

# Draft Downtown Oakland Specific Plan and Environmental Impact Report (EIR)

## Community Feedback September 4 through November 14, 2019

*The following document summarizes community feedback from Community Advisory Group meetings, Planning Commission meetings, advisory board meetings, and stakeholder group meetings held to review the Draft Plan and EIR. These notes were taken by the City team and reflect staff's account of the meeting dialogue, unless otherwise noted.*

### Contents

Planning Commission – Draft Plan.....	2
Chinatown Chamber of Commerce .....	6
Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission (PRAC).....	7
Mayor’s Commission on Persons with Disabilities .....	8
Chinatown Coalition Meeting.....	13
Old Oakland Neighbors Community Meeting.....	14
SPUR Oakland Policy Board .....	15
Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission .....	17
Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board.....	18
SPUR Board Meeting .....	20
Oakland Chamber of Commerce Meeting.....	21
East Bay Housing Organizations Oakland Committee Meeting.....	22
Community Advisory Group Meeting #10.....	23
Institutions and Transportation Agencies & Advocates Stakeholders Meeting.....	27
Library Commission .....	29
SPUR Public Discussion.....	32
Commission on Aging .....	33
Planning Commission (Draft EIR).....	35
Market-Rate Developers Stakeholder Meeting.....	40
Port of Oakland Stakeholders Meeting .....	42
Affordable Housing Developers.....	44
BAMBD Meeting .....	46
Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board.....	49
14th Street Task Force Meeting .....	52
Business Improvement District Meeting .....	54
Oakland Youth Advisory Commission.....	55
Meeting Notes Unavailable .....	56

# Planning Commission – Draft Plan

September 4, 2019

---

## Commissioner #1

- Need better a/v equipment (better visualize maps)
- Where is zoning incentive draft
- Doesn't see Kaiser \$4 Million
- Where will money come from for bathrooms, parks?
- Have you checked with Chief Resiliency Officer?
- What is community benefit program

## Commissioner #2

- What is the timeline/ what are the next steps
- Process for zoning update?
- Need dialogue with property owners
- Building typology no correlation w/ Building Code

## Commissioner #3

- Is zoning proposed in Draft Plan? What about incentives? What is being studied?
- Why can't we study [downzoning]? We're not looking at full potential if we don't even look at it as an option
- How do unlimited heights incentivize benefits?

## Commissioner #4

- P. 90 H-1.2 (Leverage the city's inventory of publicly-owned land in a manner that supports housing affordability for Oakland residents) – too vague
- Disagrees with the strategy of selling public land to use money elsewhere and not using it directly for housing
- Need affordable housing downtown – we are able to build affordable housing elsewhere, not here
- How do these policies/relate to public lands strategy?

## Commissioner #3

- Extend comment deadline to Oct. 21
- How have unsheltered been addressed?
- How have libraries been addresses (characterize as economic stimulating)
- How have shadows been addressed?

## Commissioner #4

- Number of new jobs and industry – but do we have info about the *types* of jobs to be developed?
- Howard Terminal was left out before and is included in Draft Plan

- E- 2.12 (related to potential of new ballpark) – beef this up / this represents a key opportunity to achieve other goals

**Public Speakers:**

**Speaker #1**

- E- 2.12 (related to potential of new ballpark) – beef this up / this represents a key opportunity to achieve other goals
- Copy of Plan and Draft EIR were not made public in time
- Community benefit – would we wait until community benefit program is settled to start the clock on comments? (revisit the project schedule)
- Need a list of maps/figures; maps are not legible – can't tell densities
- Establish a Planning Commission subgroup

**Speaker #2**

- Unsheltered

**Speaker #3**

- Current library plan is from the 1930s
- Ideal of equitable access

**Speaker #4**

- Libraries as refuge for homeless – not homeless shelter. Library staff not trained to address homeless needs. Included in strategy for economic development, job fairs, resume workshops, free legal advice for setting up small business, etc.
- 2018: 1/5 of households do not have broadband subscriptions

**Speaker #5**

- Libraries serve as common denominator – homeless feel welcome
- Library institution provides framework for literacy and opportunity
- vibrant place and play a role in the region
- There is no plan for Lake Merritt; should be part of a specific plan
- Buildings cast shadow on Lake Merritt which has an impact on the identity of the City

**Speaker #6**

- Need an expanded table of contents
- Revised maps are needed as soon as possible
- Need to understand existing housing to understand current intensity
- Referenced item 4 & 5 of OHA letter

**Speaker #7**

- Universal goals for equity – library has databases that benefit all businesses

- Library's role has been marginalized with a focus on homelessness as opposed to an economic development tool
- At Library Commission, focus on library-specific actions
- Need resources to address library's needs: impact fees, CIP

### Speaker #8

- Displacement, housing, homelessness are not adequately addressed
- Provide interim update to Planning Commission / community on feasibility study
- Concerned that the study isn't considering downzoning
- Time/process for review
- Media publicity – more meetings of commission
- What authority does City have relative to Howard Terminal

### Commissioner #5

- Study of in-lieu fees vs. impact fees
- Value capture mechanism: is it one study or is it scenario based or situational?
- Mobility – looks good; make sure new mobility modes, electrification of infrastructure is addressed as well as designing for all abilities, colocation of facilities (mobility hubs/transit centers)
- Want to see more "big ideas"
  - Form-based code
  - Travel lanes based on speed

### Commissioner #6

- Echo OHA – make it easier to navigate the document, index, list of graphics
- Include list of approved buildings for context

### Commissioner #2

- Project list in Appendix A
- P. 95 (Housing Measures of Success) need numeric metrics
- Page 259 (implementation table) clarity around cost and timing
- Page Appendix B.3 (development potential) confusing is existing missing?

### Commissioner #4

- Measures of success are vague specifically for Equitable Economic Opportunity and Housing
- Action item 44 (ordinance to prohibit discrimination against formerly incarcerated people) – good!
- Need affordable housing downtown (not leverage fees collected downtown and build elsewhere); there will be many low wage jobs created downtown and there will be a housing mismatch

### Commissioner #5

- Maps are hard for colorblind people to read (need shapes/patterns)

- Measures of success – good; quantify and have plan for tracking

### Commissioner #3

- More concrete plans; more fully developed programmatic steps

### Commissioner #6

- Public comments: should they be advocating for specific policies, priorities, actions?
- How should people provide feedback?

### Commissioner #2

- Hard to compare existing to proposed [development]; show visually
- Show sketch-up now [zoning buildout?] vs. proposed
- Articulate what changes mean: height/density/FAR (both visually and in writing)

### Commissioner #1

- What is the best way for citizens and public to review?
- Roadmap to get to implementation
- Anticipate the mechanisms that will allow implementation to happen

# Chinatown Chamber of Commerce

September 10, 2019

---

- Chinatown Chamber doesn't want bike lanes
- Who are the proposed improvements for? There are seniors that don't mix with bikes in Chinatown
- Franklin St. is main street Chinatown stakeholders don't want converted to two-way
- Will there be a traffic study?
- Add Chinatown Chamber as a partner in the implementation table (Chapter 7)
- What changed from Preliminary Draft Plan to Draft Plan?
- Small business cannot attend typical meetings
- Cultural Heritage: don't want to be locked into a particular format [by being designated as a Cultural Heritage District] for business (legacy business), rather, want to continue to evolve and innovate
- Biggest thing the plan can do:
  - Ask for whose benefit are recommendations being made and whose detriment?
  - If you remove street parking, Chinatown community will suffer
  - 9<sup>th</sup> Street before (rendering) is rare, it's usually very busy with people walking
  - If you remove street lanes for bikes it will hurt businesses

# Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission (PRAC)

September 11, 2019

---

## Commissioner #1

- Curious who has been involved in determining what's culturally important
- City should build more parking garages downtown
- Scooters are dangerous

## Commissioner #2

- Interested in working on the development of an edible garden program
- Plan should have goals for parks (which often get short shrift in implementation): e.g., x acres of new space, new miles of bikeways, pedestrian facilities

## Commissioner #3

- Agrees with Commissioner #2 about needing goals for parks: what does the influx of new people mean for parks per capita
- Likes development fees for parks
- Make sure there are funds for maintenance and programming – could have metrics for this as well (daytime programming, nighttime programming, etc.)

## Commissioner #4

- Oaklanders are not sharing the street well; painted lanes are not safe for bikes: is there a plan for physically separated bike lanes?
- What is the plan doing about people living next to industrial areas with pollution?
- How will I-980 redress the damage done by redlining?
- What is the plan doing about flooding, climate change and sea level rise? (lives near the E 18<sup>th</sup> project, and they are dealing with related flooding) Lake Merritt flooding? Urban heat island? Building standards to handle pollution?

# Mayor's Commission on Persons with Disabilities

September 16, 2019

---

## Commissioner #1:

- I've been trying to help a couple of colleagues who use wheelchairs find housing in Oakland. It's hard to find units with showers and accessible features.
- I'm wondering the type of design plan you are talking about for universal design requirements, would you be requiring housing developers to have a certain number of units designed specifically for people using wheelchairs or just the standard building code, which often creates units which are not suitable for all members of the community?
  - *Planning Response:* we're looking at potentially going beyond the minimum requires for A.D.A. We haven't worked with the building bureau to know what that final version, what the means to be beyond the basic A.D.A. the plan is definitely recommending we go beyond the basic requirements for A.D.A. but we would love to work with this committee on as we kind of put some meat on that to see what that means in actual policy.

## Commissioner #2:

- In your planning, bringing jobs to Oakland, are you considering jobs for [off mic]
  - *Planning Response:* Absolutely. We're looking at trying to bring jobs to meet all Oakland needs of income levels, abilities, backgrounds, trainings, what have you. We're looking at a number of policies to partner with Laney College to improve the pipeline of training for downtown jobs. we think it would be a great partner because they in downtown. so that would make a lot of sense. Again, how we take this from policy to implementation is very important. We need to execute this and the other advocates in the community to help us. thank you.

