

Draft Downtown Oakland Specific Plan

Summary of Community Comments

Comments on the Draft Downtown Oakland Specific Plan were submitted via letters, email, and notes from nearly thirty public hearings and stakeholder meetings. Staff compiled these comments by chapter (e.g. Economic Opportunity, Housing, etc.), identifying key issues and questions raised by the community and summarizing the comments. Each of these have been reviewed and addressed by the project team in order to develop the final version of the Downtown Oakland Specific Plan.

In some cases several similar comments have been summarized, whereas in other cases the language is taken verbatim from a single or representative comment.

Contents

| | |
|-----------------------------|----|
| 1 ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY..... | 1 |
| 2 HOUSING..... | 3 |
| 3 MOBILITY..... | 5 |
| 4 CULTURE KEEPING..... | 17 |
| 5 COMMUNITY HEALTH..... | 22 |
| 6 LAND USE..... | 31 |

1 ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

Affordable commercial spaces for community-serving organizations

Comment Summary

- Consider using master lease program (E-2.8) to support businesses that hire a large number of older adults.
- 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.
- Economic Opp (E-2.3) - Eliminate “requirement” and simply provide incentives. An economic opportunity is an incentive not a requirement. C-1.5 and C-3.7 acknowledge this point.

Fiberoptics and Libraries as tools for economic development and addressing the digital divide

Comments Summary

- We should incorporate fiber as an economic tool e.g., inquire with PG&E because they have the darkest fiber.
- Start conversations with telecommunications sector, e.g, conversations around MLAs (Master Licensing Agreements).

- The Main Library should be included as part of the City’s strategy for economic development. For small businesses Oakland Public Library (OPL) provides resources such as subscriptions, databases (for example direct marketing research). At the Main Library, OPL offers many programs such as resume workshops, job fairs for teens and adults and an Instagram site, Oakland Has Jobs. Other programs OPL offers are Lawyers in the Library and Tax preparation. If Main were expanded, we could offer co-working space and maker space for small and emerging businesses.

Port Operations

Comments Summary

- Policy E.2.7 which supports industrial spaces and employment policies and policies meant to target historically marginalized groups (E-3.2, E-3.3, E-3.4), but by undermining Port/industrial operations in the 3rd Street area, will undermine successful growth of blue-collar jobs which consistently provide the best wages to historically impacted groups.

Workforce Hiring

Comments Summary

- The good news is that there are strategies to reverse the decline of the skilled construction workforce. Not all the recommendations of the CII (Construction Industry Institute) report are within the scope of control of the City of Oakland, but the report recommends two actions that the City can address:
 - 1. Apprenticeship: Owners need to require contractors to invest in training and improve the skill sets of their workforce;
 - 2. Fringe benefits: owners and their contractors must retain craft professionals “with improved worksite conditions and other incentives.”
- We know what training programs work best and why. Joint Apprenticeship and Training Committees (JATC) are more effective than unilateral programs because they are the product of collective bargaining. Unlike unilateral op-in programs, enforceable labor agreements bind employers and employees alike to financial and employment commitments to skills-building training programs and retention-promoting portable fringe benefit plans.

Business Improvement Districts

Comments Summary

- The plan does not go far enough in recognizing and leveraging existing Business Improvement Districts (BID). There are only four mentions of BIDs: in supporting NCPC/ Community-based crime prevention, improving downtown Marketing and Branding, having an advisory role in Parking Revenue spending, and to support youth activities in public spaces.
- BIDs do indeed play a part in each of these areas. However, the plan could go much further in formalizing the role BIDs already perform in these critical commercial districts, and the myriad of ways in which the City and private sector rely on BIDs in achieving economic development and equity goals.

2 HOUSING

Housing & Affordability

Comments Summary

- The Plan currently contains no controls to prevent the demolition of existing rental housing to make way for new development. To help mitigate the loss of existing and more affordable housing in favor of new development, the City should either prohibit development on sites that currently have rental housing units or did so within the past 10 years, or condition approval of such projects on provision of full 1-for-1 replacement with units comparable in size and affordability.
- (Page 81) In the “Primary Challenges ...” box, a new finding is needed to define and distinguish “affordable housing” (which typically includes housing serving 50% to 120% AMI) from “homeless housing” (which is affordable for households at 20%/30% AMI and below). Housing for homeless and those of extremely low incomes is rarely included in goals for “affordable housing,” and consequently is almost never produced.
- (Page 85) At “Strengthen protections ... ,” the statement: “The City should amend the Condominium Conversion Ordinance to expand the units covered ...” is contrary to the intent of the ordinance (“no loss of rental housing”) and directly contradicts the proposed ordinance revision currently in process of deliberation and action by the City Council.
- The City should implement an active policy of “land-banking” to the maximum extent feasible, including inventorying and acquiring excess land and buildings in Oakland from private sources as well as from other governmental agencies.
- Strategies such as income subsidies should be recommended as one solution to retaining housing affordability for seniors on fixed incomes.
- 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?
- Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District (EIFD) only works in SF because it’s city and county so need to coordinate with Alameda County.
- (Policy H-1.10 p.91) EBPREC:
 - Another city-county living problem require a number of 2-bedrooms at market rate, even though it’s offered at below market rate – work with County?
 - EBPREC were 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?
- Comments on Specific Policies and Actions (pages 90-93) H-1.2: Should read “Leverage the city’s inventory of publicly-owned land by adopting an ordinance to implement the policies contained in the public land policy as outlined in Resolution Number 87483 C.M.S.
- H-2.10: The City’s affordable housing regulatory agreements already require prioritization of units for people who were displaced by “no-fault” evictions. The City should consider expanding the definition of displacement to include persons who were forced to move due to an unaffordable rent increase or series of rent increases (with appropriate documentation).

Inclusionary Housing vs. Impact Fee

Summary Comments

- H-1.2: We support studying an inclusionary housing policy downtown as an addition to rather than a replacement for the existing impact fee. Any analysis of fees and inclusionary requirements should consider the income levels likely to be targeted by each policy. In most cases, projects funded with impact revenues will target much lower income levels than are typically reached by inclusionary housing policies. This study should also include reassessing the current on-site alternative compliance mechanism in the fee ordinance, to ensure that the onsite option yields an equivalent outcome to payment of the fee.
- Evaluate income-level target when analyzing choice between impact fee or inclusionary (there are significant equity impacts).
- H-1.12: We support studying an inclusionary housing policy as an addition to rather than a replacement for the existing impact fee. However, If the City is considering replacing the impact fee with an inclusionary zoning requirement, it must ensure that any inclusionary requirement produce the same number of units, and at the same depth of affordability as the fee would yield. If an inclusionary requirement is adopted, the City should provide enough flexibility to allow this to be met not just by affordable units within a market-rate building, but also through subdividing larger parcels to permit adjacent market-rate and 100% affordable projects, and allowing the affordable units to be built on adjacent or nearby parcels
- "Impact fees" can never adequately be a substitute for building affordable units. The maximum "impact fee" is \$22,500/unit -- less than 60% of which goes into the trust fund for the production of affordable units. The current cost of producing a 2-bedroom rental unit is \$600,000 to \$700,000, minimum. Naturally, developers of market-rate housing will choose to pay the "impact fee" instead of building "affordable units". The DOSP should directly address Oakland's urgent need to adopt "inclusionary housing standards" (requirement of a certain percentage of affordable units in any multi-unit project) as all other Bay Area cities already require.

Homelessness

Summary Comments

- The maintenance of Lake Merritt and Lake Merritt Channel parkland is in part severely challenged by homeless individuals resorting to camping there. One of the plan's measures of success is "*the number of people moving from homelessness to transitional and permanent housing increases...*" (p. 95). This aspirational statement needs a targeted number and zoning provisions and strategies to accomplish it.
- There should be an additional goal to reduce the number of encampments. The plan's current statement won't make a dent. The plan should provide for a truly significant number of units of affordable housing at the deepest levels of subsidy to begin to address the increasing number and size of encampments.
- Achieving a diverse mix of housing within the Plan area requires ambitious and creative financing alternatives. New 2017 Opportunity Zones should become the focus of development for all levels of affordable housing including no to very low-income housing.

Additional

Summary Comments

- What's the current percentage of housing downtown that is affordable? According to the SE Housing Memo:
 - Downtown's current (2011-2015) share of citywide housing units: 8%
 - Downtown's share of recent (2016-2017) housing development: 34%
 - Downtown's share of planned and proposed (June 2018) housing development: 29%
 - Downtown's share of current (2015) citywide income-restricted affordable housing stock: 21%
- Baseline on p.94 seems off. Data is from Strategic Economics, Affordable Housing Memo and Directory of Assisted Rental Housing, but does not include Oakland Housing Authority Properties
 - According to EIR, there were 15,032 housing units downtown (plan area and LMSAP)
 - According to p.94, 9,557 of those were affordable – this was a mistake, it should be 2,293, for a total of 15% of downtown units in 2019 (not including Housing Authority) are deed-restricted affordable
- Why the retail figures are so high in the development program: they are so large both because they include hotel development, and they also include 3.5 million sf of retail and hotel at Howard Terminal.

