

**LANDMARKS PRESERVATION
ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS:**

**Vince Sugrue, Chair
Klara Komorous, Vice-Chair
Chris Andrews
Ben Fu
Marcus Johnson
Alison Lenci
Tim Mollette-Parks**

**LANDMARKS PRESERVATION
ADVISORY BOARD MINUTES:**

**June 7, 2021
Special Meeting 5 PM
Via: Tele-Conference**

.....

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER BY: Chair Vince Sugrue @ 5:02pm

ROLL CALL

**Board Members present: Andrews, Fu, Johnson, Komorous, Lenci,
Mollette-Parks, Sugrue
Board Members absent: None
Staff present: Betty Marvin, Deb French, Karen August**

WELCOME BY CHAIR - Board Chair Sugrue welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked Board Secretary Karen August to give a helpful explanation on the meeting and some pointers on how this works for everyone in attendance either by Zoom or by phone.

By Zoom: she asked all attendees to lower any hands that are raised and only raise them if you're interested in speaking on an item when it's called. This will help us avoid confusion and calling speakers for the wrong item. The system will keep track of the order of hands that are raised and it's important that once you raise your hand, keep it raised, unless you change your mind about speaking on that item. Lowering and raising your hand will bump you to the end of the line. Each speaker will have a maximum of 3 minutes to speak and during this time, speakers cannot concede time. When it's your time to speak, the City will unmute you and then you will need to unmute yourself on your device to begin speaking.

By phone: you press *9 to engage the raise your hand feature. When it's your time to speak, the City will refer to you by the last four digits of your phone number and then press *6 to unmute yourself. If you do not wish to speak on any item, you can also view the hearing on KTOP Live on television as well, instead of this platform if you so choose.

BOARD BUSINESS

Agenda Discussion - None

Board Matters – this will be **Chair Sugrue’s** last LPAB meeting. He will be moving over to the Planning Commission stating, this has been an amazing experience. Now, we need to vote in a new Chair and asked the Board, if there is a motion for a new Chair. **Fu** – made a proposal to nominate **Vice-Chair Komorous for Chair**, she’s been Vice-Chair for a second term now and her leadership for the Board, has been quite evident. Seconded by **Johnson**. Before the vote, **Sugrue** stated that, Vice-Chair Komorous has done exceptionally and I know she will do exceptionally in this role. **Andrews** – wanted to remind everyone, that Vice-Chair Komorous is excellent in fashioning motions. The Chair ‘cannot’ make a motion and we’ll be losing Vice-Chair Komorous’ excellent motion abilities. Someone has to rise to that occasion and wanted to warn everyone that he’s terrible at it. **Sugrue** – thanked Andrews and pointed out something that is incredibly important to everyone. Everyone on the Board has a responsibility for motions, and Vice-Chair Komorous has been our ‘star’. **August** - did a verbal count; **7 ayes, 0 no, motion passes unanimously**. **Sugrue** – asked the Board if there is a motion for a new Vice-Chair. **Komorous** – nominated **Ben Fu** as the new Vice-Chair. Seconded by **Mollette-Parks**. **August** – did a verbal count; **7 ayes – 0 no, motion passes unanimously**.

Sub-committee Reports – None

Secretary Reports – None

OPEN FORUM – **Naomi Schiff, Oakland Heritage Alliance (OHA)** – OHA is having another free on-line presentation by **Kathleen Di Giovanni**, Thursday, June 17 @ 7pm. She will talk about the history of Oakland’s Confectionary Industry. It ought to be a lot of fun and she’s done great research. Kathleen is a retired librarian, who worked in the Oakland History Room for years and knows how to find the ‘sweet stuff’. Ms. Schiff also wanted to thank Vince Sugrue for his service on the Board and OHA looks forward to seeing him on the Planning Commission. **Daniel Levy, OHA** –seconded Naomi Schiff’s congratulating Sugrue on his move to the Planning Commission and to Klara Komorous and Ben Fu on their new positions on the LPAB, and thanked them for all their work.

INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATIONS – **Alameda County Transportation Commission information presentation: “Project Status for the Oakland Alameda Access Project”**

Secretary August – introduced the speaker, Project Manager Gary Sidhu, who is also a consultant with HNTB Corp. and has been working on the project plans and community outreach. He was hired as a consultant by Alameda County Transportation Commission (ACTC) in coordination with Caltrans.

Gary Sidhu, Project Manager, ACTC – introduced his team of presenters; **Joy Shermas – Director of Project Delivery, ACTC; Gary Siegel, Project Manager, ACTC; Carie Montero, Assoc. VP, Environmental Planning Director, HNTB Corp., and Helen Blackmore, Caltrans.**

Carie Montero – gave a PowerPoint informational presentation on the Posey Tube update project (Posey Tube Portal Bldg., Oakland Landmark, Ord. 11463, June 23, 1992). The project is sponsored by ACTC and Caltrans, with Caltrans serving as the CEQA and NEPA lead agency. A draft CEQA, Environmental Impact Report and a draft NEPA, Environmental Assessment, analyzing a single built alternative was prepared for the project. The comment period for the draft EIR/EA (Environment Impact Report and Environmental Assessment), ran from 09/29/20 to 11/30/2020. The d alternative reflected extensive public outreach and engagement. The project team previously met with Oakland’s LPAB in January 2019. At that presentation, ACTC and Caltrans, introduced the proposed project to the Board, including design concepts for the Posey Tube. Some of the key elements of the project include: in Areas 1 & 2, divert regionally bound traffic away from local streets including Oakland’s Chinatown; Area 3, widen NB

I-880 Oak Street off-ramp, reconstruct 6th Street for multimodal access; Area 4, restripe 7th Street and improve intersections; Area 5, restripe Madison Street for 2-way travel between 4th, 6th & Jackson Streets; Area 6; restripe Oak Street for multimodal 2-way cycle track; Area 7, reconfigure intersections at Broadway, 5th and 6th Streets; and, Area 8, restripe Broadway and Jackson Street on-ramps. Additional details on the project improvements can be found on the Alameda Access Project website.

The project will have an impact on the Posey Tube. As documented in our draft environmental document, will we have an adverse effect. The Posey Tube is individually eligible for a listing on the National Register of Historic Places and is listed in the California Register of Historic Resources. The Posey Tube is also a contributing property to the Oakland Waterfront Warehouse District, itself a National Register Historic District and listed in the California Register of Historic Resources. As a result of the impacts on the Posey Tube, the Historic District will be adversely affected as well. Caltrans received SHPO (State Historic Preservation Office), concurrence on 02/08/2021. The finding of effects looked at a broad range of design alternatives including an alternative to fully avoid any impacts on the Posey Tube. This alternative was dropped because the resulting design would not meet the project's purpose and need.

The Oakland Alameda Access Project (OAAP), will not modify or alter any portion of the Oakland approach's Portal Building. However, the proposed project would demolish 175 feet of the Oakland approach on the eastern balustrade and associated staircase. Removal of the wall would accommodate a right turn lane onto 5th Street to the proposed Jackson Street 'horseshoe'. The existing staircase removal would allow for a proposed ADA compliant ramp. The existing straight wall will be replaced by a 215 feet, long curved balustrade wall. Also, 95 feet of Oakland's western balustrade wall will be demolished and replaced with an operationally critical new left turn lane to 6th Street. A new western balustrade wall will be constructed to the west. The western pylon base would be removed and won't be relocated under I-880 due to the physical constraints. However, the project will access the ability to relocate that pylon in the next design phase. A new shared use bike lane path will connect the compliant ADA ramp at the Posey Tube on 6th Street. Despite these changes and impacts, the Posey Tube would retain its integrity and continue to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

