

Preliminary Draft Plan

Community Feedback January 22 through March 07, 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 Preliminary Draft Plan. These notes were taken by the City team and reflect staff's account of the meeting dialogue, unless otherwise noted.

Contents

Community Advisory Group Meeting #6	2
Planning Commission – Preliminary Draft Plan	6
Library Commission	10
Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board.....	11
Planning Commission – Notice of Preparation	12
Community Advisory Group Meeting #7	15
Encampment Management Team Meeting.....	18
Chamber Economic Development Forum	19
Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission.....	20
Jack London Business Improvement District	22
Chinatown Coalition Stakeholder Group Meeting.....	24
Planning Commission – Continuation.....	25
Institutions Stakeholder Meeting	29
SPUR Board Policy Committee.....	30
Bicyclist & Pedestrian Advisory Commission	33
Oakland Food Policy Council.....	34
Transportation Technical Advisory Committee	35
Art + Garage District Stakeholder Meeting.....	38
Market-Rate Developers Stakeholder Meeting.....	40
Affordable Housing Developer’s Stakeholder Meeting	42
Chinatown Chamber	45
East Oakland Collective	46
SPUR Problem Solver Meeting.....	47
Community Advisory Group Meeting #8	48
Disability Advocates Meeting	49

Community Advisory Group Meeting #6

JANUARY 22, 2019

Economic Opportunity:

- The share of impact fees for affordable housing generated by commercial development is much smaller than that generated by residential development
- Some concern that office priority sites might be too limited
- Have we calculated the revenue generated by potential commercial development projected in the DOSP beyond impact fees collected? *Not yet – we will follow up on this*
- Workforce development recommendations have not been fully detailed out
- Timing of local hire programs is critical to ensure that construction jobs generated by new development benefit local workers
- Ensure equitable access to capital/financing for small businesses and developers
- Goal #2 is weak – does not emphasize housing access for all income levels
- In addition to key office priority sites, it would be good to talk about office conversion sites

Housing:

- Some communities incentivize housing by setting base intensity limits but allow more intensity in exchange for community benefits. But those areas are mapped for historic areas. Most of downtown is FAR 20. SF has 9.0 with increases to 18. Could we look at that as a model?
- How do you incentivize affordable housing?
- What about sea level rise in the Laney College area?
- Impact fee: income targeting is significantly lower than what you get with inclusionary
- Using assumption of 1.7 ppl. per household does not address the needs of housing families
- Reducing base level intensity does not mean you are reducing the intensity of what is actually built– building intensity can be gained through incentives. Plan needs to be specific – cannot give away the right to develop intensely without offering community benefits
- Look at Emeryville and SF
- Invest in parks and institutions
- Incentivize Affordable AND inclusionary housing
- Don't just look at housing downtown – look at how expanding opportunity. Improving mobility allows people to live elsewhere and come to downtown. Having more employment. Downtown has a unique opportunity to be leveraged.
- Non-profit based leveraging of strength of market demand. Find a way to take market demand and use it to fund affordable housing, use public lands. Develop a business model.
- Is planning department tracking types of housing that is being built? (yes)
- Intensity/incentives: bonus program will increase value, need to capture that

Mobility:

- Where do we put the second BART tube? This alignment is something that should be recommended and identified in the DOSP. Look at the layers of local/metro/regional transit networks.

- How is Downtown SF better connected to Downtown Oakland though this plan's mobility recommendations
- Emphasis on Broadway – this is a big opportunity
- Have we looked at curb space management and how new technology impacts this – detail this out more in the Plan
- BART is not discussed meaningfully yet in the Plan – looks at SF Soma's BART Plan
- Starting to look dated based on new micro mobility options – how is parking being addressed?
- Demand for curbside activity going up while demand for parking is going down – need to be bolder about this
- Not aggressive enough in reducing parking
- More partnerships with transit agencies (County of Alameda and Caltrans)
- What does Oakland transportation look like when it becomes the main employment hub of the bay area?
- Is I-980 still being recommended for new BART alignment in the Plan – should this be emphasized even more?
- Gondola being considered as a part of separate process
- Smart technology being used to manage transportation infrastructure
- I-980 may not be the right alignment for second BART tube – need to consider/study other options in more detail to provide a recommendation
- Broadway – is the vision to be a transit priority street or is it still a vehicular thoroughfare with a transit lane?

Culture Keeping:

- If city has money it should be spent on affordable spaces, not streetscape. BID or CDC can do that, or cultural district. Spend public money on more effective measures.
- “entertainment district” – official designation?
- Implementing a local hire – to keep residents here. Housing does not matter without jobs.
- Broadway is an exception to streetscape question – important main street, redesign with mobility we have today, and future. Include maintenance and durability.
- Preferred option for Art + Garage District (plan options meeting) – are both options still on the table?
- How do you preserve flex industry spaces, and build residential?
- Cultural easements, ownership opportunities
- Prioritize working with existing Oakland arts and culture organizations
- Local cultural council for each district, to review proposals that come forward
- There is not huge market for retail that is pushing out arts uses. Opportunity for pop-ups, social area on the sidewalks. Need construction above to subsidize.
- Expecting the city to run master lease program? What kind of dept or real estate management structure would city have to set up long term to be able to do that?

Community Health:

- A lot of thought about creating a skateboard park somewhere downtown – what is the impact of putting some of these spaces under the freeway? Will bring Caltrans into the conversation to implement more recreation under freeway – Snow Park another potential option
- Skateboarding in Latham Square makes it harder to maintain
- Is it responsible to create new public spaces if it is not adequately able to maintain existing ones?
- Lincoln Square Park – need to invest in existing recreational facilities above creating new ones; how it is maintained? Stronger community partnerships to achieve this goal
- People-only/car-free zones in the downtown should be included/studied in this plan
- Sea Level Rise is only addressed in community health – needs to be incorporated into land use
- Map for opportunity sites should correct City Center site (currently right over the pedestrian mall)
- Explore shared streets as well – those that are closed to cars at certain times
- Broadway is our most important public space – explore this long-term idea
- Strengthen streetscape along Broadway to get people to the waterfront
- Prioritize quality instead of quantity for public spaces
- How is the unhoused population being addressed in the Health chapter specifically? Should look into incorporating more recommendations for this population in each chapter, beyond housing
- Regional issue – but downtown has a significant share of unhoused population

Land Use:

- Density bonus does not function in a linear way – no one will get a density bonus that requires a different building construction type.
- Why not including FAR as part of height map? Hard to tell intensity that results. For housing, residential density is defining.
- TDR for historic buildings. There seems to be support. Not enough discussion in the document. Why not developed further in the document?
- Want to see connection between existing FAR and bonus program
- TDR, how much time before we can look at it as a fully viable option
- Make existing property owners aware of this potential option
- SF plan, core idea was TDR, as way of preserving historic areas and incentivizing new development.
- Disconnect, BART alignment on 980 and density is in the core. BART alignment needs to be figured out.
- How do we ensure benefits meet people in the community? Need to talk about all of Oakland, not just one neighborhood
- Central core – also appropriate for open space, community center. People need recreational activity

- Reduce traffic on Broadway. Where would be the primary route to Alameda, how does that impact Chinatown. Need to show the community what the repercussions would be
- How to catalyze great high intensity development around Broadway? What strategies can make that happen? It already does not reach full potential.
- What about differences between height/intensity map and existing conditions. What about areas where increased height in historic areas?
- Childcare on the ground floor. Will that fit in the flex zoning? Part of incentive program?
- What timeline is attached to this plan? How are priorities set?
- Can we look at interim measures – to get benefits from development proposals now?
- Want to hear from economic consultants – feasibility of proposed development
- Danger in zoning for intensity that the market is not ready to do – may cause land holders to sit on their land until they get the right price. Can constrain development.
- Amount of development potential / intensity allowed is too high already
- Explore different ways to parcelize property – take advantage of fractional ownership. Opportunities for all levels of income to own a piece of it. New technologies in ways properties are held and conveyed.
- Danger about equity in name only. How to maximize the number of social benefits that we see. We can harness a lot and do a lot here.
- How is any of this going to be implemented.