3 MOBILITY

Alameda Bicycle Pedestrian Bridge

Summary Comments

- Support for Alameda Bicycle / Pedestrian Bridge (b/c its connects Alameda residents to downtown's jobs; prioritizes active transportation; more vibrant, sustainable future).
- Little in the Draft Plan describing this proposal or recommending further study.
- Add note to the potential pedestrian/bike bridge connecting the City of Alameda and Jack London Square, that the Estuary is a federal navigation channel and the bridge cannot obstruct the movement of vessels in the Estuary.
- Oakland Alameda Access project, which does not take enough pedestrian safety into account; We support the recommendation to plan for an Oakland-Alameda Bike/Pedestrian bridge across the Estuary. This would serve to extend access to the waterfront areas to the region.

BART Station Access

Summary Comments

- Add Policy M-2.5 policy language to Appendix A (Table M-5)- take measures to maintain reliable, ADA-accessible access to transit stations, and find opportunities to increase the number of elevators.

- BART-identified needs (to expand upon and inform Policy M-2.5) for 19th St. Station and 12th St. Station (related to new elevators, escalators/canopies, ticket vending machines, etc. – see BART Draft Plan comment letter for complete list for each BART station).

Bike Network

Summary Comments

- What is the process for determining the bikeways on streets? (Between OakDOT/Planning)
- Consistency with Bike Plan (including short term Draft Plan network).
- Where is the proposed connection between the 9th St separated bike lane and the East Bay Greenway?
- Are bike lanes going to happen on 14th? There aren't any lanes traveling East/West through downtown.
- Business corridor - bounded by 7th to 11th and Broadway to Jackson, will need parking; bike lane should end at the perimeter of Chinatown boundary and develop a parking plan that addresses the needs of the small businesses.
- Appropriate locations for bike lanes should be Broadway, 11th Street and Harrison St.
- Bike East Bay supports bike lanes away from commercial corridors; no need for bike lanes on every street.

Broadway

Summary Comments

- Support transit-only lane *with* bike lane.
- Afraid of bike lanes on Broadway – even Telegraph isn't good. What can we learn from the many bike experiments?
- Look at Copenhagen for bike lanes that work.
- Don't want tighter traffic on Broadway.
- Need short-to-medium term improvement, as well as "go big" and articulate what will happen when.
- Plan could recommend a Broadway study – create it as an alternative mobility corridor; think big and holistically.
- Now is a good time to put in standards – things are empty, in transition.
- Extend the priority transit-only lanes on Broadway north to the Kaiser Medical Campus at MacArthur Blvd and south to Embarcadero West where much of the new development is concentrated.
- Oakland police should issue tickets for cars stopping and parking in Broadway bus-only lanes just as they enforce red zone curbs today.

- Maintain Broadway as a street for traffic to get around Chinatown.

Bus Layover

Summary Comments

- We strongly oppose turning Lafayette Square Park into a bus layover (Page 114/258/322 of Draft Plan); concept was also opposed in 2016 (see email for details). (creates visual blockage, pollution, impairing experience for [historic landmark] park users).
- Bus layover alternative: any remaining parking spaces [near Lafayette Square Park] should be converted to park-serving uses like bikeshare, protected bike lanes and food truck parking and not bus/car infrastructure. Lafayette Square Park is the Gateway to Oakland for folks entering from 980 and we want to showcase this historic resource, not hide it behind buses.

Curb Management

Summary Comments

- Nowhere to unload; parking garages charge \$15 for 20 minutes; delivery service has no place to park.
- Curbside Management Study (Policy M-3.6) passenger and ADA pickup/drop-off around the 12th Street and 19th Street BART stations should be carefully considered and planned to ensure safe and efficient passenger loading.

Design Guidelines

Summary Comments

- We recommend that the Plan expand on these and include generic street typologies that could be applied throughout downtown. San Francisco's Better Streets Plan contains "street types" that are a good example of this approach. These typologies can serve as a guide for designing appropriate streetscape environments, which will differ depending on the role of the street, e.g. transit corridor.
- Pedestrian paths: Needs logo/branded signage (See Broadway & Hawthorne example from the Broadway-Valdez SP).

Howard Terminal

Summary Comments

- Transport aspects of I-980 & I-880 need to connect be considered in tandem with to Howard Terminal.
- Move Amtrak station to be near BART if the Howard Terminal ballpark happens.
- Create a new Diridon Station-style terminal adjacent to Howard Terminal.

I-980

Summary Comments

- (p.48, I-980 Corridor) My preference is to cap the freeway between 11th and 20th Streets, preserving the freeway connection to I-880, and landscaping Brush and Castro as boulevards.
- We also support the conversion of I-980 to create an urban boulevard, and the conversion of numerous downtown parking garages into productive space.

Implementation

Summary Comments

- What are developers required to do for bike and ped infrastructure when building projects consistent with the Plan? What ability will the City have to ask developers to go beyond minimum infrastructure standards?
- How impact fees help to fund improvements on corridors? How will development fees be targeted toward Complete Streets gaps and other transportation infrastructure needs?
- How will the proposed investment in the proposed Green Loop be balanced with investments in other facilities, such as proposed bicycle improvements identified in the 2019 bicycle plan and improvements to existing green / park facilities in downtown Oakland?
- Transportation impact fee nexus study should be added to the plan.
- Chinatown wants close involvement with transportation recommendations including reviewing traffic studies.
- Continue to collaborate with BART and Lake Merritt Station Area Plan (and make changes where necessary) on station access improvements.
- Library is a key partner in shared mobility and equity initiatives with the City; it is a key named partner in the newly adopted Bike Plan.
- DOSP includes reconfiguration of Franklin and Webster St. and includes plans to address congestion issues around the I-980 ramps and the Webster and Posey Tubes through the Oakland/Alameda Access Project. Alameda CTC encourages continued coordination between City of Oakland and Alameda CTC through the Oakland/Alameda Access Project.

Industrial Multimodal Policy

Summary Comments

- Port's letter directs EIR to include discussion about designated Local Truck Routes and Oakland Municipal Code 10.53 Extra Legal Load Transportation Permits, which could likewise be summarized in the mobility section of the DOSP.
- Include measures to reduce conflicts between Truck Route traffic and bikes, pedestrians and other modes contemplated for 3rd St.

Jack London

Summary Comments

- 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 it's kind of physically inaccessible unless you are in a vehicle.
- Jack London: not being able for the disabled to cross over the railroad tracks, there is nothing you can do to get the railroads to cooperate. 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. 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.

Measure of Success

Summary Comments

- Recommend Adding Measures of Success to Evaluate Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety: Recommend measuring Number of Bicycle and Pedestrian Incidents on a per capita basis (population plus employment), by level of severity relative to Baseline conditions.
- Recommend Adding Measures of Success to Monitor Transit Service: Recommend adding peak and mid-day transit travel times on major transit corridors (Broadway, Telegraph, 14th Street, etc.) relative to Baseline conditions.
- Add Measure of Success. Add reduction in the number of single occupancy vehicle trips as a Mobility Measure of Success (Downtown Plan, p.132).

Micro-mobility

Summary Comments

- Bart is working with Bird and other micro-mobility (e-scooter) providers to designate specific parking areas for scooters and other shared-mobility devices at several BART stations to locate these areas out of the path of vehicle or pedestrian travel and consolidate parking; City should work with micro- or shared-mobility providers to designate similar parking zones around 19th street and 12th street stations to keep sidewalks clear and ensure safe access to transit.
- OAKLAND should have scooter parking. Examples include, Singapore scooter parking pads (picture attached), and other from U.S. cities, e.g. Long Beach.

Mobility Strategy – Support Fewer Automobiles, More Active Modes and Transit

Summary Comments

- Reduce Single Occupancy Vehicle Use: [we] support the Plan's emphasis on walking, biking and riding transit. To create a comfortable and safe environment for these modes and to help meet the City's Climate Action Plan goals, the Plan should seek to reduce reliance on single occupancy vehicles. Without this as part of the goal, the Plan could inadvertently increase use of this mode.

- Study Banning Cars: [we] recommend that the Plan order a study of banning all single occupancy vehicles from downtown. Such a ban would be a powerful approach to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, create a safer environment for pedestrians and cyclists, and improve transit flows. This is not an outlandish concept. Just across the bay, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Board voted in October 2019 to ban cars from Market Street starting in 2020.
- CAR-FREE ZONES: Place people before cars. Consider activated urban zones that are pedestrian ONLY. Many world-class cities are implementing CAR-FREE ZONES where deliveries, etc. are organized.
- Adding more bike lanes is a great idea. The Franklin Street bikeway looks fantastic. Keep expanding the Oakland bike lanes.
- Oaklanders are not sharing the street well; painted lanes are not safe for bikes: is there a plan for physically separated bike lanes?
- We should deprioritize street parking and vehicle lanes in favor of dedicated bicycle and transit lanes, on the model of the “Go Big on Broadway” option in the earlier Plan Options Report (Nov. 28, 2018) which should be restored. We prefer proposed bikeway options that include protected bicycle lanes.
- Prioritize mobility over parking. Curbside parking should be priced and enforced to maximize availability and benefit to businesses, and streets must better accommodate of diverse modes of mobility; first and foremost walking, but also transit, scooting, biking over automobiles. Expansion of parking permit districts should be explored to allow affordable employee and merchant parking in less transited areas, and integrated smart parking systems should be implemented as soon as possible to direct drivers to garages, reduce traffic, and increase revenue.

