



Introduction..... 3

 Project Description 3

 Purpose of Outreach Process..... 3

 Notification..... 3

Outreach Meetings 3

 Small Group Interview(s) 3

Summary of Key Issues & Concerns 4

 Importance of Site and Site Development 4

 Access, Transportation & Traffic Impacts 5

 Effect on Surrounding Community..... 5

 Housing 5

 Open Space..... 5

 9th Avenue Terminal 6

 Commercial Use 6

 Economic Impacts 6

 Estuary Policy Plan..... 6

 Public Process..... 6

 Project Information 7

 Supported Aspects of Plan 7

Suggested Changes 7

 Access, Transportation & Traffic Impacts 7

 Effects on Surrounding Communities 7

 Housing 7

 Open Space..... 8

 Views 8

 9th Avenue Terminal 8

 Commercial Uses 8

 Public Process..... 9

 Project Information 9

Additional Information 9
 Requests for Additional Information..... 9
 Additional Information/Comments Provided by Meeting Attendees..... 10

Next Steps 10

Appendix A – Comments Received During Small Group Meetings 11

Introduction

Project Description

The City of Oakland is currently reviewing and evaluating a proposed redevelopment Plan (Plan) for the area along the Oakland estuary identified as “Oak-to-9th Avenue.” The proposed Plan submitted by Oakland Harbor Partners, LLC includes up to 3,100 residential units, 200,000 square feet of ground floor commercial space, 3,500 structured parking spaces, approximately 27 acres of public open space, two renovated marinas, and a wetlands restoration area. This proposed Plan was developed six years after the adoption of the Estuary Policy Plan, which is the current policy framework for Oakland’s estuary area. The development proposal now before the City represents a departure from the vision set forth in the Estuary Policy Plan, and is in the process of being reviewed and evaluated by the City and the Oakland community.

Purpose of Outreach Process

The Outreach Process for this project is designed to encourage broad community input on the proposed Plan. Because the Plan does deviate from the Estuary Policy Plan, the City is interested in receiving further public comment on the Plan before the developer completes the environmental review and initiates the formal approval process. The outreach process will include a series of small group interviews and two community-wide public meetings. The small group interviews provide an opportunity for more detailed discussions with a small number of participants. The large public meetings provide opportunities for all interested parties to learn more about the Plan and to provide comments and express issues to be addressed. Overall, the City is interested in providing a Plan that balances the needs and desires of all interested parties.

Notification

The City sent personalized letters to key stakeholders identified to participate in the small group interviews (see below for more information on small group interviews). The letter provided basic project information, a brief explanation of the public outreach process and encouraged recipients to attend these initial interviews.

Outreach Meetings

Small Group Interview(s)

Small group interviews were organized to solicit feedback about the Plan and learn more about interests and concerns from a range of key community organizations regarding development in this area. The City identified key organizations to contact to participate in the small group interviews. These interviews were intended to bring together local community organizations’ interests only; elected officials and/or regulatory agencies were not included in this process.

The key objectives of these small group interviews were to:

- Better understand the various stakeholder interests and positions on the Proposed Oakland Harbor Partners (OHP) Plan;
- Broaden citywide feedback and input on the Plan;

- Obtain input on other effective ways to reach out to the greater community for participation in the community meetings;
- Gather input to help design the upcoming public meetings; and
- Request that groups encourage their membership to attend the upcoming community meetings

On February 1, 2, and 3, 2005 the nine small group interviews were conducted with representatives from 35 local community organizations (meeting invitations were extended to a total of 47 organizations). A total of 40 individuals participated in these meetings. These interviews were intended to include representatives that reflected a range of stakeholders with an interest in the proposed Plan. Representatives were grouped together by common interests. The nine groups included:

- Citizen Groups
- Chambers of Commerce
- Business Associations
- Community and Urban Development Issues
- Housing and Community Groups
- Environmental Interests
- Parks and Recreation
- Historic Preservation
- Other Oakland Neighborhood Groups

At each interview, participants received an overview of the proposed Oak to 9th Plan and had opportunities to provide comments on elements of the Plan and were asked to give input about future public involvement activities. Participants were also asked a series of questions geared to solicit specific and overall comments on the Plan.

Comments and questions were recorded on flip charts at each interview and in notes taken by meeting facilitators. The Summary of Key Issues & Concerns in this report provides a summary overview of all comments heard at the small group interviews. A comprehensive listing of all comments received at each of the interviews can be found in the Appendix.

Summary of Key Issues & Concerns

The information below provides a summary of the key issues heard at the small group interviews. This summary is not intended to be a precise transcript of comments made during these meetings, but provides an overall summary that captures the main issues and concerns of participants. Comments have been categorized to group similar ideas and comments. The organization of the categories in no way represents a hierarchy of importance or weight of an issue.

Importance of the Site

There were many comments about the importance of this particular site to the entire Oakland community. It was also noted that this is the largest parcel of land on the waterfront and the Oakland community should not lose its claim to it. One participant thought the overall vision for the waterfront area is extremely important. A master plan for the area that includes plans

for the surrounding neighborhoods would be a valuable resource to all of Oakland. Participants thought this development represents an important opportunity to include and integrate surrounding communities.

Access, Transportation & Traffic Impacts

Access to the site and impacts on traffic were two of the major concerns raised in the meetings. Several participants were also concerned that the planned infrastructure cannot support the proposed number of cars or people. Many people do not believe that there are enough routes leading to and from the site to support smooth traffic flow. Participants felt that there would be significant traffic impacts because of residents and shoppers coming into the site. Others were worried about the cumulative impacts on traffic from Jack London Square as well as numerous road improvement projects planned within the next few years (i.e. the I-880 retrofit). “Coordination with Caltrans is imperative.”

Effect on Surrounding Communities

There was a lot of concern regarding the integration of the communities surrounding the development. Several participants pointed out that the Estuary Policy Plan called for an artisan village plan that was a dense development but it took into account, and integrated, the 5th Avenue community into the new development. Many participants felt that the proposed Plan does not adequately recognize the existing community and will not allow the existing community to be sustainable, including people living in the marina. A few participants disagreed with the idea of “bringing downtown Oakland to the waterfront” since downtown is far from the development area and its character is vastly different.

Participants also worried that the height and density of the buildings would negatively impact the surrounding communities, creating a shaded, dark and unpleasant community. Others were concerned that this is an isolated development that could easily be viewed as a gated (figurative) community. One commenter was concerned that new development projects in Oakland are resulting in higher rents in surrounding neighborhoods forcing more concentrated areas of poverty.

