

Summary Notes
Downtown Specific Plan Implementation Workshops
Monday and Tuesday, June 24 and 25
4 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.
OAKSTOP, 1721 Broadway, Oakland, CA

The following information capture key highlights of the meetings. Following this general summary, additional comments and notes attached. These comments were voluntarily submitted via direct email from meeting participants as noted.

The meetings were facilitated by Surlene Grant, Principal, Envirocom Communications Strategies, LLC.

Purpose:

1. To provide for public engagement and input into the Implementation Chapter for the Downtown Oakland Specific Plan (DOSP)
2. To provide stakeholders an opportunity to share ideas on the implementation strategies
3. To involve the stakeholders in prioritizing the strategies for the Plan’s implementation
4. To find out about potential resources and/or partnerships for implementation of Plan components
5. To ultimately develop a list of priorities that the public and stakeholders have helped to generate
6. To discuss and share information constraints, opportunities, and feasibility.

Agenda:

Monday, June 24, 2019

- I. Welcome and Introductions
- II. Meeting Purpose and Framework
- III. Overview of the Draft Plan
Dinner Break
- IV. Working Dinner: Table Top Dialogue
- V. Discuss Implementation Opportunities and Constraints
- VI. Group Discussion
- VII. Close Out: Prepare for Next Day

Tuesday, June 25, 2019

- I. Welcome and Introductions
- II. Meeting Purpose and Framework
- III. Review of Prior Day
- IV. Overview of the Draft Implementation Strategy
Dinner Break
- V. Working Dinner: Implementation Priority
- VI. Prioritizing and Partnering
- VII. Close Out: Next Steps and Schedule

Monday, June 24, 2019

Due to unforeseen calendar conflicts, it turned out that the initial meeting on Monday, June 24 was in conflict with the City of Oakland City Council's budget hearing. Therefore, the timing of meeting components for the first meeting were adjusted so that during the break people could leave and go to the budget hearing.

Approximately 65 people attended Monday evening and 50 attended on Tuesday evening.

During the initial 30 minutes of each meeting, the staff and consultant team provided the customary introduction and meeting overview, and there was a review of the Downtown Oakland Specific Plan to refresh individual recall and to inform first-time attendees of the Plan basics. These presentations were followed by a facilitated discussion and table-top group dialogue designed to solicit stakeholders' comments and ideas regarding the prioritization of the strategies presented.

The following are the comments from the stakeholders regarding the discussion with the guiding questions:

- **what strategies and action steps seem most important to them in a particular topic area?**
- **is anything missing?**

Land Use and Urban Form – planning, development, urban design

Discussion Items:

- There should be some regional consideration. Should we pursue regional transit options, and how do we do that? Will that affect land use, especially with the possibility of the Transbay Tube bringing BART to Jack London Square, and close to the Ferry Terminal? Amtrak could move closer to that with some kind of transit hub and Ferry Terminal next to it.
- *Connectivity: land use and mobility.*
- Reference of access and mobility, not land use. People really want cross connection.
- Priorities are Action Steps 129, 130, 132

Culture Keeping – arts, culture, art district, (artistic space) displacement

Discussion Items:

- Details from the draft plan haven't filtered into this matrix.
- *Connectivity: there are overlapping items that address disparities that should be recognized.*
- There's a 2015 study regarding Cultural Preservation that needs to be funded.
- Overall hard to see details of the implementation strategy.
- The implementation strategies need to be ACTION items, verbs, not about another study
- It is hard to see the details in the DOSP of all the parties involved, the funding needed and the equity factors.
- Make the City's own resources the investment – invest in Library, Malonga Center, key cultural facilities

Recommendations:

- Replace “explore” with more active verbs like “adopt” and “implement”
- Use library properties as cultural facilities, prioritize funding

Mobility and Accessibility – transportation, access

Discussion Items:

- For prioritization, need to look at age and life cycle, i.e. mobility challenges facing people as they age, how people’s needs change throughout their lives
- Figure out how to have space and accessibility for all different modes, like roadway, BART, bikes, and connectivity among the modes.
- In Downtown, you can connect to any BART station or bus with cars, but gaps in having bike lanes, being able to connect bikes the way cars are connected
- *Connectivity: how all modes affect business and what role that has to play on the economy*
- Images and maps are only showing bus and bike and not looking at standard cars

Housing and Affordability – location, accessibility, availability and displacement

Discussion Items:

- The projected number for affordable units is too low of a bar
- Need to define what affordable housing, mid-income, moderate income – what all that really means. Without that information, it’s hard to know what we are striving to do.
- Identify the pros and cons of funding projects up front or facilitating properties that generate tax credit revenue that can contribute to housing in the longer term
- Of the 25 action steps, one doesn’t belong - #36 identifying hotels and meeting spaces.
- Priority or resonating Action Steps that best serve equity needs: #43, #42, #46 – add 12 units, #47.

Community Health – parks, open space, community facilities, environmental sustainability

Recommendations:

- Look for creative financing partnerships, number of opportunities in other cities. In the past, we haven’t done a lot of creative partnerships, like Mello-Roos, or other collaborations to target opportunities.
- Seek increases in capital revenue and maintenance endowments for improved public spaces, such as parks and libraries, safe public spaces. We do a lot of tactical funding, but then they go to waste because we don’t have the funds to maintain them.

- Include resiliency and sea-level rise. There's no discussion about community resiliency. How do we set goals to create a more resilient community?

Action Step Priorities and Recommendations:

- # 106 – Make bathroom facilities for everyone, not just the homeless
- #110 – look at community building with a resiliency lens
- # 112 – Invest in youth-driven programs for public spaces, emphasizing libraries and what role they serve

Equitable Economic Opportunity – business development, job training, office and commercial development

Discussion Items:

- Instead of looking at just the total numbers of jobs created, divide into sectors and look at how the numbers correspond to the equity goals per sector. It's information that we have, and so we can track.
- The plan doesn't include an action step about marketing the city as whole.
- *Connectivity: Promote culture keeping and economic development strategy, including job opportunities and tracking of different types of businesses. What is the city already doing in marketing?*
- *Economy and Capacity*
- *Incentivize office space with transit*

Action Step Priorities and Recommendations:

- # 1 -- Review and modify zoning to ensure office development is favored and remove barriers to economic development
- # 3 -- Continue ongoing city efforts to expand local hire initiatives, training, apprenticeships, partnerships. Can we have an organization that can be a liaison between city and other organizations that have local hire initiatives?
- # 6 – Review and modify zoning to promote density.
– Prioritize increasing office space density around transit.
- #12 – Master lease and downtown parking. Precedent with tenants and ground floor use at 150 Frank Ogawa. Galleries with below-market rate rent, new tenants and black-owned businesses in an incubator.

Dinner Break

As stated above many participants left at this point to attend the budget hearing. The remainder of the evening was a “round table” (around the room) facilitated discussion what other information is needed to make these goals a reality. Discussion points covered the Goals, Action Items and approaches to the Implementing the Plan.

Facilitator and Stakeholder Questions:

Many action steps say “continuing/continued.” What are the new things we can do to up our efforts? What is new, specific and different? Do people know what we’re already doing?

Discussion:

- The Oakland Department of Transportation (OakDOT) has priorities throughout the city. How does that work? How does this plan affect other agencies and departments with similar projects?
- Does focusing on Downtown mean we’re siphoning resources from other areas?
- Priorities from this plan might not be reflected in other plans. How would that carry forward? Ultimately, if there are competing interests, and someone has to choose.
- Need more actions in the plan, even if have to amend the general plan when making decisions. What do you consider?
- Are there things going on in the region that have an impact on DT? Things can affect DT from other regions. Make sure we’re not precluding other projects that can support what we’re doing.

Facilitator Question:

What about the costs or impacts? Who benefits? People here may not be impacted one way or the other.

