

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	Can the comment period and schedule be extended since the plan was just issued on March 8?
	Comment on Emily Gaspich Comment, Staff Comment: but the review period is not long enough. The plan is extensive and detailed as it should be. People have lives besides reviewing documents — this legislation will greatly affect my neighborhood and many of us need a longer review time. Why can't the review period be extended???
	where will the public meetings be held
Vision Statement	Vision Statement: Less descriptor of Oakland, ... will send language
	Residents means homeowners. Think about language. maybe instead of residents including students, employees, ... to live, work, play, pray, etc....
	Throughout the Plan, you refer to "residents" and "students." That is unfortunate wording. Many short/mid term residents are not students. If you lived in Oakland you would know that. You should refer to long term and short term residents - rather than residents and students. We are not a dichotomous community, please recognize that in your writing.
	Strategies by Topic seems to be empty. Is it meant to be that way??
	Hello, I am not sure if I am teaching the right people here but if I am not and you know who to forward this to, please do so: I was just walking down Forbes Ave and noticed that every single "Oakland" lamppost sign had a white person on it with the exception of one (which was a robot). If I was a person of color I would think the message I am receiving is that I do not matter. Please make this campaign more reflective of the actual population of Oakland. Thank you,
Vision Statement	The vision statement is a great start but it could be improved by acknowledging that Oakland is home to longstanding institutions of higher learning, which contribute to the vibrancy and attraction of the neighborhood.
	you want more residents but the Oakland area is polluted with slum lords and student parting every weekend and night nothing is ever done Oakland needs to comeback to be an actual family oriented neighborhood that should be the goal
	Yeah I think there's some good to come from putting provisions in place to have people able to BUY denser housing rather than just rent it. More condos, townhouses, multiplexes, etc for SALE
	I couldn't agree more with Oakland4Life. Mixed among the students are still residents who have lived there for 50 or 60 years and take care of their properties. It can be awful for the elderly to be surrounded by students. It doesn't matter how much work you put into Oakland, if there's not a real plan developed with the city to crack down on slumlords and carry out some real code enforcement of trash and properties, it will not get better. This should be an equal part of any development plan that is put forth.
	Since this will be a flexible document, will City Planning conduct public meetings, once the plan is adopted, to update community on the progress/changes to the plan? What is the forum to inform the public of implementation of the plan
	there was students housing projects at fifth ave next to the portal place in 2023 Oakland plan so why you removed it? It needs more student housing Oakland and it's perfect place in west Oakland only undeveloped place! It's also great location for uptown community for benefit. I am a member of the west Oakland community and I would like to you guys add more students housing next to the portal place apartment please! Only homeless people tents there and it's hard to walk from Carlow university to Birmingham bridge because of safety reasons. I would like to you guys loyal for 2023 Oakland plan for this part of the west Oakland please! Thank

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	Some of the goals of the Oakland Plan are worthy. But Oakland—and Pittsburgh—MUST STOP DESTROYING the city's beautiful Pre-War (WWII) buildings! The sheer man-hours of talented hand-craftsmanship, period design, and handsome aesthetics CANNOT (will not) be replaced by modern, profit-driven developers. Instead, they'll pull-down a beautiful 100 year old building—built by hundreds of talented, anonymous craftsmen—and replace it with a cheap, pre-fab, glass & metal monstrosity. And Pittsburghers stands-back in a stupor while it happens! Syria Mosque: gone! Pitt Stadium: gone! Skibo Hall: gone! The handsome Croatian Union Building: gone! Now the developers are coming for the Isaly's Building and Saint Agnes Church. And this is just in Oakland! Pittsburghers need to wake-up and realize that the cultural heritage of our city is being pillaged—all to line-the-pockets of slap-dash developers. Some of our ancestors toiled to create these buildings with their bare hands. We cannot let developers replace them with cheap, ugly, dated, pre-fab constructions.
Vision Statement	It is shameful that City Planners revised the original Vision Statement approved by the Steering Committee and excluded the part about "retaining existing residents, offering opportunities to age in place", but it is not surprising because the Plan offers little for them. Getting public art is apparently a higher priority.
	Substantive reframing of the role of Oakland institutions: currently, the draft and discussions about the plan position institutions as either partners or funders for initiatives or developers that can offset heights with resource allocations to the community reinvestment fund. The plan needs to situate institutions as part of the Oakland community, being a type of Oakland stakeholder that has needs and interests to be met through the Oakland plan just as other types of stakeholders' needs are met. Importantly, meeting the needs and interests of all stakeholder groups will ensure a vibrant Oakland that sustains its unique identify as a diverse residential community that is also an employment center, innovation district, and cultural district.
	Institutional roles in funding and animating community programs needs more discussion before they can be included in the plan: The University of Pittsburgh is committed to being a community partner and asset. For more than sixty years, the University has financially and programmatically supported community development, community-serving initiatives, and the start-up and capacity-building of neighborhood-based associations and organizations. We do this as part of our institutional mission and our commitment to being a place-based anchor institution. Additionally, the IMP planning process created by the Department of City Planning requires that EMI-zoned institutions engage their community stakeholders to determine the menu of investments and programs they will contribute to the quality of life in Oakland over the ten-year period of their IMP. Having just had our Institutional Master Plan adopted by City Council, we have committed significant resources and partnership to Oakland through 2032. The 2032-2042 IMP will also carry an additional set of community resource obligations. The draft plan sets targets and goals in ways that obligate the institutions to make additional community investments without certainty, clarity, and predictability of how those investments will be levied. Much further discussion and planning is needed before Pitt can agree to the resource role it is being asked to assume in the current draft plan. More is said on this below in the community section feedback.
	Number of programs and projects: The plan includes a large number of programs and projects, and we request the plan revisit how they are prioritized by timeframe to reduce the number of projects and programs happening in the 0-3- and 3-5-year ranges. These ranges have 35 and 33 programs forecasted, respectively. Reprioritization will better manage implementation resources and community expectations of what is feasible and possible in the timeframes available.
	Emphasize the presence of a globally diverse community: The growing international community of Oakland is missing from the current draft and does not reflect the considerable discussion had on the topic by the steering committee. One project, Global District, is included in the matrix, but more of the plan framing and substance needs to recognize Oakland as a Global hub within Pittsburgh.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
Vision Statement	<p>OBID - Proposed Vision Statement</p> <p>The overall vision is to make Oakland a great place to live, work, study and visit for all. Oakland’s mix of residential, cultural, commercial, medical and educational sites sets the platform for Pittsburgh’s world-class innovation district with a diverse population exhibiting equity, innovation, and inclusion.</p> <p>As we plan for the next 50 years for Oakland, we envision flexible planning and zoning along with ongoing and open dialogue, livability goals and the creation of good policies which will help shape and influence our vision which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Increase opportunities for all to live in Oakland by protecting and enhancing existing stable residential areas as well as by adding new housing types and additional residential choices;● Create vibrant and attractive pedestrian-scaled commercial areas through increased greenery, public amenities, public art and community-focused events and activities;● Provide wealth-building opportunities and promote entrepreneurship access for all through Oakland’s innovation and technology economies;● Increase residential serving retail, restaurants, and businesses from healthcare to groceries;● Enhance the community livability by offering a range of green and attractive public places accessible to all;● Build community by supporting everyone from short- and long-term residents, employees and business owners, students and local and destination visitors;● Provides varied and pleasant mobility options for connection among people and resources;● Promote a safe, environmentally sound resilient community; and● Create a permanent coalition of residents, community groups, property owners, anchor institutions, students, working people and private businesses that work together to plan for thoughtful and equitable change throughout Oakland.
	Could there be a new updated plan for community to see before goes to the PC?
	Will action teams reconvene? The staff has changed significantly on the action teams.
	Steering Committee did not even see the draft point system - City Planners and their partners made it. Same with Uses.
	Decision to go online was covid response, which made plan more accessible to some populations, but inaccessible to precisely the vulnerable groups who need to be considered, and so don’t capture all lived experiences.
	Older residents was mentioned very early at action teams, but par for the course that was filtered out as a specific goal.
	maybe should I stop commenting because I don’t see this going anywhere.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	When have a draft plan, we want to see revisions, want to see plan better organized and compiled and specificity to then move forward and know what has actually been approved. If leave some sections (e.g. Zulema workshop) then not clear what is in it, since lots of workshop notes.
	Walnut Capital and tail wagging dog. Unlikely to revise brand new UCMU that goes into place.
	still no tutorial about engage page
	things missing that would not have been missing if there had been more resident engagement. Resident voices – particularly voices of most vulnerable Oakland residents - were excluded from the plan process and this is what you get. Maybe pandemic was not easiest context or circumstance, but it's incumbent on plan participants and on DCP to look actively for ways to get past those issues now that it is possible to engage people in person and not just use Zoom and Engage site that never worked particularly well.
	alarmed that plan is only to be published as a website. Vehemently suggest that this is not a good idea, from own experience as website maintainer, that in 10 years will be able to make all of website work or to be able to refer to it in future or in two plans from now. E.g. original oakland plan in 1979 is available because can PDF and read since on paper.
	Language and other accessibility barriers – no translation and accessibility issues not as good as had hoped
	have been beating drum in north Oakland for residents to be engaged and make comments. Have large concentration of senior citizens who are not able to navigate an online platform. Senior citizens cannot navigate the engage page or find where the Herron Hill pumping station is mentioned. Herron Hill pumping station doesn't have a QR code in front of it...difficult to get people to participate.
	with my frustration that my comments will be ignored, I really don't feel comfortable encouraging others to "waste" time reading all of the material and trying to understand enough to make comments and suggestions.
	Please list all locations for paper copies. Christian Science Church maybe a North Oakland location to host plan. You could also drop off some copies at the CLP main branch for people to peruse and/or check out . You could also drop off some copies at the CLP main branch for people to peruse and/or check out.Put at Carnegie libraries – public and accessible. Maybe consider putting them in the little libraries as well. Andrea: little free library outside of Dana's Dunkin Duds laundromat that is used by students. Roy Weil: get to coffee shops too.
	Want a document that speaks to the communities needs so it needs to be very clear. Very clear feedback so Oakland community get issues addressed and that's what the community deserves.
	Difficult to navigate the engage page. Agreement amongst 2 Open House attendees
	What accountability measures are there to implement projects and programs.
	311 Service Request 628356 - Hearing for Oakland Plan, slated in front of Planning Commission 5/1 7, is the same day as Election day and demands it be moved due to conflict
	CMU wants a more intensive process for north Oakland zoning.
	Partial ED plan for Oakland. There are great recommendations.
	The process was very intentional throughout but rushed in its release.
	Forgot to say that comment period should be extended. The whole process should have been extended due to the many issues brought up. Several other plans supposedly helped create the framework for this plan which is going to be the model for the rest of the City. Quite frankly, that is frightening.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	Where is the tutorial that was promised for this website? Like the never-implemented IPOD, it was ignored. Understaffing, Staff turnover and brain drain all lead to continually flying through topics and terminology that most participants, especially residents have never dealt with before. Then DCP staff and private developer lawyers make decisions that only VERY loosely address concerns if at all. The point system was mentioned early on in passing, but the ridiculous allowances were never discussed. Residents were specifically asked if they'd like to have things like "corner stores" in their neighborhood again. Allegedly the overwhelming answer was "yes". But people's nostalgia for "corner stores" from decades ago are not a good basis for city planning to implement sweeping changes to mixed-use zoning. When DCP staff were asked if any study was done to estimate what those prices might be, there was none, and none since. The vast majority of the few small stores in the are essentially convenience stores for students with rather high prices that most long-term residents cannot afford. New ones aren't likely to be any cheaper. Particularly for (older) South Oakland residents, there is no longer any public transit option to get to Central Oakland. So many must rely on somebody with a car, and with no parking in Oakland, they must go outside Oakland for groceries. Adding a grocery store may help, but only if prices are reasonable and access is good. People are not going to carry a week's worth of groceries for multiple blocks.
	How will comments from the Open Houses be incorporated into the plan?
	Why is the Historic Architectural Inventory not incorporated/addressed in the Oakland Plan?
	Comment on above: Probably to avoid having to explain why this plan makes it easier to tear them down.
	The Herron Hill Pumping Station would be a fantastic opportunity to renovate into a combination of a fresh produce / grocery vendor (perhaps local farmers or co-op), a small fitness studio space and community center area. It's a beautiful structure with parking and close access to students and many families.
	The vision statement should definitely encourage and support permanent residents in Oakland. There is not sufficient support for long term residents in the vision statement or the plan itself. OPDC has several programs in place to support aging in place, we need more of such programs. We need to prominently address support for retaining current, permanent residents and encouraging more people to establish permanent residency in our neighborhoods
	Where is the vision for older Oaklanders to stay in Oakland? As they age, it is harder to maintain rental and owner occupied housing due to deteriorating physical ability and fixed income. Additional challenges should be expected in mobility and access to healthy food. Adding the aging/elderly as a vulnerable population and specific goal was REPEATELY mentioned at Action Team meetings and incorporated into various comments and the official Vision Statement. How was that removed? Why was that removed? Who thought that was a good thing?
	Comment on above: If you don't plan for and support older folks to live in the area, they probably won't. And what a shame given the amazing history of multi-generational families living here for over 100 years. Many of the aspects of this plan for rezoning and mobility not only don't encourage or support long-term residents, but seem designed to make them a thing of the past.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	<p>Forbes/Fifth needs to be UC-MU. It is not going to change the neighborhood tomorrow but it allows for the gradual changes that neighborhoods go through with time.</p> <p>Further, I think Forbes and Fifth being wide one-way avenues is something that needs to be revisited. These streets were not always this way and I do think it will be in the neighborhood's best interest to consider reverting them to two way streets. This will improve walkability, pedestrian safety and economic resilience in this corridor as the neighborhood gets more dense.</p>
	<p>I would like to see large, separate bike lanes connecting most streets in Oakland, even if this means reducing street parking.</p>
	<p>OBID's stakeholders are excited to share thoughts on expanding the existing Vision Statement as noted below to reflect the uniqueness and vibrancy of Oakland.</p> <p>The overall vision is to make Oakland a great place to live, work, study and visit for all. Oakland’s mix of residential, cultural, commercial, medical and educational sites sets the platform for Pittsburgh’s world class innovation district with a diverse population exhibiting equity, innovation, and inclusion.</p> <p>As we plan for the next 50 years for Oakland, we envision flexible planning and zoning along with ongoing and open dialogue, livability goals and the creation of good policies which will help shape and influence our vision which:</p> <p>Increase opportunities for all to live in Oakland by protecting and enhancing existing stable residential areas as well as by adding new housing types and additional residential choices;Create vibrant and attractive pedestrian scaled commercial areas through increased greenery, public amenities, public art and community focused events and activities;Provide wealth building opportunities and promote entrepreneurship access for all through Oakland’s innovation and technology economies;Increase residential serving retail, restaurants, and businesses from healthcare to groceries;Enhance the community livability by offering a range of green and attractive public places accessible to all;Build community by supporting everyone from short- and long-term residents, employees and business owners, students and local and destination visitors;Provides varied and pleasant mobility options for connection among people and resources;Promote a safe, environmentally sound resilient community; andCreate a permanent coalition of residents, community groups, property owners, anchor institutions, students, working people and private businesses that work together to plan for thoughtful and equitable change throughout Oakland.</p>

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	<p>We are homeowners and residents living on Coltart Avenue for over 50 years. We have lived here all our lives and raised our children here. We are opposed to rezoning the Oakland neighborhood and streets. The Oakland plan fails to acknowledge that there are permanent residents and long time renters in Oakland and disregards those of us living on Coltart Avenue.</p> <p>We feel that the Planning Commission has been misled by Walnut Capital into believing that the homes on Coltart Avenue are landlord owned rental properties for students. There are approximately 15 families and multiple longtime renters that reside on Coltart. It is a blatant lie when Walnut Capitols says that Coltart will not be affected by the Oakland Crossing development. Their proposed changes would affect our quality of life on a daily basis.</p> <p>We understand the need for change and and development in Oakland, but with the current proposal by Walnut Capital, Coltart Avenue becomes a dark street surrounded by 100-200 foot buildings depending on what you let them get away with. Don't forget Coltart is 20 feet below McKee Place and Halket Street, so we would be living in a sunless cave. We question whether the hillside behind our home could even support the construction of these buildings McKee? Has any study been done? Where is our guarantee that our homes will be protected? What if they damage our property or homes? They want to build on our property line. Shouldn't there be a buffer zone?</p> <p>Their plan will bring 8 years of construction affecting the residents of Coltart between the multiple different projects that include a proposed street closure that will increase traffic and delays just to leave and get home. If Walnut Capital wants to bring back families why does it not care what the current owners or the long time renters who live here think? We were not asked for our feedback when Oakland Crossing was being proposed.</p>
	<p>Comment on above: This website is for the overall Oakland Plan, but all still very valid points. With the changes to most of the rest of Central Oakland to multi-use with much higher building limits, vast demolition and construction could be happening for a very long time and completely remove the history and character of Oakland forever.</p>
	<p>Comment on above: Unfortunately, all of this is very very true. Why have we never been shown 3-dimensional diagrams of what might happen if the Oakland Plan and related Zoning are implemented? City Planning had funds to hire expensive consultants, but that money could have been better spent purchasing good 3-D rendering software. Show us the truth, not what you want us to hear.</p>

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	<p>Yes, Oakland needs work, but change for the sake of change is not always a good thing. Oakland has always been a tough place to navigate but the Oakland Plan may just add to the problems. (From livelong Oakland residents who have raised children here and would like to stay in Oakland)</p> <p>Want people to want to live in Oakland?</p> <p>-Clean up the garbage and pick up trashcans (fine landlords);</p> <p>-Go after slum landlords (don't give new developers the opportunity to just add to the problem. If "enforcement has never been sufficient to maintain single-family uses" why should we believe that will now be different????);</p> <p>-Enforce parking laws (ADA sidewalk requirements don't help when corners are blocked and calls to enforcement are ignored by the city);</p> <p>-Calming traffic (your new buzz word) with fewer lanes, less parking (off-site parking for a resident?), bump-outs (that narrow the road and make turning more dangerous) is more aggravating than calming.</p> <p>-Enforce laws against nuisance properties in a timely manner (before lifelong neighbors give up and move away);</p> <p>-Don't give bonus credits for even taller building (why does a neighborhood need tall apartment buildings and not reasonably sized buildings?)</p> <p>-Why can't Pitt help with the affordable student housing problem? (Pitt is not afraid to buy and build around Oakland so why not more student housing?)</p> <p>-Keep in mind that the expensive experiments in the 1970's in East Liberty and Allegheny Center failed. If people are forced to go around Oakland people will not be here to support the businesses. Closing roads will see to that.</p> <p>- "Reimagine Mobility Reimagine mobility systems in Oakland to prioritize the comfort and safety of pedestrians including those with accessibility needs, transit riders, and cyclists." (So tough luck if you need a car?)</p>
	Comment on above: Great comments. In particular about East Liberty and Allegheny Center. And "tough luck if you need a car". The philosophy of "don't create parking and they won't come" hasn't worked so far, and the BRT will do very little to change that, especially in the North Hills.
	Comment on above: Absolutely RIGHT ON , Zoe. I agree with all of this.
	<p>Who is going to enforce all of the elements of this plan. And what happens if there are infractions?</p> <p>Will the enforcers be required to live in Oakland? if not, why not?</p>

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	<p>Part 1: This was a big undertaking and know a lot of people were involved over a number of months. I have some concerns about plans and the planning process. How many will actually read the 140 page document? Plus, we also need to read the equally long IMPs from all the universities, understand them, comment, and approve. All the meetings and plans give the illusion (and opportunity) to get public comment and have a process, but it seems that we have created an unwieldy process that makes it hard to manage and to know what we are approving (and how the various plans align or not align). There is the possibility to manipulate or cherry pick with the plans too. Many of the public comments on Engage Pgh seemed good, so I would echo a number of them including “will City Planning conduct public meetings, once the plan is adopted, to update community on the progress/changes to the plan? What is the forum to inform the public of implementation of the plan?”</p> <p>I attended many of the Development monthly meetings in 2020-2021 and was surprised as I don’t remember hearing about the rezoning and trading “allowable building height for community benefits.” With four focus areas, some themes run throughout, but some seem to contradict or not align.</p> <p>Three new base zones proposed that don’t exist anywhere in city code (and could apply to other neighborhoods) really needs to be given a lot of thought and understanding of the implications. Inclusionary zoning, however, seems like a no brainer and we already have started it in other neighborhoods.</p> <p>Under “Community” and elsewhere, I like the valuing of college students and connecting to supportive programs (C8). Efforts to improve students’ time in Oakland with the hope of retaining them in Pittsburgh after graduation is important.If we could continue to find more ways to incentivize them and their landlords that would be good for all.</p>
	<p>Part 2: C3 – Public art isn’t defined and I hope we keep an expansive definition rather than a limited definition. In addition to current contemporary art, Oakland has a wonderful array of fountains, buildings, bridges, parks, monuments, a public shrine, and other unexpected public eye candy that was created by artisans and craftspeople that have memory and meaning to various groups, residents, visitors, etc. There is much to see outside, but there are also further treasures and art to be found inside a number of spaces too.C-2 “Policy” does mention the inside of buildings as something to value. Regarding public art (C3), it’s also good to keep in mind upkeep, maintenance (and factor in costs). Re: murals, it might be nice to have a changing/dedicated mural space where murals are up for 3-6 months (or some specified duration) and then are painted over with a new mural: Keeps it fresh, gets a number of artists in there, and if the mural isn’t someone’s cup of tea, another will be on the way...It can be hard to find art that everyone likes, so a changing mural wall would give something for everyone hopefully.</p> <p>The blending of existing and historic buildings with new buildings C2 is good (Cultural Heritage & Preservation) as long as it doesn’t mean institutions immediately resort to “facadism”(just leaving the historic façade and building a new structure behind). Facadism should be more of a last resort. Along these lines, having developers and institutions explore their options, think creatively, ensure good design, work with the community, understand/research the existing building’s history and story, and have a process.</p> <p>C4 – Regarding having a Doors Open Pittsburgh (DOP)-like event, DOP should also be listed as a potential partner as they have wanted to do an Oakland version. This would be a great way to access the many great interior spaces, works of arts, hidden gems, etc.</p> <p>Melwood Ave spelled wrong on page 13.</p>

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	<p>Part 3: C17 – public art walk- again an expanded definition would be good to include architecture since so many Oakland buildings go way beyond basic shelter. Oakland has an interesting collection of modern art and architecture too (1950-70s+), so there are opportunity for themed tours.</p> <p>C18 – help with home repair (could be part of workforce development too) is important to keep people in their homes, provide stability, fend off predatory buyers (as well as predatory reverse mortgage companies)</p> <p>Under “Development” D1 Community Reinvestment Fund – we get into some new territory here that I don’t believe was discussed in the Development meetings: “The City currently has no process in Oakland for development projects to earn additional building height in return to addressing community goals.” This will need more thought and process (also more specificity regarding community goals). I fear the pitting of allowing institutions and developers to build tall buildings (say 95 feet) in exchange for “addressing community goals.” A flag went up when I saw the possibility of encouraging more speculative development as that has already been an issue in Oakland and for other places (drives up prices, pushes people out, can create developer blight, etc). Taller development likely means more tear downs, disruption of the neighborhood’s unique human-scale, walkable building fabric, more developers rushing into to displace and tear down buildings – causing more fighting among residents. What would be gained and what would be lost needs full consideration? Also, with sustainability being an overall plan goal, the reuse of existing buildings is important and that should be incentivized.</p> <p>D 19 Land use proposals (land use through re zoning) really needs a careful look and consideration. I question if it should be part of this plan to allow more time (given recent issues regarding re-zoning too).</p>
	<p>Part 4: I don’t know how others feel, but One Centre in North Oakland removed some very handsome/unique historic buildings and built the massive 17-story building that really does not do any favors for the otherwise charming/walkable neighborhood. Hopefully the density has done some good since now are stuck with it for a little while (though newer construction may only last for some 40 years which is a sustainability issue).</p> <p>Throughout the plan, cultural heritage, existing and historic buildings are mentioned as having various value (public interest, sustainability, good quality design, etc.), but the separate 266 page “Historical Architectural Inventory” seems to be more of an afterthought and I don’t think the main plan references it and its recommendations. The recommendations from this architectural survey should likely be incorporated into the plan. And with the proposed zoning changes, we’ll lose some of these historic structures. Let’s incentivize reuse, recycling of these buildings (Infrastructure #14 prioritizes reuse) as part of our past and what contributes to the charm of Oakland (and it doesn’t need to conflict with needs for real affordable housing). If created, the Community Reinvestment Fund should also help to preserve buildings (façade grants and other incentives). Oakland already has a few local and national historic districts – we likely should exploring creating a few others.</p> <p>Mobility #35 - yes, let's reduce curb cut creation for a number of reasons (and front garages for that matter which also drive up costs).</p>
	<p>Comment on above: Long winded, but well done! Although if you think 95 is bad, 120, 185 and 220 a stone's throw or less from residential property is even more problematic, totally out of scale, and literally walls in residents with horrible visuals that no public art will overcome.</p>

