

COMMUNITY MEETING RESULTS REPORT

*Meeting convened Monday, September 17, 2007, 7:00 p.m. to 9:30 p.m.
Mosswood Recreation Center, Mosswood Park, Oakland
Report prepared by Bluhon Planning Group, September 19, 2007*

A. MEETING OVERVIEW

Kaiser Permanente convened a public meeting to present and solicit input on design issues regarding Phase 2 of the Oakland Medical Center. The meeting agenda consisted of:

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Master Plan Overview and Q&A
3. Presentation of Phase 2 Design Topics
4. Facilitated Community Dialogue
5. Wrap-up and Next Meeting

Michael Lane of Kaiser Permanente presented information to the community. Mr. Lane answered a number of informational questions posed by meeting attendees. Peter Bluhon facilitated community discussion and comments were recorded on wall charts at the meeting.

This report summarizes key issues expressed at the meeting and serves as a record of the meeting. Comments are organized by topic, not necessarily by the order in which the comment was made. Written comments submitted after the meeting are incorporated into the meeting record and are noted accordingly.

ATTENDANCE

Approximately 40 residents and organizational representatives attended the meeting.

Meeting Staff and Consultants:

Kaiser Permanente: Michael Lane, Project Director; Judy DeVries, Public Relations.

NBBJ Architects: Nancy Lim; Brian Lin.

City of Oakland: Scott Gregory, Contract Planner; Gary Patton, Deputy Director.

Bluhon Planning Group: Peter Bluhon; Julia Kocs; Susan Moffat.

B. SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY INPUT: RECOMMENDATIONS & QUESTIONS

1. GROUND FLOOR STREET ACTIVATION

This issue addresses the activity, uses, and design of ground floor space of the new main hospital as it relates to Broadway, MacArthur Boulevard, and Piedmont Avenue.

- a. Piedmont Avenue is an excellent retail use opportunity. The current retail uses and related pedestrian traffic on Piedmont should influence the design of ground floor space at the hospital.
 - Ground floor uses should fit into the existing area, such as a café.
 - Consider that patients and visitors will patronize this area, as well as residents.
 - Retail and consumer-oriented activities should not be adjacent to utility uses such as the trash, the mobile technology building, or the Emergency Department.
 - The “scene” is on Piedmont, not Broadway.
- b. Provide shops and other retail uses along MacArthur.
- c. The mobile technology center should not be located on the corner.
- d. Placing the Emergency Department across from the mortuary is awkward.
- e. The consensus of participants is to activate Piedmont Avenue.

QUESTIONS FOR FOLLOW-UP:

- 1-1. Explain why the mobile technology would occupy a prime corner [currently proposed at Piedmont and MacArthur Avenues.]
- 1-2. There was a café and planting area on the corner of Piedmont and MacArthur in earlier versions of the plan. Why has that scheme changed?
- 1-3. Clarify the height, location, and setback from Broadway of the nursing tower.
- 1-4. Clarify specific ground floor uses intended to face Piedmont.
- 1-5. Specify the retail uses of the former Honda auto site.
- 1-6. Is it the City’s goal to activate Broadway (rather than Piedmont)?
- 1-7. When will the Landscape Plan be a part of design review?
- 1-8. Clarify the types of clinics planned on Broadway.

2. EMERGENCY DEPARTMENT (ED) LOCATION ON PIEDMONT AVENUE

- a. There is broad concern that the type and volume of services to be located on Piedmont Avenue under the current plan would be inappropriate and negatively impact the adjacent Richmond neighborhood. The CUP, loading dock, ED entrance, tech area, and secondary parking entrance would all be located there. These uses, particularly emergency vehicles, would cause increased noise and congestion. Piedmont Avenue is too narrow and will not be able to handle the increased traffic. These services and departments should be relocated to MacArthur and Broadway.
- b. One participant indicated that he lives near the existing ED and does not find it noisy.

QUESTIONS FOR FOLLOW-UP:

- 2-1. Clarify the direction and flow of truck traffic including dock loading and operating/delivery hours.
- 2-2. Why is mobile tech center mobile?
- 2-3. Will trucks be backing up to the loading dock and will there be noticeable back-up warning beepers?
- 2-4. Specify the location and schedule of garbage collection.

