

# "The Olmsted-Hall Report, 1930."

A transcription of the text of the 1984 reprint of:

## ***Report on Proposed Park Reservations for East Bay Cities (California)***

By OLMSTED BROTHERS, *Landscape Architects, and*  
ANSEL F. HALL, *National Park Service*

The text on each page of this transcription is the same as the text on the corresponding page of the 1984 reprint, which appears to be the same as for the 1930 original, so that passages may be cited with reference to original page numbers. However, the layout of text on a given page may not correspond to its layout in the original or the reprint.

The 1984 reprint added three unnumbered pages of introductory material to the beginning of the reprint, but the pagination of the original pages appears to be unchanged. Blank pages have been retained in this transcription.

The numbers, credits, and captions for photographs, which are all omitted, are in brackets, as is any explanatory material inserted during the transcription. A large foldout color map (inserted after page 40) accompanied the original and the reprint, and another more diagrammatic map was printed on the back cover—neither map has been reproduced here.

As you can see from this transcription, neither the 1930 original nor the 1984 reprint had copyright notices. Because the original was produced for free public distribution and funded by donations, this work would almost certainly be regarded as being in the public domain. This transcription itself is hereby placed in the public domain for free copying and distribution to the extent permitted by any valid legal restrictions on the original publication.

March 2011

# Proposed Park Reservations

*[Photo: Upper end of Lake Chabot Road, showing fine inland park scenery that should be preserved and controlled for enjoyment.]*

FOR  
East Bay Cities  
(California)

1930

**Reprinted 1984**

List of Sponsors *of the*  
**East Bay Regional Park Association**  
*at Time of Publication*

---

Dr. U. S. Abbott	P. S. Beach	John A. Brennan	Reece Clark	Mrs. Wm. C. Davis
Louis Aber	George Bean	Edward B. Brewer	Mrs. Thomas J. Clark	Miss Margaret T. Davis
W. L. Abrott	Charles A. Beardsley	Thomas B. Bridges	Wellyn B. Clark	Albert S. Day
Mrs. S. J. Ackerman	Jas. G. Beaty	J. W. Bridwell	Rev. Charles F. Clarke	Rev. Richard C. Day
C. F. Acree	J. J. Beaty	Walter M. Briggs	Mrs. C. C. Clay	Mrs. Grace E. Deadrich
Charles C. Adams	T. D. Beckwith	Mrs. Walter M. Briggs	Mrs. W. T. Cleverdon	John A. Deadrich, Jr.
G. P. Adams	Mrs. Olga Beebe	J. C. F. Bright	Miss Elizabeth K. Clow	Dr. J. Camp Dean
Mrs. G. P. Adams	Mrs. L. K. Beever	Mrs. Charles W. Brock	Arthur Cobbledick	Mrs. E. R. DeChene
R. L. Adams	R. T. Belcher	Howard Bronstein	LeRoy Coburn, Jr.	Jerry W. De Cou
Dr. Herman Adler	Miss Julia A. Martins Beloff	Mrs. Richard C. Brookins	Rabbi Rudolph I. Coffee	George Deethardt
Arthur R. Ahlgren	H. J. Bemiss	F. A. Brooks	K. S. Colbie	E. I. de Laveaga
W. J. Aldridge	E. S. Bender	Miss Annie Florence Brown	Wm. E. Colby	H. W. Denhard
Carl Alexander	W. A. Benner	David E. Brown	C. L. Cole	Mrs. H. W. Denhard
Jas. P. Allen	Albert N. Benson	Mrs. David E. Brown	Mrs. K. A. Cole	J. A. Denis
Mrs. Jas. P. Allen	Frank A. Berg	Mrs. Walter S. Brown	Albert S. Colton	Mrs. Arthur P. Denton
John J. Allen	John W. Berger	Warner Brown	Robert E. Connolly	G. M. Derbyshire
Robt. Allen	Dr. T. L. Bergemann	Dr. L. E. Browning	Mrs. C. C. Conrad	Charles Derleth, Jr.
Modeste Alloo	Lloyd D. Bernard	Robert Brownlee	Mrs. Dane Coolidge	Edington Detrick
Rudolph Altrocchi	C. L. Best	J. Allison Bruner	Miss Mary Cooper	Mrs. Edington Detrick
J. M. Alvarez.	Carl Biedenbach	Mrs. H. W. Bryant	Wm. P. Cooper	Monroe E. Deutsch
H. C. Anderson	C. L. Biedenbach	W. A. Buckhart	Dr. J. G. Corneille	Chas. Capp De Wolf
Ralph H. Anderson	Jack T. Bill	George Budgen	Mrs. J. G. Corneille	R. Stanley Dollar
C. J. Andruss	E. R. Billett	P. G. E. Buechner	Frank V. Cornish	Augustin Donovan
Louis J. Angeli	Mrs. Addie M. Billings	John D. Bullock	C. J. J. Cox	Miss Katherine Douglas
Miss Nellie Anton	Miss Dorothy Billings	Miss Minnie Bunker	Ray B. Cox	Thos. F. Dowd
Eli D. Antonieu	Miss Margaret Billings	Mrs. John S. Burd	Miss Viola Cox	A. M. Dowling
Charles H. Armstrong	J. W. Bingaman	Burg Bros. Inc.	Harold H. Cozens	Dr. Sam R. Downing
Mrs. Helen S. Artieda	Mrs. J. W. Bingaman	W. C. Burgess	C. S. Cramer	M. B. Driver
D. L. Artis	Mrs. A. A. Bird	A. E. Burke	Clarence B. Crane	Aubrey Drury
Miss Lydia Atterbury	Mrs. F. W. Birtch	Miss Beatrice Burnett	Miss Anita Crellin	H. L. Drury
John M. Atthowe	F. C. Bishop	Miss Margaret Burnham	Miss Mary Crellin	Newton Drury
Lewis B. Avery	Miss Anga M. Bjornson	Mrs. Walter J. Burpee	Mrs. T. A. Crellin	Chas. E. Dunscomb
George E. Axtille	Dr. Benjamin W. Black	E. W. Burr	Miss Cornelia V. N. Cress	Mrs. Laura L. Durgin
Leon C. Babbitt	Mrs. Benjamin W. Black	A. S. Burrill	Miss Helena Critzer	D. G. Dye
Dr. S. H. Babington	Spens Black	Mrs. Harry R. Burt	F. J. Croll	Mrs. Grace S. Dyer
Dr. William Frederic Bade	Mrs. Spens Black	J. G. Buttomer	Otis Crooks	Thos. C. Eaglesome
George Chester Badger	Mrs. William Wallace Blair	Mrs. J. G. Buttomer	Daniel Crosby	Guy C. Earl
Miss Edna W. Bailey	Anson S. Blake	Sheridan Byrne	Ira B. Cross	Mrs. Guy C. Earl
Mrs. Henry Bailey	Mrs. Anson S. Blake	B. C. Cain	W. W. Cross	Carroll Ebright
Alfred E. Baker	Frances J. Blake	T. E. Caldecott	Mrs. W. V. Cruess	Ralph Eckert
Frederick S. Baker	G. W. Blakeman	A. W. Caldwell	Guy M. Crump	Geo. A. Edgar
James B. Baker	A. C. Blanchard	Harry H. Caldwell	G. A. Cummings	John W. Edgemon
Miss Harriet B. Bakewell	Walter C. Blasdale	Mrs. Tsar N. Calfee	Dr. Ruby Cunningham	Mrs. Paul Eliel
Martin T. Baldwin	Rev. J. M. Boaz	George M. Calhoun	A. B. Currier	E. C. Elliott
Miss Shirley W. Bate	Harold Bodington	Edw. L. Camp	H. A. Curtis	Mrs. Minerva G. Elliott
W. L. Ballenger	Dr. G. A. Boehmer	Rev. Harold B. Camp	Miss Jane Isabel Curtis	Eben B. Ellis
Oscar T. Barber	Wallace B. Boggs	H. W. Campbell	Thomas Dabagh	Mrs. Ralph Ellis
A. L. Barker	H. E. Bolton	Arthur M. Carden	Stuart Daggett	Oliver Ellsworth
Miss Mary Barmby	Rev. Geo. L. Boroughs	R. L. Carey	Mrs. James Dalziel	Ralph R. Eltse
Rev. John Barrett	J. N. Boroughs	Forest Carlisle	N. P. Damianakes	Rev. C. Herschel Emminger
Mrs. David P. Barrows	Mrs. B. W. Bours	W. S. Carson	Mrs. I. R. Damon	Frank W. Epperson
Howard H. Barrows	J. M. Bracket	Andrew Cartwright	Hartley Daneke	E. O. Essig
Miss Jeannette Barrows	Mrs. C. C. Bradfield	A. B. Cary	J. F. Daniel	Mrs. E. O. Essig
Miss Ann Little Barry	Henry Bradley	Wm. Cavalier	J. Frank Daniel, Jr.	Roland Esteves
J. J. Barry	P. R. Bradley	W. E. Chamberlain	Paul I. Daniels	H. J. Eustace
Louis Bartlett	Paul W. Brannon	Walter S. Chandler	H. A. Davenport	Mrs. H. J. Eustace
J.G. Bassett	M. E. Bratcher	M. C. Chapman	F. M. Davidson	Dr. Herbert M. Evans
C. D. Bates	Mrs. Marjorie Breck	Rev. O. K. Chenoweth	Albert E. Davies	Perry Evans
Dr. Helen Page Bates	Samuel Breck	S. V. Chown	Charles G. Davis	Grant L. Ewing
Rev. Dean W. H. Battershill	H. L. Breed	Mrs. G. Wilson Church	Charles W. Davis	William F. Ewing
Miss Bernice Baxter	Horace H. Breed	Thomas D. Church	Curt C. Davis	Mrs. W. F. Faber
Dr. Frank S. Baxter	Henry Breen	Mrs. Thomas D. Church	Earl E. Davis	Harry H. Fair
Howard Baxter	Father Brennan	Mrs. E. S. Clark	Gen. Wm. C. Davis	

*(Continued on page 41)*

## Foreword to the 1984 Reprint of the "Olmsted-Hall Report"

Establishment of the East Bay Regional Park District in 1934 was preceded by complex circumstances of changing land use, evolving ideas about parks and recreation, and rapid growth of the urbanized area surrounding San Francisco Bay. A major document of this period, commonly referred to as the "Olmsted-Hall Report", first published in 1930, is a rarity today, and reprinting has seemed desirable for a number of years.

In this reprint, introductory material has been added to explain the role of the Report in the formation of the District: First, a participant in the original campaign recalls what it was like to get a regional park system under way. Second, a staff member of the District has summarized the history of the formation of the District. Third, a member of the Regional Parks Association has reviewed the evolution of ideas about East Bay parks and recreation in an effort to show how the report and the District reflect their times.

In 1930, the entire study of the proposed park lands including publication of the report were financed by a grant of \$5,200 from The Kahn Foundation of Oakland. This reprint has been financed by the East Bay Regional Park District with supplemental support from The Kahn Foundation and the Regional Parks Association<sup>1</sup> totalling some \$7,000. Dollars do not go as far as they once did!

### Formative Period

Many people at different times have stood on the hills of the East Bay opposite the Golden Gate and felt something should be done to preserve the beautiful landscape. How?

### A Big Issue and a Big Question

Man dreams many dreams. By 1930 the open land in the East Bay hills no longer vital for water storage because of the availability of water from the Sierra was publicly owned land (through the publicly owned water district). This open land was no longer purely utilitarian, no longer purely functional but open land with a possibility of greenery and expansion. Perhaps a test of our growth, development of our civilization can be found in our trees, our parks — open clearings of unencumbered delight!

In a seminar of Professional Samuel May in Public Administration at the University of California, Berkeley, in 1930 these ideas, hopes, plans and their possibilities of realization were discussed. The local area was growing. The East Bay Municipal Utility District was bringing water from the Sierra. Here under our feet were many acres of publicly owned land not yet parcelled out. Many people with commercial interests were eager to do just that.

Samuel May, Ansel Hall and I had many discussions. A few people got together. Surveys were

made, photographs taken, a booklet grew into the *Proposed Park Reservations For East Bay Cities*.

There was much land unbuilt upon, saved by the earlier water companies to serve the growing communities. The water from the Sierra meant the local land was no longer so vital for catchment areas. Through the publicly owned water district it was all publicly owned land. Technical issues had to be worked out. The people had to vote a park and buy the land from themselves.

Ex-Governor Pardee, President of the Utility District, was opposed to the park. He believed he had valid reasons. He may have had a real estate gleam in his eye. It became necessary to put the issue before the public. Samuel May and the others dropped the campaign for this in my lap. The Kahn Foundation had deposited \$5,200 with the University of California in order that the Bureau of Public Administration might have the survey undertaken and develop a means for distribution of the information in the survey to the people of the district. A Committee of East Bay Citizens was formed to direct park planning affairs.

Our main task was to publish the *Proposed Park Reservations For East Bay Cities* and to get a list of sponsors. Starting out with 50, we got 1,000 sponsors. We wrote to the President and Secretary of every organization in the East Bay Cities to enlist their support in getting the public out to vote on the park proposal. Most responded offering their help.

When the Report was completed and the mailing to sponsors ready, the Citizens Committee called a meeting to decide on procedures. It was a strategic moment. I feared, in view of the opposing forces on the Committee (the Director of the Municipal Utility District and commercial interests), that there might be a year's postponement in getting the Report out to the public. To me a postponement meant no park and more real estate. I got in touch with Bob Sibley at the University of California Alumni office employment service and asked for some students to stuff the mailers of the Report. The students arrived, the envelopes were stuffed and taken into the Post Office before noon. That completed our work.

That evening at the Citizens Committee meeting I gave a report of my having mailed the *Proposed Park Reservations Report* to our sponsors. The Committee was displeased at my hasty action. They wished to be more certain of their procedures. As I saw it any delays or postponement meant no park.

I worked and spoke in the campaign for the park. The measure won. I returned to my graduate studies.

Harland Frederick

## Establishment of the District

The Olmsted-Hall Report was a compelling statement for the need for parks. It urged East Bay Municipal Utility District to open its surplus lands, pointing out that the 150-square-mile region served by the utility district was far behind comparable urban areas in parklands per capita. Olmsted-Hall envisioned a 10,000- to 11,000-acre park system extending nearly 22 miles along the East Bay hills, readily accessible to residents of the nine cities below.

(More than 50 years later, this proposal has in essence been achieved. The Park District's holdings include some 12,000 acres stretching in a nearly continuous chain for 30 miles along the East Bay skyline, as well as many other parklands throughout the two-county jurisdiction.)

Publication of the Olmsted-Hall Report in December of 1930 gave the East Bay parkland movement added credibility, with the endorsement by a nationally renowned landscape architect firm.

Since 1928, a dozen organizations had been founded by citizen activists interested in establishing parks. Spurred by the Olmsted-Hall Report's conclusions, more than 1,000 East Bay residents from these groups met on January 29, 1931 at the Hotel Oakland to organize a parkland drive. Representatives of nine cities — Alameda, Albany, Berkeley, El Cerrito, Emeryville, Oakland, Piedmont, Richmond, and San Leandro — joined in a renewed petition to East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) to create parklands out of its 10,000 acres of surplus watershed.

But EBMUD directors did not want to add parks and recreation to their already substantial water supply duties. So the representatives had only one alternative — to call for creation of a new government agency whose sole task would be to acquire and manage parklands. They proposed formation of a regional park district encompassing the nine-city, two-county area.