Throughout the work of this project since 2015, the project team has conducted extensive engagement in public outreach. To date, the team has had over 250 meetings with a diverse group of stakeholders, including the cities of Alameda and Oakland, Oakland Chinatown, Jack London Improvement District, bike advocacy groups and, numerous public agencies. Extensive outreach efforts were conducted for the public hearing and comment period for the draft EIR. This included notifications in four languages, via newspapers, advertisements and other social media. A total of 241 people attended the live virtual public hearing. The website was viewed nearly 10,000 times and the draft EIR received over 630 individual comments from 113 commenters. Comments specific to the Cultural Resource impacts were received from the Oakland Heritage Alliance (OHA), Jack London Improvement District, the South of Nimitz Improvement Council (SONIC) and a local business owner. Concerns were expressed over the proposed impacts on the Posey Tube, over potential harm that the project could cause to the character of the Oakland Waterfront Warehouse District and the sufficiency of the proposed mitigation measures presented in the draft EIR. Several commenters requested that funding be provided for the Façade Improvement Program, as a mitigation measure. In addition, stakeholders expressed an interest in the design of the new Posey Tube walls. Essential design elements were incorporated into the project, as a result of our stakeholders' comments and concerns. Currently, following the draft EIR and a careful review of all the comments received, Caltrans and the Project Development team identified the build alternative as the preferred alternative. We're also in preparation of the final EIR and EA and the development of a Memorandum of Agreement to resolve adverse effects.

Helen Blackmore, Caltrans – continued the presentation with an update on the status of the project. The finding of adverse effects was completed in August 2020 and received SHPO (State Historic Preservation Office), concurrence in February, 2021. Under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act to resolve the adverse effects to the Cultural Resources, the Posey Tube and the Oakland Waterfront Warehouse District, we made a complete Memorandum of Agreement (MOA), which documents the mitigation measures that will be completed. We've also been holding stakeholder working group meetings and, the mitigation measures are designed for public benefit and directly tied to the historical significance of the resources.

We've held four highly productive and engaging meetings, to discuss the mitigation measures for this project. They were all attended by representatives of the City of Oakland, including; Ed Manasse, Deputy Director, Planning; Pete Vollmann, Planner IV; Betty Marvin, Historic Preservation Planner; and OHA, Jack London Improvement District and SONIC. In these working group meetings, we discussed potential mitigation measures, many of which made it into the MOA and the Building Environment Treatment Plan (BETP). We also discussed project elements affecting the measures, to ensure that our avoidance, minimization and mitigation measures, adequately reflected the needs and concerns of the group.

The mitigation overview included a Historic American Engineering Recor survey of the Posey Tube; the Posey Tube will remain eligible for the National Register Nomination; a \$100,000 contribution to the Oakland Façade Improvement Program to be used for the Waterfront Warehouse District; public educational components with interpretive panels; and Caltrans will host tours of the Posey Tube Portal building, once the project is completed. Following this presentation, the MOA will be submitted to SHPO for review and comment. Caltrans will work with SHPO to finalize the MOA and, once the MOA is deemed completed, the MOA will be signed by Caltrans Headquarters, acting as Federal Highway Administration, under delegation. The document will then be circulated to invited signatories including Caltrans District 4, ACTC, City of Oakland and the Jack London Improvement District, along with concurring parties, OHA and SONIC. Further upcoming City actions include Caltrans coordinating with ACTC, the City of Oakland and the Façade Improvement Program, to develop a MOA.

Chair Sugrue –reminded everyone that this item was featured as an Informational Presentation and not an Application, so no motion will be required, but did want it open for Public Comment and questions.

PUBLIC COMMENTS/QUESTIONS – **Naomi Schiff, OHA** –thanked the various representatives of the ACTC project and the many meetings and discussions. She asked the LPAB to voice concern on the western pylon retention, it's something we did not understand fully until after the EIR was distributed. **Daniel Levy, OHA** – thanked everyone for their work on the project. We're excited about a lot in the MOA including the Façade Improvement contribution and tours of the building. Our comments towards the end have been about the western pylon and softening some of the language in the MOA, to leave open the possibility of the retention of that pylon. We noticed in the draft EIR, there was no mention of the removal of either pylon and, we want to make sure that possibility is still open in the MOA. He asked, if the LPAB could have this project come back before them, during the different phases of designs and to make sure the public, the Board and the City will have an opportunity to weigh in, provide comment and be part of this process, since this is a Landmark.