3. MOSSWOOD PARK

- a. Local playgrounds are not adequate for serving the needs of young families. More facilities and equipment are needed for young children.
- b. Kaiser should donate funds to improve the park: for ongoing maintenance and/or capital improvements. Such contributions need to be transparent to the City's budget for Mosswood Park.
- c. Consider developing a master plan for revitalization the park. The plan – developed with neighborhood and City staff involvement – will guide investment in the park.
- d. Suggestions for park improvements:
 - Improve and increase the use of the amphitheatre.
 - Replace the pergola and replant the big wisteria that used to be there. Consider using the same style pergola at Oak Glen Park.
 - Retain the basketball court and baseball field. They are well-used.
 - Add more tot lots.
 - Conduct seismic improvements of the recreation center (if needed).
- e. Good examples of improved parks include Golden Gate Park's Koret Playground.
- f. Kaiser should study the impact of shadows (from the new buildings) and increased traffic on Mosswood Park.

4. CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS ON THE NEIGHBORHOOD

- a. Monitor air quality and noise during the construction process:
 - Community members want "guarantees" from Kaiser regarding proper pollution, dust, and noise control.
 - An independent expert, paid for by the City, should monitor air and noise impacts during construction.
 - Clarify and communicate the intended work schedule and hours of operation of construction vehicles.
 - Pay attention to possible consequences of compromised air quality on the health of residents. Homes do not have sealed air conditioners as Kaiser's buildings have.
- b. Implement a citizen complaint program that provides for easy reporting and resolution of complaints.
- c. Kaiser needs to recognize the possibility of increased crime and have a plan in case problems arise.
- d. Neighborhood residents needs to be able to access air quality data during construction.

5. BUILDING AESTHETICS AND RELATED DESIGN ISSUES

Design/Aesthetics

- a. Current renderings appear square and blocky. More angles are needed.
- b. *Written comment submitted at the meeting follows:*
 - Articulate long sides of the building. There should be shadow lines, not colored stripes, vertically and horizontally. Create rhythm and do not use the same window type all the way down.
 - The main part of the hospital is a slab, not a tower. This is a design issue: adding a pinnacle is not enough.
 - Use variety of materials. Avoid mirror glass.
 - Don't make building so boxy/symmetrical. Break up the box. Each side should be different due to views, solar heat gain, etc. On the other hand, sides need to relate to each other.
 - Make the building look more delicate, not so heavy
- c. Integrate and retain classic look and style of the existing area.

Building Guidelines

- d. Consider ecological technologies and approaches in the design.
- e. Screen HVAC equipment on the roof.
- f. Antennas on the current building are not visible.
- g. Cell phone towers should not be installed.
- h. Study shadow impacts if the main tower were to move to shift closer to Broadway. Sky bridges make the building more overwhelming.
- i. Prepare a lighting study focused on the light emanating from the nursing tower at night.

Design Process and Community Involvement:

- j. A more detailed discussion is needed regarding the appearance and design of the new structure.
- k. A committee of local architects should have an opportunity to review the plans.

QUESTIONS FOR FOLLOW-UP:

- 5-1. When can community members see the current plans and elevations?
- 5-2. Elevations for the Honda site need to be presented.
- 5-3. Is there a coordinated design concept with this hospital building and the new medical office building on Broadway?
- 5-4. Proposed elevations of the hospital should be presented at the next meeting.

6. SKYBRIDGE

- a. Limit the use of sky bridges and encourage hospital staff interaction with neighborhoods and parks.
- b. Consider building a tunnel like the one at Howe Street instead of sky bridges.
- c. Sky bridges can obstruct the view of Highway 580.

7. TRAFFIC, PARKING AND CIRCULATION

- a. Kaiser should obtain information about AC Transit Ecopass.
- b. Provide signs for secure bike parking, Bart shuttle and bus stop locations.
- c. Street permit parking issues:
 - Clarify and mark residential parking areas.
 - Clarify the specifics of visitor parking, including evening parking and who pays for it. Where will residential visitors park? Will Kaiser pay for visitor parking?
 - Identify hours of availability for parking areas.
 - Expand parking program to 24 hours as done by the City of Piedmont in certain areas.
 - Increased parking enforcement is needed.
- d. Address the lack of lighting for bike and pedestrian traffic on Broadway and Piedmont.
- e. Consider increased night monitoring of the neighborhood.
- f. Impact of traffic regarding 580. In particular, will it be open to semi trucks?

QUESTIONS FOR FOLLOW-UP:

- 7-1. Kaiser needs to bring and present a circulation and traffic plan.