Mobility Strategy – Support Automobiles and Automobile Infrastructure

Summary Comments

- No consideration has been made to improve our already failing infrastructure - roads are a disaster, and will become worse with an increase in residents. OakDOT has been removing road lanes, at a time when the city is trying to add more people - since 2016 the Bay area traffic has increased 60% - so either stop building, or stop removing road capacity.
- Older people don't ride bikes, so the bike lanes aren't for them + [debate over whether African-Americans ride bikes].
- Chinatown Chamber doesn't want bike lanes through Chinatown Community's commercial core; If you remove street lanes for bikes it will hurt businesses.
- If they do bike lanes, then exploit the bike lanes for Black traditions.
- Concern about making a downtown that is too bicycle-focused; not everyone rides bikes.
- It's not realistic for a port city like Oakland to be car-free – not authentic.
- Diverting traffic from Webster should be the priority i.e., through traffic should be outside of Chinatown, not through it.

Parking – In Favor Of

Summary Comments

- Leave an adequate number of parking spaces for the electric cars of the future, and the gasoline-powered cars of the present.
- City should build more parking garages downtown.
- Institute a standard condition of approval for all new development that requires outreach and replacement for lost street parking.
- Short-term parking (that is, customer parking) is a small-business and cultural arts equity issue— but remedies are either non-existent or insufficient. Arts organizations, businesses, and nonprofits serving and run by the most-vulnerable populations are suffering, as described by the equity indicators report. For example, the plan could recommend opening the ALCO lot on 12th and Madison past 5 pm, with ambassadors to escort patrons to and from Malonga Center. The City could work with the County to facilitate shared-use parking. What other opportunities for parking exist for families, seniors, people from transit-poor neighborhoods, or from out of the area?
- Lakeshore has free parking for Trader Joe’s – why can’t we have something like that in the 14th Street corridor?
- Mayor's office has reached out to developers to talk about providing public parking, and they are interested.
- Parking enforcement of this issue (double parking or pausing in either a driving lane or bike lane), at least some, please?
- Chinatown small businesses rely on foot traffic and readily available parking; Chinatown should be planned for a "stop and shop" destination, not a path for through traffic
- “Paseos” recommendation requires greater attention to long term maintenance and keeping order. What arrangements would be made for access for small business deliveries and for customers who come from transit-poor neighborhoods, have accessibility challenges, or travel from far away?
- Need to talk about what compromise looks like [i.e. between City/development/DOT’s parking policies and business owners].
- Don’t take parking out of town faster than you can get people onto transit.
- CLT/temporary garages.
- How will handicap parking abuse be enforced?
- 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.
- Understand the environmental argument, but AT WHOSE EXPENSE? The environmental argument against parking is weak – should apply everywhere, not just enforced selectively
- Jack London has a parking system – for people who they want.
- Chinatown is thriving and has a parking structure.
- Assessment of parcels near 14th – build a parking garage and provide a REBATE as reparations to businesses for messing it up over the last five years.

Parking – Against

Summary Comments

- Parking not forward-thinking: curbside parking still exists where there should be better accommodations of diverse modes of mobility including walking, scooting, biking.
- Strengthening Oakland's Parking Management:
 - Reduce on-street parking for automobiles and return this public space back to people for walking, biking, or using transit by increasing sidewalk width, planting street trees, and adding comfortable and safe bus stops as well as street furniture.
 - Require new parking structure in developments to be designed for convertibility to future non-parking uses such as affordable housing.
 - Implement parking maximums and structure the community benefits program from developers seeking to exceed parking maximums to fund priority improvements to Oakland's street such as two-way conversions, transit, bike, and pedestrian improvements.
 - Provide designated on-street scooter and bike parking on every block.
- Make a concrete recommendation for a parking maximum for both residential and commercial development to clarify public expectations regarding future zoning code updates.
- Questions the efficacy of an "exchange program" to allow developers to construct more parking, as the negative externalities of increased VMT and vehicle ownership would detract from any benefits from such a program.
- Do not consider an "exchange" program where developers are entitled to build up to 1.25 spaces per unit in exchange for providing community benefits. By not constructing expensive parking structures, more funds should be available for community benefits and affordable housing.
- Transit Options for a Low-Car District: We support removing parking minimums for all areas covered by the plan and imposing parking maximums—or charging impact fees for parking over a 0.5 ratio, befitting the expense and opportunity cost of in-building parking.
- Parking cap – SF has 45,000 spaces. Mission Bay, etc. exist only with cars.
- If you're going to get rid of the parking, get some shuttles to shuttle people from where they are parking.

Pedestrians & Pedestrian Safety

Summary Comments

- Need for sidewalks to be widened on blocks where the existing width is insufficient for the anticipated growth in foot traffic, in particular adjacent to BART stations under 2040 Project conditions.
- Pedestrian paths: See SF plan – create pedestrian paths as they get redeveloped (give a bonus in return).
- And directional ramps for every crosswalk.
- I find it frustrating how many streets in downtown Oakland don't even have pedestrian signals.
- the Plan should explicitly acknowledge that the development contemplated under the Plan could lead to new pedestrian collision hot spots that will need to be addressed by developers or the City.
- Pedestrian paths: In SF POPOs are safer and more pleasant – some have security guards
- List more Pedestrian Policies. In the discussion of important programs and policies in the Pedestrian Plan (Downtown Plan, p. 104), please add these programs and policies from the Pedestrian Plan to the list of especially relevant ones: Maintain roadway features that reduce speeds and make pedestrian crossings safer; Improve pedestrian environment under and over freeways; Partner with neighborhood groups to perform walk audits.
- 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)
- We need to provide more clearly marked crosswalks, enforce speed limits for automobiles, and make sure sidewalks are clean and smooth. More benches and seating in downtown Oakland would also be welcome.

Reduced Transit Fare

Summary Comments

- City of Oakland should advocate for funding for a potential permanent program (to MTC's "Regional Means-Based Transit Fare Discount Pilot Program"), and to investigate means to expand the program to other operators.
- City of Oakland should consider means to support the Fare Integration Study (analyzing possibility for integrating the fare policies of all 27 Bay Area transit agencies), and any recommended actions that arise from the process.

Second Transbay Crossing

Summary Comments

- If second tube, have Amtrak near Lake Merritt.

- Plan for where BART should go. Oakland should ask for what it wants.
- BART and Capital Corridor are co-leading the effort to study the possibility for a new Transbay Crossing. BART is committed to working with the City, as although the proposed alignment has not been established, part of this new infrastructure project may be within the Plan Area.

Transportation Demand Management

Summary Comments

- Will appropriate staff resources be provided to ensure the TDM programs will be effective?
- Support Use of Transportation Demand Management Plans with Specific Goals (Staff TDM Oversight): The success of the TDM policy will require sufficient staff to oversee TDM plans. The plan should highlight the need for funding additional City staff resources and identify potential funding sources, such as impact fees paid by new developments.
- As part of TDM strategy (Policy M-2.10) City should consider a requirement that large employers provide a flexible, free, or reduced transit pass for employees.
- As part of TDM strategy (Policy M-2.10) City should consider making the free transit passes for new residential development a requirement rather than an option (as part of the "menu" of TDM measures) for all new residential development in the City. Clipper cash, rather than operator-specific transit card, would allow employees and residents more choice and flexibility in their transit commute.
- As part of Policy M-2.10, the City should require that all new development and all large employers provide a flexible, free, or reduced transit pass for residents or employees. Clipper cash is more versatile.

Transit

Summary Comments

- While the plan does provide a range of improvements to infrastructure for transit on priority corridors, it doesn't provide any discussion or suggestions to how transit service capacity should be increased to accommodate additional transit trips envisioned in the DTOSP.
- 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).
- Concerns about the buses. Bus stop is being moved in front of their restaurant, which means that parking is being removed, and they're worried that homeless people will sleep on the benches.
- I want to make sure there is a bus stop on every corner.
- 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.

- To support the increased travel demand from new expected commercial and residential development in Downtown Oakland, BART is increasing the frequency of train service and overall capacity of the system with its Core Capacity Project.

Two-Way Conversion

Summary Comments

- Two-way bikeways on one-way streets while waiting for two-way conversion.
- What are the expected impacts of the one-way to two-way street conversions, including congestion and bike and pedestrian safety? Do expected benefits vary for freeway access roads versus others?
- One-way to two-way streets conversion has support from Chinatown neighborhoods.
- Likes safer two-way streets, dedicated bus lanes.
- Recommend Further review of one-way to two-way street conversions (Study One-Way Conversions): [we] have different views on the merits of one-way to two-way street conversions. However, we agree that it is a significant change that should be studied on both a street specific basis and as part of a downtown-wide circulation study. Where conversions are undertaken, the City should develop plans to help residents and visitors safely get through the transition. The City should also consider interim measures such as adding two-way bike lanes to one-way streets prior to the conversion being completed.
- Changing from one-way to two-way will have impact on businesses in Chinatown, we don't know if action will be positive or negative. Study does not address these concerns. City should provide a traffic study for Chinatown to demonstrate potential impacts to Chinatown business community.
- Franklin to a two-way street with bike lanes would result in narrow driving lanes; loading for businesses is important; concern about the impact on delivery trucks should double-parking block the (proposed) one lane of traffic [in each direction].
- Franklin St. is main street Chinatown stakeholders don't want converted to two-way.
- Two-way conversion problematic:
 - Causing diversion
 - Should better manage one-way
 - Impacts are not well thought out
 - Might have lowering of bus speeds

Freeway Undercrossings

Summary Comments

- Prioritize freeway undercrossings that connect to BART (particularly ped pathways to and from Lake Merritt Station, those crossing under I-880 require special study).
- Prioritize Table M-3 Freeway Crossing Improvements Project list to support safe paths to and from BART Stations to new centers of development like Victory Court and Howard Terminal.