Both the East Bay Regional Park Association and a Regional Park Board formed by mayors of the East Bay cities were active in subsequent efforts to pass enabling legislation.

After extensive lobbying by citizens and parkland organizations, Assembly Bill 1114 was passed by the legislature in 1933. The bill, drafted by former Oakland Mayor Frank Mott, authorized establishment of a regional park district and its governing board. The first law of its kind in this country, it was signed by Governor James Rolph on August 7, 1933.

Next step was formal approval of the district by voters. This required an initiative on the November, 1934 ballot to approve the new district, and elect a board of directors, authorized to levy a tax of five cents per \$100 assessed valuation to finance operations. Supporters collected 14,000 signatures to do this.

Then the campaign suffered a setback. The enabling act required that initiative petitions containing at least 5,000 names be filed with Alameda and Contra Costa County supervisors before an election could be called. Some 14,000 signatures were filed in Alameda County, but Contra Costa County's Board of Supervisors refused to sanction an election in their jurisdiction, causing El Cerrito and Richmond to withdraw their support. Supervisors feared parks would remove too much land from the tax rolls. Also most of Contra Costa County was farmland then, with a less apparent need for parks and recreation.

Alameda County supporters proceeded with a massive get-out-the-vote campaign. A Committee of One Thousand urged a yes vote to create "parks for the people." Under direction of

Samuel May, Director of the Bureau of Public Administration at the University of California, campaign headquarters were set up at Hotel Oakland. May had acted for some years as a liaison between diverse groups of park supporters.

Harland Frederick, who had worked on parkland campaigns as a student of May, now sent messages seeking support from women's clubs, veterans organizations, real estate groups, and organizations of every description throughout the East Bay. "I got something like an 86 percent return — almost unheard of," Frederick recalled.

Canvassing and lobbying continued, and on the Saturday before election, a "get out the vote" parade rolled 35 miles through Oakland, with 12 floats depicting outdoor sports, camping and nature activities.

The success surprised even campaign organizers. On November 6, 1934, East Bay voters approved the park initiative by a vote of two-and-one-half to one.

On the same ballot, voters elected their first board of directors: Major Charles Lee Tilden of Alameda, successful businessman, banker and Spanish-American War veteran; August Vollmer of the University of California; Dr. Aurelia Henry Reinhardt, president of Mills College; Oakland attorney Leroy Goodrich; and labor leader Thomas J. Roberts.

East Bay Regional Park District was now a legal entity. But ahead lay a difficult task — transformation of its plans and visions into parkland realities.

Although some campaign statements had indicated parks acquisition would require only transfer of land jurisdiction from one public agency (EBMUD) to another (EBRPD), matters turned out to be a lot more complicated than that.

Even the actual amount of land available was at issue. In 1931, utility district president George Pardee had been quoted as saying that EBMUD had 10,000 or 11,000 surplus acres available for parklands. But by 1935, EDMUD was offering only 6,261 acres at a cost of \$2,179,823 — about \$348 per acre. And potential developers were interested, too.

Nor did the utility district board accept the parkland board's assertions that a simple transfer of title was the only measure necessary to acquire "parks for the people."

There followed a period of acrimonious negotiation, including joint board meetings, conflicting land appraisals, and acerbic exchanges via the press, between Major Tilden and George Pardee. Both men were heavyweights in East Bay public affairs, and had known each other since their student days in the pioneering class of 1878 at the University of California.

First break in the deadlock came when Major Tilden actually advanced some of his personal funds to buy 60 acres of privately held land in Redwood Canyon, obtaining it for \$35 per acre.

Subsequent negotiations finally led to a compromise, and in June of 1936 the park district purchased 2,166 acres of EBMUD land for \$656,544 — a little over \$300 per acre. The recently enacted tax levy was to pay for it over a five-year period, and as each increment was paid, EBMUD was to cut its tax rate by that amount, so taxpayers didn't in effect purchase the land twice.

East Bay Regional Park District now had three brand new parklands: Wildcat Canyon (now Tilden Regional Park) in Berkeley; Roundtop (now Sibley Volcanic Regional Preserve) and Lake Temescal in Oakland. "Parks for the people" had become a reality.

Edward H. MacKay III

## The Background

In 1930, the nation was in the midst of a second wave of conservation thought and action following a first wave initiated by Theodore Roosevelt with his White House Conference of 1908. Following passage of a National Parks Act and establishment of the National Park Service in 1916, the first World War had turned thoughts elsewhere. But, in 1920, a Conference on State Parks was held in Des Moines, Iowa. Annually thereafter for some years conferees met at various places throughout the nation including San Francisco in 1928. The 1929 meeting at Clifty Creek Falls State Park (Madison, Indiana) had discussions revealing the evolution, year by year, of what state parks should be. A persistent contention seems to have been the distinction between "parks" and "recreation".

In California, a State Park Commission and a Park System were formalized in 1927; in 1928 a first bond issue to acquire land for state parks passed with a 74% affirmative vote.

The younger Frederick Law Olmsted<sup>2</sup>, of Olmsted Brothers, landscape architects, maintaining the solid tradition of his father, was deeply involved in much of this. His father (1822-1903) designed Central Park in New York City, many other great American urban parks, the campus of Stanford University; was chairman of the first Yosemite commission (1864-1890) and, if anyone can be, is the patron saint of American landscape architects. The younger Olmsted prepared (1927-1928) a survey of opportunity in California for state parks and participated as did personnel of the National Park Service in the state park conferences.

The quick success of the newly created East Bay Municipal Utility District in providing an improved water supply from the Sierra Nevada in the late 20's created a moment of opportunity for parks on the local East Bay watershed lands which became surplus with the arrival of mountain water. Professor Samuel C. May, Director of the Bureau of Public Administration (now the Institute of Governmental Studies) on the Berkeley Campus, persuaded Olmsted and Ansel Hall of the National Park Service to study the potential of these lands for park use. Whether he saw "regional parks" as a consolation prize for lands not meriting state park status, or whether he saw this as an entering wedge for a regional government cannot be answered here. But, if the latter, why was the target to be only part of the East Bay, only the most urbanized parts of Alameda and Contra Costa Counties? Did he see merely a momentary opportunity to take advantage of surplus land or did he imagine a comprehensive and diverse regional park system from Bay shore to mountain top as well as from north to south? If the latter, why was the final proposal limited to the surplus watersheds? One suspects the whole thing to have been seen as a quick grab at a fleeting opportunity.

When the leaders of the Municipal Utility District, notably ex-Governor Pardee, made plain their disinterest in recreation or parks, the leaders of this East Bay park movement went to the legislature. The resulting enabling legislation created a number of new sections of the Public Resources Code (5500-5595), which mimics rather closely that for Municipal Utility Districts and, like it, says very little about the purposes of such a District.

Olmsted-Hall, in contrast, says quite a lot about what regional parks should be like, what they should try to do and what they should avoid. It is, in fact, in broad terms an important

statement of purpose for regional parks. That is why it is being reprinted.

Finally, the East Bay Regional Park District in its physical manifestations has utterly outshone the imagination of its midwives: where they foresaw a few surplus watersheds becoming parks, in fact, most surplus watersheds have become parks; beaches have become parks; intensive recreation sites have been acquired; unique landscape features, historical sites, and rare plant associations are protected in preserves.

Olmsted and Hall and, presumably, Sam May, never envisioned: Garin Ranch, Dry Creek Ranch, Sunol, Ohlone, Del Valle Reservoir, Morgan Territory, Las Trampas Ridge, Briones, Black Diamond Mines, Coyote Hills, Hayward Shoreline, Crown Beach, Brooks Island, Miller/Knox Shoreline, Point Pinole, Martinez Shoreline, and Brown's Island. All of these now are units of the East Bay Regional Parks.

In contrast, the places envisioned that have not been secured are few: Siesta Valley, Fish Ranch, a great skyline parkway encircling the East Bay and connecting with a similar parkway on the San Francisco Peninsula and in Marin County. Such lands become too dear too soon; the opportunity vanished before the vision could be realized.

Daniel B. Luten

<sup>1</sup> The Regional Parks Association, organized in 1949, is entirely distinct from the ad hoc East Bay Regional Park Association mentioned in the Olmsted-Hall Report itself.

<sup>2</sup> While often spelled "Olmstead" and even spelled both ways in the Report, this spelling is preferred.

## Resource Documents

Engbeck, Joseph H., Jr. *State Parks of California — from 1984 to the Present*. Charles H. Belding, Portland, 1980.

Scott, Mel. *The San Francisco Bay Area, a Metropolis in Perspective*. University of California Press, Berkeley, 1959.

Stein, Mimi. *A Vision Achieved — Fifty Years of East Bay Regional Park District*. East Bay Regional Park District, Oakland, 1984.

Tilden, Freeman. *The State Parks — Their Meaning in American Life*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1962.

*This report has been made possible  
through the generosity of*

THE KAHN FOUNDATION

*Report on*  
Proposed Park Reservations  
*for East Bay Cities*  
(California)

*Prepared for the*

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION,  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,

*By* OLMSTED BROTHERS, *Landscape Architects, and*  
ANSEL F. HALL, *National Park Service,*

in consultation with the EAST BAY  
REGIONAL PARK ASSOCIATION

DECEMBER, 1930

REPRINTED DECEMBER, 1984

[1. Photo by Cheney Co. *Looking west from Skyline Boulevard toward Oakland and San Francisco, showing fine growth of timber on the hillsides and fine views that can be kept open if the foreground is controlled.*]

# Introduction

During the development of the nine cities which border the east shore of San Francisco Bay the advisability of planning an adequate park system has often been recognized. Only recently, however, has a peculiarly fortunate chain of circumstances created a situation which presents an unusual opportunity for acquiring a comprehensive recreational area which will serve the entire region without involving a large bond issue or the creation of new governmental agencies.

In 1928 it became necessary for the East Bay Municipal Utility District in acquiring a distributing system to purchase the entire properties of the East Bay Water Company, containing thousands of acres of land not needed for water catchment or storage, but admirably suited for recreational purposes. Certain far-seeing individuals immediately recognized the park possibilities inherent in this situation, and in the autumn of 1928 the East Bay Metropolitan Park Association, Oakland Park League, East Bay Regional Planning Association, and several other organizations were formed for the purposes of determining what portions of surplus water district lands were suitable for use as parks, and of apprising the public of the opportunities for its recreational use. Various organizations presented resolutions to the East Bay Municipal Utility District asking that the lands be withheld from sale until public sentiment could be ascertained. A preliminary survey conducted through the assistance of Mr. Ansel F. Hall of the National Park Service during 1929-1930 showed these surplus water district lands to be admirably suited to recreational purposes, and demonstrated the necessity for further study.

The desirability of a comprehensive survey of the recreational needs of the East Bay communities, with special reference to such water district lands as might be available and suitable for parks, was brought to the attention of the Kahn Foundation in the spring of 1930, which generously deposited with the University of California \$5,200 in order that the Bureau of Public Administration might undertake this investigation.

It was suggested that a committee of East Bay citizens be organized to cooperate with the Bureau of Public Administration in giving proper distribution of the information contained in the Survey to the people of the district.\*

In order to secure an impartial and expert appraisal of the local situation it was decided to engage the services of recognized park authorities to study and report upon the problems involved. Olmsted Brothers, well-known landscape architects, and Mr. Ansel F. Hall, of the National Park Service, accepted the invitation to undertake jointly this survey on June 29, 1930.

The results of this investigation are herewith presented to the people of the East Bay region through the Bureau of Public Administration of the University of California with the hope that the facts therein contained will form the basis for a constructive plan of action which will provide for present and future recreational needs.

SAMUEL C. MAY, *Director*,  
Bureau of Public Administration.  
University of California.

*\*The names of the members of this committee appear on the inside cover page.*



December 1, 1930.

PROF. SAMUEL C. MAY, *Director,*  
Bureau of Public Administration  
of the University of California,  
Berkeley, California.

On June 25, 1930, we were asked on your behalf to investigate and to make a joint report upon the various problems involved in the suggestions for utilizing a portion of the surplus lands of the East Bay Municipal Utility District for park purposes.

As a basis for such a report we proposed to consider the following three questions:

1. What parts of the Utility District lands are well adapted for park and recreational uses?
2. For what particular kinds of park and recreational functions are such lands well adapted?
3. In respect to those kinds of recreational functions only; (a) Are the needs of the communities otherwise provided for with at all reasonable adequacy? (b) If not, are there other lands in the region, whether now publicly or privately owned, on which these functions could be provided for in a manner and at a cost clearly more advantageous to the public than by the use of these Utility District lands? (c) Finally: in a broad way, what sort and scale of program in respect to the establishment, improvement and operation of parks on these lands appears to be socially and economically expedient for the communities concerned and just which of these lands should be reserved for such use?

In the study of the problem we have been kindly assisted by Mr. F. W. Hanna, Manager of the District, and Mr. Paul I. Daniels, in charge of District lands, by several of the members of the Citizens' Committee on the East Bay Park Reservations and by various public officials. The various studies that had been made prior to this time were suggestive and helpful.

We have obtained photographs from the Cheney Advertising Company, the Berkeley Picture Shop, and R. Bransted. The air views were furnished by Waters and Hainlin and other pictures were taken by Mr. Hall and Mr. Gibbs during their survey in the field.

Respectfully submitted,

OLMSTEAD BROTHERS,  
*Landscape Architects*

By FREDERICK LAW OLMSTEAD,  
*Member of Firm.*

ANSEL F. HALL,  
*National Park. Service.*



# Table of Contents

	<i>Page</i>
LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL FROM BUREAU .....	5
LETTER OF SUBMISSION OF REPORT .....	7
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS .....	11
CHAPTER I. MORE PARKS ARE NEEDED IN THE EAST BAY DISTRICT .....	13
CHAPTER II. UTILITY DISTRICT LANDS THAT COULD BE USED FOR PUBLIC ENJOYMENT .....	17
CHAPTER III. FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTIONS INVOLVED .....	25
CHAPTER IV. PLANS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	30
MAP OF DISTRICT .....	Follows 40



# List of Illustrations

	<i>Page</i>
Lake Chabot .....	Cover
1. Looking west from Skyline Boulevard toward Oakland and San Francisco— <i>Frontispiece</i> .....	4
2. San Pablo Dam and Reservoir from hill above west end of dam .....	14
3. Panorama of Lake Chabot from middle of west side looking north, east and south .....	15
4. View of upper end of San Leandro Canyon taken from new county highway .....	16
5. Looking north down Wildcat Canyon front hill near Spruce Street Reservoir .....	17
6. View northwest from Berkeley Ridge near Westminister Road, across Wildcat Canyon .....	17
7. Panorama from Skyline Ridge west of Roundtop looking north and east .....	18
8. Subdivided slopes below Skyline Boulevard just south of Shepards Canyon looking west .....	18
9. Panorama looking south, west and north from Roundtop .....	20
10. View south along proposed extension of Skyline Parkway .....	18
11. Redwood forest in upper Redwood Canyon on private lands .....	19
12. Upper Redwood Canyon from just west of Redwood Peak looking north .....	19
13. Lower Wildcat Canyon from the Berkeley Country Club .....	19
14. View from near Spruce Street Reservoir looking north .....	22
15. View up Wildcat Canyon from old road junction just below Spruce Street Reservoir .....	23
16. Small lake in Wildcat Canyon at the abandoned Diversion Dam .....	25
17. Small Jake in Wildcat Canyon looking north .....	26
18. Upper Wildcat Canyon looking south across the valley .....	27
19. Strawberry Canyon from University of California .....	28
20. View from pinnacle in the upper end of Siesta Valley .....	31
21. Tunnel Road near Bryant looking west .....	32
22. Panorama from hill near Bryant looking west and north .....	33
23. North side of ridge in proposed reservation northeast of Siesta Valley .....	33
24. Fish Ranch from cast end looking west .....	34
25. Lower end of proposed reservation lands in tipper Redwood Canyon .....	34
26. Upper end of Grass Valley .....	35
27. Chabot Dam and Canyon below .....	36
28. San Leandro Dam from road at gate below the dam .....	36
29. Grass land on San Leandro Canyon Road .....	37
30. South end of grass land in proposed southeastern playfield .....	37
31. Road along Lake Chabot .....	38
32. Lake Chabot from the proposed parkway .....	12
33. Chabot Road southeast of dam looking south .....	39
34. Panorama looking northeast, cast and southeast from Roundtop .....	20
35. Oakland at night from Grizzly Peak .....	End Piece

[32. Photo by Hall. *Lake Chabot from the proposed parkway.*]

## CHAPTER I

# More Parks Are Needed in the East Bay District

The East Bay District, including nine municipalities and extending over nearly 150 square miles of territory, with a population now of over 450,000 and still indefinitely increasing, is rapidly becoming a continuous built-up urban region. It now has but a very small part of its area in parks, about 900 acres in all, or less than 1 per cent of the area, as compared to 5 or 10 per cent which is the amount considered by various other cities as the smallest amount that can be made to serve at all adequately. This means for the people of the District about one acre to 500 people of the present population compared to a standard of one acre to 100 in various other cities.