8. IMPACT ON REAL ESTATE VALUES:

- a. There is concern about the impact of home prices.
- b. Community members would like an independent market study done on impact of real estate values in the area.

END

Kaiser Permanente Oakland Medical Center Phase 2 Design

COMMUNITY MEETING RESULTS REPORT

Meeting convened Monday, October 1, 2007, 7:00 p.m. to 9:30 p.m.

Mosswood Recreation Center, Mosswood Park, Oakland

Report prepared by Bluhon Planning Group, October 9, 2007

A. MEETING OVERVIEW

On October 1st, Kaiser Permanente convened the second of a series of public meetings to present and solicit community input on the design of Phase 2 of the Oakland Medical Center. The first meeting was held on September 17th. The agenda for the October 1st meeting consisted of:

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Presentation & Dialogue
 - A. Neighborhood Design
 - B. Landscape Concepts
 - C. Site Access and ED Locations
 - D. Ground Floor Street Activation
~ Q&A and Dialogue ~
 - E. Building Design Issues
 - F. Traffic
~ Q&A and Dialogue ~
 - G. Other Issues
3. Summary of Outstanding Issues
4. Next Steps and Adjourn

Michael Lane of Kaiser Permanente and Jeffrey Bailey of NBBJ Architects presented preliminary proposals for the layout, site access, and design parameters of the new medical center. (A copy of the PowerPoint presentation is available on the City's web site.) Peter Bluhon facilitated community discussion and a recorder wrote comments and questions on wall charts. This report summarizes comments made by community members at the meeting. Comments are organized by topic and not necessarily in the order in which the comment was made. For topics discussed at the first community meeting, the report offers a summary of key themes expressed.

ATTENDANCE

Approximately 30 residents and organizational representatives attended the meeting.

Meeting Presenters and Consultants:

Kaiser Permanente: Michael Lane, Project Director; Judy DeVries, Public Relations.

NBBJ Architects: Jeffrey Bailey; Brian Lin.

City of Oakland: Scott Gregory, Contract Planner; Gary Patton, Deputy Director.

Bluhon Planning Group: Peter Bluhon; Julia Kocs; Susan Moffat.

B. COMMUNITY COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. GROUND FLOOR STREET ACTIVATION, NEIGHBORHOOD DESIGN & LANDSCAPE

MEETING #1 (9/17/07) SUMMARY OF KEY THEMES

- The retail character of Piedmont Avenue should influence the design of ground floor space at the hospital. Ground floor uses should be consistent with the character of upper Piedmont.
- Utility/service uses such as trash, mobile technology units, or the Emergency Department should not be on Piedmont.
- Shops and other retail uses could also be located along MacArthur.
- The mobile technology center should not be located on the corner of MacArthur and Piedmont.

MEETING #2 RECOMMENDATIONS & QUESTIONS

- Lower Piedmont is not an inviting, pedestrian-friendly environment and could be improved by adding “eyes” to the street. The proposed design does not appear to achieve this and appears like a “back alley” to the hospital with all the service entrances located there. The new facility should enhance Piedmont and make it a walkable, hospitable, and safe street, particularly for pedestrians. The new changes to lower Piedmont will affect residential property values. Therefore the appearance (during day and night), safety, and aesthetics are important.
- Consider alternative locations for the loading dock, mobile units, and oxygen tank unit, such as below grade or underground or on Broadway and MacArthur.
- If the oxygen tank must be located along Piedmont, consider placing it below street grade and/or attractively screen the facility or make it an attractive, integral part of the open space. Similarly, if other unattractive uses must be on Piedmont, consider screening them or designing them to be attractive.
- Consider moving the CUP to Broadway. Illustrate how the CUP will appear.
- The main parking garage should not be located on Piedmont.
- The mobile tech unit should not be located at Piedmont/MacArthur intersection.
- Although MacArthur is not a pedestrian route now, it has the potential to become one.
- Consider adding a water feature near the entrance, particularly if one is located on MacArthur.
- A pedestrian link from this neighborhood to downtown and lower Broadway is a desirable design goal.
- The landscape design along Howe is beautiful because it does not have an institutional character and should be emulated in the new project.

EMERGENCY DEPARTMENT (ED) LOCATION & SITE ACCESS

MEETING #1 (9/17/07) SUMMARY OF KEY THEMES

- The type and volume of services to be located on Piedmont Avenue in the current plan – CUP, loading dock, ED, tech area, and secondary parking entrance – would negatively impact the Richmond neighborhood. These uses, particularly emergency vehicles and trucks, would increase noise and congestion. Such services and departments should be on MacArthur and Broadway.