## Commissioner #3:

- One question, the presentation talked about 59% of corners having A.D.A. compliance curb cuts. And it's a goal was to get it to 100%. One question, we're talking about Oakland downtown only? Yeah, and then the other question, what was the timeframe, I got the timeframes of when you want to finish and implement. But what is the timeline you are hoping to reach 100% of curb cut? That is one question.
- The other question or request was on slide three it talks about key concepts from accessible advocacies, one of them was reduce displacement by making existing accessible. I don't know if you were here earlier but right now the Oakland housing and community development currently led by the assistant city administrator due to a lack of staffing, is contemplating whether to make residential access resources grants for loans and grab bars directly to renters as opposed to currently policy, them having to enlist their landlords to apply on their behalf. not just for downtown. If the goal was to reduce displacement by making existing units accessible it will help if renters are doing the labor. I encourage you to encourage city leadership to make those resources available to renters and it might help with this issue here.

#### Commissioner #1:

- Especially with the larger projects with management company and institutional investors, there is no landlord.
  - *Planning Response:* Yeah, thank you. It was a two-part question. The first part, the goal is 100% by 2040. We would measure on a -- as we look at the benchmark of our percentage increase from 59% to 100% on a yearly basis, upon adoption of the plan.

#### Commissioner #4:

- I was wondering, I mean, 2040 seems so far from now but at the same time I'm curious what kind of environmental standards you are putting in the building process. Air quality is going to get much, much worse.
- With the new construction, are you taking that into consideration with the HVAC and high-filtration systems, not only residentially but offices and working environments. Additionally, when we're talking about construction materials, low VOC tanks so the off-gassing doesn't affect a lot of disabled residences. if you are chemically sensitive, that could be also something from a marketing standpoint that you could promote.
  - *Planning Response:* I believe the -- in our EIR, we are very specifically increasing the requirements on future developments by the requirements to increase, improve air quality and lower greenhouse gases over the next 20 years. There will be increased requirements on new constructions for indoor air filters and everything else you mentioned. Are you familiar with how we're going to be addressing that?
  - *Planning Response:* I think of the EIR addresses generally more if you are near freeways and other sources of air quality as opposed to I think areas not near freeways. It's not really getting into, I think, as much of what you are talking about every single housing built. If there is a wildfire and you have a smoke system. I know as part of AB617, West Oakland finished a plan and some of the recommendations in there talk about creating in like the community centers in West Oakland and the senior centers, as well as schools and areas that can have air filters so people can shelter during the day to get clean air. That's something the city can look at on a broader level. A starting point because of the plan that's been done.
- Especially while you are sleeping, you are supposed to restore your body. if you are breathing in terrible air, it's not healthy. It's going to lead to a population of people with chronic illnesses, not just the disabled.
- I was curious about air conditioning. Are you providing it? Because a lot of disabled are heat intolerant. I think there is back and forth about new construction and allowing air conditioning units to be even installed. So is central air being considered with global warming with temperatures rising?

#### Commissioner #4:

- not just for disabled people but for everyone.
  - *Planning Response:* With all these things, there is a balance between adding more things and increases the cost of housing. There is always a balance of what we have to look at.

#### Commissioner #5:

- thank you -- [off mic] thank you for your presentation. I have kind of a bunch of questions. But at varying scales. one of them is your major growth is going to be in Jack London based on your graphs, residential, industrial, and I think everything except office, the percentage growth is in the Jack London area, on the other side of the freeway.
- And just as a physical note, I'm sure you are very aware but the freeway, crossing under the freeway and not being able for the disabled to cross over the railroad tracks, there is nothing you can do to get the railroads cooperate, make that area inaccessible.
- You are going to have a large population growth down there. It is access to public areas, the water, parks and everything down in that area. And it's kind of physically inaccessible unless you are in a vehicle. I mean, so whether it's something like amtrak did with the bridge that goes over it to do something.
- You only indicated a couple of major corridors that would cross it that you intend to strengthen the visual or connecting area, if there is something way to think the railroads can't cooperate. I mean, I'm able bodied and I find it difficult to cross all those tracks with the wide openings to make that more accessible.
- The other thing is in your going from the physical -- oh, and crossing under that freeway is just a real terror, it's an ugly part of life. Going out, stepping up into the land use area, again, huge residential growth down there. A lot of affordability perhaps. So, there is going to be an increase, not only of millennials and singles.
- There is only one elementary school down there and I saw nothing in the plans about coordinating with school districts and how people in a walkable downtown environment get their kids to school. There is Lincoln but it's a specialty school. And a couple of other schools that are special cases, American Indian and some for challenged students.
- Until you go out into the Fruitvale area. Is there -- I'm asking within the land use plan, if you can make accommodation and recognize there are certain other land uses that are going to be necessary to support that population to keep them in that area as to why they are there.
- Along with schools that would senior centers, other community facilities that the city may need to run or in cooperation with large land owners who are building ideally large land owners building large structures would be able to donate a floor or some such thing for cultural centers and schools. It occurred in many cities as part of their development agreement. I think that needs to be addressed. Or else you will ask people to move and there is no facilities, supermarkets or schools or any of that.

#### Commissioner #5:

- As to the other commissioner's comments, since you are rewriting the zoning ordinances in this area, this is the ability to give bonuses. And in order to achieve those, the typical things are like increased percentage of affordable housing, stuff like that.
- The building code we have under cal green, additional tiers that can be adopted locally that will bump up all the environmental qualities and other environmental aspects of the project. So perhaps adopting a higher-tier requirements similar to the LEED requirements in exchange for more square footage or something like that is a mechanism to reach those goals without having to invent the wheel all over again.
- and since I'm involved in this part of the industry and I hate encouraging more regulations upon myself, I do think that consideration and notice somewhere in the text, consideration of visibility

and universal design ordinance would be appropriate for this type of construction where you're bringing in such a large quantity of mid-rise to high-rise residential.

- Again, using the bonuses in order to have those ordinances adopted. When you adopt those ordinances you don't have to -- then we're not here fighting every developer to put in more accessible features. it's part of the building code. The developers agreed because it gets three more floors. As much as I hate regulating myself it's a good mechanism because once it's in place, it's out of your hands. I mean, it's the building department and the developer meeting the standards. No argument.
  - *Planning Response:* Thank you very much. Your comments are greatly appreciated. Last point, one of the center pieces of the rezoning effort we're going to be doing is in fact, doing a zoning bonus program so that in the areas where we're upzoning that additional increment of allowed intensity will come with certain requirements based on the particular needs of a part of town.
  - In one area, it might be below-market art and cultural space on the ground floor. Another area it might be privately owned by publicly accessible on the ground floor and a suite of other uses that would come along and meet a certain amount of required elements. Then you get the bonus intensity beyond what would be otherwise allowed.

#### Commissioner #5:

- Thank you. Again, for another commissioner's comments before, institutional properties and uses can then also include those hardened spaces for natural disasters and the air quality shelters and things like that. In the midwest it's standard for school you have a hardened assembly room for hurricanes. it's standard stuff you do.

#### Commissioner #4:

- As part of your planning process, if you've considered residential communities for people with intellectual and developmental disabilities. What brought to mind was a specific organization called The Kelsey who they are looking to have a housing project that is inclusive and a multi-family housing community which is pretty rare in the east bay. I was thinking that would be a really wonderful addition in terms of having an inclusive downtown.
- and also, thinking about how housing for care takers, for people with disabilities can be incorporated. My brother has an intellectual disability. One of the things he runs into is the turnover with the people who provide support. Because the wages are so low. The housing is difficult for them to find. So they move away or have to move into a different field. We're losing the -- it takes a lot of skill to provide that care. And unfortunately, people they cannot maintain that lifestyle in the bay area. so wanting to throw that on the table in terms of something to consider.
- Another thing I was thinking of walking by Creative Growth, which is the program for people and intellectual disabilities, and seeing how drastically the neighborhood transformed with the housing developments in that area. It makes me, in one part it's great the community has transformed. But it also made me very nervous for the sustainability in that location. Trying to think how services for people with intellectual disabilities are incorporated into this plan.
  - *Planning Response:* Regarding Creative Growth, in the plan we created a very small allowance of new growth on that particular area to keep the pressure off that corridor along Creative Growth and the properties directly along that street. to make sure that property wouldn't be subject to as much speculation to other properties we're trying to

see new growth. You brought up a lot of good points. we'll have to look at any programs we can put in to target that particular type of housing. So we'll work between now and the final to see if we can come up with a program for that. thank you.

#### Commissioner #1:

- Any other commissioners? My one request is if you have protected bike lanes to perhaps also have traffic signals on those. which some countries, such as Denmark have. Many times bicyclists do not obey the automobile traffic signal felt indicating they need to obey them, would be I think, a good example of a small addition. Which would signal their need to comply and help protect a lot of pedestrians who cannot keep up with them.
- I see there is a community review in the fall of 2019. Just wondering if you are reaching out to the community or also reaching out to community of persons with disabilities? Are things going to be accessible if you are asking for surveys, are they going to be accessible? Via website, if you are asking for these types of things, just communication things are we going to have accessibility?
- I hollered at everybody else to get the mic. Because I want people with hearing impairments to hear it. My question is: what about transportation? I want to make sure there is a bus stop on every corner. And directional ramps for every crosswalk.
  - *Planning Response:* All right. directional crossing at every crosswalk is an absolute goal. the transit network downtown gets much more dense in the 20-year plan we have here. it doesn't cover every single street but it covers a much more dense network then we have now. it would be supplemented with transit-only lanes on certain streets that would have enhanced service with more accessible and –
- Curb side transit only. Not median. Yes. Curb side.
- Thank you. I think we're all excited those of us who will be around to see all of these things.