It is adjacent to a long stretch of bay shore on the west side and to a long range of hills on the east.

### THE BAY SHORES

The bay shore is now being developed for large industrial and commercial enterprises, and the shore line is being materially changed by filling far out into the bay. A fair part, at least, of this shore should eventually be made accessible to the public for pleasure and for recreation uses, even though that question is much involved in problems affecting the employment and prosperity of the people of the region.

### THE HILL LANDS

The hill lands, on the other hand, are not suitable for and will not be needed for industrial uses. In places they do offer fine sites for homes for those who can afford to meet the greater costs of building on difficult sites and of traveling farther from the main lines of public conveyances and the centers of general activities. The hills may be made to bear a share of the public expenses of the community if so used, although purely as a public problem the use of the steeper portions of the hills for residential uses may become, and in fact is, likely to become a burden on the public for development and for maintenance far greater than the proportionate share of public revenue from those particular areas would seem to justify.

Private development is now pushing far into those hills, and has passed through the hills and begun to develop on the rolling foothills and valley lands beyond.

Much of the hill-top land and of the steep-sided valleys within them is now publicly owned in the watershed lands and in the wooded area of Sequoia Park, and some of that area is now accessible to the people for recreation and enjoyment. Much more of the area could be made accessible for such uses, without in any way interfering with the spread of suburban residential development to the adjacent areas.

Already the possibility of adapting portions of the publicly owned lands to recreation uses has been considered in so far as they may be suitable for such uses. Certainly the possibility for such development appears to be unusually favorable and one that would prove of great value to the entire region.

### THE AUTOMOBILE AS A FACTOR

Not until recently has it been possible for a large portion of the population to spend many leisure hours in the country surrounding the residential region. The general use of the automobile as a family convenience and a necessity rather than a luxury has enormously increased the range of possible travel, formerly closely limited to the lines of public conveyances. Until recently also, much of the accessible land within the range of the holiday auto trip was open and free to the people, but now the road-side lands, even far out from the built-up areas, are rapidly being fenced in and used by the owners, except where dedicated to public uses. If therefore even the present diminishing opportunity for enjoyment of the roadsides is to be preserved to the public, much more than the present amount of public roadside land must be set aside for such uses.

### THE FERRIES AND BRIDGES

The bay cities up to the present time have been largely dependent on ferries for a considerable amount of their business travel, and have had less opportunity to use the automobile as a general daily convenience than might otherwise have been the case; but that condition is likely to change. Some bridges have been built across the bay and others are now contemplated that will doubtless tend to increase still more the use of the auto-

[2. Photo by Cheney Co. *San Pablo Reservoir from hill near west end of Dam, showing interesting region in the Watershed Reservation that can be enjoyed from the border of the highway, but that is necessarily fenced in for water protection.*]

mobile and thus tend also to place still more automobiles at the disposal of the people for holiday use as well. And this will tend to increase still more the need for space for the healthful use and enjoyment of the people.

#### DEVELOPMENT OF ROADS

The increased use of the automobile has led to great development of roads and will mean much more development in the future, until all land within reasonable reach of the cities is accessible in units as small as such land may be divided.

Since the roads in the hills will be used by a large and an increasing volume of pleasure travel, it is important that ample and safe roads shall lead into the hills at various points and also that good roads along the hills shall connect these entrances in a way to care properly for *any amount of travel* that may eventually enter this region. There are now twelve roads entering the hills from the East Bay cities. Plans are now being considered for two tunnels through the hills to the country beyond that will take a large amount of travel through the hills which otherwise would have to climb over them. These tunnels if built will tend to reduce the demand for main highways into this area except for pleasure travel and local uses.

#### AMOUNT OF PARK LAND THAT MAY BE NEEDED BY THE PUBLIC

As already stated the number of people who can get into the hills is increasing, and that number is likely to become much greater; while the space they can now use for recreation is being developed for other purposes and is

likely to become much more restricted. The opportunity for acquiring sufficient areas for all public needs, even for the near future, are becoming less and less on all privately owned lands, and, therefore, the amount of land that may be needed should be determined now and such land as the public can use to advantage should be secured for the people before conditions become more unfavorable. While there is no arbitrary standard by which the recreation needs of this district can be definitely determined, the extent of the areas now needed is certainly much greater than the limited lands so far set aside for such uses in the East Bay Region, and may reasonably be great enough to justify setting aside all that portion of the watershed lands along the hills adjacent to the district that are not now needed for the water system.

#### COMPARISON WITH OTHER PLACES

Comparison with the experience of other cities and urban regions will show that they have found need for, have demanded and have secured far more park areas than the East Bay Cities now have, and that they have felt justified in undertaking large expenditures to provide facilities comparable with those that can here be acquired on land *already owned* by the District.

Mere statistical comparisons of the gross areas of park lands, or of their cost, in relation to total populations or in relation to the total area within municipal or district boundaries may not in themselves afford an exact basis for comparison, because of diversity of conditions. Such figures not infrequently lump together, as of equal weight acre for acre, park lands that are close to the

homes of the people in districts of high land values along with outlying reservations in regions of low land values and accessible to most of the people only on holidays and week ends. Similarly they lump together park lands that are intensively usable with park lands of such character that the number of people who can and do use them per acre per annum is relatively limited. Almost inevitably they make no distinction between those park lands which render high values of any given kind to each visitor and those which render much lower values of the same kind. Valid conclusions from such comparative statistics, therefore usually depend upon a considerable degree of personal knowledge of actual local conditions. The fortunate existence of large contiguous areas of public owned lands, easily accessible, and of high recreational value, in this district, in the face of the great inadequacy of existing parks makes almost any comparison accentuate the need for taking advantage of the present opportunity.

With this explanatory preface it may be illuminating to cite a few illustrative cases of park area statistics in support of the following general conclusions.

**A Few Park Systems Which Are Very Suggestive For The East Bay District\***

The Boston Metropolitan Park district	18,196 acres
Cook County (in addition to 5,912 within the city limits of Chicago), and plans for 64,000 Acres by 1950.	34,000 acres
Westchester County, New York	17,000 acres
Union County, New Jersey (A small county),	1,163 acres
Essex County, New Jersey (Newark) (A small county).	4,600 acres
Minneapolis	4,721 acres
Metropolitan Parks of Cleveland	10,000 acres
Denver, Colorado	11,764 acres
Phoenix, Arizona	15,080 acres
Fort Worth, Texas	9,000 acres
<b>EAST BAY CITIES</b>	<b>900 acres</b>

\*This information is furnished by the Bureau of Public Administration, University of California.

In various parts of the country regions comparable in area and in population with the East Bay district have

acquired large areas for park and recreation uses or have adopted plans on which they are now working on a scale which if applied to the Bay cities would call for the acquisition of park lands comparable in extent with all the area that is likely to be available in the lands that could be turned over by the Water District for such uses.

Pittsburgh has recently added 3,500 acres to its park system, the National Capitol Park and Planning Commission is acquiring, with the aid of the states of Maryland and Virginia, a 50-mile chain of parks at a cost of thirty-five million dollars, and Philadelphia is cooperating through the Tri-State Plan to add very materially to the existing 6,489 acres of park within the city limits.

**AREA NOW IN PUBLIC PARKS AND RESERVATIONS**

As previously stated only about 900 acres or less than one per cent of the area of the District is now devoted to park uses, and much of the area of each of the several cities is now subdivided extending far out onto the slopes of the hills. Land values have gone up to such an extent that there is little chance for acquiring any very large areas except in the hills. The various local areas that are held as parks and to some extent the public school grounds and playfields, the University campus and grounds, and to a still more limited extent the grounds of other public Institutions, and the grounds of clubs and societies do afford opportunity for some forms of outing and recreation for the people, and may be more extensively so used for such purposes. The large areas of country clubs and golf clubs afford pleasing landscape scenery to many, and excellent outdoor exercise to a limited few, but are not and probably will not be open to the public at large and may at any time be converted to other private uses. The airports requiring large areas of open lands are interesting features, but are and must be devoted to uses which preclude the general admission of public pleasure seekers.

**QUESTION NOT A NEW ONE**

In 1866 before the Bay cities had spread over the lowlands, one of the first reports on possible need for park lands was that of Mr. Frederick Law Olmsted, Sr., on the grounds for the University of California, in which

[ 3. Photo by Hall. *Panorama of Lake Chabot from middle of west side looking north, east and south. Near left shows mouth of Grass Valley; middle distance the groves, above steep banks of reservoir, proposed for picnic grounds; the distance at center right shows San Leandro Canyon and hills recommended for a deer park. The face of the hills on the right is in the reservoir lands and should be so kept.* ]

he urged the need for local park areas and for a pleasant park roadway extending from the University southward along the hills.

In 1906 Mr. Charles Mulford Robinson issued a report on a plan for civic improvement of the city of Oakland, in which he urged the acquisition of some park and parkway areas, and again in 1915 Dr. Werner Hegemann in his report on a city plan for the municipalities of Oakland and Berkeley urged the need for acquiring portions of the shore front and some parkways and park areas within the city and extending out into the hills.

Because of the pressure of many other municipal problems, such as the tremendous demand for highways for the automobile, and the need for a greater water system for the district, the chance for park development under the various plans and recommendations that have been made in the past has been small. Now that the cities are becoming more completely built up, and much progress has been made on the various other municipal problems it may be and *should be* possible to arouse interest in the necessity for setting aside park areas for enjoyment and

healthful recreation, and to establish a priceless heritage for the future; especially since the opportunity appears to be very good for accomplishing such a purpose at *very small cost*.

#### THE NEED A VITAL ONE

The charm of the region as a place in which to live will depend largely upon natural conditions that are destined to disappear unless properly protected for the public in general. The opportunities for enjoyment of out-of-door life are necessarily doomed to be reduced or destroyed with the increase in population, at the very time that the need will be most urgent.

*With the growth of a great metropolis here, the absence of parks will make living condition less and less attractive, less arid less wholesome. In so far, therefore, as the people fail to show the understanding, courage, and organizing ability necessary to grasp the present opportunity, the growth of the region will necessarily tend to choke itself.*

[4. Photo by Hall. *View of upper end of San Leandro Canyon, taken from new county highway.*]

## CHAPTER II

# Utility District Lands Which Could be Used for Public Enjoyment

Concurrent with the earlier development of the East Bay Cities (Oakland, Berkeley, Alameda, Piedmont, San Leandro, Richmond, El Cerrito, Albany, and Emeryville) several locally owned water systems were gradually consolidated over a period of years until finally but two large companies remained. These were the Contra Costa Water Company and the East Bay Water Company. Then followed a period of intensive competition, not only in the sale and distribution of water, but also in the acquisition of lands in the "hinterland" of these nine cities—lands which would some day be needed for catchment basins. The companies bought what they needed to round out their own holdings, but also bought up various parcels of land which might embarrass the competing company in its attempt to do likewise.

The struggle between the two competing companies was terminated by consolidation and they were continued as the "East Bay Water Company." This company operated for some years carrying a large investment in idle lands, some of which might eventually serve as catchment basins but others of which were superfluous to the business of gathering or impounding water.

Later the Mokelumne River Project was proposed as the only adequate permanent solution of the water problem for the East Bay cities. The East Bay Municipal Utility District, comprising the nine cities was then formed, to bring water from the Sierras and in 1928 the important question of whether the District should

purchase the distributing system of the East Bay Water Company or install a parallel competing system was settled, when the District commissioners proposed to purchase the distributing system and the lands necessary for storage reservoirs. The company, however, insisted on disposing of all of their lands rather than to hold the surplus lands severed from the strictly water properties. At that time they owned about 40,000 acres, more than half of which would be surplus lands. After much negotiation a final price was agreed upon and all the assets of the East Bay Water Company were acquired by the East Bay Municipal Utility District, and the title to those lands now rests in the people.

In order to determine what disposition should be made of the extensive holdings in surplus lands, the engineers of the District outlined areas to be reserved for storage reservoirs, then tentatively divided the remainder into park lands, subdivision lands, and agricultural lands. The land classification proposed by them is approximately that shown on the accompanying map.

### BASIS FOR SELECTION OF LANDS

To determine what parts of the Utility District lands are well adapted for park and recreation uses and for what particular purposes such lands are well adapted it is necessary first to consider what uses the public could make and probably will make of such lands if they have an opportunity. People will come from all parts of the

[ 5: Photo by Gibbs. *Looking north down Wildcat Canyon from hill near Spruce Street Reservoir; private MacDougall Tract on east side of Canyon in near right of picture.*]

[6. Photo by Gibbs. *View northwest from Berkeley Ridge near Westminister Road, across Wildcat Canyon. Most of the grassy hillside shown is in the MacDougall tract.*]

district, mainly on holidays and Sundays when they can devote several hours at a time to recreation.

The area will be widely used for picnics, outings, hiking, horseback riding, and field sports, both by families and by organized groups such as the Boy Scouts, Campfire Girls, hiking clubs, the Girl Scouts, etc. There are many ideal camping sites where provision can be made for rustic shelters, fireplaces, and other conveniences.

For such uses much of the land of the utility district is *admirably* adapted. Much of it is ideal in fact for real metropolitan park uses, or country park uses of a regional character, where continuity, extent, geographical unity, varied scenery, and freedom from outside activities are important factors in the value of the park. For such purposes the land is needed, as distinct from local or neighborhood parks and playgrounds which also should be accessible to the people, in smaller units throughout the residential areas.

#### WATERSHED AND RESERVOIR LANDS

The large areas that will be reserved for watershed and reservoir protection, lying adjacent to possible park reservations will add greatly to the value of the latter since they can be brought into the landscape scenery, and will serve to keep disturbing activities at a distance from the parks. Those areas by careful selection of boundary lines and location of ridge roads will add much to the scenic value of the parks even though they should be and will be fenced in against public use. Such areas also offer the great advantage of making it possible to have very long and attractive trails and roads *almost wholly free* from the dangers and disturbances of cross roads and intersections.