Planning Commission – Preliminary Draft Plan

JANUARY 23, 2019

Valerie

- There is no option B
- The process has been short circuited
- Spare the Arts & Garage District
- The space there is work space (not gallery space)
- No change to Height at Lake Merritt

Roger Clark

- Community benefits could include job training/jobs, construction jobs, apprenticeships

Lorena

- Carpenters local 713
- Construction workers; state register apprentice; require apprenticeships
- Check Rebuilding California (report)

Ashara

- Short amount of time to review plan
- Need equity through the plan
- Arts and culture was not written throughout the plan
- Climate change, climate justice only mentioned in Community Health
- Address unhoused population throughout the plan

Marina

- Historic preservation: don't raise the height limit
- No tall building ringing Lake Merritt (it will cause speculation)

Chris Roberts

- No upzoning
- Lower Broadway: no additional height
- Put the plan on hold for 60 days

Khaliel

- Hire union; young people

Joaquin Espinoza

- Union – Carpenter: graduated from apprenticeship program
- Local 34: high school, college career fairs

- On the board of the apprenticeship committee

Chris

- Carpenter's Union

Tim

- Center for Sustainable Neighborhoods
- Need affordable housing; hotel workers Conditional Use Permits
- Should have incentives in Code to use prevailing wage and apprenticeships
- Reduce base zoning

James Vann

- Solidarity with OHA / EBHO
- No building height upzoning in Gold Coast
- Support inclusionary housing
- No height increase for Fire Alarm site; no residential there; should be a park or Main Library expansion

Jeff Levin

- Compressed timeline
- Displacement/housing: these topics should not just be addressed in one section
- Need affordable housing / anti-displacement strategy
- Housing goals are too low
- No new housing programs; should include specific plan for affordable housing
- Don't upzone without including affordable housing requirements
- Impact fee to inclusionary requirement: will result in fewer extremely low units
- Policy around condominium conversions is inconsistent with Councilmember Kalb's work
- Expand impact fees
- Incentives should not necessitate change in construction type

Milo

- Social housing model: low income housing tax credit (where City owns land) like redevelopment, TIF
- Upzone other neighborhoods (such as Rockridge) and provide jobs downtown
- Better demolition controls

Chris Buckley

- Referenced the letter he submitted

Bradley Cleveland

- Support plan / equity framework – local job training, return to public of this investment
- Need community benefits program

- Anticipated projects not covered by plan – can we subject these projects to community benefits?

Hiroko

- TDR program
- Pathways to access housing
- Require pathways to ownership
- No one is tracking displacement since 2015
- Interim measures – pilot for implementing the plan

Naomi

- ZUC interim measures
- Lower Broadway – step away from historic buildings
- TDR program (Church at 17th St. / Franklin St. as candidate)
 - Old Oakland
 - Produce Market
 - Lower Broadway
 - Art + Garage District
 - Lakeside Apartments
 - Downtown National Register
- Affordable housing – Set concrete goals
- Enhance and maintain existing parks rather than creating new ones

Commissioner Manus

- Whittle the plan to 25 pages (what is the core?)
- TDR program
- What can be implemented in short term?

Commissioner Limon

- Interim measures – master lease program
- View corridors

Commissioner Fern

- Planning Commission should be involved with implementation

Commissioner Hegde

- Get current projects under aspirations / benefit program
- What is meant by living wage jobs?

Commissioner Monchamp

- BART
- Laney
- Howard Terminal

- Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) – how does the plan inhibit meeting RHNA requirement?

Commissioner Myers

- Track residency in outreach (reach out to Communities for Better Environment)
- What was the process to go from the Plan Alternatives Report to the Preliminary Draft Plan?

Library Commission

JANUARY 28, 2019

- How is Plan addressing scooters, ride share and autonomous vehicles?
- What is the impact to surrounding neighborhoods when transit is prioritized?
- Connection to San Pablo corridor?
- Seems like most of the recommendations are geared toward young, able-bodied (bike lanes, etc.). What about elderly and disabled (who need car drop off locations)?
- Tall buildings block the sun
- Expand the Free B (to connect Brooklyn Basin, Howard Terminal and destinations throughout downtown)
- How to build support for a new Main Library?
- New library – Measure DD was for operations only, now that operations are covered, wanting to take up new site for Main Library
- No libraries near Brooklyn Basin
- Library is producing a Master Facilities Plan
- Swap library (current location) for a different location near BART, Schools, etc.
- City should coordinate with Library

Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board

February 4, 2019

Naomi Schiff

- Don't use (existing FAR)
- Consider view corridors
- Consider Connections under I-880

Commissioner: Peter Berkhalter

- Equity: no mention of Ohlone
- TDR interim measures
- No Conditional Use Permits for downtown
- No parking on the ground floor
- TDR
 - Old Oakland
 - 25th Street area
 - Produce Market
- No housing in 25th Street area
- Improve graphics and maps
- Height and scale are important in KONO
- 25th Street commercial tenants need parking and ability to drive
- Parks as an incentive in 25th Street area
- Small footprint have more impact for economic vitality
- Enforce people parking in bike lanes
- Greyhound Triangle missing from map
- Discrepancies in historic resources map
- California Register
- Include details about historic districts in an appendix to the plan (from Appendix G to the 2-7-2019 Landmarks Board staff report)

Commissioner Sugrue

- Need photos of character of existing districts (Jack London, etc.) to help contextualize/design new development

Planning Commission – Notice of Preparation

FEBRUARY 6, 2019

Commissioner Hegde

- How were the range of alternatives developed?
- Extend both periods for EIR/Plan

Commissioner Fearn

- Where / what is flex commercial?

Karen (President Chinatown Chamber)

- Reduce Webster? –What are the safety and pollution impacts. How does this impact scramble intersections?

Ashara

- The Art + Garage District steering committee is happening on 2/25
- Art and culture should be underscored in every chapter

Zach (Community Land Trust)

- Extend the Land Trust
- Who was equity consultant? There is no equity in physical form. Equity should be considered at every stage of plan development, not just implementation.
- Evaluate goals of housing affordability (need case studies)
- How to address homelessness
- Support Community Land Trust
- Progress on West Oakland Specific Plan; need to evaluate this plan

Hiroko

- Extend timeline (need two more weeks to give feedback)
- Need a comprehensive list of community benefits
- Need interim measures
- How to implement cultural districts
- EIR: public health and arts should be addressed in the EIR

Unknown Speaker

- Why change height in Old Oakland?

Barbara Leslie (Oakland Chamber)

- Downtown should be used for tax base / jobs
- Should use a “feasible” approach to setting community benefits

- Don't create a "buy up" to get density in exchange for community benefits

Jeff Levin

- Housing affordability / displacement / homelessness
- Mostly the housing-related policy is just a restatement of existing City policy
- No equity lens to the Plan; integrate equity into each section of plan
- Cost burden / displacement / homelessness
- EIR: Boxes not checked for housing and economics
- Affordable housing goals will result in reduction to the percentage of affordable housing downtown
- Condominium conversion policy is out of sync with current proposal by Councilmember Kalb

Chris Buckley

- Expand application of historic building code
- Need clear mechanism for community benefits
- Emeryville – points based
- TDR program
- Analysis of community benefits to figure out what's best for Oakland

Commissioner Shirazi

- Are there indicators for success

Commissioner Fearn

- EIR: why boxes weren't checked?
- Analyzing context for OUSD (schools closing, etc.)?

Commissioner Hegde

- Need more explicit process for implementation
- Language is rather non-committal: "explore", "should"; need stronger language

Commissioner Limon

- Have we looked into Community Benefit Program (points based)?

Commissioner Monchamp

- The proposed 2-3 story scale of industrial buildings seems unrealistic (won't get layered, multiple-story buildings)
- Broadway: ped impacts (Ped Plan); parking look at less parking downtown including Jack London
- Emeryville points - good example
- Need dense enough downtown (jobs/office space)
- Only see 7 office buildings, need denser alternative

Commissioner Hegde

- Plan needs a social and economic analysis (in EIR as well); or a separate analysis; need to quantify and qualify goals and vision for project
- Map cuts Chinatown out; include analysis of Chinatown in EIR
- Incentivize affordability (housing) 2-tiered development system; baseline intensity and bonus for height

Commissioner Shirazi

- Indicators, measures of success, more about gentrification, “beef up” health impact analysis
- Lack of sufficiently addressing homelessness
- Looking at current standards for mobility (not forward thinking)

Commissioner Hegde

- CA Historic Building Code
- TDRs as part of Draft Plan
- Wood Street Equity Assessment

Commissioner Myers

- Extend the deadline to March 11
- Need progress report on other specific plans
- Consider impacts to Chinatown
- Link to Equity Report (score cared: yellow, green, red)
- Community benefits menu needs more work
- Local hire for construction for formerly incarcerated is already policy
- How will you incentivize specific industries that are growing and provide living wage?

Community Advisory Group Meeting #7

February 7, 2019

Transportation & Mobility

- Need a grand vision for Broadway; urban space to pull everyone together
 - Central ideas: connections, Broadway
 - Broadway should be addressed in the goals
- Need a more ambitious M-1 policy
- Support Oakland's role as a regional employment center
- How easy is it to get to/from the ferry terminal?
- Must consider multi-modal connectivity
- Not enough jobs contemplated in the draft
- Must consider and reference in the Plan the future BART alignment
 - I-980 won't be the BART alignment
 - All BART align in the tube for "switching"
- The necklace is a divider – separatist
- What is the social dimension to the green loop?
- What offers places to pause? We need healthy, sustainable communities, not "Big Dig" projects
- Nuance of existing parks and existing streets into public realm; green space and green infrastructure
- Examine key nodes; use to function as outdoor space
- Enhanced street trees / stormwater swales, two-way cycle track on Broadway, bring green space into urban street network
- Too many centers
- Orient streets around green space
- 100% corners; POPO; contiguous plaza and links
- Use green space in differentiated way and program around this
- Need a program of wayfinding through green space
- Stronger language around parking as the lowest priority
- Strengthen curb management (consider business loading)
- Plan for disability community (part of the City of Fremont is designed for the blind)
- Must build up downtown Oakland to strengthen the reverse commute
- Highest and most active use

TDR, Bonus Density, and Community Benefits Session

- Point made that base intensity is already too high
- Affordability is a priority for community benefits
 - Sounds like participants favor inclusionary housing policy
- Desire for conducting a community benefit prioritization working session/group
 - What are the highest priorities in different subareas?