- What is the funding for undercrossings?
- 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.
- The plan should recommend a feasibility study to underground I-880 between Martin Luther King Boulevard and Oak Streets in similar form the Big Dig in Boston.
- Could also look at undergrounding the overhead structure of BART between West Oakland and Jack London.
- This project should include undergrounding the connections to the Alameda Tubes to eliminate traffic impact in Chinatown. Undergrounding the UPRR tracks between Oak Street and Market Street should also be considered. Within this concept is the relocation of the Amtrak station to the Victory Court area closer to the Lake Merritt BART Station.
- Remove I-880.
- Underground 880 & 980 (this may be in SPUR's regional strategy).
- Recommend better coordination with Caltrans right-of-way management, better tenancy of under-freeway spaces, and immediate safety improvements by DOT.
- Underpass improvement and Webster Green lack implementation: Underpass improvement is becoming a life safety issue for residents, employees, and visitors to Jack London and Chinatown. It is perhaps the most important current issue to our neighborhood. These needed improvements are mentioned as a part of the "Green Loop". We concur that these are critical elements to achieve the plan's Health & Wellness, and Mobility & Accessibility goals, but the Plan lacks implementation and instead hands off to defunct or insufficient concurrent planning efforts to solve this key problem.

West Oakland Walk

Summary Comments

- Full design and description of the WOW clearly deserves inclusion in the Downtown Specific Plan as an important element that would link downtown with the area covered by the West Oakland Specific Plan, and we encourage city planners to make this inclusion.
- Please include in the Final Downtown Oakland Specific Plan the complete set of Map exhibits and Descriptive Text for the West Oakland Walk, just as it was in the Final West Oakland Specific Plan. Please include these elements so that the citizens of Oakland can clearly understand how the West Oakland Walk will positively affect the Downtown by linking it so strongly with West Oakland.

Miscellaneous

Summary Comments

- Expanded main library would allow for more support for bike share and shared mobility efforts.
- Bike traffic signals (to protect pedestrians).

- For bikers and pedestrian safety, as well as city income, why not provide pick up zones for [car share: Lyft, Uber] drivers? (Paid for by them) One or two spots on each block through downtown? Once established, better parking enforcement might actually be achievable.
- Driver education, maybe via quirky bumper stickers on city vehicles? 3 feet to pass, “sharrow “ (the logo) means share, cyclists are people, too, pollution free, and so on.
- Expanding infrastructure to other areas like Grand Lake Proactive Statement.
- Please review the Mobility goal, Goal 03, by adding at the end “without continued reliance on single occupancy vehicles”.

4 CULTURE KEEPING

Artist Housing

Summary Comments

- (P. 135 Outcome C-3) Affordable arts space must incorporate housing for artists.

Cultural Districts

Summary Comments

- Work on creating a cultural district program, rather than designating districts (beyond the BAMBD, which has been formally adopted already).
- The Plan currently suggests that wayfinding, urban furniture, and retail support could be implemented through “Cultural Districts.” While this is an interesting concept for the future, there is not currently revenue allocated for, or definition of, these districts.
- Curious who has been involved in determining what’s culturally important.
- 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
- (C-3.6 and p.150): Incentivize vacant spaces providing “temporary” cultural activities to link to business support programs for permanent viability. In lieu of a Fine for ALL vacant ground floor spaces that are vacant more than 9 months. Displacement / Replacement: How will relocation amounts be determined? Will relocation be within the area? Or will Oakland artists move away?
- (C-3.7 and p.156): “Explore. . . Facility Funds ” should be “Implement a “Cultural Preservation and Enhancement Fund” that is developer-funded, not added to ticket sales at existing, already taxed, cultural venues.. One developer suggested \$5,000 per unit.
- (p. 42) Provide affordable space for Master Lease Program, specify rates, or tiered, based on entity operating budget; dedicated cultural, arts, and maker spaces in new developments or long term vacant sites as well as cultural districts.
- Require design guidelines for all Cultural Districts and areas with architecturally/historically important buildings in order to result in excellence of design, to create future historically relevant

buildings. If not in an arts district, where else? Perhaps another area would be the waterfront, for truly signature buildings. (DEIR insufficient and inadequately covers this issue, p. 11, 383, 396).

Zoning Recommendations

Summary Comments

- Implement Cultural Easements in ground floor spaces (that are affordable) to provide ownership opportunities that can be supported by entities like CAST or be developed as long term spaces that incubate cultural entities. These easement allocations for ground floor spaces should earn high points for new developments' community benefit incentives.
- Designate ALL ground floor spaces as an opportunity to place Cultural Entities, with AFFORDABILITY built in.
- C-1.10: Zone to preserve and encourage PDR (Production, Distribution and Repair) is clearly highlighted in the Culture Keeping section yet is not mentioned in any subsequent zoning maps. Apply consistent language in zoning maps that refer to "FLEX-INDUSTRIAL" (again, another reason to redefine and complete the zoning incentive study).
- Need a clear distinction between cultural zones and cultural areas; alarmed at the proposed language around restricting certain uses (as a long-time property owner).
- C-1.5, p. 26: Change "Explore. . ." to "INCORPORATE an incentive plan being developed by the consultant" and include areas outside cultural districts with new and long term vacant spaces. Identify minimum gross floor area for cultural entities and PDR including in existing vacant storefronts beyond cultural district areas.
- Question: 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.
- Old Oakland - Shared workspaces aren't neighborhood-friendly retail – would rather see cultural uses.
- Old Oakland - Old Oakland currently has no bars; is mostly families.
- Preserve/Promote Arts and Culture Strategies on page 142 – In this section, you discuss the idea of providing floor area ratio/height bonuses and other incentives for adaptive reuse of buildings. This concept should be encourage in all of the buildings, and adaptive reuse should include the notion of keeping a façade while allowing the addition of greater density via vertical development. Artist occupancy in many of these buildings requires significant funds, and by promoting adaptive reuse and investment, you will increase the number of opportunities for artists to remain as part of the area's fabric.
- PDR Businesses on page 149 – The document identifies 25th Street as a primary PDR location that housed historic automobile businesses. Of our 20+ tenants, we only have one automotive business that has been in any of our buildings for 100 years and that tenant was recently placed in 456 25th Street; a building that is ripe for redevelopment as it is a single story concrete warehouse with no historical value. You should encourage the redevelopment of a parcel like this one as it would add tremendous value to the area and provides an opportunity to create new housing, artist space, etc.

- Wholesale Produce Market proposed 45' height limit is not aligned with consistent community input desiring preservation of use. The wholesale produce market is mentioned as a resource in "Culture Keeping" but still there are no mechanisms explored to protect and subsidize the continued historic use.
- Maker space could co-exist with higher height limits, yet the area is designated with the lowest possible density.

Black Arts Movement & Business District

Summary Comment

- Background:
 - All of Black California is anchored by Black Oakland.
 - They [those in power] 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).
 - OPD harassed Geoffrey's and closed it down due to a fabricated incident.
 - It feels like Black people are being designed out.
 - His family business and house was torn down for the post office.
 - The City has had a history of disregarding African Americans.
 - This is an opportunity to embrace Black culture and history and pour resources into it.
 - Lots of black women support her business, which helps with the healing of downtown.
- Importance of Housing:
 - Why do we have to live 50 miles away? Why bother doing downtown as a Black neighborhood if everyone is displaced?
 - People now are living in Antioch.
 - Success of Black businesses is tied to access to housing – has to commute 2 hours to his store.
- Process/Engagement:
 - Have not been hearing the voices of the vibrant range of black folk in Oakland.
 - Need storytellers involved.
 - The city has a STORY to tell about Black culture and history.
 - The people speaking for Black interests are often advocates for the most vulnerable, not an organized voice for black entrepreneurs.
- Vision:
 - Confusion about BAMBD roles – some would like to see it as a BID separate from Uptown/Downtown.
 - What does success look like for the BAMBD?
 - BAMBD Success looks like black nonprofits buy AAMLO and the Malonga Center, and eminent domain non-black.
 - "Bring back our mural at Alice & 14th Streets."

Art + Garage District

Summary Comments

- Designate Arts District in Specific Plan (right now the language in the Draft Plan is too vague); designate art space as part of developments.
- Some key property owners against the bonus program – thinks it'll be a new starting point;
 - Art space should be a bonus – “unlock” the potential for BMR art space.
 - Cannot legally require below market rate (BMR) artist's space.
 - Cannot implement commercial rent control.

Chinatown Cultural Heritage District

Summary Comments

- 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.

Jack London Maker District

Summary Comments

- Lack of support for Jack London Maker District:
 - Where did maker district come from?
 - Boundary seems arbitrary.
 - Architectural constraints which do not encourage industrial uses such as rail-height first floor and surrounding uses.
- Pro Industrial
 - How would fanciful new [Jack London] "cultural district" with not funding and surrounded by cookie-cutter condos be a better way to protect longshore, trucking or warehousing jobs in Oakland.
- Pro Commercial + Residential
 - Neither the Plan nor the DEIR provides a persuasive rationale for the establishment of the [Jack London] “Maker District,” an island of low intensity parcels in the heart of the Jack London District proposed as part of the Plan. We feel establishment of this intensity restricted District would stifle commercial and residential development of this area and be contrary to the overall goals of the Plan. Moreover, the various impacts of establishing this new District have not been properly analyzed.
- District Definition Needs Revision: It is unclear how “cultural districts” and “entertainment districts” were defined. The Jack London Entertainment District excludes two major venues: a 15,000sqft ESports Arena at 255 2nd and a 10,000sqft special event venue on 2nd and Alice. The district should include these areas.