#### THE FRONT LANDS

That part of the District lands lying nearest the cities, including the hilltops and the adjacent canyons and other scenic units, will be more accessible and of greater value for park uses than the more remote and less scenic areas farther back in the hills that are now being sold off as pasture or agricultural lands. Continuous areas of considerable extent will have greater value for park purposes than isolated units, for a great number of those who visit such parks will travel by automobile, prepared to stay for several hours and will not be satisfied either to remain within the limits of one small park area or to dodge from one to another through intervening suburban developments. They must have easy access and ample parking space, and many of them will not walk far from their machines, but without doing so will desire to enjoy themselves in apparently spacious park areas. The length of roadways continuously within park areas will largely determine the numbers that can be accommodated. Continuity is a *very* important factor, for crowds will flow in at the entrances and will become congested unless they can "roll on" amid pleasant surroundings till they find room and inducement to park.

Those who will want to attend gatherings, or play in large numbers in restricted areas will need large parking areas adjacent to playfields. For them too, continuously agreeable routes of access and egress are much to be desired

#### POSSIBLE USES

The lands in question offer a great variety of conditions in which various kinds of activities or inactivities can be provided for. In fact in the length of the hill region of over twenty miles there are now in public ownership areas in which almost every form of healthful,

[7: Photo by Gibbs. *View from Skyline Ridge west of Roundtop, looking north and east, Roundtop at right. Proposed Roundtop connection would in general follow ridge in right distance.*]

[ 8: Photo by Gibbs. *Subdivided slopes below Skyline Boulevard just south of Shepards Canyon looking west.*]

[ 10. Photo by Gibbs. *View south along proposed extension of Skyline Parkway through property privately owned where a road has already been located and partly constructed.*]

pleasurable, and educational inland interest can be developed for the people, (except those facilities that call for neighborhood parks and playgrounds within walking distance of the houses of the people, and except those activities that relate to beaches and large bodies of water). And such interest can be developed in most cases in areas or spaces large enough to be fairly commensurate with the size and character of the East Bay District.

#### THE PLAN

In order to determine to some extent at least what these possibilities may be we have prepared a plan (No. 9 follows page No. 40) showing the nine cities with the bay on the west side, and with proposed park reservations, the watershed and reservoir lands, and the nearby surplus lands of the Water District along almost the entire easterly portion of the map. On this plan we have shown also the existing public parks, Country Clubs, and other areas of somewhat general use, and also certain areas in private ownership that will be needed to complete the boundaries of park reservations and parkways.

We have shown existing main highways, especially those that may have some particular relation to the proposed park system; also, some other less important roads and trails, and certain proposed roads and trails that seem important in any plan to serve the proposed reservations.

In Chapter IV some of the special uses that may be made of each of the several units of the proposed system are set forth more in detail.

#### ORGANIZATIONS INTERESTED

As a further measure of the kinds of uses that such lands may be fitted to serve, a number of organizations, clubs, and societies, have been called upon for expressions of opinion. The areas in question may afford opportunity for activities of various organizations interested in scouting, hiking, nature study, picknicking, and other outdoor activities. The chances for outings and large gatherings for religious or fraternal organizations, service clubs, schools, official organizations and others, are ample, and, of still greater importance, the opportunity for smaller family outings and gatherings of neighbors are almost unlimited.

#### PURPOSES TO BE SERVED

The areas chosen for public park use should be great enough to serve both the primary purposes for which they are chosen, that of "the enjoyment of scenery" and outdoor life, and also the necessary secondary purposes, that of the "service uses" which are contingent on the presence of persons attracted to the region.

*(Continued on page 22)*

[ 11. Photo by Gibbs. *Redwood forest in upper Redwood Canyon on private lands. Taken from road along ridge south of Roundtop. Existing trail on San Leandro Ridge is just to right of picture, along which proposed San Leandro Ridge Parkway should be located.*]

[12. Photo by Gibbs. *Upper Redwood Canyon from just west of Redwood Peak looking north across private lands not on proposed reservations. Showing San Pablo Ridge at right along which Redwood Highway is proposed.*]

[ 13. Photo by Gibbs. *Lower Wildcat Canyon from the Berkeley Country Club. San Pablo Ridge in the distance and Harvey Canyon with its patches of trees at the right.*]

[9. Photo by Cheney Co. *Panorama looking south, west and north from Roundtop, showing Skyline Boulevard in left center foreground; tunnel in right center. San Francisco, Golden Gate and Mount Tamalpais in the distance. Tall buildings of Oakland in left center.*]

## **SOME OF THE MANY POSSIBILITIES AVAILABLE**

The Bureau of Public Administration directs the readers' attention to the panoramas presented on this center page and the airplane views by Waters and Hainlin on page 24, received subsequent to the completion of the main report. These pictures give some indication of the magnificent scale on which nature has provided an ideally located playground immediately adjoining the site of the nine cities comprising the East Bay Municipal Utility

District. For over twenty miles this chain of hills borders the metropolitan area, and from its heights can be viewed the most beautiful combination of mountain and marine scenery which America affords. The broad expanse of San Francisco Bay, the purple mountains of Marin and out beyond the Golden Gate the sea, stretch in vast panorama to the west, while toward the east the towering bulk of Mt. Diablo rises from the ever changing

[34. Photo by Cheney Co. *Panorama looking northeast, east and southeast from Roundtop; Lafayette Reservoir in center. Mt. Diablo in distance right beyond Walnut Creek Valley; Moraga in extreme right.*]

[Photo # 9, continued across the top from page 20.]

color of the California hills. The great variety of hill and valley, forest and plain, the absence of winter cold or summer heat, and the easy accessibility from all parts of the urban area, brings to the fortunate people of the East Bay cities a continuous opportunity for the enjoyment of the great outdoors, under the most favorable conditions. Should San Francisco, across the Bay, take advantage of the similar existing opportunity to set aside publicly

owned lands for park purposes from San Mateo north along the ocean to the Golden Gate Bridge, a great circuit could be continued on through Marin, and thus create for the San Francisco and Oakland metropolitan region a magnificent, interesting, and conveniently available park drive and varied playground which would be unsurpassed in all the land; and one of the greatest assets possessed by northern California.

[Photo # 34, continued across the bottom from page 20.]

The "service uses," some of which will be furnished without charge, include such activities as the supplying of water, lodgings, sanitary facilities, fireplaces, camping places, seats, benches, tables, gasoline and food supplies to people attracted to the region primarily for other reasons. The problem of providing for these service uses gives rise to problems of administration in their relation on the one hand to the primary purposes for which the park lands are acquired, and on the other hand to the secondary matter of costs, charges, revenues, financing, selection of operating agencies. Aside from the question of finances and administration, the need for meeting these secondary and service uses involves the inclusion of very considerable areas for them, chosen in a way to leave other and more important areas undisturbed for the main fundamental objectives that constitute the prime justification for public parks.

#### DETERMINATION OF BOUNDARIES

In 1893 in report to the Boston Metropolitan Park Commission, Charles Eliot wrote the following principles which should determine the boundaries for large reservations:

*"First.* The boundaries of the proposed reservations should, if possible, be established so as to include all lands belonging to the same topographical unit, and exhibiting the type of scenery characteristic of each reservation. Obviously, a public domain is not well bounded if it includes only half a hill, half a pond, or half a glen. Neither is it well bounded unless it includes such contiguous lands as form the essential framework of the hill scenery, the pond scenery, the glen scenery, or whatever other type of scenery it is desired to preserve . . . To city men it is most refreshing to find themselves in

what appears to be a wilderness of indefinite extent. This impression cannot be enjoyed unless the boundary of a valley reservation is established beyond the summits of the enclosing hills.

*"Second.* The boundaries of the proposed reservations should be, if possible, established upon public streets or roads, or on lines drawn where roads may ultimately be built with good grades.

*"The reasons for this principle are many. It is obvious that the back fences of private lands cannot make a handsome boundary for a public domain of any description. It is obvious that private lands abutting directly upon public lands will be much more liable to trespass than they would be if a public roadway separated the two. Private land in the position described is a nuisance to the public, while the public is likely to be a nuisance to its owner. Speaking generally, the policing and the general administration of a public reservation are greatly facilitated when the boundary is a road. Still more important is the consideration that, if the private lands which adjoin the reservation are provided with a road frontage looking on the public domain, they will eventually be greatly increased in attractiveness and value."*

The boundaries of areas recommended for Park Reservations in the East Bay Region have been determined as far as feasible on similar principles. The areas available now in public ownership are to a great extent already in "natural" units.

#### AREAS AND ROUTE LENGTHS

Out of the 40,000 acres in the district now publicly owned we find that about ten or eleven thousand acres as surplus lands can be used to create an adequate park system nearly 22 miles in length, easily accessible to serve the nine cities of the district.

[14. Photo by Gibbs. *View from near Spruce Street Reservoir looking north, showing cut over lands , with few Eucalyptus and Coyote Brush. Bare hills showing on westerly slope of San Pablo Ridge are on opposite side of Wildcat Canyon.*]

[15. Photo by Cheney Co. View of Wildcat Canyon from old road junction just below Spence Street Reservoir, showing varied and interesting forest and meadow scenery that can be preserved and enhanced under suitable plan for forest control.]

#### RECTIFICATION OF BOUNDARIES

In addition to the large areas desirable for park purposes which are now publicly owned there are a few areas in private ownership that should, if possible, be acquired to rectify boundary lines. Such areas as the MacDougall Tract in the heart of Wildcat Canyon and the Havens Tract in the middle of Grass Valley might be acquired by exchange for other properties lying on the outer edges of the public lands in a way to offer to the public, areas better suited for their purposes, and to the owners, areas that can more readily be developed for their purposes also.

#### VALUE OF LANDS

The value of such lands for recreational uses is greatly augmented because of the existence of large units of complete and self-contained scenic and recreational value. It is great also because of the extensive continuity of these units with nearly twenty miles of existing roads and many miles of hikers' trails and bridle trails almost wholly within the areas in question.

The total area recommended for such uses when compared to the areas similarly used in other and older communities seems entirely reasonable, and in some instances other cities that may have neglected such an

opportunity as now confronts the East Bay District, are now actually making enormous expenditures to provide similar areas for their people.

#### OTHER OPPORTUNITIES FOR RECREATION

The needs of the East Bay District for such recreational opportunities as can be found on the hill lands are not now at all adequately provided for elsewhere, either within the district or within a reasonable distance outside.

There are no other lands either in public or in private ownership on which such functions could be provided for, in a manner more advantageous to the public than is possible on the district lands, or at all in fact except at prohibitive cost.

#### CONCLUSION

We believe, therefore, that practically all of the front lands owned by the District and not now required for reservoir purposes should be dedicated to park purposes, and should be held as park reservations, forest reserves, wilderness areas, or open parklike pasture land, to be developed for more intensive use by the public along certain highways and in certain areas as fast as the demands of the people may warrant.

**AERIAL VIEWS**

[Photo by Waters and Hainlin. *Northern portion of proposed metropolitan park as seen from Oakland.*]

[Photo by Waters and Hainlin. *Central portion of proposed metropolitan park as seen from San Francisco Bay.*]

[Photo by Waters and Hainlin. *Southern middle portion of proposed metropolitan park as seen from Alameda Airport.*]

## CHAPTER III

# The Financial and Administrative Questions Involved

*Present Values, Possible Revenues, Possible Costs for Development and Maintenance, Care and Control Needed to Produce Greatest Benefits to the Public Through Limited Expenditures*

In the other Chapters we have explained why these lands now publicly owned are very valuable for park uses. We have shown that other comparable communities, in order to secure such values, have felt justified in acquiring park lands of similar character and extent by purchase or by condemnation from private owners notwithstanding the large cost to them of such operations.

The lands now publicly owned, if sold, would necessarily bring prices *far below any possible replacement value*, because it is a well known fact that when any organization and especially a municipal corporation or governmental agency undertakes to unload large areas of property in any one region by sale, the prices received tend to be decidedly low for the time and place, while on the other hand when such an organization attempts to acquire large areas from their various private owners, for any purpose, the prices paid tend to be decidedly high for the time and place. Such sales are necessarily made in a "buyers' market" while the purchases are made in a "sellers' market".

Such a difference between possible present salable value and possible replacement value of the lands now owned by the East Bay cities, not needed for other public purposes, but that are or will be needed for park

purposes, would mean, if the lands were to be sold, a real and serious economic loss to the East Bay cities.

Not only would the economic loss be serious, but if such lands were to be sold, there would be a serious and irreplaceable loss to the community, not measureable in dollars, in the breaking up of the present large and attractive areas; for it is unlikely that similar areas could be assembled again by purchase, at any cost whatever, at a time when the need for such reservations shall have become so urgent as to force an attempt to buy them.

While the value of the lands in question might be estimated in dollars on the basis of possible residential uses, the large amount of acreage probably precludes the possibility of early disposal. Their possible value to the public for park purposes cannot be accurately estimated because no cash value can be set upon matters of health, pleasure and recreation. And yet such values to the public are doubtless far greater in reality than any cash value that might be obtained through sales in the present market or in any future market, and are more nearly comparable to the higher value of lands that would be paid for acquisition of similar areas if these were not available.

[16. Photo by Bransted. *Small lake in Wildcat Canyon at the abandoned Diversion Dam, which can now be used as a park feature.*]

[17. Photo by Cheney Co. *Looking north across small lake in Wildcat Canyon at the abandoned Diversion Dam, showing also the big bare hills in the MacDougall Tract that should eventually be included in the proposed reservation.*]

The prevailing public opinion in communities which have had practical experience in the acquisition and use of extensive systems of public parks and which are still trying to get more land rather than to sell off any they now have, would seem to show the use-value of lands for park purposes within reasonable limits to be distinctly greater than its value for private uses, and justify the belief that all publicly owned lands having potential park value should be held as public reservations, unless or until definitely proven more valuable for other uses.

#### POSSIBLE CASH VALUE OF THE AREAS IN QUESTION

While the value of certain parts of the lands in question may be estimated at fairly high prices and while some areas might possibly be sold for high prices, especially if sold in small parcels, they should not be and could not be reckoned for the present purpose except at considerably lower figures, as they probably have no such cash sales value at the present time in large quantities. Much of the area is steep and rugged and could be developed for private uses only at heavy cost both to the developer and to the public. Many such areas can more economically be devoted to park uses under any plan. Other areas, more tractable for residential development, are relatively limited in extent and may be greatly needed for recreational uses in connection with the steeper lands. The fact of nearness to large reservoir

holdings adds a special park value to some of the lands, contributing elements of scenery, quiet and spaciousness to the other direct recreational value per acre of the lands actually opened to the public.

On a similar basis there are some portions of privately owned lands so steep and intractable that they cannot be economically developed for intensive private use, and, therefore, might well be given by the owners to the public to be held as park reservations having considerable scenic value, and thus relieve the owner from taxes and also from need for large expenditures on such areas with little hope of fair returns.

#### POSSIBLE EFFECT OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF PARKS ON ADJACENT LANDS

A direct advantage to the region can be expected to result, through the stimulating effect of actually setting aside of areas for park reservations and the establishing of definite uses for lands for which the future is now uncertain. Also the adoption of a plan for a reasonably satisfactory means of access into and along the various sections certainly should have a beneficent effect on the values of adjacent lands whether they be in private or in public ownership. Such effect should, in the light of experiences elsewhere lead to a very material increase in the salable and also the tax producing values of such adjacent lands. In the case of surplus

public lands for sale this would mean the possibility of larger returns from sale of such lands by the Utility District.