MEETING #2: RECOMMENDATIONS & QUESTIONS

- Several alternative scenarios for the hospital entrance should be considered:
 - i. Place the ED and main entrance on Broadway.
 - ii. Place the main entrance on MacArthur at the end of Howe Street with a vehicular drop-off and pedestrian entrance. An underground ramp for vehicles could connect drop-off traffic to the parking garage proposed at the southwest corner of the site. If no underground ramp is provided, then examine alternatives for visitors to access the parking garage. [Community meeting participants acknowledged that they did not want to see the parking garage access be on Piedmont Avenue so that vehicles would not turn right on Piedmont.]
 - iii. Provide a pedestrian-only entrance on MacArthur with an attractive plaza. This would reinforce the historic identity of the hospital being at Howe and MacArthur. The vehicular entrance and drop-off could remain as proposed along Broadway.
- Other design and circulation issues regarding the entrances:
 - The main entrance should be architecturally legible without the use of signs. The Broadway entrance, as currently designed, may not be obvious for visitors to find. A lot of traffic may end up on Piedmont by mistake as visitors look for the entrance.
 - Directional signage for cars exiting from westbound 580 is needed.
 - If all vehicular traffic is moved to Broadway, the pedestrian experience along Mosswood Park and that side of Broadway may be negatively impacted.
 - It is important to connect the project to Bart, Lake Merritt, and the Richmond neighborhood.
 - Large trucks should be on Broadway.
- Connecting Mosswood Park to the community is good goal. The cross-block connection (proposed in the current design) from Piedmont Avenue to Mosswood Park, however, is giving this link too much importance. The proposed plazas between Piedmont and Broadway appear to solve parking issues than create a real, pedestrian-friendly environment.

BUILDING AESTHETICS AND RELATED DESIGN ISSUES

MEETING #1 (9/17/07) SUMMARY OF KEY THEMES

- The proposed design appears square and blocky. The long sides of the building should be articulated and there should be shadow lines.
- The design should create rhythm and not use the same window type all the way down. Each side of the building should be different due to views, solar heat gain, etc.
- The building should look delicate and integrate into the classic style of the existing area.
- Consider ecological technologies and approaches in the design.
- Screen HVAC equipment on the roof.
- Antennas and cell phone towers should not be installed (or visible).
- A committee of local architects should have an opportunity to review the plans.

MEETING #2 RECOMMENDATIONS AND QUESTIONS

- Use high quality materials for the whole podium, not just the ground floor.
- Stucco or cement plaster should not be used because it will become dirty from air pollution, particularly with cars traveling on 580.
- Implement a regular cleaning program for the building.
- Use LEED standards for energy efficiency.
- Use inventive design for the tower.
- The general consensus of participants was that the building should be an interesting, creative, and beautiful design.

MEETING CONCLUSION

The Kaiser Project Team committed to return with more detailed plans and renderings and responses to community comments at the October 22nd community meeting. The meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

COMMUNITY MEETING RESULTS REPORT

Meeting convened Monday, October 22, 2007, 7:00 p.m. to 9:30 p.m.

Mosswood Recreation Center, Mosswood Park, Oakland

Report prepared by Bluhon Planning Group, October 22, 2007

A. MEETING OVERVIEW

On October 22nd, Kaiser Permanente convened the third of a series of public meetings to present and solicit community input on the design of Phase 2 of the Oakland Medical Center. The first two meetings – held September 17th and October 1st – gathered general concerns and issues. This meeting began with a presentation by Kaiser Permanente of a revised plan and was followed by a facilitated dialogue. The agenda consisted of:

1. Welcome & Introductions
2. Presentation & Discussion of Proposed Plan
 - a. Site Access Alternatives.
~ Questions & Dialogue ~
 - b. Street Activation & Mobile Tech Dock.
 - c. Loading dock & Parking Garage.
 - d. Oxygen Tank Location.
 - e. Landscape & Streetscape Concepts.
~ Questions & Dialogue ~
3. Identify Areas of Consensus & Disagreement
4. Next Steps and Adjourn

Michael Lane of Kaiser Permanente presented a revised site plan for the new hospital. (A copy of the presentation is available on the City's web site.) Peter Bluhon facilitated community discussion and Julia Kocs recorded comments.