Discussion:

- The most impacted, most vulnerable, most excluded that were not part of the process in the past should be part of the process now.
- Downtown Plan can take on funding initiatives that can help Downtown but also can help the entire city. Assessments for our park system, landscaping, lighting haven’t been updated in years. New assessments for Downtown could benefit city as a whole.
- Need to identify new revenue resources. With 50,000 new residents Downtown and same park system, need to ensure that maintenance has more resources.

Facilitator Question:

How might these things be accomplished?

Discussion:

- Looking at parks and tree maintenance, volunteers are willing to help but the city attorney said “no” because of liability. Need the attorney to find a way to allow volunteer activity to help maintain infrastructure.
- Look at performance measures for disaffected youth and connect with Oakland Unified School District to allocate resources, collaborate on interventions.

Facilitator Question:

How do we reach those who aren’t here?

Discussion Items:

- Need to apply municipal code 2.29.170.1 of the Race and Equity Office, which says the City of Oakland has committed on a departmental level to practices of fairness and social justice.
- It's not just about who's in this room, it's about who's not in this room and how can we bring them into the conversation.
- For some people it's a language barrier. For others, it's transportation or childcare issues. We have to think about what are the barriers to prevent them from being a part of this conversation.

Facilitator Question:

Not only being part of the conversation, but also what are the ways to ensure their issues are taken into consideration, like language? OakDOT with the Capital Improvement Program has adopted the Department of Race and Equity measures, and so we know that there's language that's considered in the outreach of the programming.

Answer:

- Going to where they are. So maybe they're not invited to this meeting, but there is some other outreach based upon what's going on in the community – farmer's market, etc.

Questions /Statement from Facilitator:

I agree. So, as we do more with community relations and community engagement, we need to do more to bring those people who are missing into the process. But I'm asking a broader question.

If I'm sitting at the table as a stakeholder, and we know that those people are not in the room, how do we know we're representing their interests, that they're showing up in the plan?

Luiza Leite (consultant team):

There was a process before tonight that led to this point. Remembering the findings and learnings from the disparity analysis and everything that's allowed us to get to this point, we're making sure we don't lose that in our discussions now.

General discussion about the importance of integrating equity into all City plans.

Stakeholder Question:

Can we prioritize public investments (such as investing in Malonga) over private investments?

Luiza Leite:

There are different actions - investments with specific, predicted almost guaranteed results and then incentives...

Alicia Parker (City of Oakland):

Regarding not having other voices in the room, having a diverse planning staff is critical to being able to ask the right questions and be aware.

Stakeholder Question:

There's a significant investment in Downtown, and we talk about racial equity. What about equity between Downtown and the rest of Oakland?

Discussion:

- Downtown generates more funds that can be used anywhere in the City. Important to look at dedicated revenue sources so that the needs of Downtown aren't pitted against other neighborhoods. Need to bring new sources outside of the general fund to help with equity. There will be some level of shared sacrifice.

Facilitator:

What do you need to hear tomorrow to come up with the priorities? Goal is to walk away with priorities from of the long list or action steps. No action steps will be deleted but some will fall to the bottom, yet they will stay on the list.

Answers:

- Relative weights of housing and affordability, shouldn't be weighted equally
- Ability to rank action steps within categories, i.e. by costs, timeframe
- More specifics and detailed information about the Measure of Success (MOS)
- Arts and culture are communicated as commodity, should be considered more like a small business
- Viewing MOS in different ways, such as how they're achievable or paired with each other
- Start with "Are those the right MOS?" Analyze the policies as to whether they lead to MOS.
- Things we're already doing vs. things we want to do if we have the resources.

Discussion on Measures of Success:

- MOS more important than prioritizing the action steps list. Start from what you want to see, the direction you want to go and make decisions of priority based upon those goals. Need goals statements to link action steps.
- Devise measures for concepts that are hard to quantify. "How do people in Downtown feel about the quality of the environment?" For example, Jack London Square residents saw noticeable increase in the number of trains, but there's no measure that would address it. For Downtown, measure could be the number of people who have to move to worse neighborhood because of affordability.
- If MOS and priorities are fixed in stone, not sufficiently nimble to take advantage of opportunities, i.e. new funding sources, development proposals.
- MOS should be the screening filter for the actions/policy. Better approach is to look first at the MOS and see what actions tie to them.
- Need more specifics about how the measures will be developed over time. If they're not exact enough, what we're prioritizing will get lost.
- There needs to be a study on equity and amount of development to see how MOS potentially shapes policy in the future. That'll allow us to see what of current policy is and isn't working.

Meeting concluded at 7:40 p.m.

Tuesday, June 25, 2019

Introduction and Review

There was a review of the Monday, June 24th meeting. The meeting addressed critical needs, criteria to make decisions and the importance of connectivity and intersectionality of the Downtown Oakland Specific Plan (DOSP). Based on the dialogue, team members saw the need for flexibility and new approaches to topics. Based on the information from the previous meeting, a key prioritization tool could be the Measures of Success. This meeting would focus on the quantifiable Measures of Success (MOS).

In receiving input on the plan, team members want “to get it right together.” There will still be opportunities to weigh in when it’s published. The vision is implementing and garnering support for adoption.

Luiza reviewed a PowerPoint “Implementation Criteria” slide to help guide participants: (Based on input from the room, the heading of the slide was later changed to “Food for Thought” and is included in this report.)

- Equity
- Geographical Scope
- Robustness
- Feasibility
- Existing vs. New

Stakeholder Question (Darlene Flynn, Director of Office of Race and Equity):

Is addressing structural racism considered feasible? How does equity interact with feasibility?

Luiza:

There’s interaction among all. Nothing is mutually exclusive or exists in a vacuum.

Alicia:

Plan definitely addresses changing the way we do things to address equity -

- In the past, there has been a lot of conversation about available downtown parking related to small local businesses owned by people of color, particularly in the Black Arts Movement Business District. Plan addresses small businesses through an integrated parking strategy. Partnerships with private garages, real-time displays of where parking is, helping small businesses withstand construction.

- We can modify criteria to reach out to groups that historically have been affected by racial policies and change the criteria. Plan definitely includes recommendations for changing the way we do things to address equity.
- Also includes urban designs to uplift African American history/spirit in the physical design of streetscape, increasing Downtown appeal as visitor destination and to appeal to city residents, looking at transit connections to Downtown.
- Recommendation to prioritize capital improvements for the Malonga Center for the Arts, serves diverse clientele. We make investments in the youth, the teachers.
- Possibility of creating regional employment center, waterfront connections

Joanna explained that MOS are drafts of operation outcomes to track progress of the plan over 20 years and see if they've been achieved or need revision. The team wants to hear from stakeholders if these are the right MOS, if any have been missed. The baseline is where we are now, and success is where we need to go.

Stakeholder Question:

What kind of outreach was done? The participant only learned about the meeting from a colleague, Ms. Joyce Gordon, even though his organization is 30 seconds from City Hall. There are very important voices not being heard.

Answer:

Alicia described current outreach efforts, pledged to do more.

Stakeholder Question:

What's the difference between "Prioritization Criteria" and "Implementation Criteria?"

Facilitator:

"Implementation Criteria" are the ones you know best, the lens through which you view implementation. Items were not exhausted or ranked. As noted earlier, the "Implementation Criteria" listed on the PowerPoint was the teams attempt to categorize some of the considerations brought up in the previous meeting. (The slide heading was changed to "Food for Thought.")

Dinner Break

Facilitator:

The group has discussed some common interests and values. Let's talk about additional values and insights that have not been lifted yet. Tell us what the priorities are, what matters to people.

Land Use and Urban Form

Recommendations (the speaker from the stakeholder group acknowledged that some were not well formulated):

- Add job training as an indicator on the success matrix.
- Rewrite transit measure success to include other modes besides AC Transit, such as how to deal with ride/car shares, bikes, etc.