## Chinatown Coalition Meeting

September 18, 2019

---

- Prioritize implementation and improvement of existing resources
- What else can EIFD fund?
- Share the downtown study (circa 2013) with EPS
- room to downzone? Limited now by SB330
- What are the “trigger points” that catalyze community benefits?
- Diverting traffic from Webster should be the priority i.e., through traffic should be outside of Chinatown, not through it
- Bike East Bay supports bike lanes away from commercial corridors; no need for bike lanes on every street
- Maintain Broadway as a street for traffic to get around Chinatown
- Coalition is in favor of parking underneath freeway

### On EIR:

- If everything is unavoidable, then no use in trying to mitigate
- Implementation chapter should have teeth to prioritize existing resources
- EIR has the real “teeth” and not the DOSP
- Wants to discuss the EIR with DOSP team and willing to do a joint Chamber-Coalition meeting
- Fast track affordable housing development

# Old Oakland Neighbors Community Meeting

September 18, 2019

---

- Homelessness
  - Homeless “sheds” as vision? Doesn’t like cabins being used
  - Need a plan for homelessness
  - Check with the Homeless Action Working Group
  - Explicit identification of homeless in the plan; make sure it’s a clear overlay of needs (i.e. p.177)
  - Philosophical disagreement with entrenching homeless population
- Shared workspaces aren’t neighborhood-friendly retail – would rather see cultural uses
- There is regional need for housing – is Atherton going to pay for it?
- Old Oakland is not reflected as an area on DOSP maps
- No bars; mostly families
- What is the funding for undercrossings?
- Don’t want tighter traffic on Broadway
- Height limits are misleading – exceptions are being granted right now for projects in Old Oakland neighborhood
- Old Oakland is the quiet part of downtown
- Using Nextdoor and social media is good

# SPUR Oakland Policy Board

September 19, 2019

---

## Transportation

- Move Amtrak station to be near BART if the Howard Terminal ballpark happens
- If second tube, have Amtrak near Lake Merritt
- Remove I-880
  - City: It is already in the LUTE that if catastrophic event takes I-880 down, it will not be rebuilt; could repeat this policy in the DOSP
- Underground 880 & 980 (this may be in SPUR's regional strategy)
- Create a new Diridon Station-style terminal adjacent to Howard Terminal
  - City: Could also look at undergrounding the overhead structure of BART between West Oakland and Jack London

## Office priority sites

- Still not enough; should include sites that can be aggregated, including the 2-3 story sites
- Focus office priority all along Broadway; the upzoning shown on the intensity map corresponds with what should all be office priority sites
- The City's current demolition findings are in the way of aggregating sites for office

## City Center/Old Oakland

- Punch through the convention center at Washington
- City Center is low and could potentially be redeveloped within the next 10 years
- 15<sup>th</sup> Street doesn't quite go all the way to the lake

## Pedestrian paths

- See SF plan – create pedestrian paths as they get redeveloped (give a bonus in return)
- In SF POPOs are safer and more pleasant – some have security guards
- Needs logo/branded signage
- See Broadway & Hawthorne example from the Broadway-Valdez SP

## Green Loop

- Not about taking away resources from existing parks, it's about connecting them
- Connect to Mandela Parkway and get all the way to Bay/Bridge
- Include Broadway! Desperately needs streetscape improvements, like Latham Square
- Bikes – mostly protected. Bollards are ugly!
- Broadway – problem with putting cars and transit

## Broadway

- Plan could recommend a Broadway study – create it as an alternative mobility corridor
- Now is a good time to put in standards – things are empty, in transition
- More excited to think big and holistically

- Afraid of bike lanes on Broadway – even Telegraph isn't good. What can we learn from the many bike experiments?
- Need short-to-medium term improvements
- There are cities with smaller populations who have vibrant streets
- Look at Copenhagen for bike lanes that work

#### Other

- Cover image is not a great public realm image (not activated around the edges)
- EPS analysis should discuss economic value now vs. future tax revenues
- Would like to see a map of remaining surface parking lots

# Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission

September 19, 2019

---

- Two-way conversion problematic
  - causing diversion
  - Should better manage one-way
  - Impacts are not well thought out
  - Might have lowering of bus speeds
- Need another transportation study
- Traffic circulation and transit plan: need to know how downtown will accommodate 20 million new jobs. AC Transit won't have capacity. There will be congestion. Need service level information (bus headways).
- Transportation Demand Management: low income transit pass, employers are required to pay for transit passes
- Transportation impact fee nexus study should be added to the plan
- Expanded main library would allow for more support for bike share and shared mobility efforts
- Broadway: dedicated bus and bike lane removed (disappointed)
- Need parking maximums
- Inconsistencies – Draft Plan has reorientation (2-way conversion) don't have parking (check against bike plan?)
- Two-way bikeways on one-way streets while waiting for two-way conversion
- Ban cars downtown
- Respond to climate change
- Reduce vehicle miles traveled and reduce greenhouse gases

# Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board

September 23, 2019

---

## Advisory Board Member #1

- Mitigation measures are not in specific plan. Do you want the Board to weigh in on which mitigation measures to incorporate?
  - Urban Planning Partners (UPP): these are preliminary recommendations, but the PC may have more
- TDR mitigation measures are not fleshed out in Draft Plan
  - City: 3 years is worst-case scenario; we will try to adopt with zoning package
- Partially mitigated alternative: 25% reduction seems arbitrary
  - UPP: We don't know exactly which parcels will develop
- Who identified opportunity sites? Some seem poorly chosen relative to historic resources.
  - City: [Selection criteria are available in the Plan: includes underdeveloped and not in an API or ASI.] Please provide us with any concerns about specific parcels

## Advisory Board Member #2

- Façade improvement program – does program exist now? “If re-established” seems watered down
  - City: program existing, but was funded by redevelopment, which is now gone. Plan recommends a new source of funds.
- PDR in Draft Plan –is PDR “flex industry”? Why is PDR not mentioned?
  - City: “Flex industry” is a zone that would promote PDR

## Advisory Board Member #3

- Draft Plan: compare page 205 (historic resources) to page 201 (opportunity sites)
- Why is the library an opportunity site?
  - City: at the request of the library

## Speaker #1

- New historic resources survey?
  - UPP: There are no funds to do a survey, but did a typology study
- Overlap between National Register and API historic designations? Clarify this in the text.
- Goals: number of jobs, housing units – how were these numbers created?
  - City: economic modeling, 3D SketchUp model of what it could allow
- LU-2.4 (update demolition findings) not comfortable with this / more details – concerned that this could make it easier to demolish at the edges
  - City: there are inconsistencies between the Historic Preservation Element and demolition findings. Will need to adaptively re-use buildings to be able to grow.
- Oakland Alameda Access Project – concern that the horseshoe will be detrimental to Waterfront Warehouse District; unclear where this is addressed in EIR.
  - City: this is addressed by the OAAP EIR. The DOSP EIR assumes project has happened.

## Speaker #2

- A/V still a problem
- Continue this meeting to October 16
- Points to page 1-3 of the OHA letter to the Landmarks Board for detailed comments
- Need low heights and community benefits; reduce existing by-right zoning
- P. 217 (intensity map)
- Draft Plan doesn't show existing by-right intensity
- Two-tiered framework to achieve community benefits
- Opportunity sites – classified by subgroup: inappropriate to include library, fire alarm building, which was bought with public bond money
- Draft EIR
  - Lake Merritt channel understudied in the Draft EIR – just improved through Measure DD
  - Façade improvement program – should be funded through mitigation fees; arose as a mitigation under EIR when 250 FHOP replaced a historic building; not a redevelopment project
  - Parks are understudied and under-treated – no more bus parking @ Lafayette Square – there are already diesel buses belching smoke at small children, Old Oakland does not want buses; look at it as a part of the EIR; necessary to quality of life; AC Transit should find another place – this proposal was already killed by community in 2016

## Speaker #3

- APIs are being upzoned: Produce Market, lower Broadway, Posey Tube (175' on top)
- Ambiguity in Old Oakland – is it 45' or 55'?
- LU-2.4: Avoid demolishing the edges, rather, strengthen the edges of APIs/ASIs

## Speaker #4

- Need cross sections and graphics – tiny maps are not good
- Plan is not exciting; it's in planning & EIR dialect
- How many people live downtown; what is possible under current zoning?
- Why are no new parks proposed for 45k people?
- No indication of design of new buildings downtown. Concerned about destroying Oakland's aesthetic.

## Speaker #1

- Inconsistencies between the EIR and Draft Plan
  - City: please let us know any specific issues

## Advisory Board Member #1

- Motion: Would like to see reduction in by-right density, implementation of TDR as part of the DOSP, and review of opportunity sites with regard to historic issues.

# SPUR Board Meeting

September 24, 2019 \*Notes Prepared by the Jack London Business Improvement District

---

## Attendee #1

- Intro: compare with other cities as the center of the region
- Oakland and SF originally platted at the same scale

## Attendee #2

- Worried too many ingredients in the jambalaya
- Diagram the vision for the potential
- Capture the capital
- ACTC wouldn't agree with SFMTA and lost East Bay High-Speed Rail to Caltrain electrification, Healthcare, AI, fiberoptics, infrastructure – all will dramatically change! How is Planning addressing this?
  - City Planning staff: plan doesn't preclude these. We are updating telecom re: move to 5G; Oakland will get fiberoptic with it
  - City Planning staff: this is more with the street right of way

## 50-60k office priority sites

- Consider making it possible to bridge across streets
- Only 3 cities are seeing immigration of educated people of color – Chicago, Oakland and [unclear]
- Attendee #3: Jack London has the best floor sizes and ownership, if we get another BART station

## Chapter 6: criteria regarding parcel size for density

- City Planning staff: Draft Plan had too many specifics – this was premature, will go in zoning study
- It's tough to meet these criteria if you want a small footprint but tall buildings
- Attendee #4: people want side-by-side perspectives (existing/proposed)

## Parking

- Transit - affordable?
- Parking cap – more can be bought up to
- Don't take parking out of town faster than you can get people onto transit
- Parking cap – SF has 45,000 spaces. Mission Bay, etc. exist only with cars
- Attendee #5: CLT/temporary garages

# Oakland Chamber of Commerce Meeting

September 25, 2019

---

City is reconsidering modifying the office plate regulations in the zoning

## Speaker #1:

- regarding implementation, we should think of it in five-year increments to stay ahead of trends

## Question:

- any harm in allowing higher densities in historic buildings in W. Oakland?
- Policies around culture-keeping. Can we have an additional conversation considering historic uses on properties and limitations of uses? Preference is for incentivizing/encouraging uses rather than enforcing.
- timeframe of General Plan update?