#### POSSIBLE PRIVATE DEDICATIONS

In addition to the need for reservation for park uses of lands now publicly owned and the need for some minor rectification of boundaries, it is very desirable also to bring about the dedication to public use of certain strips of privately owned land along existing or proposed highways to afford space for the development of parkway connections to or between the larger reservations. Such strips might possibly be given by present owners if they can be brought to realize the greater value to their remaining lands that will accrue from the opening of such parkways, and also the greater possibility of getting extensive public developments under way if the land is thus made available. Similar conditions in other cities have in instances resulted in ready and generous response by progressive owners of property.

#### CARE. AND CONTROL OF THE PUBLIC LANDS

Rarely if ever have other communities had the unusual situation that now confronts the East Bay District, of owning the title to such lands as can here be set aside for park purposes. It has been almost invariably true in other districts that lands needed for park and recreation purposes have passed into private ownership in whole or in part long before the need for them for park uses has been fully realized. The East Bay Cities are unusually fortunate in having such extensive and such desirable areas held intact and now available, so that a complete project can be developed without the need for acquiring much, if any, additional areas. Furthermore such a system can be developed within the present organization which is already administering the area for the people, and without additional capital investment. For the administration of these park reservations the two following possible methods suggest themselves:

1. A new district could be organized to take over the park lands and to develop and administer them. Such a

plan, however, would probably require special state legislation as we understand that there is now no adequate law under which such a district could be organized, and such a plan would, therefore, also involve delays and changes that might in the end prevent the retaining by the public of the present desirable and available areas, and might, therefore, defeat its own purpose.

2. On the other hand it would be possible for the East Bay Municipal Utility District to be given authority and jurisdiction to make these areas available for public park or reservation uses. Such a plan offers several advantages:

(a) The title to the land is already in the Utility District.

(b) The lands have been held in the past to protect water bearing lands and water sheds, and large areas must still be so held by the District adjacent to and coextensive with the lands in question.

(c) The lands in question could still be controlled in so far as necessary in a way to protect the water system.

(d) If the law under which the District now operates is not considered adequate to permit the development of certain areas for park or reservation uses, the act under which it operates could be enlarged and amplified.

(e) The present act could be and should be amended to give the District authority to levy a small tax for the purpose of protecting, and maintaining the property for park purposes, as distinct from any expenditures for the water project, and in order to prevent the parks from being in any way a burden upon the water project.

(f) Administration under the present District will obviate the necessity of creating another board or commission.

There will be need for employees devoted to and trained for the various sorts of park work, and directed by a superintendent or park executive who can be held responsible for the management of the park undertaking as a whole, without dividing his interest and energies between that work and other activities. Some plan can

[18. Photo by Gibbs. *Upper Wildcat Canyon looking south across the valley, showing Little Grizzly in the center; Grizzly Peak far to the left.*]

[19. Photo by Waters and Hainlin. *Looking up Strawberry Canyon from the campus of the University of California, showing, Skyline Ridge extending across the picture. Mt. Diablo in left distance and St. Mary's College upper right.*]

doubtless be worked out by the Utility Board in such a way that the various park problems will not be allowed to interfere with the weightier problems with which they are necessarily engrossed.

#### ADMINISTRATION

*General Principles Of Administration:* We recommend that the greater part of the proposed park be retained in its present attractive "natural" condition. By carefully planning the management of its forests and open grasslands, the area can year by year be made more attractive for park purposes at a comparatively low cost, providing the vegetation native to the region is protected or reestablished where necessary. Many smaller areas will, of course, be intensively used for field sports, picnic grounds, camping and other purposes, and these will have to be intensively developed as public demand warrants.

It is important that the general principles of administration be carefully codified by the governing body as soon as the park is dedicated. Secondly, a general plan of land use should be evolved so that the permanent development of each portion of the area will

fit in with a broad plan which is directed toward the goal of most effective service to all the people of the district.

*Gradual Development:* It is not necessary nor advisable to immediately begin intensive development of the entire area. A large part of the proposed park is already accessible by both roads and trails. These could be improved over a period of years without large capital expenditures. Certain limited areas are particularly well fitted for use as picnic grounds, playfields and centers of various field sports, and these should first be improved under the limited budget proposed below. We believe it to be an exceedingly important principle that the development of the park should not be pushed ahead of current needs but that it should keep pace with the actual requirements of the people.

Certain parts of the proposed reservations can readily be made accessible to the public at once, and such areas will require proper guarding, fire protection, and supervision and also will need certain utilities and "services," some of which must logically be rendered at public ex-

pense and some of which may reasonably become a source of revenue. For this purpose the governing body should have authority to obtain and expend funds for such development and operation as may be necessary to make the lands progressively available, and for protecting the property, to receive and administer gifts and bequests for the benefit of the parks, to employ an executive officer and proper subordinates, to obtain expert advice and to let proper contracts. It will necessarily be confronted with problems of construction of roads, trails, convenience stations, fences, shelter buildings, tables, fireplaces, and many similar utilities, and will be called upon to protect properties and plantations, and to afford proper police protection and fire protection. It should be able to do some improvement planting in places and clearing in others. But its primary function will be to establish and enforce policies which will control the character of the areas as they are gradually developed and used.

Among other powers it should have authority to let contracts for the rendering of appropriate "service uses" and alternatively to render such services through its own employees and to collect reasonable charges therefor. The governing body will doubtless be urged to grant "concessions" for golf courses, camp centers and for establishments which will furnish food supplies and other necessities to visitors. It will become important in the use of parks that such services be provided with reasonable adequacy. It will be even more important that the *extent* to which they are provided and the *manner* in which they are provided should be determined by the directors and for *the definite purpose of making the parks as such enjoyable* to the people,—*not* for the purpose of exploiting the park users to make profits either on the initiative of concessionaires seeking those profits or on the initiative of impecunious park authorities urgently in need of revenue. Provided that this principle is kept firmly in mind, it is entirely right and expedient that, for such special services, not necessarily used by all visitors to the park and involving considerable special costs, special charges should be made up to any amounts not in excess of their value to the people who use them, so as to make those special services partly or wholly self-supporting or even contributory in some measure to the general park revenues. The Board, therefore, should have power, under proper limitations, to make such services available at proper charges, either as wholly public undertakings or through properly controlled operating contractors or lessees as may be most practicable and expedient in any given case.

FIRE PROTECTION

One of the details of administration which is of paramount importance, not only to the park but also to the adjoining cities, is that of fire protection. The long dry season makes it imperative that every precaution be exercised to prevent fires and to immediately suppress any which *do* start. A fine beginning has already been made by the East Bay Municipal Utility District in cooperation with the State Board of Forestry and with certain East Bay cities and organizations in the region. If the area is opened to park use, however, more intensive control will be necessary. Properly located roads and trails within the park will greatly facilitate such protection. Not only will fire protection insure the maintenance of this beautiful area in its attractive natural state but it will also present an additional measure of safety to nearby cities, as there is always danger of fire sweeping into settled districts from adjacent grass or forest lands.

POSSIBLE MAINTENANCE COSTS

As a possible basis for determining the amount of money that may be needed annually in the near future for maintaining the proposed reservations and park areas, and for such minor developments as may be made from time to time by the maintenance forces, the following figures may serve:

1. Board of Control, minor expenses .....	\$2,000
2. Secretary, stenographer clerk, supplies, etc. ....	10,000
3. Superintendent, and	
6 foremen	
24 laborers	
4 cars	
2 trucks .....	64,000
4. Rangers and fire wardens .....	12,000
5. Roads, buildings, fences, water, electricity,	
planting .....	<u>40,000</u>
	\$128,000

To meet such expenses an annual tax of three cents on \$100.00 on the \$440,000,000 assessed valuation of the District would produce \$132,000, enough to cover the budget above suggested. This would permit gradual development of the park without bond issues or other capital outlay. The District is now compelled to spend considerable money for the protection and administration of these lands, which under the park plan will be charged to the park budget and the cost against water correspondingly reduced.

## Chapter IV

# Plans and Recommendations

The advisability of setting aside for park use an area of surplus Utility District land extending along the hills in a strip 22 miles long from Richmond to San Leandro has been recommended in previous chapters. The detailed description of the individual parcels of land and discussion of their interrelation and their suitability for park use have been reserved for the present chapter. In order to facilitate the identification of the smaller tracts

they have been given numbers on the map to correspond with numbers in the text. Careful reference to the map in connection with the reading of this chapter is essential.

The property in question naturally divides itself into several distinct units, and for convenience in discussion we have numbered them from north to south along the entire system as follows:

### Twenty-Eight Areas Considered In Relation To The Proposed Park Reservation System

Plan Reference Number	District Lands Needed Thirteen Parcels of	Four Adjacent Water Reservoir Areas	Three Adjacent Public Park Areas	Eight Privately Owned Strips or Areas Needed
1.			Alvarado Park City of Richmond	
2.				Mouth of Wildcat Canyon
3.		Wildcat Canyon Reservoir Land		
4.	Lower Wildcat and Harvey Canyons			
5.				McDougall Tract
6.	Middle Wildcat Canyon and Brissac Field			
7.	Upper Wildcat Canyon and Grizzly and Bald Peaks			
8.	Bald Peak, Saddle and Picnic Hill			
9.		San Pablo Reservoir Land		
10.	Bryant Roadside and Ridge			
11.	Siesta Valley			
12.				Skyline Parkway, Bald Peak to Roundtop
13.	Roundtop Hill and Ridges			
14.	Fish Ranch			
15.				Roundtop Ridge connection
16.				Skyline Parkway, Roundtop to Sequoia Park
17.			Sequoia Park City of Oakland	
18.				Skyline Parkway, Sequoia Park to Grass Valley
19.				San Leandro Ridge connection
20.	Upper Redwood Canyon			
21.	Upper Grass Valley			
22.				Havens Tract
23.	Lower Grass Valley			
24.	Chabot Hill, Picnic Grove and Deer Park			
25.		Lake Chabot Reservoir Land		
26.			Oakland Municipal Golf Course	
27.	Chabot Lake Roadside and Playfield			
28.		San Leandro Reservoir Land		

[20. Photo by Gibbs. *View from pinnacle in the upper end of Siesta Valley, showing new Skyline Road on the left, passing through the tree covered saddle just to the left of Bald Peak.*]

In the above list there are three (3 ) existing public park recreation areas adjacent to or near to the district lands; four parcels in water reservations; eight parcels or strips of privately owned areas, needed to complete the system, and thirteen parcels of district lands recommended to be reserved for recreation. In addition, a few parcels are shown which are now owned by the District but not included in their plans for water land reservations and which have relatively little value as a part of the proposed system and are therefore not included in the recommendations for park reservations, but are recommended for sale for other purposes.

#### EXISTING PUBLIC PARK AREAS

The three existing public park or recreation areas, Alameda Park, Sequoia Park and Oakland Municipal Golf Course (numbered respectively 1, 17 and 26) add interest to this proposed system and will benefit materially by being adjacent to and connected with the proposed reservations and it is possible that eventually some satisfactory plans of consolidated or cooperative control of the two classes of property may prove feasible and economically desirable for the best interests of the public. Those three areas have started to attract interest to the hills and they lie at the gateways to larger areas beyond, so they will naturally tend to overflow into the larger areas when larger areas are made available.

#### WATER RESERVATION AREAS

The four parcels now in water reservations at Lower Wildcat Canyon, San Pablo Reservoir, Lake Chabot and San Leandro Reservoir (numbered respectively 3, 9, 25 and 28) are necessarily closed to the public although they may be enjoyed as seen from the highways and nearby lands, for they have great scenic value. The reservoirs will probably be kept full a part of the time though they will doubtless be drawn down eight or ten feet, at other times. The pleasant type of woodland or partly or full open pastoral scenery can be and likely will be preserved, and, under a plan for clearing or planting where needed and for continued grazing of the open

areas, can be made even more attractive in the future. The boundaries of those areas where adjacent to the proposed park reservations should be so chosen that border roads will command fine views over the water lands and thus afford to the public the benefit that results from the existence of the water lands, wherever that can be done without in any way jeopardizing the purity of the water. Where such boundaries follow existing or proposed roads the fence on the water land side should, if possible, be kept back far enough from the road so that it will not be conspicuous and also so as to leave space for roadside picnics, for border plantations, and for occasional "overlook" points.

#### *No. 3. Wildcat Canyon Reservoir Lands.*

The proposed reservoir in lower Wildcat Canyon may have a dam nearly one hundred (100) feet high at the lower end across which a road is suggested. The reservation itself will be a relatively small one that will be almost entirely surrounded by park reservations.

#### *No. 9. San Pablo Reservoir Land.*

The San Pablo Reservoir, four and one-half (4½) miles long, containing eight hundred and sixty (860) acres of water surface, is a large and imposing lake in a large reservation, as shown in illustration No. 2.

#### *No. 25. Lake Chabot Reservoir Land.*

Lake Chabot is a beautiful lake created as a reservoir. It is closely surrounded by hills and wooded areas as shown in illustration No. 3.

#### *No. 28. San Leandro Reservoir Land.*

San Leandro Reservoir occupies a long narrow canyon bottom, is very picturesque and attractive as seen from the roads or the hills above, such as that shown in illustration No. 4.

#### PRIVATE LANDS NEEDED

The eight parcels or strips of privately owned areas needed to complete the system contain three acreage parcels (numbered 2, 5 and 22) and five proposed park-

way connections (numbered 12, 15, 16, 18 and 19), which are discussed below under their respective numbers.

*No. 2. Mouth of Wildcat Canyon.*

The lands lying below the levels of possible side roads from Alvarado Park to the two ends of the proposed dam should be publicly owned as a bit of park land to add interest to the roads leading into the proposed reservations, and also to prevent despoilation of the canyon bottom in any attempt to use it through development which will be at best unsatisfactory.

*No. 5. McDougall Tract.*

The McDougall Tract on a bare grassy slope in the narrows of Wildcat Canyon has relatively little direct value for park purposes as shown in illustrations No. 5 and No. 6, but it is inside the proposed reservations. If left in private ownership, however, it may become a source of annoyance, through unsightly development or otherwise. It should, therefore, be acquired by the public, possibly by exchange for other District lands equally valuable to private use, but less in the way of reservation development.

*No. 12. Skyline Parkway, Bald Peak to Roundtop.*

From the Bald Peak Saddle to Roundtop over the top of the traffic tunnel a new Skyline Boulevard is now contemplated, part of the way through District lands and partly through private lands. The roadway should be located on easy lines and grades and should be designed in a way to emphasize some of the finest views.

The right of way should be wide enough to allow for one or possibly two roads of generous width, for a trail,

a bridal path, and some border plantations, and sufficient to control the foregrounds of some of the best views as well.

*No. 15. Roundtop Ridge Connection.*

On the ridge between Roundtop and the Fish Ranch a location for a road or trail should be acquired as shown in illustration No. 7. Possibly a strip can be obtained as a parkway dedication or in exchange for a portion of other lands now owned by the District just west of Roundtop. It should be wide enough to provide space for a roadway, for trails, a bridle path and some border plantations, preferably one hundred fifty feet to two hundred feet (150 feet to 200 feet) in width.

*No. 16. Skyline Parkway from Roundtop to Sequoia Park.*

Through the District owned lands past Roundtop some control over the lands below, the level of the road is needed both to prevent unfortunate attempts to use the very steep slopes similar to that shown in illustration No. 8, and also to protect and develop the best views out over the city.

