

Dec. 14, 2009

Location:	19th to 54th Avenues south of I-880 (See map on reverse)
Proposal:	Discussion of Historic Preservation Issues in the Central Estuary Specific Plan Area and recommendation of preferred alternative to CPC and CC
Applicant:	CEDA
Planning Permits Required:	Specific Plan and Environmental Impact Report
General Plan:	Waterfront
Estuary Policy Plan:	Light Industrial, Planned Waterfront Development, Residential Mixed Use, Heavy Industrial, and General Commercial
Zoning:	M-40 Heavy Industrial and HBX-3 Housing and Business Mix
Historic Status:	Four Areas of Secondary Importance in the Plan Area
Service Delivery District:	3, San Antonio
City Council District:	5
Action to be Taken:	Discussion and recommendation to CPC and CC on preferred alternative
For Further Information:	Contact Alisa Shen at 510-238-2166 .

SUMMARY

The Strategic Planning Division of CEDA and its team of consultants developing a Specific Plan and EIR for the Central Estuary area have completed concepts for the Plan Area and would like to solicit from the LPAB preliminary input on proposals related to land use and transportation concepts to be used as a basis for developing the Specific Plan. By changing allowable land uses, instituting development standards and guidelines, and identifying priorities and potential funding sources for public improvements, upon its adoption the Plan could increase or decrease the likelihood of redevelopment of parcels that contain historic resources.

The Central Estuary Plan Area is generally encompassed by 19th Ave. to the north, 54th Ave. to the south, I-880 to the east and the Oakland Estuary to the west. As background for the Specific Plan process, consultants prepared a historic context for built environment resources, based upon previously prepared documents such as planning studies, EIRs, and/or historical resources inventory and evaluation reports provided by the City of Oakland. Jingletown, a residential neighborhood located in the center of the Plan Area, and its surrounding areas are considered to have a high potential for historic resources in need of further historic survey in subsequent environmental analysis. The residential and industrial buildings within Jingletown, as well as bridges (i.e. Park Street Bridge, Fruitvale Bridge, and High Street Bridge), wharves, and piers are also considered potential historical architectural resources in the Plan Area.

Through an extensive community outreach and involvement process, including a series of six community workshops attended by between 40 to 70 participants, three draft alternative development concepts and a draft preferred alternative for the area have been developed. The three draft alternatives offered a variety of different configurations of proposed future land uses and street networks and included extensive analysis of transportation, economic, demographic, public health, and sustainability impacts. Based on these alternatives, the community expressed preferences for maintaining and expanding industry and jobs that have economically and environmentally beneficial impacts. Additionally, they supported creating targeted opportunities for redevelopment to support the expansion of the existing Kennedy Tract neighborhood and provide healthier, safer and higher-quality conditions for the neighborhood, the Plan

Area, the City and the region. In a well-attended and interactive workshop, diverse interest groups including residents, business owners and interested advocacy groups coalesced around a preferred alternative that reflects these priorities.

The community preferred alternative is a hybrid of the three land use alternatives, incorporating certain components from each alternative. The preferred alternative includes: (a) West Subarea, mixed-use infill, maintain specialty food producing industrial area; (2) Central West Subarea, preserve the existing neighborhood including live/work uses; (3) Central East Subarea, new mixed-use residential development; and (4) East Subarea, industrial uses and limited residential development buffered by research and development.

The Central East Subarea contains a major opportunity for mixed-use redevelopment and extension of the street grid and creation of a waterfront park through redevelopment of the approximately 26-acre Owens-Brockway Glass plant. The Owens-Brockway property itself is rated Cb+3, which is a property of Secondary Importance that is not in a district, but the OCHS considers it to be potentially eligible for the National Register, for instance if restored or re-evaluated (b+). As currently rated, however, this property is of Secondary Importance and is not in a district. Due to the type of development envisioned and the scale, configuration and condition of the existing factory, adaptive re-use of the existing structure appears to have limited viability. However, the Plan's standards and guidelines could encourage applicants to conduct further evaluation of re-use potential. Redevelopment of this site could allow the introduction of small, human scaled blocks, creation of a waterfront park, an increase in residential density near the Fruitvale BART station, greatly improved street connectivity, and many other goals of the Central Estuary Plan.