## Comment:

- appreciate the increase in office space from Preliminary Draft Plan
- Can overcome historic building restrictions in KONO
- Speaker #2 (Library advocate): renovating the Main Library is important because it's an economic engine
- Must attach a carrot to any fee increase, e.g., impact, transportation, etc. Developers already have to do transit improvements AND pay impact fee
- we should incorporate fiber as an economic tool e.g., inquire with PG&E because they have the darkest fiber
- Somewhere, City of Oakland has a map of dark fiber network. "MLA" (Master License Agreement), e.g., laying conduit vs. splicing (lateral)
- we must start conversations with telecommunications sector, e.g, conversations with MLA
- Boys & Girls Club downtown would be ideal

# East Bay Housing Organizations Oakland Committee Meeting

September 25, 2019

---

- What are the plans for Laney?
- Laney and Victory Court are in inundation areas. Should we instead consider a “retreat” strategy (rather than assigning new development to waterfront areas)
  - City: We would use development as impetus to do substantial mitigation
- Already expensive to put down infrastructure, so upgrading infrastructure to withstand flooding will be cost prohibitive
- Do you have the resources to implement the plan? Are other cities doing this? Can we learn from them? Need a robust and actionable implementation section with funding sources and staffing long-term
- How DOSP interplays with plans in surrounding neighborhoods?
- How was the estimate for the jobs/housing impact fee established? The estimate should be higher for office – suggests that only 25% of square footage would be office

## Zoning incentive study

- Sweet spot where density/intensity incentives make sense for developers. Set base zoning at “sweet spot” to trigger use of incentive zoning. Is city looking at optimal base zoning?
- Going to steel construction costs so much it’ll wipe out any profits from bonus. Worked well in Broadway-Valdez, where the base is 45’
  - City: Even if they are not taking advantage of height, they can take advantage of density
- In BVDSP do we know the percentage of density bonus units? City needs to evaluate where it is working and where it isn’t. It could prepare a map of the units that used density bonus to notice any trends. (Concern about upper end of BVDSP; would not need to take advantage of density bonus; not “capturing” value since property owners already get high intensity)
- Strategic downzoning
  - SB 330 (Skinner) prohibits downzoning – exception if purpose is to encourage affordable housing; study that reducing base zoning works to incentivize housing (BVDSP)
  - It’s well-established that it’s not a taking if they have other viable economic value
  - Attendee #1: aware that it’s a live debate! SPUR is worried about reducing zoning.
  - Attendee #2: the reality is that some projects aren’t penciling already
  - Attendee #3: some aren’t, but we said the same thing in 2016 and we’ve had unprecedented building. The study’s assumptions are really important.

## Other

- For the plan’s percentage breakdown of housing vs. commercial – what assurance is there that the plan will produce any residential?
- How long would the plan for I-980 take?
- When would we start seeing construction?
- Evaluate income-level target when analyzing choice between impact fee or inclusionary (there are significant equity impacts).

# Community Advisory Group Meeting #10

September 25, 2019

---

## Visuals

- Would be good to rotate sketch-up model (Figure LU-20 in Draft Plan) (or at least have ability to show different vantage points during presentations)
- It's hard to read the Development Program table on the slides

## Produce Market

- what is the plan for engaging the Produce Market stakeholders?
  - *City response:* the City will coordinate with the Produce Market stakeholders to determine the best approach to engagement. Note: Produce Market stakeholders were involved in a two-day Jack London District meeting on the DOSP during Preliminary Draft Plan development.

## Plan is weak on housing unsheltered residents

- needs more aggressive policy statements.
- It's a major business problem as well.
- Look to 430 & 401 Broadway, which are owned by the County
- Incorporate the recommendations of the Mayor, Joe DeVries, etc. and look at short and long-term solutions [Note: the DOSP has worked w/the Mayor's staff and Joe DeVries and will follow the approach of the updated PATH Plan, once it is published]
- Need robust policies around addressing homelessness, specifically sheltering the homeless

## Affordable housing

- Clarify that (in slide 25) the support for affordable housing downtown is not in opposition to housing outside of downtown; it's more of an affirmative statement that affordable housing must be downtown and in other areas in the City.
- Check the assumption that affordable housing wouldn't be built downtown if we don't target housing funds to the downtown – the City *has* been building housing downtown; is it spending more per unit here?
- Retail Parking is a problem – developers are getting carte blanche over the streets during construction; parking is a problem – people who live there are getting tickets left and right (there's supposed to be less enforcement around the development, but it's not happening)
  - Target is coming, but people will still go to Emeryville because it's close and there's parking
- Need to better engage the small businesses; the BIDs have a good database of businesses, and the Chamber of Commerce offered to host a meeting of businesses
- 14<sup>th</sup> street business owner said it's only the second day someone has come in to invite her to a City meeting

## LLAD

- How is it possible to increase the Landscape Lighting and Assessment District (LLAD)?

- *City response:* requires voter approval [Note that an increase has failed on the ballot in the past]

### Intensity map and zoning incentive study

- Why are so few areas proposed to be subject to the proposed zoning incentive program (it should be the entire plan area, including Jack London east of Broadway)? Concerned that there doesn't seem to be a public process for making this decision.
  - *City response:* the proposed zoning incentive program would only apply to areas anticipated to be rezoned to have increased intensity or to change from industrial to residential, thus the added value created through the upzoning would be subject to the incentive program
- Has the consultant (preparing the zoning incentive study) been asked to evaluate potential for additional value capture from strategic downzoning? Why is it not at least being studied?
  - *City response:* no, the consultant has not been asked to evaluate any downzoning to ensure predictability for investors. The study is looking at the capture of *new* value.
  - Concern that SB330 will make it illegal to downzone. Note that it will allow an exception if that downzoning is to achieve affordable housing. It will also allow you to downzone in one area if you upzone in another for no net loss.
- Is the scope for the consultant final?
  - *City response:* yes; however, the CAG is being asked to provide feedback on the initial findings from the zoning incentive study
- When will the CAG be able to give feedback on the study findings?
  - *City response:* the study will be published in November, well in advance of any CAG meeting on the topic.
- *Will the study be completed before the EIR period ends?*
  - *City response:* No, but it is not necessary. The EIR studies the maximum contemplated *with* incentives. The expectation is that the zoning to be adopted will be no more than this maximum, so would not have an impact on the significance findings of the EIR.
- The relationship between increased density and value is not linear due to construction costs by building type (increase from 50' to 75' is significant, increase from 75' to 100' is useless)

### Implementation

- What is the plan for prioritization of actions in the implementation table?
  - *City response:* the timeframe is a proxy for prioritization (short, medium and long term actions); periodic reporting on the Downtown Plan (reporting on the Measures of Success) and the implementation working group convened to continue oversight of the downtown plan will also be an opportunity to ensure progress on the plan meets the community's desired priorities.
- How do we get more projects on the list?
  - *City response:* That is the purpose of this comment period and the associated meetings.
- What is the criteria for implementation? Need a roadmap for how recommendations in the Draft Plan become real projects
  - *City response:* see response above.

- Has the City reconciled this list (Appendix A) with the Capital Improvement Project list? (need to be clear about the list)
  - *City response:* throughout development, City staff have been coordinating across departments (as well as with the community) to ensure the recommendations are actionable; the Final Specific Plan project list will be provided to the OakDOT for grant funding; the capital projects in the plan will also go into the citywide CIP process and be subject to those criteria (note that the CIP list is different from what is funded under each year's budget)
- Some items in the action table are vague; some are specific. For example, need to make sure that instead of sending a task to Cultural Affairs, the plan is specific about allocating general funds to that particular task.
  - *City response:* we welcome feedback about making more definitive actions by CAG members submitting detailed comments identifying partnerships, funding sources, etc. (where possible) to make the action more concrete.
- Some items that are on the action/policy lists aren't in the implementation table
- Need design guidelines to establish clear objectives. Zoning must address the design of tall buildings to make sure that they are well-suited to their surroundings and maximize light and air, produce a varied skyline (currently buildings are being addressed one by one, without a plan for how they relate to one another and shape the skyline). Figure out the purpose of the design guidelines and work backward from them. Oakland needs to be okay with developers pre-screening themselves out if they don't want to meet Oakland's standards.
  - *City response:* design guidelines are not part of the consultant scope of work, however design guidelines are included as policy recommendations in the Draft Plan. Zoning update will include design guidelines that are place-based; by-right standards will also be established.
- Need a clear distinction between cultural zones and cultural areas and is alarmed at the proposed language around restricting certain uses (from a long-time property owner)
- Descriptions and priorities for each neighborhood is unclear

### Small businesses

- Business owner in BAMBD would like for staff to "come to us" and engage business owners.
- They have come together a few times, but are not part of a formal organization.
- Customers are complaining and choosing to shop elsewhere because they can't park.
- The Chamber does lots of work with small businesses and would be happy to help with engagement, including hosting a meeting at their location.
- There should be postcards with Draft Plan information in every coffee shop with a call to action
- The long process of the plan and resulting turnover makes engagement with businesses hard, but we can't let up because we're in the home stretch
- Could contact business license holders in the plan area

## Other

- Plan should be written in plain English (avoid jargon and technical descriptions – example: “how big the buildings are going to be” and “what kind of businesses can be there”) and have a glossary of terms/acronyms
- Website should have a more clear “call to action”
  - *City response:* City website is constrained by a content template that makes clear messaging difficult. The DOSP team continues to work with the City website team on improvements.