- Downzoning is desired by some members. There's no legal obstacle, but a political challenge.
 - Idea that area could be downzoned in a phased process
 - Resistance to upzoning
- Nadine reminded that you can require community benefits through base requirements too
- Concern that Chinatown wasn't mentioned in the neighborhoods list
- Concern that the plan language isn't very robust. Too much "consider" and "study"
- Need to view TDRs within the context of the larger community benefits program, and then decide if and how TDR could make sense
- There's an idea that these community benefits systems often don't work because the community still comes back for more from developers even if they meet the requirements.
- Decided to create a working subgroup of the CAG to develop community benefits structure.

Affordable Housing Session

- Idea of setting an aspirational affordable housing goal as a target, and maybe including an interim goal
- Concerned about setting a 15-20% goal, because it implies a reduction of % affordable housing that currently exists
- Think about the goals in terms of affordable units that need to be produced per year. This may seem less daunting.
- Idea that the affordable housing goal should be 30-35%
- It makes sense to target affordable housing to transit-rich areas like downtown, even if there are other tradeoffs
- Increase the impact fees
- Make the homelessness Measure of Success explicit about housing the homeless; don't imply removal
- Move away from "research" and "study" types of language and state what will be done
- Plan needs stronger goals and priorities; for example, why not focus on Broadway given its significance?
- Include diverse housing types
- Include a baseline for displacement
- Inclusionary housing discussion:
 - There's an appetite for an inclusionary housing requirement. But, maybe impact fees could instead be raised to encourage use of on-site provision without creating a requirement
 - It's okay to create a horizontal mixed-income neighborhood without an on-site inclusionary requirement
- Deploy public lands and other sites in downtown to contribute to creation of affordable housing
- Need a study of inclusionary policy and fees that will find the sweet spot of maximizing affordable housing revenue to the city while still encouraging overall housing production

- Need indicators that dictate when and why you need to reassess aspects of the plan. Don't wait for a calendar-based revisit. (scenarios: for example if Google develops in San Jose; if West Oakland BART takes off, etc.)
- No passive verbs in plan
- Need a specific value system around Broadway
- Need a specific value system for housing
- Affordable across all types of housing including live-work
- Need affordable commercial
- Must consider the character of the place
- Need both inclusion and impact fee
- Need an industrial zone (not a "maker" zone)

Height/Intensity

- Working group to address height/intensity/zoning
- Existing heights too high; should be set at a point that creates an incentive
- Most affordable housing can't exceed 7 stories; if base is that or above won't go to affordable housing

Encampment Management Team Meeting

FEBRUARY 8, 2019

Attendees: Alan Law (Electrical), Sgt. Jon Rodin (OPD, homeless outreach), Karen Boyd, Dan Wilson (Alameda County vector control), Frank (Public Works), Talia Ruben (Human Services; oversees outreach team); Dario Hunt (Human Services); Felicia Bryant (Fire and medical response), Joanne Karchmer (Mayor's Office); Joe DeVries

Downtown Oakland Specific Plan Notes:

- Highlight workforce development
- Focus housing on people earning 20% AMI or less
- Look at transitional vs. permanent
- Look at infrastructure, include measures of success
- Create a map of encampments and resources
- Process: P³ Policy, Procedure & Protocol meetings Wednesdays 3:30-5:00 – could attend one to talk more about policy

Other Notes:

- Community Cabin sites are at Northgate & Miller, Lake Merritt
- [Unclear where]: Moved people to the south side, cleaned the North side to clear the walkways
- Cars were towed so that lighting could be fixed (cars were not being used as homes)
- Jefferson Square Park cleared (Castro, 7th from JKL to Jefferson)
- RV/Vehicle referral process – referrals are increasing; they have been instructed not to tow but send outreach instead, but outreach has not had much success
- Lakeside Park clearing – they hold shelter beds for them, but nobody accepts; have 10 spots at the Holland exclusively for people from the Lake Merritt community – five from the Lake Merritt Cabin Community and 5 from Lakeside Park. Have done intensive outreach at the lake.
- Discussion of the value of numbers – counted 30 people at Lake Merritt, but that was just in one area, and there are undoubtedly more
- The Holland (641 W Grand, old Julia Morgan hotel) is transitional for singles or couples, just opened 3-4 weeks ago (after the Henry Robinson)
- People prefer to stay in the areas near where they're camped (i.e. they move to the community cabins near where they're camped)
- East 12th: the area under the 12th Street bridge has been closed since October
- There is an ordinance in front of council: can't be within 100' of a play structure without a child
- Mosswood Park has a "temporary unenforced zone" now contained to one area
- Councilmembers are split – some want to designate some parks for permitted camping (McElhaney has resisted, but Kalb and the new councilmembers are interested)

Chamber Economic Development Forum

FEBRUARY 13, 2019

- Consider Asian purchasing power; Asian restaurants in Jack London area; Chinatown is 1950's; if we keep Chinatown as is, it will fade away
- What is the strategy for providing variety of homeownership structures?
- Need to increase density, which will lead to impact fees
 - Higher density in Jack London
 - Not dense enough by half or more
 - Why limit building at all in the core and along the freeway?
- There are more prime sites for office than shown
- No dynamic vision: we have rail, highway and ferries – why not become the downtown for the entire Bay Area region and displace SF over the next 30 years?
- Dynamic vision for public realm missing
- 2 office districts is a bad premise; it should be the entire downtown
- Whole downtown as employment hub (not just two office districts)
- Don't need homogenous heights/districts; we can put tall buildings next to short buildings
- Don't penalize density (by offering increased density in exchange for community benefits); density actually costs more and has to be incentivized

Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission

FEBRUARY 13, 2019

Open Forum Speaker

- 5,000 new housing units near Lincoln Recreation Center with no schools, community centers or parks – they need new recreation resources, and intend to build a new three-story facility

Commissioner Comments

- Related to Community Advisory Group membership – are there any “native” Oaklanders? Do any of the members come from council districts 4, 6 or 7? What are the demographics of the CAG?
- Downtown needs skate rinks, arcades and bowling alleys – community benefit
- Consider bathrooms as community benefits; parks should have bath stations/showering stations
- Speaker likes the plan and feels “heard” specifically with creation of the BAMBD
- Downtown needs to make it easier to permit events: from a person playing saxophone to large parades. How can we make it easier? Work with the merchants
- Speaker likes paseo concepts (these should be requirements)
- Festival streets – how to implement to connect arts and different cultural experiences
- Some of the art should be interactive, able to be climbed on
- What is being done to address schools? Children? Dogs? (to serve all the new units)
- What is the actual plan to connect Brooklyn Basin to Jack London? How to walk from one to another, across the waterfront?
- Likes the graffiti art shown; should have graffiti art walls near waterfront, play structures and skate parks; need “destination tags”
- Plan materials should be in multiple languages (including Spanish and Mandarin) – and communicate through pictures
- Show the Chinatown recommendations from the LMSAP along with everything else
- Both sides of Broadway are a mess at 12th due to construction – need to coordinate it
- What are the long-term goals to obtain park space? How to ensure developers don’t “opt out” of providing parks and community benefits?
- How does the plan incorporate all the plans and programs from other departments?
- Will there be a certain kind of office? Specifically, what will be breakdown between community-serving non-profits vs. tech?
- Retain residents who have been here: avoid green gentrification
- What will be the affordable housing breakdown? Consider that the AMI is very high here
- Need housing affordable to someone with just enough income to not qualify for subsidies/Section 8, but who still can’t afford average rent
- Need a draw to get out and walk the business strip, especially on the weekends; good to have some chain retail and “show room” stores (where the merchandise is bought online, but sampled in person) to anchor “mom and pop” stores
- What is the process to update the specific plan?
- Who will maintain greenspace?

- What are the culturally diverse ways of creating/designing parks? (Multi-generational, etc.)
- How are you disseminating info about these types of meetings? Need to put flyers at recreation centers, knock on doors

Public Speakers

- Where does Lake Merritt Station Area Plan stand right now?
- Lincoln Rec center will be affected by all the new units, and it's already overutilized
- Want a 3-story Lincoln Recreation Center
- How to connect new parks to existing parks? Demand will grow
- What is plan for resilience (rising water)?
- Like the "green loop"

Friends of Lincoln Square Park

- 96% of new units being built now are market rate (rent: \$4,800 per month)
- There is too much focus on open space and nature; no mention of programming and recreation – this is oversight of Preliminary Draft Plan, and this is where the cultural aspects happen
- We need recreation centers (potentially including showering facilities)
- Lincoln Recreation Center is the only public recreation center in downtown
- Plan should acknowledge existing public recreation centers and need to accommodate growth/modernization
- Chinatown parks serve everyone in the downtown and need to benefit from the resources of the plan
- Prioritize investment in existing parks and facilities (that are already serving existing residents, as an antithesis to green gentrification)
- Don't prioritize the "Green Loop"
- Prioritize places people are already enjoying
- Plan needs to address Lincoln Recreation Center, as well as other CIP priorities
- Need bigger capital investment on existing resources
- Include Chinatown future development in sketch-up graphic

Jack London Business Improvement District

FEBRUARY 19, 2019 *Notes Prepared by the Jack London Business Improvement District

Open Space

- More open space, and most importantly access to it, would be a valuable amenity to health and quality of life for Oaklanders. The plan recognizes this, that's a good thing.
- Webster Green as an improved open public space features prominently. That's a good thing. The plan should explore mechanisms to achieve it.
- Estuary Park redesign is underway, and the plan should support connections and access to it and all of the waterfront open space.

