^{(master plan)?} ^{How?} Why?

↓ What originally to happen.

1. History.

↓ 2.

- Long political who involved process.
- financing-
- Envi. consid.

future



Problems w/ Devel.