



## **CENTRAL ESTUARY PLAN**

A Vision for Oakland's Waterfront

### **Summary**

#### **Community Workshop #5**

#### **Fruitvale-San Antonio Senior Center, Oakland**

#### **Thursday, October 1, 2009**

#### **6:30-9:00 p.m.**

#### **Workshop Format and Process**

The City of Oakland is preparing a Specific Plan that will help define and determine a common vision for the Oakland Central Estuary. The Plan will provide a framework to support the development and enhancement of the area and balance land-use goals with the environmental, economic, health, and quality-of-life interests of the community. The City is conducting a series of eight community workshops to encourage public input throughout the Plan's development.

The fifth community workshop, held on Thursday, October 1, 2009 at the Fruitvale-San Antonio Senior Center, was attended by nearly 40 community members, representing a cross-section of stakeholders, including residential, commercial, industrial, and recreational interests.

The purpose of the meeting was to provide an overview of three potential land use and circulation alternatives for the Plan Area and to collect public comments about these alternatives. These draft alternatives were based on a combination of previous public input, existing conditions, and land-use analyses.

The workshop agenda included a presentation on the three draft alternatives, a Question-and-Answer session, and an open house featuring exhibit boards that displayed data on the wide range of key considerations examined as part of the development of the draft alternatives. Project staff was available to answer questions and collect comments from attendees.

#### **Presentation**

##### *Welcome and Introduction*

Eric Angstadt, deputy director, CEDA, City of Oakland, welcomed meeting attendees, provided an overview of the Central Estuary planning process and reviewed the goals and purpose of the fifth community workshop. Mr. Angstadt recommended that community members familiarize themselves with the draft alternatives, which will be accessible on the project website, in preparation for the sixth community workshop.

### *Presentation: Draft Alternatives*

Timothy Rood, Principal at Community Design & Architecture, explained how the draft alternatives had been developed, provided an overview of the key features of each of the draft alternatives, and discussed what to expect at the next community workshop.



Mr. Rood's presentation highlighted the following features for each draft alternative:

#### **Alternative 1**

- Strikes a balance between industrial and residential development
- Preserves and protects the food industry in the western sub-area and provides new industrial space at the Owens-Brockway site
- Provides new regional retail area off High Street
- Allows intensive mid-rise residential development in the Tidewater area

#### **Alternative 2**

- Adds new housing on the ConAgra site, which expands the Kennedy Tract neighborhood to the west
- Allows new mixed-use development and planned waterfront development in the western half of the Plan Area
- Focuses industrial development and job growth in the eastern sub-areas

#### **Alternative 3**

- Maximizes waterfront residential development, especially near parks and along the waterfront
- Provides targeted industrial space for “green” and bio-technology start-ups and food production
- Provides the necessary development opportunities and associated revenues to pay for creation of a continuous Embarcadero Boulevard as envisioned by the Estuary Policy Plan

A PowerPoint of the full presentation from the fifth workshop is available on the project website: [www.oaklandnet.com/Central\\_Estuary\\_Plan/](http://www.oaklandnet.com/Central_Estuary_Plan/)

#### **Question and Answer Session**

Surlene Grant, Principal at Envirocom Communications Strategies, facilitated a Question-and-Answer session following the presentation. Ms. Grant asked meeting attendees for their feedback regarding each of the alternatives and to identify any key features missing from the draft alternatives. Although she asked these questions about each of the



alternatives individually, most comments/responses tended to be more general and applied to all three draft alternatives. Questions and answers from this session are included in the summary under Public Input, below.

## Open House



After the Question-and-Answer session, meeting attendees were encouraged to visit the exhibit stations, which provided information on the draft alternative analyses covering land use and circulation concepts; site-specific alternative design concepts; transportation impacts; economic, socio-economic and workforce impacts; sustainability opportunities; and public health impacts.

During this section of the workshop, meeting participants were able to speak at length with project staff and were encouraged to provide written comments on a “graffiti wall” and on comment forms.

## Public Input

The following is a summary by topic area of questions, responses, and comments regarding the draft alternatives. Comments were collected during the Question-and-Answer and Open House sections of the meeting. Some comments may have been reworded in order to clarify meaning; comments do not necessarily appear in the sequence that they occurred. This summary is not meant to serve as an official meeting transcript.



## General

- **Are services, such as police, fire, or schools designated in any of the land use alternatives?**  
Once the land uses have been determined, the Specific Plan and EIR will discuss how public services will be provided to the plan area.
- **Where will copies of the Alternatives Report be available?**  
In addition to being available on the project website, [www.oaklandnet.com/Central\\_Estuary\\_Plan/](http://www.oaklandnet.com/Central_Estuary_Plan/), beginning in November, copies of the Alternatives Report will be available at the Community and Economic Development Agency, Strategic Planning Division, 250 Frank Ogawa Plaza, Suite 3315 (3rd floor), Oakland, CA 94612.

### Alternative 1

- Alternative 1 has good research and development industry features.

### Alternative 2

- It seems like placement of residential uses west of Fruitvale Avenue might result in the construction of a light rail system that links all residential areas together.
- An appropriate amount of live-work space is blended into this Alternative.
- Some participants agreed with the concept of transitioning to green industry.