Economic Opportunity

- The plan has taken a significant and impressive approach in equity and inclusion. This is crucial and something we can be proud of.
- The plan illustrations show predominantly small scale, predominantly residential development in Jack London. The plan should consider larger office or bigger industrial/maker spaces here. Jack London is a proven desirable office sub-market. We recommend that the plan to consider office priority sites within Jack London.
- We recommend better definition and adaptability in a plan for ground floor uses as supply of retail space increases to avoid over-supply and vacancies.

Housing

- The plan shows an increased residential density on the East side of the District, where housing is already being developed. While this makes sense, we recommend that the plan explore housing density near the proposed Howard Terminal/A's Ballpark. In general, the height illustrated in Jack London seems unnecessarily smaller in scale.

Mobility and Accessibility

- Accessibility is crucial for Jack London, and we emphasize the importance of improving the access between Jack London Waterfront and the rest of Downtown through major underpass improvements.
- We question curbside parking in Downtown Oakland, apart from deliveries and loading necessary for ground floor commercial use. Personal car ownership and use is declining, and the Plan should be forward thinking and aspirational. Streets should be great, safe places accommodating our diverse modes of mobility—walking, scooting, biking, riding transit—with excellent visual and physical access, and parked vehicles seems antiquated and out of alignment with this Plan goal. Downtown streets are simply too important and must serve everyone.

Culture Keeping

- The Plan should re-visit uses and height limits associated with proposed "Jack London Maker District" west of Broadway. There is no reason maker space should not co-exist with higher height limits

- Consider architectural constraints for buildings along 3rd Street and suitability for industrial/maker space. Many 3rd street buildings are at rail height.
- If there is a Ballpark on the waterfront, the Plan should consider whether a Maker District should and can dominate that District.

What's Missing

- The A's Stadium at Howard Terminal should be part of the Planning Process. Adjacent uses, infrastructure, and access should support this potentially transformative major development.
- Jack London's Wholesale Produce District seems forgotten about.. If it is a use that is desired to be protected, the Plan should explore mechanisms to protect and subsidize the continued historic use. If not, solving the question of long term relocation, and what replaces it is an opportunity and should be explored.
- Both Office and Housing illustrations seem to suggest mid-rise and lower density, not high rise, but Jack London is an appropriate place for high rise.
- Train Quiet Zone should be explicitly recommended. Bike and pedestrian improvements on Embarcadero are important but not enough. The economic opportunity of the Train Quiet Zone infrastructure improvement is significant.
- There is low height on Broadway to protect historic Buildings, however height limits seem odd in the District (figure LU 11 pg. 284)
- Sea Level Rise considerations seem inconsistent: sea-level rise impact zones defined, but then planned development is shown in those zones, is that realistic?
- A plan to engage the County, CalTrans or Union Pacific for Opportunity Sites.

Chinatown Coalition Stakeholder Group Meeting

FEBRUARY 20, 2019

- How can the City integrate the work of the Lake Merritt Station Area Plan into the Downtown Plan?
- The Draft Downtown Plan should put all community-desired benefits out there, not just things with identified funding sources
- In the Lake Merritt Station Area Plan, Chinatown Coalition had to fight with staff to get benefits in the plan (because staff wanted everything to have an identified funding source)
- Downtown Plan felt different; City was in an economic upswing and this time there were grandiose visions of, for example, removal of the I-980 (when during the Lake Merritt Station Area Plan process, the community was discouraged from visionary ideas because of the economic climate of the time)
- The boundaries of the Lake Merritt Station Area Plan are being chipped away at (Laney College area/Victory Court)
- Chinatown is integral to downtown and feels excluded (left out from Figure LU-12, etc.)
- Want Chinatown covered in the EIR
- Want list of community benefits from Lake Merritt Station Area Plan included in downtown plan implementation chapter
- Where is the traffic study for downtown (that was supposed to be accomplished in the Downtown Circulation Study)
- Why is 2-way conversion not a priority for Webster? It should be, Harrison St. and 10th St. too.
- No bike lanes through the heart of Chinatown
- No bike lanes on 7th, 8th or 9th Streets
- Chinatown needs to provide input on Bike Plan update
- Must consider commercial traffic loading/unloading (schools, businesses, medical facilities rely on loading zones; thus no bike lanes)
- Prefer 10th Street and 14th Street for bike lanes
- Unite Chinatown and Jack London (dramatically improve freeway underpasses); should have parking under freeways (similar to Rockridge)
- The downtown is over-zoned; there is no way to get community's aspirations
- Community benefits should be conditions of development
- A traffic study evaluating the impacts of development in Alameda is needed

Planning Commission – Continuation

FEBRUARY 20, 2019

PUBLIC COMMENT

Robert Ogilvie (SPUR)

- The PDP is underselling density (we could be like Portland or Denver), and the EIR should study much more density. Need to be more of a regional business center; too much residential is being built for SF commuters

Mark Bruceman?:

- wants view corridors to protect views of downtown across Lake Merritt (new 1314 Franklin will cover the view of the Tribune Tower) – this is part of a grand solar monument that the transcendentalists and freemasons put in place [FYI: https://localwiki.org/oakland/Oakland%27s_Downtown_Equinox_Observatory]

Ed McFarland (JRDV):

- remarkable draft with interesting complexity, but there are three foundational gaps: 1) Density is missing; we need commercial density for a long-term tax base, driving jobs and housing; 2) Workplaces overwhelm all other uses in community benefit, but the plan has only allocated 12% to commercial; 3) Feasibility of development

Adam Simons, Schnitzer Steel:

- concerned about residential development at the periphery of 3rd Street corridor; we have a working waterfront that is growing; this could create conflicts and drive out industrial; please study these conflicts in EIR

Peter Birkholtz (LPAB & AGD):

- want to push comment deadline to 3/4/19; why is the AGD boundary so big in Appendix B?; retain light industrial zone – height is a character-defining feature; they received pushback from Planning on creating interim regulations; requesting that no CUPs be issued until the plan is adopted

Todd David (Bay Area Housing):

- this is an opportunity to position Oakland as a jobs/housing center; be bold – don't limit development in the EIR, learn from the Central SOMA plan, where they've already maxed out the development allowed by their EIR

Tim Frank (Center for Sustainable Neighborhoods):

- PDP reflects considerable detail to specific neighborhoods; need to create an implementable plan – currently don't have the construction workforce to build it, so need a workforce development element to the plan

Ronnie Turner (developer):

- the draft has been a robust exercise that he's excited about; more density downtown will lead to more affordability; less restrictions will lead to continuing the economic boom

Jeff Levin (EBHO):

- Planning Commission should provide direction to staff; EIR scope should cover economic and jobs; EIR should include socioeconomic analysis (like that done for the Wood Street project) and health impact assessment, including potential for displacement; housing targets are too low

Zach Murray (OakCLT):

- Plan is partly about education: this is a missed opportunity to present options; density doesn't improve affordability (mention of a study); policies in draft are status quo, which isn't working; "West of San Pablo" – last area of low-income and African American residents in the downtown – who asked them about calling it that? – should use density to leverage opportunity there

Seth (local developer):

- Appreciates the many iterations, but it needs to be more ambitious: the density is missing in office by about 50-100% and housing by about 25%

Victor Parr? (CA District Council of Labor):

- EIR scope: how will this impact industrial jobs?

Greg McConnell (Jobs & Housing Coalition):

- 20 years ago, no one knew we'd have this kind of development; need to plan for greater density and opportunity

Charlie Ream (BART):

- project has done tremendous outreach; plan comes at a crucial moment with the opportunity to incentivize and catalyze growth in the Broadway corridor and take advantage of the second transbay tube

Katherine Sturbens (Friends of the Oakland Public Library):

- Alarmed no mention was made of libraries, including a new main library; this is a once in a generation opportunity for a new main library

Steve Lowe (West Oakland Commerce Association & Jack London):

- DOSP should connect with WOSP; provide more specific planning for lower Broadway; BART has refused to look at making the Y there a BART stop, but it would be a great location; it's flanked by surplus County buildings, and needs something to give it a new life

Unknown Speaker

- Support the pipeline of skilled workers; require local contractors

Linda Hausrath (Economics):

- Downtown is the economic engine of the city; plan shows 8:1 ratio of housing: office; we can include more office but still provide the same amount of housing by building more densely

Barbara Leslie (Metro Chamber):

- Too much energy into splitting up the pie, not growing the pie; people conflate density with the hot market and causing the housing crisis; what led us to the current situation is underbuilding and undertraining our workforce

Christopher Buckley (OHA):

- Keep building heights in line with the existing heights in historic areas; the PDP is sketchy regarding density; EIR should consider impacts on historic properties and historic areas; consider studying going back to pre-2009 zoning as one of the EIR alternatives; need to include design guidelines to create consistency

COMMISSIONERS

Shirazi:

- homelessness; any updates?