## Affordable housing

- Where does the statement that the downtown accounts for 25% of the City’s affordable housing come from? More useful would be the number of affordable units citywide vs. downtown, or what the current % of affordable housing is downtown. In 2015? In 2018? How much is deed-restricted?
- Meeting the RHNA is not a good goal for the breakdown of affordable units by income; need to prioritize low and very low

# Institutions and Transportation Agencies & Advocates Stakeholders Meeting

September 27, 2019

---

*Agencies/organizations present: Walk Oakland Bike Oakland, Transport Oakland, Alameda County Transportation Commission, Port of Oakland, County of Alameda, Caltrans District 4, Capital Corridor Joint Powers Authority, Bike East Bay, City of Oakland Department of Transportation, Laney College, Oakland Museum of California*

- Does SB 330 limit application of impact fees?
  - *City response: City will look into implications of SB330.*
- Will the City be updating impact fees?
  - *City response: the Draft Plan includes recommendations to update the Capital Improvement Impact Fee (for parks) and the Transportation Impact Fee.*
- What is the plan for bike lanes? Are bike lanes precluded from the future of Broadway just because of the transit- only lanes?
- What is the process for determining the bikeways on streets? (Between OakDOT/Planning)
  - *City response: the Draft Plan includes the recommended future bike network (both near term and vision network). These recommendations carry forward the bike network from the 2019 Bike Plan.*
- Disrupting residential is more significant than disrupting industrial (related to changes anticipated in Jack London area)
- Jack London seems to have the most transformative change anticipated
  - *City response: the zoning for the Jack London area has not been updated since the 1960s, thus, it is the area most in need of updated zoning (and the area with the potential for change from industrial to residential uses in strategic areas).*
- How are hotels addressed in the Draft Plan? Specifically, where will they be allowed?
  - *City response: Policy H-1.9 in the Draft Plan encourages the development of more commercial hotels downtown to relieve pressure to convert permanent housing units and SRO hotels to short-term tourist rentals. Specific locations for permitting hotels will be identified in the zoning update.*
- Laney College representatives want to keep opportunities as broad as possible (potential for hospitality, etc.). Some things listed in the Draft Plan are not possible. How does the plan address gentrification? (this isn't fleshed out in the Draft Plan)
  - *City response: The City used the content from the Laney College Master Plan to develop concepts for the Draft Plan. The Draft Plan supports the Master Plan while giving Laney/Peralta even more options to provide value to benefit students, staff, and the wider college community. This could include providing student and/or staff housing and connecting with the mixed-use development and waterfront connections that are also proposed in the Draft Plan for the Victory Court area south of I-880.*
  - Displacement can result from gentrification. Displacement is identified as an equity indicator in the Draft Plan. Page 24 of the Draft Plan lists all of the policies included in the Draft Plan that address displacement.

- What's the difference between policy and project? Are projects funded piecemeal? How do these projects relate to funding and deliverability?
- What are the plans for I-880 crossing in the short term?
  - *City response:* undercrossings identified as a priority connectivity improvement in the Draft Plan. As development projects in close proximity to the freeway undercrossings are developed, they will also be making improvements to the areas.

#### Appendix A Transportation and Transit Projects

- Will you be patching them all together?
- Will you redo the transportation impact fee?
- Is there an idea for new revenue streams to make projects such as two-way conversion happen?
  - *City response:* the transportation-related infrastructure projects will be provided to OakDOT who will then apply for grant funding to design and construct the projects. Also, the existing infrastructure bond is used to match/leverage infrastructure opportunities.

# Library Commission

September 30, 2019

---

## Questions/Comments During Presentation

- Concern about making a downtown that is too bicycle-focused; not everyone rides bikes.
- If Main Public Library site is identified as an opportunity site, concerned that it will be subject to “highest and best use” real estate development mantra; the public library should be included as a different category of opportunity site (because the building itself is of architectural significance); the category should be “adaptive reuse” (to distinguish it from a site that would likely be razed and replaced with new construction).
- How does the Capital Improvement update interplay with community benefit program?
- How are impact fees broken down (and how much do libraries get)?

## Public Speakers:

### Speaker #1

- The library currently occupies an entire city block; this is significant; don’t give it up. Don’t go for leased space (example of Piedmont and Rockridge libraries being displaced from their leased space).
- Need flexibility and opportunity for improvement of this current site
- If homeless services are offered by the library (as the Draft Plan currently suggests), then the library needs trained social workers (necessitating a major staffing plan) and additional space and staff.
  - Alameda County has health department and social workers and a building at 125 12<sup>th</sup> Street – this would be more appropriate to use for homeless services than the library
- As far as the library serving as a respite center, it would need to be upgraded (it shut down during the last heat wave because the air conditioner stopped working)

### Speaker #2

- The Main Branch of the Oakland Public Library is an asset (in its current location and because it is an entire City block).
- The building is nearly 70 years old and is an example from the period in which it was built
- The library needs maintenance in all aspects
- The library is already doing all of the things that are discussed in the Draft Plan (staff make it happen with limited resources) – how can we be more aspirational?
- Central libraries are unique – they house unique collections and have ability to do overarching things
- The Oakland History Room is a tremendous resource, acts as de facto City archive
- Library needs more space for seating, viewing recordings, digital access, security, climate control, space for collections, space for staff, space for public programming, etc.

### Speaker #3

- Why is West Oakland Branch Library discarding African American books? What happens to them? African-Americans are not getting library jobs/only being hired part-time. System for hold notifications isn't working.
- How is housing being constructed?
- Parking is a major issue (residents need somewhere to park)
- African Americans will not be getting the jobs touted as being created in the Draft Plan

### Speaker #4

- Friends of the Oakland Public Library is a non-profit funding arm of the library
- Library is more than just a place for youth; it is multi-generational and has low-barrier access to comprehensive services. It has resources to help with job search and applications, housing applications, college search, recreation, youth leadership council, youth poet laureate program, summer reading, story time, school support, and volunteer opportunities.
- There is a Friends of the Main Library organization being formed

### Speaker #5

- We appreciate that the Draft Plan includes many of the ideas that were suggested by the community related to the library.
- Worry about characterizing the library as a place for homeless to receive shelter during the day; library is unequipped and the library doesn't have the space; would need social workers, etc.
- The computer room is full of kids/teens doing homework; digital divide: as of 2010 Census, 21% of Oaklanders didn't have access to the Internet
- Library should be characterized as an economic development tool (they have subscriptions, databases, resume workshops, job fairs, lawyers in the library, small and emerging businesses can do direct marketing research, etc.): libraries offer co-working space and maker space
- Library could help achieve equity by expanding on assistance with resumes, job applications, housing applications, etc.

### Library Commissioners

- Some cities have separate impact fees for libraries so that the funds are dedicated to libraries (more common with County libraries)
- Draft Plan projects about two branch libraries worth of residents over the next two decades
- Hoover Foster Branch could service these new residents – library use by plan area residents isn't limited to the plan boundary, so funds should support this library as well
- Make sure that the plan includes access: transit, elevators and ramps (for all ability levels)
- Library should be part of economic development strategy; library could be equipped to assist people in the "gig" economy (where they are making their own jobs)
- Plan should focus more on the educational function of the library (library picks up after school services no longer offered by local schools)
- As a co-working space (when more and more jobs can be done remotely) the library can bring people together (students, elderly, homeless, etc.) for authentic interaction, building relationships and avoiding segregation

- Library is a culture-making institution; its multi-lingual and multi-ethnic programming offer everyone an ability to participate, and people's expectations of civic engagement are formed by being able to access resources like the library offers
- Address the increase in charter schools that lack open space having impacts on downtown's open spaces
- Would like to see libraries under the capital improvements section [of the implementation matrix]

# SPUR Public Event Discussion

October 1, 2019

---

## City Planning staff: Slide showing downtown in the region and city

- Mental health
- Update on walk this way
- Expanding infrastructure to other areas like Grand Lake - proactive statement
- Schools? How can we coordinate better?
- Architectural review? Wind? Shade? Yes, Design Review Committee

## Public Speakers:

### Speaker #1 – Residents lately haven't heard much

- Ongoing engagement?
- When people are tired and the process has been long?

### Speaker #2 – Amtrak?

- Crossing at Broadway?

### Speaker #3

- BART adopted 35% affordable and it's working. Bump up the goal!
  - Yes, but BART leased land to developer below market rate
- Higher education? Activating downtown?

### Speaker #4: Retail leasing- trying to convince retailers to come to Oakland

- Needs it in City Center, Telegraph
- Tax credit for retailers
  - City retail study led to the Broadway Valdez Specific Plan
- City Planning staff: problem property owners won't rent because they think they can get more for another use.

### Speaker #1

- Support the business that *are* here
- Concentrating retail?
- Support Indie Alliance (and use to engage local business)

# Commission on Aging

October 2, 2019

---

## Overall Comments:

- Commission held/attended a livable city listening session in Chinatown
- 20% of Oaklanders are seniors, but seniors are only mentioned 27 times in the plan
- In 20 years, 30% of Oaklanders will be seniors – need to be planning for this
- Many seniors won't make the trip downtown, need support in their neighborhoods
- Need to address not just in the increase in amount of seniors, but the changes in the population and demographics: for example, divorce rates are much higher, and many more older adults are living alone than in the past
- Why is Chinatown not included in Draft Downtown Plan EIR? (Pedestrian safety is a concern for Chinatown)
- Where will money come from for policies related to investment in senior centers?

## Outreach

- Concern that the survey did not reach enough people and was not translated or provided to enough people via paper (80% of surveys for older adults are returned as paper surveys; respondents who respond via internet are generally more affluent)
- Many seniors don't live in senior centers
- Note that the Commission contains expertise at outreach to seniors (SAHA, Center for Elders Independence). They send out surveys after every session. A focus group could be useful.
- DOSP staff noted that the Commission's expertise will be particularly useful to leverage when updating the citywide General Plan, starting after the DOSP planning process is complete
- City Human Services Department staff: DOSP staff were in very good communication with him and his staff, and the appropriate agencies were given the survey

## Economic Opportunity

- Older adults will be living longer and in the workforce longer. Need to address workforce opportunity including businesses that serve seniors and senior entrepreneurs (throughout the city).
- Consider using master lease program (E-2.8) to support businesses that hire a large number of older adults
- City Human Services Department staff: For senior employment, we have access to the Assets Program, which is local and not constrained by federal guidelines so can hire seniors for jobs not limited to government and nonprofit

## Housing & Affordability:

- Commissioners like the policies to promote universal design

### Community Health:

- Need to address crime, sidewalk quality, and homeless residents living on the sidewalks – in addition to the inherent problems with crime and homelessness, these impact people’s ability to go outside and color their emotional experience
- Some seniors feel that the area is *underpoliced*
- Commissioners like the idea of a mental health street team – reports of police being called and not knowing how to handle mental health issues and overreacting, causing unnecessary trauma (e.g. by pulling out weapons)

### Mobility:

- Commissioners like how the plan addresses transit
- Need to invest in transit that specifically supports seniors, such as increasing the amount of available taxi scrip – this is a way to address people driving personal automobiles and parking downtown
- Q: Has there been an assessment of where older adults and people with disabilities live regarding crossings? (A: No, we don’t have that data, but the Draft Plan does respond to data about the high-injury networks)

### Follow-Up:

- DOSP staff to send presentation
- Commission may send additional written comments to DOSP staff
- Commission will consider sending a representative to attend Community Advisory Group meetings

# Planning Commission (Draft EIR)

October 2, 2019

---

## Commissioner #1

- How was Chinatown addressed in the EIR?
- Health impact assessment was recommended by the community (page 13 of DEIR); why wasn't this included? Does City have plans to include one?
- How did we arrive at partially mitigated alternative?
- What is the population density? [1.9 person per household]
- What is the zoning incentive program timeline?
- Does max units in EIR include zoning incentive program?
- How is Climate Action Plan being addressed, relative to cumulative impacts?

