

COMMENTATORS AT THE OAKLAND CITY PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE UPTOWN MIXED USE PROJECT

October 15, 2003; Hearing Room 1, City Hall, 1 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, Oakland

Public individuals spoke first, followed by Planning Commissioners.

Public Individuals

John Revelli. Introduced himself as the owner of Revelli Tires on 20th Street. Made the following comments:

- The EIR did not contain a discussion of the impacts of the Project on small businesses.
- Revelli Tires is a family-run business and has been so for 45 years.
- Revelli Tires is dependent upon its location, which is in close proximity to BART; therefore, for the business to remain viable, it would have to be relocated to within 1 block of a BART station. However, a relocation would be a hardship because John Revelli is the sole owner/operator of the business.
- The Uptown Project should be built around Revelli Tires and should leave the business intact.
- He will also submit his comments in written form.

1

Tony Fung. Introduced himself as the owner of the full-service garage and smog station within the Project site. Made the following comments:

- The EIR did not mention the environmental impacts that would result from the relocation of businesses within the Project site.
- Due to the lack of available sites, CEDA would not be able to relocate businesses within the vicinity of the Project site.
- His business is dependent upon being in close proximity to a BART station, and he will be forced out of business if he is relocated.
- The Uptown Project should incorporate his business; residents within the Project site will require the services of a garage and smog station.

2

Julia Liou. Introduced herself as a representative of the Oakland Chinatown Coalition and other Chinatown-based organizations. Made the following comments:

- The Chinatown community is concerned about cumulative impacts on neighborhoods around the Uptown Project site.
- 9 percent of Project trips will go through Chinatown, but the EIR does not include detailed analysis of the Project's impacts on the Webster/Posey Tubes intersections.
- The EIR needs to better analyze the cumulative effects of the Project on Chinatown (including the effects of Jack London Square projects). Chinatown is one of the Bay Area's 52 most impoverished communities.

3

Anna Naruta. Made the following comments:

- The EIR needs to better analyze the cumulative impacts of the Project on surrounding communities.
- She supports Joyce Roy's March 28 letter, which stated that the Project should be integrated into the Uptown entertainment district.
- The Project should preserve historic resources within the Project site, including the 19th and San Pablo Commercial District and the Rankin Plumbing building, which is 120 years old.
- The public park should front on Telegraph Avenue.

4

5

6

- Historic buildings within the Project site are small, and are generally located on the periphery of the Project site (e.g., Navlet’s), and so could be easily incorporated into the Project.
- Two previous Chinatown settlements (dating as far back as 1869) were located within and in close proximity to the Project site on 19th Street and San Pablo Avenue, and 22nd Street and San Pablo Avenue. These communities should be discussed in the EIR in more detail.
- Mitigation measures should be included that reduce impacts to archaeological resources associated with these communities. Page 213 of the EIR states that there is a low to moderate chance that archeological resources will be uncovered on the site. Due to the extensive history of the Project site, there is a high likelihood that unidentified archaeological resources are located on the site. The EIR should address these cultural resources that are likely to be present within the site. Oakland General Plan Policy 4.1 mandates protection of underground cultural resources.

**6
cont.**

7

Erin Beales. Introduced himself as the new owner of Navlet’s. Made the following comments:

8

- Navlet’s as an architectural resource is underrated in the EIR; the building should really be rated an A. The building has been restored to its original 1924 condition (the signs and glass windows have been restored).
- Navlet’s contains architectural details and a three-tone paint job that would be obscured by shade.

9

Steve Lowe. Made the following comments:

- The public park should be relocated to Telegraph Avenue, so that it will be subject to more surveillance. The City should look at park location alternatives.
- A park belongs in the heart of Oakland’s retail center, and could have a role similar to Union Square in San Francisco.

10

Joyce Roy. Identified herself as a representative of the Sierra Club and an Oakland resident. Made the following comments:

- The Project needs to reference the fact that the Uptown District is primarily an entertainment district.
- The Project is not consistent with the objectives of the Uptown Redevelopment Plan.
- The proposed park should be in a more public place to take advantage of good views of the Uptown District and Downtown, and to separate housing from surrounding areas. This park could energize the area, and provide a separation between conflicting land uses.
- She will also submit her comments in written form.