Monchamp:

- BART's Oakland stations are too far apart (except for 12th and 19th), particularly compared to San Francisco's: we need a Jack London BART station, and should study this separate from the second transbay tube, which may never happen (i.e. a station on the existing BART lines)

Charlie Ream:

- a study is beginning on the second tube, but a goal of the second tube would be to connect to Capitol Corridor

Hegde:

- Plan has done some deep work. How will the community benefit checklist be created? Will the PC have input into the scope for the study?; raise affordable housing targets; include public health assessment as part of CEQA; look at displacement as part of CEQA; include an alternative in the EIR to increase density

Shirazi:

- Appreciates multiple equity consultants; likes workforce: include this as a goal; highlight equity up front; study increased density in conjunction with displacement; mobility and accessibility in the future: use outcome-driven methods and different modes; given the

ongoing discussion regarding a BART station, add something to the plan about connecting downtown to Jack London, West Oakland and East Oakland; yes, include mention of libraries; land use section needs more about activating public spaces

Manus:

- Concerned that too many issues have been raised tonight and there's not enough time; BART is not the solution; there are plenty of good and bad examples in the Bay Area of community benefits programs: use those rather than starting from scratch

Limon:

- Acknowledged the insane schedule staff is keeping; p. 283 shows opportunities for increased bonus density; has overwhelming support for being bolder in increasing height/density; opportunity in sites LU-12: can we expand this?

Shirazi:

- Lots of work in implementation section; convert the measures of success into performance indicators with the analysis method described

Monchamp:

- BART is outside our jurisdiction but planning for it isn't; consider looking at a BART station in Jack London as an EIR alternative; continue thinking about connectivity with the surrounding neighborhoods – environmental impacts is one way to look at it; agrees that we need more office than shown in the map on page 288; we need enough density for the future and we need people to use density bonuses – study this balance; refer to the BVSP retail plan for possible strategies; address homelessness

Fearn:

- Proposes scheduling a PC session in July about implementation; this should be a vision document – look at the regional plans – needs to be transformative; supports increased office, but being nuanced with the zoning; likes the anti-aggregation measures in the back of the PDP – fears that if we steer toward aggregation we will lose ownership opportunities for local, small-scale developers

Manus

- worried about time; wants to have commission weigh in regularly (AP suggested a working session that would be less of a formal hearing but noticed as a special hearing)

Institutions Stakeholder Meeting

FEBRUARY 21, 2019

Institutions Represented: Alameda County, Laney College, Oakland Housing Authority

- Consider incentives for student housing (many Laney students are housing insecure/homeless/living in cars)
- Must strike the right balance for new jobs and housing (so that workers have a place to live)
- Need sufficient housing
- Will there be a big push for Alameda County sites and Policy Department sites near I-880?
- How does the Downtown Plan intersect with the Lake Merritt Station Area Plan?
- There was a charrette for the Museum to open the museum up to the neighborhood (10th Street/Fallon Street corridor) (redo sidewalks, connections to open space, etc.); should consult the findings of this effort
- Regarding bike lanes – what about delivery trucks? (space for loading; bike lanes interfere with this)
- Laney is looking for new R+D / maker space (training facilities)
- Oakland Housing Authority wants more intensity near Harrison St./ 15th St./19th St.
- Laney Parking Lot Development Feedback
 - Would likely face pushback from environmentalists (from development near the Lake Merritt Channel)
 - Housing at the parking lot could be a good thing (would need mixed use to provide the laboratory/practical application/incubator space)
 - Would need public/private partnership
 - Concern about gentrification
 - Laney and parking lot are within an Opportunity Zone, any implications?
 - Check with Facilities Planning Committee
- Page 92: manufacturing is missing from each of the existing or future key sectors; training in this field is required by the regional community college consortium and the California Community College Chancellor's Office
- Laney is interested in partnering with the city and private enterprise to ensure students are trained in the employment sectors targeted for expansion
- Alameda County is scheduled to have its real estate master plan by 2019

SPUR Board Policy Committee

FEBRUARY 22, 2019

City: Joanna, Ed, Bill. SPUR: Elnora Robert Williams, Mull?, Morten, Robert Ogilvie, Egon Terplan, Sarah Karlinsky, Adam Goldenberg, Dahlia Chazan, Paul (Signature), Lynette Dias, Brian Francis, Louis, Josh Simon

Economic Opportunity

- What about industries that can thrive downtown, not just middle wage industries?
- How many square feet are projected on the office priority sites? It doesn't look like the PDP has protected enough commercial
- What should the split be with office and residential? 70/30?
- What's the methodology used to get to the 17million square feet?
- Allowing residential may not be an incentive for developers to build office
- Don't just fiscalize land use (i.e. look at the highest revenue production); if you don't have residential, you don't get retail

Laney College

- facilities master plan calls for mixed use already. Make sure you review it.

Sarah Karlinsky

- Have you downzoned? Ed: there are no areas where we've downzoned, just some refinements around the Art & Garage District
- Change the color scheme on the intensity map to be less confusing – show no color at all for the LMSAP
- Density Bonus: don't structure the community benefits program this way; it's saying that it's okay if people underbuild and don't provide benefits – it's a lose-lose scenario: need minimum performance standards (including intensity)

Louis

- Look at SOMA plan – need innovation space and Class C space, not just class A office

Morten Jensen:

- Broadway should be a focus; include the second BART crossing; disparities should include transit; downtown is the epicenter of rail and transit for the East Bay

Josh Simon

- There's a danger when we change zoning heights, if the value of the change doesn't get us what we want
- Can't do affordable housing any higher than 7 stories, so need to incentivize anything over 75 feet. Affordable housing developers will be building the same 7-story building anywhere in the city

- Healthy neighborhoods are diverse, with mixed-income buildings; questions assumption that everything needs to be tall

Morten:

- Yes, it should be mixed, but downtown is different from any neighborhood

Dahlia:

- Plan needs to talk about Oakland as the real center of the East Bay's transit; use it for placemaking and create a transit hub, like Salesforce in SF or Diridon in San Jose
- Prioritize jobs more: the axonometric (SketchUp) shows lots of residential that should be office

Louis:

- What is the next economy?

Elnora:

- What is the legacy we're leaving? The PDP has all the t's crossed, but what about inspirational and profound ideas? How do we create centers of excellence around x and y?

Egon:

- What is the big idea of downtown? Sure, Lake Merritt and Broadway are good, but what's unique or greater than the sum of its parts? (example: San Jose's paseos)

Bill:

- What cities hit that inspirational success, they've usually made some physical move that represents a set of values and hits several goals

Egon:

- 17million square feet would double what we have now and put downtown at the scale of something like downtown Dallas; it would be half the size of downtown San Francisco
- What are the surrounding neighborhoods going to provide in terms of new housing? This should be clear in the plan as well – how the other neighborhoods support downtown in being downtown

Adam

- The size of the lot is very relevant to office; need to put the right things on the right sized lots – s Oakland's superblocks have been done poorly
- The PDP is both car-friendly and assumes that the car will stay the way it is
- Bill: Need to not be overly deterministic in 20 years allow flexibility and incremental changes

Bill:

- there are plenty of cities that are vibrant and have character with low heights (Washington, D.C., Paris, etc.)

Morten:

- Start with a moral imperative to set the tone (i.e. SF did “SF is one of the world’s great cities”); something like “this is the economic and cultural center for the most diverse people in the world” – there’s no other place like this – it should be a mini chapter

Bill:

- Portland’s plan is easy to understand and recognized (everyone can see Mt. Hood, everyone can walk safely to school)
- Problem-solver next week: Keep the presentation small; Helen will ask Robert to send bullet points of what to focus on; if we want to send any materials (like slides) ahead of time, Helen will send out

Bicyclist & Pedestrian Advisory Commission

FEBRUARY 21, 2019

**These meeting minutes are in draft form and pending approval as of March 08*

Speakers other than commissioners: Hank Phan, Sarah Fine, Kent Lewandowski, Hank Phan, Jayne Chang, Scott Blanks

- Since the Lake Merritt Station Area Plan was already adopted, the Downtown Specific Plan does not study that area but does bring recommendations for the Chinatown area on things like park improvements, community center needs, and bicyclist/pedestrian improvements into the Downtown Specific Plan section on implementation. From a transportation perspective, Chinatown was included as part of the Downtown Specific Plan.
- While the City is trying to leverage money coming from outside developers to achieve greater goals, many of the projects listed in the Plan can be done with independent funding sources like grants.
- The City is considering raising the transportation impact fee which currently covers CEQA impacts but no actual improvements. With an enhanced impact fee, the City can use the money to pay for transportation projects as they see fit.
- It is important to connect Downtown with the water given there is a freeway in the way. The City is looking at ways to use money from the enhanced impact fee or incentivizing developments to meet their public art requirement to make underpass improvements.
- The two-way street conversion priorities were chosen by OakDOT and were identified for their potential to make significant complete street improvements to the streets since doing two-way conversions are very expensive and require replacing all the traffic signals.
- While the Plan discusses removing Interstate 980 to enhance the connection between downtown and West Oakland it is too big of a project to be within the scope of the Environmental Impact Report and will need its own project as a follow up to the Downtown Specific Plan.
- One way streets make some bicyclists feel more comfortable especially for left turns.
- Scooters are mentioned in the plan but there are no detailed recommendations because the transportation scope was done before the scooters arrived in Oakland. The plan will add information on scooters in the next six months, but their impact should be studied separately.
- The Planning Department is working with the Mayor's Commission on Persons with Disabilities to include specific recommendations on disability access/accessibility over the next six months.