Housing

The scope of the housing portion of the Plan brought about several comments. Participants wanted to make sure that affordable housing would be included as part of the project, noting the original development plan submitted to the Port of Oakland included 15–20% affordable housing. One participant suggested the developer consider affordable housing to be 30% below market rate.

Some participants want to ensure that the housing that is created is an inviting and safe atmosphere to live in noting challenges with noise and pollution as well as concerns about seismic activity.

Open Space

Keeping the open space public is a key factor to this project. Participants were concerned that once residents move in they will apply pressure to the City and developer to make the area more private and discourage outside public use of the open space areas. The open space areas should be visible to the public from outside the development. One participant noted that the existing restored wetland area was created as mitigation from a past oil spill; it is imperative

that the integrity of this site is maintained. Participants also discussed specific uses for the open space areas such as recreational activities and wildlife habitat.

One commenter noted that Measure DD had a vision of creating green space along the waterfront all the way down to the airport and this project seems to counter those ideals. It was also noted that the Estuary Policy Plan calls for 60% open space and this Plan is only 43%. However, other participants were concerned that there is little demand for the open space, asking that the developer define the existing need for more open space in the Estuary.

9th Avenue Terminal

Many participants wanted to see the preservation of the 9th Avenue Terminal. It was noted that the Terminal is being reviewed for landmark status, and also that the Terminal was not preserved in the Estuary Policy Plan. Several commenters stated that the Terminal is the last one of its kind and creates historic connectivity to the area.

Commercial Use

How the commercial use would impact the rest of the City was a significant topic of the meetings. Some commenters wondered if the retail space was needed or sustainable; they noted that the mixed-use space in Jack London Square is mostly empty because of insufficient planning. Others wanted to know if the retail space will support just the local residents or attract outside customers.

Economic Impacts

Some participants thought that there would be negative economic impacts on the City stemming from this development. They noted that the project area is part of the Oakland Central City East Redevelopment Plan, which means the tax dollars generated will go to the redevelopment district and not the City. Therefore, City services (police, fire services, etc.) will have to be paid for by other tax dollars for the next 35 years.

Others were concerned that the land is actually worth much more than what the appraiser reported and thought the property pricing should be compared to that of equivalent properties along the Estuary.

Estuary Policy Plan

Most of the participants were concerned that the proposed Plan does not reflect the Estuary Policy Plan adopted by the City in 1999. They believe the developer was granted the exclusive development rights because they would follow the Estuary Policy Plan or engage the public in a specific plan process, noting that any changes to the Estuary Policy Plan should be made through a large public process. Many participants believe that the Estuary Policy Plan process created a satisfactory plan and it should not be set aside after so much work was done by members of the community.

Public Process

Many participants felt that the process is moving too quickly and that people are not knowledgeable enough about the Plan to give input. A few groups said that while they want to work with the developer to create an acceptable development, they feel they are being ignored. The groups are committed to changing the project through a charrette process, politically or otherwise. Many groups expressed the desire to be at the negotiating table, working with the developer. Several participants asked that the developer hold a design

charrette so that surrounding communities and the public can provide input on the design and are not just reacting to an existing development plan. They believe that there should be more collaboration and input from the entire Oakland community before the Plan goes to the Planning Commission.

Project Information

Concern was expressed about the vagueness of the project description and because there are no verbal descriptions or effective maps/models. Participants thought the description should include more technical information. Another felt they would be legitimizing this Plan by commenting on the specifics, especially since it is a conceptual plan.

Supported Aspects of Plan

Several participants supported the types and amount of open space and parks in the Plan, especially along the waterfront. One commenter thought that the parkland could have many public uses if proper buffer areas are established around the homes. Residential units in the development were generally supported with a balance between the scale of the development and the economics. Support for the renovated marina was also mentioned by one commenter.

Suggested Plan Refinements

Access, Transportation & Traffic Impacts

Suggestions from participants regarding access to the site focused on the need for comprehensive public transportation to serve the residents and those working in the area. Participants made suggestions on methods to encourage the use of public transportation. In addition, several participants commented on the importance of including connections to other communities through physical infrastructure and links to the existing neighboring businesses and communities.

Effects on Surrounding Communities

One commenter suggested that the development should be complementary to the final plan for Jack London Square. Another noted that the Plan should consider the need for schools or where children living in the area would attend school. Several commenters suggested that the area create an artisan community to attract artists and commercial uses for other Oakland residents.

If creative mixed use is implemented, including shops, light manufacturing, live-work studios, and artisans, the development could be a source of employment for people from the surrounding communities. One commenter suggested that the Plan include job opportunities that would give preference to Oakland residents. They would also like to see the developer provide pre-construction training so local residents can be hired to work on the construction activities.

Housing

Many participants asked that affordable housing be included in the development in order for people who make less than \$40,000 per year to be able to buy into the development. Several community groups stressed that the percentage of affordable housing should be the same, around 30%, regardless of the number of units in the development. Members of the Oak to 9th Community Benefits Coalition suggested that the developer integrate the information

provided in their Community Benefits Agreement to address affordable housing, jobs and community opportunities.

Other commenters want to see a live-work community with no more than a third of the development being strictly residential. They want to see at least half of the space used for light industrial purposes, not live-work lofts only used for desk jobs. One participant also suggested that there should be a variety in the architecture in the development, which could be achieved by employing several different architects and builders.

Open Space

A variety of ideas were expressed regarding the open space proposed in the Plan. While some commenters suggested that open space be left undefined, others suggested defined recreational space such as a soccer field. Most felt that a balance between programmed and flexible use space was the best use of the land. Many participants felt that the open space should have connections to the Bay Trail, Jack London Square, and other communities, and that there should be a consistency in signage with the rest of the Bay Trail so that people are instantly aware that they are welcome. There was also a suggestion the some open space be set aside as habitat for native plant and wildlife species.

Many participants also suggested creating a large open space where community festivals and concerts could be held. It was noted that open space areas should be separated from residences in order to avoid noise and traffic conflicts.

Views

Several participants suggested that the visibility of the public open space and waterfront from the Embarcadero needs to be preserved. One commenter suggested that the Plan could include high rises on the Embarcadero with view corridors separating them so the public space is visible. One participant also suggested consulting the Bay Conservation and Development Commission regarding the buildings going over 6 stories and their potential interruption of sight lines.

9th Avenue Terminal

Several suggestions for the preservation and reuse of the 9th Avenue Terminal were made. Many participants thought the historic buildings could be used to draw people to the waterfront by offering the development a historic and distinctive look and feel. Several suggested that at least the 1920's portion of the Terminal should be saved in order to maintain its historic value. Participants suggested that waterfront and structures be reused in creative ways, with relation to history and natural history of the town. Suggestions included indoor open space uses (for festivals), partial residential use, museums, restaurants, cafes, and stores. Examples of successful adaptive reuse projects were given, including the Ford assembly plant in Richmond, Chelsea Piers in New York City, the Marine Terminal Lofts in Minneapolis, and the Torpedo Factory in Arlington, Virginia.