The Plan Area contains no known properties listed in the National Register of Historic Places, California Register of Historic Places, or City Landmarks designated (or "listed") by the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board and no Areas of Primary Importance identified by OCHS. Four Areas of Secondary Importance have been identified, but no significant change is proposed in three of these areas: the California Wire Cloth, California Cotton Mills, and Embarcadero Cove ASIs. In the fourth area, the 36th Avenue/East 8th Street Residential District ASI, the Plan could develop strict design standards that would apply to currently vacant parcels, to ensure that infill development would be contextually appropriate.

This report presents alternatives and recommendations for the Board's consideration. City staff requests that the Board recommend adoption of the draft preferred alternative to the Planning Commission and City Council. Based on input from advisory bodies, Planning Commission and City Council, the preferred alternative will be refined and a draft Specific Plan prepared including proposed land uses, as well as design standards and guidelines reflective of community and City priorities. Once the draft Specific Plan is prepared, it will be presented to the advisory bodies, Planning Commission and City Council for comment; the comments will be incorporated into the final Specific Plan.

BACKGROUND

The Oakland Estuary waterfront is a significant citywide and regional resource that connects the City of Oakland and the surrounding region to the San Francisco Bay. The Central Estuary, the focus of this Plan, offers substantial opportunity for new residential and industrial development, infrastructure and open space improvement, and general quality of life gains. As a result of the Industrial Land Conversion Policy discussion, City Council directed that a Specific Plan be developed for the Central Estuary Plan Area, which is generally encompassed by 19th Ave. to the north, 54th Ave. to the south, I-880 to the east and the Oakland Estuary to the west. The Central Estuary Plan, a Specific Plan and EIR for the Central

Estuary Area, aims to develop a coordinated vision for the future development of the area that supports both Citywide and neighborhood priorities.

A series of Community and Economic Development (CED) Committee and City Council meetings were held from July of 2007 to March of 2008 to discuss the need for Central Estuary Plan. The City Council directed staff to develop a proposal for a scope of work, budget and steering committee to direct a Specific Plan and EIR process. Staff convened three community meetings to develop the scope of work and to discuss merits of a Specific Plan steering committee. Ultimately, both staff and the community agreed that a steering committee was unnecessary. At its December 2008 meeting, the City Council approved City Resolution 81696 and Oakland Redevelopment Agency Resolution 2008-0099 which authorized the allocation of \$2,113,024 for the preparation of the Specific Plan and EIR with 90% of the funds from the Coliseum Redevelopment Project Area and 10% of the funds from the Central City East Redevelopment Project Area. In January 2009, after a competitive bidding process, the City of Oakland entered into a Professional Services Contract with the firm of Community Design + Architecture to work with the City to prepare the Specific Plan and related EIR.

The Plan Area is roughly 416 acres, of which approximately 319 acres are made up of individual parcels and the remainder are public rights-of-way. For the purpose of this study, the area has been divided into four Subareas representing fairly distinct districts within the Plan Area; see Appendix A: Subarea Map. A detailed description of the existing conditions, challenges and opportunities within the Plan Area is available as a separate Existing Conditions report.

To arrive at a vision for this area, in-depth study of existing conditions and recent development, coordinated with extensive public outreach, has defined the realm of potential opportunities in the area.

POTENTIAL FOR CHANGE ANALYSIS

As part of the Specific Plan process, consultants used a range of qualitative and quantitative data to identify the parcels in the Plan Area that represent the greatest opportunities for change over the short- and long-term horizons. This assessment is based on the physical and economic characteristics of individual properties, with a focus on identifying the sites with the fewest barriers to redevelopment and those that are most likely to support higher intensity uses. Key findings from this analysis include:

- The majority of parcels in the Central-West Subarea are small and owner-occupied; these are unlikely to be redeveloped in the near future.
- Residential and commercial development opportunities may conflict with employment opportunities. Without protections for their current use, many of the most important employment centers in the Plan Area will also represent major opportunities for redevelopment.
- The largest primary opportunity site is the 27-acre Owens-Brockway site in the Central-East Subarea.
- While Con-Agra is not a primary opportunity site, it has an important influence on the viability of redevelopment on adjacent sites. Con-Agra's rail service and industrial character both act as a buffer against conversion of industrial land and a deterrent to new residential development.
- The highest concentration of opportunity sites is in the East Subarea.
- Opportunity sites will change depending on infrastructure improvements and on the location and type of new development.