Displacement Cultural Businesses

Summary Comments

- KONO: Koreana Plaza is the heart of KONO in a lot of ways. How would it be built upon without impacting who comes to my neighborhood and why, and also what would be the impact on First Fridays.
- KONO: The other thing I would like to comment on is around culture keeping. In particular in regards to two of the "opportunity sites" and what impact they might have on culture. One of those sites is the parking lot of Koreana Plaza. But I'm wondering if it the cultural impact has really been thought through.
- For the Laney College parking lot what I wonder about is not only the community and staff of the College itself, but also the flea market that happens most Sundays. Where would that go? I'm guessing it would leave Oakland - leaving a population underserved and not likely replaced by anything being built. A bit of culture gone.
- Prevention of displacement needs to extend to preservation of cultural assets and small, locally owned businesses, particularly those rooted in communities of color.

Business Improvement Districts

Summary Comments

- The Downtown Plan area covers four established Business Improvement Districts: Koreatown/Northgate (KONO), Uptown/Lake Merritt, Downtown, and Jack London. Business Improvement Districts further equitable economic development through daily retail and tenant support in filling vacancies and navigating complex permitting processes, community support and engagement, communications, construction disruption mitigation, workforce development, culture keeping through public art installations, events, and programming, and many more activities aligned with the goals of this plan.
- DOSP is heavy on cultural districts, but has missed the role that BID's 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.

Miscellaneous

Summary Comments

- 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
- Oakland's historic (c. 1916) Produce Market also needs its own specific plan, harkening back to previous efforts to preserve the area, as in the Oakland–Sharing the Vision plan four Mayors ago. This area, unique in California and obviously a Pike Place Market in waiting has been sidetracked over and over again, probably because the economic development rationale has not been an integral part of Oakland planning, for reasons given above.

- EIR CULT-1Aii: Why delay implementing Transfer Development Rights (TDRs), included in Oakland's General Plan 25 years ago, for 3 years after plan adoption? Change the schedule to one year. (DEIR p. 11, 19, 20, 336, 355)

5 COMMUNITY HEALTH

Homelessness

Summary Comments

- Need a plan for homelessness; Explicit identification of homeless opportunities in the plan; make sure it's a clear overlay of needs (i.e. p.177); Philosophical disagreement with entrenching homeless population.
- Philosophical disagreement with entrenching homeless population homeless "sheds" as vision? Doesn't like cabins being used.
- Use funds to address our homeless issues, food help for our hungry citizens, seniors, families and affordable housing.
- (Page 176) This page, "Homelessness Support Strategies" is misplaced. The discussion and treatment of "homelessness" is a component of, and should be incorporated within a newly reconfigured chapter, titled "Housing and Homelessness."
- (Page 177) Figure CH-6 (map). It is recommended that the 'Tuff Sheds' sites are temporary incidents similar to (informal tent encampments) and should not be mapped as permanent fixtures. If desired, Tuff Sheds villages could be shown in a 'Housing and Homelessness' chapter together with informal tent encampments on a map of "homeless encampments" throughout the City (as of a specific date).
- As the phenomenon of "homelessness" is a new fixture on the urban landscape and one that is not likely to disappear any time soon, the Plan should include criteria for location of abodes for the unsheltered, including criteria for placement that best assures adequacy, safety, and public health.
- (Page 184 CH-1.20) The creation and management of safe needle exchange and disposal operations should be components of a progressive homelessness program, and should be integrated with wrap-around services to comprise an effective, comprehensive, and healing approach to homelessness, citywide. [Housing & Homelessness]
- 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. 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 12th Street – this would be more appropriate to use for homeless services than the library.
- Bathrooms and showers for the homeless and people who can't afford a house.
- In the homeless section, it suggests Community Cabins and Tuff Sheds are different levels of interventions or strategies – they are one in the same.

Mental Health

Summary Comments

- History helps with mental health (feelings inspired by being in old buildings of people who have lived here; heritage).
- 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).
- Mental Health: I would focus on expanding resources for intervention that are not nec police. Council asked us to look into a CAHOOTS model from Oregon where calls for service are parsed and responded to by MH team when OPD is not really needed. Becomes an augmentation or bridge between traditional services like the clinic and criminal justice. More appropriate and cost effective response.

Public Safety / Other

Summary Comments

- Some seniors feel that the area is underpoliced.
- 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.
- Consider requiring air conditioning in new units. Many disabled people are heat intolerant.
- Safety for people who patronize small businesses.
- More safety barriers around parks!
- Good Middle School and high priority, affordable housing, more parking, safety, shopping complex, food and entertainment.
- The Plan document refers to Oakland Alameda Access project, which does not take enough pedestrian safety into account, and Walk This Way, which has stalled indefinitely and lacks funding.
- For childcare providers, esp those of us serving low income families, childcare facilities that are licensable are an on-going issue. Not sure how this exactly works into the plan but clearly a critical step for being family friendly and worker friendly.
- I was surprised we talked about storage but not about public restroom facilities. That is proposed in the current adopted budget.
- Where will money come from for bathrooms, parks?
- Oakland should also consider providing restrooms and break facilities in downtown Oakland for bus operators.

- (Page 187, CH-2.15) Design standards for development should strongly encourage high light-reflective surfaces (white to beige tones), and should do all possible to discourage black and other dark exterior finishes.
- Oakland is part of the World Health Org's Age Friendly Cities initiative. While designed initially to support the aging population it has begun to be used more broadly to make cities senior and youth friendly. Using some of this language given its comprehensive approach from the built environment to the system of care of people might help link us to broader international initiatives. Here's a link to doc: https://www.who.int/ageing/publications/Global_age_friendly_cities_Guide_English.pdf
- (Page 160) The data provided in the 'graphical statistics page' should be updated and reconfigured accordingly if distinct chapters as recommended are established. . "
- (Page 169) Figure CH-1 (map) fails to illustrate the Fire Alarm Building site (triangular block between Lake Merritt and the Main Library) as 'public open space.'
- (Page 160 CH-05 Community Health) under Health Disparities': "Vehicle-Pedestrian Motor Vehicle Accidents Emergency Department Visit Rates (2013-3Q2015). All Races: 121.9, African American/Black: 212.8." This is mathematically inaccurate. I believe it should be written All Races: 334.7 Black 212.8 (Black is a subset of All). Also, not sure how the data ended up with fractions with a defined time period. It's not as if someone is .7% hit by a vehicle or go to the hospital .7%. Same incorrect math applies to the next paragraph on Age Adjusted Asthma. It is an important piece of information, just needs to be accurately stated.
- Healthcare, AI, fiberoptics, infrastructure – all will dramatically change! How is Planning addressing this?
- "A safe place for kids to play in downtown."
- I've lived in downtown Oakland for over 7 years and couldn't imagine calling another part of the Bay Area home but currently downtown can be dangerous for those with disabilities, the elderly, and children as people treat 14th st as their personal highway.
- Where will money come from for policies related to investment in senior centers?

Libraries

Summary Comments

- It is significant that Main Branch of the Oakland Public Library currently occupies an entire city block. Its location is an asset and the building is nearly 70 years old; it is an example from the period in which it was built. Don't go for leased space. The Piedmont and Rockridge libraries being displaced from their leased space.

The library would have to be updated to serve as a respite center. The library shut down during the last heat wave because the air conditioner stopped working.

The library needs maintenance in all aspects, including: more space for seating, viewing recordings, digital access, security, climate control, space for collections, space for staff, space for public programming, etc.

Draft Plan projects about two branch libraries worth of residents over the next two decades.

Make sure that the plan includes access: transit, elevators and ramps (for all ability levels)

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?

- 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 could help achieve equity by expanding on assistance with resumes, job applications, housing applications, etc.
- Some cities have separate impact fees for libraries so that the funds are dedicated to libraries (more common with County libraries).

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.

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.

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 should be characterized as an economic development tool and should be part of economic development strategy (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 be equipped to assist people in the “gig” economy.

Plan should focus more on the educational function of the library as they offer after school services no longer offered by local schools.

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

- 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.
- I am very concerned about the deterioration of the Oakland Main public library. The Main Public Library is at the core of public access to vital resources, teaching and educational courses. In specific, this refers to low-income people who rely on free resources at the main public library in Oakland. This is not fair at all, we as taxpayers get to decide the allocation and spending of our tax dollars. And the most essential component to any city-is the public library, and quite frankly I don't see my tax dollars being used to that end. As a taxpayer and a resident of Oakland who was born and raised in Oakland, I am not at all pleased with what I see, the city's negligence and absence of appropriate distribution of government resources that are supposed to be used to

preserve the Main branch is not being used for its purpose and intention. It is necessary to examine renovations and a master plan.

- Concerned about emphasis on library as shelter.
- Provide access to resources.
- Include in economic development.
- Include OPL on implementation matrix list for capital improvements.
- Current library plan is from the 1930s.
- 2018: 1/5 of households do not have broadband subscriptions.
- Libraries serve as common denominator – homeless feel welcome.
- Library institution provides framework for literacy and opportunity.
- At Library Commission, focus on library-specific actions.
- 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.
- Overall, the DOSP does not include the library's more traditional role in providing access to resources and opportunity. Our libraries are committed to balance the needs of all populations and serve to distribute information and host service events which assist with everything from job placement to legal assistance.