Commercial Uses

Recommendations for land use in the development varied greatly. Suggestions for commercial uses include an exhibition hall and/or an art gallery for local artists, outdoor and marina activities, restaurants, an amphitheatre, cafes, and other retail space (not office space). A few commenters noted that high-end retail would not be the best use of the estuary.

Rather, stores should capture the marine atmosphere instead. Some participants wanted a more detailed list and description of what facilities would be available on the project site.

Public Process

Several recommendations for the large public meetings were given at the small group meetings. Participants asked that there be sufficient advanced notice of the public meeting, including consulting small groups before scheduling public meeting to avoid timing conflicts. One participant suggested using a public service announcement or media release to get information out about the public meetings. Participants also asked that, if the public meeting involves breaking into groups, the groups should be mixed up in order to get input from a variety of people. A few commenters asked that the developers and the City attend the next meeting.

Project Information

Most of the participants thought that more images of the project were needed to fully understand the development. Some requested changes to the current map include identifying the existing 5th Avenue community, adding information or simulations of the sunlight and shadowing in the proposed plan, and showing restored wetlands on the development map. In addition, the map should be made available to the public in an easily printable size. Provide more accurate and realistic visuals for the public process.

Other participants requested new project images. These included a 3-D map of the towers, a topography/elevation map, visuals of recreational activities, and an overlay map comparison with the Estuary Policy Plan. Several simulations of views around the project were requested, including views at boat level from the Lake Merritt Channel, Alameda, the hills, 880, and the Embarcadero.

Additional Information

Requests for Additional Information

During the small group meetings participants requested several additional pieces of information. Clarification on what constitutes open space and how long the developer would have to maintain the open space was requested. One commenter asked how the Measure DD money that was allocated for the purchase of open space in the Oak to 9th district would be distributed since it is not needed in this Plan. One commenter asked for more detailed info about cleanup of the site; who would pay for it and what exactly needs to be cleaned up.

Provide additional financial information about the property showing what the property currently generates in property tax and use fees and what the property could generate with the development. Others would also like to see a social and economic analysis in the EIR.

One participant asked that the developer show how this project would fit in with other plans. Provide more rationale for the high density towers and how the towers would blend into the whole development. Provide more information on the target residents envisioned to occupy the development. Provide information addressing the number of slips that would be removed from or added to the marina. Provide more information explaining the ratio of business to residences that a “neighborhood” like this requires. Demonstrate how the businesses will serve the residents and what additional service may be sought outside of the development (e.g. supermarket).

Additional Information/Comments Provided by Meeting Attendees

9th Avenue Terminal: A landmark application is in place with the City. Landmarking does not preserve the building forever. There would have to be a historic review before it could be knocked down. The Terminal probably falls under the federal historic landmark guidelines (section 106).

Tidelands Trust: Tidelands Trust lands cannot be used for residential housing. With the recent law change, now the Port can sell the “after acquired” lands (not the originally acquired land). The 9th Avenue Terminal is on originally acquired land.

Estuary Policy Plan: One meeting participant felt that the answer to question #4 on the Frequently Asked Questions is incorrect. He pointed out that the Oakland Estuary Plan is a general concept plan while the Estuary Policy Plan was adopted into the General Plan in 1999. He noted that they are two distinct documents. He thought the City rewrote part of the Estuary Policy Plan that the City Council approved (in 2000) meaning the City has not published the Council approved version of the Estuary Policy Plan.

Next Steps

Two public meetings will be conducted: March 30th and April 9th. This will be an opportunity for additional community-wide comment regarding the Proposed Plan for the Oak to 9th Waterfront area. The City will review the comments heard during the public outreach process and determine the direction to take with the developer and the proposed Plan. The City will take into account issues and concerns voiced by interested stakeholders and consider options with the developer.

Appendix A – Comments Received During Small Group Meetings

The following is a comprehensive documentation of the comments and issues heard from participants in the small group meetings for the Oakland Waterfront Oak to 9th Public Participation effort. Please note this is not intended to serve as a precise transcript of each meeting. Comments and issues are organized by topics and questions presented by facilitators during the meetings. Under each meeting there is a list of those organizations that were represented and those organizations that were unable to attend.

MEETING #1: February 1, 2005 – 10:30 a.m. -12:00 p.m.

Attendees: Oakland Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce
Oakland Chinatown Chamber of Commerce
Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, Alameda County

Unable to Attend: Oakland African American Chamber of Commerce

Comments / Issues / Concerns:

Importance of Site and Site Development

- Projects like this need to move forward and communities need to get behind their elected officials to encourage implementation of projects.

Concern Regarding Aspects of Plan

- Concerned that the current infrastructure along I-880 (on and off-ramps) and Oakland surface roads can not handle the additional traffic the development would bring.
- Evaluate the cumulative impacts on traffic for the entire region. There are numerous road improvement projects planned within the next 10 years (CALTRANS I-880 retrofit, Laney College, Measure DD projects and 12th Street Improvements). Also consider the potential increase in use of the Posey and Webster Tubes to avoid traffic on I-880. Need to coordinate with these projects to encourage a smooth traffic flow.
- Would like to see some affordable housing included in the Plan. In this case, consider affordable housing to be 30% below market rate.

Supported Aspects of Plan

- Plan opens up more area along the Estuary for public use than any other single park or open space area available to date.

Suggested Refinements to the Plan

- Developer needs to provide more specific information otherwise it is difficult to provide specific feedback on the Plan.
- Recalculate the open space for the development by taking into account that the 5th Avenue area is not included in the overall project site. The percentage of open space acreage may be closer to the Estuary Policy Plan.
- Define the existing need for more open space along the Estuary and reconcile the projected utilization with support for open space.

- Since this area includes public space, the development should follow a theme that is dedicated to honoring Oakland's history.
- Identify potential links to the development through public transportation.
- Provide more information explaining the ratio of business to residences that a "neighborhood" like this requires. Demonstrate how the businesses will serve the residents and what additional services may be sought outside of the development (e.g. supermarket).
- Provide more defined recreational areas in the open space such as a ball park or soccer field.

Issues and Concerns

- Any developer faces many incentives and disincentives for building projects and housing. Oakland needs to go to state and federal representatives to make these development projects work.
- The Developer needs to work with surrounding communities, Fruitvale, San Antonio and Chinatown, to hear their input and concerns and to coordinate any activities.
- Concerned about safety in the construction phase for minority workers.
- Concerned about the view and noise impacts of construction and final development.