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	I echo "long winded" and other's comments on enforcement of the plan, the unwieldiness of the process and other points speaking to improving affordability and non-car mobility options. I am less concerned with historical preservation than I am increasing the housing supply, though I'd prefer a measured approach there rather than wholesale demolish and construction.
Community	
	I would like to see a greater emphasis on the preservation of existing housing and encouraging affordability for permanent residents, perhaps through greater promotion of the Community Land Trust. Stronger emphasis on historic preservation and repurpose of Oakland’s public and private architecture. Development that supports and compliments historic architecture.
	Comment on above: I agree, much of the appeal in Pittsburgh is its historic architecture. Maintaining that should be taken into account when designing the new buildings that are planned to be put up. A lot of the new construction in the Strip district is an example of how new construction can change the entire "feel" of a community.
Community service hubs	Project describes community service hubs, which we agreed is best for Oakland. Header describes combining community centers in one site. Love the proposed use of the Herron Hill Pumping Station and its green space for use by the community. North Oakland has no public meeting space, as witnessed by lack of site to enter input on the Oakland Plan! Would like to see some mention of activities for both senior citizens and students both of whom live in North Oakland. Great to see short timeline for implementation of projects on city owned property
	I would not agree that employees and visitors are residents of Oakland. Please revise accordingly.
	C.1 Goals: this reads as very generic. Not Oakland specific. We want a plan specific to the needs of our neighborhood. for example, most people are within a 20-minute walk to some sort of store for basic needs. So, it doesn't really speak to Oakland very specifically. Was that a generic concept lifted from some other planning document? Representation in decision making seems out of place in that category - along with access to the riverfront. we need a goal category specifically to civic engagement and social capital in Oakland. wouldn't the vital riverfront areas item be better suited to the Infrastructure chapter? It just doesn't seem to belong there. I don't know what the neighborhood of choice item is getting at in terms of a goal as Oakland has the amenities listed. what is the goal? To have equitable access to those amenities? I could get behind that, but it needs to be revised to read that way.
	C.2 goals. the housing preservation item seems better suited for the Development chapter. we could say more here about cultural heritage and be more direct and proactive about anti-racism. so, this should be revised to remove bricks and mortar items (which should be in Development) and add more about people and culture here.
	C.4 Goal: the two items listed here are solid, but generic. They don't speak to Oakland specifically. This is a plan for the Oakland neighborhood. public safety concerns here often involve very large gatherings with lots of underage drinking that can become dangerous and cause public safety issues. they at times have also become attractive nuisances attracting criminals from other areas of the city/region to partake of unregulated alcohol/substances or sell them. through advocacy and collaboration, Oakland residents and OPDC have made great strides with enforcement partners to address these public safety issues. There should be a goal statement to reflect that such a state of affairs should continue and if there are issues, all partners spring to action collectively to address it.
	Goal C.5.A - while the concept has merit, as written this is too vague and broad to be of much use.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	Goal C.8 could go with Goal C. 4. goal C8.A neglects to mention Oakland's effective model for collaboration for code enforcement: Oakwatch. The statement is very generic. We want a plan that is specific to our neighborhood: Oakland. Why not mention Oakwatch, say that it remains strong and effective in its work? Goal C8.B - should clarify here that what is being recommended is to provide access to resources. This could be combined with recommendations for civic engagement, public resources generally rather than being under the nuisance and enforcement item. There is also nothing about rental registration - maybe that is in the Development chapter, which would be fine as a location because bricks and mortar items should go in that section. But rental registration is a program related to code enforcement, livability, safety - so it is odd that it is not included here.
	Goal C.7 - it is odd to list this goal of building community as only being in the right-of-way. please revise. We want to have programming to build community. In the right of way or other places. What is missing here is more about the value of social capital and valuing community organizing. There is nothing about maintaining neighborhood engagement, strengthening ties between residents. This is very important in a section on Community. It is left out here. We must add this in. Also, strengthening dialogue between divergent groups. Organizing to assist resident to have access to resources and services. Networks built between and among residents to support each other. There is so much about actual community that is missing from this chapter called Community. We must revise.
	Policy C.1 - some mention of civic engagement in a reactive sense, but nothing about social capital, social networks amongst people themselves. access to basic needs really speaks to Development chapter - what you are talking about is bricks and mortar policy. having it here does nothing that we can act upon. so that policy is not useful for our plan. Prioritize people of ages/abilities: similarly, this should be in the Mobility chapter. it is not useful here. What's missing from this policy point are Oakland-specific community policies that support community ties, social capital, and civic engagement. that is what should be contained in this chapter.
	Policy C. 2 - these are bricks and mortar items that belong in Development chapter, not here. We must have items in the correct chapters in order for this plan to be useful for our community. Please revise to put these items in the appropriate chapter.
	C8 in Goals is too specific. We need enforcement of health, parking, occupancy, safety for ALL residents. Landlord registration is to help- but I am doubting that. What is needed is existing ordinances and a city law department that is not afraid to go after slum/absentee landlords and parking scofflaws.
	Enforcement is a huge issue. If it is ever regularly more expensive to get parking tickets than to illegally park in Oakland, that would be a big help. That goes with many other issues like garbage handling etc.
	I like how the fact they are looking into making Oakland a more vibrant and social place for people of all classes. i feel like them wanting all this affordable living and spending places would be a good thing for the income of traffic to Oakland and also the social life. and making all these arts and community day like things of bringing people together is a good thing for the city. it would definitely be a good place to be that sounds fun, secure, and safe.
	Policy C.2 - blend historic and new development: what incentives accompany this statement? Without financial assistance, design guidelines, or incentives, this is unlikely to be realized.
	Policy C.4 nighttime safety: per the language in this statement, it clearly belongs in the other chapters of the plan - mobility. Also, what is the way that we will know if this is achieved? It is vague: what do you mean by mobility option? what do you mean by emergency services in this statement?
	C.4 Policy - public safety - engagement. Yes, that belongs in this chapter.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	C.5 Policy - Public facilities and services: invest in community and recreation facilities: this should have very specific recommendations for facilities, based on analysis of existing facilities and specific recommendations for what is missing. services and programs at community facilities should be in this chapter, but seem to be missing. Given the length of this plan process, this should have specificity based on analysis rather than a vague statement that does not have clear direction. this make it very difficult for the community to use this plan in implementation. You state "policy and fire stations" - need to correct the typo as you must mean "police" - but more importantly: are we in fact in need of more fire stations? if so, where? that would be in the development or infrastructure chapter, it would seem to me. Thus, this statement is formless and of little use to us as a community going forward. Are the city police zones changing and we would therefore see a police station in Oakland? I doubt that. Let's rid this document of statements that are vague, unhelpful. How do we define "adequate services"? Where is the analysis showing us what is needed and how to measure whether it is adequate? the open space recommendations should be in the infrastructure chapter.
	C.6 Policy - Public health: universal design. your statement conflates universal design with other public health programs and services. they should be separated to be more useful. For universal design, it would best be located in the Development chapter, as it relates to bricks and mortar - so part of design guidelines. here in this chapter, we may have a focus on universal design in principle, but have recommendations for programs and services to meet the needs of persons with diverse abilities. Or you are making a recommendation that there be case management support, mental health resources, health programming and education for those with diverse abilities, but there is nothing about those services in general. Also, where is the analysis of what services are needed? Case management at what scale? for whom? what mental health resources are missing? there certainly are mental health resources in Oakland today. So, what do you mean specifically with this policy item? what health programming is needed? Health education? What analysis led to this recommendation? How will we know when we've met the need and achieved success? Without these items, this policy recommendation is not useful to the Oakland community during implementation.
	C.6 Policy - public health - increase food access: This needs to be more specific to be useful. what is the analysis of the scale of food insecurity in Oakland? Who needs the services specifically? food pantries do provide access to healthy food, as do farmers markets and grocery stores. So, what is this policy recommendation really saying? It is vague. What is the specific action? How does the community take this statement forward into implementation? How is this a policy action? It is so vague that it will not be useful and then no action will be taken.
	C.8 - Policy - nuisance and enforcement - rental registry is city-wide. Yes, we want it to be enforced here. But what is the specific policy recommendation for this Oakland plan? we could track data related to registrations, inspections and conduct analysis. could provide education to Oakland landlords (OPDC already does this, so can be a recommendation to bolster and continue). This may be a program item, but I don't see it in the other portions of this chapter. Please change the language of "manage occupancy issues" as it is too vague. Please edit to: "enforce occupancy limits of the city of pittsburgh code (provide citation)". Here the policy can be more specific to describe the resources to be deployed in order to achieve this. Enforcement of more than three unrelated persons in a housing unit is a significant issue in Oakland. We should spell this out more clearly why it is an issue and how it relates to safety concerns, escalation of property prices, displacement of long-term homeowner residents, and other neighborhood quality concerns. Setting enforcement of the occupancy law as a priority would be very beneficial. This recommendation should include ways that various public agencies can work together on enforcement. Also, education for landlords and renters can be helpful in an effort to avoid the issue in the first place. showing how rental registry can play a part in this would be important as this section is revised.
	Comment on above: I see today in the PG that Rental Registry is still (or again) being challenged. Doubt we will ever see it fully.
Connect students to supportive programs	c.8 project - funding would be needed if this involved staff time.
Community building events	C.6 program - I suggest editing this so that the primary goal is to build relationships among residents themselves. Building social capital among Oakland residents is a high priority to develop strong social networks for Oakland residents themselves. This will support strong resident organizations and better networks to connect residents to resources and civic engagement opportunities. We can also develop metrics to measure success.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
Community building events	<p>Comment on above: C6. program. We need a local newspaper -- similar to what the Oakland News did for us decades ago. This would promote locate community groups and their activities.</p> <p>We need loops busses throughout Oakland for various residents to get around our neighborhood. Students have their university transportation, but residents have no convenient (and free) way to get from one part of Oakland to another. Re: Oakland Loop Bus. Such buses would certainly promote community building.</p>
Homeowner rehab program	C.10 program - OPDC has existing programs to support home repair and maintenance. Given that they are existing, I would revise the timeframe on this item to be ongoing rather than starting in 3 years. More resources are needed to fund the programs. We offer home repair grants for senior homeowners under 80% AMI that is related to the Oakland CLT. We support home maintenance so that homeowners can safely age in place and also retain homes for affordable homeownership in the future. This is the comprehensive approach that is needed to support overall health of our residential neighborhoods. We also have a facade grant program - matching grant with no income qualification; no match required for homeowners under 80% AMI. Thus, this item should be edited to be more specific as indicated here.
Honor Oakland's heritage	<p>C.11 program: this item should be edited to reflect the fact that this plan process included the report: Oakland Historic Architecture Inventory Report. Why is this item written as though that document does not exist? Edit to state that guided by the report, the community and partners in the preservation community will work to nominate areas/structures as city designated or NRHP. Actions can also include providing educational opportunities for the community to learn more about the resources identified in the report and to pursue the items for further study that the report indicates.</p> <p>This will need to be referenced to the Development chapter as well. In order to reconcile potential conflicts of zoning changes and historic architecture/historic preservation, we will need to consider incentives and financial resources to support preservation and restoration of historic assets. Development pressure will make wholesale demolition more and more likely. Identifying areas/buildings for preservation is a high priority and addressing the financial needs of restoring historic buildings is a need that this plan should address.</p>
Honor Oakland's heritage	Comment on above: good points. I believe the houses that Walnut Capital want to demolish on Halket could have historic value. Please check with the Historic folks. They are great homes that should never be torn down — especially if replaced by an (up to) 400 foot long structure which is permitted in the zoning code I believe
Honor Oakland's heritage	Comment on above: The houses on Halket have no significant historical value. They have been sub-divided and used as rentals for years. We need increased density to prevent urban sprawl. It is time for Oakland to become a more dense city.
Honor Oakland's heritage	Comment on above: Oakland isn't a city, it's a neighborhood, and like many neighborhoods, used to be separate if not autonomous and eventually annexed by the City of Pittsburgh. Urban sprawl is an ongoing reality, see also Philadelphia (County). Overbuilding here won't ever stop it. It is driven by overall population and cyclic focus on, and desirability of, city or suburb/rural living. Subdivision of buildings does not necessarily reflect on historic designation. Many of those buildings that I've seen inside, have very impressive interiors. Replacing them with MASSIVE single block-long 400ft wide by 120ft, 185ft, 220 ft high behemoths will not be pretty and do very little to promote community.
Honor Oakland's heritage	Comment on above: Architectural consultants for this plan suggested they be considered for historical designation based on their architecture.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
Honor Oakland's heritage	<p>Comment on above: Fine, Oakland is a neighborhood in the city of Pittsburgh, really doesn't matter for the question of density. Neighborhoods come in all shapes and sizes around the world. Some with tightly pack dense buildings, others with smaller houses and lawns. Having tall buildings does not make or break a community. You can meet or ignore your neighbor just as easily on a street filled with rowhouses or in an apartment building.</p> <p>The definition of overbuilding - "to build houses or commercial developments in excess of demand" - the neighborhood of Oakland has a huge unfulfilled demand for more housing of all types. There is no danger of "overbuilding". Increasing density is the answer to limiting urban sprawl. If the people can't live in Oakland then they need to live somewhere. Where is new housing stock being built in the city of Pittsburgh? The Strip, East Liberty, etc. but not really in Oakland. A lot more is being built up by Cranberry and in the Norhthills. We need more housing solutions here. I understand it is hard to watch a community switch from a low density to high-density - I have seen it myself in DC. This is the time to switch to higher density and allow more people to live in Oakland.</p> <p>I do think we need to think about creating more community spaces in the neighborhood of Oakland, planting more trees, do curb cuts for stormwater drainage, etc. There are lots of ways to create community. Take out a section of street parking and put in some bocci ball courts.</p> <p>It would be great if there was a large parking lot like they have in Shadyside by the hospital, right in Bates valley. That could help remove hundreds of cars from Oakland. Throw a green roof on top and now you have a great place for field sports - we need more green space for youth activities. It could connect with the new redevelopment.</p>
Organize around food access	<p>C. 15 program - We should revise this recommendation to be based in data analysis of existing sources of food. Most residential areas are in walking distance of a food store of some type. We could offer financial support/incentives to those stores to improve their fresh food offerings as needed. It would be good to include in this recommendation addressing food insecurity and supporting organizing and outreach to people experiencing it. Also, support for a network of food pantries (this is ad hoc at this time and could be bolstered with planning and funding). Related here to food insecurity, but also to C.20 senior services, it would be good to explore a program like meals on wheels for seniors. community garden sites might belong in the infrastructure chapter.</p>
Arts and design committee, Live-work spaces for artist, Public art walks, Support diversity in the artist community	<p>Let's consolidate C.5, C.13, and C. 17 to have this organized a bit better. Further comment: C.21 consolidated with these also</p>
Targeted anti-displacement program	<p>C.23 program - this recommendation should be revised to specify stay in their homes as well as stay in the neighborhood. It is vague as written. If existing homeowners, programs can meet needs to remain in home (OPDC offers currently). If a renter at risk of displacement, we may offer services to move to homeownership here in Oakland - so to stay in the community but move from renting to owning. We also offer services to access rental assistance, financial coaching, access to income supports, employment counseling. OPDC offers a program aimed specifically to address people of color who are renting and at risk of displacement. Our program provides education and grant funds for people of color to purchase a home in the Oakland Community Land Trust. This program's specific aim is to address our racial homeownership gap and our racial wealth gap here in Oakland. It also supports social capital, community ownership, and permanent affordable homeownership. So, please edit this recommendation to support existing programs, grow them - rather than just creating new/ignoring existing. We need to invest in our existing community strengths. Also, potential funding sources are broader that those you list - add state, foundation. Remove OPDC from a funding source. We would be project lead and raise the funds from other funding source.s</p>
Free access to cultural institutions	<p>I think it will be a better way to connect the community and get the necessities of the community. I also think once they get the wants and needs for the community, they can keep adding to it as more thoughts and ideas come along in the future.</p>

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
Free access to cultural institutions	Comment on above: I agree that this will be a great addition to the neighborhood to increase community connection. Currently I think access to cultural amenities is highly focused on students, so I think the survey will help decision makers better understand the variety of residents present in Oakland. Like you said, once the needs and wants of the community is establish, young and elderly alike, they can give better access to cultural and recreational places. I'm mostly thinking about the museum and Phipps. Having a reduced price for residents would benefit both the users and cultural places.
Community Service Hubs	if this community center had some restaurants or vendors inside I'd be there a all the time
Improve after school opportunities	The long-term residents of Oakland have jobs that often require them to work hours that conflict with the normal schedule of school aged children (i.e. healthcare workers, foodservice workers for the universities etc.). With parents being out of the house it is important to implement after school opportunities to provide children with the ability to interact with their peers and grow with the community. The best way to invest in Oakland is to invest in the youth of the long-term residents.
Improve after school opportunities	It is important to note in this section that OPDC has a successful program model with a well-honed curriculum, School to Career. This model for high school students is an asset for the community upon which to build and adapt to meet neighborhood families' needs.
Oakland as a Civic Laboratory	I think this is a wonderful plan to ensure the overall plan continues to grow with the community and with its needs. Oakland has many student residents that come and go as they graduate, so this plan should offer opportunities for new comers to also have a say in what projects are funded in their community. This allows for that. I am wondering how this will be advertised and how accessible will it be to submit project ideas. Who will hear about the community based-process and how will the residents get involved in the decision making?
Oakland as a Civic Laboratory	I caution us to avoid the laboratory concept. Oakland residents don't need to be experiments. Oakland community members often feel that they are overly "planned" or experimented due to the many student class projects and such that involve time and energy but may not result in change after the class ends. This recommendation would be improved to simply state that the goal is to provide flexible source of funds in modest amounts with few restrictions so that Oakland residents can implement resident-serving programs. Similarly, decisions should be made by Oakland residents. I would not agree that OTF would be the appropriate group to determine funding allocation if this is for residents, then residents should determine the allocations.
Resident Representatives	Correction needed: it is not accurate that existing home repair programs require the homeowner to get contractor bids themselves prior to being enrolled in the program. OPDC offers a home repair program for seniors and is an administrator for the URA HAP. Your statement is not true for either of those. Please make the correction.
Scale Up Childcare Services	might be worth revising in light of current state of Build Back Better bill. I'd like to see mention of prioritizing slots for Oakland residents and prioritizing employment opportunities for Oakland residents at childcare centers.
Oakland as civic laboratory	Remove OnePgh as an implementer and funder.
	C7- Community Uses in the Right-of-Way. I believe there should be C7.B for items such as the Greenway along Lawn Street. That is, consider the use of right-of-ways for items such as Community Gardens and Walking Tracks.
	consider a NID for Central Oakland - this should be a project or program recommendation
	Is there a reference page for abbreviations like NID? This website and this plan are long, complicated and exhausting to read through. It's hard to understand and comment on such things.
	Looking at the Policies section, the majority of the items read more like goals: they lack the specificity necessary for them to be considered policies. After all this time, why is this section still so vague? Shouldn't there be some details included as to how these will be accomplished? For example, Goal and Policy C-1 discussed civic engagement and community involvement in the decision-making process, but there is no mention of how, exactly, this will happen. Free access to cultural institutions is great, but it is hardly the most important portion of this goal, and yet it is fleshed out while others are still very much lacking detail.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
Support resident access to resources	C-22: How will this increase in staffing at non-profits and institutions be financed? This is a great idea, but without a real plan, it has no legs. Will the City subsidize this effort? Or will the groups themselves be responsible for securing this funding? If the latter, it will place an enormous amount of strain on local groups because they must hire/reallocate and train staff in addition to spending time applying for grants to pay them. Anyone who has participated in either of these processes knows that they are often quite intensive; putting this onus on local groups will force them to choose between these new responsibilities and fulfilling those that they already have.
Senior services	<p>Program C-20: Volunteers can be a wonderful source of human capital, but in a place like Oakland, these volunteers are often students. Students are an inherently ephemeral population and should not be relied on to provide these kinds of service; vulnerable populations benefit the most from consistent, long-term relationships, as these allow the building of trust and understanding. Short-term engagements are best suited for discrete projects with tangible outcomes, like rejuvenation and beautification projects.</p> <p>Also regarding C-20: who will screen and train these volunteers? Elder care can be quite multifaceted, and training for these volunteers must be an intentional process, not an afterthought.</p>
Live-work spaces for artists	C-13: I love the idea of live-work spaces for local artists, but shouldn't we focus first on creating affordable housing for all, not just artists? There is a shameful lack of affordable housing options in the area, and allocating portions of Oakland's already strained real estate options for this project seems misguided.
Community service hubs	<p>We greatly need community service hubs which we need Oakland. Having combined services in one site is what we need. Seniors services need to be included in these centers.</p> <p>The proposed use of the Herron Hill Pumping Station and its surrounding property is a great opportunity for our community.</p>
Improve after school opportunities	<p>School-age children enjoy interacting with young adults, so perhaps after-school programs could provide part-time jobs for college students. This would give children role models who are pursuing higher education, some of whom grew up in other countries or other parts of the U.S. and can share their perspectives. Because university classrooms are fully booked only during the same hours that K-12 schools are in session, those classrooms may be able to do double duty hosting after-school programs.</p> <p>Prioritizing enrollment of Oakland residents in Oakland after-school programs will be necessary to achieve the goal of getting to know other Oakland kids--because parents working in Oakland who live other places will like the idea of having their kids in after-school care near work. There is a shortage of after-school programs in most parts of the metro area.</p>
	All community residents participating in decision-making roles must be reimbursed for their time. Explore whether it's possible to offer choices for reimbursement (cash, transit funds, other). This policy should be expanded city-wide.
C-1, Free access to cultural institutions	The Peterson Event Center is listed as part of the cultural district in the draft plan. We are not able to commit free access. We do donate tickets frequently to community groups but cannot agree to universal, free access.
C-6, Community building events	Please add short-term residents.
C-5, Arts & design committee	Strike specific Pitt representatives (Arts and Design Faculty) and insert Pitt Art Committee representation. This provides us flexibility and ensures alignment with campus public art efforts. Please specify the goals of the committee. Why is no funding source needed? We assume there would be funding needed to implement recommendations/actions of the committee.
C-7, community service hubs	Pitt is not in a position to fund centers but is happy to support programmatically. This is an example of a program that needs far more extensive planning discussions (per our feedback memo).

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
C-11, Honor Oakland's heritage	Would like the city to consider adding Pitt and any other relevant institutions. What would be funded and what would be the funding responsibility of the institutions?
C-12, Improve after school opportunities	Pitt is able to be a programmatic partner but would need more specific clarity about the funding responsibility of the institutions.
C-14, Oakland as civic laboratory	What would be the funding responsibility of the institutions? Programmatically, we are very interested in being a partner. We caution on the use of the word, "laboratory" to describe a community: it could be perceived as denoting treating Oakland as an experiment to be studied.
C-18, resident representatives	We agree that resident participation (especially in neighborhood associations, civic processes, and development input) is critical. Much more definition and planning is necessary for this program. What funding would be expected of Pitt?
C-19, Scale up childcare services	What funding would be sought from Pitt?
C-23, Targeted anti-displacement program	Again a very good idea. What funding would be sought from Pitt? We recommend this be started sooner than year 3.
	the section reads as a residential neighborhood plan and does not fully capture the unique nature of Oakland as a community that includes many stakeholder groups with identified, shared goals that exist between residents, institutions, businesses, and cultural entities. We request that additional discussion with Oakland institutions be held before the plan is finalized to better understand if their needs are represented in the plan.
	for the projects and programs listed, considerable capacity building is needed to ensure there is a diverse set of community-based organizations identified as leads and partners. In the current draft OPDC is listed for almost every project and program. Though OPDC is a strong and central Oakland organization, that is undue reliance on one specific organization and does not recognize the diversity of community-serving organizations needed to steward a strong community. We request that a strategy be written for Building the Capacity for existing neighborhood-based groups and development of future community organizations that will be required to carry out the plan.
	As mentioned earlier, the projects and programs need greater specificity before we would be comfortable being listed as a lead, partner, or funder (either called out by name as the University of Pittsburgh or by being considered part of the institutions stakeholder group). While we are supportive of these initiatives, we request planning meetings occur for these initiatives before the plan is finalized so that those stakeholders listed for each project or plan can come to agreement on the nature of their involvement. (Community service hubs, Oakland as Civic Laboratory, Partnership for health & safety, community building events, honor oakland's heritage, oakland town center, revolving loan program)
	Additionally, for every project that lists institutions as funders, we request that before the plan is finalized that there are discussions with the University of Pittsburgh about what funding would be sought from the University and the feasibility of Pitt providing that funding. We are very supportive of the initiatives being proposed, but there is significant institutional funding already being directed to community-led initiatives and significant funding being allocated to the community-facing programs outlined in Pitt's Institutional Master Plan.
C-7, community service hubs	PID would like to be included as a partner
C-8	PID would like to be included as a partner
C-12, Improve after school opportunities	PID would like to be included as a partner
C-14, Oakland as civic laboratory	What is this and how is it funded? Oakland commercial districts should be eligible as well.
C-22	Will this include residents who rent as well? How is home repair program being funded? It should not be funs for residents only - small businesses should be eligible as well.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	<p>"C1 - Increase access to daily needs." - Grocery, grocery, grocery! GROCERY STORE PROJECT PLEASE. If we have no cars everyone needs to be within a few blocks of a grocery store. We need more access to affordable vegetables, preferably one that is independent enough that prices stay low. If possible, use green space on the roof as a park or build apartment buildings on top of the grocery store. It will probably need a parking garage underneath</p> <p>"C1 Blend historic and new development" - we need incentives for existing historical buildings that are Housing associations to maintain and repair themselves. HOAs almost never qualify for federal or state tax credits, get higher rates on loans, and currently require more expensive permits for work (\$1000/apartment permit vs \$300/house permit). To preserve historic buildings please structure rules to include HOAs opportunities.</p> <p>"C3 Public art" - Murals are art installations too! I would love some green in the winter on some of the sad, sad concrete. Calming, beautiful plants are hard to dislike. The pigeon in East Liberty is also pretty nifty. Psychedelic murals can be a bit overwhelming.</p> <p>"C5 invest in community and recreational facilities" - yes more parks that are small and disperse please! Wooden benches to sit on, that both dry off quickly and don't get cold in the winter, would be amazing.</p> <p>"C6 Increase Food access" - Please make a grocery store (and/or more affordable vegetables for sale) a PRIORITY. I want to see it on the project list. What companies is the city working with? What sites have been identified? Where are there opportunities to build housing on top of the store or to build green space on the roof?</p> <p>"C7 Enliven public streets" - I would love it if the southern part of Craig street were a pedestrian only space and that cars were directed to parking all around this pedestrian space. I realize that is difficult. Dithridge by the Mellon institute might be an option- or the side streets that connect Dithridge to S Bellefield or Craig could become mini parks.</p> <p>"C8 - Enforce the Rental Registry Program"- Yes please!</p>
	<p>It is too difficult to figure out where one is in the structure of this entire web presence. When I ready something and then go onto another section, there is no way (that I can see) to search and get back to a the previous section where I want to make a comment. Not a user-friendly interface at all. It should be if you truly want user and citizens/residents to comments and question.</p>
	<p>Comment on above: Early comments to City Planning about the difficulty of navigating the website and understanding what is on it were not acted on. Promised tutorial for the comment period never appeared.</p>
	<p>and if one makes a mistake, one cannot go back and edit it. Once more, not a user-friendly web site. Besides, many of my community do not have access to wifi and computers, so do not see this information. How can they be expected to react to what is on this site -- they cannot do that and you certainly know that and have just written their options off as immaterial.</p> <p>Followed by another comment: Oh! I do see that I can delete a comment that I have made, but really don't see any way to update an existing entry.</p> <p>Followed by another comment: The online tutorial that was promised to us (but never came to fruition) might have helped to explain this functioning.</p>

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	"a community of choice": 1) If you really want a "community," you should concentrate on providing homes for families. Long-term renters could be families, if the buildings are designed to encourage that, and are affordable. "Communities" are not formed in ten-story buildings where the residents are just passing through. Perhaps there could be a study of recent-vintage large apartment buildings in Pittsburgh to find out if any have long-term renters (and families?) or if there is inevitably high turnover. 2) Families with children will "choose" neighborhoods with schools. What can the city do to re-establish any of the several lost schools in Oakland? 3) Neighborhoods with a significant proportion of long-term residents make for safety ("eyes on the street"), mutual trust, and stability. 4) A goal of 10% affordable units is too low: what can be done to encourage (force?) developers to do better in this regard?
	Comment on above: I agree with Kathy.
	Comment on above: I agree with Kathy.
	<p>I think the occupancy code in Pittsburgh needs to be redone. To enforce the code as written is harmful to many communities. It does not make logical sense that a family of unlimited size can live in a house together, but only three unrelated individuals can live in the same house.</p> <p>Here are some scenarios that would be illegal if the code was enforced as written.</p> <p>Imagine a four bedroom house, a single mom and her two children, if she chooses to have a partner and that partner moves into the house before marriage the entire family could be evicted based upon these rules.</p> <p>Again, same four bedroom house, four adult refugees living together to save money, they too would be in violation.</p> <p>Same for four college students who would like to live near campus so they don't have to drive share a house - they too would be in violation.</p> <p>The list of four non-family members combinations is virtually endless - all of which would be in violation of the city code.</p> <p>The code as written is legal way to to keep the "undesirables" out of a community. It is strongly supported by the large landlords that benefit by limiting the amount of rental space available which then in turn leads to higher prices because of the limited rental options.</p> <p>Some would argue that there are safety concerns - okay, same four bedroom house, how are the safety concern higher if four unrelated people are living in the house versus four family members? Hiding behind "safety concerns" is also another tool to enforce these racist, anti-affordable housing, anti-non-traditional family, xenophobic, policies.</p> <p>Historically these homes have always had many more individuals living in them.</p> <p>There could also be unintended consequences of reducing the density of students in Oakland. If a large number of students are forced out of the area, they will need to live somewhere. Surrounding neighborhoods will see an influx of student rentals, thereby driving up rental prices in those areas; there will be increased traffic because students will need to have cars to get around, etc.</p> <p>The counter-argument could be that the universities need to provide more housing - okay, where are they going to build? Pitt already has plans to tear down many of the houses on Atwood and businesses to put in more housing. These properties will no longer collect property tax because they will be part of the University.</p> <p>Increased density by a better creating a better occupancy code is the best way to increase affordable housing. It is also the most environmental/sustainable approach as well. The more people using a shared resource the better. The more students who can live within walking distance of campus the better. The more houses that have student housing that are privately owned the more tax revenue return to the city and our school district.</p> <p>I think this plan needs to be redone with a great emphasis on student and supporting their needs. We should make Oakland the student destination. This will encourage them to live here versus out in other neighborhoods. Lean into the strength of what we have.</p> <p>We need a plan that allows for more development across Oakland. Too much of the currently building stock is in poor condition. The more housing that we can provide the more people we can have in the area. Stop the enforcement of an out-of-date occupancy code.</p>

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	Comment on above: The occupancy rules may be a bit problematic on enforcement, but eliminating them based on these allegations of racism etc, seems a bit of a stretch. If property owners hadn't already been violating the rules to stuff too many students in because collectively they can pay more rent than a (single or double parent) family.
	<p>neighborhood that I live in. At one of the Steering Committee meetings I understand that there was a consultant about density who said that density is NOT better from many perspectives.</p> <p>Over occupancies creates more rubbish, more noise, more damage to homes, more cars looking for parking.</p> <p>The universities should simple build satellite campuses. Besides, many students found that online learned worked quite well.</p>

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	<p>Comment on above: There are a couple of issues comtated in this thread. Let's take them apart</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Parking - Parking will always be an issue in a city that was built when public transportation was more common (trollies) and cars less so. The way to solve the parking issue is to limit each physical address to 1 or 2 cars. You could even say if you have a driveway you are not allowed a permit. I agree with a system that better limits the number of car permits per house. The issue of renters vs. families is immaterial - a family of four could easily have four cars if both adults and any of the kids have cars.- Rubbish - Rubbish can be generated by families and renters. Walk around on a spring day and see how much rubbish that has been tossed down the hillsides behind long-time residents and rentals. This is not just an Oakland issue, it happens across the city. There are rules on the books for rubbish-related issues, just enforce them more. The city should also consider picking up recycling every week. Also, we need a better system/drop off location for hard to recycle and hazardous items like paints, solvents, televisions, e-waste, etc.- Noise - Again there are rules on the books, parties happen both at rentals and owner occupied locations. I am all for people being able to have freinds and family over to their home. After 10 on the weeknights and 11 on the weekend quiet the party down. To me the noise pollution (and air) is the use of leaf blowers and gas powered lawn mowers.- Satellite Campus - Building more outside the city core is exactly the wrong approach environementally. The city of Pittsburgh has the infrastructure to support 600,000 people - we are no where near those numbers. Everytime something get built outside of the city more urban sprawl occurs. We are losing more and more farmland and forest land due to these practices. This is what increased density is all about. More people using a finite resource.- Online Learning - My daughter who attends Pitt had a horrible time with online learning. This is not what college is supposed to be a about. It was super anti-social and did not allow her to work with her other classmates outside of class. There are many studies showing the huge increase in anxiety and mental health disorders from the all time being spent online. We to create more community spaces for people to gather.- Enforcement of Occupancy Code - There is clearly a potential for racism or heteronormative family standards in the enforcement. Since enforcement is done based upon complaints from neighbors or "neighborhood watch" groups, they can pick and choose who they call to report. Here is a simple example, four Lantino men shared a house to save money - if a nosy neighbor doesn't like those "Mexicans" in their neighborhood they could call them in. But if a white couple made up of two divorced adults who are not married and thier kids move in - the nosy neighbor wouldn't know that they were in violations of the code. The system current system gives too much power to individual neighbors to enforce who they want in their neighborhood. I work with the immigrant community, they are under great pressure to work hard and save money. It is such a point of privilege to sit back and say there should only be three unrelated individuals in a four bedroom house. Same for students or any other groups of individuals who decide to live together to share expenses or to try to create a shared community.- Landlords - I have lived in Pittsbugh for 35 years, I haved lived in many sections of the city, Southside, Mount Washington, Freindship, Squirrel Hill, and now for the past 23 years in Oakland. When I was younger, some of places I stayed in were budget accommodations, I didn't pay much rent and landlord didn't reinvest much into the building. This is the same issue in Oakland (and the rest of the world) - there some great landlords and some poor/bad ones. Having more housing options in the zone would put greater pressure on landlords to rise to competition to attract renters.- Students are the reason for Oaklands success - without three vibrant Univeristies what would Oakland be? We need to drastically increase the density of Oakland, I
	<p>I think there should be a plan to redevelop Louisa Street into a more pedestrian-friendly alternative to Fobes Ave. The whole street could become an outdoor seating area with food trucks and outdoor amenities. We need more outdoor seating venues and park areas. This would create a great commnity zone.</p>
	<p>Comment on above: Dear Oakland Resident, closing Louisa St and for such limited access would not be helpful in the short or long run. This is Pittsburgh, with limited good weather opportunities all around, and huge dropoff of demand in the summer. Long range plans are great, but the immediate issues also need to be addressed. Cars are here, and going to be here for decades, especially coming from out in the suburbs and surrounding towns/cities, and the data from the Residential Parking Permit Program have not shown any decrease in local demand for parking. Having to traverse huge blocks between bates to Sennott or Forbes will only make things worse, even dangerous when you consider emergency vehicle access.</p>