- Rewrite historic preservation because some of actions are already happening.
- Connect ground floor activation with what's happening on the street.
- Keep farmer's market at FAR1, which has wonderful focus and is lacking in Jack London Square
- Consider –
 - Changing zoning sizes for greater density
 - Changing zoning requirements to allow smaller sites to have larger site coverage
 - Subsidizing retail space for daycares, schools
 - Looking at the Ferry Building model in San Francisco, where retail is subsidized
- Establish cultural district programs that has funding and works as opposed to our current "in name only." Whether it is possible to map cultural district and historic preservation together so you have double district designations, which could help with tax incentives and funding.

Other Discussion Items:

- Whether there's increasing tension between historic preservation and future capacity development
- Whether CalTrans can partner
- Transit alternatives for Broadway, over to Clay, along Third Street.
- Will there be a protected bike lane along the Broadway freeway underpass, the Washington Street underpass or both?
- The two goals of 6th Street between Broadway and Washington are A) fix it up and B) incorporate a transit center.
- Do we have the Oakland A's or don't we have the Oakland A's?

Facilitator:

Summarized some of the points that were voiced across the room: job training; working with transit services beyond AC Transit; cultural and historic preservation, zoning, partnering with CalTrans, cultural districts.

Major point brought up on Monday and Tuesday is determining the things that already are done. Do we spend our time with things that we've already done or do we spend our time with new things?

Community Health

Looked at the definition and central idea of Community Health, and a lot of it was targeted toward green space. Wanted to expand upon that definition, looking also at:

- The health of the people in the community, considering everything from violent crime to youth-oriented opportunities. Also looking at resilience – short- and long-term issues.
- Measurement of outcomes as it relates to providing food access, clean air etc. on a daily basis and also emergency types of services. Providing essential services is important since we've all had a scare with the fires. How do we provide safe places for people to go and shelter?

- Habitat and how can we create safe programs to decrease violence and truancy by building relationship with people, establishing youth councils to provide more opportunities. We're unclear as to how to speak to those things.
- Improved outcomes, for example, as it relates to the African-American population, revising some of our thought processes.
- More effective use of public space to improve quality of life, i.e. providing bathrooms, drinking fountains, benches; create connectivity from one place to another or between the street and the structure
- Habitat and how can create safe programs to decrease violence and truancy, building relationship with youth, establishing youth councils to provide more opportunities.
- Improving bike lanes, also addresses mobility

Stakeholder Question:

Did you talk about the homeless?

Answer:

Yes, discussed input that came directly from the homeless population, such as providing rest rooms (and for everyone, not just homeless), creating the Care Village

Talked about providing mini grants to fellows to work with homeless people, who can then work with their communities to bring ideas back.

Culture Keeping

Group reviewed each Action Step, starting at 79.

Action Step 98 was the top priority:

Expanding the City's internal capacity in the Cultural Affair Department because a lot of the recommendations are predicated on that. Acknowledged the difficulties, such as reallocation of OakDOT funds, which would require a ballot amendment.

Other general recommendations:

- Increase investment within the Malonga Center and move it under Cultural Affairs, where it might be better served. Discussed other city resources that are undermanaged and under promoted and what it would take to get more visibility and awareness. Examples are OACC and AAMLO.
- Use new fees, such as funding surcharges on entertainment ticket sales, impact fees or contributions toward facilities. Need to do a comparative analysis to determine which is more profitable.
- Activate Frank Ogawa Plaza for more youth-serving activities
- Change language from passive to active in Action Step 79. Instead of "explore," use "fund and implement" some of the recommendations from the Mayor's study from 2015.

- Prioritize public cultural spaces – public buildings, OACC, Malonga, Main Library, rec centers into a place where they can be used to provide other services in addition to providing cultural programming.

Action Step Priorities and Recommendations:

- Action Step 87
 - Prioritize reducing barriers to outdoor vendors, and using Frank Ogawa Plaza as an example for integrating outdoor vendors, public vendors in those spaces, conversion of pop up space to permit spaces and the synergies.
- Action 91
 - Update Lake Merritt Specific Plan based on what’s coming out of the Downtown Specific Plan
- Action 95
 - Make sure the cultural facilities downtown are more publicly marketed to the community so people know that they exist, what their functions are and where they are.
- Action Steps 81 and 92
 - Use the Black Arts Movement Business District - the only official cultural district - as a model. We already have several emerging art district movements that can be pilot programs. Tailor them so they’re not cookie cutter.

Housing and Affordability

Recommendations and Comments:

- MOS baseline for total numbers and affordability should be for the same year, 2015. Concern that the goal of 15 to 25 percent is less than where we are today.
- If 25 percent Downtown is affordable, and we set a goal of 15 to 25 percent, we’ll end up reducing the share of affordable housing and working against goals of equity and diversity
- Are the accessibility goals required in private projects (discussion about ADA applicability, additional standards and where they’re applicable)?
- Focus on the cost burden of people with the most severe housing burden, paying more than 50 percent of their income; that captures the goal of helping lower-income people and gets more at equity issue.
- Two goals – 1) Get people off the street, even if that means into temporary or transitional housing and 2) Get people into permanent supportive housing
- Discussion around the falling percentage of African Americans, particularly downtown crosses over to Culture Keeping. Need to target both absolute numbers and percentages.

Surlene:

Question as a non-facilitator: If looking at percentage of African Americans living downtown, are we looking at *how* they are living downtown? Many black and brown people are living there, but not living well.

Answer: That's the focus on percentage of income devoted to housing, where there are pretty severe racial disparities.

[Next participant spoke too fast]

Comments:

- Include the "Missing Middle" in the discussion of affordable housing.
- Mix of affordability Downtown should mirror mix of affordability in the city as a whole. Mirror the Housing Element and RHNA.
- Talk about inclusionary zoning only on performance actions, focus less on "continue" items. Want to look at new things, particularly for downtown.

Action Step Priorities and Recommendations:

- Action Steps 31 through 35
 - Prioritize pros/cons, provide more support for specific incremental funding, increase impact fees
- Action Step 36 (**note that there are two Action Steps "36" on the matrix**)
 - Identify sites for hotels, meeting spaces, look for places to disincentive SROs
- Action Step 36 (**note that there are two Action Steps "36" on the matrix**)
 - Follow Community Land Trust models, co-ops, broader ownership
- Action Steps 39 – 40
 - Increase services for the homeless, co-location in buildings with formerly homeless people
- Action Step 37
 - More DT outreach to the homeless to educate about range of services: rights as tenants, counseling services, emergency services, emphasize most vulnerable.

Stakeholder Questions:

Did you think of public/private partnerships for use with city or county-owned land, i.e. Main Library? How much are you prioritizing inclusionary zoning?

Answer:

Regarding County property, we're hoping the City's Public Land Ordinance, passed last year, will be adopted before this plan is adopted. Didn't have a discussion about pros/cons of inclusionary vs. impact.

Stakeholder Question:

Is the EPS (consulting firm) study looking at inclusionary vs. impact fee regarding affordable housing?

Answer:

No, looking at feasibility of up-zoning and the value of up-zoning, also in-kind donations going toward needs of community, such as open space, low-market artist space. Looking more at the costs on developers.

Stakeholder Question:

Will inclusionary vs. impact fees be studied?

Answer:

No, when we do next update of nexus of the impact feasibility study, we'll look at increasing impact fees or inclusionary zoning. Update is mandated by law to occur every five years, coming out in 2020.

Equitable Economic Opportunity

Recommendations:

- Break out job growth statistics by sector and race within sectors with diversity of business ownership
- Add job training metric to the MOS to determine which programs/nonprofits are doing well, have highest placements

Action Step Priorities and Recommendations:

- Action Step 1
 - Create minimum density standards as well as maximum, i.e. realizing that a four-story building could be nine stories.
- Action Step 3
 - View job training from city-wide focus, particularly East and West Oakland
- Change word “continue” to “assess,” “expand” and “create” new opportunities
- Action Step 6
 - Review and modify zoning to promote density
- Action Step 7
 - Complete study of zoning incentives. Must include forms of community benefit (maybe menu system)
 - Assess and understand purpose of impact fees

Action Steps to Add:

- Improve marketing internally and externally with such groups as Visit Oakland, Chamber, CDCs, working together to develop a marketing strategy - not only for jobs and employers, but also visitors and events.
- Create an economic development commission, which would be a more effective way to implement parts of the plan.
- Add business retention, expansion and attraction, especially where we're losing businesses.