Additional Information Requests

- Provide a map that shows the existing area with layers that fold down to show development, open space and other amenities.
- Provide additional financial information about the property showing what the property currently generates in property tax and use fees and what the property could generate with the development.
- Provide more information on projected use of the open space areas based on use at other locations in the Estuary.
- Provide more information on the target residents envisioned to occupy the development.

Other Comments

- Since Oakland is a transportation hub in the Bay Area, encourage state involvement in the review and development of solutions to address of overall transportation issues.

MEETING #2: February 1, 2005 – 1:00 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.

Attendees: Economic Development Alliance for Business (EDAB)
Airport Area Business Association

Unable to Attend: Lake Merritt Business Association
Jack London Merchants Association
Cypress Mandela Training Center
Building Trades Council of Alameda County
Bay Area Council
Eastlake Merchants Association

Comments / Issues / Concerns:

Importance of Site and Site Development

- The overall vision for the waterfront area is important. A master plan that includes plans for the surrounding neighborhoods would be a valuable resource to all of Oakland specifically those in surrounding neighborhoods.
- Oakland needs more housing especially residences that are considered affordable (at or below market rate).
- Important to maintain the historical value of the 9th Avenue Terminal.

Concern Regarding Aspects of Plan

- Need more information detailing the displacement of any existing businesses and what compensation would be made available.
- Consult the Bay Conservation and Development Commission regarding the buildings going over 6 stories and potential interruption of sight lines.
- Need to respect the community of artists in the 5th Avenue area and coordinate with their needs.
- Management of traffic coming in and out of the development needs to be addressed.
- Concerned about the level of density and height of the buildings planned.
- Concerned that the increased traffic going to the development could result in increased trash along the roadway. Need to coordinate with the railroad owners to develop maintenance responsibility and strategy.
- Need to reevaluate the balance of open space availability and accessibility.
- Concerned that this development would become an isolated “island”. Need to fit together with the other developments and surrounding communities.

Supported Aspects of Plan

- Support the inclusion of open space and public park access.
- With proper buffers, this area could easily support many outdoor dining and meeting areas which would add to the success of this development.
- Residential units are a good fit for the area. Need to provide a proper balance between the scale of the development and the economics. More housing is a good opportunity for all of Oakland.

Suggested Refinements to the Plan

- Need a better definition of who the target residents include. Need to consider facilities like schools if families are targeted.
- Currently, there is no public transportation service to the Embarcadero. This Plan must include provisions for public transportation to serve the residents and those working in the area. Buses and BART are key services to factor in, but also consider adding a ferry stop.
- Provide a better outline of the retail businesses that would occupy commercial space. Recommend that 5% of the space should be commercial.
- Develop a complete vision for the waterfront area. Show how this project would fit in with other plans.
- Include a facility for an exhibition hall and/or an art gallery for local artists.
- Leave open space as green open areas. Do not define specific uses for open space.
- Need to include a reasoning of why people would want to come to this development. Describe what will make this area unique and different and how it will fit in with the rest of Oakland.
- Provide a more detailed list and description of what facilities would be available on the project site (stores, activities, galleries, amphitheatre, etc.). Suggested using the 9th Avenue terminal to house a book store or café.

Additional Information Requests

- Provide information addressing the number of slips that would be removed from or added to the marina.
- Clarify how and for how long the developer will maintain open space areas.

MEETING #3: February 1, 2005 –3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Attendees: East Bay Asian Local Development Corporation (EBALDC)
Oakland Community Organization (OCO)
Oakland Coalition of Congregations (OCC)

Unable to Attend: East Bay Housing Organization (EBHO)
Oakland Citizens Community for Urban Renewal (OCCUR)

Comments / Issues / Concerns:

Importance of Site and Site Development

- Important opportunity to integrate surrounding communities into the new development. Stay away from a “gated” community that would exclude people living nearby.
- This development could be an opportunity to help in efforts to maintain the presence of people living and working in Oakland.
- Include the surrounding communities in the review of the Plan as they want to be included in the process. The meeting participants represent a large population of Oakland residents and want to ensure that the City and the developer hear and understand the communities they represent.

Concern Regarding Aspects of Plan

- Concern that the land is actually worth much more than what the appraiser reported. Compare pricing of equivalent properties along the Estuary.
- Concerned that the proposed density is too high for what the area can support.
- The original development plan submitted to the Port of Oakland included 15–20% affordable housing. Concerned that this version of the plan excludes the affordable housing element.

Supported Aspects of Plan

- Support the inclusion of open space areas in the Plan.
- Feel this project could be designed to provide benefits for all of Oakland.

Suggested Refinements to the Plan

- The median household income for candidates for affordable housing is between \$27,000 and \$30,000. The development should include housing that can accommodate those families/individuals.
- Include job opportunities in the Plan that would give preference to Oakland residents. Would also like to see the developer provide pre-construction training so local residents can be hired to work on the construction activities.
- Integrate the information provided in the Community Benefits Agreement to address affordable housing, jobs and community opportunities.
- Include the benefits of open space in the economic review of the development. Open space could be considered a subsidy of benefit to the developer.
- Need to include connections to communities through physical infrastructure and links to the existing neighboring businesses and communities.

- The displays provide a human scale evaluation of similar developments, but the towers are not shown at the human scale. Provide more rationale for the high density towers and how the towers would blend into the whole development.

Issues and Concerns

- Concerned that new development projects in Oakland are resulting in higher rents in surrounding neighborhoods forcing more concentrated areas of poverty as people can not afford to buy or rent the new apartments and houses.

Other Comments

Participants provided a brief overview of their organizations and involvement in the Oak-to-9th Coalition. Each group also noted that they represent a large population of Oakland residents and want the City and developer to consider that their input comes from that larger population.

- Oakland Community Organization (OCO) works with 25 to 30 churches near the proposed project area. OCO provides grassroots outreach on housing, education and safety issues. St. Anthony's church is one of the congregations involved with OCO representing about 500 families that live about 1 block from 9th Avenue.
- Oakland Coalition of Congregations (OCC) works with about 33 congregations and 2 community organizations. Within one church involved with OCC, there are over 5500 members. Key issues that OCC is concerned about include providing affordable housing, maintaining diversity in Oakland neighborhoods, protecting renters from rent increases that force them to move from Oakland and integrating neighborhoods to avoid concentrated areas of poverty.
- East Bay Asian Local Development Corporation (EBALDC) is also part of the Oak-to-9th Coalition and is involved in local housing, business development and community issues.