BOARD COMMENTS/QUESTIONS – **Sugrue** – asked if the Board could get details on the western pylon and thanked OHA for all their consistent hard work: I don't know what we'd do without them in this city. **Montero** – the western pylon base will need to be removed. There is an operational, critical left turn lane onto 6th Street coming out of the Tube, that is in direct conflict with where the actual base is currently located. We have committed to a further look in the design phase to see whether the pylon can be slightly shifted to a new location near but not in the exact location it's in now. We've done

extensive traffic studies for this project and that left turn lane is required. If we don't have that, then there will be extensive queues backing up into the Posey Tube, which can cause operational failures. **Komorous** – the LPAB will support any and every effort for a retention of the maximum amount of the historic fabric and, we would appreciate if that pylon could be relocated. **Montero** – yes, we are trying to find ways to do that. **Andrews** – thanked everyone for the presentation; any efforts we can make to improve traffic conditions in cities is always great. He wanted to remind folks why we (LPAB) care so much for these pylons. If we look at civil engineering since WWII, we see desolate, awful spaces, and somehow civil engineers before WWII thought about the way things look and how to function. We have this beautiful entrance into the tube done before WWII, and after, we just have masses of concrete everywhere. That is why we're obsessed with this pylon, because it has beauty and grace. He mentioned an article in the *New York Times*, that cities want to tear down freeways and build beautiful tree lined boulevards. Oakland was one of the cities mentioned in the article.

Fu – said it was a great presentation and wanted the engineer to explain why the operation is critical for the removal of the pylon. **Brandon**, there is a Traffic Operations Analysis Report, mentioned in the draft EIR and available on the project website. Due to the changes in the lane configuration, the Posey Tube will have one of the right lanes coming from Alameda go to the right and the left lane will continue to Downtown Oakland and the Harrison & 6th intersection. If you do not provide that lane, there will be additional queueing for the left turn movements that will go past the bottleneck and has a potential to back up into the tube during AM/PM peaks. That condition would not be operationally acceptable.

Komorous – wanted to reiterate OHA's point on the previous discussion. I understand we cannot make a motion and this is an Informational Presentation, so I would like to make a request to the applicant on behalf of the LPAB, that you do come back for future presentations and that the LPAB will see and stay involved with the design process as it goes forward. Would you be able to confirm, at this time, that you will be coming back? **Montero** – 100%, we have that in our agreement document, our MOA and our BETP, that we'll present to you all, twice during the design phase. Once at 65%, to present and hear your comments/concerns and again at 95%, so you all can see how we've progressed and if we were able to address any of those comments/concerns raised at 65%. We would encourage, if anyone would like to participate with us in the group meetings, which we have throughout the design phase, please do. **Fu** – at the 65% stage, would the relocation of the pylon be better configured or if not, anywhere between 65% and 95%, would you be able to commit to a separate meeting to show the pace of that relocation plan. **Montero** – at the presentation we'll make at the 65% design, we should have enough information to know whether we can relocate that western pylon. So, we will have that survey information available and the design would have progressed to the point where we can definitively say what we can do. We should also have some more information about the condition of the pylon itself, and that has some bearing on whether the pylon can be relocated and kept intact.