The Potential for Change Assessment began by determining which parcels are NOT likely to be redeveloped, (known as "Hard Sites," for the purposes of this analysis). These include parcels on which

new buildings have been constructed recently, parcels with highly valuable buildings, parks, schools, and some single family homes.

After the Hard Sites were removed from consideration, the Primary Opportunity Sites were identified. These are sites that, given their physical and economic attributes, are likely to be most attractive to investors interested in converting parcels into more intensive uses once markets recover. These were determined by looking at factors such as proximity to the water, parcel size, the character of the buildings, and ownership characteristics.

Finally, a set of Secondary Opportunity Sites were selected. These are properties whose current physical and economic characteristics do not suggest that they represent prime development opportunities, but which have at least one of the characteristics that make them attractive for development and are adjacent either to major arterials or to a cluster of Primary Opportunity Sites. Consequently, these properties may be considered the long-term development opportunities in the Plan Area.

Sites identified as either opportunity or hard sites, overlaid with Areas of Secondary Importance (ASIs) and Potential Designated Historic Properties (PDHPs) from the OCHS, are indicated on maps included under Appendix B of this report. As the environmental review of the Plan commences, significant environmental impacts of the Plan on historic resources will be identified, along with appropriate mitigation measures. See “Scope of Work for Environmental Review” in the “Presence of Known Historic Resources” section of this report.

Limitations of the Analysis

There are several important caveats to keep in mind when considering the opportunity sites analysis:

- The analysis included a number of factors related to location, size, ownership, recent transactions, and investment/building improvement value. Presence of historic or potentially historic buildings and the possibility of reuse was not considered as a primary indicator, as redevelopment could potentially reuse all or part of existing structures on those sites.
- The analysis does not consider the strength of existing businesses, which may be profitable and have little desire to relocate. In these cases, the physical and economic characteristics of the parcel may overstate the likelihood of redevelopment.
- The analysis does not consider the potential cost of rehabilitating buildings with historic resource potential for adaptive re-use, which may make development on some parcels infeasible or which might only be warranted in the context of a relatively large, high density project.
- The analysis does not consider cost of environmental remediation, which may make development on some parcels infeasible or which might only be warranted in the context of a relatively large, high density project.
- The potential for particular land uses is highly variable among opportunity sites. Some sites, such as those adjacent to the waterfront, may be attractive to residential or office developers, but would be dismissed by retail developers as too far from the highway. Conversely, parcels adjacent to the highway might be unappealing to residential developers, due to concerns about exhaust and noise.

This analysis offers an assessment of what is most likely to be redeveloped, and should not be considered an indication of what *should* be redeveloped. Many of the opportunity sites identified are currently in use as industrial lands. There may be important reasons for preserving these industrial lands, including the desire to preserve a particular business that is a critical employment engine or goods/services provider for the city and region. The existing user may also be important in supporting a particular industrial cluster in the area or as a contributor to the local tax base. Finally, it may be desirable to preserve these industrial properties in order to foster future businesses or to reuse the buildings to define a unique character for the area, as well as to improve sustainability. Consequently, while the analysis

may indicate that higher intensity uses are possible on these sites, in some cases the existing use may conform better to the goals of the plan. In this sense, the same parcels that would be considered “Opportunity Sites” from the perspective of potential redevelopment could be considered “Vulnerable Sites” from the perspective of industrial land policy. Ultimately, the overall vision for the Plan Area will be the major determinant of which of these should change.

PLAN ALTERNATIVES

Based on the priorities expressed by local residents, business owners, and policymakers and the results of the economic and potential for change assessments, consultants developed three alternative development concepts for the Plan Area (see Appendix C: Draft Alternatives Maps). Each alternative represents a market-feasible possible development scenario. The alternatives are illustrative, meaning that each alternative is not intended to represent exactly which land uses or building configurations would be allowed on particular parcels, but rather to illustrate a range of possibilities for development and investment, providing a basis for the analysis of potential benefits and drawbacks of a range of possible futures. Extensive analysis of the effects of the Alternatives included transportation, economic, fiscal impact, demographic, public health and sustainability analyses, the results of which are available in a stand-alone Alternatives Report. In general, the results were mixed, with each Alternative performing well in some areas but poorly in others, illustrating the complex trade-offs among the many policy factors that determine land use.