From the Roundtop reservation to Sequoia Park the Skyline Boulevard will greatly increase in importance and should control some land on the upper side for trails and some on the lower side for control of the fine views over the city, such as are indicated in illustration No. 9, and for planting. It should be wide enough also to allow for further widening and realignment of the road when that becomes necessary. Through Sequoia Park some widening and realignment will doubtless prove necessary as the volume of travel increases.

[21. Photo by Gibbs. *Tunnel Road near Bryant looking west—a much used thoroughfare likely to become a state highway. Hills on left in private ownership; on right is proposed park area that can be planted.*]

The road should be located on easy lines and grades and should be designed in a way to emphasize some of the finest views.

The right of way should be wide enough to allow for one or two roads, a trail, a bridle trail and some border plantations and to control some of the best views as well.

*No. 18. Skyline Parkway from Sequoia Park to Grass Valley.*

From Sequoia Park to upper Grass Valley along the present boulevard and through privately owned and partly developed lands where a road has already been roughed out as shown in illustration No. 10, a wide parkway of really fine proportions should be planned. This might well be a two road parkway, for which a widening of one hundred to one hundred fifty feet (100' to 150') on the northeasterly side most of the way should be acquired. It is possible that under a suitable plan such right of way might be dedicated by the owners if they were convinced that such action would stimulate development along this route.

*No. 19. San Leandro Ridge Connection.*

From the Skyline Boulevard to the District lands on San Leandro Ridge and in upper Redwood Canyon as suggested in illustrations No. 11 and No. 12 a parkway connection is needed, for which a right of way might be acquired as a dedication by the owners of adjacent lands in connection with possible negotiations for exchange of lands farther south (as proposed for parcels No. 20 and No. 22). Such a right of way should be one hundred fifty to two hundred fifty feet (150' to 250') wide to permit of development of a fine parkway unit suitable for the region where large park areas and fine estates may be developed.

*No. 22. The Havens Tract.*

The Havens Tract in the center of Grass Valley now divides that valley into two sections. It is property of limited value for private use, separated as it is from other lands now being marketed. It has considerable possible park value in connection with the surrounding areas and its acquisition seems desirable. It has been suggested that this area might be acquired by exchange for property adjacent to other lands of the same owner, in the upper

end of Redwood Canyon, which even though valuable for park uses, lie on the outer edge of the publicly owned areas and so could be excluded from the general plan.

#### HIGHWAY APPROACHES TO THE PROPOSED SYSTEM

There are now a number of roads entering the hills, of which the principal ones, twelve in number, from the cities along the twenty-two miles of front reading from north to south, and as lettered on the plans are as follows:

- A. McBride Avenue at Richmond to Alvarado Park and the mouth of Wildcat Canyon.
  - B. Arlington Street and Westminster Road to tile hilltop at El Cerrito.
  - C. Spruce Street and Euclid Avenue from Berkeley and Albany.
  - D. Claremont Road from Berkeley, Oakland and Emeryville.
  - E. Tunnel Road (from same).
  - F. Snake Road from Oakland, Piedmont and Alameda.
  - G. Joaquin Miller Road and Skyline Boulevard (from same).
  - H. Old Redwood Road from Oakland and Alameda.
  - I. Skyline Boulevard extension across Realty Syndicate lands (from same).
  - I. Sequoyah Club Road from Oakland (if extended).
  - K. Golf Links Road.
  - L. Estudillo Avenue from San Leandro.
- Five other roads enter the hills from south, east and north.
- M. Lake Chabot Road from Castro Valley.
  - N. Redwood Road from Castro Valley.
  - O. Moraga Valley Road.
  - P. Tunnel Road from Walnut Creek.
  - Q. San Pablo Road from the north.

These entrances should be recognized and made as attractive and safe as possible and should connect directly with such interior roads as may be developed within the reservations.

[22. Photo by Gibbs. *Panorama from foot of hill near Bryant looking westward, showing at left location for road up the hills, through grass lands.*]

[23. Photo by Gibbs. *North side of ridge in proposed reservation northeast of Siesta Valley.*]

[24. Photo by Gibbs. *Fish Ranch from east end looking west, showing field area suitable for picnic and playgrounds to be reached by a road or trail from Siesta Valley at the right. Roundtop just left of center beyond the hills—the Bald Hills in the right distance are just above Siesta Valley.*]

**COUNTRY CLUBS, GOLF CLUBS,  
INSTITUTION GROUNDS**

Near to or adjacent to the proposed park system there are a number of areas more or less used as public grounds by few or many, and that serve people for some of the activities similar to those of parks; such areas are shown on the plan and include:

- St. Mary's College
- Orinda Country Club
- Berkeley Country Club
- University Of California
- Claremont Country Club
- Mills College
- Piedmont Riding Club
- Sequoyah Country Club
- Oak Knoll Country Club

[Photo by Bransted. (not numbered or captioned)]

[25. Photo by Gibbs. *Lower end of proposed reservation lands in upper Redwood Canyon, showing fields and canyon bottom. Proposed ridge, road will follow the top of ridge at the right; valley road from floor of valley at left will climb up around back of hill in the center.*]

## SERVICE CENTERS

In the discussion various so called "service centers" have been suggested and these have been shown on the plan and lettered, reading from the north end of the properties southward, as follows:

- R. Small center at bottom of Harvey Canyon.
- S. Brissac Field.
- T. Upper Wildcat.
- U. Bald Peak Saddle and Picnic Hill.
- V. Bryant cross roads.
- W. Lower Siesta Valley.
- X. Roundtop Saddle.
- Y. Lower end of Upper Redwood Canyon.
- Z. Havens Corners.
- AA. Lower Crass Valley.
- BB. Chabot Hill Picnic Grove.
- CC. San Leandro Playfield (southeast corner).
- DD. Castro Valley Gate.

At some of these various points the demand for shelter and services will arise at the outset and for them the question of policies and plans as discussed in Chapter III will need careful consideration in order to prevent unfortunate or unsightly conditions, and to work toward an orderly and satisfactory development.

## PROPOSED PARK RESERVATIONS

The thirteen parcels of District lands recommended to be reserved as park reservations are as discussed below under their respective numbers.

*No. 4. Lower Wildcat and Harvey Canyons.*

In lower Wildcat Canyon and in Harvey Canyon a fairly large area should be reserved for park uses extending up to the top of San Pablo ridge on the east as shown in illustration No. 13. The boundary should follow a line suitable for a scenic ridge road, and there a road should be located in a way to command fine views over the San Pablo Reservoir. Harvey Canyon offers little attraction at present but should be partly planted and might be fenced and pastured as a "deer park". At

the foot of the canyon, at the point marked R, where roads will meet there will be need for a small service center.

Along the west side a roadway should be located at the top of the valley slopes in a way to be of real scenic value and to afford access to possible picnic sites and overlook points along the route, and to serve as a fire break as well.

West of this road the remnants of land can be treated as a roadside parkway strip for picnic grounds and similar uses, in such areas as that shown in illustration No. 14.

The vegetation along the westerly side of the canyon is largely brush with scattered trees. The easterly side is largely in grass with a few groups of trees, but can be changed to an interesting landscape by planting in places and by modification of existing tree groups. Much of the grass can be maintained as a permanent feature if controlled by suitable methods of pasturing.

*No. 6. Middle Wildcat Canyon and Brissac Field.*

From the McDougall Tract to Wildcat Road, a distance of a mile and a half, there is a wider valley with rolling hills, where golf can be played, and where picnics and various forms of recreation can be provided for. In this area another small service center will be needed eventually at the point marked S, as shown in illustration No. 15, where a road can be extended south from the lake at the canyon bottom up to the bend in Wildcat Road on the hills farther south. Such a center should relate to the wooded area, the small lake and to a possible site for a club house for golf.

The small lake no longer used for water storage can be made an interesting feature of the park area as shown in illustrations No. 16 and No. 17.

*No. 7. Upper Wildcat Canyon and Grizzly and Bald Peaks.*

From Wildcat Road south to the saddle at Bald Peak, Upper Wildcat Canyon shown in illustration No. 18 is a complete unit nearly two miles long, broad enough for another golf course or for other forms of active

[26. Photo by Gibbs. *Upper end of Grass Valley, showing road in left distance that can be extended down the ridge.*]

[27. Photo by Hall. *Chabot Dam, Grass Valley outlet shown in distance.*]

recreation. Through this area a road should be extended up one side of the valley to provide for a reasonable amount of circulation, and at each end of the road at points marked "T" and "U" other centers for service eventually will be needed. This reservation should extend eastward to include the ridge and to include its easterly slope down to Wildcat Road.

On the west side a border road can be located within the reservation to pass east of Little Grizzly Peak and to command fine views over the valley. South of the new Skyline Boulevard the very rugged slopes extending down to the lands of the University of California, shown in illustration No. 19, should be retained as public property either to be developed as forest land or possibly to be used in connection with the University lands for an arboretum over which the city will be seen as in the right view in illustration No. 35 at the end of this report.

*No. 8. Bald Peak Saddle and Picnic Hill.*

The saddle at Bald Peak, where the new Skyline Boulevard crosses the head of Wildcat Canyon and of Siesta Valley, contains a small attractive wooded area which is fairly level as shown in illustration No. 20. It forms an ideal center for picnics and automobile parties. In connection with this area a fairly large parking area

will be needed and much of the hill on the west side, which might be called Picnic Hill, can well be used as an overflow area if a small additional road be carried around the west side of that hill.

At this point four roads should meet, the Skyline Boulevard from two directions, a third should come up Wildcat Canyon, and a fourth should enter from the head of Siesta Valley.

*No. 10. Bryant Roadside and Ridge.*

Along the north side of the main highway which runs eastward from the tunnel toward Walnut Creek, and east of Siesta Valley, there is a high ridge dropping down toward Bryant at the San Pablo Road. Through this area from the Skyline Boulevard a road is suggested to wind down through interesting pastoral scenery in a way to make a fairly large area accessible for development, as shown in illustration No. 22. At the cross roads where a filling station and a fire station have already been installed a local center will doubtless develop (at V). From the proposed road a cross connection should be made at El Toyonal Road across the private lands to Wildcat Road. And at the saddle on the ridge it should connect also with a suggested road down Siesta Valley.

[28. Photo by Gibbs. *San Leandro Dam from road at gate below the dam. A new road to serve as an outlet from the proposed deer park and southeastern playfields can be extended up to the right, then cross the dam to wind up to the top of hills on the left.*]

[29. Photo by Gibbs. *Grass land on San Leandro Canyon Road, showing area suitable for large playfield.*]

Along the north side of the tunnel road a strip of land should be reserved for park scenery extending northward to proposed ridge road for a part of its length, including the area shown in illustration No. 21. The top of the high ridge near Siesta Valley, shown in illustration No. 23 above the proposed ridge road should be kept in the park reservation.

*No. 11. Siesta Valley.*

Siesta Valley forms a very attractive and complete unit of landscape in itself rising from the Tunnel Road, northward a mile or more in distance to the Saddle at Bald Peak. The westerly slopes of the valley are partly wooded and much of the floor is wooded with pines, eucalyptus, some oaks and California Bay, and the like. The easterly slopes are almost wholly bare except for six or eight gullies extending from the floor up the slopes to the top, in which there are some springs and in which trees are growing most of the way up the bottoms of the gullies.

The floor of the valley needs more open space on the flatter areas, where trees should be cut, while some of the steep slopes may well be forested. This valley is exceptionally good for public uses. A road will be needed winding up first one side of the floor, then the other from an entrance on the Tunnel Road up to the Skyline Boulevard. A golf course easily accessible to the people of the north end of the city of Oakland may be located in the valley and a service center will doubtless be needed eventually and probably should be located near the center where the road will cross the valley (at W) . Space can doubtless be found near there also for large gatherings, possibly for a "bowl" for drama and music, and there is ample space for fireplaces, seats and tables and for various fields for games as well.

Two small areas along Claremont Road that lie west of the Siesta Valley and below the summit of the ridge are outside the natural limits of the larger park areas and need not be included in the proposed reservations, therefore they can reasonably well be sold for other purposes.

*No. 13. Roundtop Hill and Ridges.*

The hill at Roundtop is a prominent feature with its fire guard tower and fine outlook in all directions. It has (at X) the one recreational center which is now open to the public on District lands. This center will grow in importance and can be made a valuable recreation feature. The long strips of public lands extending west and south from Roundtop are exceedingly valuable for park and parkway uses in connection with Skyline Boulevard and should be kept in the reservation.

*No. 14. Fish Ranch*

The Fish Ranch contains some very interesting, fairly flat grass land, partly wooded in the northerly and easterly portions, as shown in illustration No. 24, through which a road or trail from Siesta Valley can be located to rise to the saddle at the easterly corner. The balance of the ranch is extremely rugged, unfit for reasonable subdivision, picturesque and interesting for hikers and nature explorations and should be kept as a wilderness for that purpose with one road or trail up from the easterly corner to the top of the ridge toward Roundtop.

*No. 20. Upper Redwood Canyon.*

In the Upper Redwood Canyon a fairly large and complete unit of land is publicly owned, cut off from existing highways by private property, both at the head of the canyon and at the lower end. As one of the lesser

Photo #30. Photo by Gibbs. *South end of grass land in proposed southeastern playfield, where auto parking space is available.*]

[31 Photo by Hall. *Road along south shore of Lake Chabot.*]

park units, this area, with water lands along its easterly boundary, can be made accessible and useful. A road should be opened from the south to run along the ridge at the edge of the water lands to connect with the proposed parkway No. 19, and thus to become one of the main if not the main parkway route along the hilltops. A road along the hilltop will afford access to the area and form a natural boundary line between water lands and proposed park reservation. But it is possible that an additional road for through travel from north to south should be made through the valley itself, dropping down from the north on public lands and crossing a short stretch of private property in the floor of the valley, as shown on the plan and also in illustration No. 25.

On the proposed lower road a service center will be needed. A small center has already been started at the cross roads on private property just south of the proposed reservation and that will tend to grow, and be stimulated by any park activities, but use of the valley floor for recreation will develop a need for some shelter, and supplies and conveniences will be needed in the park itself at or near the Point X.

Just south of the proposed reservation it would be desirable to acquire some if not all of the lands within the triangles between the roads. On those areas there are now several buildings—a school, a store, and a few houses—that would doubtless prove costly to acquire. Back of them the land should be acquired, and possibly some agreement might be reached with property owners to control private developments in a way to encourage a better kind of development than otherwise is likely to occur. Some minor adjustments of boundaries may prove desirable and the relation to the Piedmont Riding Club property may prove mutually advantageous in the care and development of the two properties.

*No. 21. Upper Grass Valley.*

From its source down to the Havens Tract upper Grass Valley is a rather barren, steep sided valley with a

relatively narrow bottom. It can be reached from the north by the proposed extension of Skyline Parkway and that road can be extended southward along the easterly ridge to meet the new County Road at the saddle near the easterly corner of the Havens Tract as suggested in illustration No. 26.

Another road can be extended along or near the westerly boundary to serve as a firebreak as well as a means of access. The valley can be made more attractive by planting and the bottom land can be used for some forms of recreation in connection with the proposed center at the lower end at "Z".

*No. 23. Lower Grass Valley.*

Below the Havens Tract the floor of Grass Valley is fairly wide, suitable for golf and other forms of field recreation. There are now old roads at each side of the bottom land, but these should be closed to leave the bottom lands for recreation. Roads across the valley are proposed at "Z" and at "AA", and along the ridges at either side, one on the east side to rise from "AA" to the new county road on the ridge.