Following the presentation and a Q&A period, the facilitator asked participants to evaluate how well the proposed plan achieved ten key goals expressed by the community at the two previous meetings. An empty circle was placed next to each goal and the group was asked how fully the circle should be filled to represent how well the revised plan achieves the goal. Eight of the ten criteria were fully filled while two received half circles.

This report summarizes comments made by community members at the meeting and are organized by topic, not necessarily in the order in which the comment was made.

ATTENDANCE

Approximately 45 residents and organizational representatives attended the meeting.

Meeting Presenters and Consultants:

Kaiser Permanente: Michael Lane, Project Director; Judy DeVries, Public Relations.

NBBJ Architects: Jeffrey Bailey; Brian Lin.

City of Oakland: Scott Gregory, Contract Planner.

Bluhon Planning Group: Peter Bluhon; Julia Kocs.

B. MEETING COMMENTS GROUPED BY TOPIC

The goal statements below (lettered A, B, etc.) represent key themes derived from community comments at the first two community workshops. The italicized text summarizes Kaiser Permanente's October 22nd design proposal. Comments and conclusions from the 10/22 community meeting follow.

1. GROUND FLOOR STREET ACTIVATION, NEIGHBORHOOD DESIGN AND LANDSCAPE

A. Create a safe, aesthetic, and active pedestrian-oriented environment along Piedmont.

Kaiser Permanente Proposal

The new plan consists of a larger pedestrian zone along Piedmont, primarily due to the movement of the oxygen tank unit, placement of the mobile tech dock underground, and moving the loading dock entrance to Broadway.

Community Comments, 10/22

- Lighting is necessary for the walks. Lighting is needed below tree canopies. Use bollard lighting and focus lights downwards instead of upwards.
- Discussion is needed about streetscape and signage.
- The design and aesthetics of the street level façade will require community review.
- Street lighting and pedestrian safety on Piedmont Avenue needs clarification.
- The streetscape plan between Warren and Broadway is needed.

Conclusion

Meeting participants broadly supported the proposed plan for Piedmont, with the condition that the design and aesthetics of the ground floor façade be reviewed by the community.

B: Ground floor uses should be similar to upper Piedmont.

KP Proposal

The retail uses along lower Piedmont have not been determined. Internal hospital programming requirements will determine what, if any "retail" use is provided.

Community Comments, 10/22

- Questions were asked regarding Kaiser's flexibility to put retail uses on the ground floor.

Conclusion

Meeting participants broadly supported the proposed ground floor plan along Piedmont.

C. The mobile tech unit should not be located at Piedmont/MacArthur.

KP Proposal

The mobile tech dock will move down into the loading area below grade. This will increase opportunities for street activation.

Community Comments and Conclusion, 10/22

There was broad support for the proposed placement of the tech unit.

D. Consider a different location for the loading dock. Clarify the direction/flow of trucks. Ideally, trucks should be on Broadway, not Piedmont.

KP Proposal

The parking garage will shift to the north to allow for a service access drive accessible from Broadway.

Comments and Conclusion, 10/22

Meeting participants broadly supported the proposed solution.

E. Consider a different location for the oxygen tank unit.

KP Proposal

The oxygen tank unit will move to the south edge of the site (near the freeway) which allows for a larger green triangular space to the south of the ED auto entrance.

Comments and Conclusion, 10/22

Meeting participants broadly supported this plan.

F. Consider moving the CUP to Broadway.

KP Proposal

The proposed CUP will be a 3-story building along Piedmont.

Community Comments, 10/22

- The parking garage is a known entity, and the CUP is an unknown entity. Greater, more detailed information is necessary on the proposed design of the CUP.
- Based on one community member's visit to the CUP at the Kaiser Walnut Creek, she suggested that the CUP on Piedmont is acceptable in terms of noise impacts.
- The design of the CUP needs to be further addressed.

Conclusion

Meeting participants accepted the location of a CUP on Piedmont with the condition that the design and aesthetics are acceptable.

G. Consider transforming MacArthur into a more pedestrian-friendly route, possibly with retail uses.

KP Proposal

The entire sidewalk and streetscape around the hospital, from Broadway to Piedmont, will have several active ground floor activity zones and a pedestrian-friendly streetscape. A landscaped, pedestrian-friendly entrance will be provided at the end of Howe Street.

Comments & Conclusion, 10/22

Meeting participants broadly supported the plan for MacArthur.