Oakland Food Policy Council

FEBRUARY 21, 2019

Downtown Plan – Preliminary Draft Plan was part of the group’s larger agenda

- There has been an increase in the homeless population
- What is “affordable” and for whom?
- Santa Rosa installed solar power BBQ grills in their public parks
- Are there provisions for procurement policies for local businesses/construction?
- Does the plan account for the City’s Healthy Development guidelines?
- Need more vibrancy downtown: retail/restaurants, etc.
- Office areas are dead after 5pm
- Need nightlife – activities/events at night
- Has staff been collaborating with the Department of Race & Equity?
- Need a grocery store downtown (and other neighborhood serving uses)
- Check out [Oakland Releaf](#)
- Need to have equity in public works projects (building of streets/sewers, etc.)
- Jobs at Howard Terminal should be more than just low wage service jobs
- Strengthen collaborative efforts for pipelines to jobs, etc. Minneapolis named racism as the structural barrier to address in all of its public policy.
- In San Francisco, the [South of Market Stabilization Committee](#) would be a good group to collaborate with
- Urban Farm at Laney College provides space for resettled refugees

Transportation Technical Advisory Committee

FEBRUARY 22, 2019

Comments by Agenda Items

1. Introductions (5 min)
2. Preliminary Draft Plan Overview (10 min)
3. Mobility and Accessibility Chapter
 - Central Idea (5 min)
 - Question about how we are collecting and using public feedback – thinks that downtown is extremely transit friendly and isn't so sure we should spend to much focus on accommodating cars downtown
 - Chinatown wants to avoid drive-through traffic – we need to ensure Broadway, or other potential projects, don't divert more cars through Chinatown
 - Measures of Success (10 min)
 - Mobility Framework (for each section below, we would present the slides and invite discussion for each slide with timekeeper to make sure we get to each topic below)
 - Mobility Maps (20)
 1. Why do we show the “Going Big On Broadway” with a two-way cycle track in the section drawing – but we don't support this on any of the other bike maps?
 2. Establishing modal priorities is the best thing that a plan like this can do
 3. Mentioned BART looking at a second tube crossing – think we can just mention this as a policy recommendation, study the location options for a second tube crossing and BART station in downtown
 - Mobility Focus Corridors (20 min)
 - Supportive Policies (20 min)
 1. Rename bike lanes, mobility lanes to incorporate scooters too
 2. Add some policy about smarter curbside management
 3. Recommendation to digitize transportation maps internally to better manage curbs, transit/mobility regulations, parking, etc.
 4. Recognize that Howard Terminal and nearby freight train tracks will not be an easy place to transform into walkable pedestrian, especially with A's stadium proposal – it will be challenging to get people across those tracks

Advocacy

- Census shows many zero-car households; we need to provide services to these people
- Need to paint a picture of how people are already being impacted negatively by the car-dominated system; the baseline that the car proponents are using is false. Address their *concerns* rather than going with their proposed solutions
- City needs to take leadership role on this

Measures of success

- Add transit mode share
- Cost measure seems to put onus on agencies to cover cost
- Transportation demand management – include transportation impact
- Use “lifeline measures of service” – the official definition
- Bus-only lanes improve speed and reliability, but not frequency; these should be separate measures
- Measure the disparity between driving and transit travel time
- Connectivity and integration
- Fare: the reduced fare measure could be met with a little free shuttle from a housing project, but that isn’t what we want – goal should just be “Affordable AC Transit and BART”
- Include bus and train in mode share – yes, this info is available disaggregated by race
- Oakland has a strong commute trip transit share – goal should be to maintain and build on this
- There’s a discrepancy between the infographic and p.138 (the infographic is incorrect)
- Include ferry as well – ferry is reversing directions Oak-Alameda, so commute will go from 35 to 20 minutes, which improves options and improves access from Alameda to Oakland
- Measures should be consistent with Census data
- Add “travel speeds” – reduce severe and fatal injuries for *all* collisions, not just bike and pedestrian (slowing traffic is a goal too)

BART

- Fare/integration is a regional agency issue, not in DOSP scope
- Transit impact fees
- Oak DOT: we’re tracking how many people are getting Easy Passes

Chinatown:

- It’s fair for people to say, “What will the diversion rates be?” – that’s a reasonable concern
- 9th Street – Chinatown doesn’t want reduction of lanes because of double-parking
- Chinatown supports the first parking pilot
- If at any point we’re not giving Chinatown what they’ve asked for, need to clearly explain why

Broadway:

- Vision network is good, but conflicts with the two-way cycle track shown on p. 17
- You can’t divert bike traffic off main thoroughfares to make them transit only – see Mission & Valencia; people will ride in the red lanes if they’re there. People will want to ride on Broadway
- Need bike connections to the BART symbols on the map (maybe they’re there, but it’s not clear)
- Broadway connects 12th Street BART with the train and ferry – good bus service is the connection and the whole region depends on it

Concepts:

- Make clear that these are concepts, not final plans – convey that there will be follow-up studies
- Well-done: defining model priorities is the most important thing (like the triplets)
- Show hierarchy of needs and which streets prioritize what, rather than cross sections
- Don't put the second transbay tube on the map, but do address it

Other

- Acknowledge the need for rail capacity
- Actively create pilots to respond to new technology
- "Mobility lanes," not just bikes – emphasize that they help getting scooters off the sidewalks
- M-3.5 serve needs of residents, and diverse mobility needs
- Digitize curb spaces to change and track use of curbs – see LA mobility data standards; need clear rules and our own tracking, not relying on private companies (i.e. scooters) to track
- A's stadium – potential conflict with freight

Art + Garage District Stakeholder Meeting

FEBRUARY 25, 2019

CONCERNS

Arts as Critical to Sustainability of Oakland's Community and Cultural Diversity

- Oakland is known for its Black culture
- There is a lot of segregation in the arts community; no one talks about it
- Arts and Culture should be addressed throughout the plan
- The Planning & Building Department's future Cultural Strategist (temporary position) should help convene artists around this topic

Artist Displacement

- Cannabis is out-competing arts- and artisan-related uses
- Oakland artists are being displaced by San Francisco artists
- Significant displacement of artists in the Uptown area (from building owners deciding to "go in a different direction" (such as creative office, co-working space)
- No protection for artists

Community Benefit Agreements

- Does the planning department get copies of the Community Benefits Agreements that are being negotiated case-by-case in the downtown now?
- Can the pro-formas used for justifying developers requests for increases in height be made public?
- The existing process is not transparent and there is no accountability or follow through on CBAs

Housing

- Market rate and affordable housing developers should be included in the same meeting (do not hold separate meetings for each of these groups)
- Why can't vacant housing be used as temporary housing for the thousands of unhoused people forced to live on the streets?
- How is the plan addressing homelessness (the majority of whom are African American)?
- Rather than introducing housing in the 25th Street area, should figure out how to keep what's there
- The problem with inclusionary housing is that it goes to people with higher incomes (see San Francisco); need to make sure enough is targeted at the <30% AMI population

Plan Outreach/Community Engagement

- The Preliminary Draft Plan reports mostly white, highly educated people attended the February 2018 community workshops
- The team should reach out to unhoused residents, the majority of whom are African American
- Can the Art Murmur help convene these meetings?