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	<p>Comment on above: But, some of us disagree. We elderly residents need to keep the streets open so that we have easy access to hospitals and doctors. We need cars to get around in, since walking to a bus stop is difficult. When any street gets closed, it limits our options for travel and confuses us. Be kind to the elderly and keep streets open.</p>
	<p>Comment on above: Cities around the world are converting streets into more pedestrian-friendly zones with huge success. I attended the Pro Walk Pro Bike Conference (PWPB) https://www.walkbikeplaces.org/ in 2014 that was held here in Pittsburgh, it was an eye-opener as to what other cities are doing across the world. I also attend many PWSA meetings where I learned about the opportunities for community revitalization through green infrastructure.</p> <p>Let's address the concerns, good weather days - at the PWPB one of the conference speakers addressed that very question about how many good weather days we have here. He suggested that we have over 300+ days a year that weather would allow for events to take place. He then went on to list events that do well here despite the cold like First Night and Downtown Holiday Market. I liked his comment that said that there is no such thing as bad weather - just bad clothing. When I was visiting Russia, restaurants in early spring had outdoor seating but they provided all the guests with blankets.</p> <p>Closing streets - Major cities like NYC have closed streets to allow for more green and community space. In Times Square the same complaint about safety access was thrown around but in the end, the closing of the streets made it safe for pedestrians, cars, and emergency vehicles. I think closing the section of Louisa Street next to the community center and fire department would be a great test for a community space. There are many ways a street can be closed. It could be closed on the weekend, evenings, all the time, etc. We need to get out of the mindset of being car-focused. I always hear Oakland non-profits clamoring about having more community get-togethers - why have a space like Louisa Street - and then program a bunch of cool stuff throughout the year. Look at what the PDP has done for Downtown. They have hundreds of events that draw people into the area. We need a group who can do that for Oakland and a space where that can be done.</p> <p>Public Transportation - I agree we need a better inter-Oakland bus loop. Why do Pitt and CMU have their own shuttles when one free shuttle for anyone in the community would be much better? Better signage of where bus routes go and posted timetable would be huge. I would use the bus more if I easily knew where it went.</p> <p>We need to increase the density and amenities in this zone so that students will feel like they need to bring a car to school. Also by adding a wider range of housing types we will attract a wider range of residents. We bought our house in Oakland in the mid-90's the place was a dump, we gutted, rewired, sheet rocked, sanded, etc. Not every young family has the time, patience, or money to live through a multi-year redo. We need a plan for new energy-efficient housing stock that attracts employees and young professionals. It would be great if everyone could live in a four-bedroom house, with a picket fence, a half-acre of lawn but that is not the reality of living in an urban center.</p> <p>I strongly support the elderly, I am frequently shoveling my elderly neighbors' sidewalks but it breaks my heart to see them in huge old homes that they can not keep up. It is expensive and dangerous when things are not maintained. I know of two elderly neighbors who are desperate to stay in the neighborhood but there is a lack of housing options. I strongly believe that more transitional and mixed-aged housing should be built - hence the increase in density. There often comes a time when</p>
	<p>There is too much emphasis on creating family housing in this plan. We need more and better student housing.</p>
	<p>Comment on above: No - I believe that the plan has too much "transitional" housing. That's for people who want to live in a high-rise. Do we see any room to single family homes (not high rises) like row houses or duplex or single houses? I don't think so.</p>

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	<p>The Pittsburgh Innovation District suggests the following edits to C-13 Program:</p> <p>Live-work spaces for artists and entrepreneurs: this should also include live-work spaces for residents connected to the innovation economy. We want to see entrepreneurs live and work in Oakland.</p>
	It seems that non-residents have a stronger voice than me about what my part of Oakland will look like in the future. Those who live here must have stronger voices than those who work here or are here just for a couple/few years for school. We need a community center, building should not be so high/long, we need a loop bus, we need no bus layover (if one would fit in zoning). Many of my neighbors to not us technology. You need to find better ways to reach them.
	Comment on above: Sadly this is the result because the Steering Committee was purposely designed to allow only five of 35 people representing Oakland neighborhood groups. The universities had nine - three each. The Action Teams could have anyone on them, some of whom were paid consultants or it was job-related. "Engagement" with this website was a challenge for many residents and remained virtually unchanged despite early and ongoing complaints. I know of 311 entries that I can't find here despite this being touted as the repository for all comments and what is to last for years.
	There are many single family homes in my neighborhood that have been granted "two-family" status illegally with somebody in the city looking up phone numbers from the 1950s. If there was more than one phone listed, the applicant was granted a two family Occupancy Permit. In most cases, that two family designation was not remotely true. All of the two family Occupancy Permits in Oakland should be examined to see when, who, and why they were granted. Ones that are incorrectly should be canceled retroactively.
	Support for Oakland's residential organizations needs to be provided so they can continue to advocate for and strengthen their neighborhoods. This can be in the form of meeting spaces or financial.
	Comment on above: Yes, please include financial backing for Community Organizations and for a local resident newspaper for various neighborhoods. And free convenient meeting space is critical.
	Why don't we Oakland Residents have access to our riverfront? We see it everyday. We hear and see the boats from the great views that we (still) have (sometimes). Yet, without being a paying member of the Yacht Club on the Southside, we have no convenient or easy access to the river. No benches, no docks, no playground. If this is in your plan, I didn't see it. If it isn't, please put something in there.
	We need an Oakland Community newspaper -- not one done by/for university or hospitals but one done by and for residents. It should be about neighborhood events and issues -- with a direct line to our Council people and the Mayor.
	OPDC thinks a lot about this because it is a significant part of what we do. Feels this chapter needs most rework. Would have liked more research by planners on services in the community.
	Oakland pretty segregated, need policies and programs to specifically address this, e.g. welcoming new immigrants, Black homeownership, engaging with police, etc.
	Chapter does not consider OakWatch, does not engage with how to make code issues more transparent (?), concern that code complaints could be used for ulterior motive and how to manage that impact on marginalized groups; protesters seen as focus of issue/concern in chapter rather than police in unmarked vans; enforcement agencies are not always prepared on some level for ways in which their interference can make people more unsafe
	Aging in place; Needs to acknowledge existing programs like home repair supports;
	I don't think there is enough for the older residents of Oakland - I consider them another marginalized group.
	Hoarding, neglect, isolation among residents due to mental health – chapter needs to address this more
	Emergency care equipment in Oakland should have mental health phone number hot lines etc.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	Community centers / public facilities – lots of interest and opportunities, plan is sparse on this (SJ counters with Community Hubs)
	not enough in plan for older residents, and they should be considered as another marginalized group, e.g. shuttle needs. Andrea B: yes, older residents should be explicitly identified as vulnerable.
	want to be sure that tailor programs specifically to Oakland and not just to generic neighborhood.
	<p>This chapter draft does not have strong connections between goals, policies, and projects and programs, which makes it difficult to evaluate. This is particularly evident in Goal C1, “Community programs and livability,” which includes no mention of either community programs or livability in its detail. It’s worth unpacking this goal on its own, because as written it obscures the purpose of the rest of the chapter.</p> <p>C1. Community programs and livability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•C1.A Representation in decision-making. Civic mindedness is fostered through resident engagement in decision-making processes, and by serving on boards and committees.•C1.B Twenty-minute neighborhood. Ensure residents in every part of Oakland can have access to resources to meet their basic needs within a 20-minute walk or roll from their home.•C1.C Neighborhood of choice. Excellent access to healthcare, educational opportunities, entertainment, and cultural resources make Oakland uniquely desirable for people at all stages of life.•C1.D Vital riverfront areas. Oakland’s riverfront has public amenities that create a unique place for the community to enjoy the Monongahela River. Multiple options exist to safely and comfortably travel from inland areas to the riverfront. <p>This goal as written has very little meaning within the Oakland context, and the subheadings do not offer clarity. Each subheading belongs elsewhere, or perhaps nowhere.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•Residents build civic mindedness through interactions with their neighbors, relationships they build with each other, and with the organizations working in their communities. This civic mindedness then drives resident participation in decision-making processes, not the other way around. If the goal is increasing resident representation, that should be clearly stated; and the policies and programs that support this should be about increasing support for community organizing and community-building activities.•Oakland is already a twenty-minute neighborhood, if the criterion is that one needn’t “roll” more than 20 minutes to meet basic needs. Increasing walkability and locating more neighborhood-serving businesses in Oakland is addressed in the Development chapter.•Oakland is already a neighborhood of choice – and indeed many more people would choose to live in Oakland than current infrastructure can safely support, or affordability allow. If this goal is about improving the quality of life for Oakland residents, it should just say that.•Oakland’s riverfront does not currently meaningfully connect with the rest of the neighborhood. If the goal is to improve connections to the waterfront, that should be clearly stated... but in the Mobility chapter, not here.
	All of this chapter’s goals and policies should be re-examined and edited to ensure they communicate a consistent set of intelligible recommendations that support the larger vision of the plan.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	Public Art and Cultural Preservation: Although it is home to Pittsburgh’s flagship cultural institutions and a lively variety of architectural styles and historic structures, Oakland is noticeably lacking signature public art, an arts scene or support for local artists, or programs designed to uplift and support cultural and historic preservation.
	Public Art and Cultural Preservation: The proposed “Arts and Design Committee,” a recommendation of the public art technical advisory group (TAG), is a necessary first step to implement policy C3, and could easily be combined with Program C21, as the goals of each are congruent and mutually dependent. Sadly, the obvious haste with which the raw notes from the TAG were dumped into this proposal make it hard for the public to understand. The Arts and Design Committee should not consist of representatives of dozens of different stakeholder organizations and institutions; it should instead be a project of the Office of Public Art, curated by working artists and designers with a strong appreciation for the uniqueness of the Oakland context. It is incorrect to state that no funding for this initiative is needed. On the contrary, the committee will need access to resources to implement any of its recommendations – and indeed the lack of that kind of funding was specifically identified as a challenge local artists and community-based arts organizations grapple with.
	Public Art and Cultural Preservation: DCP commissioned an Oakland Historic Architecture Inventory Report. That report should guide community and preservation stakeholders to nominate areas and structures for national and local protection.
	Public Art and Cultural Preservation: The plan should include incentives and financial resources to support preservation and restoration of historic assets. Development pressure, greenlit by proposed zoning changes, will make wholesale demolition more and more likely. Buildings worthy of preservation include both the “important” architecture as well as the more humble – and preservationists and property owners should have support and guidance to help them protect and preserve their pieces of Oakland’s heritage.
	Civic Engagement: Community organizing in Oakland is a particular challenge. This is partly because short-term residents make up such a significant percentage of the residents in lower-density areas; partly because Oakland is starkly segregated, both racially and economically; and partly because there are so many different residential and demographic types that outreach methods must be multiply layered to reach everyone.
	Civic Engagement: Developing strong networks and building social capital amongst Oakland residents is extremely important in order to make civic engagement possible; and that civic engagement is what makes it possible to connect residents to resources, strengthen the effectiveness and responsiveness of community organizations, and advocate for a healthier community.
	Civic Engagement: The plan should outline clear strategies and policies that will actively challenge institutional racism and segregation. It’s hard to make progress on making Oakland more welcoming to new immigrants, or halting displacement of Black homeowners, or engage constructively with law enforcement if we’re not braced to confront racist assumptions head-on. This is a lot of work – a lot of community organizing and engagement, a lot of collaborative work with investors and funders and institutional and public stakeholders. Celebrating diversity is something that’s only possible when the systems designed to support folks are not conspiring to keep them down.
	Civic Engagement: The plan is noticeably lacking in strategies and programs designed to build bridges between students and older long-term residents. This “enemy amongst us” attitude was brought up many times in action team meetings, but is nowhere mentioned or addressed.
	Civic Engagement: Oakland residents are not lab rats, and the use of this neighborhood as a “civic laboratory” is not appropriate. Providing a flexible source of funds in modest amounts with few restrictions to support Oakland residents implementing resident-serving programs – this would be helpful. OTF would not be the appropriate group to determine funding allocations. If this initiative is intended to benefit the community, then residents should determine the allocations.
	Community Needs: Oakland’s communities – all of them – are under continuous stress, and this chapter ought to include policies, projects and programs designed to reduce, mitigate, and combat those stresses. No single set of services or supports will meet everyone’s needs.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	Community Needs: There is a marked need for community centers and public spaces where neighbors can connect with each other, gather to discuss issues of common interest, and get connected to resources that address immediate needs. There is plenty of community interest in these, and the opportunity for some really terrific initiatives, but the plan is really sparse on details.
	<p>Community Needs: There’s one program mentioned in this chapter for supporting homeowners with home repair funds, but the chapter doesn’t acknowledge work that is already being done. OPDC has worked in the past with the URA and with state and private funds to provide façade grants and other home repair supports. These kinds of supports are necessary, if long-term residents on fixed incomes are to stay in their homes as well as stay in the neighborhood.</p> <p>oThese programs are resource-intensive. More resources are needed.</p> <p>oOPDC offers repair grants for senior homeowners under 80% AMI in connection with the Oakland CLT. We support home maintenance so that homeowners can safely age in place and also retain homes for affordable homeownership in the future.</p> <p>oWe also have a façade grant program - matching grant with no income qualification; no match required for homeowners under 80% AMI. *It is not accurate that existing home repair programs require the homeowner to get contractor bids themselves prior to being enrolled in the program. This needs correction.</p>
	Community Needs: OPDC offers services to access rental assistance, financial coaching, income supports, and employment counseling, including referrals to local job training programs. These programs address real community needs and need to be highlighted in the Community chapter.
	Community Needs: The lack of fresh food in much of Oakland is a real concern; programs and projects intended to address this must be informed by empirical data. Most residential areas are in walking distance of a food store of some type. Financial support and incentives to those stores to improve their fresh food offerings would be helpful, as would support for existing initiatives addressing food insecurity and outreach to the people experiencing it.
	Community Needs: Every day we confront the need for mental health supports and supportive services for Oakland residents. We often struggle to connect Oakland residents with supports for hoarding, housekeeping, dealing with infestations of various sorts, neglect, isolation. There are missed opportunities throughout this chapter to advocate for stronger programs and initiatives to address mental health issues. For example, OPDC’s community services staff read this and immediately asked why the proposed program to install emergency care equipment in public spaces around Oakland wouldn’t also include Naloxone, or even just phone numbers for mental health support lines like the suicide prevention lifeline.
	Community Needs: The School 2 Career program at OPDC is a tested curriculum to support high school students academically and broaden their career options with mentorships that build skills and social capital. This model for high school students is an asset for the community upon which to build and adapt to meet neighborhood families' needs.
	Public Health and Safety: The two most salient public safety concerns in Oakland are behavior (underage drinking, noise, vandalism, harassment, etc.) and property maintenance and occupancy. Not every population in Oakland is made safer by increased police presence; not every property management problem is solved with fines and citations; and not every party is a threat to public safety. Like every other policy theme in this chapter, making Oakland residents safer and supporting public health requires many layered strategies, and the active collaboration of multiple community stakeholders.
	Public Health and Safety: Enforcing occupancy limits as articulated in the city code is crucially important not only for public health and safety, but for halting displacement and preserving affordability, managing infrastructure and waste, and providing safe and efficient mobility options. Enforcement requires collaboration across multiple public agencies, in close concert with neighborhood partners – just as Oakwatch has been doing for more than ten years, though this chapter does not mention Oakwatch, which is strange. Education for landlords and renters is also key to making occupancy enforcement a more manageable task. Rental registration can help with all of this – the Community chapter should outline how.
	Public Health and Safety: Neighbors sometimes use code enforcement complaints as a proxy for disagreements with each other – it’s important to be sure that enforcement doesn’t make vulnerable Oakland residents feel more unsafe than they already do.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	Public Health and Safety: This chapter contains many mentions of police in places where it seems inappropriate and weird. For example, supporting protests and public assembly activities requires educating institutions and law enforcement, more than correcting protestor behavior. Where protests in Oakland have involved violence, it is never the case that protestors have been the sole perpetrators of violence. Police in unmarked vans and armored vehicles armed with sonic canons have contributed rather than reduced tensions during recent protests.
Community Service Hubs	Love the Fieldhouse as a location; needs renovations. Ideas of expanding or rebuilding makes alot of sense. We need windows and support!
Community Service Hubs	Appreciate that existing orgs will support with programming. Opportunity to add programming. The more, the better. Listen to community voice in developing that programming. Hire local. Add SONG as an organization to implement (in Project Goals and Components).
Improve after school opportunities	Project leads: include The Corner (already does this) and SONG (we do it too!). Would love all three orgs to collaborate.
Improve after school opportunities	We need to integrate more students into the community. Activities to bring students and residents together.
Support Diversity in the Artist Community	Appreciate the connections of providing places for artist to make a living.
Support Diversity in the Artist Community	Can we make special connections to local residents in addition to diverse artists? Local residents would add to diversity.
Resident representative	Idea of paid position from the nhood is wonderful.
Resident representative	Support with childcare and financial services. Make it easier to hear voices of all.
Resident representative	Get more participate on weekends and if there's food/support/ welcoming atmosphere.
Resident representative	Like this. What does this mean? Embedded within community and build capacity or to serve as engagement opportunities for orgs with capacity.
Resident representative	How many representative are envisioned? Directed by community organizations, funded by institutions and foundations.
Resident representative	Strengthening and formalizing existing groups? Plus, creating additional channels for engaging harder to reach populations.
Resident representative	School-based representatives may be needed here (general, not a specific school). le a community resource instead of a PTA.
Homeowner rehab program	This is important to SONG.
Connect students to supportive programs	What is Pittsburgh passport? oMarket the Burgh to graduating students and local talent. Series of events to engage with leaders, etc. Networking to retain brain trust.
Connect students to supportive programs	Public schools are also an opportunity for connections to local leadership in industries.
Connect students to supportive programs	Internship opportunities can be folded into this.
Connect students to supportive programs	Regional effort to retain local talent and graduates. Events with local industries.
Connect students to supportive programs	Oakland is wonderful. This is important. Oakland can be a place to transition through different phases of life.
Community Service Hubs	North Oakland - We need one!
Free Access to Cultural Institutions	Museums already moving in this direction.
Free Access to Cultural Institutions	We're partnering with orgs that provide social and community benefits and it's been successful. Our funding community and donors stepped up to support this effort.
Free Access to Cultural Institutions	Great to see this. I've attended the museums since my childhood.
Support protests and public assembly activities	Would this involve venues? ie. Schenley Plaza. Would this help organizations create events in those areas. Yes. Exactly.
Community Service Hubs	Where is this now? Who hires?
Community Service Hubs	Would project partners work with their City Councilor to move forward? Yes. DCP is facilitating body for it.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
Community Service Hubs	3 City Council districts - how much are other districts involved in what's happening in other districts? We try to reach out to principle. All 3 were on Steering Committee. There is coordination.
Community Service Hubs	There wasn't anything specific about the different needs for the different parts of Oakland. North and South Oakland have different needs for example. The community hubs should meet the needs of their specific area.
Community Service Hubs	Pumping Station is priority. Cleanups planned for this summer.
Arts and Design Committee	Public art in Oakland is represented through architecture as well. Adding public art should include architecture, highlight it and compliment it.
Homeowner rehab program	Community organizations expressed concern about preserving existing residents and homes. CBA to execute on a larger scale.
Honor Oakland's heritage	Who? Preservation Pittsburgh, foundations, institution. Annual events, reoccurring.
Honor Oakland's heritage	Preservation is important in Oakland.
Organize around food access	I remember when we had 2 grocery stores. It's surprising that there's not one now. Happy that there will be a grocery store.
Scale Up Childcare Services	Local seniors may be great as caretakers. This could create new connections through the neighborhood. Training/certifications may be necessary. Potential Pilot program.
Development	
Design guidelines	Technical aspects of this proposal should limit architectural designs or materials that cheapen the quality of Oakland. Besides limiting EIFS, there should be guidance on limiting the amount of glass curtain wall on structures as this material doesn't provide any contextual design elements to this area. Examples of poor use of materials and large expanses of glass would be the Oxford Building at 3501 Forbes Ave. and the Falk Medical Building at 3601 Fifth Ave. The facades on these building do not positively impact pedestrians or others that see this building every day. Having a mixture of materials while still limiting glass area could still allow daylighting, but negatively impact the visual impact to the community.
Design guidelines	Comment on above: Definitely! There's a big difference between the feel of Oakland when you go further West down Forbes as opposed to more East, which you can directly attribute to the tackier looking buildings!
	Throughout the Plan's 3 Ps, you refer to "residents" and "students." That is unfortunate wording. Many of our short-term residents are not students. If you lived in Oakland, you would know that. We are not a simple dichotomous neighborhood, please recognize that in your writing. Perhaps refer to home owner residents, long-term renters, and short-term renters. Whatever issues affect student also affect other renters.
	The idea of seeing new buildings designed and built in styles that integrate with and complement our rich Oakland architectural heritage is a GREAT goal. However, the problem is that developers and builders always want to choose the cheapest building materials ... so I am not sure that quality buildings will ever be proposed by developers. The Bridge and SkyView are to recent and relevant cases -- those are both ugly and will decay into uglier buildings in just a few years. What city regulations permitted those building to happen? What are you proposing to prevent that type of construction in the future? This needs to be expected and demanded practice from developers, not something that gives them points to build their structures higher and higher, or closer to residents and sidewalks

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	<p>About this: Support the Rental Registration Program and other efforts to improve living conditions and fair treatment for all renters.</p> <p>If the Rental Registration ever does get fully implemented, it will improve living conditions, sanitary conditions, and quality of life not just for renters. Many of my fellow long time owner residents in South Oakland have worked for years in failed attempts to get PLI to pay attention and prosecute scofflaws. Short term renters usually don't care, they are only around for 9 months or a year or two. It is the long term residents (owners and renters) who truly need this. BUT this Rental Registry will work only if it is enforced on a regular and continual basis. That is the key.</p> <p>Enforcement is also the key for parking issues, unsightly rubbish, clean streets, etc. The city repeatedly fails on enforcement. This is the reason most of my long term neighbors have moved away. Sometimes it almost seems that the city has planned that dispersement of owner-residents by ignoring enforcement and hoping residents move away. It happened in Central Oakland, then moved into South Oakland and other areas.</p> <p>How can you make enforcement a central issue?</p>
	<p>D-4 Encourage family residences over high rises. Families with or without kids don't want to live in high rise buildings. Encourage townhouses, detached houses, duplexes - something with a front door, porch, and front/back/side yard. High rise buildings do not create or encourage communities of people who meet and talk to one another. They are really transitional housing for folks who do not want or need to integrate into a true neighborhood. (or is that truly what the Oakland Plan is about -- transitional housing...?)</p> <p>- For what it's worth, there are families with and without kids who do happily live in apartment buildings in Oakland and elsewhere in Pittsburgh, as in virtually every urban center in the world; and apartment-dwellers are at least as likely as homeowners to build relationships with neighbors they see in the hallways and elevators every day. A variety of housing options is best.</p>
	<p>Allowing developers to put money into Community Reinvestment Fund seems to be just a way for them to "buy" more height. Is that your intent?? I believe that it should not be permitted. It is similar to countries and companies buying carbon credits -- for example, put money into a Brazil rain forest, so a USA city can be ruined. Seems like the Community Reinvestment Fund contribution is similar and would be a very bad practice and hard to monitor and track.</p> <p>Please scratch that escape clause. Have developers follow the rules. Already your Plan will eliminate public input at Zoning Board of Adjustment hearings, why make it even easier for developers to have Carte Blanche to take over neighborhoods without community input?</p>

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	<p>I'm sure that I can eventually figure it out, but the Oakland Plan site is very confusing to me and has required hours of my time to follow every path and to digest what is there and to understand the inter-relationships. AND I must yet take the time required to read 95 pages of the Use Standards - comparing them to each of the NEW and old districts where they are permitted "by right" or with conditions. How can 30 days review period for this material be acceptable? Please give us more time to review your extensive site and the information contained in it.</p> <p>Maybe 30 days is the minimum you need to provide, but it is not enough time for the public to read and truly digest this important Plan. Can you make an exception to 30 days and give us more time?</p> <p>I need more time especially since Walnut Capital is already using some of the elements of the new UC-MU zoning area in the updated information presented to the Planning Commission on 8 March.-- if we don't have time to read and analyze your Oakland Plan documentation we cannot adequately address both the Oakland Plan and how Walnut Capital expects to capitalize on the Oakland Plan for their Oakland Crossing.</p> <p>Of course you know that the city has decided to revise (yes, this is the third revision) of Ordinance 2021-1906 - this is Ordinance about Oakland Crossing proposed by Mayor Gainey's office and with input from Walnut Capital. This Ordinance goes in front of Planning Commission for a vote on 22 March and, I believe, what is presented and voted on includes some of the still-draft Oakland Plan items. How can this be acceptable and permitted? Can you explain this somewhere?</p> <p>I am not sure what will happen with the Planning Commission and City Council with OPR-E, but seems to me that the Oakland Plan approval/input-process must be delayed until it is fully vetted in public, regardless of what happens with that Oakland Crossing ordinance.</p> <p>You have a number of ways to get public input -- please put the brakes on your process until you get substantial, extensive, and important input from residents. The input must not limited to that from hospitals, universities, contractors, developers, real estate agents who have extensive paid staff to read and analyze the benefit to themselves. They have scores of paid people who can look over the information. Residents and neighbors do not have the same luxury.</p> <p>My plea: Your Oakland Plan process is our only hope of having some little bit of a neighborhood to enjoy as we have in the past. I'm asking you to please give us time to read, review, compare, and discuss your plan. I'm sure that we can figure it out, given time. But we need more than 30 days!! (as noted before, this is especially true since half of that review period allotted for the Oakland Plan will be needed for us to prepare for the Planning Commission hearing/vote on 22 March about OPR-E!)</p>

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	<p>This plan is purposely being PUSHED THROUGH to avoid discussion and full evaluation of a "project" by an organization that has kept hidden it's ownership. WHO IS WALNUT CAPITAL anyway? Something is wrong with this picture.</p> <p>.....on a less confrontational note, I am in total agreement with @BTrimble! Born, raised and still a resident of Oakland, the neighborhood has a solid history in the growth of Pittsburgh! It is an International GATEWAY to the University Center of Pittsburgh and the ongoing Pioneering Health Research that has helped move this city from Steel to Science. The invasion of new construction in this area, lacks architectural design creativity!! Its cheap material and design screams "tear me down for the next project". Oakland's structures and the redesign that honored them, tell a story of Jonas Salk and the vaccine he invented, Forbes Field where Clemente and Stargell played, and Schenley High School where many sports legends attended. It has always been a walking/biking neighborhood where the "real societal impact" of those living and working there can still be seen in its structures....Until these past 5-10 years. Many of the homes targeted to be torn down on Halket Street are THREE LAYERS THICK OF BRICK! Others to include the one I grew up and live in are as well! The Isley's building is where they made the Klondikes still enjoyed by many today way before there was a Ben & Jerry's! Tear it down for a Giant Eagle or a parking lot because it's easier than designing a building around it to showcase history is probably what will be done! Developers and their Architects LACK CREATIVE IMAGINATION in their design and the City Planning Commission and past/present Mayors lack the stones to enforce thoughtful design when they are clearly, by POSITIONAL AUTHORITY, in a place where they could require it!</p> <p>Oakland is a RESIDENTIAL neighborhood because of it's residents. It's LONG-TERM residents! Those with families who make it a place to call home! Look to the other successful Research University Center Cities and you'll find history demonstrates lower crime, greater beautification and much greater stability where housing is a fine balance between the number of rental units vs. personally owned property.</p> <p>Before we get too far down the road in tearing even more down, would someONE please stop and THINK!</p>