MEETING #4: February 2, 2005 – 10:30 a.m. -12:00 p.m.

Attendees: Friends of Oakland Parks and Recreation

Unable to Attend: Oakland Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee
Jack London Aquatic Center

Comments / Issues / Concerns:

Importance of Site and Site Development

- Important to coordinate with the Estuary Policy Plan Advisory Committee and others involved in those planning activities.
- Considers this redevelopment project a “pot of gold” that may be more appropriately located elsewhere in Oakland away from the shoreline.
- Include the marina operators in the development discussion.

Concern Regarding Aspects of Plan

- The plan should be kept in the spirit of the Estuary Policy Plan and should explore other funding options. Proposition 12 and Proposition 40 were passed to fund a project that will follow that vision. If this development will not do so, please wait for a project that does. (*Proposition 12 aims to” protect land around lakes, rivers, and streams and the coast to improve water quality and ensure clean drinking water; to protect forests and plant trees to improve air quality; to preserve open space and farmland; to protect wildlife habitats; and to repair and improve the safety of state and neighborhood parks”. Proposition 40 is a” \$2.6 billion bond issue approved by voters to pay for environmental conservation, parks and recreation, and historical and cultural preservation.”*)
- Concerned about the high density residential development proposed in the plan.
- Concerned that once people move in to the area they will apply pressure to the City and developer to keep the area more private and discourage public use of the open space areas.
- Consult the Bay Conservation and Development Commission regarding necessary set backs from the wetland areas.

Supported Aspects of Plan

- Oakland is a waterfront city, but access to the estuary has been walled off. This area is a great opportunity to open up the waterfront visually and physically. Ensure that the open space areas are visible to the public.
- Supports the plans to renovate marinas.

Suggested Refinements to the Plan

- Keep the 9th Avenue terminal for a “park-friendly” use such as a museum, restaurant or store. Want to provide an opportunity that will encourage the public to use the facility.
- Include a public meeting or festival site that could be of use to all of Oakland. Suggest locating a festival site in more of a commercial or retail area as opposed to a residential area. Include provisions for parking to serve this site.
- Consider the need for schools or where in Oakland kids living in the area would attend school.

- Do not include buildings behind Estuary Park. Providing more open space could be considered a tradeoff for allowing high density in the other developed area.
- Include some affordable housing in the Plan.

Issues and Concerns

- Concerned that these small group meetings is trivializing the importance of the Estuary Policy Plan.

MEETING #5: February 2, 2005 – 1:00 p.m. -2:30 p.m.

Attendees: Urban Ecology
East Bay Alliance for a Sustainable Economy (EBASE)
PolicyLink
Urban Strategies Council
Asian Pacific Environmental Network (APEN)
Asian Health Services
Lakeshore Business Improvement District

Unable to Attend: San Antonio Community Development Corporation
East Bay Asian Youth Center

Comments / Issues / Concerns:

Importance of Site and Site Development

- Will these comments have any weight? Is the developer bound to take them into consideration? This process seems redundant because we have already communicated our needs with the developer.
- Would like to be at the negotiating table, working with the developer.
- There is a need for community festival space. This area could bring community events back to Oakland, including the Blues Festival.

Concern Regarding Aspects of Plan

- The 5th Avenue entrance does not direct the flow to “main street” retail shops. Retail space should encourage local residents to come to the waterfront.
- What is the actual size of retail/commercial space? The commercial space is listed as “up to 200,000 square feet” but the documented intent is to build 110,000 square feet.
- The 5th Avenue entrance does not invite the public into the green space. A potential trail and retail corridor on 5th Avenue would be cutoff with this Plan.
- Public space in housing courtyards isn’t open space because it feels like someone’s front yard. Open space should be inviting to the public with easy visual cues.
- The Estuary Policy Plan calls for 60% open space and this Plan is 43%. The weight of the Estuary Policy Plan needs to be addressed.
- Will there be enough parking or transit services for events? This could negatively affect traffic in the surrounding communities
- This project will likely increase the amount of traffic in the area. Chinatown currently has the highest number of pedestrian accidents in Oakland. What processes will be implemented to mitigate/help this situation, especially with the increase in traffic.
- The City’s record in developing transit in new areas is poor, i.e. for Jack London Square. Shuttle/bus service depends on the size of the development and the City should commit to creating this service beforehand.
- Consider the cumulative effects of this and other projects on traffic, especially the I-880 improvement and the Broadway/Jackson project.

Suggested Refinements to the Plan

- There will be a lot of traffic from the new housing. This should be a transit oriented development; design it to promote public transit by reducing the ratio of parking spots to residences.
- 5th Ave. is the only at-grade entrance so use it to show people that they are invited to walk to the waterfront (streetscape entryway).
- Right now the open space is just big lawns. There should be a balance between programmed space and flexible uses. There is a need for athletic facilities, especially in the San Antonio area.
- Open space should be public with connections to the Bay Trail, Jack London Square, and other communities. Make sure the bike and pedestrian trails feed into and are incorporated into the development. There should be a consistency in signage with the rest of the Bay Trail so that people are instantly aware that they are welcome.
- Retail space should include cafes and an inviting atmosphere around the waterfront (right now the retail is on “main street” and away from the water). The commercial space should be retail, not office space.
- See the AC Transit letter from June 30, 2004. Transit/bus service is usually subsidized by the developer in developments of this size. This could include parking fees for residents (kept separate from rent/purchase price).

Issues and Concerns

- There should be integration of the surrounding community: traffic/connector issues, immigrant community, and small businesses.
- The development should make the communities better not worse. Plan for the inevitable traffic and school impacts.
- Would like to see affordable housing for people in the area, those who make less than \$40K per year (most around \$20K). The percentage of Affordable housing should be the same (30%) regardless of size of the development (# of units).
- Development should include jobs and job training for the local community.

Additional Information Requests

- Requested the entire summary of comments from all the small group meetings.
- Would like to see a social and economic analysis in the EIR. This is a political and real world process, not just about communications.
- There should be a 3-D map of the towers available.
- The maps that are currently available are broken up in parcels with no diagram to help put them together. Make a map available to the public in an easily printable size.

Other Comments

- Members of the Oak to 9th Community Benefits Coalition were in attendance at this meeting: APEN, Urban Strategies Council, PolicyLink, and EBASE.
- Please give us ample notice before the public meetings so that we can inform our members.
- APEN has written materials translated and simultaneous interpretations (Spanish, Vietnamese, Mien, Cantonese, and Mandarin) at their meetings.

MEETING #6: February 2, 2005 – 3:00 p.m. -4:30 p.m.