From the city of San Leandro through the Estudillo Avenue entrance at "L" a road along the border of the Lake Chabot Reservoir lands to Grass Valley at "AA" is needed, and the small area between this road and the Oakland Municipal Golf Course should be reserved as land having high value for roadside park uses, as shown in illustration No. 27. This road should connect also with the proposed ridge road on the westerly side of Grass Valley, by a branch toward the north and another toward the south.

*No. 24. Chabot Hill Picnic Grove and Deer Park.*

The largest area available for a single reservation is that lying between the Lake Chabot and the San Leandro

Reservoir lands. It is crossed by the new County Road to Hayward and by the old San Leandro Canyon Road, and another cross road is suggested from lower Grass Valley through the Picnic Grove for access and interior circulation.

On the east boundary along the top of the ridge a road is proposed to serve both for access to the upland, and for fire protection, and that road should be continued along Rocky Ridge to the road in Las Trampas Creek and to Moraga. From this proposed ridge road a branch road should be extended down through the private property to San Leandro Valley and to cross over the San Leandro Dam, then to climb up onto the ridge toward the proposed picnic groves. The westerly end of this route may well serve as the boundary between water lands and park lands, as suggested in illustration No. 28.

The square mile of privately owned property lying at the head of the San Leandro Canyon Road is mostly rough hills of little value for agriculture or private development, which should be acquired to be added in part to the water lands and in part to the park lands in order to complete the boundaries, to permit complete control of travel within the properties, and to remove a possible source of serious trouble and annoyance.

The entire hilltop of Chabot Hills with its large amount of woodland and some upland grass areas, offers ample space for picnic groves of large proportions in which an upland center will be needed eventually, at or near point marked "BB".

The open field of fairly level area on the San Leandro Canyon Road as shown in illustration No. 29 offers a fine site for a large playfield in the southeastern end of the park system with room for parking a large number of automobiles along the road and at the southerly end of the field shown in illustration No. 30. The balance of the hills can well be treated as a "deer park" or as a wilderness area to be kept largely in forest and to be made accessible for such limited numbers of visitors as are interested in that type of development. In this area it will be possible to develop a zoological garden also if the demand should warrant.

Near the playfield another small service center will be needed at the point marked "CC".

The boundary between the picnic groves and the Lake Chabot water lands will necessarily be an arbitrary one. It should be high enough on the hills to afford proper

protection to the reservoir, but should if possible leave in the park area some of the points and ridges from which fine views over the reservoir lands can be developed for public enjoyment.

#### *No. 27. Chabot Lake Roadside and Playfield.*

At the southwest corner of the Lake Chabot lands where the road from Castro Valley enters the property there is a large field on the right of the road that would make a fine large athletic field or playfield, and that could well be made available for such uses even if under a temporary plan subject to possible abandonment later in case the water level of Lake Chabot should be materially raised.

Along the west side of the road from Castro Valley to the Dam there is a wooded border strip that adds greatly to the charm of the drive along the lake as shown in illustrations No. 31 and No. 32, and there is space under the trees in places that could be used for picnics under proper regulations, as suggested in illustration No. 33.

Near the entrance from Castro Valley there will be need for a small service center at the point marked "DD",

#### POSSIBLE GREAT CIRCUIT

The plans as here proposed provide for a complete system of park and parkway reservations in and along the entire ridge of hills back of the East Bay cities and this plan may well be considered also as one important link in a possible large circuit to extend around the entire San Francisco Bay.

Such a circuit would extend from Richmond through the proposed East Bay system, then south to Hayward, across the San Mateo Bridge along the Skyline Boulevard through the Spring Valley water lands, back of San Francisco and along the great highway to Golden Gate Park, then to the Presidio and across the proposed new Golden Gate Bridge to Sausalito and Muir Woods, then to Bolinas Bay, the Alpine Reservoir and to Mount Tamalpais, and from there to San Anselmo and then across the proposed new bridge again to Richmond. In all, such a circuit would extend about one hundred thirty miles through many parklike and recreation areas, and of this the proposed system in the East Bay District will be one

[33. Photo by Hall. *Chabot Road southeast of dam looking south, showing border woods valuable for picnics.*]

of the most varied and interesting. Some of the areas that would be traversed are shown in illustration No. 34. Back of the East Bay region is the State Park on Mt. Diablo, not a part of a circuit, however, as it stands out as an isolated unit by itself, reached rather by the traffic isolated around the ends of the hills or through tunnels beneath them.

In the above discussion of possible and desirable park and recreation areas and reservations for the East Bay District mention has been made of many improvements, roads, trails, forest plantations, clearings, pasturing, fences, golf courses, recreation fields, picnic groves, service centers, bridle trails, acquisitions and exchanges of lands, all of which have a definite bearing upon the possible means of enjoyment by the public of the areas in question.

The question, however, which calls for immediate and careful consideration is that of setting aside now all those publicly owned lands which are especially suited for park purposes, and are not needed for water storage and protection. A second question is that of obtaining by dedication, by exchange or otherwise the few strips and areas of privately owned lands which may be highly desirable to facilitate the most complete and satisfactory development of the public lands that may be so set aside for recreation uses.

When such areas have been established as reservations subject to proper fire and police protection, grazing and forest control, the development for special uses can be advanced gradually and need be made only

as and when public demand and use may warrant. The reservation of the areas, however, must be considered now while lands are still available and suitable for such purposes.

## CONCLUSION

The East Bay communities face an unusual opportunity. Nature has placed within easy reach of this growing region a contiguous border of scenic land, most of which is too rugged for industrial, or extensive residential purposes, but possessed of a high recreational value. A peculiar chain of circumstances has brought over 40,000 acres of this hill land into public ownership, only a small part of which is essential for water purposes.

The present inadequacy of the region's park facilities, and the absence of any other near-by areas suitable in character or extent to take care of present or future recreational needs, makes it apparent that an adequate portion of these publicly owned lands should be reserved for park purposes; thus securing for the people a greater benefit than would accrue from any other use, or possible sale.

The plans and recommendations above presented in this report provide for an unusually attractive regional system of park reservations, forest reserves, wilderness areas and other recreational facilities, without resorting to the large capital outlays which other metropolitan communities have been compelled to expend in order to secure a comparable area of less desirable character.

[35. Photo by Berkeley Picture Shop. *Oakland at night from Grizzly Peak.*]

- Vincent C. Faria  
A. C. Faris  
Mrs. Ray W. Farley  
Mrs. H. B. Farnsworth  
Stanley Farrar  
L. P. Farris  
Everett E. Farwell  
Lauren E. Ferguson  
Mrs. W. G. Ferguson  
D. C. Fessenden  
C. P. Finger  
Dozier Finley  
W. H. Fischer  
Miles B. Fisher  
P. M. Fisher  
Ralph T. Fisher  
R. M. Fitzgerald  
Fred A. Flanders  
Dr. Sanford Fleming  
Lloyd J. Fletcher  
Miss Catharine Flinn  
Mrs. Clara E. Flint  
Miss Jose Maria Floares  
Rev. Clarence E. Flynn  
F. E. Forbes  
Dr. John N. Force  
R. C. Force  
Frank Stuart Ford  
Bruno Forsterer  
James H. Fort  
F. W. Foss  
Mrs. W. G. Foster  
Mrs. Miles E. Fox  
W. B. Francis  
Miss Anna Graeme Fraser  
Mrs. Sue L. Fratis  
Verne Frazee  
Mrs. Adeline Frederick  
Harland Frederick  
R. S. French  
Carl M. Friden  
George Friend  
Miss Blanche H. Frost  
Mrs. Carl H. Fry  
John H. Fuller  
Wm. C. Fuller  
Mrs. Wm. C. Fuller  
George B. Furniss  
E. H. Furth  
Frank S. Gaines  
Esson M. Gale  
Howard Gale  
Maj. M. M. Garrett  
Rev. Edgar F. Gee  
Glenn E. Gee  
Charles L. Gibb  
Rev. Thomas T. Giffen  
Mrs. Edith A. Gilbert  
R. E. Gilbert  
Howard Gilkey  
Clark C. Gillis  
Dr. L. H. Ginno  
Willard E. Givens  
Ray H. Glassley  
Monsignor Jos. M. Gleason  
Mrs. Robert A. Glenn  
H. H. Glessner  
Dr. Kate R. Gompertz  
LeRoy Goodrich  
Mrs. LeRoy Goodrich  
Mrs. John E. Goody  
Arthur W. Gorrill  
William H. Gorrill
- Mrs. William H. Gorrill  
Wilson S. Gould  
Mrs. Henry Francis Grady  
Com. J. S. Graham  
Mrs. J. S. Graham  
Mrs. A. E. Graupner  
Richard Graves  
Mrs. Richard Graves  
Leon E. Gray  
J. C. Green  
Miss Virginia Green  
Will W. Green  
M. Groden  
A. R. Groenink  
Ernest T. Grove  
M. F. Guitwits  
Charles A. Gulick  
Peter Guldbrandsen  
Heber Gute  
Lloyd J. Fletcher  
H. J. Gute  
Mrs. H. J. Gute  
Mrs. Louisa F. Haas  
Mrs. H. D. Hadenfeldt  
Hugh L. Hagan  
Ansel F. Hall  
Chas. B. Hall  
Miss Dorothy Hall  
S. W. Hall  
Max Hamm  
Miss Ida M. Hammond  
E. A. Hansen  
Wm. H. Hansen  
Mrs. Will. H. Hansen  
Mrs. Etta Hanson  
Miss Elizabeth Hardison  
Col. E. J. Hardy  
Mrs. Hester Harland  
A. K. P. Hartmon, Jr.  
John M. Harmon  
Manse M. Harris  
Paul Hartsall  
Miss Janet M. Hartzell  
Mrs. H. F. Hartzell  
E. J. Harward  
C. F. Hassler  
William S. Hatch  
Henry R. Hatfield  
J. M. Hauan  
G. E. Hauser  
Herbert Hauser  
Mrs. Lila R. Havens  
R. S. Hawley  
Miss Bertha Hays  
M. A. Hays  
Miss Annie Hayward  
Miss Anna Head  
Eskild Heidekker  
E. O. Heinrich  
Theodore A. Heinrich  
Dr. Hubert Heitman  
Mrs. Hubert Heitman  
C. N. Helmick  
Walter T. Helms  
Denis L. Hennessey  
J. A. Hensley  
W. B. Herms  
Alex. R. Heron  
Jas. Brown Herreshoff  
Mrs. H. N. Herrick  
George W. Hickman  
Clifton E. Hickok  
Mrs. Eva F. Hicks  
Ernest Higgins
- Sidney A. Higgins  
Mrs. Sidney A. Higgins  
Frank E. Hinckley  
J. H. Hink  
Lester W. Hink  
Dr. Harold H. Hitchcock  
Elgin T. Hittell  
Mrs. Elgin T. Hittell  
Leslie W. Hobson  
A. F. Hockenbeamer  
Rev. W. R. H. Hodgkin  
Miss Emma Hoehner  
Herman C. Hoferick  
E. C. Hoffman  
Mrs. E. C. Hoffman  
W. A. Hofrichter  
Lloyd J. Hogan  
Mrs. Lloyd J. Hogan  
Bruce Holman  
E. Bruce Holmes  
E. Clarence Holmes  
Mrs. E. Clarence Holmes  
G. N. Holmes  
Percy Hopper  
C. D. Horner  
F. L. Horney  
Max Horwinski  
O. E. Hotchkiss  
Charles Houser  
Miss Edith L. Houston  
Charles P. Howard  
E. A. Howard  
Mrs. E. A. Howard  
Herbert S. Howard  
Lee Howard  
Dr. Albert B. Howe  
Mrs. Carrie L. Hoyt  
Mrs. J. G. Hoyt  
C. E. Hudsteth  
Sam. J. Hume  
C. H. Hunt  
H. C. Hunter  
Rev. Stanley Hunter  
M. E. Hurley  
Edw. K. Hussey  
Lincoln Hutchinson  
Charles Gilman Hyde  
George F. Imbach  
John P. Irish  
A. H. Irving  
Mrs. A. H. Irving  
Miss Sue J. Irwin  
H. J. Isgar  
Edward M. Jaffa  
Dr. Edwin P. James  
Wm. C. James  
J. H. Jamison  
Rev. John R. Janeway  
Geo. A. Janssen  
Dr. Irene C. Jenkins  
W. T. Jenkins  
A. C. Jensen  
Dr. Willis Linn Jepson  
H. W. Jewett  
Miss Hazel Jochem  
Alex. Johnson  
Rev. H. S. Johnson  
Mrs. Irwin M. Johnson  
M. N. Johnson  
Mrs. O. B. Johnson  
H. W. Jones  
Herbert Jones  
Mrs. O. C. Jones
- Roscoe D. Jones  
D. L. Jungck  
William C. Jurgens  
John B. Kaiser  
Eva Kantz  
Denes Karoly  
Mrs. Joseph Kay  
Miss Kathleen Keating  
Charles Keeler  
W. H. Keenan  
Mrs. W. H. Keenan  
Walter Y. Kellogg  
Dr. Frank L. Kelly  
A. G. Kelsey  
W. W. Kemp  
Robert Kennedy  
Rodney E. Kenyon  
Robert J. Kerner  
Charles E. Keyes  
Harmon C. Kibbe  
George Killion  
Ralph W. Kinney  
Mrs. Florence K. Kirby  
Howard Kirk  
Mrs. Howard Kirk  
M. W. Kirk  
Mrs. M. W. Kirk  
Morio Kitagaki  
Raymond S. Kitchener  
Frank L. Kleeberger  
R. H. Kline  
Ralph A. Knapp  
H. W. Knoll  
P. C. Knudsen  
Chas. A. Kofoid  
Mrs. Chas. A. Kofoid  
Ben F. Kopf  
F. N. Kornhaus  
Mrs. Newton A. Koser  
Mrs. Peter J. Kramer  
C. C. Kratzer  
A. L. Kroeber  
Herman Krusi  
George Lafabregue  
Glenn C. Laird  
Fred B. Lamoine  
H. L. Landis  
Col. and Mrs. Edwin Landor  
Clemens Laufenberg  
Harry B. Langheldt  
Stephen Langmaid  
Mrs. Stephen Langmaid  
Miss Alma R. Lavenson  
Miss Anna C. Law  
Abe P. Leach  
Robert F. Leavens  
Joseph N. Le Conte  
L. J. Le Conte  
H. J. Lederer  
H. T. Lederer  
Miss Bernice L. Lee  
Charles H. Lee  
Edwin A. Lee  
Dr. Robt. T. Legge  
Mrs. Robt. T. Legge  
B. H. Lehman  
Derrick N. Lehmer  
Mrs. Derrick N. Lehmer  
S. J. Leland  
A. O. Leuschner  
E. H. Levy  
Ivan M. Linforth
- Mrs. Earle G. Linsley  
Austin W. Little  
F. J. Lobbett  
Leonard B. Loeb  
Mrs. John Louis Lohse  
Mrs. Annie Long  
Mrs. Oscar F. Long  
T. S. Lossing  
Rev. Sidney Love  
Mrs. E. P. Lowe  
Norris Lowenthal  
Russell Lowry  
Dr. Edgar A. Lowther  
George L. Luce  
P. D. Lucey, Jr.  
Rev. P. T. Lynn  
Harvey B. Lyon  
Mrs. Harvey B. Lyon  
Vaughan MacCaughy  
Austin F. Macdonald  
John A. Macdonald  
Rev. John S. MacGeary  
Allister MacKenzie  
Mrs. E. Madison  
Frederic E. Magee  
Mrs. Frederic E. Magee  
H. C. Maine  
Mrs. Fowler Mallett  
G. C. Mann  
F. E. Mansfield  
Arthur E. Manter  
Luther Brusie Marchant  
W. R. Maring  
Gerald Marsh  
Mrs. James M. Marsh  
Miss Violet B. Marshall  
Mrs. Edna Martin  
Dr. L. A. Martin  
H. N. Massey  
Homer C. Mather  
Mrs. G. A. Mattern  
Herbert C. Matthews  
Mrs. Eleanor P. May  
Dr. Eugene S. May  
Samuel C. May  
Edwin L. Mayall  
B. R. Maybeck  
Cochran McCarron  
Richard H. McCarthy  
Mrs. Richard H. McCarthy  
H. N. McClellan  
J. Sherman McDowell  
Duncan McDuffie  
Rev. Henry B. McFadden  
Charles F. McFarland  
F. E. McGurrin  
John H. McHaffie  
Mrs. Florence O. McKibben  
Mrs. Elizabeth McKinney  
Miss Fannie W. McLean  
Benoni H. McLure  
James McManus  
Miss Barbara B. McMillan  
H. E. McMinn  
O. K. McMurray  
Miss Norah McPh. McNeill  
James C. McPherson  
J. A. McVittie  
L. R. McWethy  
Wm. H. Mead  
Dr. A. M. Meads  
Mrs. A. M. Meads  
Mrs. Robert W. Mearns
- Mrs. Mary T. Meredith  
Woodbridge Metcalf  
Christian Meyer  
Mrs. Christian Meyer  
Mrs. Elsa Meyer  
Dr. Edith Meyer  
Henry H. Meyers  
Mrs. J. B. Mhoon  
Dr. L. Michael  
Andrew Miller  
Dr. Chas. Howard Miller  
Clement H. Miller  
Harry East Miller  
Harvey D. Miller  
John A. Miller  
Mrs. Nettie May Miller  
Wesley C. Miller, Jr.  
Mrs. Joe Miserez  
Sidney B. Mitchell  
J. K. Moffitt  
Wm. Monohan  
Dr. Robert C. Moody  
Mrs. Robert C. Moody  
Rev. Addison S. Moore  
Lawrence F. Moore  
Mrs. Stanley Moore  
Fred N. Morcom  
Mrs. Teresina B. Morgan  
Wm. S. Morgan  
Walter Mork  
Prof. W. S. Morley  
Mrs. W. S. Morley  
Dr. Bert J. Morris  
C. E. Morris  
Edwin H. Morris, Jr.  
Wm. F. Morrish  
George D. Morrison  
G. E. Mortensen  
R. B. Morton  
Mrs. Mary Mounday  
A. H. Mowbray  
Prof. Walter Mulford  
Edgar E. Muller  
Fred Mulvany  
Mrs. Charles G. Murray  
Robert Myers