Fu – so at this point, the preservation relocation of the pylon is not committed yet, depending on the study and the condition of the pylon. **Montero** – yes, for the eastern pylon we committed to keeping that pylon in place, there are no project impacts that would require the removal. We'll be protecting that pylon during construction with an environmentally sensitive area fencing and have a number of measures written into our contract document to ensure it's properly protected and monitored during construction. But, for the western pylon, it's clearly in conflict with our current design and we will be committed to exploring the question of if it could be relocated. This is still an open question. **Sugrue** – this is helpful, I wish we had gotten this from the developers, in terms of percentage of completion. What are we looking at right now, what percentage is this presentation at now? **Montero** – this presentation is approximately 35%. That's when the project gets to the environmental milestone, where they have the project report completed. **Sugrue** – we're excited to see this progress and grateful you've

built into your plan, that you'll be returning to us because, this is very important to us. **Montero** – thanked everyone for the opportunity to present this project and appreciated everyone's time and excellent questions.

APPLICATIONS – No Applications were presented.

ANNOUNCEMENTS – **Sugrue** – reminded everyone that he's moving on to the Planning Commission, but felt a little 'bummed'. He stated, you've all become my friends in this process and I'm incredibly grateful for this opportunity. I've enjoyed spending time with everyone, this is a labor of love, we all do. I've learned so much from everyone and thank everyone so much. He asked to please email or phone him, because he plans on becoming an active voice of historical preservation on the Planning Commission. It would be great to be updated and consider him as a liaison on that board. He asked to please update him on any action items or projects and will be more than happy to carry the voice of Landmarks through the Planning Commission, consistently.

Komorous – stated, 'right back at you', how much we've appreciated you being on the Board and what a huge impact you made. I'm so grateful being Vice-chair, I was always so relieved that you were running the meetings especially in the beginning, when we switched to Zoom, it was so awkward. How deftly and ably you managed all those meetings. I also appreciate how clearly you summarized, when we had those complex and difficult issues come before us, and your perceptive questions. I run out of words and get completely speechless, that we're going to miss you. We should have made a motion for you to stay. I understand that you are going to a very important role and we appreciate this idea of having you on the Planning Commission, and there could be more interaction with the Planning Commission. That is very exciting and thank you, thank you, thank you!

Fu – wanted to echo Vice-chair Komorous's comments and thanked Chair Sugrue for his guidance, leadership, keeping the Board moving and running an excellent meeting every month. What a time to join the Planning Commission for Oakland, there's a lot of projects and the City made a good choice in your appointment. Congratulations and thank you again.

August – this is my first time as acting Secretary but in attending prior LPAB meetings, I've enjoyed learning from you and the way you chair these meetings, you will be missed. Congratulations and much success in the new role and we look forward to continuing working with you.

Andrews – since you succeeded me as Chair, when I stepped off the Board and termed out, you were such a good Chair that when I returned to the Board, everyone forgot that I was ever Chair. This move to the Planning Commission is critical and exciting, you're going to get a lot less sleep and more reports to read. Thank you again for your service.

Marvin – I have appreciated your calm strength and the way you have led this Board. You kept it on an even keel and things never got into shouting matches. You have treated Board members, the public, the applicants with astonishing fairness and courtesy. Not by being just a yes man or a goodie-goodie but with fairness and insight. I'm vastly impressed. I'm also going to pay my specific tribute to you, which has to do with something that is much more vernacular. I've quoted it over and over again, and that relates to preparing for the upcoming Mills Act item next month. I have used this quote for at least two years now to encourage applicants, as I tell them to look at agendas and packets from past years, that the Board Chair said that the applicants' written applications were a 'blast to read.', So, thank you for that. It's been quoted far and wide.

Sugrue – Right on! I'm glad I could bring some of my surfing and rock climbing lingo into the Board. Thank you so much, I really appreciate all the kind words and I feel very honored to have been on this Board with everyone, thank you.

UPCOMING – **Marvin** – The Mills Act and Heritage Property applications for 2021, at the next LPAB meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – for April 12, 2021 - **Komorou** - made a motion to approve minutes, **Fu** seconded, **August did a verbal vote; 5 ayes, 2 abstentions, motion passes.**

ADJOURNMENT – 6pm

NEXT REGULAR MEETING: July 12, 2021

Minutes prepared by: **LaTisha Russell**