11

12

13

Naomi Schiff. Identified herself as a member of the Oakland Heritage Alliance. Made the following comments:

- Historic buildings could be incorporated into the Project at 20th Street and San Pablo Avenue.
- The DEIR is incomplete for the following reasons: it does not analyze alternatives that include the preservation of on-site historic buildings; it does not analyze the design sensitivity of historic properties surrounding the Project site; Block 7 was not adequately analyzed.
- A greater distance needs to be maintained behind the Fox Theater.
- The hamburger stand on Block 9, which is an excellent example of “googie” architecture, should be maintained as part of the Project.
- She will also submit her comments in written form.

14

15

16

17

John Chapman. Identified himself as a representative of the Livable Communities Initiative. Made the following comments:

- The Project combines economy, environment, social equity and civic engagement, represents a good plan for the revitalization of the district, and combats sprawl. | **18**
- The EIR should talk about the benefits of the Project, which include the provision of housing near jobs and transit, the clean-up of on-site contamination, the provision of transit opportunities, the reduction of obesity, and the recycling of land. |

Sanjiv Handa. Identified himself as a representative of the East Bay News Service. Made the following comments:

- The City does not have the capabilities to deal with neighborhood impacts that would be caused by the proposed student housing on Block 7. | **19**
- Politicians neglect Oakland residents and quality-of-life issues. | **20**

Planning Commissioners

Anne Mudge. Made the following comments:

- It would be useful if the EIR included a map that shows proposed uses transposed on zoning designations. | **21**
- On page 49, SBC and PG&E are designated as “Other Agencies” when in fact they aren’t permitting agencies. | **22**
- The EIR needs to include additional discussion of the relocation of businesses from the Project site. | **23**
- It is hard to tell from the EIR which buildings are proposed for demolition. Figure IV.I-1 should show these buildings. | **24**

Mark McClure. Made the following comments:

- The EIR should include more information and analysis regarding relocation of businesses from the Project site. | **25**
- The EIR should include alternatives that include different park locations. | **26**

Colland Jang. Made the following comments:

- The study intersections analyzed in the EIR should include those in Chinatown and the Broadway corridor. | **27**
- The intersection of Broadway and 5th Street is operating at LOS F. Why wasn’t this intersection subject to detailed analysis in the EIR. | **28**
- Are there detailed plans for Block 7 (if so, this is unclear in the EIR)? | **29**
- Why does the EIR only consider alternatives for Block 7? |
- The EIR should include alternatives that include 20th Street and San Pablo Avenue (historic resources). | **30**

Michael Lighty. Made the following comments:

- The EIR needs to be more explicit in regard to what buildings would be demolished within the Project site. | **31**
- Historic buildings, especially those fronting on San Pablo Avenue and the Great Western Power Company Building, should be incorporated into the Project to give it character. | **32**
- The quality of the park space would be improved by moving it to Telegraph Avenue. | **33**
- The Project’s impacts on pedestrian safety and traffic volumes in Chinatown should be quantified. | **34**

Nicole Franklin. Made the following comments:

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Project includes 43,000 square feet of commercial space. Performing arts and entertainment uses should be incorporated into this space to provide for after-hours activity.	35
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Why are there no population, employment and housing impacts? One would assume that impacts would result from such a large number of people moving Downtown.	36
<p>Clinton Killian. Made the following comments:</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The intersections shown in Figure IV.D-2, Study Intersections, are not representative of all the intersections that would be affected by the Project.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Why were no intersections in West Oakland analyzed except for West Grand?	37
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Intersections between East Adams Point and the Lakeshore District and Downtown Oakland should be analyzed.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Figure IV.D-8, Project Trip Distribution, is incomplete: West Grand would be affected by the Project, especially when you take into account regional trips.	38
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The EIR should analyze the impacts of the Project on the Paramount.	