Attendees: Oakland Heritage Alliance
Friends of the 9th Avenue Terminal

Comments / Issues / Concerns:

Importance of Site and Site Development

- This is the sale of public land that belongs to all Californians so there should be greater public involvement. We need to make sure this is a smart investment.
- This process lacks a feedback mechanism. There should be more collaboration and input from the community before the Plan goes to the Planning Commission. The process should be iterative.
- The developer was granted the exclusive development rights because they said they would follow the Estuary Policy Plan or do a charrette. They have not followed through with this Plan. The City does not want to discuss alternative Plans, only wants a reaction to specific/existing Plans.

Concern Regarding Aspects of Plan

- The original artisan village plan was a dense development but it took into account the 5th Ave. community.
- This Plan does not “bring downtown Oakland to the waterfront.” Downtown Oakland does not have 20-story buildings except a few isolated towers.
- The retail space is in the center of the development and difficult to access. It is far from parking.
- Are the buildings built on podiums? (Garage on ground floor with landscaping on top)
- 9th Ave. Terminal is the last one of its kind and it is unacceptable to knock it down. It creates historic connectivity to help with the atmosphere of the area.
- The Plan knocks down too much of the Terminal. It is inappropriate to say the 9th Ave. Terminal will be preserved when the Plan includes a proposal to knock down the majority of the building. This reduces opportunities for obtaining historic tax credits; work with the proper agencies early and often in order to get the credit. The volume, shape, presence, and massing of the current building should be respected. Even rebuilding part of the Terminal is not authentic.
- Grass/open space in place of the terminal would be on a slab/pier, not on the ground. The City says that the pier cannot be reused, but it would need to be fixed in order to use the pier for grass space. The structure was built to hold the weight of trucks; it is “over built” for mixed reuse.
- How do you define green space? Does it mean publicly accessible? Is the space between the buildings or the roadway median strips counted?
- Large events: will public events be allowed there? Amplified music would have limited use next to residences. There is a conflict of interest having open spaces near the buildings.
- This is an upscale development, how will that affect access to the waterfront for the less wealthy? Open space should feel open, with visual connections and visual cues. This feels like it is cutting off the coast.
- The development creates a “wall” along the Embarcadero to prevent public access.
- Does the purchase price go up based on the number of units? If the number of units goes up the potential profit for the developer goes up. The price should reflect that.

Suggested Refinements to the Plan

- Use historic buildings to draw people to the waterfront with a distinctive look and feel. Reuse waterfront and structures in creative ways, with relation to history and natural history of the town. Be creative, build on the existing character.
- Could the 9th Ave. Terminal be mixed-use if some residential is mixed with some other uses (according to Tidelands Trust regulations)?
- The Terminal is 180,000 feet (roughly 4 acres) of open space (covered, but open). Could be a convention center with great, flexible access. Terminal reuse: Festival of the Lake (from Lake Merritt). Include the 50 small movie-making businesses at the Army bases that are being kicked out.
- Consider adaptive reuse of the 9th Ave. Terminal. Examples of adaptive reuse:
- Ford assembly plant (Richmond) – Long public process, historical structure adaptive reuse, successful federal tax credit.
- Chelsea Piers (New York City)-reuse as sports venue, lots of uses.
- Marine Terminal Lofts (Minneapolis).
- Torpedo Factory (Arlington, VA) – densely filled art center with competitive space rental.

Issues and Concerns

- The public should feel welcomed to their waterfront and not like they are in a private yard.

Additional Information Requests

- The project description is too vague; there are no verbal descriptions or effective maps/models. Description should include technical information. We need to see the project to fully understand it and its potential profit.
- There is only one map of the project on the City website; it is flat with no perspective. The pictures presented at this meeting do not fairly represent the project because they are of 2-3 story buildings and the project is comprised of 6-8 story buildings. Please provide more accurate and realistic visuals for this process.
- 5th Ave. is a potential historic district. It is misleading to show it as a blank space on the map. That is where the character of the area is.
- These meetings should be followed up/repeated when better descriptions and representations are available. People need a realistic vision of the project to make effective comments.

Other Comments

- 9th Ave. Terminal has a landmark application in place with the City. Landmarking does not preserve the building forever. There would have to be a historic review before it could be knocked down. The Terminal probably falls under the federal historic landmark guidelines (section 106).
- Tidelands Trust lands cannot be used for residential purposes. With the law change now the Port can sell the “after acquired” lands (not the originally acquired land). The 9th Ave. Terminal is on originally acquired land.

- There should be sufficient advanced notice of the public meeting (5 weeks). Consult groups beforehand to avoid timing conflicts. Use public service announcements/press releases to notify the public because newspaper ads are insufficient.

MEETING #7: February 3, 2005 – 10:30 a.m. -12:00 p.m.

Attendees: Fifth Avenue Institute
Fifth Avenue Preservation and Development Committee
Fifth Avenue Waterfront Alliance
Fifth Avenue Waterfront Coalition
Jack London Aquatic Center
Jack London District Association
Waterfront Action
South of Nimitz Improvement Council (SoNIC)

Comments / Issues / Concerns:

Importance of Site and Site Development

- This is the largest parcel on the waterfront and we should not lose our claim to it. Oak to 9th is a great opportunity for our community if it is done correctly.
- The process is moving too quickly and people are not knowledgeable enough about the plan to give input. There is a great opportunity to meet everyone's needs but developer hasn't made good faith effort. The developer can still make a profit with an appropriate development.
- We want to work with the developer to create an acceptable development but he is ignoring the community and the Estuary Policy Plan. This group is committed to changing project through a charrette, politically or otherwise.
- This project does not resemble the Estuary Policy Plan at all. They did not follow the Estuary Policy Plan or have a series of public meetings, even though they said they would. Consider a charrette process so that the public has input on the design and is not just reacting to an existing development plan. There should be input about what people want to see on the waterfront.
- This group is committed to changing project through a charrette, politically or otherwise.
- This process was just created to allow the developer to say they had done their part for public involvement. No changes will be made to the project because of this process.
- The developer has not come up with a specific plan as promised.

Concern Regarding Aspects of Plan

- The Port's initial study showed that the 9th Ave. pier could not be maintained or upgraded. It will need to be maintained to put green space on top of it. Who will maintain the pier and the green?
- Access to estuary critically important part of Estuary Policy Plan. This Plan will limit public access by removing Tidelands Trust "privatizing some of the open space."
- There is a significant difference between the community generated plan and the proposed development.
- Biggest objection to the project is density. Infrastructure cannot support the proposed number of cars or people. There will be 3500 cars and people filling 3100 units (up from the originally proposed 2100) taking up space. There are also trains, freeway on-ramp constraints.
- Commercial spaces need to be suitable for the retail they are supposed to support. Will they be sustainable?