William H. Myers  
 H. H. Mylander  
 Hudson Nagle  
 J. H. Napier, Jr.  
 Albert Nashman  
 Chas. Naylor  
 Duncan Neilson  
 Mrs. Allen Neuman  
 F. R. Neville  
 Mrs. H. E. Newman  
 Miss Lois Newman  
 Miss Nedi E. Newman  
 Elmer E. Nichols  
 Luther A. Nichols  
 Roy T. Nichols  
 Weldon C. Nichols  
 Mrs. Emily H. Noble  
 George H. Noble  
 Harry Noble  
 Mrs. Harry Noble  
 Mark Noble  
 Carter Norris  
 Franklyn W. Oatman  
 Miss Mary B. O'Bannon  
 Judge Frank M. Ogden  
 Roy L. Oliphant  
 A. L. Oliver  
 Edwin L. Oliver  
 J. J. O'Neil  
 Rev. George A. Osman  
 George Oulton  
 Mrs. Winfield Scott Overton  
 W. G. Paden  
 Harold L. Paige  
 Mrs. Mary Trueblood Paine  
 Geo. C. Pape  
 Mrs. Geo. C. Pape  
 F. M. Parcels  
 Mrs. F. M. Parcels  
 C. E. Parker  
 Mrs. Floyd Edson Parker  
 J. M. Parsar  
 E. B. Parson  
 Miss Harriet T. Parson  
 Mrs. Marion Parson  
 Rev. N. C. Parson  
 Mrs. Clara Martin Partridge  
 Dr. Mary J. Patterson  
 Frederick R. Peake  
 A. M. Pearce  
 Maxwell Pease  
 Frank J. Peck  
 Peter O. Pederson  
 Dr. Hugh E. Penland  
 Mrs. Hugh E. Penland  
 Miss Margaret H. Perkins  
 Dr. Newel Perry  
 Dr. Chas. E. Peters  
 Mrs. Chas. E. Peters  
 H. K. Petersen  
 Fred C. Peterson  
 Rev. Geo. W. Phillips  
 L. B. Phillips  
 Mrs. Martha E. Phillips  
 C. Stuart Phister  
 Mrs. Edgar N. Pickering  
 Row W. Pilling  
 Edwin Pillsbury  
 Mrs. Edwin Pillsbury  
 Milton E. Pinney  
 C. C. Plehn  
 Augustus S. Pollard  
 Frank Pollard  
 Miss Margaret I. Poore

Miss Ada Elizabeth Porter  
 J. P. Porter  
 Mrs. Thomas M. Potter  
 Dr. Alvin Powell  
 Mrs. J. A. Powell  
 L. S. Pratt  
 Ralph A. Presher  
 Clarence N. Price  
 Clifton Price  
 H. I. Priestley  
 George W. Prising  
 Frank H. Probert  
 Mrs. Charles Quale  
 Mrs. George A. Rader  
 Max Radin  
 Clifford B. Radston  
 Brother Ralph  
 P. S. W. Ramsden  
 Miss Gertrude M. Ratcliff  
 W. H. Radcliffe, Jr.  
 Mrs. W. H. Radcliffe, Jr.  
 Rev. Albert E. Raugust  
 John W. Ravekes  
 P. O. Ray  
 Rev. W. P. Reagor  
 Fred E. Reed  
 C. Rees  
 Mrs. C. Rees  
 Rev. Robert Rehkugel  
 Dr. Aurelia H. Reinhardt  
 Dr. A. E. Reische  
 Harry Reite  
 Mrs. W. B. Reynolds  
 Donald B. Rice  
 Mrs. Austin C. Richards  
 Dr. Dexter N. Richards  
 Mrs. Dexter N. Richards  
 W. A. Richmond  
 Sam A. Rico  
 S. S. Ripley  
 Mrs. S. S. Ripley  
 Clifford E. Rishell  
 George R. Ristrem  
 Dr. Mary B. Ritter  
 Mrs. J. Mitchell Roberts  
 Mrs. O. C. Roberts  
 T. J. Roberts  
 R. W. Robertson  
 Victor J. Robertson  
 Mrs. W. S. Robie  
 Judge E. C. Robinson  
 F. E. Robinson  
 Harrison S. Robinson  
 Jas. Bestor Robinson  
 Leo S. Robinson  
 T. M. Robinson, Jr.  
 Mrs. W. Robinson  
 Dr. P. A. Rooney  
 Rev. Galen Lee Rose  
 Mrs. Bernard J. Rosenthal  
 Mrs. M. C. Rosseter  
 Mrs. Orville W. Rote  
 Mrs. Albert H. Rowe  
 L. E. Rowley  
 Dr. J. Elliott Royer  
 Mrs. J. Elliott Royer  
 C. E. Rugh  
 Miss Rhea Rupert  
 Robert N. Rushforth  
 Miss Carma Russell  
 Frank M. Russell  
 Harold B. Rutley  
 Mrs. Ann Ryan  
 Rupert R. Ryan

Mrs. Rupert R. Ryan  
 Henry A. Sammet  
 A. H. Sanborn  
 Edgar M. Sanborn  
 B. S. Sanders  
 Louis B. Sands  
 Mrs. Louis B. Sands  
 De Forest Sanford  
 A. B. Saroni  
 Miss Blanche E. Sawyer  
 Mrs. Anna L. Saylor  
 Robert M. Saylor  
 O. G. Schaaf  
 Rudolph Schevill  
 Mrs. Oscar A. Schlesinger  
 Walter S. Schmidt  
 Henry W. Schnebly  
 Harry L. Schroy  
 Louis E. Schuessler  
 Walter E. Scott  
 Mrs. Walter E. Scott  
 J. T. Scow  
 Mrs. Lucia L. Searls  
 Dr. L. R. Sears  
 Miss Laurine Seewaldsen  
 L. B. Self  
 W. H. Sellander  
 Alanson Sessions  
 W. A. Setchell  
 Fred Seulberger  
 J. Carl Seulberger  
 Charles A. Shane  
 R. W. Shannon  
 O. D. Sharpe  
 Dr. J. R. Sharpstein  
 A. E. Shaw  
 Mrs. A. E. Shaw  
 Charles F. Shaw  
 Mrs. Harris F. Shaw  
 Willard W. Shea  
 Dr. H. W. Sheldon  
 George D. Shepherd  
 H. W. Shepherd  
 A. T. Shields  
 Rev. Henry H. Shires  
 Rev. J. R. Shoemaker  
 J. A. Shoptaugh  
 A. F. Shulte  
 Mrs. A. F. Shulte  
 Robert Sibley  
 G. J. Sielaff  
 Harry R. Sims  
 Horace G. Simpson  
 Mrs. Horace G. Simpson  
 L. A. Sirad  
 Percy R. Slaiter  
 F. B. Smiley  
 Mrs. B. J. Smith  
 C. A. Smith  
 George W. Smith  
 L. W. Smith  
 Seldon C. Smith  
 Mrs. Seldon C. Smith  
 Miss Susan T. Smith  
 John J. Snedecor  
 Chas. E. Snook  
 Judge Homer Spence  
 George Sperbeck  
 Thos. C. Spilker  
 Robert G. Sproul  
 Mrs. Robert G. Sproul  
 Redmond C. Staats  
 Mrs. Ethel G. Staehling  
 A. G. Starr

Fred W. Starratt  
 Miss Lucy Ward Stebbins  
 Frank W. Steers  
 J. N. Steiner  
 J. F. Stephens, Jr.  
 L. F. Sterner  
 Harold P. Stevens  
 E. A. Stevenson  
 E. B. Stoddard  
 Robert E. Stone  
 George M. Stratton  
 C. J. Struble  
 Wm. P. St. Sure  
 Harry E. Styles  
 Mrs. Clement M. Summers  
 Oscar Sutro  
 John R. Sutton  
 Mrs. John R. Sutton  
 H. S. Swanson  
 Rev. Herman A. Swartz  
 Mrs. Herman A. Swartz  
 Dr. Charles A. Sweet  
 Dr. Clifford Sweet  
 F. H. Swift  
 Mrs. Telura Swim  
 Miss Mabel Symmes  
 Rev. C. W. Taber  
 Stanley G. Taggard  
 Mrs. Stanley G. Taggard  
 Judge R. B. Tappan  
 A. G. Tashiera  
 I. B. Taylor  
 James P. Taylor  
 Leo E. Taylor  
 Paul S. Taylor  
 Samuel H. Taylor  
 J. S. Teddy  
 Sam W. Terry  
 Frank H. Thatcher  
 Max Thelen  
 Mrs. Max Thelen  
 Rev. Lloyd B. Thomas  
 George C. Thompson  
 Hollis R. Thompson  
 Vernor E. Thorp  
 Carl E. Thorsby  
 G. S. Thrumman  
 Mrs. Amy E. Thurston  
 Capt. Walter G. Tibbitts  
 Mrs. R. R. Tillotson  
 J. L. Todd  
 Perry T. Tompkins  
 Miss Katherine Towle  
 C. K. Townsend  
 Mrs. C. K. Townsend  
 Rev. Ernest A. Trabert  
 C. T. Travis  
 Mrs. Wm. Trewartha  
 Delger Trowbridge  
 Mrs. Delger Trowbridge  
 W. B. Trull  
 Miss Bertha M. Truman  
 Harold I. Trumbull  
 C. M. Twining  
 L. C. Uren  
 Robert P. Utter  
 E. M. Vail  
 E. L. Van der Naillen  
 Dr. F. J. Van Horn  
 Lester Van Ness  
 A. Van Pelt  
 A. Vestal  
 George R. Vestal

Herbert A. Vicars  
 Dagmar H. Vinther  
 Wm. G. Volkmann  
 Mrs. Wm. G. Volkmann  
 Dr. Edward von Adelung  
 Sidney M. Wahl  
 Capt. G. B. Wait  
 Mrs. G. B. Wait  
 Mrs. Vernon Waldron  
 Miss Maude M. Wallace  
 Mrs. James Wales  
 Sidney M. Wales  
 Burton L. Walsh  
 Edward M. Walsh  
 C. M. Walters  
 Mrs. Violet R. Ward  
 Nairne F. Ward  
 Mrs. E. V. Warner  
 Roy E. Warren  
 William H. Waste  
 Irving B. Waterbury  
 Edward J. Waterhouse  
 Miss Jessie E. Watson  
 Chas. C. Way  
 Mortimer H. Weed  
 David Weeks  
 Walter S. Weeks  
 Mrs. Glenna B. Wehrung  
 Judge L. R. Weinmann  
 Clifford E. Wells  
 C. W. Wells  
 E. Wells  
 Howard O. Welty  
 Frank W. Wentworth  
 D. H. Wessel  
 John Franklin West  
 B. Gail Wetzell  
 Edgar Weymouth  
 R. B. Whalen  
 Mrs. Benjamin Ide Wheeler  
 Charles S. Wheeler, Jr.  
 Earl D. White  
 John D. White  
 Rupert Whitehead  
 H. H. Whiting  
 Miss Beatrice M. Whitnah  
 Clarence W. Whitney  
 Mrs. Charles Wiener  
 Dr. Earl Wilbur  
 Mrs. Earl Wilbur  
 John Lee Wilbur  
 Miss Alice Earl Wilder  
 Miss Beatrice Steel William  
 Miss Cora L. Williams  
 Miss L. A. Williams  
 Mrs. Thomas H. Williams  
 F. A. Williamson  
 Mrs. C. W. Willis  
 Mrs. Ben F. Wilson  
 Bird Wilson  
 F. G. Wilson  
 Mrs. Frank Wilson  
 Miss Mary E. Wilson  
 Mrs. S. B. Wilson  
 Mrs. George E. Wiltse  
 Donald P. Wingate  
 Mrs. Clara Blackmar Wise  
 C. W. Withoft  
 J. H. Witt  
 Miss Agnes R. Wood  
 Fred T. Wood  
 Phillip R. Wood  
 Wallace A. Wood  
 Miss Annie Woodall

Allison M. Woodman  
 George T. Wright  
 Vincent Wright  
 Mrs. Vincent Wright  
 F. J. Wuepper  
 Marnie Yarrington  
 Dr. George E. Yenne  
 Mrs. F. E. Yoakum  
 Chas. M. Young  
 Hobart Young  
 Joseph Young  
 Judge Oliver Young  
 Mrs. T. M. Young  
 W. B. Zambersky  
 Chas. W. Zimmerman  
 Herbert Zuckerman  
 E. W. Zueger

[Inside back cover]

[Back cover with diagrammatic map of proposed parks.]