H. The existing informal landscaping along Howe should be emulated elsewhere.

KP Proposal

Kaiser proposes a lush landscaping plan that requires reduced irrigation and maintenance. The plan will be informed by the Oakland landscape guidelines. The plan will include landscaped medians and benches, especially at the pedestrian entry points.

Comments & Conclusion, 10/22

Meeting participants expressed broad support for the proposed landscape plan. It was suggested to look at the landscaping plan in the front of the De Young Museum in San Francisco where layers of space are achieved within a small area.

2. EMERGENCY DEPARTMENT LOCATION, SITE ACCESS AND CIRCULATION

A. Emergency vehicles and trucks will increase noise and congestion along Piedmont.

KP Proposal

The proposed plan provides a clear entry-point to the hospital on Broadway and a clear vehicular entrance to the Emergency Department on Piedmont. The vehicular entrance is aligned with Westall to enhance pedestrian safety. Ambulances will arrive from Broadway and MacArthur are required to turn off their sirens at a three-block radius, except when they need to cross a street.

Community Comments, 10/22

- There is concern about separating private vehicular ED traffic from the regular garage traffic. A suggestion was made to combine the ED vehicular traffic with the outpatient patient traffic in order to decrease congestion on Piedmont. Jeffrey Bailey of NBBJ indicated that this could potentially cause accidents.
- Consider offering the current hospital ED parking space for regular public use.
- The number of parking spaces at the ED should be increased.
- Consider using the ED parking for long-term parking at the current hospital.
- Clarify the flow of traffic to and from the ED.
- KP should monitor ED parking usage by patients who use the ED facilities.
- Background data on Broadway traffic is needed.

Conclusion

Meeting participants expressed partial support for the overall site plan and suggested that further changes could be made to enhance pedestrian safety.

B. Consider three alternatives for locating the hospital entrance and ED:

i. Entrance & ED on Broadway.

ii. Entrance on MacArthur with vehicle drop-off.

iii. Pedestrian entrance on MacArthur with an attractive plaza.

KP Proposal

Each scenario above was presented with a pro/con assessment. Kaiser's proposal consists of the main vehicular and pedestrian entrance on Broadway, an additional pedestrian entrance at MacArthur and Howe Street, and the ED entrance on Piedmont.

Community Comments, 10/22

- Participants asked questions about the scenarios presented. There was particular interest in seeing a scenario where the ED would remain on Piedmont but vehicular access to the ED would be from Broadway.
- It was suggested that the entrance on Broadway should be for drop-off patients, but the primary entrance would be at Howe Street.

- The volume of patient drop-off/pick-ups will continue to make parking problematic unless the increased parking needs are addressed.
- The flow of traffic and the egress from the ED designated parking area needs further discussion.

C. Design the hospital entrance so that the architecture indicates the entrance, not signs.

KP Proposal

Kaiser considers signage important and is reviewing various approaches.

Community Comments, 10/22

- Architectural issues regarding the entrance design need to be addressed.

3. NEIGHBORHOOD TRAFFIC, PARKING AND CIRCULATION

A. Clarify location and flow of traffic for ED area and the parking garage.

KP Proposal

The exact location of the parking garage is still under discussion, but the proposed plan for the new parking garage will alleviate some of the congestion concerns. The flow of traffic through the parking garage and possible exit routes are still being discussed. The current plan allows the option for an exit onto Broadway. A modest increase of traffic is expected compared to current flow. Some of the traffic is already on Broadway, but no current data is available. The BART shuttle will remain on its current route, but there is a possibility of expanding its route.

Community Comments, 10/22

- Community members request background data on current Broadway traffic.
- Consider routing all emergency vehicles through the parking garage by putting in a no-charge entrance. This could cut the traffic on Piedmont dramatically.
- Consider finding more ways to mitigate the impacts of increased traffic in order to prevent gridlock on Piedmont.

C. AREAS OF CONSENSUS AND DISAGREEMENT

At the end of the meeting, the group was asked to evaluate the proposed plan against ten criteria. There was broad support for the proposed location of the mobile tech unit, loading dock, oxygen unit tank, and the CUP. Participants believed the plan would provide an improved, pedestrian-friendly environment along Piedmont and MacArthur and that the ground floor uses would be acceptable. There was strong support for the landscape plan.

There was general agreement that the revised plan is a considerable improvement over the original plan. Some participants, however, indicated that site access and layout improvements could be made. Also, participants suggested that noise and traffic impacts on Piedmont (due to the ED entrance) need to be further addressed.

The meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.