## Public Speakers

### Speaker #1

- If impact contributes to a significant, unavoidable impact, mitigation measures should be incorporated into specific plan
- Reduce base zone and density as part of TDR program; currently this mitigation measure should be implemented in 3 years but it should be immediate
- Heights in APIs/ASIs will encourage removal of these buildings
- There are historic significant buildings associated as opportunity sites – review opportunity sites to address this

### Speaker #2

- Concerned about impacts to historic resources due to height/FAR increase: Produce Market, Lower Broadway, Old Oakland, Lake Merritt, in front of Posey Tube
- Main Library as opportunity site/Fire Alarm Building/Pose Tube
- Confused about the Waterfront Warehouse District depicted on Page 224 of Draft Plan

### Speaker #3

- Equity should be part of each chapter
- Retitle the housing chapter "Housing and Homelessness"
- Make "Sustainability and environmental stewardship" (most important) a separate chapter
- Put more attention to value capture, public land, inclusionary zoning, land banking, community benefits

### Speaker #4

- Advocates for surveys of existing buildings – this should be a mitigation measure
- Retain light industrial through Art + Garage District; lower base zone

### Speaker #5

- Need solutions to homelessness
- House current homeless/close to homeless
- Zoning measures to provide low and very-low income housing
- Homelessness as a coherent section – its own chapter
- Use County properties at 4<sup>th</sup> and Broadway for permanent housing
- Special zoning and land use as permanently affordable
- Incentives for SRO
- Establish target numbers for present homeless to be permanently housed

### Speaker #6

- Transport aspects of I-980 & I-880 need to be considered in tandem with Howard Terminal

### Speaker #7

- Lack of affordable housing; lacks specifics, doesn't address the truly poor
- Low goals and lack of accountability, specifically 25% is too low and there are no associated income categories (i.e., extremely low-, very low-income, etc.)
- Include milestones along the way
- EIR: address environmental impact of displacement

### Speaker #8

- Reduce baseline density
- Consider what skyline will look like? Do you have images?
- Not enough about design of buildings

### Speaker #9

- Gaps in engagement
- Maps cuts out Chinatown however, it was redrawn to include some parts of downtown (from Lake Merritt Station Area Plan, West Oakland Specific Plan); Chinatown should be integrated into all aspects moving forward
- Chinatown wants close involvement with transportation recommendations including reviewing traffic studies
- Don't give away height by right
- Prioritize existing parks
- Howard Terminal should be addressed in EIR
- How are we prioritizing in West Oakland Specific Plan? What is the plan for prioritization?
- Listen to youth

### Speaker #10

- Better beginning
- Need streetscape analysis of new buildings' impact on the street level
- Is skyline important?

- What is essence of Oakland, authentic?
- 5 story razed for 40 story
- No boring rectangular buildings with flat roofs
- Old Oakland is left off of most maps – combined with Chinatown on Broadway character description
- Plan for where BART should go. Oakland should ask for what it wants
- No parks under freeway; resources should go to existing parks

#### Speaker #11

- Need to continue tonight's discussion
- EIR getting short shrift
- Reduce building by-right zoning and it can be increased in exchange for providing incentives
- Action step 54 and 74 contradict historic preservation
  - Historic buildings are assets, not obstacles
  - Capitalize on virtue
- Parks section weak and inadequate; existing parks need more resources; existing paseos, plazas, etc. need maintenance
- Lake Merritt inadequately covered, will be impacted by growth, is wildlife habitat
- TDR can't wait for 3 years, is already in Historic Preservation Element

#### Speaker #12

- Plan has adverse impact on Measure DD
- More residents without meaningful mitigation measure for maintenance of parks
- Inattention to Lake Merritt & Channel
- Gold Coast: limit height to 55'

#### Speaker #13

- Lake Merritt Channel will be impacted by envisioned development and heights should be lower than what is currently proposed

#### Speaker #14

- Allow high rise and eliminate sunset
- EIR says downtown is infill site; it is on infill.
- No plan for Lake Merritt; it's an orphan

#### Speaker #15

- Jack London Maker District and impact relative to SB 617
- Inadequate review of impacts to industrial uses (both impacts to the City and to individual businesses)
- Howard Terminal has lots of problems, and should be integrated in plan
- CARB Plan applies to Jack London and Howard Terminal
- Address industrial concerns and freight issues

### Speaker #16

- Emphasis on economic opportunity (Draft Plan)
- Port should be noted in economic opportunity – has 84,000 jobs and supports family support-wage jobs
- Ensure compatibility of DOSP with Port and strengthen the relationship between seaport activities and DOSP

### Speaker #17

- SB743 VMT reduction is good
- EIR suggests that the lower alternative would have *more* impacts
- Shortage of construction workers – need to address construction industry workforce with a development-specific policy
- Reduce base zone; increase benefit zone

### Speaker #18

- Continue tonight's meeting
- Reduce base zone
- Don't use the RHNA breakdown as affordability targets: focus on lowest income levels
- Look at the economics of downzoning
- Affordable housing goal is too low (page 94)

### Speaker #19

- Continue tonight's meeting
- OHA recommendations (detailed in letter to Planning Commission)
- City says it can't downzone, what about SB 330(?); doesn't preclude downzoning
- General Plan amendments on p. 225 proposes higher intensities (limited in intensity map)
- APIs/ASIs (see letter for their 2-tiered development program)

### Speaker #20

- Should not include parking – given climate change, the last thing we need is to worry about traffic and parking
- Opportunity sites too limited (need housing)
- Office priority sites should not take viable housing sites. Put an extra impact fee on these.
- Goal is tall buildings in places like Lake Merritt

### Speaker #21

- Commend staff – good draft plan
- Likes safer two-way streets, dedicated bus lanes
- Victory Court receives too much attention – half the units are in brownfield
- Equitably share growth within downtown; Gold Coast is proposed for hardly any new growth
- Zoning incentive program needs to focus certain things for certain areas (list of desired community benefits is too long)

- Existing low-income housing

#### Speaker #22

- History helps with mental health (feelings inspired by being in old buildings of people who have lived here; heritage)
- Existing low scale
- Prioritize walkability
- Don't become a bedroom to SF

#### Commissioner #2

- Greater understanding of tools (TDR, zoning)
- Not seeing Chinatown
- Sense of what's possible

#### Commissioner #1

- If different comment deadlines, how do you reconcile with Draft Plan?
- Close Draft Plan and Draft EIR at the same time or keep them both open
- Good to see traffic study for Chinatown
- How are aesthetics analyzed relative to Lake Merritt?
- Would new projects be denied or supported based on EIR findings?
- Legal impetus against looking at lower baseline in zoning incentive program (SB 330); need to at least study option of downzoning

#### Commissioner #3

- Continue this item to another hearing
- Reduce base zoning – developers should be happy because it creates consistency
- Vague; not a lot of concrete actions/numerical goals

#### Commissioner #4

- Continue this item to another hearing
- Implementation – incentive zoning is key piece – need clear program

#### Commissioner #5

- Continue this item to another hearing

#### Commissioner #6

- Another hearing on incentive study [Staff: zoning is separate ordinance, may be adopted later, will go to ZUC]

#### Commissioner #2

- Urge the public to provide substantive and detailed input, not general generic input

# Market-Rate Developers Stakeholder Meeting

October 7, 2019

---

## Housing

- No unlimited height; need to leverage to create use of density bonuses
- SB35 did calculations – you can almost pencil at density bonus with 35% affordable rates without outside subsidy
- We can use SB35
- Buy upgrade update capital stack
- Policies don't do enough to increase housing (affordable housing)
- Explore the community land trust model, land trust model can be very powerful for existing housing, redoing the capital stack
  - Enhance the authority of the City to work with land trusts – seminar on land trusts?

## Designate Arts District

- Right now the language in the Draft Plan is too vague
- Ghielmetti against the bonus program – thinks it'll be a new starting point; designate art space as part of developments (cited ULI letter to Pete Vollman)
- Cannot legally *require* below market rate (BMR) artist's space
- Cannot implement commercial rent control
- Needs to be a bonus ("unlock" the potential for BMR arts space)
- We can incentivize the arts district without formally designating the district
- Black Arts Movement and Business District adopted in name only
- Need an implementation program for the arts districts
- Perception is that Signature Development is opposed to Art + Garage District
- Strengthen language in vision for arts districts; need to designate them in the specific plan
- Need to call for Arts Districts community groups; the BIDs could be conveners for the arts districts; Need clarity – form-based, list of incentives
  - Think more about implementation – no teeth to enforce it

## Neighborhood vision

- Strengthen arts districts
- Create committee to explore them
- Broadway-Valdez required a retail committee housed at the Chamber of Commerce
- Could use the BIDs
- Overlay zones

## Intensity map

- 110 SF, 175' height most difficult for them to build in – limited to 85' with Type III construction
- Density is too low for it to be with it
- Instead go up to purple (80SF density) – greater impact for units (affordable housing)
- Unfinanceable

- Over 85' marginal cost is higher
- SB35 allows additional concessions
- Height doesn't matter, density matters

### Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District (EIFD)

- Only works in SF because it's a city and county
- Need to coordinate with Alameda County
- Focus on this!