MOS to Add:

Include metric of property ownership by race.

Stakeholder Question:

Regarding Action Step 21, and the adoption of a youth empowerment zone. Lots of bars Downtown, creates a tunnel of spaces for only 21 and up. Organizations like Youth Radio not integrated with social fabric, isolating for people who are underage.

Answer / Discussion:

In the outcomes, underrepresented youth are tied into job training with a focus in East and West Oakland. We have a large hub of job training already. There should be a youth empowerment zone that looks at more than job training. It could be expanded to look at community health. Expansion of the concept is important. Any of the conversations should be led by young people, particularly youth of color.

Discussion about possibility of bars providing food earlier in the day, open to under 21. Missed opportunity of the Emporium game room, which is only 21 and up.

Transportation

Recommendations:

- Add parking supply, on-street and off-street. Find measures for loading, drop-offs, etc.
- Include more than walking and biking on a two-wheel bike, look at improving others forms such as human-powered, or human-assisted mobility
- Find a way to measure -
 - The number of people on the street, the street quality of life, how to activate more space for people
 - The ease of getting to small businesses; conduct a survey, “How did you get here?” “How easy was it to find parking?”
 - Travel time – how long it takes to get to DT from other parts of the city by transit modes

Other Discussion Items:

- Chinatown
- Redesigning streets to improve mobility for modes other than cars streets, pushback is what happens on the curb
- Bike Safety – disparity report, not just overall crashes but also by race/income

Action Step Priorities Recommendations:

- Action Steps 72, 73
 - Parking and curb-side management is a priority and should move from “near term” to “more immediate.”
- Action 51
 - Emerging technologies, trying to find one thing for each mode.
- Action Steps 57
 - Adopt City’s Complete Streets Policies

- Action Steps 62, 63
 - Prioritize connectivity, access and safety measures.
- Action Step 64
 - Link core bike network to the short-term network of the Bike Plan. Use transit pass to reduce the costs of transit.
- Action Step 66
 - Use Transit Priority Treatments, which provide one of the greatest impacts.
 - Add a measure for construction projects' impacts on sidewalks and streets.

Stakeholder Question:

Did you talk about land? The Land Use group talked a lot about Transportation. In the past, discussed the two together, but here they're in slightly separate camps. How to bring them together?

How do we measure success and make connection more than the obvious? There are land use recommendations in the Mobility chapter, and vice versa, but no measures of success.

Answer:

Our measure of success is around construction impacts and the number of people on the street.

Comments:

- Need conversation about people who are focused on transportation and people who are focused on land use about transportation. Also, plan doesn't address how developers are going to use the ground floor.
- Consider ground-level uses beyond community spaces. Include discussion about sidewalk space.
- Can we agree on where the Transbay tube, BART stations, etc. should go? How does the intersection of transportation and land use dictate how we're going to grow in the next 20 years?
- Look at plan at in a Bay Area-wide context. We are the very center of the Bay Area, strongest regional economy in the world. This plan should be a way of dragging money here from rest of the Bay Area.
- To what extent does sea-level rise (SLR) impact land use and vice versa? Not discussed widely in Community Health. Need to look at individual projects and regional infrastructure.
- Are we encouraging development in places subject to SLR, maybe we shouldn't develop in places that will trigger litigation?
- Scenario in San Francisco study looks at what does San Francisco do about transportation when City of Oakland becomes the regional employment hub?

ANNOUNCEMENT: Public comments deadline, July 15.

Meeting ended at 8:20 p.m.

FOOD FOR THOUGHT

- **Equity:** Which disparity indicators are impacted by this action? How is this measured? Who benefits and who is harmed?
- **Geographic Scope:** Which neighborhoods are impacted by this action? Does it improve all of Oakland or could it divert resources?
- **Robustness:** Does this action achieve multiple plan goals and outcomes? Is it more or less impactful than other actions in achieving the same plan goal or outcome?
- **Feasibility:** Is this action easy to implement or are there many challenges (legal actions, funding gaps, political will, etc.) to implement?
- **Existing vs. New:** Is this action focused on existing programs and policies or is it new? In this case or for this particular outcome, is it better to focus resources on the things we are already doing or try something new?

ATTACHMENTS

The following pages are notes submitted by various stakeholders and staff members.

Except for some minor formatting changes, they have not been edited or changed.

Comment from Morten Jensen, JRDV Urban International

Thanks for the meeting I attended Monday (June 24, 2019)

The following are my last comments on the plan. I still didn't see a few items I had suggested and had hoped would become action items including:

1. Incentivize reconnecting Old Oakland to City Hall, particularly cutting path through convention center.
 2. Incentivize better connection from Uptown to lake by encouraging pedestrian connection from end of 15th Street to Oak Street (crossing Harrison).
 3. Redesign Broadway to better serve new mobility modes (which I thought was already in previous plan documents.)
-

Malonga Center Discussion Notes (June 24, 2019)

Note: This was a breakout meeting from the larger group meeting.

- Alicia Parker - Planning, aparker@oaklandca.gov
- Nicholas Williams – Parks and Recreation
- Roberto Bedoya – Cultural Affairs
- Carla Service – Dance-A-Vision
- Naomi Diouf – Diamano Coura
- Coco Duhon Kelley – Diamano Coura

Meeting purpose: to begin a discussion with City of Oakland's Planning, Parks and Recreation, and the Cultural Affairs departments, and the Malonga Center Artists about the Malonga Center and its direction as an arts center.

- Artists want to elevate the building to a world-class performance center.
- Cultural Affairs relationship is funding.
- Parks and Recreation – maintenance issues of the building.
 - o What is City policy on the maintenance of its building?
 - o What is prohibiting this happening now? A building manager focused on the building as a whole.
 - o Should there be retreat to further discuss concerns?
- Being under Parks and Recreation, the marketing is missed to promote the building as an arts center.
 - o What is the policy around the money being earmarked for the center?
 - o Leadership vacuum within Parks and Recreation – currently there isn't the capacity to mobilize with the artists at the Center.
- Cultural Affairs has the capacity to animate the center, but not to handle the maintenance of the building.
- What is Parks and Recreation's vision of the Center?
 - o How can Planning, Parks and Recreation, Cultural Affairs and the Centers' Artists all work together?

Action Items:

- Send out the Rainin Foundation report on the Center.
- Retreat planning.

Comments and Notes from Naomi Schiff for Monday, June 24 and Tuesday, June 25.

These notes are from the summary during which Surlene asked each group for their main points. Most of the groups looked at the "indicators of success" document first, and the summary chart with action steps. I've tried to name one or two people at each table so you can figure out which group these are.

I did not understand the "next steps" statements so do not here provide notes on that. I think it would be great if you could send out a summary or something describing potential future meetings, approximate timing, the bifurcation between plan and zoning document construction, and what opportunities for public input and additional outreach staff is pursuing. It was discussed toward the end of the meeting, and several staff team members chimed in, but all did not say the same thing and so I came away uncertain. I don't think we need fancy timelines or charts: but a list of what is happening by approximate month, with description of whether meetings are advisory/discussion/public input or actual formal review with commissioners opining or in some cases voting.

Group #1: LAND USE/URBAN FORM: (This is the group I was in. By the end it was Ed Manasse, Steve Lowe, and myself but for the first half included many others, such as Matt Weber from Ellis)

REVIEW OF SUCCESS INDICATORS

- Job Training should be added as an item to the success matrix.
- Transit part should be rewritten, too focused on AC Transit; what about ride share/car share, other modes, how to integrate
- Historic Preservation item doesn't make much sense, must be rewritten in light of how things actually work. Landmarks designation is subject to approval by owners and requires city council action, so arduous, infrequent, unworkable as a planning tool.
- Under what circumstances can smaller sites build to larger coverage, perhaps in exchange for community benefits? (asked by Matt Weber of Ellis Partners)
- Much more attention needed for successful ground floor activation that also relates to and creates activity on the street and sidewalk. Kid-oriented uses? Subsidized retail? Look at ferry building model in SF, where retail is subsidized to get an active scene, which helps lease commercial space above at higher rental rates.