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	<p>Comment on above: What can I say... Of course OaklandChild is right. It appears that short sighted, profit driven plans by developer(s) are driving the Zoning changes to Oakland right now. If the Gainey/Walnut revised Ordinance 2021-1906 is "passed" by Planning Commission on 22 March, the Oakland Plan must be modified to meet their version of the Zoning. That is entirely not acceptable and City Planning must do something to prevent that. There must be some legal procedure that is being side-stepped and needs to be articulated.</p> <p>And...Why can't you get more city residents engaged in this discussion. I could count the number of true Oakland residents at the DAM session on 19 March on one hand. I guess all that is really required for City Planning to say that the DAM happened and was a success, but you know that it was not a success. You are simply not getting word out across the city to those that need to realize that re-zoning can affect them one day too. Were the RCOs represented at the DAM? One was, was the other? Were Oakland and nearby community groups notified directly?</p> <p>And...the fact that the incorrect Zoom URL was posted on this web site was oh so unfortunate -- perhaps there were hundreds folks who would have joined, but could not because of the address being wrong. I finally got online about 30 minutes late. I heard another participant (a resident, by the way) who worked for 1.5 hours trying to figure out how to join. Yes, there will be another opportunity for you to count success at having held a DAM session on Wednesday 23 March, but I do not believe such meager results can be called success. And hopefully somebody in City Planning recognizes the shortcomings too.</p> <p>But... thank you for extending the review period to 1May. It is beyond me why we residents had to spend so much time begging for that when we could have spend that time investigating the details of the Zoning and proposed pie-in-the-sky projects.</p>
Community Reinvestment Fund	This is simply an way for developers to get taller and taller buildings (the point system) by giving money to some fund. I don't see how this increased height (or perhaps it would be the elimination/reduction of set-backs, etc) truly benefits residents of Oakland.
Global District	It is hard to see how this recommendation supports equitable development or is something that Oakland's residents see as a need. There already are global food purveyors throughout Oakland. Who determined that they all have to be located in the Fifth/Forbes corridor? It's not something I've heard from residents. I would argue against Reinvestment Fund resources being spent on this as it simply does not seem necessary, nor does this text show how we would be sure that business owners were Oakland residents (truly locally-owned). What would the residency requirements be? Would you define "locally-owned" as the owner living in the 15213 zip code? For what length of time? without such a requirement, it does not support neighborhood goals. There are existing programs to support business start up costs, provide business planning assistance. This recommendation seems unnecessary. It definitely is not a justifiable expenditure of community reinvestment fund resources.
Land Use Strategy	Comment on above: Ohhh, I now see the comment "away from Oakcliffe area". What exactly does that mean. We have had experience with developers to know that they will challenge anything that is not specific. This would be one place -- what does "away from" mean? One foot away? 10 feet away? 30 feet away. This is not enforceable and I think you know that.
	Likes intentionality of recognizing that students are residents
	Likes transit-oriented housing (Oakland used to be a transit hub)
	Likes that plan has a strong emphasis in growing and supporting missing middle housing. This will also attract more households w children.
	Glad there's opportunity in the plan for employment and growth in employment
	Keep Inclusionary Zoning in the plan!
	Important to acknowledge the fact that the employment area is right next to a residential area and seek a balance.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	Goal language not specific enough around the understanding of a student-driven market. This goal needs to be more specific about reducing student demand by increasing on-campus student housing. Universities should be housing their students.
	Re: Community Reinvestment Board - be aware that having an application requirement will likely be a barrier to people whose applications in the past have not been well received.
	Re: Community Reinvestment Board - develop a sensitive conflict of interest policy. Some of the people who should be on on the Board could also be qualified recipients of funding, or may have HH or family members who want to seek funding.
	A denser, more vibrant Oakland that more people have an easier time getting to will more easily support a full-service grocery store.
	Encourage higher-density student housing closer to campus.
	Encourage more student housing on campus.
	New campus housing also needs to be priced for students, so they don't have to look for cheaper, over-occupied, poor-quality housing off campus.
	General concern about new proposed building heights.
	High-rise housing is transitional housing and will not attract new families to the area.
	Oakland will have a problems attracting families without a walkable neighborhood school.
	Did Pitt do a housing study?
	How does Oakland Crossings going to Planning Commission interact w/ the Oakland Plan going to Planning Commission?
	RE: the renderings show in Suggested Projects. Is that something we'll see in 10 to 20 years or does it depend on Walnut Capital developing the site?
	RE: Walk to Work Program, are institutions going to be recruiting their employees to live in Oakland?
	How will commercial activity be regulated?
	Is there a specific vision for food stands and farmers markets?
	Is there opportunity on Community Reinvestment Board for resident representation?
	Question re: clarification between zoning boundaries and land use on the map
	Question re: viability of mixed-use buildings in the Innovation District
	Question re: relationship between Plan, including Land Use Strategy, and zoning proposals
	Not enough emphasis on availability of housing for family, long-term residents.
	Incentivize missing middle housing the way that high-rise units are incentivized.
	Consider disincentives for demolishing existing middle-type housing.
	Question re: how the Plan has or has not driven the Zoning
	Question re: performance point system.
	Question re: vision of the Oakland Innovation Zone (is it where start-ups begin and later move out of, or is it where growing businesses move to for expansion phase)?
	Desire for more specific guidelines about use of good-quality materials in Oakland Developments
	Question re: lack of metrics in the Plan
	Question re: Intent for Oakland Cultural District
	D1.B Land use addresses community needs.: this statement is so vague it has no meaning.
	D1.A Development review system: what is the goal statement here? I guess to implement the plan. But maybe we could have more aspiration.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	goal D2.C Buildings that belong in Oakland: this seems out of place in this category. I think we need a goal category for excellent urban design. the goal statement should be specific to high quality materials and contributing to the public realm. As this is written, almost anyone with any project can say they are meeting it. Also, we need a goal statement about valuing neighborhood character and historic preservation. Also a goal statement about particular focus on development at various scales being in close proximity to each other and reducing harm to lower intensity uses. Really looking out for those at a structural disadvantage -- and not name-calling "NIMBY" or anti-development when people are simply looking out for their quality of life, neighborhood character/integrity.
	Goal D3.A Welcoming Oakland.: this belongs in the community chapter. Not in the Development chapter. Please relocate this.
	Goal Equitable Development: what's missing from this goal section, D3, is a goal about leveraging new development to support Oakland resident community needs, especially under resourced/marginalized members of our community. Priorities: affordable housing, neighborhood-serving retail, and employment opportunities.
	Goal D3.B Buildings that overcome inequities. :what does this statement mean? this is so vaguely worded I don't know what it is trying to convey. please revise or delete.
	Goal D3.C Inclusive hiring. : please revise this goal statement to assert that new development will adhere to MWDBE targets (which need to be included) in a proactive manner. Also to prioritize Oakland MWDBE businesses. As currently written here, this statement is vague and obtuse. Also, it leaves it open to interpretation whether someone has "maximized opportunity" - someone can say they did. for MWDBE efforts to be successful, developers have to go out of their way to meet the targets, support and mentor businesses, etc.
	<p>Housing goals, D4. So much missing here. The goals you have listed in this section do not address Oakland's housing needs, aspirations, nor challenges. Please add:</p> <p>a goal to encourage, support, and grow homeownership in Oakland. The goal should be measurable.</p> <p>a goal to provide permanently affordable homeownership opportunities in Oakland through Oakland Community Land Trust. To grow the Oakland CLT to scale, thus supporting neighborhood health through community ownership, resident self-directed stewardship, addressing racial homeownership gap, and permanent affordable homeownership.</p> <p>a goal to leverage new development to increase the supply of affordable housing for low-income people. (we have tools such as affordable housing bonus points and IZ, so need goal statement to go with it.)</p>
	Goal D4.B: could remove this goal from this section as you already have it above in goal D.2A. you have it here under housing, but then say "all buildings" and "employees" so that indicates something other than housing. so, section D. 2 would be more appropriate.
	Policy D. 1 - hillsides: I'm glad to see this statement included. It is much needed.
	Policy D 3 Access and influence. : this should be moved to the community chapter. please revise.
	Comment on above: "Policy D 3 Access and influence. this should be moved to the community chapter. please revise.": Ditto access to careers. that recommendation should be in the community chapter as well.
	Policy D. 4 there should be a policy to encourage homeownership in Oakland.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	<p>Goal D4 - Should note explicitly that achieving this goal will require the construction of subsidized student housing. Students are ineligible for means-tested affordable housing, and only a small percentage are able to afford market-rate units (presuming occupancy laws are enforced); the missing piece is safe and attractive student housing close to campus that is affordable to students at or below mean income levels. This is likely something only university subsidy can provide.</p> <p>Actually, let me state that more forcefully: this needs to be articulated as a separate goal. To achieve equity, locate a more diverse population in housing close to work in Oakland, reduce stresses on low-density residential areas, increase affordability and opportunity - there MUST BE a commitment on the part of the universities to increase their supply of affordable and desirable housing for their undergraduates, and that commitment needs to be significant in scale. The market WILL NOT take care of this problem, it requires PRIVATE SUBSIDY, and the only entities that can provide that are the universities. Nothing else articulated in this plan will work without that commitment. If the universities are unwilling to make that commitment, that failure needs to be articulated in this plan.</p> <p>And to be clear, this point has been articulated over and over and over again in steering committee meetings, action team meetings, individual conversations with DCP planners. This is not new.</p>
	<p>Comment on above: This seems to me to be the best path forward for solving Oakland's housing issues. The issue that I have (as someone who isn't an Oakland resident, but is also a city resident and utilizes the neighborhood frequently) is any attempt to just block construction of new multifamily housing in Oakland causes the student slum to expand in literally every neighborhood with direct bus access to Oakland (which is most of the rest of the East End. Anti-density arguments thus become zero-sum - the gain of long-term residents of Oakland only happens due to a loss elsewhere. The only way to solve this in a way that benefits the entire city is to have enough student housing positioned close to campus to stop being a student slumlord from being more attractive to small-time property owners than the other options.</p>
	<p>Comment on above: This sounds a lot like the NIMBY (Not In My Back Yard) allegations. The truth is many students CHOOSE to live in other neighborhoods because of the high concentration of students already in Oakland and that contributing to the deteriorating situation of the long-term residential areas with higher rents, less well-maintained rental units, parking etc. But I can't imagine any City Police officer telling someone "Well, you live in Sq Hill/Shadyside..., what do you expect?" My blood has boiled more than a few times in the wee hours of the morning when they have refused, or ineffectively stopped loud and disruptive parties.</p>
Environmentally sensitive areas	<p>Project D. 3 - environmentally sensitive areas.: Why would the plan not already have this information? We have this information today. The plan document should reflect this rather than this being another implementation to-do item.</p>
Missing middle housing	<p>project D-6. Missing middle housing: Oakland residential areas already have a lot of this housing diversity today. this recommendation needs to be revised to recognize the specifics of Oakland's market conditions - dominated by intense investor speculation. Any changes to allow ADUs and other additional units in R1 areas will not result in affordable housing unless we tie the allowance to inclusion in the Oakland Community Land Trust. This way, homeowners can have the benefit of the extra unit to support wealth building or provide an affordable housing unit. Otherwise, any changes will simply result in fueling investor speculation and potential negative impacts to surrounding residences.</p>
Oakland town center	<p>Projects D.7 Oakland Town Center: When you click on the link, you go to the page with workshop materials, but what we need is an actual recommendation. The link with the workshop materials should be in the appendix. We need to distill this into a vision. It would be good to have a couple of options during this plan review process to get feedback and then have a final version of a concept in the plan.</p> <p>- Absolutely. Many designs were discussed for the Isaly's site at that workshop.</p>
Sustainability for existing buildings	<p>project D-9. Sustainability for existing buildings: if this is already covered in the Infrastructure chapter, we do not need it duplicated here. It will just make the plan more cumbersome and unwieldy. Let's edit this.</p>

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
Sustainability for new buildings	project D-10. Sustainability for new buildings: this statement is so vague and general as to be next to useless. We need something specific. Otherwise, it has no use. building code dictates efficiency. zoning incentivizes it. simple economics of energy efficiency encourage its use. the market is making efficiency and renewables better all the time. Funders of affordable housing, such as PHFA, already require energy efficiency in order to get the funding - so you are not adding something new here. What is the project? Since it is in the project category - please describe a specific project. This should be revised or removed. You already have "high performing buildings" in the goals. We already have the 2030 district. What are you adding?
Transit oriented zoning	<p>Project D-11. Transit oriented zoning: please revise these two sentences for clarity. It really doesn't make sense. transit is by nature along corridors. so, that statement says nothing. Also, what do you mean by "provides for the needs of the community?" we have transit today. our commercial zoning overlaps with transit routes for the most part. Transit is far from some residential areas, so their needs are not met, but otherwise many people have their needs met by transit. So, what are you saying here? The last sentence describes the function of zoning -- to identify where kinds of development can go. How does it relate to "transit oriented zoning"? this item seems quite meaningless.</p> <p>the existing OPR zoning contains bonus related to proximity to transit. so, we have this today. You state here that this is part of the Oakland Plan zoning proposals, but I do not see it in that document. There are performance points in the code today in 915.07 about transit oriented development. That must be what you mean.</p>
Employer assisted housing	program D-16. Employer assisted housing: to support neighborhood health long term, tie homeownership support to Oakland Community Land Trust. Homes can be both permanently affordable and also non-resale formula restricted/market rate. The latter are required to be owner occupied, however, and are permanently part of the CLT. This helps grow the Oakland CLT and helps to meet the goal of maintaining a stable base of homeowners in the neighborhood. Without connecting home purchase support to Oakland CLT, employers will further fuel speculation as homes would eventually become investment properties. This is counter to long term neighborhood health.
Neighborhood sustainability identity	program D. 20. Let's just have a great plan with solid vision and good recommendations and work to implement it. We don't need yet another "marketing" effort. the plan has sustainability and equity goals. Period.
Opportunities for Hispanic businesses	program D. 21 - should not be an expenditure from the Oakland community reinvestment fund unless there was an enforced Oakland residency requirement. the equitable development bonus points really need to benefit Oakland residents.
	Add project/program to grow the Oakland Community Land Trust. Priority to increase the number of homes to grow the CLT to scale. Programming to support various pathways into the CLT: acquisition of properties to be sold to homeowners, tax-deductible donation of land to CLT, support for existing homeowners to join the CLT and receive payments, home repair funds/support or other services, bequests. Priority for equitable development funds as this is a direct benefit to Oakland residents and an anti-displacement strategy with long-term wealth building benefits.
	Add: a statement regarding residential neighborhood conservation areas. We need an clear, explicit statement that lower and moderate density residential areas of the neighborhood are remain as such. They are residential protection areas where zoning changes will not be entertained. This way aggressive speculators are forewarned that zoning changes will not be permitted. This will assist policy makers and also make it publicly clear that aggressive speculation and buy-outs are not an option worthy of pursuit in those areas.
	<p>There are some great proposals in here. I especially support the Community Investment Fund, I think that is very important as we want to move forward as a city to include all. In that realm I also highly support the inclusionary zoning part.</p> <p>In addition, as we are facing this climate crisis, I think that sustainable buildings are extremely important.</p>

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	As a former Oakland resident, I find this plan very exciting. In particular, the projects relating to a community investment fund, inclusionary zoning, and sustainable buildings will make a real difference in local quality of life. I encourage City Staff to implement these initiatives.
	As an Oakland resident, I would love to see more sustainability efforts around college campuses. Youth will often follow what they are surrounded with, and if we are surrounded by sustainable efforts in buildings such as composting, more recycling, and things like that, the youth will be more inclined to continue these practices on their own accord.
	I'm glad that not only is Pittsburgh trying to account for sustainable design, but resilient design in regards to topographical issues. As climate change impacts the city more and more, we are at greater risk of things like landslides. And as someone who used to live in Oakland, there are certainly rental properties that are at risk of falling into Panther Hollow!
	Reforming the zoning code to support transit oriented development is a great idea. I wrote some suggestions in a blog post here: https://connect-pgh.com/pittsburghs-zoning-makes-it-difficult-to-be-car-free/
	Research shows that inclusionary zoning is counterproductive. By making it more expensive to build new housing it restricts supply, making the existing housing stock more expensive. Pittsburgh and Oakland should not pursue inclusionary zoning.
	we also need resources to provide incentives for landlords to accept housing choice vouchers - and TA re: improvements so units pass inspections.
	Does TA stand for "true affordability"?
	nice rosy words that seem to benefit Pitt and upmc expansion. I want to know how this effects long term residents pertaining to rising real estate taxes and what projects plan to use eminent domain to strip residents of their land. Oakland is a space of narrow streets and alleys without enough parking for residents and landlords who pack 10 or 12 students in a house. You need someone on your board who isn't looking to Pitt and upmc as some kind of saviors of neighborhoods their unchecked expansion have already ravaged.
	In response to range15213: The Steering Committee had about 35 members. By design, only 5 were representing resident organizations. NINE were representing universities. All others were Oakland "stakeholders" - UPMC, nonprofits, elected officials, etc. The result speaks for itself. "Retaining existing residents" and "offering opportunities to age in place" were removed from the Vision Statement right before the draft went public.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	<p>Great piece on thinking about good development in cities:</p> <p>It also includes discussion on building density that fits within a neighborhood's existing footprint - which I believe is what many long term Oakland residents want. That's a much better alternative to speculative 12+ story buildings that pack students into studios like sardines. To that end, there are some great examples of 3-5 story density with greenery and parks in the US. Chicago, especially Hyde Park, Chicago come to mind.</p> <p>"D1 Reduce negative externalities "- as you build multi-use space please think of the noise of garbage pick up - currently pick up can happen at 6am despite quiet hours in the city ending at 7am. Moving the required time for trash pick up could help as commercial spaces need trash pick up 3x or more per week. Intense lighting, especially for 24 hour institutions like the gas station on Craig St., can also negatively residents with blue light messing with their sleep schedule. The Dark Sky ideas will help with new development, but not existing development.</p> <p>"D2 Inspiring gateways." Please add murals of plants on boring walls! Any amount of green helps - ask residents who's windows face a boring wall if they want a mural! There are very few open spaces left in Oakland that could become parks or remain green. Make them parks - dog parks can provide funding to keep the park alive- before they get bought by private Developers. The empty lot at 245 N Craig St. comes to mind.</p> <p>"D2 Design for children" Upgrade all crosswalk signals to numbers - I always see people, including catholic school students, run across the 5th and Craig crosswalk because the walk symbol is about 3 seconds long. Raise/continue the sidewalk through the street on new projects so cars have to enter pedestrian space rather than pedestrians entering car space. Make streets one-way where possible so its easier for kids to see cars coming (also increases parking!).</p> <p>"D3 Equitable economic development" Grocery store, grocery store, grocery store!! Get us access to affordable vegetables year round. Oakland is a food desert.</p> <p>"D4 Students as residents...retain them following graduation". I am a grad student - the biggest thing you can try to do to keep me (beyond employment) is MORE GREEN SPACE. Anywhere I live, I want more trees, more parks, more murals of plants, fewer cars I think will hit me as I walk, and public indoor places you can be for free as the winter is cold. It's so hard to find benches here or a nice tree to sit under in Schenley plaza to read (no one sits in the field in the summer because there's no shade). So far...I hate to say it...Oakland has been one of the most frustrating places I've lived. Sorry the piece was supposed to be linked. It's about some innovative development thinking/strategy in AU: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5qGHUcyriso</p>
	<p>Comment on above: In order to make the sort of Hyde Park-like mid-scale development work, you need to commit to little to no structured parking. I mean, you can look at the layout of that neighborhood, where multi-story walkups have either no parking whatsoever or a 1-2 space garage in the back.</p> <p>In contrast, even with the proposed 50% parking reduction (which would be a big help) you'd still need to set aside all of the ground floor of any small-scale apartment building for a parking garage.</p> <p>Since Uptown has revised its zoning to eliminate parking minimums, some compact small/mid-sized apartment buildings (like on the 1400 block of Forbes and the 1700 block of Locust) with zero off-street parking have been built, showcasing what could be built in Oakland if parking minimums were zeroed out. We all know there are plenty of Oakland renters (graduate and undergraduate) with no cars who would happily live in such buildings and get the discount of not having to pay for useless garage space.</p>

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	According to City map, 1400 Forbes has no RPPP. 1700 Locust does, but neighborhood identified as "Bluff", and the majority of nearby streets are not permit.
	<p>What seems missing from these Karl Zimmerman's notes on Uptown small/mid-size buildings is whether residents actually do have cars and park them somewhere besides in the building. According to official map, there are apparently no Residential Permit Parking Program (RPPP) areas in Uptown, so one can safely assume their parking issues are not like Oakland that has precious few streets that are not permit areas and in most cases (wildly) oversubscribed just by car permits, let alone visitor pass use. On top of that, the long decline and lack of development in Uptown gave those residents a much different perspective about attracting any new development.</p> <p>https://gis.pittsburghpa.gov/pghpermitparking/</p>
	<p>Affordable Housing and IZ -- Not sure where this goes, maybe here.</p> <p>Seems that the city is considering affordable housing new-build units to be kept as affordable for 35 years. Not sure where I read that, but I believe that it is true. That is must too short of a time. Affordable housing units should be kept that way for perpetuity -- not just for 35 years. Currently there is an affordable housing development in East Liberty where tenants are being evicted -- it only had to be affordable for 35 years. The buildings are currently owned by some East Liberty community organization (corner of Rippey and South Negley Ave,) and being sold to some developer. All of the tenant must leave. Thirty-five (35) years is not a long time to live in a family home -- it is unfair to evict somebody whose home has been an affordable unit.</p>
Community Reinvestment Fund	We want to leverage new development -- value capture -- to support community needs, so this is positive. We need to keep this very focused, however, in order to actually accomplish that. As described here, this fund is way to open-ended and broad. We should look to the East Liberty TRID which has a small oversight board of objective civil servant professionals and a very limited range of priorities for which the funds can be used. Also, we should consider URA or office of management and budget as potential administrators, rather than DCP. We should make sure that the proceeds are used only to support affordable housing development in Oakland, either for rent or for sale (if for-sale, must be through Oakland CLT in order to ensure permanent affordability), home repair/facade for low-income homeowners, economic opportunity for Oakland residents (education/jobs), and limited programming to meet needs of low-income individuals (food supports, health services).

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
Design Guidelines	<p>the organizing principles do not speak to the interests/needs of residential communities, especially those areas where mixed use/commercial/institutional areas meet residential areas. It is in this context that we see much of our design challenges. the organizing principles should speak to this. As it is, it seems focused more just on public art, which has other sections of this document. design guidelines should speak to ways that development can be sited to minimize negative impacts to adjacent residential areas.</p> <p>there is a general tone of animosity/dismissiveness to community in this text. statements like need to find a "productive role for community" and "engage collaboratively and productively" are negative in tone. Instead, what about building capacity in terms of design concepts, providing tools and training resources in design language, have experts work alongside community members to provide design assistance when engaging with development proposals so that there is a level playing field? With neutral design expertise alongside residents, they could have the capacity to propose design alternatives, analyze materials, etc. there is a fundamental structural imbalance between the capacity of Oakland residents and extensive financial resources of large entities proposing development. building capacity specifically to lift up community capacity is what is needed. Paying community members, particularly disenfranchised groups such as BIPOC, diverse abilities, seniors, to participate would also be part of this.</p> <p>this sentence is vague:</p> <p>Recommend the use of MOUs and other documentation to clearly state arrangements and outcomes from planning and design processes what does this mean? I'm not sure we need more and more layers of "arrangements." Our plan should be what we need.</p> <p>Because it is such an important issue, it would be good to reiterate here that steeply sloped, landslide prone hillside areas should not be viewed as development sites. People should not consider them to be filled with parking garages or large scale development.</p> <p>design guidelines should also include strategies for activating first floor commercial spaces to avoid the conference rooms, workout spaces, etc that deaden Fifth/Forbes Avenue, add nothing to the public realm and are overall negative locations in the business district.</p>
Land use strategy	What we heard - Housing: you have heard that Oakland Community Land Trust is an existing tool to combat the challenge of high prices for homebuyers and to the notion that nothing can be done. Please add this to the list of bullets.
Land use strategy	Project goals and components - housing strategy: agreed that student affordability and long term resident affordability are linked. There are no strategies here, however, to address student affordability. full-time students are expressly prohibited from eligibility for housing subsidies and income limits tied to AMI. We should make this clear in the document. When we say affordable housing, we mean for people who are not full time college students. Just increasing density in Central Oakland may result in nicer quality housing that students who can afford it will choose. it can also address the negative externalities of trash, noise, safety, etc of undergraduates renting older homes. OPDC supports inclusionary zoning and affordable housing bonus points. It will be good to have opportunities for lower-income residents to be able to have rental opportunities in central Oakland (and throughout Oakland). but we do not have a strategy here for affordable options for college students.
Land use strategy	<p>Project goals and components - housing strategy: again, to reiterate: you call out in the third bullet specifically "affordable dorm and apartment housing"</p> <p>Nothing in the zoning proposal (IZ or bonus points) will achieve that.</p>

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
Land use strategy	Project goals and components - housing strategy: Preserve and expand housing options for long-term residents: the Oakland Community Land Trust is the tool to provide affordable homeownership opportunities and to ensure that the affordability remains in our community permanently. for missing middle housing, we must tie this to the Oakland CLT to avoid more expensive units being added to our neighborhood areas that further drives up prices. In Oakland's particular market, adding extra units such as ADUs will not automatically result in affordability. Through Oakland CLT, we can ensure that they would be affordable permanently. through Oakland CLT, additional "missing middle" like duplex or ADU can be a way to help families of color build wealth through living in their home and renting out the extra unit. This only works to achieve our community goals of affordability and wealth building if it is part of Oakland CLT. Without it, it is just investors speculating in our neighborhood to make the most money, causing property values to go higher, and causing negative impacts to surrounding neighbors. Oakland CLT is the answer here. Plus, the residents have the benefit of community ownership and self-regulation - building social capital and civic engagement at the same time.
Land use strategy	slide: map: proposed high density residential area: goal should include maintaining neighborhood character. it is stated in "character" bullet that there would be a mix of restored buildings. We need programming/financing to support this, however. it states "allow neighborhood serving on atwood and mckee" but when I review the zoning, I don't see anything related to that specifically. It is allowed on Atwood under current zoning. but perhaps it is allowed throughout under the proposed zoning, rather than just these streets. may be more successful to allow in nodes - worth further discussion and clarification.
Land use strategy	map: proposed lower density residential areas: I would like to see "promote and retain homeownership"added to the goal statement. for the mixed-use bullet: what is the proposal or analysis to allow small scale commercial uses? I do not see this in proposals. Merits further discussion. in the programming bullet, please edit to specifically call out the Oakland CLT as the tool to provide permanent affordable homeownership. it is also an anti-displacement tool. the statement is vague as written.
Land use strategy	map: proposed innovation district areas: we have heard consistently resident alienation at the "innovation district" concept. This goal statement reinforces that. It would be great to include goal of a mix of retail uses that support both commuters and long term residents. you hint at it a bit in the character bullet, but it would be good to be more clear in the goal. not sure why global district is called out as this seems to be the case currently.
Land use strategy	map: proposed mixed use areas: would be great if the goal and/or character statement included something about mitigating negative impact of higher intensity uses on nearby low intensity uses. We have that in the purpose statement in existing OPR zoning. there is a little hint at urban design bullet, but overall really missing in this entire planning document. I think it will take more than just green buffers to address the issues related to new taller buildings adjacent to smaller buildings. Design guidelines and placement of building on the site to pull development away from surrounding residential and ensure loading/trash hauling is not right next to surrounding residential.
Provide low-cost commercial space	it would be a mistake to utilize oakland community reinvestment fund resources because those funds should benefit Oakland residents.
Revolving loan program	How is this specific to Oakland? This is not part of a strategy for Oakland specifically. Therefore it should be deleted from the Oakland Plan. If there was a specific carve out to ensure a certain portion would be available to support Oakland projects, maybe leave it in, but otherwise this should be deleted. Plus, UPMC has already done this in partnership with Bridgeway Capital. It is city-wide if not region-wide. And it exists today. This was indicated at a working session, yet remains here so please edit accordingly.
Oakland town center	Oakland Town Center should be named "Zulema on the Boulevard" << give Zulema Street and Park a real spot in the world! If I must ask a question... why not name the area Zulema on the Boulevard??

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	<p>OBID is suggesting adding the following goal to be added under D1 Land Use Policy and Regulations:</p> <p>Framework to provide innovation economy assets. Incentives, requirements, and policies work together to encourage the development, growth, and full potential of the UC-E/Innovation District.</p>
	<p>Comment on above: As I and other have noted, the "Innovation District" is a self-name private construct for self promotional purposes. it is not recognized or identified as part of UC-E.</p>
	<p>OBID is suggesting the following goal to be added under D2 Urban Sustainable Design:</p> <p>Buildings that belong in the Pittsburgh Innovation District. Building design and size that speak to the unique opportunity of Oakland and contribute to the unmatched potential of the innovation and technology economies within the District.</p>
	<p>In response to OBID: There is no recognized geographic Pittsburgh Innovation District. It is self-identified for self-promotional purposes.</p>
	<p>OBID is suggesting to add the following goal to be added under D4 Housing:</p> <p>Residents and entrepreneurs have access to career services and opportunities that allow them to work in their neighborhood, and Oakland’s low-income employees, students, and innovators have access to affordable housing that allows them to walk to work or school.</p>
	<p>OBID suggests the following policy edit (underlined below):</p> <p>Manage density. Locate dense development in appropriately designed buildings inside the Pittsburgh Innovation District and other locations near transit and other supportive amenities</p>
	<p>In response to OBID: There is no recognized geographic Pittsburgh Innovation District. It is self-identified for self-promotional purposes.</p>
	<p>The Pittsburgh Innovation District suggests the following alterations to the Goals of the Development Chapter:</p> <p>(new goal) D1.D Framework to provide innovation economy assets. Incentives, requirements, and policies work together to encourage the development, growth, and full potential of the UC-E/Innovation District.</p> <p>(new goal) D2.C Buildings that belong in the Pittsburgh Innovation District. Building design and size that speak to the unique opportunity of Oakland and contributes to the unmatched potential of the innovation and technology economies within the District.</p> <p>(edited goal) D4.A Jobs and housing for all. Residents and entrepreneurs have access to career services and opportunities that allow them to work in their neighborhood, and Oakland’s low-income employees, students, and innovators have access to affordable housing that allows them to walk to work or school.</p>

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	In response to mmaddenI think it is very shortsighted to limit investment into the a single actual zoning area like the proposed UC-E, or the unofficial private "Innovation District". While the UC-E may be more suited to specific types of innovation and entrepreneurship, excluding or reducing investment into other areas would be a huge mistake.
	<p>The Pittsburgh Innovation District suggests the following alterations to the Policies of the Development Chapter:</p> <p>(edited) D1. Land use policy and regulations</p> <p>Managed density. Locate dense development in appropriately designed buildings inside the Pittsburgh Innovation District near transit and other supportive amenities.</p> <p>(new policy) D4. Housing</p> <p>Entrepreneurs as residents. Tap the full potential of Oakland’s innovation and technology economy by providing the right mix of housing and amenities to retain them as talent and homeowners.</p>
	<p>The Pittsburgh Innovation District suggests the following alterations to the Projects of the Development Chapter:</p> <p>1. add the Pittsburgh Innovation District to the D-2. Design guidelines Project Partners</p> <p>2. (edited) D-8. Innovation District marketing campaign</p> <p>Develop marketing campaign that advertises positive aspects of Oakland in terms of central location, affordable housing efforts, economic opportunity, walkability, transit access, parks, and cultural resources. The goal should be to attract a diverse set of permanent entrepreneurs, innovators, and residents to locate in Oakland.</p> <p>When to start: 0-2 yearsProject lead(s): PIDProject partner(s): OPDC, OBID, institutions, PAACPotential funding source(s): Foundations, grants</p>
	I don't believe that we need a specific "innovation" district. Oakland has always been full of innovators -- we don't need a special district to point that out. Oakland is a vibrant BUSINESS district and that in itself should be obvious to "innovators". And we have always been a very diverse community.
	Comment on above: I agree with ReadThisPlease that there have been and will continue to be innovators from and in Oakland that are not associated with the private consortium calling itself the Pittsburgh Innovation District. I wish you well, but similar to other comments I've made, it is far easier to push for outrageous sweeping changes in an area you don't live in, but stand to substantially gain financially, without much regard for the negative consequences.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	it is criminal that the draft doesn't suggest upzoning the entire neighborhood to build an inclusive neighborhood, more similar to the "old Oakland" some people romanticize, with sustainable walkable businesses & diverse neighbors. Oakland's exclusionary zoning has driven disparities with the increased demand for housing, pushing people out due to the lack of development. Setting the community in amber to satisfy the loud few who do not understand the housing market, nor how slowly development works, & seem to not respect the needs of others, is a deep disappointment to see in an official City document. Please press on with what most of us want, don't listen to the NIMBYs
	In response to keatinga: It seems quite easy for people that don't live in the area to call those that do NIMBYs (Not In My Back Yard), especially when the issue in question is nowhere near THEIR back yards . My position, and observation of the vast majority of those opposed to some prominent specifics of this plan, is not opposed to some change or (re)development, but to go about it in a measured, thoughtful way that respects the existing residents and the history and culture of the area. This plan has many aspects that are far beyond the pale. Increasing heights in some areas to 200%-500% of current heights, and 400ft wide buildings so close to existing residential areas with and odd collection of allowed uses seems absurdly counter to any reasonable goals and totally inappropriate for a 10 year plan. We opposers are keenly aware of the housing market in Oakland, and the somewhat unique and artificial pressures created by 3 universities, 5 hospitals as well as other commercial interests on housing, traffic, parking etc. Many of the suggested proposals are speculative at best. What few actual studies are in cities and areas that are not entirely comparable to Oakland/Pittsburgh, now or even if these things are implemented. Pittsburgh does not have major public transit that would ever approach NYC or DC. My apologies for repeating a theme, but it is of utmost importance to review actual data. Pitt Institutional Master Plan (IMP) shows with significant existing implementation of proposed traffic strategies still have 45% single occupancy vehicle (SOV) use by staff, and in next 10 years with even more as yet unidentified programs, they only expect to reduce SOV by roughly 3%. And that is before the massive increase of office/lab space currently planned/expected by a handful of buildings under existing code (with variances, but still well below proposed changes). With so much at stake, it only takes a small error in predicting the future to create permanent damage to the area. Cars are here to stay for at least the 10 years of this program.
	Comment on above: The problem is, Oakland does not exist as a neighborhood in isolation. The longstanding lack of additional built density in Oakland close to Pitt and CMU (which I freely admit is in large part due to the lack of on-campus housing being built by the universities) has pushed renters basically everywhere else in the East End. It's better for the city by every metric if the additional units of housing are placed within walking distance of the universities/hospitals, rather than being a 20-30 minute car or bus ride away. And NIMBY politics typically result in the neighborhoods which have the least internal self-organization and the loosest zoning bearing the brunt of development, which is what causes a lot of gentrification (probably wouldn't have seen hundreds of additional units of housing in the East Liberty area, for example, with more housing options built in Oakland).