### Alternative 3

- **Why was a continuous Embarcadero Boulevard only found in Alternative 3? Could a continuous Embarcadero be ‘mixed and matched’ with the other alternatives?**

Several existing industrial uses are incompatible with a waterfront boulevard, because they require access to the waterfront for barges. Alternative 3 explores the potential conversion of these properties to new uses. A continuous Embarcadero would likely require additional right-of-way that would become available only as parcels were redeveloped, as well as revenues for construction that would come from more land use conversions and development.

- A continuous Embarcadero Boulevard that traverses the Plan Area is a positive feature.

### Transit and Traffic

- **Are improved traffic connections running from north to south under consideration in any of the alternatives?**

Once areas have been identified for their specific land uses, it will be much easier to figure out where and how traffic connections can be improved. Once the details of land use are worked out, we will address traffic issues.

- **Were train tracks and train uses considered in the development of the draft alternatives?**

The draft alternatives are developed with a scope of 10 to 20 years. Many factors, particularly an increase or decrease in industrial land use, will impact train traffic.

- **How will new residential developments impact traffic conditions in the Plan Area, especially around the bridges connecting to Alameda?**

Once land use designations have been made, a traffic analysis can occur. Then, areas for improvements, such as wider roads and additional stoplights, can be identified. Those details will be worked out later in the process.

- In Jack London Square, there are popular and thriving residential areas next to busy train tracks.
- What measures will be taken to mitigate traffic congestion?

- How will land-use choices impact traffic?
- Alternatives should have more transportation connections to Jack London Square and/or Oak to 9th projects.
- Traffic connections across I-880 need to be improved.

### **Zoning and Adaptive Reuse**

- **Why is there a yellow “racetrack”-shaped oval on all three alternatives, circling a single block, in the Kennedy Tract area? Is it an indication that this single block will definitely be redeveloped?**

The yellow “racetrack”-shaped oval in the Kennedy Tract area indicates that multiple properties on the block are owned by a single owner. Per the market analysis, it is anticipated that this one block will be redeveloped for multi-family residential use in the next 10 to 20 years, once a Central Estuary Plan is implemented. The area encircled in orange (around most of the Kennedy Tract) will be preserved as Live/Work.

- **Can zoning and land use specifications be used to protect historic structures and sites?**

At this point in the development of the Specific Plan, the only determinations that can be made effectively are where specific redevelopment will occur, and how the sites that may become available should be rezoned. Private investment would determine what types of units (high-rise or mid-rise, condominiums or rental units, adaptive reuse etc.) would be the most marketable.

Historic preservation and adaptive reuse of industrial sites is also a subject that will be addressed when design guidelines are written for each new zone.

- There was no mention of historic preservation or adaptive reuse of industrial sites.
  - Encourage adaptive reuse or historic preservation of industrial land/buildings.
- There is concern that residential developments will come only in the form of ownership condominiums. A Specific Plan cannot control the form of ownership of development. Residential development could be a combination of rental and ownership housing, as determined by the market.
- Identify which industrial structures are to be preserved or reused.

### **Waterfront**

- The waterfront is an asset that should be available to everyone so that they may enjoy the aesthetic beauty of the Estuary.
- The waterfront should be saved for uses that require water, such as industry and boating, and not for residential uses.
- Housing near the waterfront will make it more vibrant.

- Some people didn't want housing all along the waterfront; rather housing should be concentrated in strategic locations because housing privatizes the waterfront.

### **Residential/Commercial Land Use**

- Encourage more density.
- How will the alternatives affect services like police, fire, schools, and commercial retail uses like supermarkets, etc.?
  - This will be addressed as the Plan is fine-tuned.
- Situate residential use around the boathouse to encourage its use by more people.

### **Industrial Use**

- **Why do all three alternatives reduce industrial space?**  
 A study on the viability of various current uses was conducted. The study involved economic research, phone interviews, and data analysis about the productivity of certain industries. This research showed that the food service industry is thriving and expanding. The rationale for setting industrial land aside for food service was based on the vitality of the industry. The Plan Area is not being redeveloped by eminent domain; it will be transitioned over a period of time. As this transition takes place, more square footage could be dedicated to residential use. All three alternatives can accommodate an increase in the number of jobs while at the same time reducing the total amount of industrial square footage, by transitioning to industries that provide more jobs per square foot.
- Industrial land/space loss is undesirable.
- Dislike loss of industrial land/space, specifically because:
  - It is bad for the city tax base because other industrial business may flee.
  - Estuary waterways are necessary for the industry located there.
- Needs more innovative ideas for replacing the industrial space.
- Co-location of industrial and residential uses is not inherently incompatible; innovative buffering techniques are needed for appropriate transitions to maintain the integrity of both uses.
- If ConAgra and Owens/Brockway Glass (businesses) stay, the area will remain as it is.

### **What is missing from the Alternatives?**

- How will State regulations like AB 32 and SB 375 be reflected in the alternatives?
- All alternatives lacked attention to the Embarcadero Cove area.
- Where is the regional commercial use?

**What's Next?**

The next meeting will be held on Saturday, November 14, 2009 at the Beacon Day School at 2101 Livingston Street, Oakland, CA 94601. Notification will be sent out in advance of the next meeting.

For more information, please visit the project website:

Para obtener más información:

**若要了解詳情**

**Để biết thêm thông tin**

[www.oaklandnet.com/Central\\_Estuary\\_Plan/](http://www.oaklandnet.com/Central_Estuary_Plan/)