ACTION STEPS

- Ed says produce market area might be enlarged a little, retain FAR 1, see it as an attractor of activity and visitation
- What to do west of Broadway over to Clay, 3rd St. Industrial Corridor. Should mixed use be considered, which might include more residential? (See Vivian Kahn comments which are undoubtedly forthcoming.) BART 2nd tube could travel on a new separated route, maybe there is ample space for a multimodal transit center here, or at the foot of 980. Study two possibilities: a) a grand station along a new BART route, around Embarcadero to Third Street. or b) Add a station around 4th

and Broadway at county property, perhaps incorporating the under-freeway walkway into such a development.

- Ed says they have to look at development around Howard Terminal with/without proposed stadium.
- freeway undercrossings Broadway/Washington: work with Caltrans. Protected bike lanes?
- -Vision of 6th St./880 area between Bway/Washington: a) fix it up or b) incorporate transit center
- -L.U.-2.3
- Cultural Districts Program. How to establish program with incentives. Maybe use historic preservation districts to help map "double" district designations-- historical and cultural--to help with things like tax incentives as well as zoning designations.

Group#2: COMMUNITY HEALTH (Dianne Tannewald was in this group)

- green space
- habitat for people, flora, and fauna
- safety programs
- noted no youth at the table or in the room! need to remedy that
- maximize use of AAMLO
- revenues for ongoing maintenance a high priority
- attention to public spaces
- improve and expand access to bathrooms, which have become limited to places where one has to pay (editorial note: or at city hall where you have to get security checked before using public restroom, now!)
- drinking fountains needed
- explore use of rooftops and connectivity between buildings
- mobility - downtown bike lanes
- lockers for possessions of unsheltered people
- establish minigrants for community projects

Group #3: CULTURE-KEEPING (Eric Arnold was in this group)

Success measures:

- Critical to add capacity in the cultural affairs dept., which is mentioned very frequently as the dept. to carry out tasks, but don't have nearly the bandwidth. TOT tax?
- Consider moving Malonga center to cultural affairs, rather than parks and rec. Maybe arts venues should all be under cultural affairs, which could market better?
- Under managed city resources: OACC, AAMLO, Malonga (even some of the spaces at the Fox??)
- fees/funding: surcharge on tickets, or perhaps impact fees? Analyze best way to finance
- Establish youth activities, perhaps at Frank Ogawa Plaza

- Use active verbs in list of action steps. (Maybe group all the "keep on doing what already doing" items with more specific language where efforts should be enhanced or strengthened?)
- Prioritize cultural spaces to provide more FREE public services.

Specific tasks:

- 79. - Don't "explore", act!
- 91. - opportunities and regulations to encourage outdoor vending
- 95. - marketing needs to be strengthened a lot
- 81 and 92: use BAMBD as pilot, but also designate other districts. Each should have its own distinct character, so model may not be the same for each. Again, see that cultural affairs needs to be funded, staffed up, etc.

Group #4: HOUSING (Jeff Levin was in this group)

measures of success:

- Baselines in doc. for affordable and other units come from different years, please fix.
- Goal in doc. states 15-25% affordable; yet since we now have 25%, could present a stepping down of affordability percentage overall. Stick with 25%?
- accessibility: how to require greater accessibility (beyond ADA) in market-rate housing units
- housing cost burden: reduce the no. of people subjected to SEVERE burden, that is, more than 50% of income, which would measure lower-income residents and allow incorporating statistics that capture both race and income demographics.
- unsheltered: need both short and long-term solutions, should be distinguished between
- baseline % of current African-Amer. residents. Targets should look at both absolute numbers AND percentages.
- assess housing condition
- housing element: mix of affordability should match citywide goals

Action steps:

- -New actions: 31, 32, 33, 34
- -prioritizing downtown for affordable housing?
- -relationship with neighborhoods?
- -Should incremental funding go to downtown or citywide?
- -36a incentivize SRO retention, disincentivize conversion
- -36b land trust not the only method; broaden ownership models possibilities
- -37 active outreach at SROs to educate tenants re rights
- -39+40: services for homeless in buildings that provide low-inc. housing. Provide outreach, counseling, legal, emergency displacement prevention
- -inclusionary vs. impact fees?
- -public lands ordinance should be passed before this plan adopted
- -re EPS study: study inclusionary vs. impact fee

Group#5: Economics (Vince Sugrue was in this group)

measures of success

- -job growth
- -sector
- -by race within sector

- -diverse business ownership (no data presented?)
- -job training
- evaluate existing programs

Action steps

- Consider minimum density as well as max.
- Job training citywide: because people live all over who work or seek work downtown
- Need for projects to generate community benefits. Where are impact fees used?

A new action step:

- culture and arts: market internally and externally

property ownership

Oakland's economic and workforce development dept. what is it doing, is it effective? How does it interact with community?

Establish a commission to oversee econ/workforce development, something like old EDAB/EDAC of relevel. years

21. Youth empowerment zone:

sidebar conversation: nowhere for kids to go downtown; many age-restricted venues, nothing to do. Library as a free resource. What else? Yet there are youth-oriented nonprofits such as Youth Radio. But have to pay to hang out anywhere, or be over 21. Example: place that replaced Rudy's in the Fox.

TRANSPORTATION (Dave Campbell was in this group)

- How to measure parking supply?
- Loading/drop-off/pickup?
- Look at travel times by various modes into the downtown area
- bike/ped safety disparities
- not just walking/biking but all modes, now with scooters, ride share, etc.
- number of people on the street should be measured; look at ground floor uses with relation to sidewalk use and activation
- access issues for small business: survey? parking availability, other forms of access
- actions 72 and 73

OTHER NOTES:

- Sole planning commissioner present was Clark Manus participating yesterday only. Library commissioners showed up each of the two days.
- Several sectors from city hall present the first day did not return the second, such as Joe DeVries of tuffshed fame.
- Alex Marquess of Lynette McElhaney staff attended yesterday, came late but then stayed through most of it.

Comment deadline moved to July 15.

Notes and Comments Submitted by Joanna Winter, City of Oakland Planning Department

June 25, 2019 Community Health Group Notes [\(Incorporating Diane Tannenwald's notes\)](#)

Participants:

- Alex Marqusee (District 3)
- Alison Grady (Activist, Young Dems)
- Steve Snider (Uptown/Downtown BID)
- Diane Tannenwald (Library)
- Ada Chan (Library Commission)
- Coco Duhon Kelley (Malonga/Diamano Coura)
- Ryan Russo (DOT)

Central Idea

- Needs to incorporate a more holistic approach to community health (mental health, resilience, safety and violence prevention)

Measures of Success (note that some of these may be better framed as actions than measures)

- Park Quality: include Lincoln and Madison parks [note: this only makes sense if they received a D or F]
- Street Trees: trees are carefully selected, *healthy, maintained* and vary
- Affordable Healthy Food Access
- Crime rate: Make sure that this measure actually reflects what we want it to; if we're adding 100k people, crime will more likely increase; also, increase in crimes reported is just increase in crimes reported (partly because they ambassadors are reporting them!; the total numbers may actually be decreasing. Ideas include:
 - Number of BID ambassador de-escalations that prevent crimes
 - Better coordination between BIDs and OPD, including consistent staffing from OPD (currently it's impossible to build relationships because staff turn over every 3-12 months and there's no institutional knowledge)
 - Property crime (this is mostly broken car windows, and is underreported because it's more trouble than it's worth to report)
- Adequate free gathering space: City Hall, libraries and recreation centers. Note: they shouldn't be expected to be revenue-generating – need to change this model.
- Essential service facilities: libraries and rec centers are all retrofitted to be essential service facilities; available as cooling stations, air quality respite stations, safe gathering spaces during a significant event (Baseline: Existing number of ESFs; Target: all ESFs)
- Illegal Dumping: Reduced response time to complaints; reduction in illegal dumping; awareness of who to contact (bad example: number of complaints – there may be a ton of people calling 311, but that doesn't mean that there are more complaints in that area, just that lots of people feel entitled to report it)