- What is the commercial component of the process going to be like? Will it just serve the surrounding housing community? Where will people who live there go for services and goods? Having to leave the site will generate more trips and traffic problems.
- The height and the density of the buildings will keep people from seeing in the light of day. The area will be shadowy and dark.
- The Estuary Policy Plan calls for access to the waterfront for the community at large. If the green space is maintained with homeowner fees it will lead to the privatization of green space.
- The project area is part of the Oakland Central City East Redevelopment Plan which means the tax dollars generated will go to the redevelopment district and not the City. City services will have to be paid for by other tax dollars for the next 35 years.
- The development should support and enhance the artisan community. The current plan does not recognize the existing community and it is not compatible. The existing plan will not allow the existing community to be sustainable.
- With 3,100 units at roughly \$500,000 is about \$1.5 billion. The developer is being greedy.
- The developer should build a more aesthetically pleasing development.
- Bringing downtown to the water's edge is a stretch because Oak to 9th is nowhere near downtown.
- This is an isolated development that could easily become a gated community. Even if not literally gated, the blocked access to the waterfront creates an implied gate.
- There are not enough routes in this plan to provide adequate access to the area.
- The waterfront is valuable for all of Oakland, not just those with money.
- People that live in the marina will be displaced by the development. The owner of 5th Avenue would like to improve the marina but has not been granted more than a 30-day lease.
- The project is too dense with only 3500 parking spots. There would be gridlock during rush hour in the morning between all of the cars, freeway on and off ramps, and two-lane road.
- The RFQ the Port put out for builders was to lease the property and now it is being purchased. The developer is paying \$18 million and it could get \$20 million tax breaks, so they are making money.
- The mixed-use space in Jack London Square is mostly empty. The ground floor commercial spaces were not designed correctly for retail use and now they are either office space or empty.
- Study the cumulative effects on traffic from the Jack London Square development and this.
- Estuary Park was supposed to be enlarged, but using it for large public events it is incompatible with the apartments closely surrounding the park.
- The Estuary Policy Plan was developed based on the fact that residences could not be built on Tidelands Trust land. Since the Tidelands regulations were changed it changes the parameters of the Estuary Policy Plan.
- This is the biggest open space on the estuary and it should not be privatized (literally or figuratively).

Suggested Refinements to the Plan

- There should be a variety in the architecture in the development. Employ several different architects and builders to get a wide variety.

- Certain types of development tend to “privatize” area instead of drawing people in. The commercial uses may just serve housing. Want to generate citywide uses as a destination (e.g. artisan community). It is important to support access for people who don’t live in the area.
- Make this a destination by preserving the artisan community. It will attract artists and commercial uses for other Oakland residents. Oakland does not have another area like this.
- Open up the artists’ studios and shops. 5th Ave. will draw a lot of people to the area because they want to see the artists work and visit the waterfront.
- Make sure that there is access for non-residents so that they are drawn in and the open space does not become a privatized front yard.
- Creative mixed use should include shops, light manufacturing, live-work studios, and artisans. This will be a source of employment for people from the surrounding communities. The live-work space should not just be for computer work.
- No more than 1/3 of the development should be residential to make it truly work-live. At least half of the space should be light industrial uses.
- The development should have at least 25% workforce housing. There is a need for housing in Oakland and a development should meet the needs of the mixed economic levels so the whole city is represented.
- The 9th Avenue Terminal could become the Fort Mason of the East Bay as long as the area is not privatized. Save the original Terminal building and you could get a historic tax credit.

Additional Information Requests

- Part of the Measure DD was allocated for the purchase of open space in the Oak to 9th district. Who would get the DD money now that it is not needed for the parks?
- The representation of the plan is very light, but it would be dark and shadowy because of the density.
- The pictures are of 2-3 story buildings and do not accurately represent the 6-8 story buildings proposed in the plan.

Other Comments

- Is the list of groups that were invited to these meetings available? How were the groups divided up?
- Are these meetings part of the EIR process?
- Who is Public Affairs Management working for? Who is your contract with? Concerned about the developer under City’s direction hiring consultant for outreach.
- The answer to question #4 on the Frequently Asked Questions is incorrect. The Oakland Estuary Plan is a general concept plan. The Estuary Policy Plan was adopted into the General Plan in 1999. They are two distinct documents.
- One participant thought the City rewrote part of the Estuary Policy Plan that the City Council approved (in 2000) meaning the City has not published the Council approved version of the Estuary Policy Plan.

MEETING #8: February 3, 2005 – 1:00 p.m. -2:30 p.m.

Attendees: Golden Gate Audubon Society
Lake Merritt Institute
Sierra Club
Greenbelt Alliance
Fifth Avenue Waterfront Alliance

Unable to Attend: Baykeepers

Comments / Issues / Concerns:

Importance of Site and Site Development

- Why hasn't the developer completed a specific plan? The Estuary Policy Plan says there should be one. Going to the EIR process without specific plan is concerning.
- No weight is being given to the Estuary Policy Plan. The Estuary Policy Plan process created a satisfactory plan and it should not be set aside after so much work was done.
- Any changes to the Estuary Policy Plan should lead to a large public process. Small group meetings and a typical public hearing is not a sufficient public process.
- What are the other community involvement efforts?
- We would like to have a graphic and hands on process to develop this site. A broad-based, independent, iterative charrette process. Would rather work with a blank slate than try to tweak an existing plan.
- The developer has not been responsive to any comments to date. If this continues the community is heading in the direction of court action.

Concern Regarding Aspects of Plan

- Estuary Park used to have music events several times a year but the neighbors complained about the noise. It is unlikely that you could get agreement from community to allow events. Use of the area is incompatible with residences.
- There should be a provision for wildlife habitat as the area is already inhabited by waterfowl. This habitat has been reduced over time and this is the last remaining natural habitat in Oakland for these species. The Lake Merritt Channel is also very important to waterfowl because it is a visual guide to Lake Merritt.
- The estuary is a public resource, which is why there was no residential development in the Estuary Policy Plan. There is room for some residential use but the area will need to encourage others to come into the area to use the open space.
- It is not smart growth to create this kind of density without transit.
- We would like to go back to the drawing board rather than refine an existing plan.
- Concern about developed area near Aquatic Park.
- Is developer expecting to pay for clean up? It seems like this will be paid for with public money.
- The development should hold onto the core concept of the Estuary Policy Plan; creating open space and preserving habitat and wildlife space. This Plan is in direct conflict with the Estuary Policy Plan and does not address wildlife needs.
- This plan turns the 5th Avenue community into a ghetto. It does not preserve and enhance the community. The area is zoned industrial and when residential properties are brought in the industry will be phased out. This community is valuable and should be preserved.