### Additional Discussion:

- What is a more streamlined approval process; developers need certainty; need more clarity about form
- Need to *not* have them go to Council and PC & entire appeals process to get the bonuses
- Need more than a list of community benefits
- Tone: Is density a bad thing? And, should people have to give something up to get it?
- Treat density as a good thing, get fees, market will adjust to them, don't try to hold density hostage – just pushes people to go with the same type III
- Fees are main resources. Keep raising the fees
- Make it feasible to make density happen
- Building 85' or lower is easier, more affordable
- Focus on fees (complicated formulas (i.e., incentive program) is not helpful)
- Is there a way to prevent challenges to approval of projects using the incentive program? If a project is ministerial, but it still needs to go through CEQA, that is a problem - Not requiring a Conditional Use Permit (CUP)
- What triggers CUP/Variance and other discretionary approvals now in downtown?
- If we just allow more development, we will not make a plan that is in the community's interest
- Higher density does not preclude larger units
- Transfer density from Transfer of Development Rights (TDRs) to central core
- Vancouver makes it work with land lift
- Fees are worthless – only 800 units could be built (a drop in the bucket)
- TDRs seem promising
- Affordability requires outside funding (doesn't happen with all private capital)
  - City: What would height be that with density bonus could get you to build?
  - Height 275, density 80-87 gets small sites built
- Units leasing up fastest are 3-bedrooms (\$950-1000 rent per bedroom)
- Will help millennials now and seniors and families later
  - City should stay out of product types – let the market do it and correct
- Retaining historic resources – TDR is good, more attention
- Got to >30% affordable only with redevelopment funds, need fees (or rents so astronomical for market that it subsidizes)
- Need to tax/charge fees for development

# Port of Oakland Stakeholders Meeting

October 7, 2019

---

- What are the mechanisms/trajectory for the DOSP?
- What is the plan for if the A's ballpark doesn't go forward?
- Howard Terminal EIR is scheduled to be released in Jan. 2020.
- City Planning staff present to the Port Board of Commissioners on 10/24
- Zoning in Jack London area is from the 1960s (this will be important to highlight to Port)
- The Downtown Plan will be an opportunity to update the Estuary Policy Plan as well

## Concern about Jack London Maker District

- How will maker space, small craft businesses be protected?
- Will it allow other uses to start penetrating?
- The "industrial land policy" – nothing was adopted, just a statement of importance
  - Does the Draft Plan evaluate the loss of industrial land?
  - Port ENA requires a "compatibility plan" with seaport operations: land use, operational, transportation, design commitments

## Why is the area near Howard Terminal being updated as mixed use? Why would we zone to match a 20-year-old General Plan?

- City Planning staff: Brush to Castro, there is encroachment into industrial, and Castro to MLK – these are the only areas the plan would be changing
- Uses along 3<sup>rd</sup> are not all that truck-related (at the western end they are)
- Are truck-related businesses on 3<sup>rd</sup> Street addressed in the Draft Plan?
- Tenants believe that due to the maritime character of the area, everything West of Broadway should be industrial
- Conflict: the Port works east-west, whereas downtown works north-south
- How does the alternative for Howard Terminal get enforced?
- Rail flanked by compatible uses, this are must consider the needs of truckers/rail to get east/west

## Must consider goods movement; 3<sup>rd</sup> Street is a major corridor in the plan (3<sup>rd</sup> Street from Market St. to Adeline St. is designated a Heavy Weight Corridor; from Adeline St. to Mandela Pkwy is truck-serving and truck-oriented)

- The Port gets customers because it's easier that Long Beach/LA; Port is worried that changes will diminish our competitive advantage
- If the area is more than 60% residential, it can't have a designated truck route
- DOSP needs to account for this; need industrial focus "complete streets"

## Alameda County Truck Management Plan reference in EIR

- Electric trucks, although they are better for the environment, are heavier; Heavy Truck Routes matter for supporting electrification

- Could 3<sup>rd</sup> Street (in the industrial buffer) be a truck parking corridor? (to get trucks out of W. Oakland?) (Subject to [for example, residential] parking permit model). Parking is mostly overnight Schnitzer trucks.
- Concern: need to restrict parking – truckers will often switch off to older, dirtier trucks once they are off the Port.
- Mark truck routes in the DOSP
- Add caveats to specific plan noting that Howard Terminal will be studied later, similar to I-980
- Figure LU-13a: areas 6, 19, 18 should be light industrial
- Address truck/freight in plan – Add regional freight movement plans to DOSP – AC & MTC
- Has UP commented? They want grade separation, and will need to give approval for a quiet zone.

# Affordable Housing Developers

October 11, 2019

---

## Chapter 2: Housing Affordability

### Policy H-1.1 p.90

- makes sense, but when there are limited funds...

### EBPREC (East Bay Permanent Real Estate Cooperative)

- Important to have a focus around downtown
  - *City response*: are you building ownership units downtown? Condo model, coop, land trust could see
- Building in West Oakland
- People aren't building condos (affordable) with subsidies; no subsidies for homeownership opportunities.
- Increase points in NOFA for homeownership
- Only a few developers doing homeownership
- Habitat doing 85 units in West Oakland

### Policy H-1.2 p.90

- No distinction of ownership vs. rental
- Important to create wealth

### Policy H-1.4 p.90

- Rather than dedicating funds, just use the criteria in *Policy H-1.1 "Examples of potential scoring criteria adjustments could include prioritization of the downtown specific plan area receiving additional point..."*

### Policy H-1.10 p.91

- Incorporate them in Measure KK funds
- Are there Zoning code regulations that get in the way?
- SF and San Jose both have projects that have challenged the building code
- Another city-co-living problem require a number of 2-bedrooms at market rate, even though it's offered at below market rate – work with County?
  - EBPREC was able to prove it'd stay affordable, but did not have a lot to demonstrate or prove this; what if City signs off on it?
- Community land trusts are acquiring land and paying property tax at market value

### Policy H 2.12 p.93

- Prioritize and be more proactive
- Oakland has AMI restrictions
- We need inventory to be built for this to be effective

## Measure of Success p.94

- Clarify definition on *Measure of Success Affordable Housing part* – if homeownership could not go higher than 30% of income, lender can go up to 46% debt to income ratio
- “40% Moderate Income (80% -120%)”
  - There aren’t really public resources for this (moderate income)
    - City responses: on-site inclusionary
    - State funds?
  - Moderate income units are for white people; goes against the equity goals
  - Even if we reach the high goals, we are not reaching the existing percentage in downtown – white people are the ones who qualify for moderate
- Measure W does include vacant homes
- Preservation of existing stock – easier to keep people in place
- Disincentivizing vacancies (like AirBNB and second homes) – vacant unit tax
- *Unsheltered Residents* – Be much stronger. X% to traditional housing Y% to services.
- Other ways to measure wealth in addition to AMI, but can get tricky

## Partnerships:

- Will [developers] attach themselves to a community stakeholder to make sure the benefit provided is actually useful to the community – What’s the process?
  - Need funding for tenant improvements
  - Developers need to be engaged with the community in the planning and design of tenant space to avoid the tenant settling for the “leftover space.” Developers should pair with community partner early on to ensure timely lease-up
  - Disincentivize vacant
- What about the next 20 years? Flexibility as it changes? Needs to be flexible or iterated

# Black Arts Movement Business District Meeting

October 11, 2019

---

## BAMBD

- Anchors of the BAMBD – AAML, Malonga Center, Geoffrey’s
- Have not been hearing the voices of the vibrant range of black folk in Oakland
- All of Black California is anchored by Black Oakland
- Confusion about BAMBD roles – some would like to see it as a BID separate from Uptown/Downtown

## Attendee #1

- On 17<sup>th</sup> street there are 7 buildings going up at the same time, she has had three asthma attacks from the dust, businesses have shuttered – need a financial offset to help
- Also, trees being cut Webster between 17<sup>th</sup> & 19<sup>th</sup>

## Attendee #2

- They do anything they want to the Black community
- Jack London Village had the largest tenant population and was bulldozed for a hotel (that was never built)
- Parking issues on 14<sup>th</sup> Street – destroying the street, with bus lanes, can’t park or get deliveries. Jack London doesn’t have meters.
- OPD harassed [Attendee 2’s business] and closed it down due to a fabricated incident

## Attendee #3

- It’s not realistic for a port city like Oakland to be car-free – not authentic
- Need storytellers involved
- Need to talk about what compromise looks like [i.e. between City/development/DOT’s parking policies and business owners]
- Angry that he hasn’t been invited to BAMBD-related meetings – people did not go into his building to talk to him
- What does success look like for the BAMBD?
  - Attendee 2
    - Success looks like black nonprofits buy AAMLO and the Malonga Center, and eminent domain non-black
    - If you’re going to get rid of the parking, get some shuttles to shuttle people from where they are parking

## Attendee #4

- Her staff flyered for this meeting. Counting on this group to share with their people (the “griot & the grapevine”)
- The people speaking for Black interests are often advocates for the most vulnerable, not an organized voice for black entrepreneurs

- Sometimes Planning doesn't know what's happening with DOT
- DOT should be here at this meeting

#### Attendee #5

- Why do we have to live 50 miles away? Why bother doing downtown as a Black neighborhood if everyone is displaced?
  - Attendee 2: because of the STORY this city has to tell about Black culture and history!
- We need to understand what the economics of this is!
- Tied to access to housing – has to commute 2 hours to his store
- If they do bike lanes, then exploit the bike lanes for Black traditions

#### Attendee #6

- There is IMMEDIATE need. The future is great, but it's difficult NOW
- PG&E took out parking in front of the store, blocked off for a month, and sales declined – she's asked people to let her know every time they try to come to her store but can't find parking, and is keeping a record
- There is nowhere to unload – the parking garage charges \$15 for 20 minutes
- Lots of black women support her business, which helps with the healing of downtown

#### Attendee #7

- What's happening now should have been 5 years ago, before the development came in
- Her city is working against her
- The people ahead of her didn't die for her to get called "Black"
- Take design tips from the Japanese – they watch the paths people take to make sure new development would be harmonious
- What about the people who have put in blood, sweat and tears [into their businesses]?
- People now are living in Antioch

#### Attendee #4

- Tried doing these meetings in 2015, but people couldn't see the development coming
- Oakland's politic is a politic of group