- Public amenities add to community healing: garbage cans, restrooms, water fountains, benches, art, interpretive info, wayfinding
- Coordination with County health services
- Cross-reference Mobility measures regarding pedestrian injuries and reduction of private vehicles (but make sure that a reduction in vehicle trips in a specific area actually reduces overall vehicle usage, not just pushing traffic from one area to another)
- Mental Health: hosting quarterly, well-publicized “care village” (coordinate with Alameda County’s new facility on Franklin)
- Public space activation: track and increase, particularly at Frank H. Ogawa Plaza (which is currently poorly coordinated)
- Youth: Need a measure of places where youth – particularly black youth – feel welcome downtown, and can go if they’re under 21 or can’t afford a cup of coffee (First Fridays is the only time youth feel welcome) – why not encourage bars to be open before their usual opening hours to youth under 21 (perhaps they could serve food)? – talk to youth
- Cabarets: black-owned cabarets need to be able to get licenses
- Privately Owned Public Open Spaces: do these work? Are they accessible? Consensus was mostly no – example was Modern Coffee off Broadway, where you have to pass security guards to get through. NOT welcoming.
- Youth: increased minority youth population downtown on a regular basis
- Cultural Facilities: What are the gaps in cultural facilities?
- Downtown Public Art: How do you incentivize public art through regulations?
- Resiliency: community building; creation of X community councils or system
- Protect Oakland’s shoreline
- Libraries: Increase in patronage of African Americans and Latinos at libraries by providing partnership opportunities and programs that target and reduce disparities as identified in equity indicators report
- Land Use: square feet of “sustainable and green” commercial space is constructed
- Land Use: Cultural & Community Facilities: Add the Asian Library and AAMLO
- Invest in maintenance of geographically walkable and sustainable improvements to meet communities’ needs
- What physical form/shape/culture do we want Oakland to take? Infrastructure design has an effect on people – lots of time spent on the greenway, but majority of downtown is buildings – what about rooftops, facades, lobbies, sunlight, noise, colors, etc.? Connected? Sustainable? Reflect in action steps

Action Steps

- Existing Action Steps
 - 104: Define what “working with the community” means [maybe follow guidelines, or using the implementation advisory group outlined in the draft plan]
 - Noted policies were: 110, 112, 113 & 117
 - 112: Invest in youth-driven programming **and facilities** (like 1st Fridays); hand this task to the youth commission; focus on black youth, who feel least welcome; consider mini-

- grants for fellows to work on this, which were used well in the violence prevention project
- XX: Increase capital revenue and maintenance endowments for improved parks and public spaces (creative funding, leverage partnerships, assessments, benefit assessment, tax increment, Melo Roos, grants, bonds, endowments, etc.)
 - 110: Create cross-functional , interdepartmental, interagency team to implement community safety initiatives...
 - Meet people in neutral, safe spaces
 - 111: Continue the partnership between the City and outside organizations (such as MISSY, BAWAR, others) to create and enhance...
 - 114: What about funding for this?
 - 115: Coordinate with BCDC [JW: BCDC should be listed as a partner]
- Missing action steps
 - Require green roofs, at least some with public access; develop private and public roofs into community benefit
 - Develop private and public ground floors into community benefit and plazas (example: Numi has an experimental garden – encourage private buildings to partner with public orgs. Connect ground floors to streetscape and plazas – not once a month, but continuously activated
 - 13th Street is developing a new public space via DOT’s work; the BID is taking the lead on programming, but is trying to program it away from youth to deal with crime [note: the cause of crime on that corner is not necessarily “youth”]
 - Make sure there are action steps that relate to all the revised measures of success discussed at this meeting
 - Better public-private connections (example: PG&E had a gas leak/air quality issue – it was challenging to get them to respond)
 - Reinststitute the OPD metro division; this is under consideration to help support the downtown nightlife scene [see Alex Marqusee for more information]
 - 120: Require green to increase native flora and fauna as well (not just on rooftops)
 - Restoration of flora and fauna (like milkweed for butterflies and night heron habitat)
 - Needle exchange locations
 - Childcare centers
 - AAMLO – looking at how we can transform the design to be more welcoming to black people (currently in a very Eurocentric building)
 - Provide various free, flexible public spaces that foster opportunities to address the communities’ changing needs and enhance people’s quality of life (lead agency: libraries)
 - Co-locate facilities and services to better meet community needs and reduce disparities
 - Identify synergies between parks, libraries, other public services and private organizations and companies to target services to meet community needs such as reentry opportunities, anti-truancy programs, healthy living, etc.
 - Resilient community building and connectivity for all via personal service or through free public access (i.e. libraries, parks & rec)

- Air Quality: Provide healthy places such as libraries
- Public Health: decrease in disparity in mortality rates

Note: There's a new tax being considered for the March 2020 election that would be broader than the LLAD (John Bliss and Brooke Levin coordinating)

Community Health Outcomes

- CH-1: Include safety, truancy, violence (violence reduction – target disparities)
- CH-2: Include resilience and environment

Other Topics (mostly took notes on measures of success)

- Economic Opportunity: job training success
- Housing: Focus on severe housing cost burden; two homelessness goals (1. Off the street, 2. Into permanent/permanent supportive housing); what are we allowed to require re: universal design of private development (new development? Remodels?)
 - Action Step 36: land trust AND CO-OP models
- Mobility: Add micromobility to biking & walking measure; timed lights, construction zone impacts, number of people on the street (cross-reference with land use); parking supply (how do we want to measure this?); loading and drop-offs; access to small businesses; increase in (free!) EV charging stations
- Culture Keeping: Racial diversity absolute numbers and percentages; not just POC living downtown but living well downtown (cross-reference with housing cost burden)
- Land Use: How to integrate transportation and land use (1. Ground floors and street activation; 2. Densities and where we want the second Transbay tube; 3. Scenario planning); don't let tech companies create their own self-contained worlds
- Economic Opportunity: Civic Corps – w/o contractor's license [I think Diane was referring to a problem the City had in working with Civic Corps due to the City Attorney's office]

Housing and Affordability Implementation, Comments from Housing & Affordability Group, LK Notes

June 25, 2019

The group decided to focus just on new initiatives as opposed to the ones that said continue, they agreed that the ones that said continue should be continued.

The Implementation steps should be in order of priority.

Action Step:

#32: Should instead prioritize projects that would prevent displacement and help with homelessness. As the Implementation is currently written, about scoring criteria to prioritize housing funds in downtown, there was concern from the group with consequence of diverting housing from other areas.

#35: It was recommended to add for Market Rate Housing, there already are requirements for Affordable Housing. This should be a **short-term** priority.

#36a: Identify sites for hotels and meeting space, attract hotel developers and explore co-investment opportunities in order to help prevent the conversion of SRO's to boutique hotels.

#36b: Research unique consideration of applying the community land trust model and other alternative ownership programs/models (such as co-op, etc.) in downtown to determine whether and how to proceed; adopt recommendation. This should be a **mid-term** priority. The Land Trusts should work with the City and Affordable Housing Developers.

#37: Should add specifically to outreach to SRO residents who are the most vulnerable of being kicked out in downtown and adding in specifically "funding sources for renter services, counseling, and legal services." This should be a **short-term** priority.

#39a: Should add to have co-locations of supportive services in Affordable Housing developments. This should be a **short-term** priority.

#39b: This should be a **short-term** priority.

#40b: This should be a **short-term** priority.

#43: Should actively encourage 100% Affordable Housing projects to use SB#%. This should be a **short-term** priority.