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	<p>I have commented on a number of other comments, but want to put a more encompassing comment likely crossing topics.</p> <p>The process for this plan was far too hurried for no good reason than to open the gates for large developers. The wholesale changing of much of the zoning of residential areas with mind-boggling increases in height, size, use, etc. are highly unreasonable, many without understanding how Oakland actually works, especially for residents. Literally living in the shadow or very nearby these buildings will NOT encourage long-term home ownership or even rentals.</p> <p>All proposals for reducing parking requirements seem to completely ignore actual circumstances unique to Oakland, and Pitt's Institutional Master Plan (IMP) showing with significant existing implementation of proposed traffic strategies still have 45% single occupancy vehicle (SOV) use by staff, and in next 10 years with even more as yet unidentified programs, they only expect to reduce SOV by roughly 3%. And that is before/without the massive increases about to come.</p> <p>The City Planning staff have changed drastically since this plan started 2 years ago. Most of the key people are simply gone. Current staff have often been unable to answer questions about the plan, as recently as Friday 4/29/22.</p> <p>This website started off as difficult and hasn't had much of any improvement. The few small delays in the timeline do NOT reflect the difficulties and failures to properly discuss and explain numerous topics that most people are completely unfamiliar with. For example: NOBODY discussed the highly generous point system vs what community members listed as priorities. The "pay for points" and penalties for non-compliance are minimal and easily considered a business expense well worth the vast increase in building that developers are allowed. Both monetary options should be annual and forever since the building and financial gains are. Pitt promised to implement a grocery store in their IMP, but now that gets points that were never discussed. Uses like hotels (still in here?) getting points makes no sense and never listed as a priority at any Action Team meeting I attending (which is just about all in all 4 categories).</p> <p>The Planning Commission stated that this was a lot of text for them and seemed lacking important details, but voted to recommend. What? We mere mortals are even more perplexed and confused.</p> <p>Especially as templates for the entire City, this needs a LOT more discussion and changes.</p>
	BTW, several comments that I asked City Planning staff to include when I was unable to access this website, don't appear to be anywhere. I thought this website was the library and archive for all comments. How many other comments were not included here?
	If programs and / or projects conflict with IMP goals and objectives, how will conflicts be reconciled? Ex: "Some buildings with admirable facades do not serve the insitution or the commuity well b/c they are unable to be made energy efficient or fuctional; two buildings on O'Hara have some significant facade details but they are not functionally good. buildings." "The hillside to the north of O'Hara already has development and new development can repair old mines, address reforestation and stormwater; D1 might have conditions since Pitt's hillside redevelopment was part of the IMP. "Meetings note the approved IMP is the criteria but if addenda are done over the course of 10 years the cultural district is the zoning to be adhered to and the cultural district is not welld efined except for free access. The implications need to be understood."
	Employer sponsored housing (D16) is an admirable goal, and one Pitt clearly shares. However, the "Detail" notes that programs "must" be linked. "Must" is not a good word choice. It is noted a university's goals for such a program may differ than other employers. As such institutions need autonomy and control over our own sponsored program and under no scenario should that be turned over to OPDC to administer.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	Understanding the resources available and required to sustain certain systems and programs is critical to their success. How is the City planning to financially support the various committees, boards, funds, enforcements mechanisms etc. that require administrative resources at a minimum? Ex of the Oakland desired plan for tomorrow driving zoning would be hlepful. Such as identification of a bonus height with a contribution to the development of ag reen area than the limitation of 20 feet that is not always possible.
D-13, Collaborate on local tenanting efforts	Much can be done with collaboration. Define the end goals? How will we know when we are successful?
D-14, Community reinvestment board	How is this prioritized with other uses of the investment fund?
D-1, Community reinvestment fund	Since the system is in place for City Planning to receive the funds, does City Council have to approve expenses.?
D-2, Design guidelines	Design Guidelines are difficult and need to be done carefulliy. A lot of input is important but group design never works. How does this relate to the existing Institutional guidelines. The IMPs of the institutions all have their own design guides. How does CDAP fit in here? Relationship to the RCO review?
D-16, Employer assisted housing	Housing near workplaces is a goal along with preservation of some of the existing community housing. Multiple strategies are needed. More than one idea is important. How will the implementation team be organized. A university may have a different strategy than the neighborhood but equally valuable.
D-3, Environmentally sensitive areas	I do not see how this implementation team has the skills to do this. Is science not important here.? It is a very important goal. The areas need to be defined first before this can be a goal. The partners are too limited.
D-17, Equitable development committee	Good goal. How is equitable development defined and administered?
D-18, Global district	This would be so exciting and a real reflection of the community.
D-4, Green buffer requirement	This needs to be more specific. Green in Oakland is very important and larger areas make more sense than smaller swaths that are difficult to implement. Existing geography may not accommodate this project by project.
D-5, Inclusionary zoning	Good goal. Relationship to the IMP?
D-20, N'hood sustainability identity	Definition required. University has very big goals here. What is the purpose of the committee
D-21, Opportunities for Hispanic businesses	Speaks to diversity and that is good. Goal stated in D1 and D 14. Requires more dialogue to implement.
D-23, Revolving loan program	What funding would be sought from the University of Pittsburgh?
	Affordablility: We need resources to provide incentives for landlords to accept housing choice vouchers, and technical assistance to encourage improvements and investment so units pass inspections.
	Affordablility: The plan must be clearer in stating the community's priority for affordable homeownership – and a key strategy to achieving that is the Oakland Community Land Trust. Growing the CLT to scale is the only way to ensure affordable homeownership can ever be achievable in Oakland. The CLT should be a priority for equitable development funds and employer assisted housing programs, as it is a direct benefit to Oakland residents and an anti-displacement strategy with long-term wealth building benefits. Without connecting home purchase support to Oakland CLT, employers will further fuel speculation as homes would eventually become investment properties, something that would be directly harmful to long term neighborhood health.
	Affordablility: The plan should clearly state that leveraging new development to increase the supply of affordable housing for low-income people is a goal. The plan includes tools such as affordable housing bonus points and Inclusionary Zoning – but it needs a goal statement.
	Affordablility: Construction of subsidized student housing is a must. Students are ineligible for means-tested affordable housing, and only a small percentage are able to afford market-rate units (presuming occupancy laws are enforced); the missing piece is safe and attractive student housing close to campus that is affordable to students at or below mean income levels. This needs to be articulated as a separate goal. In order to achieve equity, locate a more diverse population in housing close to work in Oakland, reduce stresses on low-density residential areas, and increase affordability and opportunity, there must a commitment on the part of the universities to increase their supply of affordable and desirable housing for their undergraduates, and that commitment needs to be significant in scale. There is no market solution to this problem.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	Variety and Strong Urban Design: Particularly in light of recent events, it's clear we need a clear, explicit statement that lower and moderate density residential areas are to be preserved, and that these are protected areas where zoning changes will not be entertained. This will assist policy makers, and will also make it clear that aggressive speculation and buy-outs are not a viable option in those areas.
	Variety and Strong Urban Design: As part of the plan process, the city contracted an updated survey of historic properties in Oakland. Preservation recommendations in that survey should be represented in the goals and policies of the plan.
	Variety and Strong Urban Design: Strategies to support and expand “missing middle” housing in Oakland should be revised to acknowledge the dominance of intense investor speculation in Oakland’s housing market. Any changes to allow ADUs and other additional units in R1 areas will not result in affordable housing unless those properties are included in the Oakland Community Land Trust. This is the only way homeowners can enjoy the benefit of an extra unit to support wealth building or provide an affordable housing unit. Otherwise, additional allowances will simply fuel investor speculation and aggravate negative impacts to surrounding residences.
	Variety and Strong Urban Design: The plan invited community input in two public design charrettes for the Boulevard of the Allies between Halket and Bates, and Forbes between Meyran and Semple. Design recommendations from the plan’s consultants fall short of making specific recommendations, however. More work is needed to distill a clear vision for the future redevelopment of these areas.
	Variety and Strong Urban Design: The plan should have a goal prioritizing excellent urban design. The goal statement should be specific, including the use of high-quality materials and architecture and public spaces that contribute to the public realm. It would also be helpful to have a goal statement – consistent with the existing goal statement of the Oakland Public Realm districts – that protects lower intensity uses from the impacts of higher intensity uses.
	Variety and Strong Urban Design: Design guidelines should also include strategies for activating first floor commercial spaces to avoid the conference rooms and workout spaces that deaden Fifth/Forbes Avenue and add nothing to the public realm.
	Sustainability and Open Space: High performing buildings are an essential goal
	Sustainability and Open Space: Steeply sloped, landslide prone hillside areas should not be viewed as development sites.
	Equity: The plan should include a clearly stated goal to leverage new development to support Oakland resident community needs, especially the needs of the most vulnerable members of the community. Priorities should include affordable housing, community needs (food, health, youth), and employment opportunities.
	<p>Equity: The plan includes a proposed community reinvestment fund, which is a great idea, but needs more detail.</p> <p>oThe fund should be carefully focused in order to deliver measurable benefits to the residential community, including affordable housing development; home repair and façade improvements for low-income homeowners; economic opportunity for Oakland residents (including education, job training, and local career paths); and limited programming to meet the needs of low-income households (including food supports, supportive health services, and youth programming). It would be a mistake to use the Oakland community reinvestment fund to provide low-cost commercial space for business owners who do not reside in Oakland, because those funds should benefit Oakland residents.</p> <p>oWe need guidelines up front to define eligibility for the items to serve Oakland residents, and the funds should be administered by objective public sector professionals (a review panel of no more than 3 – 5 civil servants with appropriate expertise) through a transparent process.</p> <p>oThe value capture that supports this fund should be more carefully and clearly researched and explained. How much support for a CRF does the city expect bonus points and other incentives will generate, and under what conditions? If it's the CRF that is delivering benefits of economic development in Oakland to Oakland residents, it's important to make sure it's up to the task.</p>

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	Want clearer goal for fostering and preserving homeownership, similar to Oakland 2025 Plan. Community Land Trusts are key strategy for community for homeownership. Would like Oakland Community Land Trust highlighted as a tool to achieve goal. (cites prior communication to SC about this). Variety of pathways for homes to be part of CLT.
	Confusion re: Affordable housing for students. Would like more clarity that undergraduate students would not be eligible for affordable housing as defined by HUD.
	Pressure on housing market. Affordability and specific groups, POC, others. Low-income folks.
	Value Capture to help affordable housing,
	CRF – need to define uses of that fund and where to target those funds
	Reducing harm on lower intensity uses; design guidelines and other tools; avoid name-calling as anti-development folks who are concerned about neighborhood quality of life
	Oakland Town Center page – not sure if that is the most compelling name for that area’s redevelopment. Link only goes to workshop page but want more clarity about what redevelopment would look like.
	What area’s are being preserved for low density? That needs to be explicit to developers and Planning Commission.
	Development more bricks and mortar with housing and land use etc. whereas community more programmatic, and so making recommendations about how to tighten/consolidate so have a plan that is easier to follow and implement. Don't want excess duplication.
	need to have replacement of housing stock and avoid tearing down housing.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	I find it confusing, and I've been involved, between the community and development chapters (example: homeownership, preservation of residential communities). Permanent residents are not mentioned prominently in plan.
	what will happen to my comments? I feel I am wasting my time. Do my comments go into a vacuum? I understand City needs to state what is best way to do it. Glad to have another month to comment and will comment more.
	yES!! we need a hardware store and other normal shops — not more restaurants.
Land Use Policy & Regulations, Goal	Suggested new goal: D1.D Framework to provide innovation economy assets. Incentives, requirements, and policies work together to encourage the development, growth, and full potential of the UC-E/Innovation District.
Land Use Policy & Regulations, Policies	Suggested edit: Manage density. Locate dense development in appropriately designed buildings INSIDE THE PGH INNOVATION DISTRICT AND OTHER LOCATIONS near transit and other supportive amenities
Urban Sustainable Design	Suggested new goal: D2.C Buildings that belong in the Pittsburgh Innovation District. Building design and size that speak to the unique opportunity of Oakland and contribute to the unmatched potential of the innovation and technology economies within the District.
Housing	Suggested edit to "Jobs and housing for all" goal: Residents AND ENTREPRENEURS have access to career services and opportunities that allow them to work in their neighborhood, and Oakland's employees, students, and innovators have access to affordable housing that allows them to walk to work or school.
D-13	PID would like to be included as Implementor
D-1	PID would like to be included as Implementor
D-2	PID would like to be included as Implementor
D-15	PID would like to be included as Implementor
D-16	PID would like to be included as Implementor
General Thoughts	Given limited human / fiscal resources, suggestion to rethink the project priorities and focus on low-hanging fruit in the 0 - 2 years
General Thoughts	A thriving innovation district will require a robust mix of uses and we propose allowing more mixed uses in proposed all three areas to allow for more mixed uses
General Thoughts	We need to understand the level of approval process for the uses (Zoning admin approval vs. Zoning Board)
General Thoughts	we are seeking to achieve more residential uses in the UCE and RMU
General Thoughts	RMU should allow for more flexible work from home scenarios to attract startups
D-14 Community reinvestment board	There should be Oakland organizations listed (inc OBID and OTF)

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
D-2 Design Guidelines	This will require time and attention in order to be thoroughly developed - we should have consultant assistance. If done well is great but if not can be detrimental to the community. Guidelines should be written in a way that allows for thoughtful and diverse architectural approaches. Design should not be connected to displacement. IMP have their own design guidelines.
D-5 Inclusionary zoning	Should there also be an Affordable Housing bonus?
D-22 Provide low-cost commercial space	Move this timeframe to 0-2 years
D-21 Opportunities for Hispanic businesses	Move this timeframe to 0-2 years
D-24 Support local businesses	Move this timeframe to 0-2 years
D-12 Wayfinding for neighborhood businesses	Move this timeframe to 0-2 years
	The plan should clarify language regarding the following terms: “city equitable development trust fund”, “community reinvestment fund”, “community reinvestment board”.their use is confusing throughout the document. It is not clear whether they are interchangeable.
Mobility	
Reimagine Bates Street	Widening Bates Street for the purpose of more single occupancy vehicles would be a disaster, leading only to greater congestion and parking problems in Oakland. For the sake of mobility, equity, and the climate, DOMI must do whatever it can to push against a 4 SOV-lane Bates.
Build Up OTMA	I feel like this would be a great plan to put into action. Me as a bus rider i know and feel how good is to feel that my bus route is a reliable bus to take. so them putting money up to do things like improving pedestrian walks and the bus management on design is a great idea. also them trying to fund bus shuttles for the college students that would be a great thing coming from a college student. it would be easy on there commute to class making them either on time or earlier. thats not selfish thinking.
Reimagine Boulevard of the Allies	awesome
McKee Place Complete Street	i think this would make mckee and louisa much safer to walk and bike on. i hate cares
Centre Avenue & Craig Street Pedestrian Safety and Transit Improvements	As a resident at this intersection, crossing by foot is a daily threat. Very little time is given for pedestrian crossing, and pedestrians should not have to press the button to request the crossing signal. I used to depend on the Healthyride bikeshare station for commuting, but it’s recent removal was a shock! A mobility hub would be hugely beneficial, especially should it include bicycles. Lookin forward to seeing these improvements soon!
Centre Avenue & Craig Street Pedestrian Safety and Transit Improvements	Comment on above: I agree! As someone who frequents this intersection and used to utilize the bikes often, I'm excited to see these new changes implemented!
Complete the Fifth Avenue Bikeway	Completing the Fifth Avenue bikeway would be of benefit to the local economy of Oakland. Being from Shadyside, I often avoid going into Oakland mainly because of the lack of bikeways going into the neighborhood. I know that other cyclist in the surrounding neighborhoods feel the same way. Fifth Ave. traffic is often a result of cyclist taking up an entire lane of traffic so having a dedicated bike lane would also help ease that consistent issue.
Centre Avenue & Craig Street Pedestrian	This proposal is very vital to the overall well-being of the daily commenters which frequent this intersection.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
Reimagine Boulevard of the Allies	<p>As a member of Saint George, located on the corner of Dawson Street and Boulevard of the Allies, I am in full support of the project's goals, as I am sure the rest of our congregation will be. However, I would suggest some items for consideration, including:</p> <p>1. The junction of Dawson Street where it joins Boulevard of the Allies is always a congested area, especially on Sunday mornings and at other times when services are being held, including the whole of Lent, Christmas, etc. This is normally caused when cars on Dawson are waiting for the traffic light to turn onto Boulevard of the Allies, blocking the road for cars coming from across the street on Dawson St., and turning into Dawson Street from Boulevard of the Allies, and if the proposed pedestrian peninsulas are installed on each corner, I am sure this will be made much worse. My suggestion is to designate Dawson Street as a one-way street up to Temple St with traffic flow from the cathedral to the funeral home, following the direction of the one way system already in place on the other side of Boulevard of the Allies.</p> <p>2. Parking is a major issue, especially for our older and handicapped parishioners. We would like you to consider this in your planning by: a) keep the existing handicapped space(s) intact on Dawson St in front of the cathedral. b) make allowances for parking on Boulevard of the Allies next to the church during service times.</p> <p>To my knowledge, nobody from the planning committee has reached out to the cathedral for their input on the proposal and I would encourage you to contact our priest, Father Joshua, phone (412) 681-2988, so we can work together on this project for maximum benefit to all.</p> <p>With kindest regards, John Steadman</p>
Reimagine Boulevard of the Allies	<p>Comment on above: I'm so relieved to see members of St. George's parish responding here. As a local neighbor and a member of the steering committee for this plan, I did recommend to the planners they reach out to Father Joshua, but I believe they had some trouble connecting before this draft was published. There is (was?) more in this project sketch about parking for St. George, which is definitely an important consideration.</p>
Complete the Fifth Avenue Bikeway	<p>I believe that the completion of the Fifth Avenue bikeway would be a great step in increasing cycling connectivity and safety in the Oakland Area. As a person who commutes by bicycle and takes most trips by bike and public transit, having safer options to get around in Oakland will make me more likely to travel to the area to shop, eat, or visit friends. I think that many would agree that more connectivity for active forms of transport are only beneficial to the people in this city, not just cyclists, but also cars, by being able to protect cyclists from vehicles and also keeping a good separation of transport modes to improve traffic.</p>
Build Up OTMA	<p>Agree we need to enhance OTMA. We have many transportation issues that are unique to Oakland.</p>
Integrated Shuttle and Transit Mobility Study	<p>Remove shuttles from residential streets. The streets are narrow and were designed for local, residential use. For example, have advocated for the removal of shuttles from N Dithridge Street which is narrow (one way) and residential. The intersection at Dithridge and Centre is made even more dangerous by shuttles both crossing and</p>
Integrated Shuttle and Transit Mobility Study	<p>Comment on above: Agreed. This is a persistent issue and you lay out a very clear remedy, Kathy. Let's make these changes.</p>
Integrated Shuttle and Transit Mobility Study	<p>Shuttle overlap and shuttles on residential streets/incursion into residential areas while not serving long term residents is a persistent issue. Once and for all we need a solution. remove shuttles from residential streets. Eliminate the inequity of shuttles on residential streets that foster investor speculation and bring traffic/pollution/safety concerns without any benefit to long term Oakland residents. We need a publicly available local transit service to serve these areas. And we need to remove shuttles from residential streets.</p>
Manage On-Street Parking	<p>I have concerns about hybrid parking permits. With the elimination of stickers and visitor passes, we were assured there would be increased enforcement. The hybrid permits would seem to decrease the availability of parking for permanent residents</p>

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
Pedestrian Safety Improvements	The intersection at N Dithridge and Centre Ave. needs pedestrian enhancements. No signal, shuttles turning, limited visibility. Bollards are often knocked over. This is an intersection where many seniors, as well as students, cross to access bus stops on Centre. Delivery vehicles are parked on Dithridge obstructing view. Perhaps right turn only at this intersection and make upper Dithridge one way heading south to eliminate congestion caused by cross traffic and increase both vehicle and pedestrian safety. Pedestrian crossings will increase when community gathering space is completed at Herron Hill Pumping Station.
	Need rapid transit expanded into Oakland, Hazelwood, Greenfield, Squirrel Hill, downtown. T into Oakland was cancelled. You cannot bike / walk 50% of the time in Pittsburgh. You cannot bike / walk while carrying laptop, books, groceries, cleaning supplies, etc. 80% of the time. Older people and people with disabilities cannot bike or walk from point A to Point B. Need roads open to cars and keep bikes on bike trails. Thank.you!
	Comment on above: I agree with you that we need more room for rapid transit but, the more transit could cause for more traffic, and more accidents could occur. Maybe they could make it 70% transit (for bigger vehicles) and 30% for the bikers, walkers, and the disabled. Just a suggestion.
	Comment on above: The only way commuter traffic single occupancy vehicles (SOV) from outer areas like North Hills is going to be reduced is with major improvement in transit options. Light rail? More park-n-rides? Not sure, but will take time to figure out and implement. In the meantime, plan on having similar ratios of SOV in those areas for a decade or more.
Manage On-Street Parking	Project goal to convert all RPP areas to Hybrid is simply stupid. We residents petitioned 75% of our neighbors to be an RPP area 40 years ago. Now, with very little real resident input, it is already open to non-residents like rental company vehicles and B&Bs. The addition of Hybrid parking will open all RPP areas for anybody if they pay a fee. I know that the Parking Authority had low income last years, but putting the burden of increasing revenues by pushing Hybrid parking into RPP areas is unfathomable. We already have little enforcement. The RPP areas would need continual enforcement for their entire active period and even extended that enforcement time because of hospital workers and others who love to park our neighborhood any time they think they won't get a ticket. We are an aging population who needs to have a hope of parking within 3 blocks of their homes. Dump this Hybrid Parking for all RPP areas. It should by only by 75% of resident request!
Curbside Management Toolkit	Curbside Management - can this strategy be expanded to include residential areas. More explicitly apply this to all streets in Oakland.
	Design standards for sidewalks (residential and commercial; tree pits, materials, etc) are necessary.
Manage On-Street Parking	Any traffic study would need to be longer than 6 months. Remember that most of the short-term renters in my neighborhood are only parking when the universities (mostly Pitt I suspect) are in session. If one investigates and collects data during a university break, you get an entirely different perspective -- and there is actually parking available on the streets. There would still be hospital workers parking illegally and with "borrowed" visitor passes, but any project would need to last at least a year so that the full picture of the parking situation is captured.
Bus Stop Enhancements	Every bus stop should have weather protection and seating standard to improve comfort and, more importantly, to provide safer waiting areas for disabled people.
	Comment on above: I agree with you that we need more room for rapid transit but, the more transit could cause for more traffic, and more accidents could occur. Maybe they could make it 70% transit (for bigger vehicles) and 30% for the bikers, walkers, and the disabled. Just a suggestion.
Bike Route Improvements	We should add or make more room for bicyclists. Although they might be a pain sometimes with all the traffic, they also need to be places too. So I figured, if we added

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	<p>That was the biggest obstacle I faced thinking about improving the pedestrian experience on Forbes. The way Forbes and Fifth are set up now mimics that of the interstate they come off from, and being so close to that exit/on ramp it's difficult to try and reorganize the traffic flow from Forbes. The best I could come up with, without doing some extensive research, was maybe trying to do something with Boulevard of the Allies, but that road already has some strain on it.</p> <p>Another option would just be trying to provide a replacement for the people that usually drove through Forbes via reliable and efficient public transit. Buses likely won't be enough for that though s it once again goes back to biting the bullet on the Spine Line.</p>
	<p>This chapter has a lot of really good initiatives for the project, but it seems to fall short in the areas where it really has the opportunity to capitalize.</p> <p>This project is getting underway at a crucial time, gas prices are soaring and the climate crisis is looming. There is no better time to begin fundamentally rethinking the way we plan cities to remove car dependency. This chapter makes a good attempt to address this, namely with the improvement of the biking infrastructure, pedestrianization, and bus service. But, I can't help but feel it falls short.</p> <p>The bike lane improvements are overall pretty thoroughly and efficiently planned, though I would add we should strive to replace all "standard bike lanes" with at the very least "bike boulevards". Standard bike lanes offer little to no protection for bikers.</p> <p>It's great to see the plan striving to make Oakland more pedestrian friendly, but it still allows for many missed opportunities in that regard. There is a stretch of Forbes Avenue by the University of Pittsburgh Craft Ave to S Bellfield Ave that is prime for a closed off pedestrian street. The area is fairly dense, full of many local (but also chain) shops and restaurants, and typically full of people to the point that the current sidewalks are crowded. This area has already experimented with a pedestrian street on Oakland Avenue in the summer that is a rousing success. All of the conditions necessary for a thriving pedestrian street are in place here, the only thing standing in the way is the immense amount of car traffic. I would propose the the street be reduced to only bus, emergency, and bike traffic as these can coexist with a pedestrian street.</p> <p>The last but most important part of this plan I'd like to comment on is the bus and public transit improvements. These improvements overall just seem like they're falling so short of what they could, and should, be, especially if we want to create the thriving transit oriented community described in the goals. Don't get me wrong, improving the bus service to the area is great, but it seems more like taking the easy way out for public transportation. What really needs to happen here, and not just with Oakland, but also in terms of the Hill plan, is for the Port Authority to finally commit to "the Spine Line" and construct a rail transit system. Connecting the two largest economic centers in the Pittsburgh region, especially considering the predicted growth of the Hill and Oakland, is essential to creating a more accessible, environmentally conscious, and modern city and region. There are many studies out there, both official and non-official, that provide insight into potential routes, costs, etc, and it is certainly worth looking into further. The fact of the matter is, bus rapid transit, while certainly much better than what the area currently receives, does not provide the adequate efficiency, speed, nor comfort that would be required for what is already one of Pittsburgh's most heavily transit utilizing areas, let alone considering the increases that would be seen from the rest of this plan. Yes, BRT will certainly be cheaper as well, but only upfront. It will end up costing the city more down the line in terms of both financials and social losses. Now is the most opportune moment to begin developments like this. We can't let it slip past us.</p> <p>I've decided to do a little research into possible funding sources for the rail development since no matter how you look at it, that will be the most difficult obstacle to overcome. It would be worth looking towards the private sector for this development, as has been noted in previous studies, and in this case perhaps current Oakland</p>

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	<p>Comment on above:: Interesting comments. I wonder if anybody remembers that both Forbes and Fifth used to be two-way streets -- that changed in the early 70's. I believe the idea then was to move the traffic through Oakland at a faster rate. I wonder is anybody ever compared before and after traffic rates. It certainly was pedestrian safer with both being two-way. How about we put it back to both being two-way?</p> <p>I have heard that it is now impossible because of the entry to Parkway -- that slip lane, so two way traffic can never go back onto Fifth. Some planners thought that was a great idea -- the one-way system and the slip lane -- but now we are stuck with it. (I always wonder if somebody got a bonus or promotion for the idea that continues to cause traffic tie-ups -- a shame if they did, since it stops us doing things in Oakland now.</p>
	<p>Comment on above: There has been a lot of research on the effects of one-way streets. The conclusion has been although they do moderately improve traffic speeds for drivers, they are horrible for pedestrians. Conversion back to two way streets reduces illegal speeding and reduces the number of pedestrians hit/accidents in general.</p> <p>Given what was done to Fifth/Forbes around the Birmingham Bridge, a full two-way conversion would be very expensive, but I would think it would be relatively easy to add back in opposite lanes up to Halket or Craft.</p> <p>I think Forbes works okay as is, but something needs to be done regarding Fifth. That street is a nightmare for pedestrians, as can be seen by the necessity of those railings seperating the sidewalk and the road.</p>
	<p>Comment on above: That was the biggest obstacle I faced thinking about improving the pedestrian experience on Forbes. The way Forbes and Fifth are set up now mimics that of the interstate they come off from, and being so close to that exit/on ramp it's difficult to try and reorganize the traffic flow from Forbes. The best I could come up with, without doing some extensive research, was maybe trying to do something with Boulevard of the Allies, but that road already has some strain on it.</p> <p>Another option would just be trying to provide a replacement for the people that usually drove through Forbes via reliable and efficient public transit. Buses likely won't be enough for that though s it once again goes back to biting the bullet on the Spine Line.</p>
Centre Avenue & Craig Street Pedestrian Safety and Transit Improvements	Center and Dollar Strret is the real problem. Someone will get killed if you don't do something. Lots of chaos , people park in front of the fire Hydrant blocking visibility. Park on the other side center . Someone will get hurt .
Centre Avenue & Craig Street Pedestrian Safety and Transit Improvements	Comment on above: I would like to second this. At the very least, having some mirrors to see around the corners would be very helpful. There are stores there that need to allow street parking, which I am fine with, but because of the parking it is impossible to see around the corner. Mirrors + extending the yellow lines might help with this
Centre Avenue & Craig Street Pedestrian Safety and Transit Improvements	Considering that this is one of the main intersections of the area, the priority given to pedestrians for commuting is extremely poor. The wait for a green signal is extremely long and the duration of a green signal is very short. I believe that a shift in priority for commuting is required starting with pedestrians, followed closely by two wheelers, and then cars and other large vehicles.
	Need to consider new lighting. new lighting lets one see blocks down the road, old lighting you can only see the house right under the light