Description of Alternatives

Elements common to all the Alternatives include maintaining a mix of housing and industry; maintaining food-related industry in the West Subarea; preserving and creating more opportunities or small businesses; maintaining the eclectic character of the Kennedy Tract Neighborhood; encouraging the re-use of existing buildings where possible to create a unique and distinct character for each subarea and to improve sustainability; creating more housing opportunities near parks and the waterfront; continuing to connect the Bay Trail and connect people to the two major waterfront parks; and improving connectivity, particularly for walking, biking and transit access.

Alternative 1 strikes a balance between industrial and residential development by securing an industrial future in the west Subarea and at the Owens-Brockway site, while allowing intensive residential development in the eastern end of the Plan Area. This alternative secures the food-related industry in the West Subarea by maintaining the ConAgra facility to discourage residential expansion and restricting new residential development in food-related industrial areas. It also provides new smaller-format industrial space at the Owens-Brockway site to accommodate new and growing businesses in the Plan Area. Alternative 1 adds the most retail of any alternative, providing a major new retail center north of Tidewater Avenue in the East Subarea. New waterfront residential development is concentrated in the south of Tidewater area where there is easy access to the Martin Luther King Shoreline Park and in the waterfront area between Alameda Avenue and High Street.

Alternative 2 strikes a balance between industrial and residential development, by allowing new mixed-use development and planned waterfront development in the western half of the Plan Area and focusing industrial development and job growth in the eastern Subareas. New waterfront residential development at the location of the ConAgra facility and near Union Point Park expands the Kennedy Tract residential neighborhood to the West. The Owens-Brockway site is redeveloped as light-industrial and R&D space around a technology incubator that helps generate new businesses to reinvest in not only that site, but also the industrial areas between Alameda Avenue and High Street and also to the South of High Street. This alternative adds the fewest new residents, loses least industrial space, and adds the most jobs of any alternative.

Alternative 3 maximizes waterfront residential development opportunities while providing targeted industrial space for the two major industrial opportunities – green and biotechnology startups and food production – in the Plan Area. Alternative 3 provides the necessary development opportunities and associated revenues to potentially facilitate the creation of a continuous Embarcadero Boulevard as envisioned by the Estuary Policy Plan, which could dramatically improve walking, biking and transit availability in the Plan Area. Alternative 3 provides the most new residential development of any alternative, focusing new residential on locations near parks and the waterfront including the ConAgra site and the area South of Tidewater. In the area north of Tidewater, industrial space targeted to green business and R&D startups is provided to capture spinoff businesses from an R&D incubator space that is potentially located on PG&E’s facility. This alternative adds the most new residents and loses the most industrial space. However, it still loses less than half of the total industrial space and will likely add more jobs than it loses due to higher intensity industrial and office uses being added.

PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

A community workshop on November 14, 2009 was devoted to identifying a community-preferred alternative. The workshop was attended by approximately 40 members of the community, including property owners, developers, area architects and representatives of advocacy organizations. The majority of participants had participated in one or more of the previous five workshops in which the vision statement and draft alternative development concepts, described above, were developed. Attendees participated in a hands-on map-based activity to develop a preferred alternative in small groups, then came together as a large group to reconcile the four plans and develop a consensus plan representing the community-preferred alternative; see Appendix D, Preferred Alternative Map. The community preferred alternative is a hybrid of the three land use alternatives, incorporating certain components from each alternative. The participants reached general consensus on the future of each subarea, as well as some key ambitions to improve the Plan Area as a whole, as described below.

Area-Wide Concepts

The key area-wide concepts espoused by the community and reflected in the draft community-preferred alternative have to do with increasing connectivity through the area, especially for pedestrians and bicycles, and creating a distinctive place by re-using existing buildings where possible or using components of buildings reflective of the unique area character at the center of the Plan Area. Throughout the process of developing the Plan, the community has supported new development and increased density in certain areas as a means to achieve goals elaborated in the vision statement, including increased access to the waterfront, better connectivity through the Plan Area for all modes, increased transit service and more neighborhood-serving retail. The provision of a continuous west-east roadway was a recommendation of the Estuary Policy Plan that has continued to have strong community support throughout the community process. The community-preferred alternative provides such a roadway and will set standards for landscaping and pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure to ensure that it is an attractive and safe facility. Additionally, the desire to convert Fruitvale Avenue into a more local-serving pedestrian and bicycle-friendly corridor is supported by providing opportunities for the desired neighborhood-serving retail on that corridor. Anticipated redevelopment of a number of the parcels along this corridor and the potential opportunity to convert the unused rail spur to Alameda into community-serving open space combine to create a unique opportunity to redefine this area and better connect the immediate neighborhood and the Fruitvale neighborhood to the north to the waterfront.