#46: Should update Jobs/Housing Impact Fee Nexus Study.

Additional Action Steps to Add:

- A. Public/private partnership of using library and county properties for Affordable Housing. Also look at co-locating public facilities with affordable housing above.
- B. Have a sales tax/parcel tax for affordable housing.

Additional General Measures of Success Comments

- Should be in order of Priority.

- Should add something about integrating housing for families in downtown with 2-3 bedroom units (there was some disagreement about this in the group, some thought that downtown is not very conducive for families).

Housing & Affordability:

- Total Housing Stock

- **Baseline:** As of 2019, there were 12,030 housing units within the plan area.¹
- **Measure of Success:** Downtown Oakland more than triples its current housing stock by 2040. 29,077 new units are added by 2040, bring the total of dwelling units in the downtown plan area to 41,107.

Comment: Jeff thought that this should be 2015 in order to compare the affordable units percentage since the number of affordable units is also 2015 numbers.

- Affordable Housing

- **Baseline:** As of 2015, downtown had a count of approximately 2,293 affordable units within the plan area.²
- **Measure of Success:** Affordable Housing construction in downtown tracks with market-rate housing construction at a rate of 15% to 25% of new units, adding between 4,350 and 7,250 income-restricted units within the plan area.

Comment: The group asked if there is a 2019 number? Jeff would like to still note the year that had the highest percentage of affordable since there has been less affordable units built recently and more market rate, so his fear is that the percentage has already declined.

Group thought this should be at least the same percentage of affordable units that were in downtown in 2015 (Jeff stated this was 25% of units were affordable in downtown in 2015).

Should also include percentages for the different affordability income levels, the percentages should match that of the Housing Element RINA percentages. (Jeff wanted no moderate income units, while another group member disagreed and that also contradicted the Housing Element percentages which include RINA and Jeff was in agreement of using the RINA percentages).

- Accessibility

- **Baseline:** XX% of units downtown [or units built downtown annually] meet universal design standards.
- **Measure of Success:** A majority of newly constructed units, including affordable units, meet universal design standards and allow residents of various physical abilities to live downtown and to age in place.

- Housing Cost Burden

- **Baseline:** In 2015, 40.1% of White renters and 63.4% of Black renters, as well as 29.1% of White homeowners and 44.6% of Black homeowners in Oakland faced housing costs greater than 30% of their household income.

Comment: The group thought it should relate to income level, the suggestion was to use the Extreme Housing burden of 50% or more.

- **Measure of Success:** These figures are reduced annually and the racial disparities in these statistics diminish each year.

¹ Draft EIR

² Strategic Economics, Affordable Housing Memo and Directory of Assisted Rental Housing

- **Unsheltered Residents**
 - **Baseline:** During a 2017 survey in Oakland, a total of 2,761 individuals were counted as experiencing homelessness, with over 68% identifying as Black or African American. Homeless advocates estimate that the actual number of persons experiencing homelessness is closer to 9,000. ³
 - **Measure of Success:** The number of people moving from homelessness to permanent housing increases, and disparities among unsheltered residents is reduced.

Comment: Should add in the number of homeless is reduced with people moving to sheltered Transitional Housing with the goal of increasing to permanent housing. (First goal is to get people off the street, then find permanent housing)

- **Racial Diversity**
 - See Culture Keeping Racial Diversity Measure of Success

Culture Keeping:

- **Racial Diversity**
 - **Baseline:** Between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of Black residents in Downtown Oakland decreased. Between 2000 and 2015, the proportion of Asian residents decreased.⁴
 - African-American population in the greater downtown fell from 27.6% to 20.1% from 1990-2015.
 - Asian population in greater downtown declined from 40.8% in 2000 to 39.7% in 2015
 - Latinx population increased from 6.8% to 8.9% from 1990 to 2015

Comment: Should list actual population numbers since the goal is not to reduce the population.

- **Measure of Success:** The current decline in the Black and Asian resident population is stopped and does not continue a trend of further displacement.

Comment: Should look at percentage as well as population. Group was not sure if keeping the same percentage of Asians made sense because they felt that a large population is in China Town and China Town is not proposed to take up a larger geographic footprint.

June 25 Culture Keeping Table Notes

Group attendees: Regina Davis, Eric Arnold, Caleb Smith (Library Commissioner), Ada Chan, Coco Duhon-Kelley, Carina Lieu (City of Oakland Youth Commission), Yusef Wright

Culture Keeping – Measures of Success

- Suggested additional measures:

³ Admin Draft 1, Housing and Affordability

⁴ Disparity Analysis

- Need a measure to track business incubation/business assistance
 - Need a measure to track congregation space for youth (plazas (Frank Ogawa Plaza; Latham Square; Lake Merritt Amphitheater), libraries, Lincoln Rec Center Summer Nights; YMCA; First Friday (youth zone); bars that have food items and are thus open for young people before a certain hour, etc.)
 - Marketing/promotion budget for Malonga, AAMLO, OACC
 - Measure one-time revenues and general fund expenditures for Malonga, AAMLO, OACC
 - Installation of wayfinding signage; tracking of advertising
 - Track businesses serving as social hubs; offering mentoring (e.g., Benny Adems Grooming Parlor, Regina’s Door)
- **“Arts & Culture Businesses”**
 - **Baseline:** Data used to produce Oakland’s Cultural Asset Map indicate that 161 arts and culture businesses, institutions, and nonprofits are currently located downtown.⁵
 - **Measure of Success:** Arts and culture institutions and businesses increase in number and proportion to all businesses downtown.

Comment: Group discussion: need to define “culture” businesses to include ethnic businesses [term coined by note-taker] (such as the small businesses in Chinatown); point is to include more than just cultural businesses such as museums, performance venues, etc

Specify how MOS will be measured; group discussion included adding a column to the implementation matrix attaching Measures of Success to Implementation Actions

- **Cultural Facilities**
 - **Baseline:** Currently there are XX venues, galleries, and meeting spaces in Downtown Oakland.
 - **Measure of Success:** These spaces are valued and continue to be utilized while an additional XX cultural spaces are built.

Comment: Comment was made about the need to distinguish between community-serving non-profits galleries (such as Betti Ono) and high-end boutique galleries (that are displacing local artists)

Need to separate out public vs. private spaces

Implementation Actions

- Need to include mitigation for construction impacts: notification/coordination (update SCAs)
- Need to include Cultural Facilities (Libraries, etc.) as Disaster Preparedness Centers (“cooling stations”)
- Need more active language (e.g., “adopt + implement” not “explore...”)
- Incorporate recommendations from Mayor’s Arts Taskforce

⁵ City of Oakland Cultural Affairs Division. Belonging in Oakland, Cultural Development Plan. Vanessa Whang, Communities in Collaboration and Alex Werth. 2018, pp. 69.