Moreover, I would like to take a moment to address the DOSP proposal to use the libraries as daytime shelters or drop in centers for the homeless and other vulnerable neighbors. While the libraries always have and will continue to welcome all Oaklanders, the DOSP's vision of libraries as daytime shelters creates a new expectation for social services and capabilities that the libraries do not presently possess. While libraries in San Francisco have dedicated social workers, Oakland's libraries do not, and it would be a disservice both to library staff and the unhoused if the library were to be thrust into such an important role without adequate resources. The term "shelter" misconstrues the ongoing role of our libraries to serve as places of "refuge".

- Need resources to address library's needs: impact fees, CIP.

Parks, Public, and Open Space

Summary Comments

- (Page 183, CH-1.7) There must be better ways to activate public space than encouraging "pop-up vendors" to set up shop. With the low level of maintenance available by the City, the rapid accumulation of generated debris will make bad matters worse for maintaining public spaces.
- (Page 183, CH-1.11) Public spaces serving persons with disabilities should be provided and implemented ... not just "invested" in.

- (Page 183, CH-1.10) Although it may sound natural and inviting, “edible gardens” will generate loads of spoiled fruit covering the ground and attracting rodents, vermin, and disease. If implemented, sufficient maintenance must be an incorporated component.
- The Fire Alarm Building site (triangular block between Lake Merritt and the Main Library) should be designated as part of the Lake Merritt park lands, public open space, and reserved for public uses.
- The Channel from Lake Merritt to the Estuary is insufficiently discussed. Adjoining 275-ft height limits should be revisited. The Channel’s health, flow, marine life, birds, animals, ecology, and protection from pollution are essential. Everyday access to the water should be protected and development held well away from the water. Paths and open space should be accompanied with appropriate plantings to support the ecology of this fragile area.
- Measure DD Bond funds have made significant, popular improvements to the parklands at Lake Merritt and along the Lake Merritt Channel. The parklands, which form the entire eastern border of the Downtown Oakland Specific Plan (DOSPP), are essential to meeting the park needs of the plan’s projected residential population. However, the plan gives scant attention to these parklands. Several of the plan’s projects and policies will have an adverse impact on the future life of various improvements funded by Measure DD.
- "Integrate parks into a seamless web. The minimal attention accorded parks is a striking failure of the plan. A small step in the right direction would be for the plan to call for knitting together all the existing parks and proposals for their improvements into a broader vision: the Green Loop, West Oakland Walk, Estuary Park, Jack London’s waterfront, the Bay Trail, the Lake Merritt to Bay Trail Bike-Ped Bridge, and the paths around Lake Merritt and along the Channel. These elements of public infrastructure offer ample places for making the city more engaging to all; integrating them into a seamless web would greatly increase their value."
- Ensure that development along the Channel respects its ecology and is required to provide continuous public access. The plan makes scant mention of the Channel. The safety and protection of the Channel ecology, and its protection from pollution, are essential. The plan must ensure that development on either side of the Channel on Laney, Peralta, and Victory Court parcels takes this into account. The proposed 275’ height limits should be re-examined and re-mapped where buildings might line the Channel (fig. LU 10a, p.217). The plan must ensure everyday access to the water by residents and visitors alike on paths through public open space on either side of the Channel. Development along the Channel shore must not be allowed to overwhelm, detract or impede public access. The plan should call for appropriate plantings along the edge to support wildlife and the marine ecosystem and reduce polluting runoff.
- Identify realistic financing dedicated to the maintenance and upkeep of the Lake Merritt parklands Our primary issue is with the plan’s failure to ensure that sufficient maintenance and upkeep of the Lake Merritt parklands will be provided now and into the future. The plan proposals and related mitigations don’t address the predictable increase in their use by the projected increase in population of more than 50,000 residents. The draft EIR acknowledges this problem: “The amount of acreage of parks in downtown is small in comparison to other parts of the city, and with the projected increase in population, the existing overused parks will become increasingly more overused” (p. 623). On-going maintenance of the City’s parks and open spaces remains a chronic budget problem. For that reason alone the plan must propose a realistic financing method that will provide a steady, dedicated stream of revenue sufficient for parks

maintenance needs and permanent upkeep. Suggesting an update in the LLAD (CH-1.6, p.182, draft EIR p.622), which has already failed more than once, cannot be considered realistic in addressing this need.

Sufficient, ongoing maintenance of the City's parks and open space provisions remain a chronic budget and staffing problem, lacking a permanent solution. LLAD has proven to be inadequate for the support of needed maintenance. The Plan should propose solutions that provide a steady, reliable, and dedicated stream of revenue for maintenance needs and permanent upkeep.

- Please acknowledge that new parklets, alleys, and open spaces are not the same as a larger, higher capacity public indoor recreational center. As the population grows, so must our ability to provide indoor space for every generation and resident in order to avoid displacement and contested public spaces. Like our libraries, these rec centers are central gathering places and allow for a wide range of mixing, social interaction and community building.
- Please make an effort to better to understanding the impact of growth on our only downtown recreation center and prioritize a larger recreation center at Lincoln Square Park. The current EIR does not adequately address this concern or the predictable adverse effects that will ensue without further mitigations and assurances.

How will our only downtown recreation center that serves residents of all ages be able to handle the recreation needs without displacement of the existing community users?

- P. 622: Comment: Why are the only policy proposals focused only on new park spaces? Why does the Webster Green get called out as a specific project, even though it is not on the City's CIP, but a larger and expanded Recreation Center at Lincoln Square Park, which is at the top of the CIP list, does not?
- Parks and Recreation Advisory Commissioner Smith is 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. Need 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.).
- Prioritize resources for existing parks; existing parks need more resources; existing paseos, plazas, etc. need maintenance.
- No parks under freeway.
- (p.48, I-980 Corridor) Additional traditional parks are not needed on the I-980 air-rights as there are plenty of nearby traditional parks in Downtown and West Oakland. What is needed are linear parks for biking and mini parks for intimate neighborhood needs like those found in Battery Park City.
- The Plan should emphasize the need for stable and adequate funding mechanism for these parks. The 2002 Measure DD Bond (\$198M) has provided the capital funds to improve the park. It does not include maintenance monies. The draft EIR acknowledges this: "The amount of acreage of

parks in downtown is small in comparison to other parts of the city, and with the projected increase in population, the existing overused parks will become increasingly more overused” (p. 623). The increase of housing will create a greater need for maintenance of our parks, in particular Lake Merritt, as the park use will be increased.

- My concern involves the Lake Merritt Channel which provides important public access to the water and rich birdlife. The plan must preserve and protect public access while providing development that development on either side of the Channel on Laney, Peralta and Victory Court parcels.
- Change downtown Oakland to a beautiful park
- Green Loop: Include Broadway! Desperately needs streetscape improvements, like Latham Square.
- We also support Friends of Lincoln Square Park's efforts to build a larger higher capacity recreation center as it is our only recreation center Downtown.
- Prohibit private development in parks (such as the recent telecommunications incursions at Lafayette Park that have limited its public use).
- Trees being cut Webster between 17th & 19th
- Address industrial concerns and freight issues.
- Jack London Maker District and impact relative to SB 617.

Transportation

Summary Comments

- Green Loop: Bikes – mostly protected. Bollards are ugly!
- Green Loop: Broadway – problem with putting cars and transit.
- Green Loop: Not about taking away resources from existing parks, it's about connecting them.
- Green Loop: Connect to Mandela Parkway and get all the way to Bay/Bridge.
- Make sure that the plan includes access: transit, elevators and ramps (for all ability levels).
- "Improving the Livability of Oakland's Streets:
 - Prioritize funding for one-way to two-way street conversations improving the livability along these overbuilt and automobile dominated corridors.
 - Seek quick-fix solutions in addition to the permanent improvements for the Highway 880 underpass and Highway 980 overpass projects that are critical to connecting downtown to the surrounding neighborhoods. Extend the pedestrianization of 13th street from Harrison street to Lake Merritt creating a seamless pedestrian plaza between Preservation Park and Lake Merritt.
 - Increase the size and activation opportunities of Latham Square by pedestrianizing Telegraph Ave between Broadway and 16th Street."

- I-880 and the UPRR tracks: The specific plan should identify the undergrounding of portions of these obnoxious transportation facilities on urban form impediments to connecting Downtown to the Estuary Waterfront.
- In favor of parking underneath freeways.
- Underpass improvement and Webster Green lack implementation: Underpass improvement is perhaps the most important current issue to our neighborhood. These needed improvements are mentioned as a part of the “Green Loop”. We concur that these are critical elements to achieve the plan’s Health & Wellness, and Mobility & Accessibility goals, but the Plan lacks implementation and hands off to defunct or insufficient concurrent planning efforts to solve this key problem.

Sustainability & Environmental Stewardship

Summary Comments

- "Sustainability & Environmental Stewardship" is the most critically important topic affecting to the city’s future; the discussion and treatment of these topics must appropriately acknowledge this reality. Also, work is currently in progress within the city to develop a ‘Climate Action Plan.’ Such Plan should be incorporated.
- Overall, the DOSP is a positive step forward as a vision for an inclusive, sustainable Oakland. [We] urge the Oakland Planning Department to develop and refine this vision in the coming months. We urge the city as a whole to move forward with the same vision, boldly transforming ourselves for equitable adaptation in the climate-changed future.

Resiliency – not just flooding; soft-story buildings, fires.

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 lead 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.