West Subarea

In the West Subarea, mixed-use infill would be allowed to continue around the Embarcadero Cove area, but the growing specialty food producing industrial area east of Dennison Street would maintain and protect its industrial use, and the ConAgra flour processing facility would be maintained. Because over 90% of the flour produced at the ConAgra facility is used within 25 miles of the site, the community

agreed that the economic and environmental benefits of this use outweigh aesthetic considerations. However, the community stressed the importance of providing Bay Trail connection along the waterfront edge of this facility within their parcel if possible, or, if food security issues will not permit that alignment, on an isolated pier-supported structure, as is currently being implemented further east at the site of the Oakland Museum of California's Women's Board Warehouse.

Central West Subarea

In the Central West Subarea, preservation of the existing neighborhood and its eclectic character including live/work uses, was a priority. Additionally, the residents indicated acceptance of some additional residential and neighborhood retail development in order to increase vibrancy in the neighborhood and improve neighborhood convenience, area security and transit availability. To this end, existing waterfront warehouse uses that do not take best advantage of their location or allow waterfront access were determined to be good candidates for redevelopment, as medium-density residential development with landscaped and publicly accessible waterfront setbacks. However, re-use of some waterfront warehouses, or components thereof, could be encouraged in the Plan, to improve the sustainability of development and to provide a unique character for new development. New retail and north-south pedestrian and bicycle connections could be provided along Fruitvale Avenue, as described above.

Central East Subarea

In the Central East Subarea, the Owens Brockway glass manufacturing plant is a key opportunity site that is over 25 acres and has sought to relocate numerous times in recent years. The community felt this site presented the best opportunity for new residential development, as it would expand the existing Kennedy Tract neighborhood and provide the density needed to achieve various community goals. The community-preferred alternative for this site includes a large publicly accessible waterfront park at the existing location of Alameda Avenue. In addition, the illustrative development concept also includes an approximately 1-acre urban park within the redeveloped Owens Brockway site. If their relocation proved feasible, components of the Owens Brockway site, such as the large concrete smoke stacks, could potentially be re-used as sculptures in the park. The community expressed a preference for mixed-use development with ground floor retail uses, which may be achievable in limited amounts due to economic constraints on retail uses. Retail located in this area could front onto an improved Fruitvale Avenue, creating a vibrant main street through the area that better connects the Kennedy Tract to the new residential development and creates a pedestrian corridor linking the Plan Area to Fruitvale BART and to Alameda. Regional-serving retail to provide jobs and convenient services could be located along High Street near the existing Home Depot center, expanding that retail center near the reconfigured I-880 interchange and capturing Alameda traffic. Redevelopment throughout this area not only provides the opportunity for a substantial waterfront park and continuous Bay Trail connection, but also creates a significantly more interconnected street grid that allows for more convenient pedestrian and bicycle access across the Plan Area.

East Subarea

The East Subarea currently supports a number of light industrial employers as well as some regionally-significant heavier industries, all of which the community hoped to preserve, while revitalizing industry, providing improved Bay Trail connections, and creating an opportunity for limited residential development adjacent to the Martin Luther King Regional Shoreline Park to take better advantage of the scenic location and existing park. The community-preferred alternative reflects this mix of desires in a carefully constructed balance that hinges on redevelopment of the nearly 20-acre PG&E facility as a green jobs incubator surrounded by light industrial space to provide new jobs. The new residential development fronts onto the expanded EBRPD park, and is buffered from industrial uses by R&D employment uses.

PRESENCE OF KNOWN SENSITIVE ARCHEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Based on a record search at the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information Center (NWIC), no previously documented prehistoric archeological sites have been recorded in the Plan Area. However, it is expected that several types and classes of archeological sites may be present in the Plan Area, particularly along the bayshore and in close proximity to drainages and geomorphic features. The Cultural Resource Map attached (Appendix E) shows the locations with moderate potential for the presence of buried prehistoric resources.