Interim Measures

- There is significant development happening now. How can the plan advance interim measures that could be test cases?
 - Have a list of artists seeking space that could fill ground floor uses
 - Have a list of community-desired benefits for developers to provide

Importance of Ownership

- Models of ownership for both housing and commercial space is critical to ensure sustainability

Next Steps

- Group requested ongoing Art + Garage district-focused meetings
- Culture districts working group (to advance concept of cultural districts) should also happen
- Participants at future meetings should convey their space needs

Market-Rate Developers Stakeholder Meeting

FEBRUARY 26, 2019

- Study the option for inclusionary housing policy
- Developers need streamlined approval process
- Unlimited height removes City's leverage to incentivize community benefits
- Question about whether increased development intensity (height/density) should be a *requirement* or a *voluntary* program
- Concern about an incentive program resulting in low scale buildings because developers will opt out of providing community benefits and just use state density bonus and build at a lower scale
- If there was unlimited height, City could permit doubled density in exchange for community benefits + streamlined review
- CEQA should address streamlining future projects
- Redevelopment of City Center seems unlikely
- Office development contributes more to City budget
- Impact fees are a good tool to contribute to affordable housing production
- Majority of area near San Pablo is too low-scale and under-planned; need higher heights
- Few lenders will finance a housing/office tower development (in Oakland or in the rest of the country); so, should not show those types of mixes (Figure LU-12)
- The development program sketch up model (Figure LU-12) is not aligned to the proposed intensity areas (LU-11b)
- Downtown has unique transportation assets and City should have more density near transit
- Why restrict ground floor bars/entertainment?
- What is meant by arts uses being "outcompeted" by other uses? Arts uses require foot traffic that bars/restaurants bring
- Who will benefit from zoning restrictions on bars/restaurants?
- If you can't lease the space (because zoning has limited the types of uses permitted), then will the building be subject to the vacant parcel tax?
- Need credit enhancements ("affirmative" enhancements) to rent space to artists
- City needs to carefully consider regulatory changes
- What about requiring a Conditional Use Permit for non-arts uses instead of prohibiting bars/restaurants? Conditional Use Permit should expire when the business closes
- The mix of uses (not just artists) made Uptown successful
- The changes to the Land Use Classifications to update arts-related uses is a good idea
- Need zoning for creative arts uses (distinguished from retail)
- The City's existing Public Art requirement is not necessarily resulting in great art projects (some are a mis-match to the project)
- Need to look at tax elements such as Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District to target resources to small businesses rather than blanket exclusions/prohibitions on competing uses
- Master Lease program is good in theory (there are functional issues in Oakland); needs more work to figure out the details

- City should not be involved in Master Lease Program (becomes too political; places barriers on business); an intermediary non-profit should handle the program
- Zoning regulations are updated too slowly to regulate uses; why should we try to protect arts uses? should just let the market dictate what happens; arts in Uptown were not always there
- We should encourage great buildings and have developers build out great ground floor spaces (that would be universal – work no matter what business inhabits them)
- We're behind the times because we require CUP
- If you try to “steer” market through zoning prohibitions, should have periodic feedback loops
- [SF Prop M](#) is a case in point in regulation (passed by ballot measure) that caps the annual amount of office development and is up for reconsideration

Affordable Housing Developer's Stakeholder Meeting

FEBRUARY 26, 2019

- Impact Fee calculation needs an asterisk or footnote on methodology
 - What are its assumptions and baselines
 - Estimate doesn't account for city's share of subsidy nor developers who opt out of fee
- Need to periodically recalculate impact fee as development occurs in real-time
- How are we prioritizing neighborhoods that get the most NOFA funding?
- Need to be transparent about the cost to build housing
- Estimated \$100-150k per unit of local subsidy; Downtown Plan should address how to cover that gap
- Feasibility analysis is more important than a nexus study
- Bring market rate and affordable housing developers to the same table
- NOFAs should award points to less-desirable projects
- Policy H-1.5: Regarding EIFDs, how do we create a transparent tool for community benefits? County and City should combine increment
- BART and AC Transit should give up their increment (Special District) for affordable housing. This would require an "opt-in" agreement from other taxing entities.
- This holds potential to build citywide coalition
- 50-50 city-county share of affordable housing
- Public sector is increasing value of land; a mechanism to capture that value should be in place (Impact fees is also value capture mechanism)
- Retention/preservation vs. production; focus should be on retention and preservation; waive transfer tax and business tax as one example to support retention/preservation of existing housing.
- DSP induces more commercial development which doesn't pay impact fee
- Difficult to see which options work when unclear what the need is
- There is interest in ownership opportunities and long-term preservation; gap still needs to be identified.
- Re capturing value: can parcels closest to the BART stations be held to a higher standard than parcels farther away?
- Chinatown has effectively demonstrated that inclusionary housing is possible
- Adjacent site incentive to encourage social cohesion between buildings (retail)
- Need to rethink application of density bonus program whereby affordable units can be offsite/adjacent rather than within the market-rate development
- Where's the "missing middle" (80% - 120% AMI) in all this?
- "Protect, Produce, Preserve"
- Policy H-2.1: Re Purchase and Rehab; mix of city and private non-profit developers acquire and rehab SROs
- To be effective, collaborate with Oakland Housing Authority to secure Section 8 vouchers and target adequate supportive services through Alameda County. Supportive service contracts typically do not go longer than 1 year.

- Other non-conventional models of assuming ownership of SROs might include co-ops or land trusts
- Missed opportunity: MacArthur Motel at Oak/11th Streets slated for demo
- Pre-designate which buildings are eligible for SRO
 - Need to know what it takes to rehabilitate/preserve
- Need policy for 1:1 replacement for any demolished building and other demolition protections, e.g., owners prohibited from taking advantage of bonus incentive program.
- Either 1:1 replacement OR no bonus incentive
- Demo findings should prevent conversion of lower-end housing
- *City should be responsible for notifying affordable housing developers when demolition or SRO conversions are happening
- Policy H-2.10: Re homeownership opportunities; first time homebuyer mortgage assistance program requires participant to be Oakland resident or employee
- Need to add legacy residents for return—how does the city ensure broader application pool?
- If I-980 ever demolished, place parcels in a land trust and consider reparations; needs a specific acknowledgement
- Return and re-populate downtown; revenue generated downtown should be targeted for East Oakland. Downtown is creating value for public
- “Right of Return” Ordinance should be extended to include acquisition and rehabilitation of buildings with income-restricted units

Plan Integration

- Address Chinatown on DOSP and its share of any tax increment
- Policies in place will impact adjacent neighborhoods, even if not within DOSP boundaries
- Equity indicators in West Oakland Specific Plan (WOSP) should be considered in the DOSP.
- DOSP should integrate with neighboring plans (West Oakland Specific Plan, Broadway-Valdez Specific Plan, Lake Merritt Station Area Plan)

Additional Comments from Brian Warwick, Oakland HCD:

- Jeff Levin made the point, not mentioned in the notes, that a lot of the policies say vague things like “explore xxx policy.” I agree that a lot of these policy goals seem very preliminary and think it makes more sense to do more of the study/exploration work prior to release so as to set more tangible next steps in the document.
- The notes say “pre-designate which buildings are eligible for SRO.” To clarify, the comment was that we should work with the Oakland Housing Authority to see if they can pre-designate MTW funds to SROs that enter into an affordability agreement. Such an assurance by the Housing Authority will help affordable developers underwrite the purchase and rehabilitation of these buildings. Without this guarantee, these acquisitions are much riskier, as they typically require an ongoing operating subsidy in order to pencil out.

- Regarding policy H-2.10 (“Explore legally compliant ways of targeting homeownership resources to individuals or groups harmed by discriminatory housing policies”): To Jeff Levin’s point above, I think we can flesh this policy out a little more prior to releasing the document. I would expand this to include rental housing, not just homeownership. The city already has a live/work preference for all affordable housing we help fund. We also have Affirmative Fair Housing marketing guidelines and review the marketing plans of affordable developments to ensure they reach various racial and ethnic groups. We could potentially add a “legacy resident” preference, which [Portland](#) has done. I think the next steps would be thinking about the practical steps that would be involved with implementing this—how applicants could go about proving that they (or their parents or grandparents) were harmed by redlining or displaced due to urban renewal. (Perhaps we could identify a nonprofit partner to help do this outreach and documentation work.) I think it’s also worth being honest about the numbers involved—tens of thousands of people were harmed by redlining and urban renewal, whereas down payment assistance might benefit a few dozen families a year.
- Regarding the discussion around various land value recapture schemes, I think it’s worth noting in the Plan that Property Taxes are the original land value recapture mechanism, and that we are constrained by Prop 13 from capturing the value created by rezonings and infrastructure improvements. If Prop 13 is reformed, we could recapture this value in a much more straightforward way. This doesn’t change the practical considerations of what to do, but it situates our city in the context of statewide policy issues, and may help frame the conversation going forward.
- One goal that we have discussed in HCD is implementing a centralized online waitlist for affordable housing, similar to what [SF has](#). Some of these policy goals around preferences for specific demographic groups would be much easier to implement with a centralized waitlist. A centralized waitlist would also enable us to collect a lot of useful data about who is applying for affordable housing. (Race, gender, income, household size, etc.) This might enable us to further our work in terms of researching and addressing race & equity goals. Throwing this out there because we’ll be more likely to actually implement it if it’s integrated into our policy documents.