- Have you checked with Chief Resiliency Officer?
- The global climate crisis is not impending but ongoing. Wildfires, blackouts, coastal retreat, climate refugees, and more are already daily concerns for our community and State—yet we have failed to address the automobile dependence that is a primary driver of the crisis. The DOSP must consider how our built environment affects Oakland’s 2030 climate goals. Dense transit-oriented urban infill is a moral and practical imperative for a viable urban future. Research indicates that incentives do change behavior: more transit accessibility, and less free or subsidized parking, will both attract more people who want to go without a car, and make the choice to reduce car use easier for current residents.

What is the plan doing about flooding, climate change and sea level rise? (lives near the E 18th project, and they are dealing with related flooding) Lake Merritt flooding? Urban heat island? Building standards to handle pollution?

Institutional properties and uses can then also include those hardened spaces for natural disasters and the air quality shelters and things like that.

- (Page 162 CH-05 Community Health) “Poor air quality results in high asthma rates...area west of San Pablo Avenue.” Is this statement saying that Black residents succumb to air pollution at a higher rate than other races or is it saying that all races succumb to the polluted air along these corridors but due to the fact there are more black residents in that area they are disproportionately affected? This is an important distinction: If Black residents have a higher sensitivity to air pollutants, then why and how to amend this? If it is simply that everyone living there has similar issues it would be a more straightforward problem.
- Victory Court receives too much attention – half the units are in brownfield. This is in the context of a request to increase zoning in other areas of downtown, including Lakeside.
- Already expensive to put down infrastructure, so upgrading infrastructure to withstand flooding will be cost prohibitive.
- What is the plan doing about people living next to industrial areas with pollution?

6 LAND USE

Opportunity Sites

Summary Comments

- We would like a large proposed residential building shown on the opportunity sites map in the DOSP [at 2430-2440 Telegraph and 489-493 25th St.] If we need to submit an application despite being told not to, then we will do so. It is an excellent location for housing, or alternatively office or a hotel.
- Figure LU – 3: We would like you to add 456 25th Street, 489-493 25th Street along with 2434-2440 Telegraph to the list of opportunity sites as these should be redeveloped.
- 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).
- The zoning and use designation for the Fire Alarm building should be “public facility” and “open space.” It is incorrectly labeled under Land Use and Urban Form, chap. 5, pgs. 217 and 221, figs. LU-10a and LU-11 as an “opportunity site”. This public property should be deleted from the set of parcels available for development. It is correspondingly mislabeled in figs. 111-9, 13 and 14 in the draft EIR.
- (Page 201, Figure LU-3; also, Page 203, Figure LU-4) The Oakland Main Library & Fire Alarm Building sites are “public facilities” and “open space,” - It is erroneous and mis-leading to designate these valuable public assets as “opportunity sites.” The City Council rejected efforts to designate the FAB for development on at least 4 occasions. This mis-identification should be corrected and these and similar mis-labeled parcels (such as the Laney College parking lots, and others) should be properly designated.
- Classify “opportunity sites” into distinct categories, with identifying names and the distinct categories added to the Opportunity Sites Map (Figure LU-3, page 201). All sites in APIs and ASIs should be considered as “historic district infill” and not included in the Opportunity Sites Map.

“Underutilized sites” should similarly exclude historic resources. “Adaptive reuse” site language should be rewritten to refer to the Historic Preservation Element and language already in other city requirements. And, publicly owned sites should have their own category, as these public assets should be preserved for public-serving uses.

- Replace Figure LU-3 “Opportunity Sites” with a map or several maps that distinguish infill sites, adaptive reuse sites, publicly-owned sites, and remove historic resources (Figure LU-5), ASIs and APIs from that map. Preservation and reuse of historic resources is city policy, so they should not appear on the opportunity sites map.

Historic Resources

Summary Comments

- Opportunity sites seem poorly chosen relative to historic resources.
- Re: TDR--people like the mitigation measure, want it implemented in 3 years.
- PDR in Draft Plan—is PDR “flex industry”? why is PDR not mentioned?
- Overlap between Nat’l Register and API designations.
- Update demo findings (LU-2.4)-not comfortable, need more details.
- Keep infill development in historic areas to the same scale as surrounding Areas of Primary or Secondary Importance.
- Reduce existing excessive by-right zoning intensities (floor area ratios or FARs, height limits and residential densities) coupled with increased, or “bonus” intensities in exchange for community benefits, including affordable housing and transferable development rights (TDRs) for historic buildings.
- Ensure that new development within or in proximity to Areas of Primary and Secondary Importance (APIs and ASIs) do not exceed the scale of contributing historic buildings within the APIs and ASIs.
- Provide a robust TDR program.
- Problematic intensity example: Lower Broadway ASI, which contains Oakland’s six oldest documented buildings from the 1850s and 1860s, which are one and two stories (about 15–25 feet in height). The current FAR is an excessive 7.0 and the proposed FAR increases this to 7.5 with a grossly excessive 85-foot maximum height limit. [We] recommend a maximum height limit of 25 feet.
- Problematic intensity example: Lakeside apartment district API or “Gold Coast”. This area currently has an appropriate 55-foot height limit and 4.5 FAR but is proposed for upzoning with a 65-foot height limit and 5.0 FAR (Intensity Area 2) and an 85-foot height limit and 7.5 FAR (Intensity Area 3). The existing height limits and FAR should be retained.
- Problematic intensity example: Old Oakland API with maximum contributing building heights of approximately 45 feet, including parapet. The proposed maximum FAR is 2.0/3.5 with 44/55-foot

height limits. A 45-foot height limit would be appropriate, but it is not yet clear if the maximum height limit will be 45 feet or 55 feet. It should be 45 feet.

- Expand the zoning intensity program boundary (shown on the Page 217 map) to include most areas outside of APIs and ASIs and delete areas which includes certain APIs and ASIs. Expanding the zoning intensity program area will compensate for [our] recommended reduced by-right intensities within APIs and ASIs. Examples of APIs and ASIs that should be deleted from the intensity program area include the Downtown and Uptown APIs and the Upper Telegraph Avenue 23rd–27th St. ASI.
- Direct the consultant preparing the zoning intensity study to identify: (i) where reductions in current by-right intensities will incentivize developers to seek bonus intensities under the community benefits/TDR programs; and (ii) the reduced by-right intensity levels. See 5-28-19 zoning intensity study proposal.
- Delete the following provisions from the implementation action list: a. Action step 54, third bullet (page 270) that calls for “exploring allowing additional height on parcels adjacent to historic properties that rehabilitate the adjacent historic property”. This strategy is an unnecessary incentive for historic building rehabilitation and could significantly compromise the setting for rehabilitated buildings. LU-2.1 and LU-2.2 are cited as relevant policies, but these policies do not mention this strategy.
- Delete the following provisions from the implementation action list: Action step 74 (page 276), which states “update the city’s demolition findings to allow development near the periphery of fragmented Areas of Primary Importance and Areas of Secondary Importance that is compatible with the historic district”. This action step appears to promote demolition of contributing buildings within APIs and ASIs. If portions of APIs and ASIs are “fragmented” (presumably by vacant lots), compatible development of vacant lots should be promoted instead.
- Some provisions of the draft plan, notably the “Proposed Maximum Intensity Map” on page 217, are clearly inconsistent with [our] objectives, especially Objective 2. Consistency with Objectives 1 and 3 is unclear, because the viability of Objective 1’s community benefits program and Objective 3’s TDR program depend on base (“by- right”) zoning intensities (height, FAR, and residential density) being low enough to incentivize developers to provide community benefits (including TDRs) in exchange for increased “bonus” intensity.
- A Super-specific Plan will be needed to address select areas of Oakland's Downtown that the DOSP either skips over or doesn't adequately cover: The stretch between 8th Street and 4th on Broadway is a virtual no-man's land that stymies proper connection between Old Oakland and Jack London Square, and, despite numerous charrettes and discussion regarding this weakest link what should be Oakland's main boulevard, it remains today perhaps the largest deterrent to the vitality and interactivity that good, community-inclusive planning can bring.

Cultural Districts

Summary Comments

- Require DESIGN GUIDELINES for ALL Cultural Districts and areas with architecturally relevant buildings in order to result in HIGH LEVEL Design to created FUTURE historically relevant buildings.

If not in an arts district, where else? Perhaps another area would be the waterfront for truly signature buildings.

- (LU 2.3) Cultural Districts Program: Each Cultural District should specify community priorities by district.
- Page 219 – Support Cultural Districts Through Zoning – This section discusses incentives which encourage the support of the arts, which makes sense. However, the section then reverts back to the concept of restricting uses and required uses, which will lead to empty storefronts and dying retail areas, which isn't good for anybody.