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	Sidewalks - how do we look at ownership, funding, maintenance, design, that doesn't burden the adjacent property owner or ignore the needs of residential neighborhoods
	Entry points/wayfinding signage for trails, steps
	Trail connection to Eliza Furnace Trail
	Goal M1B - this would be transformative. If PAAC could deliver on direct N-S access into Oakland (via Bigelow, Centre, Bates, SOV commuter pressure from neighborhoods outside the East End and N/S/W suburbs would be greatly reduced.
	Policy M1 - rapid transit access w/in 10 minutes is possible only with BRT on the Boulevard (preferably connecting to BRT service on Second Avenue).
	Policy M4 + M6 - somewhere in these two is a reduction in the demand for vehicle ownership in Oakland, but it isn't clearly articulated. Perhaps better stated as a goal? This was heard consistently in mobility, development, community: Oakland has to reduce the demand for resident parking as well as the demand for visitor parking, by making it easier and cheaper to not own a car than it is to own a car in Oakland. This requires Oakland to become a truly walkable community, with amenities (groceries, grown-up retail, services) located in the neighborhood. Car-share should be a priority in this regard: make it easier for any student to rent a car (eg Zipcar) than to own/park one. Incentives would include promotion of car-share programs (and development patterns that prioritize walkability, density, etc.); penalties for car ownership should include redesign of RPPP program to exclude vehicles registered to permanent addresses outside the RPPP areas (and certainly exclude out-of-state plates!).
	Comment on above: Free loop buses for resident are desperately needed. Bring back the Oakland Loop!
	Comment on above: also, consider reducing the # of permits allowed per housing unit here in Oakland
	in Policy M.1: Resources for TDM.: this should be moved to a different section as it is not specifically related to transit service and stations. TDM is more broad. I think TDM should be its own header with policy statements under it. In that case you would add fewer trips with only one passenger, which is also not directly related to transit service and stations as that could be accomplished in other ways, not only transit.
	policy M6. Parking -- off-site parking: in Oakland, parking is in such high demand, that this already occurs. We don't need a marketing campaign. People find parking wherever they can get it. I'm concerned with this listed as a policy overall -- to have a lot of "off-site" parking. This can become harmful for the community when speculators would read this and think they can build parking lots in all sort of places in the neighborhood, contrary to zoning, to provide "off-site" parking. We already have this issue with hillside areas and valleys where speculators think they can fill those areas with huge parking structures. We need to explicitly state that this is not what we want. Please revise this item or remove it altogether. Better would be to have controls on additional parking lots and structures so that we encourage other modes of travel to Oakland.
	policy M.6 parking - surface parking: It is helpful to have this statement as an attempt to address the issue of the sale of parking spaces on residential property to commuters. A challenge to enforce, for sure.
	I'm excited by policy M4, implementing the Bike(+) plan for Oakland, as well as the general recommendations around giving cyclists and pedestrians priority. Prioritizing active transit is not only a key tool in mitigating carbon emissions, but it also helps reduce unnecessary car-related fatalities and keeps us safer.
	I am so excited that the City of Pittsburgh is prioritizing accessibility in Oakland. I went to school at Pitt, and while I no longer live there post-graduation I am in Oakland
	Speaking as a former Oakland resident, I would definitely have used bike lanes when I lived there. Many residents are working-class, and not all can afford cars. The sections of this plan around expanding bike & pedestrian infrastructure, and implementing the Bike(+) Plan for Oakland should quickly be put into practice.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	As someone who uses Oakland regularly as a pedestrian or a biker, I wholly support the implementation of the Bike+ plan for Oakland. Any improvement and expansion of pedestrian infrastructure is extremely important to me.
	As a resident of Oakland, I feel it is very important to have safe spaces for bikers and walkers alike, especially on college campuses where most kids do not have access to cars in this city. I also agree wholly with increased bicycle circulation.
	The city should reform the zoning code to get rid of mandatory parking minimums. This change is especially valuable in locations like Oakland that have good transit.
	<p>Comment on above: Agreed 100%. Downtown has lacked residential parking minimums for some time, and the Uptown Public Realm has extended this area considerably. Oakland is the second central business district of the city, and already contains the highest residential density. In addition many students (undergrad or graduate) do not drive and have no need for parking attached to their housing units.</p> <p>A lack of any parking minimums would allow construction of smaller apartment buildings to be much easier, as any need for structured parking such as a garage would be eliminated (the new zoning largely bans surface lots from my understanding, meaning garages are the only option). Structured parking is typically quite expensive, adding an additional \$20,000-\$40,000 per space to building construction. This necessitates more expensive units. Cities such as Minneapolis have found that average rental costs have dropped as parking minimums have been eliminated.</p>

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	<p>"M1 Safety & Accessibility" - please use the blue lights you have on busses or very yellow light. This not only helps with the dark skies but won't hurt drivers vision, not interfere as much with local residents sleep etc.</p> <p>"M1 Multimodal connectivity" - I am terrified to bike in Oakland because as a pedestrian I have to dodge cars. Bike lanes, like roads, aren't useful if they don't connect. Right now there is no way to get from North Oakland to Schenely park with bike lanes. Neville is along the train tracks, at least 100 feet below schenley park proper.</p> <p>" M2 Open space uses in the rights-of-way" - On Forbes Ave by CMU you have entire lanes of street blocked off yellow so *no one* can use them - not cars or pedestrians. You have turning lanes that are almost never used too. Reclaim this space for pedestrians. Also please widen the sidewalk on the bridge so (1) we don't get stabbed by umbrellas, (2) we don't get soaked by cars driving by, and (3) people on crutches and wheelchairs can get past pedestrians walking the other direction.</p> <p>" M2 Leading pedestrian intervals" - What about designated certain stretches of road as Pedestrian Priority and keeping the sidewalk level the entire stretch. Any time the sidewalk meets a road, have a car go over the sidewalk bump. This makes the space *for* pedestrians and forces drivers to feel out of place. Another Idea - incorporate yellow into an official pittsburgh crosswalk design to go with the bridges and increase visibility of crosswalks.</p> <p>"M2 Sidewalk experience improved" - wider sidewalks! Wide enough theres also a bike lane with a 3" curb to the road and a second 3" curb to the sidewalk. Make streets one way, claim one row of parking to expand sidewalks. This will also encourage people to only bus or not own cars in Pittsuburgh. B</p> <p>"M3 Identify ADA sidewalk needs" - the bridge on Forbes by CMU has a very narrow sidewalk that is hard to get through on crutches/scooter/wheelchair because other people walk in the opposite direction. There are also poles in the middle of the sidewalk all over the place.</p> <p>"M6 - Surface parking" - Build a parking garage with plants on the walls and a *park* on the roof so people like looking at it and like using it. Make part of it a dog park so people from the neighborhood can meet each other. Incorporate rent-a-car opportunities like Zip-car so residents don't need to own.</p>
	<p>I love to see biking and pedestrian safety as so important to this plan. As a student at Pitt I would always ride my bike to get around. Many times I would have drivers on my tail or have to avoid folks opening their doors. Increasing bike infrastructure and making sure all that infrastructure connects would have made me bike even more and even maybe convinced more of my friends to bike as well.</p> <p>The only objection I have is that there is no focus on creating a bus lane down Forbes ave. A dedicated bus line on Forbes would increase the speed of buses through Oakland for those headed to Squirrel Hill and further on down Forbes meaning less likelihood of Oakland traffic causing delays for folks taking the 61 lines. With enough support we could even eventuall see the line electrified with above street wires in accordance with city sustainability goals.</p>

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	<p>Are trees going to be cut down for the "Connect the Junction Hollow Trail to North Oakland?"</p> <p>How do we address the garbage, broken table on the porch, and broken glass on the sidewalk at</p> <p>1 BOUNDARY ST.?</p>
Traffic calming corridors	<p>Traffic calming would be welcome on Blvd of the Allies, which can be frightening for even high-stress bicyclists to use given its quasi-freeway-like streetscape and lane widths. But it can be hard to avoid for bicyclists, since there's no alternatives to get through its corridor.</p>
Manage On-Street Parking	<p>Under "What we heard" -</p> <p>While Oakland has many Residential Permit Parking (RPP) zones, many people continue to park in these areas without a pass for free and the limited means for enforcement has not been sufficient to eliminate this problem.</p> <p>This is misleading and not entirely accurate. Enforcement is obviously important, but the overwhelming dysfunction with the RPPP zones in Oakland is the fact that each of them is fatally over-subscribed. DCP and DOMI should have requested RPPP area subscription data and the city's calculation of the number of possible parking spaces in each area to establish the baseline here. Broadening access to on-street parking in areas that are so heavily over-subscribed is not sensible.</p> <p>There are ways to restrict RPPP eligibility that conform to existing law. For example, consistent with PA law (which in Oakland has been deliberately not enforced for decades), residents who are here for more than 90 days should be required to register their cars in Pennsylvania. Any applicant for an RPPP permit should be required to demonstrate that their car is registered in PA. It would not be in any way contrary to the spirit of the program to further require that the car be registered at the address in the RPPP area, since after all the intent is to limit on-street parking to residents of the area, not visitors (however long-term).</p> <p>The rationale behind the hybrid idea here is that it could generate revenue that would help with enforcement. It would be a simpler and more straightforward thing to ensure RPPP citation revenue is earmarked for RPPP enforcement - currently all the ticket money goes into the general fund, and the city has no way of calculating the "revenue" enforcement generates.</p> <p>The city could also explore raising the permit price, which hasn't changed since the program's creation almost 40 years ago. The program could offer a means-tested reduced price for low- and fixed-income residents. The market rate for an off-street space in Central Oakland is ~\$125/month; but an RPP is \$20/year.</p> <p>These are all things planners "heard" in action team meetings and discussions with community members, but they aren't reflected here.</p>
Manage On-Street Parking	<p>The South Side PED is designed to capture visitor parking revenue during off-hours because so much of Carson Street is a nighttime economy - visitors to Carson Street's bars and clubs arrive after the typical hours for enforcing on-street parking charges. That's not the case in Oakland, where the overwhelming demand for overnight on-street parking is from residents, not visitors. Patrons of Oakland's bars are generally local.</p>
Bus Stop Enhancements	<p>helters at all bus stops would be great as well as ensuring that there is good drainage at the stop because there are sometimes big puddles the busses hit and splash everywhere onto people. Seating is also a great idea. Making sure people are dry and protected when waiting for busses. Lighting at night would be good too. Thanks!</p>
Reimagine Robinson Street	<p>Great ideas and illustrations for addressing a pressing, persistent problem.</p>

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
Reimagine Boulevard of the Allies	As a longtime member (55 years) of St. George Orthodox Church on the corner of Dawson St. and the Blvd. of the Allies, and as an avid bicyclist, who uses many of the bike lanes in the city (I am also a city resident {Squirrel Hill}), I would like to explain the impact of this change of the Boulevard as it affects our parish.
Reimagine Boulevard of the Allies	I am concerned that this plan will negatively impact available street parking for churches including St. George Antiochian Orthodox Cathedral, which is at the corner of Dawson St. and the Blvd of the Allies. Parking is difficult in Oakland and parishioners rely on available street parking to attend services.
Reimagine Boulevard of the Allies	Zulema St is an important relief valve for Bates St. fire trucks need to exit Bates to get to Oakcliff and a relief vavle to traffic leaving Oakland,
Reimagine Bates Street	<p>Widening Bates Street for more vehicles is not future proof. It is proven across the country that creating more lanes leads to even more traffic. Supply and Demand. Bates gets backed up because of all the traffic to the Parkway East and the incredibly short on-ramp, and the short-off ramp coming off the Parkway. With the future Oakland Crossings, and the Hazelwood Green site, the city and state really need to think about future proofing the Parkway.</p> <p>The city needs a road "diet," not get more hungry. The intersection with Zulema Street is worthless. I never see anyone drive on that road. Same with the little Coltart crossover to Bates. You have enough lanes on the Blvd, so maybe ease the congestion coming down from Forbes and Fifth first before creating more lanes.</p>
McKee Place Complete Street	This would make McKee Place a safer spot around the Pittsburgh campus. It would also reduce the noise by half. This would increase property value for landlords on this street significantly
McKee Place Complete Street	Comment on above: I might be inclined to agree with you, however, what do you have at stake in this decision
McKee Place Complete Street	Making McKee a one way will be a traffic nightmare. There’s already very bad traffic during rush hour. Making it one way will not help. Taking away street parking will cause major problems for residents who depend on it. Bike lanes are unnecessary on McKee. Focus on Forbes and Fifth where there are many more bike riders. This project would be a waste of the city’s money in my opinion.
Complete the Fifth Avenue Bikeway	great project, solid analysis - would benefit cyclists. Would design likely involve a bike box at Neville to accommodate turns in the direction of Ellsworth?
Centre Avenue & Craig Street Pedestrian Safety and Transit Improvements	looks like some much-needed improvements and is clearly described and illustrated.
Build Up OTMA	Would like to see OTMA's board diversified to include (more) Oakland residents, bicycle advocates, bus commuters from other neighborhoods, students. Would like OPDC to be a partner in this project. For OTMA to be a leader in neighborhood transportation planning, need a stronger connection to the neighborhoods and residents. Strongly support broadening mission.
	What is the timeline of implementation of the projects/programs, and which are shovel ready? There are a lot of elements in the Plan and how will prioritization happen
	In general, when doing improvements, work with institutional partners where feasible to get extra feet/space beyond existing ROW. Example of Fifth and Morewood and how CMU-DOMI-PAAC are coordinating -- that is important for better addressing transit, bike, pedestrian, vehicle user needs in Right of Way

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	Support for more pedestrianization and less Single Occupancy Vehicle usage. Concern if BRT will be adequate to achieve Oakland Plan goals and get more people on transit. Spine plan or spine corridor - -a proposed “T” or rail extension from downtown to Monroeville. It will be a missed opportunity given more people are moving to taking transit, e.g. young people and others, and there has been a recent push for transit now so how to best take advantage of the moment, and also as considering regional connections. Need more ambitious transit goal. Not opposed to BRT, since even if we had light rail service, we would need bus service. Also interest in informing planning opportunities outside of Oakland Plan that tie to light rail expansion. [discussion in virtual open house in response]
	When bus lines change due to BRT, how to ensure also meeting other neighborhood bus connectivity needs? [discussion in virtual open house in response]
	Many two-lane streets have parking. Is it possible to replace parking that is on the side of major corridors with bus lanes instead? [discussion in virtual open house in response]
	Do you have more information on the BRT route? [discussion in virtual open house in response]
Central Oakland & Pitt Bicycle Connection	Discussion in virtual open house re: how the proposed Central Oakland & Pitt Bicycle Connection ties into the BRT cycle track and the larger bike network and existing options, such as the existing route using Pitt’s Posvar Passage and Bigelow.
Central Oakland & Pitt Bicycle Connection	To get funding for this proposal, consider multimodal funding, CMAQ, TAP and review their eligibility requirements. DOMI would likely be the applicant for the university, especially on Pitt property, to make improvements. CMAQ and TAP is every year, but financial awards are made available on a two-year basis. Eligibility requirements changed in 2019 to ensure the municipality is engaged and partnering with community organizations/advocates etc. DOMI would therefore need to be involved as part of this. PennDOT would need to be involved for Forbes, Bates, Boulevard of the Allies. Multimodal funding through State's DCED come with different level of requirements. Look at new federal infrastructure bill and influx of dollars, as it might allow for more projects to be done (still competitive process). All funding sources embrace collaboration, community-buy-in, engagement, multiple partners.
Complete the Fifth Ave Bikeway	Are you looking at dedicated bike signals and turn lanes? Western PA School for Blind Children is in the area. There have been challenges with cyclists not understanding signal prioritization. 80 schools send their students to that facility – it is very busy, and need to consider how teachers and students navigate near fast cyclists, in order to avoid pedestrian/cyclist collisions. In other locations like Forbes, Bigelow, O'Hara, bike boxes have helped.
McKee Place Complete Street	Virtual Open House conversation around how quickly this project might be implementable based on which elements involve paint-based implementation as compared to longer-time-frame construction improvements
Reimagine Bates Street	There are wooden steps connecting Hodge and Ayers that need to be restored. They are passable now but not hugely stable or safe enough for the seniors who live on Ayers St.
	There needs to be pedestrian and bike access added down the hillside by Swinburne and near the nursery site, to get down to the Hollow – it would need a switchback route. The goal of this would be to increase access for bike commuters, first/last mile connections. The current route for such commuters is very roundabout: using Boulevard, then poor sidewalk conditions on Bates, to get to the trail.
	Explore opportunity to do restoration of the existing steps that go from behind Dan Marino field across the parkway down to 2nd Ave - new construction may pose implementation challenges but maybe it's more feasible to implement if the steps are restored. This was seen as a plus to residents in past when the idea was introduced.
Reimagine Bates Street	There is resident interest in restoring the Lawn Street green strip (before the hillside drop-off) to make the neighborhood more attractive and also there is interest in restoring the Rockcliffe Alley trail that begins at Lawn/Ophelia (Oakcliffe may be able to confirm, but likely the green strip is higher priority).
Reimagine Bates Street	Please protect Bates Street parklet (southeast corner of Bates/Blvd of the Allies) during PennDOT widening project
Reimagine Bates Street	Eliza Furnace trail access is important
Reimagine Bates Street	Frazier street steps' reconstruction -- City is adding a bike runnel. Need to have signage here, as that would be especially key for connection to 2nd Ave and Bates and neighborhoods. PennDOT proposed Shared Use Path on Bates also needs to integrate with this and signage.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
Reimagine Bates Street	What is the timeline for Frazier St steps reconstruction?
Reimagine Bates Street	Regarding Eliza Furnace Trail Access and Bates Street: In the past the trail bridge was raised (to avoid truck clearance issues), and this resulted in the removal of the goat trail. Access is critically needed here from the Oakland side to the trail, since only other way via Oakland to get to the Eliza Furnace Trail is from Junction Hollow Trail/Boundary St.
Reimagine Boulevard of the Allies	Regarding the pedestrian bridge that is proposed separately from Oakland Plan: it is important to preserve the Zulema parklet green space. It doesn't provide safe navigation across Blvd for the majority of South and Central Oakland and serves more the proposed development itself. It is better to look at other alternatives to ensure there is safe access across Boulevard of the Allies.
Reimagine Boulevard of the Allies	During rehab work on the Charles Anderson bridge, look at also repairing the Juno steps. This issue has been a long-time concern voiced by residents. Could the City acquire the 3 homes on Juno? Take note too of the area easements and Juno being a paper street. Need trail access to simplify access and ease safety. When the Mon-O project was previously looking at heavier vehicles, there were hillside stability issues, but maybe instead Juno could be restored as a pedestrian trail. This would improve trail access to/from Greenfield and Oakland. The Juno steps today are almost completely impassible for most pedestrians, given their missing treads. Trash is gathering down there.
Reimagine Robinson Street	When implementing Fifth/Robinson proposal, the path of least resistance would be to use existing right of way, but there may also be additional opportunities that could be explored.
Safe Multimodal Connection from Fifth Ave to the Junction Hollow Trail	This proposal is important given it is a north-south connection in Oakland and this is a commuter route (non-transit commute)
Safe Multimodal Connection from Fifth Ave to the Junction Hollow Trail	Exploring a legal crossing of the railroad tracks by Panther Hollow Lake was a big part of the Mon-O project. DOMI had looked at potentially a tunnel under the tracks rather than a bridge. However, recognize that realistically this could take some time.
Safe Multimodal Connection from Fifth Ave to the Junction Hollow Trail	Panther Hollow stormwater work could have been combined with adding sidewalk to Neville Street, but the community was told no engineering was done to determine how to do sidewalk, it was only known that it was possible. Duquesne Light Company was initially going to dig up the south portion of Neville and people asked DLC to put in a sidewalk on the side of the sub-station but there is still no sidewalk. Area has not been leveled out. [discussion in virtual house regarding latest plan]. There is a simple approach to manage this: rebuild intersection where Joncaire connects with Boundary and S. Neville (intersection area is having drainage issues), and install a crosswalk there to connect. Or, if the sidewalk is on the west side of S. Neville, then would not need a crosswalk. Explore issues related to encroachment and wall near CMU parking lot, and the museum. While this project is pursued, also need to track if the museum parking garage is ever rebuilt.
Safe Multimodal Connection from Fifth Ave to the Junction Hollow Trail	OPDC comments that the Oakland community preference would be for an on-street pedestrian route. Off-street is better than what we have now (see Green Street Team work in 2016 or 2017). However, very concerned that teenagers, who comprise most pedestrians now using the route, may not utilize the off-street shared use path option. For this reason, there really needs to be an on-street/at-grade route. Need to ensure Mon-Oakland project serves Oakland neighborhood and there are sidewalk improvements through the Hollow. Fast cyclists are less of a hazard on the roadway. It's ok to have sharrows on the road and also have cyclists use sidewalk as needed, but key for pedestrians to have a sidewalk. CMU students, Central Catholic students, and Pitt students often are walking that way. There are also some joggers.
Safe Multimodal Connection from Fifth Ave to the Junction Hollow Trail	Adjacent neighborhood residents have been agnostic as to whether it is an on-street or off-street route. But resident drivers are encountering lots of pedestrians on the street, and this leads to swerving etc. and those residents are concerned by this.
Safe Multimodal Connection from Fifth Ave to the Junction Hollow Trail	Joncaire Steps needs signage to indicate it is a path to a multimodal commuter corridor. Need signage for Junction Hollow Trail as well. There is not signage for city steps and trails now, as roadways have been the focus of signage. More signage also ties into how we encourage steps as a commuting alternative for users.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
Safe Multimodal Connection from Fifth Ave to the Junction Hollow Trail	PWSA had a plan for underground work in Schenley Park. There was a walking trail introduced under the Murphy Administration that now exists, and it connects Junction Hollow Trail up the hillside to Bridle Trail. From Bridle Trail, if take Zigzag Trail, it drops you at the Junction Hollow Trail on the other side of the tracks and avoids the need to cross the railroad to gain access to the Junction Hollow Trail. Look at improvements to this trail.
Bike Route Improvements	Are you also looking at dedicated bike signals and turn lanes? [discussion at virtual open house]
Bus Stop Enhancements	I broadly support Bus Stop Enhancements proposal. BRT also will affect existing bus stops.
Curbside Management Toolkit	Forbes and Fifth see lots of food delivery and other delivery issues. Need to consider bike lanes and bus lanes relative to deliveries, and this is good to see considered here in the plan.
Curbside Management Toolkit	Sometimes there is an enforcement issue with bike and bus lanes...there needs to be more enforcement. Bollards are disregarded by some. People are parking in bike lanes despite bollards.
Curbside Management Toolkit	How does this curbside management proposal interact with BRT? Does it apply more or less to side streets? Considering Fifth/Forbes feasibility. [discussion in virtual open house]
Curbside Management Toolkit	Accessibility and pull-offs - paratransit needs to get as close as possible to point of service. Food delivery - issues if too many Uber eats vehicles, for example, are utilizing limited and vital curbside space on a primary street. Glad for BRT's approach to how PAAC buses can get around paratransit vehicles -- good to think of all modes, and also not just buses only for curbside access.
Improve City Steps	I like wayfinding and emergency call boxes. We should maintain these steps as streets since that is their legal designation. Not all people can use them, but those who can, it's one more way to increase mode options. I used steps a lot at one point in life and they're very useful - saved me half my commute time.
Manage On-Street Parking	OPDC attendees would be likely to support this proposal. There is a lack of enforcement of standard RPP zone which makes it difficult (need two enforcement checks/rounds, at start and after duration limit). With parking, it's a different place in Oakland when it comes to academic year vs. during winter or spring breaks. OPDC has been pushing for a while to address parking issues. Whatever else do for transit, you will still need residents to have a place to park their vehicle. To extent existing RPP areas have been abused by lack of enforcement, this is one way to solve the problem, though it's not the only way and may or may not be the best or worst way. If rest of neighborhood is on board, then I would be too. Enforcement is an ongoing larger budgetary concern and key.
Manage On-Street Parking	The extension of metered parking to 10pm happened in Ravenstahl mayoral administration, and there was some opposition back then. There are people returning from work who live in Oakland and need to find a parking place near their home - the existing 6pm time may be too early for that. Maybe 8 or 9pm could work, and should consider range of options. Want to ensure that residents can get home and claim a spot for night, and also want people to be able to enjoy night-life. Pricing and timing would need to involve more analysis. I trust further study by experts would help shape that and then we adapt accordingly.
Pedestrian Safety Improvements	Lighting needs to be improved for safety – the replacement of street lights with LED are very helpful. City needs to incorporate equity into siting/prioritizing new lighting. Need significant volume. Residential areas should be given top consideration. [discussion in virtual open house of LED roll-out by City]
Sidewalk connections and accessibility improvements	I am interested in making Forbes, especially near university, more pedestrian-friendly. Lots of pedestrian traffic from university and neighborhood, but there is also lots of car traffic as it is a major boulevard/connector. The current use of the road doesn't seem to match the vision of the greater Oakland plan. Area will continue to increase in popularity.
Sidewalk connections and accessibility	Look to past efforts in 2008 - introduced curb extensions from Craft to Bigelow on Forbes to improve pedestrian visibility and safety, leading pedestrian interval signals.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
Sidewalk Improvement Program for Homeowners	Important to address sidewalks in residential areas. Denver & Boston are both cities working with state DOT on ownership of sidewalks in public ROW. Design standards are key, explore curb management per district area type. Some locations now have brick, which are not safe, as they are slippery and present ADA concerns. The presence of tree pits also needs to be considered. Maintenance of sidewalk per standards is key given all that is asked of sidewalks to do for the mobility network. Sidewalk inventory is important, and consider where improvements would serve connectivity especially, e.g. between neighborhoods in spots that are not directly next to property owners. SPC started gathering data of sidewalk inventory (please review) - width, material, curb cuts, etc. Consider sustainability of materials and cost savings opportunities.
Traffic Calming Corridors	Look at South Craig Street with its business district for traffic calming strategy - make sure there are slow speeds so pedestrians can get around. Cyclists are riding on sidewalks. There is on-sidewalk dining. Need to work with businesses and institutions, including CMU, to improve upon this situation and better manage the different needs there.
Transportation Demand Management	TDM is important also for lessening pedestrian-vehicle collision risks.
Transportation Demand Management	Primary function of a Transportation Management Association is TDM. Oakland and downtown have been key focus. Need to consider beyond just work and school trips - it's every trip, medical appointments, entertainment, reverse commute, etc.
Transportation Demand Management	In Traffic Impact Studies for institutions' Institutional Master Plans and development projects, there is encouragement to have a TDM coordinator. I have a concern though, that since campuses' geographic areas blur, there needs to be a basic set of TDM goals that are shared and aligned with the Oakland Neighborhood Plan and ensure collective alignment between institutions and better joint achievement of TDM goals. Similarly, need DOMI TDM goals to be shared and aligned with other TDM efforts at institutional and neighborhood level. (Tie in with future City TDM coordinator role).
Transportation Demand Management	With TDM, you need to look closer at incentives and how to achieve mode switch. Federal funding doesn't allow money to be used to pay for cost of modal switch. Need
Bike Route Improvements	Below Birmingham Bridge: how could we connect 5th Ave to Eliza Furnace Trail underneath Bridge via Brady Street? That is a connection to explore. The current connection is a dirt ramp and it's not official and there is no sidewalk to the trail.
Bike Route Improvements	I'm glad to see the connection on the map that would address the Chute. We've been dealing with the agony of the Chute for probably about 20-25 years.
Reimagine Bates Street	It's key to have a bike connection from Bates Street to the Eliza Furnace Trail
Reimagine Bates Street	There are prior known serious problems with trying to widen Bates: massive DLC transmission line along Bates, noise mitigation issues and tall wall, removing homes on east side of Bates might be issue for landslides. Driving up Romeo and Cato and Juliet, one can see houses' precipitous situation. Widening on either the west or east side of Bates would be very problematic. Consider earlier bridge as well.
Reimagine Bates Street	Before the new bridge, there had previously been a bikeable (though non-legal) path from Bates to Eliza Furnace Trail, and now the path is more difficult. Other connections are more convoluted and/or require use of Bates/2nd Ave intersection crossing. Steep grades were an issue in the past around making the path ADA accessible.
Reimagine Boulevard of the Allies	This is an important connection. It's good to think through the bridge as well. It would be really good to have signal improvements.
Safe Multimodal Connection from Fifth Avenue to Junction Hollow	Neville/Boundary Street (north and south of Joncaire) is in poor condition. Speed humps are in good shape but in between them the roadway is not in good shape. Once get onto the back street, it is in poor condition. The street could benefit from good pavement. It is a highly used corridor for commuters and is poorly lit, especially in the Boundary section south of Joncaire (e.g. with poor lighting someone such as a cyclist may not see a pothole, etc.).
Transportation Demand Management	There is not enough in the Plan about reducing car ownership in Oakland
Traffic Calming Corridors, Pedestrian Safety Improvements	Intersections are about both pedestrian and traffic safety. Traffic safety is about more than just calming. Need to deal with intersections more explicitly in the plan.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
General, Bike Route Improvements, Reimagine Boulevard of the Allies	There are key missing elements and connections – e.g. Boulevard at Bates, or bicycle connection along Bates. We recognize that many projects are examples of ways to implement policies/goals. Need to more fully explain how all things connect, and contextualized, so people can wrap heads around what would be done upon implementation...Appreciate that most projects are examples so there could be similar interventions but people need to see those connections.
Sidewalk connections and accessibility improvements, Partnerships for micromobility solutions	Sidewalks – need to do more to safeguard pedestrian safety on sidewalks. Such as licensing and management of scooters, which get parked across sidewalks and trails. Sidewalk obstruction due to trash containment.
Sidewalk connections and accessibility improvements, Partnerships for micromobility solutions	Need clear parking areas for Spin scooters, especially where in heavy use.
Manage on-street parking	Parking – opinion that hybrid RPP not appropriate for Oakland since doesn't address underlying dysfunction of RPP permits being oversubscribed/ no extra space to share with commuters/visitors. Residents forced to park illegally just to find a spot within same neighborhood.
Manage on-street parking	RPP program page does not incorporate in its “what we heard” section the concerns with RPP eligibility. Should have cars registered at an address in district or at least in PA to be eligible for permit.
Reimagine Bates Street, Reimagine Boulevard of the Allies, Improve City Steps	Juno (in danger of being fully eradicated) and Frazier Street steps are missing...the general improvement of steps referenced needs to be more specific. Ayer Street steps in Oakland also need fixing. Rock Alley missing completely and how to build robust connections to outside of Oakland.
Bike Route Improvements, Safe Multimodal Connection from Fifth Avenue to Junction Hollow	Bicycle track connection – e.g. South Neville by Joncaire – difference of opinion on how should happen. Possibilities about if prefer X option over another.
Connecting to the North and South Hills	Port Authority needs to continue actively looking for a north-south connection.
Reimagine Boulevard of the Allies	The workshop charette [Boulevard & Zulema] had multiple options—one was a road diet and another was angling it differently. What is on the website doesn't explore those in meaningful way. It should be something that gets more considered.
Reimagine Boulevard of the Allies	I would like to have had the [Zulema] proposal give a few options and then seek feedback from public, rather than 60 pages of workshop notes.
Reimagine Boulevard of the Allies	Clear that we do not want Zulema street closed and plan does not call for that street closure. And park not to be closed. But we want a drawing showing some improvements to the area to help people imagine how that green space would look once improved and have safer access to it.
	Not sure where this belongs, Subways need to be considered (Herron Hill and Bigelow). Maybe under Blvd of Allies have a subway (like bikes, etc.). Haven't seen comment addressed in past.
Partnerships for micromobility solutions, Educate all users about good travel behavior	If someone is riding an unregistered non-Spin brand scooter without geolocation, then what is the point – need enforcement. Technology too easy to copy and have a new product. [Anecdote of person on scooter yelling at commenter as pedestrian to get out of way.] Plan needs to elevate this in importance. Will never reduce traffic if that's the problem.
Educate all users about good travel behavior, Partnerships for micromobility solutions	Bikes, scooters, all of the new rideshares. No lights at night among bikes, scooters, skateboards, motorized skateboards, etc., people riding drunk, with 2-3 people, going through stop signs at 15 mph, littered all over, etc. IF this is not addressed might as well abandon transportation strategy etc.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
Educate all users about good travel behavior	Of course, one way to reduce cars in Oakand is to get scooters and scooter riders under control. If they all behaved, people could use them instead of cars. In general, these problems are not about the vehicles, they're about the operators of the vehicles. Studies say that about 15% of motorist ignore traffic laws, a slightly lower percentage of cyclists ignore traffic laws. I'm guessing that a similar percentage of micromobility users misbehave, a similar percentage of pedestrians misbehave. So there should more attention to education and enforcement of all people traveling in the public ways than to specific vehicles -- the variety of vehicles will inevitably expand, it will be too hard to chase.
Sidewalk connections and accessibility improvements, Partnerships for micromobility solutions	Scooters! Enforcement!! They are on the sidewalks for days!
Sidewalk connections and accessibility improvements, Partnerships for micromobility solutions	SPIN rules for parking are in fact very clear. However SPIN isn't doing a very good job of enforcing their rules. Even if you report violations, nothing seems to happen -- several times they have told me that the very visible 5-digit number isn't enough, I need to find a 7-digit number somewhere on the handle.
Sidewalk connections and accessibility improvements, Partnerships for micromobility solutions	I thought SPIN (and SCOOBIEs) was supposed to be able to track routes via GPS, so 5 digit and location/time should be enough. And also are there duplicates of 5 digit?
Sidewalk connections and accessibility improvements, Partnerships for micromobility solutions	...[response to attendee 2]: even if there are duplicates in the 5-digit sequence (are there really more than 99,999 of them?), when I send a geotagged photo of one parked illegally, that should uniquely identify it, because the scooter reported the location when it was parked
Manage on-street parking	Anybody living in Oakland understands that Hybrid would be a disaster for residents.
Manage on-street parking	The Oakland plan is a 10-year plan and you're not going to get rid of cars in 10 years. Free bus passes, shuttles are going to increase but so are the developments. In 10 years, we will have the same amount of cars with new development (Bed Tower etc.). No excess space available for parking or vehicular street capacity.
Manage on-street parking	Note that CMU Master Plan calls for many new buildings but "no net new parking"
Manage on-street parking	RPP: Paying for \$5 as car from Allegheny County. Out of state student cars – insurance company should know if housed outside of where registered. It should be requirement for RPP. If you don't live here or car not registered here, you pay more or don't get a permit.
Manage on-street parking	Enforcement, enforcement, enforcement.
Reimagine Bates Street, Reimagine Boulevard of the Allies	There's no left turn inbound to Bates street.
Reimagine Boulevard of the Allies	Zulema Street road diet vs. Being closed off all together. Road diet first is a better way to go since doesn't constrict people. If on Halket at Panera and want to get to Bates, why go all the down to intersection to get through, when there is a perfectly good street that could be maintained.
Reimagine Boulevard of the Allies	Once we lose streets, never get them back. Lost part of Hamlet St that went through Magee Hospital site. Losing street behind Niagara St since UPMC bought that. Why can't City keep streets for public access and parks for public enjoyment.
Reimagine Boulevard of the Allies	Getting from Oakcliffe to the Post Office and other places, needs Zulema Street.. That fell on deaf ears too, since the plans (agreement with Gainey) now says that Zulema will stay open only until Bates Street gets reconfigured. That one really confuses and disappoints me.
Integrated shuttle and transit mobility study	Oakcliffe has continually requested something like the old Oakland Loop — since Universities don't permit us on their vans. That also fell on deaf ears, I believe.
	There's a goal missing, or perhaps one of the goals needs to be better articulated, to clearly state that the plan vision for Oakland is one in which it's at least as easy to