- The Estuary Policy Plan showed no housing below the Embarcadero to keep the waterfront as a public resource. In this plan the streets will feel private and there is no view of the public spaces from the Embarcadero.
- Air quality and noise issues may affect buildings close to the Embarcadero and I-880.
- The density is not as important as the scale of buildings and compatibility of uses. It should be an organic extension of existing, lively, friendly community.
- Has developer calculated financial feasibility?
- What is the definition of open space?

Suggested Refinements to the Plan

- The plan could include high rises on the Embarcadero with view corridors separating them so the public space is visible.
- There should be more visibility of the open space from the Embarcadero.
- Keep at least the 1920's portion of the 9th Avenue Terminal; it could be used as indoor open space. This represents a great opportunity for reuse.
- The eastern shoreline of the channel up into the channel (south of the pump) should be the minimum, sustainable amount of habitat.
- Focus on the interface between water and land. It should not be people oriented vertical bulkheads, think creatively about what can be done with the shoreline. Maximizing flat space leaves no habitat value in the land.

Issues and Concerns

- The area should be compact, walkable, transit accessible, mixed income, and integrated with the outside communities.
- The area should be transit accessible with usable public space.
- The development should include affordable housing.
- There should be frequent transit trips to the area because of the density of the development.
- The existing restored wetland area was created as mitigation from past oil spill. It is imperative that the integrity of this site is maintained.

Additional Information Requests

- A tour of the site (5th Ave. and 9th Ave. Terminal) would be helpful.
- The restored wetlands should be shown on the development map.
- Would like to see more detailed info about cleanup. Who would pay for the cleanup? Would federal funds or other public funds be used? Is the site a brown field? What exactly needs to be cleaned up?
- The photographs presented here are misleading because only 3-story buildings are shown and the gathering spaces are not large enough to hold the crowds shown.
- There should have been more information provided in advance of this meeting.
- We would be legitimizing this plan by commenting on the specifics. It is also difficult to comment on conceptual plan. The developer should submit an alternative plan that follows the Estuary Policy Plan guidelines.

Other Comments

- The restored wetlands are mitigation for an oil spill. It is crucial that the integrity of the site be maintained with any development.
- “I usually think something bad will happen if I don’t get involved and I would like that to change to something great will happen if I get involved.”
- Will these comments be included in the environmental document?
- How were the groups chosen for these meetings?
- What are the other community involvement efforts?

MEETING #9: February 3, 2005 – 3:00 p.m. -4:30 p.m.

Attendees: Lakeshore Neighborhood Crime Prevention Council
Sequoyah Hills Homeowners Association
Lakeshore Homes Association

Unable to Attend: Oak Center Neighborhood Association
Shepard Canyon Homeowners Association
Sequoyah Canyon Homeowners Association
Haddon Hills Homeowners Association

Comments / Issues / Concerns:

Importance of Site and Site Development

- This area was stolen from Oakland by criminal developers and the City went through decades of litigation to get it back. This is a great opportunity for Oakland to become a coastal city and it would be a shame to see private residences usurp the public views.
- There is no natural constituency here. Make sure that all Oaklanders are aware of the project and what they could lose/gain with it.
- The Estuary Policy Plan is part of the General Plan and there has been no process to change it.
- The developers should be at the next meeting.
- If you break into groups at the public meeting they should be mixed up in order to get input from everyone.
- Don't want a repeat of the Leona Quarry project off of I-580/Edwards. There was a compromise as a result of litigation but the community is disappointed.

Concern Regarding Aspects of Plan

- There will be significant traffic impacts because of residents and shoppers coming into the site. Consult with Caltrans.
- It would be hard to get here and there doesn't seem to be much parking.
- Will the retail support the local residents or attract outside customers?
- If this were downtown it would be part of the revitalization. Is there demand for this or will it pull people out of other shopping districts? What is the strategy of putting business and residences together? Does this complement or detract from the downtown revitalization? It's hard to see how businesses will attract people to this area.
- Study the economic impact on Oakland as a whole. There is potential negative economic impact on the rest of the City that need to be "netted."
- The profile/view change will affect the open space. Will people on I-880 be able to see the water? With a 1-story building can't see the ocean but you can see the sunset.
- Is the 24-story building height allowed? Has Alameda expressed concern/interest about the towers?
- Will there be soundproofing in the residences? They are right up against I-880.
- Are seismic issues being addressed since the area is not bedrock?
- How quickly can the area be evacuated if necessary for safety?

- Who pays for the police and fire services? It will drain this City of tax money. Because the development is part of the redevelopment district the taxes will go to the district, not the general fund.
- What percentage of the Terminal is preserved in this plan? Is the 9th Ave. Terminal preserved in the Estuary Policy Plan? The Terminal is up for landmark status.
- What happens to existing buildings? What will happen to the existing tenants on the site?
- Is the land owned by the Port or City?
- Measure DD had a vision of creating green space along the waterfront all the way down to the airport. This project seems to be counter to the Measure DD ideals.

Suggested Refinements to the Plan

- Make the development complimentary with the final plan for Jack London Square.
- Will the fire department training tower be removed? It is an eye sore.
- What types of stores are planned in the area? Not just more Starbucks: dog parks, fishing, other outdoor/marina activities. High end retail is not the best use of the estuary. Restaurants that take advantage of the views, use the maritime area, and don't squander the natural resources.
- Are these rental units or for sale? Push for affordable housing.
- Are penetrable views possible? Study which views need to be preserved. The view down 5th Avenue, of open space and water, would be a connection to the rest of Oakland. Also preserve the view from the Lake Merritt Channel.

Issues and Concerns

- Access is a real issue – also parking?
- Potential more broad economic impacts on city as a whole.
- Consider the continuity with the surrounding communities.
- There should be recreational activities in the open space. Hiking and biking trails.

Additional Information Requests

- Graphic that shows how it would look from various vantages (e.g. San Antonio, Alameda, Hills, etc.). What will the project look like from I-880 and the Embarcadero?
- Would like a visual of the recreational activities.
- Compare this plan and the Estuary Policy Plan (height and density) through an overlay map.
- Need to see the height of the buildings to evaluate the impact on views from the hills and Alameda (visual simulations).
- Boat-level view simulation coming down the channel.
- Provide a project model (or virtual model).
- A topography/elevation map would be helpful.

Other Comments

- Use publications for neighborhood groups:
 - Use email broadcast
 - Contact neighborhood association leaders
 - Friends of Oakland
 - Oakland Parks coalition