Jack London Maker District & Produce Market

Summary Comments

- Our client feels, and would ask the City to address, that the creation of the proposed Maker District would be inappropriate for the highest and best uses of the properties in this area of the Jack London District, especially considering the Plan's stated desire to maintain truck routes along 3rd Street.
- p. 224 & 225: Waterfront warehouse district - name the district, clarify zoning.
- The proposed [Jack London] Maker District would restrict the height, density, and maximum FAR of properties in this four block by two block area to a maximum of 55 feet in height, FAR of 3.5, and density of 300 SF - In contrast, properties immediately adjacent to the proposed Maker District, several of which are identified as "publicly-owned," along both 880 to the north and the railroad tracks to the south, would be permitted as much as 275 feet in height, FARs as high as 17.0, and maximum densities of 90 SF and 110 SF respectively.
- OAKLAND WATERFRONT WAREHOUSE DISTRICT: please do not increase FAR or density of this historic district, which has been formally listed on the National Register of Historic Places since 24 April 2000 and is designated as an Area of Primary Importance by the City of Oakland. Table LU-3 in the Plan (page 224): proposes to change a portion of the WWD from FAR 5.0 to FAR 12.0 (please see ID 20).
- WHOLESAL PRODUCE MARKET: please do not increase FAR or density of this Area of Primary Importance as proposed in Table LU-3 of the Plan (page 224). Increasing the FAR from 1.0 to 2.5 will guarantee the destruction of the Market (please see ID 33). The Market is unique in Northern California, if not the entire state and is truly a character defining element of the Jack London District. If the market activity relocates or ceases to be economically viable, the City might consider increasing FAR and density (more than currently proposed), but now is NOT the time.
- LOWER BROADWAY: please do not increase FAR or density of this Area of Secondary Importance where there are six one-and-two-story buildings dating from the 1850s to the 1870s. All may need restoration and/or rehabilitation, but this is no reason to increase FAR from 7.0 to 12.0, which will guarantee their destruction. Reducing FAR and adding height limits of 25 to 35 feet might ensure preservation of these historic resources, which include the oldest building in the City of Oakland (at 3rd & Broadway).

- Produce Market should take full advantage of the location, opportunities, and urban growth possibilities of the Produce Market District and provide development standards and increased intensities that allow for high-rise, mid-rise and low-rise development options.

Art & Garage

Summary Comments

- We are stakeholders in the area with 9 buildings and more than 20 tenants on 24th and 25th Streets. We own many of the buildings that the DOSP describes as being drivers in the Arts and Garage District, and we are responsible for attracting the artists into several of those spaces and the area; the restrictions placed on 25th Street as described in the DOSP are restrictive and penalizing in a way that discourages owners, like us, who have long been supportive of Oakland and its organic nature for growth. We have long dreamed of building live/work style housing over many of these buildings at a density worthy of this Downtown location, and the DOSP as written eliminates that opportunity.
- Your proposed land use zoning restrictions, suggested mandate for owners to compensate displaced artists, and limitations on building height and FAR, when compared to similar adjacent areas, are all penalizing to owners that have provided an opportunity for businesses to occupy spaces in this area.
- Conversely, owners that continued to hold-out for higher rents or left their spaces vacant without regard for being additive to the community are being rewarded with flexible zoning, no penalty on changing uses in their spaces and increased density/heights. Those owners are able to demolish their buildings, build taller building with fewer use restrictions and receive economic benefits of not having to pay displacement fees in cases where artists' leases are up. Instead of penalizing owners like us who have helped build the community and the culture, you should be incentivizing us to keep some of the uses that you'd like to see and rewarding them as such.
- You should be creating an environment in these areas, and for these owners, to benefit economically with the allowance of greater height, more units per square foot of land creating affordability for tenants like artists (less square footage for actual units), encourage live/work options, etc. (Instead, these owners and areas are being limited through various zoning restrictions and development limitations, which also run contrary to helping achieve the stated goals of additional housing opportunities.)
- These owners could do even more for the artists and growth of the area if incentivized to do so with flexible zoning and fewer development restrictions, rather than being encouraged to remove artists before the implementation of this DOSP in order to avoid displacement charges.
- #4 Koreatown/Northgate on Page 52 – 25th Street should not be treated differently than 24th, 26th and 27th Streets. 25th should be encouraged to add housing above with flexible, mixed-use below. We would like to see 25th Street given the same opportunities provide on 24th, 26th and 27th Streets.
- Land Use Controls on page 148 – There are several land use controls identified to encourage more arts. If you penalize developments that directly displace existing arts and PDR uses, you are unfairly and economically burdening those owners that have helped create the culture that you are striving to keep. You are forcing those owners to carry the burden of “culture keeping” on

their properties for the benefit of the adjacent owners and the entire City. You also suggest restrictions on the amount of retail, restaurants, etc., which will lead to vacancies and empty storefronts which will quickly destroy an area and diminish the street activation that is critical for all business, including artists.

- Character and Intensity Strategies on page 210 – On this page in the 3rd paragraph, 25th Street is identified as a historic warehouse district, which is inaccurate and needs to be changed. In the next paragraph, the document describes a “key aspect of the economic development for downtown...” includes encouraging more housing and more spaces for art. In order to accomplish this priority, the Mixed-Use Flex concept is added. This concept makes sense and should include all of 25th Street. It should be added to Figure LU-8A. In fact, the example for Mixed-Use Flex in Table LU-1 includes our building on 25th Street, yet it is called out for Flex only. The land use designation for buildings on 25th should be changed to Mixed-Use Flex.
- Retain light industrial through Art + Garage District; lower base zone.

Land Banking

Summary Comments

- The City should implement an active policy of “land-banking” to the maximum extent feasible, inventorying and acquiring excess land and buildings in Oakland from private sources and from other governmental agencies, for housing its citizens.
- Reduce existing excessive by-right FARs, height limits and residential density to promote community benefits, including affordable housing and TDRs to preserve historic buildings. The Specific Plan provides an opportunity to correct the mistakes of the 2009 rezoning that provided excessive by-right height limits and FARs, which eliminated any incentives for developers to provide community benefits, such as affordable housing and acquisition of TDRs from historic buildings in exchange for increased height, FAR and residential density on their development sites. For example, much of downtown Oakland was provided with a by-right 20.0 FAR and unlimited height in the 2009 rezoning, which, unfortunately, appears mostly retained in the Preliminary Draft (based on the areas designated for “unlimited” height on the draft intensity map), which, in the absence of FAR designations, will presumably retain the existing excessive by-right 20.0 FARs. This is especially disappointing, given such statements in the 2016 Plan Alternatives Report as the following on page 4.7: “Rezone areas with unnecessarily excessive height limits to allow for more flexibility with density bonuses and other developer incentives”. By comparison, the maximum by-right FAR in San Francisco resulting from its 1985 Downtown Specific Plan was 9.0, which can be increased up to 18.0 with TDRs and other community benefits. “Overzoning”, such as what exists in downtown Oakland, tends to artificially inflate land values and create more barriers to providing affordable housing and encourages owners to “land bank” their property while waiting for a major development project that will pay them top dollar. Ironically this can discourage development, rather than encourage it, as intended by overzoning. Land banking also tends to encourage a slumlord mentality, with building owners reluctant to spend money to properly maintain their buildings and refuse long-term leases that could include major tenant improvements, thereby discouraging high-quality tenants.

Maps, Figures, & Tables

Summary Comments

- Although the draft plan describes such a two-tiered system in its “zoning incentive program” discussions, the proposed maximum intensity map only shows maximum intensities, without the by-right intensities. The by-right intensities are needed in order to evaluate whether the community benefits and TDR programs will actually work.
- (Page 197, Figure LU-1) The “Transit Access Map” should include principal modes of travel and transit connections to and between BART stations.
- C-1.10) Zone to preserve and encourage PDR (Production, Distribution and Repair) is clearly highlighted in the Culture Keeping section yet is not mentioned in any subsequent zoning maps. Apply consistent language in zoning maps that refer to “FLEX-INDUSTRIAL.”

Industrial Uses/Industrial Conversion/Port of Oakland

Summary Comments

- Create "industrial sanctuary" zones which include policies for exclusion of and buffering from inconsistent land uses and provision of safe and efficient heavy truck routing.
- Port's letter directs the EIR to include more discussion re: West Oakland Specific Plan policy related to industrial nature of the area and the vision for the 3rd St. Opportunity Area, which could similarly be addressed (in an abbreviated fashion) in the DOSP.
- Retain ALL light Industrial zoning not just on 25th Street in the AGD, but compare to current zoning (see letter for map) and apply to the rest of the AGD area as well as make this type of light industrial/clean industrial zoning as an option for ALL ground floor spaces in DT. Oakland MUST engage in retaining as much industrial light manufacturing zones as possible. Please also reconsider the conversion of industrial to residential in the estuary area. PLEASE REFER TO CHARACTER MAP on PAGE 211 of the DRAFT DOSP. (NOTE: the SPOT ZONING THAT HAS TAKEN PLACE as indicated in the Current Zoning Map for the City of Oakland)
- Land use conflicts (from new non-industrial uses) and congestion are contrary to the goals of the plan and will negatively impact the quality of life for future residents and businesses, just as they will negatively impact the Port of Oakland's future.
- DOSP does not clearly tell the public about the scope and scale of what is being proposed for this current industrial buffer zone, Analytical Environmental Services prepared an analysis that estimates approx. 30,000 new residents; a new neighborhood of 30,000 deserves baseline analysis. DOSP does not detail how it intends to accommodate all of these new residents except in the most cursory of ways.
- City has not analyzed its impact on the Port or its tenants, its transportation and circulation impacts, its transit impacts (noting the absence of any analysis of the amorphous A's gondola project) and to preserve its equity and economic development goals, where it intends to grow future blue-collar middle-class jobs if it is sacrificing urban industrial properties.
- RE: Waterfront Industrial Corridor. Our waterfront is a key element in Oakland's industrial economy. Residential development does not belong at 3rd Street adjacent to the industrial

corridor. Such development would undermine decades of work to preserve our industrial economic base. We must have a buffer between the downtown and the industrial waterfront. The Plan should assure Oakland's industrial, logistics and maritime companies along the waterfront continue to flourish, providing jobs and tax revenue.