

**From:** [Annette Glanckopf](#)  
**To:** [Council, City](#); [Clerk, City](#); [Anderson, Daren](#)  
**Subject:** Vote yes on bathrooms in parks  
**Date:** Monday, April 10, 2023 11:28:49 AM

---

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.**

---

Dear City Council

Please vote **yes** on bathrooms for Ramos and Rinconada parks. Every good size park needs a bathroom. It is critical especially for seniors and children, but necessary for everyone else at any age,

People bring up time and time again, the argument that homeless will use the bathrooms. This was true when we wanted them in Hoover and Seale park. It has not proven to be an issue.

Homeless people need bathrooms. I believe there should be more public bathrooms; not at the \$1.7 million as the one in SF. We should provide bathrooms for homeless, as well as for everyone else.

Please do not let the few folks who complain about this, stop you from voting **YES** to install the bathrooms, which are needed, especially in parks that get a lot of use.

Not to be too graphic, but when you gotta go, you gotta go.

Thank you  
Annette

**From:** [herb](#)  
**To:** [Council, City](#); [Clerk, City](#)  
**Subject:** August 10, 2023 Council Meeting, Item #8: Restrooms in Rinconada Park and Ramos Park  
**Date:** Sunday, April 9, 2023 5:10:07 PM

---

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.**

---

**AUGUST 10, 2023 CITY COUNCIL MEETING, AGENDA ITEM #8  
RESTROOMS IN RINCONADA PARK AND RAMOS PARK**

I believe you should not approve the proposal until the contract shows site plans for the two restrooms.

The Park Improvement Ordinance for Ramos Park (Ordinance No. 5520) clearly identifies the location of the restroom, so I don't know the reason why there is no site plan included in the contract for this agenda item for that restroom.

The park improvement ordinance for Rinconada Park was given an ordinance number (Ordinance No. 5487) but was only introduced on January 13, 2020 yet never had a second reading and, therefore, is not a valid ordinance.

Despite the fact that the Rinconada Park ordinance for a major captial improvement project was never adopted, major renovations have been constructed at the park.

The only versions of the Rinconada Park ordinance online in the City Council agenda packet for January 13, 2020 and in the City Clerk's records of ordinances refer to an attached plan, but there is no plan attached, which means there has never been a proposed action of the Council that authorizes the restroom construction, and the only way the public can know where on Hopkins Avenue the restroom will be located is to wait until it is installed.

Maybe it would be a good idea to delay approval until the Rinconada restroom proposal is placed on a future meeting's agenda when the site plan for that restroom is included in that meeting's agenda packet at the time the packet is originally distributed and placed online.

You might even want to belatedly adopt Ordinance No. 5487, becuae that ordinance was not adopted when it was introduced on January 13, 2020, but required a second reading to be adopted.

Herb Borock