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
Manage on-street parking	Hybrid RPPP is not appropriate for Oakland, because it doesn't address the underlying dysfunction of the program here: each of the Oakland RPP districts is over-subscribed, and there simply isn't any spare capacity to share with commuters and visitors. There needs to be some bigger-vision solution for limiting eligibility for permits – perhaps insisting that cars be registered at an address in the district, or at the very least in Pennsylvania (as is already required by law for anyone resident in the state more than 90 days)?
	A few of the projects are really incomplete, which is understandable, but it could be better explained in the Plan that you're all aware of the missing pieces. Eg S. Neville, Juno and Frazier steps, Bates widening, Bates bicycle connection from Boulevard – there are way more unknowns than there are knowns.
Manage on-street parking	One of the recommendations in the Mobility Chapter is making all Resident Permit Parking hybrid. Anyone would be allowed to park in RPP zones - permit holders, which will include landlords, medical care takers, child care workers, and contractors, would not have to pay, but others would. This was put into the plan by City Planners and their partners, not by the Mobility Action Team. It seems the motive is to generate revenue. Can that recommendation be removed?
	Would you reconsider instances where there was bus stop consolidation as part of this effort
Reimagine Robinson Street	Does this limit parking to the one side of Robinson? [Staff provided verbal clarification on the proposal in the meeting]
Reimagine Robinson Street	Will a traffic light be put on Fifth at Robinson? Otherwise how does a pedestrian cross the street? [Staff provided verbal clarification on the proposal in the meeting]
Reimagine Boulevard of the Allies	In the morning I can see traffic backed up over the bridge going into town...not in 'dribs and drabs' so one lane would compound the traffic.
Manage on-street parking	how long can people park on a hybrid area??? keep renewing so park all day? / enforcement would have to be allllll day and night // can we set the time to 1/2 hour and be sure that it is enforced??
Manage on-street parking	Has there been a resident survey on the South Side on how their Enhanced Parking Zone has affecting their RPP zones? Anecdotal stories are that it made RPP parking more difficult.
Manage on-street parking	Is tdp for Oakland residents or those traveling through Oakland and how do we protect the needs of Oakland residents. Isn't the BRT going to create the need for parking in Oakland.
Manage on-street parking	but enforcement of parking is only one with one or two circuits around the neighborhood right now. will that change>
Manage on-street parking	We saw how successful that public process was for getting us the new RPP ordinance....she said sarcastically...

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	<p>Hi!</p> <p>Oakland adjacent/Upper Hill resident - I love the idea of a community center like the one on Centre ave. across from the ONE building. With that in mind, what is going to be done with the funding that was provided for an adjacent & very important neighborhood - Upper Hill - literally just footsteps away - There needs to be a bridge built between our lovely neighborhoods. I guess you can say - bridging the gap.</p> <p>For instance: The MLK Garden & Library on Milwaukee St. it's a beautiful location, with a gorgeous sculpture - I am fortunate I get to walk by it every now & then. When I walk by I see the FUTURE, I see a library & a garden....& what about the planning that was halted due to COVID for the project on the Robert Williams Memorial Park ?</p> <p>The reservoir above Oakland. Everyone looks at it from Oakland...</p> <p>It would be mindful to BEAR in mind not only OAKLAND but the adjacent areas, as we are all connected here. I do feel that many of these projects are amazing.</p> <p>My main concern is gentrification - when you put a focal point on where more money is being spent or just focusing on students vs. long-time residents. You cannot build a better Oakland without paying attention to your neighbors up the street. :)</p> <p>How do we bridge this gap & not gentrify by focusing on one neighborhood & not the other</p> <p>How does city planning want or plan to bring all of our neighborhoods together...</p> <p>All this being said - I LOVE OAKLAND, I walk to Carnegie & campus everyday & I am happy that some progress is being made, suggestions are being offered & there is public feedback being considered -- However, we must have those neighborhood connections and not ignore how gentrification is problematic for the multitude of obvious reasons</p> <p>Thank you for your time</p> <p>BA</p>
	<p>So happy this is in the works! Thank you! As residents of Oakland at 3955 Bigelow Blvd., we use the intersection of N. Craig and Centre everyday and are dismayed by the number of blind/walker/wheelchair residents who have to hustle to get through the crossing light. They need more time. At Centre & Bigelow is is 25 secs--much better. Also we desperately need more policing of the violations of parking at the fire hydrant at Dollar Way & Centre--I have photos of numerous cars parked with impunity there--restaurants/food takeout/barber establishments on Centre are the reason. With the view blocked, exiting from Dollar Way to make a left on Centre is hazardous! I have seen so many near misses, particularly as cars don't heed the 25 mph zone and the view of them going west on Centre is blocked by the parked cars! It is a terrible accident waiting to happen! And the situation is complicated by cars illegally parked on the right on Dollar Way, just around the corner from Centre--again, I have many pics of them--they block the access into Dollar Way and obscure the view. All no parking lines need to be repainted yellow! Enforcement of the no-parking is key! Let's not wait until something awful happens... Please LMK to whom I can send the pictures.</p>
	<p>D-5 Ease foot and bike traffic by under-the-street "subways" underneath the Blvd of Allies would be great. I know there might be cables and pipes, but surely there are some places this could happen. There is a pedestrian underpass at the intersection of Herron Street and Bigelow Blvd., so that is at least one precedent that could be followed. Such a well-lit subway -- or even multiple ones - would make foot/bike traffic from one side of the Blvd of Allies to the other much much safer- and it could even make street traffic flow better.</p>
	<p>Instead of completely closing Zulema, what about reducing it in size?</p>
M-14, Address enforcement biases	<p>Work with subject experts might be the approach.</p>
M-15, all-weather walkability	<p>What role would the university have in this other than volunteer support?</p>
M-1, bicycle and pedestrian connection to the riverfront	<p>This is a good project but will this all be publicly owned land or wihtin the ROW? If not what is the intention for easements or land acquisition?</p>
M-16, bike route improvements	<p>Good program to support and create greater bicycling connections within the neighborhood.</p>
M-17, build transportation planning capacity	<p>This works and should be made to work even better by connecting to peoples needs.</p>

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
M-2, Build up OTMA	This is a very good goal to tie into other goals like environmental and community.
M-19, Bus stop enhancements	Good program to support transit and provide needed amenities within the neighborhood.
M-3, Central Oakland and Pitt bicycle connection	Good project to create greater bicycling connections within the neighborhood.
M-4, Centre Avenue and Craig Street pedestrian and transit safety improvements	Project is needed at this challenging intersection. Use of green infrastructure area seems out of place on the western side of the street. Possibility to explore other practices that could be implemented on more of the street than just that one side.
M-20, Community-based approach to parking enforcement	Parking concerns are important within the neighborhood, what does the execution of the program entail? As stated in the description, public awareness and education is important.
M-5, Complete the Fifth Avenue bikeway	Good project to create greater bicycling connections within the neighborhood and into other neighborhoods.
M-21, Connecting east-west within the city	Good program to support and create greater transit connections.
M-22, Connecting to eastern corridor growth	Good program to support and create greater transit connections.
M-23, Connecting to regional and national transportation	Good program to support and create greater transit connections.
M-24, Connecting to the Mon valley communities	Good program to support and create greater transit connections.
M-25, Connecting to the North and South Hills	Good program to support and create greater transit connections.
M-27, curbside management toolkit	Good program but knowing that there are concerns with parking and that space along the sidewalk is limited how this could/would be translated to the neighborhood.
M-28, Eliminate obstructions to improve accessibility	Good program to support and promote greater accessibility.
M-29, Enforce sidewalk standards	Good program to support and promote greater accessibility.
M-30, Improve city steps	Good program to support and promote greater accessibility.
M-8, McKee Place Complete Street	While its good to see space given to bicycles the traffic implications should be considered. What would be the impact on the traffic volumes for making this a one way instead of a two way street? How would it effect people currently use the street by entering it at Bates and heading westward? What is the impact to the driveway entrances for the building as you get closer to Forbes Ave?
M-32, Partnerships for micromobility solutions	Good program to engage stakeholders in mobility related issues.
M-33, Pedestrian safety improvements	Good program to create greater pedestrian safety throughout the neighborhood.
M-34, Performance-based parking	How is a performance based parking defined?
M-35, Reduce curb cut creation	Good program to support and promote greater accessibility and safety.
M-9, Reimagine Bates Street	Though the project states that there will be biking facilities and address public transit routes, the widening of the street is concerning in that it has the potential to create more traffic in the corridor. Consider how widening would be effected by adjacent properties and structures. What is the plan for this corridor without the widening of the roadway?
M-10, Reimagine Blvd of the Allies	Good project that will help address safety along this corridor.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
M-11, Reimagine Robinson Street	Good project that will help adress safety along this corridor.
M-12, Safe multimodal connection from Fifth avenue to the Junction Hollow Trail	Good project that will help adress safety along this corridor.
M-36, Sidewalk connections and accessibility improvements	Good program to support and promote greater accessibility and safety.
M-37, Sidewalk improvement program for homeowners	Good program to support and promote greater accessibility and safety.
M-38, Support frontline and shift workers	Good program that aligns with other mobility related recommendations.
M-39, Traffic calming corridors	Good program that helps create a safer pedestrian environment.
M-13, Transit parking offset	Who would be responsible for providing passes and incurring the cost?
M-18, Transit pass purchasing	Many Institutions in Oakland already have transit insentivized for students, faculty, and staff. While this is a good program, what are the mechanisims to get private entities onboard.
M-40, transportation demand management program	OTMA already doing this to some extent and this seems like a duplication of other recommendations.
M-41, Walking is healthy informational campaign	Good program to help promote health and support better pedestrian systems Oakland-wide.
	There are several strategies which overlap, and we recommend combining them. The shuttle conversation is also in the sustainability area and the complexity of the task suggests it might be best planned in the mobility area • Conversations with DOMI and the institutions did not show an overlap in service with Port Authority so the strategy my need to be different than simply replacing a shuttle or combining shuttles
	Enforce RPP, no hybrid. This will not help us, will allow parking.
	Transportation Demand Management (TDM): TDM is not properly articulated as a goal in the Mobility chapter. The current draft mentions it as a sub-bullet under the “Transit service and stations” policy, and by itself only as a program (M-40) – but it’s the informing principle that ties many of the policies, programs, and projects together, and it deserves its own goal statement. Cars are choking our neighborhoods, and the Plan needs to articulate what the Mobility, Development, and Community Action Teams heard from community members over and over again: we must reduce the demand for and use of cars to travel into, around, and out of Oakland. This requires a layered set of strategies that would work best if it were made very clear to what end they were all oriented.
	Transportation Demand Management (TDM): Firstly, Oakland has to reduce the demand for resident parking, by making it easier and cheaper to not own a car than it is to own a car in Oakland – and this needs to be stated as a policy in the plan. Implementing this policy will require Oakland to become a truly walkable community, with amenities (groceries, grown-up retail, services) located in the neighborhood. Car-share should be a priority strategy: we should make it easier for any student to rent a car (eg Zipcar) than to own/park one. Incentives could include promotion of car-share programs (and development patterns that prioritize walkability, density, etc.); and the Residential Permit Parking Program’s eligibility criteria should be adjusted (more on this below).
	Transportation Demand Management (TDM): Second, public transit options must be strengthened – both intra- and inter-neighborhood routes (more on these strategies below).
	Transportation Demand Management (TDM): Third, private transit options within the Oakland neighborhood should be reduced, if not eliminated. Last-mile transport from park-and-ride facilities, for lack of a better option, is acceptable; but private shuttles for university students within the Oakland neighborhoods undercuts public transit, exacerbates congestion and makes it difficult to maneuver through neighborhood streets, and increases rental pressure in low-density residential areas. Re-think the wording for Goal M1.A.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	Transportation Demand Management (TDM): Third, private transit options within the Oakland neighborhood should be reduced, if not eliminated. Last-mile transport from park-and-ride facilities, for lack of a better option, is acceptable; but private shuttles for university students within the Oakland neighborhoods undercuts public transit, exacerbates congestion and makes it difficult to maneuver through neighborhood streets, and increases rental pressure in low-density residential areas. Re-think the wording for Goal M1.A.
	Transit: PAAC transit routes are designed primarily to serve commuters traveling downtown. Oakland’s exemplary service choices along the Fifth-Forbes corridor and the Boulevard of the Allies are primarily a function of the fact that these routes pass through Oakland on their way between downtown and the East End and eastern suburbs. Service between Oakland and areas outside the East End is not great, as those connections generally require transfers and more circuitous travel routes. Within Oakland, no public transit service connects South Oakland with North or West Oakland, and this creates hardships.
	Transit: The plan’s policy to provide rapid transit access within 10 minutes for all parts of Oakland is possible only with BRT on the Boulevard, preferably connecting to BRT service on Second Avenue. Ensuring that any future Bates-widening project prioritizes transit support is vital to realizing this.
	Transit: Re-imagining Oakland as a transit hub (Goal M1.B) would be transformative to the neighborhood. If it were possible for the Port Authority to deliver direct north-south service directly into Oakland (via Bigelow, Centre, Bates) (Program M25), single occupancy vehicle commuter pressure from neighborhoods outside the East End would be greatly reduced. It’s terrific this connection has been included and called out this way in the plan.
	Transit: Residents have continued to request that Port Authority restore loop service on the discontinued 84B route; and barring that restoration, have requested the universities open their private shuttle service to the public at large. A public option is in the best long-term interests of the neighborhood. Institutions should halt private shuttle service to South Oakland, and instead provide support to Port Authority to restore public transit service.
	Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety and Circulation: Contrary to what one might expect in a university-dominated neighborhood, Oakland does not have a particularly large number of students on bicycles – and a big reason for this is the lack of safe bicycle routes connecting the campuses with Oakland’s residential neighborhoods. Bike routes through Schenley Park stop short of penetrating into the neighborhood, beyond isolated tracks on Bigelow/Bayard, almost as if past bicycle route planning prioritized ease of construction over utility for riders. We are encouraged to see a concerted effort in this plan to deal with the holes in the bike network here. Pedestrian safety is often lumped together with bicycle safety, but requires different interventions.
	Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety and Circulation: Safe Multimodal Connection from Fifth Avenue to Junction Hollow Trail is well-articulated, and we are thrilled DOMI is undertaking to make this connection a reality. It would be helpful to state clearly in the project intent that providing an at-grade – or at the very least clear and desirable off-road – pedestrian-only connection between Hamerschlag Drive and Joncaire must be a priority. The utility of a pedestrian-only route will be greatly diminished if users must share a lane with bicyclists, or zig-zag across Neville, or climb out of the way to accommodate existing infrastructure. Solutions here must be direct and obvious.
	Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety and Circulation: Pedestrian improvements at Centre and Craig (Project M4) are much-needed and well-thought-out. Similar thought should be given to the intersections at Neville and Fifth and Craig and Fifth.
	Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety and Circulation: McKee Place Complete Street is similarly an innovative idea that makes use of McKee’s greater width to provide a safe connection for bicycles between Bates and Forbes. It’s a little unclear how automobile commuters trying to access the UPMC garage on McKee between Forbes and Fifth will navigate the transformation of McKee into a one-way southbound street, however.
	Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety and Circulation: Completing the Fifth Avenue Bikeway is well-articulated with solid analysis and is much-needed. An integral goal of this project should be to complete the connection between S. Neville and Centre Avenue.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety and Circulation: Oakland is home to a number of sets of Pittsburgh steps, several of which are in dangerous disrepair. Steps are mentioned in the plan only in connection with the City Steps Plan (linked from Program M30), but it would be helpful in the context of other articulated goals in the Plan to call out the Oakland steps in need of attention: Juno Street (connection to the Boulevard of the Allies at Parkview), Frazier/Romeo Streets (connection to Bates above the Parkway exit ramp), and Ayers Street (connection to Mackey).
	Accessibility: Sidewalk safety is key for pedestrian and for wheelchair safety. Programs M28 and M29, enforcing sidewalk standards and removing utility pole obstacles, are a good start; and programs M36 and M37 complement them by inventorying and supporting (and mandating) repairs to broken and mis-aligned sidewalks. In Oakland, sidewalk obstructions are just as likely to be caused by improperly contained trash, dumpsters, and incomplete utility repairs – and detouring into the street (as many pedestrians and wheelchair users are forced to do) can be made more difficult and dangerous by the fact that on-street parking is so close that getting out of the street and back onto the sidewalk is sometimes impossible.
	Parking: The demand for parking has been a driver of unaffordability, congestion, greenspace destruction, threats to pedestrian and bicycle safety, and poor quality of life in Oakland for many decades. Solving these problems is only possible if we reduce demand both for on-street parking and for off-street parking.
	Parking: Policy M6 has three parts. Two parts are excellent and we have stated support for them above: it’s crucial to reduce demand for parking; and prohibiting all new surface parking lots (and eliminating illegally paved surfaces!), consistent with the goals and policies articulated in the Development and Infrastructure chapters, is a great idea. The third part, however, is problematic: off-site parking is not a solution to the too-many-cars problem, and merely distributes this problem to more vulnerable lower-density residential neighborhoods.
	<p>Parking: The Residential Permit Parking Program has been dysfunctional since its inception in Oakland not because of poor enforcement, but because the RPPP areas are so heavily over-subscribed, overwhelmingly by student renters. Enforcement is of course necessary and important, but even perfect enforcement would not make it easier to find a place to park. Oakland is a walkable community – as illustrated by the tendency of student renters to leave their cars parked on the streets for weeks at a time without moving them – and the city should look for ways to make sure Oakland’s streets are not being used just to warehouse students’ cars.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">oThe city could and should consider reducing the number of permits allowed per housing unit in Oakland.oResidents of buildings that provide off-street parking spaces should not be eligible for RPPP permits. This would be consistent with the intent of §914.02 of the city code.oThe city likewise could and should consider restricting eligibility for permits to cars registered to addresses within the RPPP area.oAfter-hours enforcement of the RPPP would be helpful; and if that can be achieved only with a Parking Enhancement District (PED), so be it – but we are doubtful a PED is appropriate to the Oakland context, where the overwhelming demand for overnight on-street parking is from residents.oHybrid RPPP is not appropriate for Oakland because it doesn't address the underlying dysfunction of the program here: each of the Oakland RPPP districts is over-subscribed, and there simply isn't any spare capacity to share with commuters or visitors. This was stated over and over again in plan meetings, but strangely isn't included in the "what we heard" section of the RPP program here.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	<p>Traffic Management : Oakland is the daily destination for thousands of commuters and visitors arriving by car; but it is also a conduit for thousands of commuters and visitors on their way someplace else. The Boulevard of the Allies, Fifth Avenue, Forbes Avenue, and to a lesser extent Centre Avenue and Baum Boulevard are all essentially highways through Oakland for traffic that does not stop. Taming that traffic is essential to street safety and the quality of life here. We are encouraged by the proposed projects on Robinson Street, the Boulevard of the Allies, Craig and Centre, McKee Place, Bates Street and South Bouquet for their careful consideration of safety, clarity, accessibility, and humanity.</p> <p>Notably missing from this plan is a re-design of the intersections of Bates and the Boulevard of the Allies, and Halket and the Boulevard of the Allies - which are lynchpins for transit, pedestrian and bicycle access, cars, and trucks. Reimagining these intersections will be integral to delivering on promises to improve Zulema Park, expand BRT connections along the Boulevard and down to Second Avenue, and provide safe pedestrian and bicycle access between Oakland and the South Side.</p>
	<p>i believe we need the 84b bus back if only a couple times in morning and afternoon. I would do a lot more shopping and dining in Oakland if didn't have a thirty minute walk to main Oakland from my home at the end of Frazier Street. This is a far walk for a senior with arthritis or in bad weather or safety concerns also. The 84b would be freedom back for so many residents of South Oakland.</p>
	<p>Comment on above: I agree, at least the 84b if not further or connecting multiple loops would make more of Oakland more accessible to so many residents, especially older folks with limited mobility.</p>
	<p>Multiple shuttle buses on residential street are very disruptive and ridership is minimal on my street. Let's have a system, available to everyone that does not disrupt residential streets</p>
	<p>Comment on above:: I agree, more (free or at least affordable) access to one shuttle system would be very helpful!</p>
	<p>With increased traffic on Bayard and Centre Avenues, safety issues, particularly regarding pedestrians, need to be addressed. More cars traveling on residential streets to avoid traffic on Craig and Centre. Intersection at Centre and Dithridge very hazardous. Cars and shuttles using Dithridge to avoid lights on Craig increase danger to pedestrians. Perhaps consider making north end of Dithridge one way southbound to avoid cross traffic at the intersection. Maybe right turn only at Dithridge and Centre.</p>
	<p>When describing commercial corridors OBID suggests the following phrase:</p> <p>Vibrant commercial and innovation corridors</p>
	<p>Comment on above: It's hard to tell with this phrasing out of context, but while planning for "vibrant" corridors is a good goal, when they repeatedly become canyons of gaudy modern buildings, it's hard to imagine "vibrant" as "full of energy and enthusiasm" vs harsh, blinding reflections.</p>
	<p>OBID is suggesting the following edit to the goal listed under M6 Parking/ M6.B Transition Parking:</p> <p>Transition parking. Development that incorporates significant amounts of parking is carefully designed so that parking structures can be converted to other uses and circulation between buildings can be efficiently reprogrammed for non-auto uses. Developers that provide less spaces than required by zoning are able to pay for parking alternatives such as bus passes or into a multimodal support fund.</p>

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	Comment on above: I'm not sure what "other uses" means. If you mean converting a parking garage to a retail or dining business, what would that actually look like. Have you seen it in other cities? This is an odd request unless you have something specific in mind.
	Comment on above: Apologies for repeating part of my comments, but bears repeating: Many mentions of parking alternatives are void of any specifics, especially any with actual instances or even theoretical studies to support their use. Any actual strategies mentioned like bus passes generally ignore the Pitt Institutional Master Plan (IMP) showing with significant implementation of those strategies still have 45% single occupancy vehicle (SOV) use, and in next 10 years with even more as yet unidentified programs, they only expect to reduce SOV by roughly 3%. Cars are here to stay for at least the 10 years of this program.
	<p>The Pittsburgh Innovation District suggests the following alterations to the Goals of the Mobility Chapter:</p> <p>(edited) M6.B Transition parking. Development that incorporates significant amounts of parking is carefully designed so that parking structures can be converted to other uses and circulation between buildings can be efficiently reprogrammed for non-auto uses. Developers that provide less spaces than required by zoning are able to pay for parking alternatives such as bus passes or into a multimodal support fund.</p>
	Comment on above: Apologies for repeating part of my comments (although this comment seems to be a copy/paste of another person's post), but bears repeating: Many mentions of parking alternatives are void of any specifics, especially any with actual instances or even theoretical studies to support their use. Any actual strategies mentioned like bus passes generally ignore the Pitt Institutional Master Plan (IMP) showing with significant implementation of those strategies still have 45% single occupancy vehicle (SOV) use, and in next 10 years with even more as yet unidentified programs, they only expect to reduce SOV by roughly 3%. Cars are here to stay for at least the 10 years of this program.
	<p>The Pittsburgh Innovation District suggests the following alterations to the Programs of the Mobility Chapter:</p> <p>(edited) M-18. Transit pass purchasing</p> <p>Create program that allows employers, developers, and other organizations to make transit pass purchases at a discount through funding provided by developers who choose not to build the maximum parking spaces required through zoning.</p> <p>When to start: 3-5 yearsProject lead(s): PAACProject partner(s): institutions, major employers, OBID, OTMAPotential funding source(s): Institutions</p>
	Pitt already offers free transit access, and many other single occupancy vehicle (SOV) reduction strategies, and their Institutional Master Plan (IMP) notes 45% SOV use by staff. In the next 10 years with even more as yet unidentified programs, they only expect to reduce SOV by roughly 3%. Cars are here to stay for at least the 10 years of this program. With massive increases in business occupancy in new buildings, inadequate parking is nearly guaranteed to increase stress with illegal parking in residential areas. Even the hybrid permit/pay system will do little to reduce demand, as there is little or no excess capacity in those areas. It will just get more direct revenue for City. The City should figure out how to increase enforcement and fines, and redirect those funds to the City.
	We residents need loop busses that get us into various parts of Oakland. (Free would be nice, but most of the elderly have PAT passes.) University folks can call a shuttle, but we cannot. I shuttle could make short trips just around Oakland and perhaps to a grocery store or shopping are aimed a real people (i.e., not just students). If the Oakland Plan is truly concerned about its Senior Citizens, this is critical.
	Comment on above: Having some access, even limited, to various shuttles would be a great help, especially to older residents to get to current and future services. I used to walk to post office, but getting older, inclement weather and time constraints have forced me to increasingly drive there. When City Police, Pitt staff and even postal workers have to park illegally to access the post office, it doesn't say much for both the planning that located it there, or the ability to ever provide enough parking for individuals with limited transportation options to get there and other places in Central Oakland in particular.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	I would like to see garage elevators for multiple cars. I believe that we will never see a reduction of cars in Oakland. Once solution would be to take up a small footprint for cars to use an elevator to park in a stacked fashion. Or else an elevator mechanism for cars to move up through a building -- this takes up a lot less room than the ramps that we currently see. We see things like this in Japan and car-centric cities. Why don't we see more of that in Oakland.
	It's a mistake to keep the parking minimums & attempt to incentivize less parking by asking developers to pay in lieu. Cities with existing in-lieu programs aren't as transit-rich as Pittsburgh; it's not a proven model for mode shift & still primes developers to build parking. Instead of what's in the draft plan, I encourage you to remove the minimums, like downtown & uptown, & instead have low parking maximums, similar to the base height maximum, & only allow more parking to be earned through bonus points, with a hard maximum, same as the bonus height maximum. The draft policy encourages parking & only potentially gets community amenities/payments when the developer does what we actually want (no one is asking for more parking!), which is a backwards way to try to get what we want; we need to stop punishing development for wanting to do the right things
	Several recent projects planning on adding upwards of 700 new jobs/commuters but only 100 parking spaces is not going to do much besides increase illegal parking in surrounding residential areas. Downtown doesn't have any similar offloading. Uptown was allowed to deteriorate to the point of being desperate for development and apparently willing to suffer through the potential growing pains. Oakland is a very different story than either one.
Central Oakland and Pitt bike connection	Second one because if your lane isn't protected then it's worthless... And please put in actual bollards instead of those silly flexible ones. And why does this need to take 5-10 years???
McKee Place complete street	more raised crossings across McKee would slow one-way traffic and reduce right-hook pedestrian/bike crashes
Reimagine Boulevard of the Allies	<p>I am a parishioner at St. George Orthodox Cathedral, which is located at the northeast corner of the Boulevard of the Allies with Dawson Street. I've been attending this church since I was born in the later 70s, and can say this intersection hasn't changed since that time.</p> <p>Many of our parishioners drive to attend services. Parking is a critical need for congregation, as we only have a small parking lot and parking on Dawson Street is limited. The City has graciously granted us permission to park on the Boulevard of the Allies on Sundays. The inbound lane of the Boulevard of the Allies is crucial for funeral processions to stack vehicles while waiting to leave for the cemetery. The conceptual plans showing the proposed bike lanes on the inbound lanes eliminates the parking adjacent to the church. The same can be said for weddings.</p> <p>All this said, I can see why modifications to the Blvd are proposed. Vehicles drive too fast and a City needs to take all modes of transportation into account. I can see the design to place a bike lane on the Blvd, considering Schenley Park is on the other side of the bridge. Speaking of the Bridge, which I understand is under design for a rehab or replacement, how does this concept tie in with the proposed bridge? How will the lane typically extend east through the Park? Bike lanes lose their function if they don't connect to another facility. Is it possible to move the bike lane to the outbound side?</p> <p>It's also daunting to cross the Blvd, especially for older folks and children. So I do appreciate attempts to shorten the crossing distance, which bump-outs do achieve. But I have concern with the bumps on Dawson affecting the disabled parking in the front of the church.</p> <p>Leading pedestrian intervals are proposed, which are effective to give pedestrians a head start crossing the street before vehicles get the green indication. So is the traffic signal getting replaced in its entirety? This intersection currently runs on a fixed cycle and is in desperate need of detection.</p> <p>I look forward to future coordination efforts between the City and the church.</p>

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
Reimagine Robinson Street	<p>I appreciate all the time involved in making these proposals. I am still concerned that cars will make the illegal turn to get onto 376, but it's a better design than what we currently have. The sidewalk curbing all the way up Robinson street is problematic. Residents on the lower section of Robinson (below Terrace) had their curbs eradicated when the city re-paved the street. The asphalt goes right up to the curbs, so parking cars can barely notice when they are rolling up onto the street. Additionally, I had an elderly resident who really wanted to get a street tree install, per a program with Tree Pittsburgh. When they looked at her street (with no sidewalk and crumbling on the edges) they said that they couldn't install a tree, because they couldn't make a tree bed. So residents who want to discourage cars parking on their sidewalk need another solution if we can't install a healthy tree.</p> <p>Instead, the city should consider large, concrete planters where you could plant native shrubs or grasses that require low maintenance but discourage cars from pulling up on the sidewalk. Not every resident might want a tree because they know that the traffic moves so fast on Robinson that they get their mirrors hit or their car gets damaged. So it's a problem - if everyone parked off the sidewalk properly, then the width of the cars would also help slow down the traffic. Because everyone parks on the sidewalk, then cars on the street feel that they can drive faster, because the street appears wider.</p> <p>The crossing guard that works on the corner of Robinson and Terrace has said that this is one of her most stressful intersection in her career. She also added that there needs to be major calming measure in this intersection - cars regularly roll through the stop sign.</p> <p>I think that Carlow is going to be redeveloping the site at the bottom of Robinson street. It would mean a lot if they could make some street tree beds on that side - -it could contribute to slowing down traffic as it moves up Robinson street.</p> <p>As a parent with small children, I wonder when I'll feel comfortable with them walking around the neighborhood on their own. There has already been one pedestrian death since we moved here, and I hope there are not any more. Redesigning the street to make it safer for people would have a significant impact on this.</p>
Bus stop enhancements	please increase the number of buses on the 64 route
Transit oriented deveopment and commercial corridors and nodes	Vibrant commercial AND INNOVATION corridors
Parking	M6.B Transition parking. Development that incorporates significant amounts of parking is carefully designed so that parking structures can be converted to other uses
	When Anderson Bridge is finally rebuilt, add a pedestrian/bike path from Parkview elevation down into Junction Hollow.
	I like I-24. There are many side/back yards in Oakland that have been paved or chipped and turned into flat-lot parking lots. I suspect that many do not have appropriate occupancy permits and curb cuts. And they have probably not paid appropriate taxes on those properties for years. These lots should be easy to identify and investigate. It would be a good source of revenue (or collect the back taxes for illegal parking fees that were charged). Then you could delete the idea of moving Hybrid Parking into each RPP area -- since I believe that proposal was directly aimed at raising income that was lost in the past couple of years.
M-16	PID would like to be included as Implementor
M-17	PID would like to be included as Implementor
M-7	PID would like to be included as Implementor
M-15	How will this be paid?