Two historic archeological sites are located within the Plan Area, including the Southern Pacific Railway rail spur that runs through the West Subarea of the Plan Area and a cluster of 10 historic period features near High Street and I-880. The mix of residential and commercial uses in the Plan Area also suggests a high likelihood of encountering historic-era archeological resources, including the archeological remains of building foundations beneath the existing potentially historic structures.

Work Scope for Environmental Impact Report

As part of the development of the Specific Plan EIR for the Central Estuary Plan, consultants will contact the City's Cultural Heritage Survey staff, as well as relevant historical societies or other institutions via letter to determine if any areas of historical archaeological concern are documented. At a minimum this will include the Alameda County Historical Society, Oakland Heritage Alliance, Oakland History Room, Oakland Main Library, and the Bancroft Library (if open). Consultants will also contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in Sacramento and request that a sacred lands search be conducted. Consultants will obtain from the NAHC a list of interested Native American groups for Alameda County who may have information regarding cultural resources on the property and contact local interested Native American groups regarding known resources within the project area. Once a list of interested Native Americans is obtained from the NAHC, they will be mailed a project map and request for consultation. Opportunity sites that qualify as Potential Designated Historic Properties will be identified, and the potential for the presence of historic archeological resources on these and other sites will be discussed.

Using information gathered from the background research, consultants will prepare the cultural resources sections of the EIR, including full environmental settings for archaeology, and ethnography relevant to the Plan Area. As no field studies are anticipated, consultants will use information gathered from the previous work to determine the potential presence of cultural resources within the Plan Area that were not subject to previous cultural resource studies, based on conceptual project descriptions provided in the Specific Plan. The EIR will also include a discussion of impacts and mitigation measures based on research data, as well as a checklist for mitigation measures, monitoring triggers, monitoring frequency, and responsibilities.

PRESENCE OF KNOWN HISTORIC RESOURCES

As background for the Specific Plan process, consultants prepared a historic context for built environment resources, based upon previously prepared documents such as planning studies, EIRs, and/or historical resources inventory and evaluation reports provided by the City of Oakland. The context addresses the historic themes represented in the development of these resources, or historic built environment, in this part of the City of Oakland. As shown on the Cultural Resource Map (Appendix E), Jingtletown, a residential neighborhood that straddles I-880 and includes a portion located in the Plan Area, and its surrounding areas are considered to have a high potential for historic resources in need of further historic review in subsequent environmental analysis. The residential and industrial buildings

within Jingtletown, as well as bridges (i.e. Park Street Bridge, Fruitvale Bridge, and High Street Bridge), wharves, and piers are also considered potential historical architectural resources in the Plan Area.

An environmental review in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) is forthcoming, once the draft Specific Plan is prepared. This review will include the identification of historic resources under CEQA.

The Oakland Cultural Heritage Survey (OCHS) rates historic resources such as Landmarks, Areas of Primary Importance and Secondary Importance, and Local Register properties, the presence of each of which is described below.

Landmarks

The Plan Area contains no known properties listed in the National Register of Historic Places, California Register of Historic Places, or City Landmarks designated (or “listed”) by the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board.

Areas of Primary Importance

The Plan Area does not contain any Areas of Primary Importance identified by OCHS.

Areas of Secondary Importance

At least three Areas of Secondary Importance are present in the Plan Area.

The 36th Av/East 8th residential district: There are approximately 26 parcels within the Area of Secondary Importance known as the 36th Av/East 8th residential district, which are located between Fruitvale and 37th Avenue, south of I-880 north of the Owens Brockway plant. Individual ratings of these building range from C2+, downward through Dc2+ and Fd2* (the 2 rating applies because the area is an ASI, and the contributing buildings are therefore PDHPs). The buildings are not considered to be part of the Oakland Local Register of Historical Resources and therefore are not currently considered to be historical resources for the purposes of CEQA. No alteration of the existing buildings is proposed as part of the community-preferred alternative, and infill development in this area would reflect special design standards to ensure appropriate design and scale that will be developed as part of the Specific Plan.