- The “Key Equity Indicators Addressed” column was oversimplified
- Row #94 (re: Historic Buildings – handwritten notes from sticky notes)
 - Encourage use of State Historic Building Code in the rehabilitation of historic buildings (Building Code)
 - Implement a TDR program that is specific to fund the rehabilitation of historic properties
 - Explore allowing additional height on parcels adjacent to historic properties that rehabilitate the adjacent historic property
 - Allow for use conversion to historic buildings when they submit a rehab plan (e.g., SF’s Planning Code that allows office conversions when a historic building maintenance plan is submitted)
- Suggestion to move management of the Malonga Casquelourd Center for the Arts to the Cultural Affairs Division

- Table edits:
 - Row #80 replace “Explore the development...” with “Adopt and implement...”
 - Row #XX (proposed new cultural facilities fee): consider a ticket sales tax fee (surcharge on entertainment tickets); need an analysis on what would work better Hotel tax increase vs. ticket sales tax (disagreement at the table about the equity impacts from ticket sales, some thought charging the “little guy” (i.e., concert goer) was not equitable). Seattle example was cited as a potential model.
 - Add to “Potential Funding Sources”: “CIP; philanthropic grants”

Priorities

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Notes</u>
Row #98	*clear highest priority* More funding for Cultural Affairs (to implement the actions in the Plan; without staff, actions don’t matter, if there is no one to implement them; Cultural Affairs needs a Cultural Facilities Unit)
Additional priorities in numerical order	
Row #79	replace “Explore zoning...” with “Fund and implement zoning...”
Row #81	Add “Economic and Workforce Development” and Dept. of Transportation” as “Related Existing City Policies and Programs”
Row #82	add to description that the building should also have regular and ongoing maintenance
Row #84	add “Library Services” and “Dept. of Human Services” to the “Partners, Agencies, Institutions and Organizations” column
Row #85	change text to “Work with the Library’s Master Facilities Plan to modernize and expand the Main Library and explore funding strategies”; add “Library Services” to “Lead Agency” column
Row #86	(no additional notes)

Row #87	reference programming relatively underutilized space such as Frank Ogawa Plaza
Row #91	(no additional notes)
Row #92	(no additional notes)
Row #95	Discussion centered around the Malonga Center and Oakland Asian Cultural Center
Row #101	(no additional notes)

Economic Opportunity Table Notes – June 25, 2019

Measures of Success:

- Tax Revenues – may need to measure this as a running average instead of a year over year increase in revenues and contributions to the general fund to better account for natural ups and downs in the economy; it is more important to measure a general upwards trend in revenues rather than an increase every year
- Funds for Citywide Services – should there be a specific target for the percentage of general fund monies invested back into sensitive communities? Should this target reflect population changes?
- Job Growth – change this to measure the increase in jobs by sector and by race, instead of just growth in overall jobs downtown
- Diverse Business Ownership – this will be relatively easy for the city to measure moving forward; there should be some measure, either a new one, or included as a part of this that discusses participation in WMBE licensing since participation today has been very low (many businesses do not perceive any benefit from registering)
- New Measure: Property Ownership – we should be tracking property ownership by race in the downtown
- New Measure: Visitors to Downtown – we should be tracking the number of visitors and tourists coming to Downtown each year and look to increase this
- New Measure: Economic Impact of Downtown Events (perhaps revenue generated?) – downtown as a cultural hub is an important piece of its overall economic development strategy; this measure seeks to quantify the wealth generated by downtown events; should discuss what data exactly can/should be measured to quantify this economic impact
- New Measure: Placement Statistics from Joab Training Programs – we are currently missing a measure that addresses to effectiveness of job training programs; many existing programs track placement of recent trainees (including placement into trade internship positions) that the city can compile and track on an ongoing basis; other useful measure could include enrollment and graduation numbers in such programs

Action Items:

- Action 1 – an office/mixed-use developer at the table feels that it is a mistake to require office at office priority sites, recommends changing this to incentives
- Action 3 – change to ‘Assess and continue’; potential partner is the Career Workforce Trades Institute, who could act as a liaison; this action is very important and should not require many additional resources from the city
- Action 6 – discussion of modify this action and associated policies to consider density/FAR minimums at specified locations near transit
- Action 7 – This study should include fast-tracking permits and streamlining CEQA review as an additional incentive; according to developers at the table this incentive is very valuable as time and certainty do incur large costs in new development projects
- Action 8 – some at the table feel that continuing to increase impact fees is a punitive measure to development and could reduce overall growth

- Action 12 and 13 – land use and mobility tables discussed the issue of how we can guarantee pedestrian-friendly ground floor uses; any master-leasing programs and zoning updates should reflect a broader idea of what constitutes a pedestrian-friendly ground floor
- Action 16 & 17 – the existing Business Assistance Center is seen as ineffective today due to lack of capacity and resources; the table suggested that instead of expanding their services they take on a role of liaison or a business 311 that directs people to the right programs and organizations; partners could include the libraries, Impact Hub, and Main Street Launch
- Action 21 – what exactly is a youth empowerment zone? Instead of growing the number of youth-oriented programs make this about oversight and ensuring that existing downtown youth programs are legitimate and effective; some feel that existing youth organizations are isolated, and do not adequately integrate the youth of Oakland into the broader fabric and activity downtown; there was also mention of increasing the number of businesses that welcome youth under the age of 21 – one example of Emporium, a bar/arcade located in a largely city-owned building which does not allow people under 21 at any time during the day
- New Action: Improve and expand downtown specific marketing and branding initiatives – right now there is only one person in charge of marketing at the city; if downtown is considered as one of the main revenue sources of the city, there should be a more robust effort to increase marketing, not only to businesses and employers, but also to visitors and potential residents; this could be handled by Economic Development and Cultural Affairs, in partnership with Visit Oakland, downtowns BIDs, chambers, and the BAMBD CDC; it would likely require the creation of new staff positions
- Emerging priority actions:
 - Action 1 – Review and modify zoning to ensure office development is favored at office priority sites...etc.
 - Action 3 – Continue ongoing city effort to expand local hire initiatives, training, apprenticeships, partnerships as specified
 - Action 6 – Review and modify zoning to promote density and a mix of transit-supportive uses at specified locations
 - Action 7 – Complete the currently underway study of zoning incentives/value capture in downtown and implement its recommendations
 - New Action – Expanded marketing and branding efforts for downtown
- Other notes:
 - Economic & Workforce Development is currently tasked with overseeing almost all of the Economic Opportunity actions – can there be other/more partnerships or committees to help manage and implement?
 - Work with the school district to help implement any youth related programs
 - City buildings that will soon be retired could be converted to a regional Port Authority, which one attendee felt was sorely needed in Oakland, and should be located downtown

Plan Policies:

- Policy E-1.1 – change to “tenant requirements, or other direct and indirect contributions”; think of this as a menu approach that incentivizes instead of requires

Mobility Table Notes – June 25, 2019

Measures of Success

Should also include measures for:

- Loading/drop offs/use of curb space. Perhaps the measure can be of observed double parking, or occupancy %
- Are there measures of success for the color curb program in Chinatown? These could also be used for the DOSP
- Measure travel time to downtown, by mode.
- Measure cost to get downtown (transit fare, parking, etc)
- Measure number of people on the street. Can measure at different times of the day; measure in different contexts (entertainment district, retail areas, etc.)
- Measure small business access. Perhaps measure can be a survey of business owners and/or customers; can ask how customers arrive/how easy it is to get there, how easy to find parking/cost to park, etc. Measure of success would be positive trend in responses.
- Should reference mode shift goals in climate action plan. Can measure air quality, car/truck noise levels, etc
- Measures should focus on equity – access to many modes
- The bike and pedestrian safety measure – should reference disparity analysis, measure of success should measure if those that data (injuries/deaths by race) is improving
- A measure of success can be that the range of mobility options expand (including new technologies)

Policies and Action Steps

- Identified as priority action steps:
 - #71 and #72 (expand Park Oakland and develop a Curbside Management Study). Want to move this to immediate action, within the first year
 - Identified one per mode that is most important:
 - #51 (emerging technologies)
 - #57 (implement Complete Streets)
 - #62 (priority connectivity and access improvements) and #63 (safety measures)
 - #64 (core bike network)
 - #66 (transit priority treatments)
 - #68 low-income transit pass – this policy should also include a free transit pass for school-aged children (see Sacramento example)
 - #67 was identified as a priority for Chinatown
- Need a policy about maintaining mobility/access during construction
- There was a discussion about bringing the downtown plan into alignment with the Bike Master Plan and 2017 Pedestrian Plan
 - #49 – need to refer to bike plan and pull out policies and actions related to downtown for bike parking

- #64 – the Bike plan uses the term “short term network” not core network
- How will decisions about funding be made – using bike plan recommendations or DOSP?
- How will decisions be made about pedestrian or bike improvements, if they have a common funding source?
- What happened to the idea for “Go big on Broadway”. That was in the Preliminary Draft DOSP but Broadway not included in the Bike Plan. The DOSP should dream big and include bike track on Broadway, at least as a long term idea.