#### Attendee #8

- Keeping people in the loop – communication – share the meetings!
- Need affordable housing for business owners

#### Attendee #9

- Need emergency financial support
- Immediate community engagement
- It's a state of emergency – need one-on-one education
- Marketing and mailing of all addresses in the district

## Additional

- Break the plan into a more simplified powerpoint and present that
- Need compassionate planning
- Attendee 4 will create a shared doc for the BAMBD members
- Need a welcome packet for new businesses
- Enforcement issues (construction and parking)

# Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board

October 14, 2019

---

## Speaker 1

- Open forum state history presidential tax incentive just signed
- Oakland Monster

## Public Speakers:

### Speaker #2

- Expansion of Main Library is critical—equity – library is great equalizer
- P.286 action 111
- Fire alarm building—don't use it and library
- Share community input

### Speaker #3

- P.225 W.W. District not clearly labeled
- W.W. District FAR going
- Inconsistency in DEIR – Greyhound and library not consistently marked as opportunity sites (plan p.224 & 225, p.344 & 340 of DEIR- exists buildings: doesn't show library as existing building) [see follow-up email from Brian Mulry to Lynette Dias]
- Definition of success – more rigorous than “increase” or “decrease”
  - Land use: wants actual numbers – same as unsheltered residents

### Speaker #4

- Concerned about emphasis on library as shelter
- Provide access to resources
- Include in economic development
- Include OPL on implementation matrix list for capital improvements

### Speaker #1

- Concerned that the study doesn't include entire plan area and downzoning
- Scope developed without public review
- Lower Broadway – want the addresses of 7-8 oldest buildings added
- AGD limited to only one street in plan – more streets than that
- Example: JLS as a failure of a commercial district – if historical buildings had been preserved, it might be vibrant
  - Produce Market – only thing left – important to protect it

## LPAB:

### Advisory Board Member #1

- Define opportunity sites?

- Expand scope of study?
  - *City response:*
    - 8 prototypes- variety of heights, uses;
    - Both inside and outside black lines; Core-height unlimited but density and FAR are lower
    - These heights could be applied anywhere throughout the downtown (prototypes could be applied)
    - If reducing value of what development already had
- Will there be opportunity for CAG to meet with consultants?
  - *City response:* Yes, when released
- Will they be open to changing study?
  - *City response:* If it can be, yes

#### Speaker #5

- It'd be a taking? Doesn't that happen all the time?
- Doesn't seem like a reason not to study it
- Trying to provide best value to Oakland, not developers
  - *City response:* consultant is aware of the concerns and will be addressing them in the report

#### Speaker #5

- Could include a list of all historic buildings
- Lynette—Bridget was having trouble getting the list
  - We will look into it
- Last week –big conference re: GHG's not talking about reducing carbon embodied energy of structures within existing buildings (not in the scope of CEQA, but could be addressed in plan)
- Carbon capture calculation? Missing from EIR
- Resiliency – not just flooding; soft-story buildings, fires

#### Speaker #6

- Green building ordinance – does tack on requirements (demo findings) when historic buildings are demolished
- Also, we now have soft-story retrofit ordinance

#### Speaker #5

- Fearful of relying on demo findings if we're weakening then
- Include info re: soft-story program

#### Advisory Board Member #2

- TDR – people like the mitigation measure, want it implemented sooner than 3 years

- *City response:* make recommendations and we will analyze
- As the process goes on, we will weigh feasibility

### Speaker #5

- Specific plan implementation committee – who’s on it? Historic and member of Public
  - *City response:* we welcome suggestions
- Thanks for additional time
- Good development plan but not a good cultural or historic preservation plan

### Advisory Board Member #2

- Reduce baseline height and FAR to support TDR
- Review proposed opportunity sites and why historic sites are included
- Delete Action 74 p.276 (update demo findings on periphery and potentially erodes already fragmented)
- Delete Action 54 p.270 bullet#3 (add height on parcels); only allow TDR to be transferred away from historic areas
- Reclassify opportunity sites: vague, distinct categories for what its an opportunity for
- Incorporate MM. DEIR Cultural (1A—if?) into plan as proposed
- Include new design review criteria: massing and building top standards, etc. for Iconic skyline, add to zoning review and design standards
- Peter: remove inconsistencies between DEIR and Draft Plan
  - *City response:* we don’t put zoning in Plans
  - Klara: don’t like it, doesn’t mention zoning or two-tiered system
- Peter: address inconsistency around waterfront warehouse district
  - Were increased heights an error? If so, please correct

### Advisory Board Member #3

- “Iconic” buildings: wondered if there is a vision of the skyline

# 14th Street Task Force Meeting

Meeting called by DOT to discuss the 14th Street ATP Grant Project

October 22, 2019

---

## Attendee #1

- Used to work for CalTrans, understands transportation
- Concerns around the busses
- Blocked in by development on almost all sides – high-rise between MLK & Jefferson, historic buildings rehabbed, back lot was once an access to the restaurant, but is now being built
- Construction is starting before 9am
- Can't get in to unload
- Delivery service has no place to park – 60% of their business is delivery (also has catering service)
- Scooters are a problem
- People are not obeying speed limits, and are angry – got hit by a car
- Delivery is double-parking to unload
- Construction is starting 6-7am
- People think the business isn't open – construction parking is blocking them
- The trees haven't been trimmed and are blocking their sign, so no one knows they're there
- Construction doesn't give updates
- They were told the construction would be 3 days, but it was 9, and they were supposed to be paid by the developer for the days that they were forced to close, but they're refusing to pay for all 9
- Construction next door is causing damage to their building (they have tenants upstairs)
- Bus stop is being moved in front of their store, which means that parking is being removed, and they're worried that homeless people will sleep on the benches
- Why aren't developers at this meeting?
- How can they [Attendee 1 and family] be part of this 14<sup>th</sup> street dream? They have land they can develop!
- They would be very interested in sprucing up their façade, signage, but they looked into a new sign and the cost was too great
- They don't have a place to put the sign – were told they couldn't put it somewhere else
- There was an option a while ago to spruce up the outdoor space, but they didn't have the 50% to split with the City's Redevelopment program
- They could come to meetings in the morning and evening

## Attendee #2

- Has reached out to developers to talk about providing public parking, and they are interested

### Attendee #3

- Lakeshore has free parking for Trader Joe's – why can't we have something like that in the 14<sup>th</sup> Street corridor?
- Provide construction companies with parking and shuttle THEM

### Other

- Enforcement is not showing up for construction
- Discussion of whether African Americans ride bikes
- Older people don't ride bikes, so the bike lanes aren't for them
- Construction companies aren't hiring African-Americans
- Want Mayor Schaff to show up for one of these meetings
- How about a moratorium on the taxes small businesses are paying for litter?
- There's no street sweeping happening, but parking enforcement is still ticketing!

### Attendee #4

- Jack London has a parking system – for people who they want
- It feels like Black people are being designed out
- This is an opportunity to embrace Black culture and history and pour resources into it
- Understand the environmental argument, but AT WHOSE EXPENSE?
- Assessment of parcels near 14<sup>th</sup> – build a parking garage and provide a REBATE as reparations to businesses for messing it up over the last five years
- Their family business and house was torn down for the post office
- The City has had a history of disregarding African Americans
- The environmental argument against parking is weak – should apply everywhere, not just enforced selectively

### Other

- Chinatown is thriving and has a parking structure
- Request developers with parking below residential to make it available to public – lease it back to the City to sublease
- Why has the City only collected \$8million of the \$25million in impact fees it should have collected?
- BAMBD should hold meetings to develop an alternative plan
- In 1979 people were arrested because the Grove-Shafter freeway wasn't hiring African-Americans, and they found \$13 million
- Other agencies need to be in the conversation – like AC Transit
- Want City to check to make sure nothing's going to happen in the intervening time – no projects that we don't already know about
- Wants businesses to set the agenda for the meeting – creating a 14<sup>th</sup> Street merchant's group

## Business Improvement District Meeting

November 4, 2019

---

- Need regular format for interaction between City and BIDs; BIDs would like someone from City to come to all the meetings (City staff previously attended). BID Alliance meetings are 3<sup>rd</sup> Thursdays at 2pm at the Metro Chamber of Commerce
- BIDs want to be a partner to the City in the DOSP – they are already doing much of this work and are concerned that they’ve been overlooked.
- DOSP is heavy on cultural districts, but has missed the role that BIDs already play – and BIDs can support cultural districts as well with retail pop-ups, public space activation, a vending program on Frank Ogawa Plaza, etc. – easy things right out of the gate. They already have the infrastructure on the ground. Allocate responsibility to what’s already existing.
- BIDs will submit comments showing how they are doing work across the various plan topics and to support the various stakeholder groups of concern (e.g. youth, people at risk of displacement). They will also fill in the Implementation Matrix with places where they can be partners and/or have existing programs.
- BIDs would be interested in supporting the BAMBD, if the BAMBD merchants want
- Remove the “ghost districts” that no one advocates for – the Jack London Entertainment District in the Draft Plan doesn’t coincide with where entertainment venues are; it isn’t clear where the Jack London Maker District came from; there isn’t agreement in the community about the Art & Garage District (particularly regarding the existing KONO district).
- City will work on creating a cultural district *program*, rather than designating districts (beyond the BAMBD, which has been formally adopted already); DOSP recommends developing a process, criteria and tools that can be used by a community that is organizing to create a cultural district.

## Oakland Youth Advisory Commission

November 14, 2019

---

What defines affordable housing?

Response: housing that is newly constructed or preserved that has income and rent restrictions for a specific period of time. As a general rule, nobody should pay more than 30% of their income on housing.

Is the City thinking of the all impacts of building the A's ballpark at Howard Terminal and what are the taxbase implications?

Response: Yes, the DOSP staff is closely monitoring developments related to the A's ballpark and carefully considering the impacts it will have on nearby jobs as well as impacts related to potentially changing permitted land uses.

How is the city handling homelessness?

Response: The DOSP addresses some of the challenges associated with homelessness in a chapter but also recognizes that several other city departments are also tasked with addressing homelessness.

## Meeting Notes Unavailable

---

Jack London Improvement District Meeting

October 14, 2019

Port Board of Commissioners

November 14, 2019