California Cotton Mills (CCM): The California Cotton Mills ASI includes multiple parcels that are located on both sides of I-880. Although the main CCM building is on the other side of I-880, there are other related buildings in the Plan Area: (019_004900303) is rated C2+; (019_004900306) is rated C2+. C2+ = of Secondary Importance and contributing to the ASI. These ratings make them PDHPs that are not considered part of the Oakland Local Register of Historical Resources. These buildings were recorded as part of a local government inventory (URM survey, 1994-1995) and both have California OHP ratings of 5, and are presumed to be historical resources unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates they are not. The DPR523 forms were accepted by OHP on September 30, 1995. These properties are therefore considered to be historical resources for the purposes of CEQA. Demolition of either property would constitute a significant adverse change and would be a significant impact on the environment. No change is proposed in this area as part of the community-preferred alternative.

Embarcadero Cove: The OHCS identifies Embarcadero Cove as an ASI. There are at least 9 moved properties at Embarcadero Cove, including four residences on the east side of Embarcadero (APN 019_049000200). On the west side of Embarcadero (APN 019_00490001000), there are several moved buildings, including Quinn’s Lighthouse, three Italianate residences, and the former East Oakland (Brooklyn) Railroad Station building. These buildings are all rated C2+, of Secondary Importance, and are in the Embarcadero Cove ASI. The buildings are not considered to be part of the Oakland Local

Register of Historical Resources. Although a Primary Record has been submitted to OHP for the district, the Primary Record has a status code of 7, so the district is not considered a CEQA resource on the basis of an OHP status code 1-5. No change is proposed in this area as part of the community-preferred alternative.

California Wire Cloth (CWC): The property (including two parcels: 019_004800400 and 019_004800300) is rated by OCHS as an ASI. It is not considered to be part of the Oakland Local Register of Historical Resources. Although a Primary Record has been submitted to OHP for the district, the Primary Record has a status code of 7, so the district is not considered a CEQA resource on the basis of an OHP status code 1-5. No change is proposed on this parcel as part of the community-preferred alternative.

Property of Major Importance with potential for Highest Importance (Local Register)

California Cotton Mills (CCM): The building at 1010 22nd Avenue (APN 019_004900201) is rated B+a2+, which is a property of Major Importance with potential for Highest Importance, and is a contributor to the CCM Area of Secondary Importance. A Potential Designated Historic Property (PDHP) that has an existing rating of “A” or “B” is considered part of the Oakland Local Register of Historical Resources, and is therefore considered a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA. Demolition of the property would constitute significant adverse change and would be a significant impact on the environment. No change is proposed on this parcel as part of the community-preferred alternative.

Properties of Secondary Importance, Not in a District

Owens-Brockway, aka Owens-Illinois: This property is rated Cb+3, which is a property of Secondary Importance that is not in a district, but the OCHS considers it to be potentially eligible for the National Register if restored or re-evaluated (b+). As currently rated, however, this property is of Secondary Importance, and is not in a district. The buildings are not considered to be part of the Oakland Local Register of Historical Resources. The property was evaluated as part of a local government inventory and has a California OHP rating of 4S7, and is presumed to be a historical resource unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates it is not. The DPR523 form was accepted by OHP on September 30, 1995. This property is considered to be a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA. Demolition of the property would constitute significant adverse change and would be a significant impact on the environment. This parcel is proposed to be redeveloped as residential development and open space as part of the community-preferred alternative. More detail is provided under Key Issues and Impacts, below.

ConAgra, aka Western Milling - Oakland Elevator & Mill Co.: This property (APN 019_007100106) is rated by the Oakland Cultural Heritage Survey (OCHS) as a C3, which is a property of Secondary Importance that is not in a district. It is not considered to be part of the Oakland Local Register of Historical Resources. Although a Primary Record has been submitted to OHP for the district, the Primary Record has a status code of 7, so the district is not considered a CEQA resource on the basis of an OHP status code 1-5. No change is proposed on this parcel as part of the community-preferred alternative.

Numerous other properties with OCHS ratings of C3, of Secondary Importance, that are not in a district, are present in the Jingtowntown area. Some of these properties may be investigated further for potential reuse to preserve their historically significant architectural features and revitalize their use where appropriate.

Other Historical Resources under CEQA

There are also a few properties that are considered to be historical resources under CEQA, regardless of their OCHS rating, because their California OHP status code is 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5.

Barrows Pringle-Bayly Underhill factory: APN 019_006800203, at 646 Kennedy Street, is OCHS rating Dc3 (a PDHP). It was evaluated by OCHS as part of a local government inventory (URM survey 1994-1995) and has a California OHP rating of 5, and is presumed to be a historical resource unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates it is not. The DPR523 form was accepted by OHP on September 30, 1995. This property is conservatively considered to be a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA at this time. Demolition of the property would constitute significant adverse change and would be a significant impact on the environment. No change is proposed on this parcel as part of the community-preferred alternative.