Chinatown Chamber

FEBRUARY 26, 201

Transportation

- Do all options include dedicated bike lanes?
- What is bike population in Oakland?
- Bike will kill livelihood of small business (dependent on delivery) – need to preserve
- Don't think bike lanes are good; disconnect b/w curb access and curb use (Franklin St. rendering); problem with 2-way conversion
- What is the plan for loading/drop off for seniors?
- Traffic study needs to consider Chinatown
- Good traffic/bad traffic
- Safety is a big issue
- 2-way conversion (concern over road diet)
- If one way, will there be room for emergency vehicles?
- Ped scramble to address safety
- How will scrambles change if 2-way?
- Chinatown is participating in the parking pilot program
- Don't want changes to Broadway to impact Chinatown
- Without parking businesses relocate; easier to park and do business
- Double parking is a problem; narrower streets will only worsen this
- Chinatown gets deliveries around the clock; will leave some businesses out

Underpasses

- Haven't seen parks work in underpass (unless they have programming such as skate park)

Culture Keeping

- Culture Keeping: Asian culture is evolving very rapidly (current market is out of tune with higher-educated Asian-American culture). Look at new market opportunities.
- Fig. VG-19 (rendering of 9th street) seems like a stereo type; 19th Century culture. Need more contemporary interpretation (Shanghai/Hong Kong)
- Asian (high-end) restaurants
- Don't want to displace existing small-scale businesses, but need to look forward
- Chinatown is a community of elderly & extended family
- Recognize Chinatown the way it is and embrace the future; we need to meet today's people's needs
- Want seniors who don't speak English to be self-sufficient; but can't only cater to seniors; need to balance old & new
- Soba Ramen + Shooting Star (new restaurants)
- Need mixed-income
- Let Chinatown Chamber know when they need to participate
- 2 major clinics in the area serving 25K families
- Chinatown is like a City within a City

East Oakland Collective

FEBRUARY 27, 2019

16-17 total people in attendance, more than ½ responded they “go downtown” for meetings, going out to eat, and nightlife (bars, shows, etc.)

Questions and comments from participants

- What are/who drew the boundaries for the DOSP? [did someone ask who drew them? I don't remember that]
- What is considered affordable?
- What is the breakdown of AMI by unit in the affordable housing targets?
- Is the affordable housing going to be concentrated or dispersed throughout?
- Transit to downtown is long, circuitous and expensive – having bus passes only available to people associated with organizations leaves many people out
- Will the community benefits be written directly into the plan?
- Electric Vehicles should be figured into the plan; “the reality is that people are still going to drive” – how do we support people in making the choice to use electric vehicles instead?
- Is funding committed for a master lease program?
- Are we talking to OUSD and charter schools?
- If building residential along 1880 and 1980, we should consider planting trees to mitigate pollution impact
- Will there be improved transit options *within* downtown? Including expanding the free B shuttle to weekends?
- Can developers pay for the green loop as part of the community benefits?
- Would the green loop displace homeless encampments?
- What is the timeline of the plan and consequences for failing to follow through?
- How are we measuring success and tracking results?
- Are there funding sources identified for these policies?
- *Providing wifi service is a major equalizer; having wifi only available for people able to pay for goods [note: City is working on this in the downtown – DOSP should follow up to find out more]
- *outdoor electrical outlets!
- *who has veto power to deny the plan, i.e., “who has the power to reject ideas?” Concern that throughout Oakland there used to be infrastructure such as benches, but someone has made the decision over the past fifteen or so years to exclude people from public spaces – a racist policy. How do we build a structure into the plan that precludes individual departments from making these kind of decisions that override the values of the plan?
- ***“Downtown over the past 20 years has witnessed a visual genocide of public space with spaces defensively designed such that those without money are prohibited from occupying and enjoying that space.”***

SPUR Problem Solver Meeting

FEBRUARY 27, 2019

Downtown's role in the region

- Regional employment center, transit hub, civic and cultural center, and visitor destination
- Largest employment center in the East Bay
- Accounts for 1/3 of City's Jobs and 2/3 of City's office space
- Economic activity in Downtown generates tax revenues that support municipal services for Oakland residents throughout the city

Economic sectors poised for expansion

- Industries with a Large Presence Downtown
 - Accommodation, Food Services, Arts
 - Fire, Insurance, Real Estate
 - Health Care and Social Assistance
 - Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services
 - Public Administration
- Fast Growing Industries
 - Accommodation, Food Services, Arts
 - Administration, Support, Waste Management
 - Educational Services
 - Information
 - Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services
- Significant Middle-Wage Employment Opportunities
 - Construction
 - Educational Services
 - Health Care and Social Assistance
 - Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services

Challenges to achieving Downtown's competitive advantage

- Limited number of prime sites for major office development (i.e., parcels of sufficient size, on or near Broadway, close to the BART stations)
- Relatively poor condition of bus stops and transit stations and their immediate vicinities; investment is needed to shift mode share to greater transit use
- Community-serving nonprofit organizations, artists and small businesses are facing displacement
- 70% of downtown jobs require an associate's degree or higher level of education; placing most downtown jobs out of reach of many Oakland residents, especially people of color

Community Advisory Group Meeting #8

FEBRUARY 28, 2019

- Will Dover Kohl have already incorporated what's necessary in order to implement the equity plan?
- Vivian: can we have a checklist of how the plan responds to each criteria?
- Hiroko: specific timeline for DKP to accept comments?
- Naomi wanted clarity on how decision-making structure
- What are the measures of success for culture keeping?
- Members of CAG should be providing data to establish a good baseline for implementation
- Savlan will look into possible baseline data
- Compare Lake Merritt/Uptown BID vs. Downtown BID studies (2016)
- CAG would like to see consultant list and scope as well as review the RFP for an economic consultant who would study approach and options for TDR/zoning incentive programs
- Consultant will not be a subconsultant of DKP
- Elisse: Wants to closely evaluate the short-term goals vs. long-term vision for any zoning incentive program
- Ener: concerned with cost control. Upzoning fuels land speculation if owner sees the potential for unlimited height.
- Ronnie: linkage fee ~\$3/sq. foot
- Hiroko: is DKP evaluating each incentive zone as it relates to each community benefit?
- CASA is a reputable group facilitator
- Vivian: more appropriate term is "development intensity" or form-based code. Need a "downtown for everybody"
- No public planning process for Howard Terminal
- "Jobs-housing balance" vs. "workplace vs. residential"
- Compassionate building—housing survivors of trafficking
- Chris: revisit design guidelines
- Naomi: call on past experience from specific planning and see what worked and didn't

Disability Advocates Meeting

MARCH 07, 2019

Attendees: Judith Smith, Hoang Banh (ADA Programs), Joanna Winter (Strategic Planning), Thomas Gregory (The CIL), Alicia Parker (Strategic Planning), Anh Nguyen (ADA Programs)

General

- Use the plan to make disability visible (photos/renderings, content)
- Call out disability in the same way that race and age is called out
- Measures of Success for each chapter should include disability
- Include icons for policies that address equity and disability (e.g. DOT does this in their project fact sheet list – different icons for pedestrian, parking, ADA, etc. projects)

Racial equity indicators

- Disaggregate these by disability as well as race and create policies to close the gaps for people with disabilities as well
- Transit dependency is an important indicator for people with disabilities as well

Housing

- Strategy 2: include “visitability,” not just accessibility for owner (i.e. someone with a wheelchair should be able to visit any home) – see Sonoma County’s guidelines
- Include existing housing, not just new construction: help people age in place
- Policy H-1.8: Create a fund to help owners and renters with home modifications for accessibility (including low-cost grab bars) – this is an anti-displacement strategy
- Note that displacement has a social impact, particularly to people with disabilities – often neighbors help, and displacement severs these social networks
- Include number of units with universal design as a measure of success

Economic Opportunity

- Policy 3.3 – Be explicit about including disability in “inclusive” downtown workforce (include disability everywhere until it is assumed)
- Central idea: “and businesses owned by people of color and people with disabilities.”

Mobility

- Sidewalks
 - Sidewalk management is important and needed: cafes/outdoor seating, signs, scooter parking – make sure encroachment is consistent and enforced
 - Coordinate sidewalk widening with districts prioritized for sidewalk cafés (possibly aligned with arts districts)
 - Need wider sidewalks in Chinatown

- Encampments are blocking sidewalks and forcing people in wheelchairs (and others) go into the streets (ADA Programs has received many grievances about this) – Encampment Management Team has addressed by attempting to keep encampments to one side of a street so that there is one side of the street clear
- Scooters/Micromobility
 - Scooter parking pad is illustrated on Page 176 (good!)
 - Address disability in considering micromobility – call out people with disabilities as a reason dockless mobility needs to be regulated
 - See City of San Diego for scooter regulations
- Curb ramp issues
 - There are no curb ramps on Jefferson & 18th (this is shown as an improvement on the project map)
 - Compliance issues: new curb at 8th & Broadway is built with a single ramp even though a double ramp is required – problem with enforcement
- BART elevators
 - Consider hiring someone to maintain elevator cleanliness – BART and MUNI are funding this at Civic Center BART station
 - Yes, make elevators transparent (BART has committed to this with new elevators)
- SF senior disability action network
- Special events interfere with accessibility
 - BART elevators are often blocked off during special events, which are increasing in frequency
 - Make sure the Special Event Task Force addresses accessibility

Culture Keeping

- Cheaper rent for cultural businesses, and also for those owned by people with disabilities

Community Health

- Policy 1.1 (pg. 238); create universal design requirements for playgrounds
- Make sure people with disabilities are reviewing public realm improvements (example: Albany installed concrete tables with no wheelchair access)