Sunset McKee Co warehouse: APN 019_005400305, at 2105 Livingston Street, is OCHS rating is Dc3 (a PDHP). It was evaluated by OCHS as part of an a local government inventory (URM survey 1994-1995) and has a California OHP status code of 5S, and is presumed to be a historical resource unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates it is not. The DPR523 form was accepted by OHP on September 30, 1995. This property is conservatively considered to be a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA at this time. Demolition of the property would constitute significant adverse change and would be a significant impact on the environment. No change is proposed on this parcel as part of the community-preferred alternative.

Scope of Work for Environmental Review

As part of the Environmental Impact Report, consultants will assess whether the Specific Plan program will cause a substantial adverse change (CEQA significant impact) to historical resources as identified in the description of current conditions. If a substantial adverse change to historical resources is identified, consultants will develop proposed mitigation measures that would reduce or eliminate those impacts.

KEY ISSUES AND IMPACTS

The 36th Av/East 8th residential district is an Area of Secondary Importance adjacent to much of the development activity proposed by the plan. While the preferred alternative does not contemplate redevelopment of the existing resources in the ASI, a number of vacant parcels in the area would likely be developed. The Specific Plan will include design standards that would ensure contextually appropriate design of buildings in this area as well as transition to new development proposed within adjacent areas.

Owens-Brockway, aka Owens-Illinois, is a property of secondary to major importance, not in a district, that is at the center of redevelopment activity proposed for the Plan Area. OCHS considers the property to be potentially eligible for the National Register (b+). However, this parcel is proposed to be divided into blocks with new streets and redeveloped as residential development with ancillary retail uses and open space in the community-preferred alternative. The Owens-Brockway glass plant has undergone significant downscaling of employment in the last decade and its owner has made multiple attempts to sell the property. The existing facilities are unique to the heavy industry currently in operation there and if retained in their current location, would not allow the street connections and small-scale blocks envisioned in the preferred alternative to be made. It is expected that due to the existing site and building configuration and the type of development envisioned, adaptive re-use for residential use is unlikely; therefore, the majority of these facilities would likely be demolished as part of redevelopment.

NEXT STEPS

The consultant team is currently soliciting feedback from a number of bodies including:

- Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board
- Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission
- Planning Commission
- Community and Economic Development Committee
- City Council

Based on input from the advisory bodies, Planning Commission and City Council, the preferred alternative will be refined and a draft Specific Plan prepared including proposed land uses, as well as design standards and guidelines reflective of community and City priorities. Once the draft Specific Plan is prepared, it will be presented to the advisory bodies, Planning Commission and City Council for comment; the comments will be incorporated into the final Specific Plan.

The next public workshop, the seventh of a total of eight, will be held in February or March, when key elements of the draft Specific Plan will be presented for public input. The public review draft Specific Plan is anticipated to be circulated in April and presented to the LPAB and other City advisory bodies, Planning Commission and City Council for review and comment in May. Based on this input, a revised public review draft will be prepared and circulated in June and following inclusion of public and City comments, the Specific Plan will be finalized. Development of the EIR will begin after the preferred alternative is selected. Once the Specific Plan and EIR are complete, adoption hearings will be held.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Consider community preferred alternative and identify areas of potential concern and additional opportunity and recommend preferred alternative to the Planning Commission and City Council. Based on input from the advisory bodies, Planning Commission and City Council, the preferred alternative will be refined and a draft Specific Plan prepared including proposed land uses, as well as design standards and guidelines reflective of community and City priorities. Once the draft Specific Plan is prepared, it will be presented to the advisory bodies, Planning Commission and City Council for comment; the comments will be incorporated into the final Specific Plan.

Approved for forwarding to the
Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board:

ERIC ANGSTADT
Deputy Director,
Community and Economic Development Agency

Prepared by:

Alisa Shen
Planner III, Strategic Planning

Attachments:

- A. Subareas Map
- B. Potential for Change and Areas of Secondary Importance Map
- C. Draft Alternatives Maps
- D. Preferred Alternative Map
- E. Cultural Resources Map
- F. Photos of Historic Resources