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
M-20	There is confusion around this - please provide more detail as to how this program will work.
M-25	What are Oakland institutions listed? Are they expected to financially support this? They have expressed concerns for this.
M-26	How is this above current requirements? This seems unnecessary and looks like an extra unnecessary burden.
M-7	This section needs much further discussion. Why are institutions listed as funder?? Line 1 should be its own goal.
M-10	This should include OBID
M-29	This should be ALL owners including residential
M-33	This is low hanging fruit that can be achieved quickly and we should move the implementation timeframe to 1 - 2 years
M-40	There is a shortage of available parking for small business owners who lack public garages and lots (most garages are institution or privately owned). Business owners rely on their cars as they may take several trips per day for business needs.
M-13	This is vague
	311 Service Request 628354 - Caller thoughts on Oakland Revision plan - Caller objects to Revised Parking for Area E RPP zones, This will reduce parking for residents as they lose parking to non Residents
	311 Service Request 624747 - Call in about The Oakland Plan - caller is a commuter who bikes frequently. She has experienced the frequent anger and frustration of drivers in lane, is very supportive of bike lanes.
	<p>311 Service Request 622649 - Mr. Stock called in to say that he is 75 years old and lives in the Oakland area. He walks with a cane and says the bicyclists and scooter riders are making it very difficult for senior citizens to function and travel through Oakland anymore. He says he believes bicyclists should have to be licensed or registered somehow to make them more accountable. Mr.</p> <p>Stock said he was struck by a bicyclist years ago and ended up with several injuries, including broken ribs, and the bicyclist just left the scene. He said he moved back to Pittsburgh because he always felt safe here when he was young but now he feels that the Oakland area is not safe for senior citizens anymore. He said the college students do not pay taxes and are running things over there. He said there are bicyclists and scooters being ridden on the sidewalks, and police cannot do anything about it. He said he has tried to discuss this with the college kids when they ride past him and they act like they want to fight.</p> <p>He said if Mayor's Office's plan is to create more bike lanes and make the city more convenient to travel through only for young people, neglecting the elderly who have lived here and paid taxes their entire lives, he will strongly consider moving to a suburb because he feels that his generation is being neglected and forgotten.</p>
	M-7 - seems like 2 different studies.
	concerned that Walnut Capital can cite an agreement with Mayor Gainey and close Zulema Street.

Infrastructure	
	I.B.b - does locally-grown food mean food grown in Oakland? Or grown in the region? I support this if it refers to food grown in the region.
Reimagine Robinson Street (Stormwater)	I love the idea of adding more green infrastructure especially in dealing with storm water. However, with the new green infrastructure, will the plants used be local and be supportive of the local ecosystems? Also, have you considered improve the pedestrian walkways to make them safer and wider to fulfill the residents' desire to make it feel more like a neighborhood street? Trees are great but being able to walk safely to view those is also important.
	i believe in this program too. since they want to modernize and make it more open to social and beauty then yes get rid of the parking lots that are just taking up space. because it really could be turned in a spot that can be sold or used for events in oakland if it maintained well.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	I'm liking the plans so far. Interested to dig deeper and see what other community input is.
	I-2 talks about green spaces in Oakland. That is good. We neighbors should not have to fight long and hard for the city to realize that Zulema Park needs to be kept. However, keeping Zulema Park seems to have been offered to appease the neighbors of South Oakland. This really should have never demanded our close attention and pleading. The city should NEVER turn parks or parklets into developed/built-on areas. Once public green spaces are lost to development, we never get them back. This is also true of developments taking over streets. Once a street or alley is lost to a developer/hospital/university, we residents and visitors NEVER get them back as a public road or space. Because there was no public process, it now seems we have lost Emily Way to UPMC/Magee (please prove me wrong on that). We had already lost Hamlet Street on the Central Oakland side of Craft Avenue -- it is now built-over with a huge private hospital building with no green space or public access given to the public.
	I like I-24. There are many side/back yards in Oakland that have been paved or chipped and turned into flat-lot parking lots. I suspect that many do not have appropriate occupancy permits and curb cuts. And they have probably not paid appropriate taxes on those properties for years. These lots should be easy to identify and investigate. It would be a good source of revenue (or collect the back taxes for illegal parking fees that were charged). Then you could delete the idea of moving Hybrid Parking into each RPP area -- since I believe that proposal was directly aimed at raising income that was lost in the past couple of years.
Comprehensive electric vehicle strategy	Although electric vehicles are the new thing as of right now, they can also be very expensive to maintain. The charging station ALONE can cost from \$1000 - \$ 7000 (for the battery and installation process). Having all those electric stations outside can cause for theft, damage, or even electrocution (when it rains). I don't think electric cars or stations would be a great thing for the community.
Encourage More Community Gardens	Community gardens are a great and awesome way to bring the community together. They can plant all types of fresh fruits and vegetables for the whole community!
	Excited to see Bird Friendly Design incorporated into the plan. Bird-window collisions are a much bigger problem than people realize and need to be addressed.
	I5 should make mention of PLANS to maintain an increasing tree canopy in Oakland. Simply "ensuring retention efforts" won't do.
	Policies I8, as a section, needs to be rewritten with urgency and prioritized or removed completely. Where would the "opportunities for residents and employees to grow food" be in Oakland? We know this is something desired, but there is no mention of how we accomplish this goal at all, other than "identifying and optimizing green spaces." The plan should not state adding opportunities for urban agriculture when there is no supportive evidence that say's it'll get done.
	<p>I love the idea of welcoming all people no matter what race and however way they feel. Housing is definitely the best idea to improve and bring to Oakland because there are a lot of college kids that need housing I also found out that they are planning a grocery store near Panera bread which is a very very great idea because there is nowhere to get groceries in Oakland.</p> <p>I have to say that planning on how to manage rainwater to reduce basement flooding and river pollution can be a great thing for the community and also creating new and better open spaces in parks and hillsides is a great thing for [eople and to bring the community together.</p>
	<p>As a former Oakland resident, I know how much less green space Oakland has compared to some nearby neighborhoods. The tree canopy & greenway expansion sections of this plan are exciting to me.</p> <p>I also appreciate the Comprehensive Electric Vehicle Strategy. It can be difficult for folks who don't own homes, or don't have driveways outside their properties, to consider switching away from gas. This initiative could help with that.</p>

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	I am excited by goal 18—urban agriculture, including the goals around having local food networks and growing food in the neighborhood. In accordance with the principles of food equity, I hope, in addition to simply creating spaces for communities to grow their own food, there are also robust educational programs and tools to empower our community to take the lead and create a truly grassroots food network in Oakland.
	As someone who lived in a very rural area before coming to live in Oakland, I have a very strong appreciation for open green spaces, especially the ones that are far and few between in Pitt. I would love to see more open green spaces in Oakland that I could enjoy.
	<p>I have planted several trees already in Oakland and I would love to see an expansion of the tree canopy. It can have so many benefits for the general population (when maintained properly) from providing cooling during the summer, to cleaner air, and mental health benefits when living amongst more trees. I'd love to see more greenways in Oakland and the entire City, as they help us with facing the global climate crisis, especially mitigating landslides.</p> <p>I support the comprehensive electric vehicle strategy! My community recently installed an electric vehicle solar station and it added a great resource to our community!</p>
	My dad used to talk about how Pittsburgh was one of the literally "greenest" cities from above, referring to the view of the beautiful tree canopy over Oakland. I am glad to hear that this is something the city is reinvesting in, not just for the environment but the beauty of the neighborhood!

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	<p>"I2.-Integrate green"- Where it is not possible to expose dirt, planters could help integrate green and absorb rain water. Planters can go by bus stops, next building walls and ideally have plants that are green year round</p> <p>"I3 Convert to renewables & I-13." - Barriers to renewable adoption that must be overcome are primarily financial. While Pittsburgh is cloudy, more greenhouse gas emissions are displaced by installing renewable energy here than in other, sunnier places like Arizona. This is because our electricity includes a lot of coal (The capacity factor in Pittsburgh is 17-20% I believe). PA has a lower SRECs market than other states and the federal tax credit (1) almost never applies to large apartment complexes that are HOAs and (2) is beginning to sunset (decrease in future years). At the city level, helping connect large apartment complexes to installers, providing tax incentives or trying to connect residents with quality financing could help accelerate the process.</p> <p>"I4. Waste management and recycling, I-28" - Love the idea of setting up city wide composting! Germany has some great existing systems requiring waste separation and pay-for-bottle-return at grocery stores. Canada has also been doing some innovative things. Japan has a model where you have to pay for trash by the bag which radically reduces waste...but in the US people may just dump their trash everywhere else. People also aren't great at putting things in the right bins (I really think we need color coding on our labels..) so I would recommend tying it to a passive-aggressive campaign "Don't be a twit check you can recycle/compost it" or something.</p> <p>"I5. Tree canopy, I-19 " - Can partner with universities for their community days so that students plant trees. Love the shade parks - shade also makes sidewalk walking in the summer better.</p> <p>"I8. Urban agriculture, I-20" - some buildings may be structurally sound enough to do rooftop farming. I came across an apartment building in NYC recently that had chickens on their roof.</p> <p>"I9. Air" - air quality can be significantly improved with more intervention at local coke works and coal plants. The problem is that a lot of the emission capture technology is too expensive or still in the demo or research phase.</p> <p>I-1 - DC fast charging costs will probably be lower if they are sited next to substations.</p> <p>I-5 - I have heard discussion of removing the district heating plant (Bellefield boiler) that is in the hill next to the library. While it would be great to eliminate it, be careful as (1) I think natural gas emissions are lower than this area's electricity emissions for heating and (2) district heating is much more efficient than building based heating. The district heating is heating a large number of radiators in old buildings, which are complicated to replace with heat pumps. In other words, do the full life cycle analysis</p>
Energy strategy	<p>Need to specifically target incentive programs to non-resident property owners, who do not typically benefit from the utility savings that investment in weatherization (and low-energy design) yields - since the costs of utilities are borne by their tenants.</p>

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
Encourage More Community Gardens	<p>Community gardens are a great way for individuals to have a sense of pride for their neighborhood while growing and caring for the food they grow. In addition, they provide means to food in what currently food desert. The problem here is that land use is a big issue in Oakland, and it's not addressed here.</p> <p>Where might there be room have plots of land dedicated to this use? The Plant 2 Plate garden is mentioned but will be demolished and relocated for development by the end of this year. Institutional partnerships are also mentioned, but with no teeth to support that claim.</p> <p>I would like to see mechanisms considered when growing in Oakland's context (rooftop gardens, hydroponic/aquaponic systems, etc.)? It seems to me this is a narrative that will make false promises, and if it's not feasible it shouldn't be a part of what we're promising Oakland residents.</p>
Green street network	i don't like green plants on my grey sidewalks. it would destroy the urban look
Green street network	I love this idea! It is important to plant local biodiversity in these planters to grow habitats. This is a great way to bring natural ecosystems into the built environment.
	as one of the many elders in my neighborhood of Oakland I'm concerned about the disposal of waste, sanitary products. It goes far beyond grocery bags. I'd like to see research on that. What is going to be done? it will continue to be a large and probably growing problem.
Reimagine Robinson Street (Stormwater)	The project, in theory, sounds great. But what about the 2 years it will take to construct this? None of the institutions in Oakland seem to talk to each other already. Between the city, the University of Pittsburgh, UPMC, and the other major corporations, there seems to be at least 5-7 construction project within a one mile radius of Robinson Street already. The traffic in this part of the city is a disaster at almost all hours of the day, and closing Robinson Street for 2 years to construct this area would only contribute to that. I agree that Robinson Street needs to be improved, but it needs to be done in a way that coordinates well with other surrounding streets.
I-04, Develop strict hillside development code	Would the focus on the mitigation efforts be on just Oakland? It might be helpful to partner with Tree Pittsburgh, TreeVitalize, Friends of the Riverfront, etc. So that we can build on current programs instead of creating something new.
I-05, Energy strategy	The 2030 District is already working on this. What more are expected from the implementers?
I-06, Energy study requirement	Would EMI be left out of this zoning code amendment? IMPs state energy goals and should be sufficient without needing a study.
I-12, Open Space expansion	Open space goals are in IMPs. Would this apply to EMI zoning districts?
I-16, Bates basin sustainable renovation	For new greenway trails and restoratoin of forest pathways, Landforce would be a good partner organization.
I-19, Comprehensive tree strategy	Should this also include forest restoration?
I-21, Establish pollinator conversion programs	Past efforts to de-lawn should be taken into consideration on future projects.
I-26, Reduce student landfill waste	Efforts outside of University owned and operated housing will be promoted. Financial resources going to off campus efforts are limited, but could partner in promotion.
	When implementing this section, there are several areas that overlap with Institutional Master Plans (IMP). The commitments in those plans went through extensive community process and promises were already made. The Oakland Plan should be a complimentary guide for the areas obligated to uphold an IMP. • Increasing green space development • Looking at reforestation on the hillside • Addressing building performance through LEED or another system
	Natural Resources: Among the biggest stresses on Oakland's natural resources are the demands for rental housing and parking. Lack of robust regional transit directly serving Oakland (especially from the north and south) and the dearth of housing that is both affordable and desirable has produced a market in which almost every inch of privately-held property is used either for housing or for parking cars, making it difficult to maintain open greenspace, unpaved or permeable surfaces, and tree canopy. The Infrastructure chapter addresses the need to support each of these things.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	Natural Resources: Open space. This section is a little vague and doesn't have concrete details in the projects and programs section. It's not entirely clear what existing open spaces would "count." The existing conditions report maps out areas in color, but more detail is needed. Something like the list that was included in the Hazelwood Plan, for example, would be helpful.
	Natural Resources: Green alleys. We're so glad to see this as a project – but we'd like to add St. James Place and Mackey Street to the list; and we'd like to see the proposed Rock Alley project connecting Lawn Street with Second Avenue called out here as a project that would both enhance hillside management and expand pedestrian connectivity. More detail would be helpful, to explain why for example Euler and Iroquois were the only two alleys identified here
	Natural Resources: Stormwater management also needs a little more detail. Among the proposed policies is one to de-pave Oakland – we would like this defined. What tools might be available to the city to re-examine existing surface lots to determine their legality; or what kinds of incentives might the city and PWSA offer to property owners to replace concrete with permeable paving blocks; or what kinds of strategies might the city deploy to restore brick and other semi-permeable surfaces for alleyways and minor streets?
	Natural Resources: The comprehensive tree canopy and electric car studies are terrific, and we'd love more of that kind of in-depth case study everywhere in the plan.
	Urban Agriculture: As noted above, the demand for parking has led property owners all over Oakland to pave over rear yards (where service alleys permit access for off-street parking) and to replace side and front yards with driveways. As a result, Oakland renters don't have many options when it comes to garden space, whether public or private. Another limited resource for community gardening is humans to do the work. Oakland's demographics skew towards the edges of the age spectrum (we have a lot of students, and a lot of elderly residents, and comparatively few folks in between), and connecting able bodies with the work that needs to be done in late spring, summer, and early fall is not simple, and requires continuous work.
	Urban Agriculture: Community gardens are a great way for residents to build a sense of pride for their neighborhood while growing and caring for the food they grow. They can also help supply fresh produce, which is an important resource in the parts of Oakland that are food deserts. But where can they be created, how can they be sustained, and what resources are available to residents looking to expand opportunities for community agriculture?
	Urban Agriculture: Institutional commitments to providing garden plots where students can learn gardening techniques, build teamwork, spend time outdoors, and develop a sense of stewardship for the neighborhood are not clearly articulated here, or anywhere. For example, Pitt's Plant2Plate garden on Oakland Avenue is slated for demolition to make room for new residential development in the near future; but there is no clear plan to identify an alternate space accessible to Central and South Oakland student residents.
	Urban Agriculture: Some programs to nurturing and encouraging Oakland growers to create gardens within Oakland's constraints (e.g., container and rooftop gardens, hydroponic/aquaponic systems, etc.) would be helpful.
	Energy and Utilities: As members of the 2030 District, Oakland's institutions are already committed to reducing their energy and resource loads, and they have access to the resources and expertise needed to implement their sustainability strategies. Infrastructure Action Team leaders heard repeatedly throughout the plan process that more resources and incentive strategies are needed to encourage and support private property owners, especially landlords whose tenants pay their own utilities, to invest in energy efficient appliances, insulation, HVAC systems, etc.
	Energy and Utilities: The plan should mention the 2030 District and explain strategies available today to implement the universities' climate action plans (and the city's!). The Energy Strategy is a great start.
	Energy and Utilities: The plan should include a program or project more robust than mere education, to encourage private property owners to reduce their energy and resource loads.
	Energy and Utilities: PWSA's plans to remove lead service lines from Oakland should also be called out here: this work will keep PWSA busy for the next several years in every neighborhood in Oakland.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	Communications: The Internet is increasingly regarded as a public good, and access to it is a matter of equity. The plan includes a goal to expand free WiFi, and to provide Oakland residents with training and support to allow them to take advantage of it; but this is supported only by one project, which is providing data and community service hubs. Existing providers of public internet access – notably the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh and the Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy – should be supported to expand their coverage areas (and institutions that do not offer free WiFi should be encouraged to remove their gates for this purpose). City-owned assets such as the Frazier Field House and the Herron Hill Pump Station could be equipped to provide free WiFi almost immediately, even in advance of future facility re-designs or upgrades. This would be enormously helpful in delivering programming at these facilities that benefits the surrounding community.
	Waste Management: Inadequate trash containment, collection, and management are almost a salient feature of today’s Oakland, and all of Oakland’s neighborhoods are in urgent need of robust and well-targeted strategies to combat these problems. This section needs to consist of a lot more than weekly recycling and student move out/material reuse.
	Waste Management: Highlight enforcement on dumpsters and trash containment, to hold landlords more accountable. DPW needs more resources to be able to enforce existing laws adequately; and the city should consider modifications to existing containment laws. oOver-occupancy creates trash containment problems: a single-family house might contain a dozen or more students in one or three or five units, and those dozen create more weekly trash than the ordinances were designed to accommodate. Current rules state that properties containing more than 5 units must contract for private waste management; the rule should be shifted to be 4 units or more. Enforcement must be tied to the rental registration ordinance. oCurrent rules also permit trash to be left for collection in bags; this should be changed to indicate trash must be placed for collection in a closed can. oDPW should provide guidance to Oakland landlords regarding strategies for trash can management. Current rules require cans be brought in off the sidewalk, away from view of the public right of way – but for many buildings in Oakland, this is difficult to accomplish. Design guidelines for street-level garbage can containment would be helpful here.
	Waste Management: Incentive programs for landlords to accommodate cardboard recycling stations on their properties would help enormously. The University of Pittsburgh should be invited to consider extending its on-campus cardboard recycling programs to pilot locations off-campus.
	Waste Management: DPW should produce targeted guidelines and resources for student renters, and those materials should be made available on the academic calendar (so, mailed to all Oakland addresses in late August, for example).
	Waste Management: Policies and programs to collect and properly manage food waste and recycling at restaurants would be enormously helpful. The plan should also include goals and programs on composting and composting stations.
	as one of the many elders in my neighborhood of Oakland I’m concerned about the disposal of waste, sanitary products. It goes far beyond grocery bags. I’d like to see research on that. What is going to be done? it will continue to be a large and probably growing problem.
	15 - “preserve existing trees” is not sufficient. We need a strong commitment to maintain and care for the tree canopy that exists, as well, as add to the tree canopy
	I 7-8-9: Enforce the law against front-yard parking pads (retroactively!), and require higher proportion of green area in backyard parking lots. Every block on residential streets should have at least one "bump-out" rain garden with a tree. Figure out some way to require maintenance of existing trees, and encourage more of them. Subsidize improvement of existing inadequate tree pits. Narrow streets should have only one-side parking to allow for safer bike use, wider sidewalks, and tree space. Of course, these changes would require much better transit options, so residents don't feel forced to have cars.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	Comment on above: Great idea. Get rid of the illegally authorized parking pads that are throughout Oakland. That worked 50 years ago, but they need to go. Find out who signed the authorization and cancel it. I'm guessing that many of the property owned who initially acquired the parking pads, have sold to absentee landlords (easy enough to check, eh?). Regardless, get rid of them.
Comprehensive electric vehicle strategy	Although electric vehicles will be a part of our future, the installation of charging facilities should not impede pedestrian infrastructure. The large charging stations cut into already miniscule pedestrian public space. It is imperative that developers instead reduce parking volumes and use charging stations between cars rather than on sidewalks/shared space.
	is there a physical copy?
Comprehensive electric vehicle strategy	flexible co-op charging
Data at community service hubs	fieldhouse effort is currently successful
	Energy burden. creative thinking is needed to address the split incentive between owners and tenants.
Encourage more community gardens	support
Encourage more community gardens	<p>Pitt's Plant to Plate would like to expand their current location and relocating their garden behind Peterson Event Center. New plot is several issues, distance from the campus core, erosion, salt storage contamination issues. Would like to find a better location and be able to provide food for students.</p> <p>Have communicated with OPDC, make sure they can become tree tenders to support the Tree Canopy goals. Work within Pitt's IMP to make sure they can better utilize the campus land. Incorporate more urban garden space. That P2P partnership is a very pressing issue with the timing and need it to start now to address the food insecurity happening NOW. Move timeline to now and would like to be added directly as a collaborator</p> <p>Need to get out into the community and would like to get support from the City.</p>
Hillside Stabilization and Protection	How can this be shifted to now because as development is happening, there needs to be stabilizing efforts immediately so that there is not erosion and additional issues.
Reduce landfill waste	recycling pilot? when could we start? bi-weekly is a barriers to student participation
Reduce impervious areas	<p>what is the programming for impervious area.</p> <p>What are the criteria for grandfathering ? i d we need to inforce the ordinance and not waive everyone</p>
Resident Education	make sure education are also targeted to owner of residential buildings so they can improve their tenants space
	NO mention of the 2030 district which is surprising because GBA led conversations.
	Waste and recycling needs more. Oakland has a huge trash problem. We need to highlight enforcement, hold landlords accountable, market and educate. Need to implement more on how to manage food waste at restaurants. It was in the conversation but didn't make it into the plan.
	Stormwater management needed more of something (?)

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
	Define depave oakland. Like concept of green alley but want more details, how is that identified and where should these be located?
	More detail requested in urban ag and community garden strategies. What areas count as open space, what are existing open spaces. takes a lot of work. Needs more details.
	Comprehensive tree canopy – like that and want more case study.
	Very concerned by hillsides – a bit vague about how City should go about doing that. E.g. by what authority and how remove structures that should not be there, how do maintaince, what replace with, what guidance for property owners, etc.
	I like the tree canopy bit too, but then I have never in 40 years seen the city help clean up the street/sidewalk leaves. I have seen the city vacuuming up leaves in other Neighborhoods (Sq Hill) , but never in Oakland. I always wonder why. If we neighbors are to request trees, I believe that the city should, not only trim them, but also clean up leaves.
	not rushing to get more trees since don't understand City guidance on that.
	am concerned about maintaining once planted and the proper space required. Don't want them under utility lines or for trees to be removed when they're juveniles. Not worried about the leaf maintenance. Maintenance needs to be defined for those that have trees. Andrea: City is doing better with this and has quite a bit of guidance on right tree in the right place. Relies heavily on volunteers – continuous effort to deploy and train. OPDC in convo with UPitt on this.
	On Atwood there are 2 old plain trees and they're tearing up the sidewalk. The owner will probably cut them down. Should be a cost sharing program for saving the sidewalk and the older trees.
	Maintenance of tree canopy should definitely be included.
I-5	Add businesses and commercial property owners to assist reducing energy burden.
I-19	Add OBID; we need more trees in commercial areas as well.
I-21	OBID should be here -w e have lawns in commercial district areas as well
I-7	OBID should be a partner re: Euler Way
I-9	Should include OBID as a partner for both commercial corridors - who manages this Trust Fund?
I-25	OBID as partner to help.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
Zoning	<p>On the whole I am supportive of the plan. But the decision to effectively ban new residential buildings (unless 100% affordable) from the Fifth-Forbes corridor is incredibly wrongheaded. The "clearing" of central business districts of residential uses is considered one of the big failures of mid-20th century zoning. One or two additional historic midrises are converted from office to residential uses in downtown Pittsburgh every single year! I can't imagine why anyone would believe it makes good sense in terms of urban planning to ban new market-rate units entirely from the core area of Oakland. Even when these buildings are expensive, they serve an important role, as new-construction buildings skim off the "top of the market" and depress rental prices in more dated units.</p> <p>The supposition that this land could be better used for office projects is just that. In a post-COVID work environment, can we really presume there will be substantial demand for new office space in Oakland? Oakland Portal has remained mostly vacant for decades with little sign of development, though I am aware of the proposed senior apartment.</p> <p>2. In addition, the boundary between the two areas seems to be set very broadly. Putting it at Louisa Street actually results in several short blocks of largely prewar residential structures being included in the "no-residential zone." Are we saying the long-term plan is to have those areas to be cleared of residents in order to have more office space? Do we really want to tie the hands of future development so that the existing apartments closest to Pitt's campus can't be upgraded?</p>
Zoning	Comment on above: some very good points in the comment above
Zoning	Comment on above: One further thing I have been considering: Since the new zoning does nothing to stop the expansion of Pitt and UPMC's EMI zones - and it is openly mentioned that nothing would stop Pitt from constructing additional dorms in the Fifth-Forbes corridor - restricting zoning by banning residential essentially puts Pitt and UPMC at an advantage to expand their campuses into this area over private developers, who have a more constrained set of options. This is very bad from a public policy perspective, considering both are tax-exempt entities.
Zoning	Why can't UC-MU retain the residential compatibility that we had with OPR-D? It seems that the new set-backs are no-where near to the "protection" that OPR-D set-backs provided. It seems that residents are written off and don't really don't anymore. Seems that we are being encouraged to leave and let Oakland become all offices, universities, and hospitals. Why?
Zoning	And why shouldn't rooftop decks, storm water management systems etc. be included in the calculations of the maximum allowable building height?? They add to height and should be counted. This is also true of the "corner" entrance extensions/protrusions that are currently permitted. Why give more height?
Zoning	I have heard the rationale for facade articulation, but I believe that these "articulated" buildings with their colorful blocks of outside materials will look dated in just a few years. They are not the classic and timeless look of brick or wood that we historically see in Oakland. Why don't you ask for these classic building materials for the facades and don't bother with the articulation.?
Zoning	When this plan was mentioned to Oakcliffe, the example of things that would be considered was the inclusion of alleys and walkways so we would no longer see long buildings without any pedestrian pass-throughs. This 400 foot maximum (pg 11) goes directly against this and what we were told/expected. Such long buildings are pedestrian unfriendly and rather ugly. They are especially troublesome to handicapped/elderly who must figure out how to get around them with no alley or pass-thru available.
Zoning	Why do you would want to reduce the amount of parking required for development by 50% of the minimum required. Even further reduction with contribution to Mobility Improvement Trust. This is just silly. All drivers can simply scoot into Oakcliffe and park. This is especially true since I have seen proposal to change all RPP areas to include Hybrid Parking. We also know that RPP visitor passes are easy to abuse - simply by giving/se an email and password. DO NOT include parking reduction.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
Zoning	It says that the Zoning in UC-MU is to "encourage a mixture of restored historic homes and modern apartment buildings...." But we know that Walnut Capital plans to tear down the 4-square homes on Halket (across from Magee Hospital). No way to save those existing sturdy homes? A survey of Historic buildings by the city even suggested that that style of home could qualify for some type of historic status. It would be nice if the new Zoning could saved them somehow.
Zoning	Please remove firearms sales from the permitted uses in the new zoning districts.
Zoning	The Forbes-Fifth Corridor needs to be UC-MU, not UC-E. Mixed used development is more sustainable and leads to a more vibrant neighborhood. Banning residential land use in the core of the neighborhood is short-sighted, especially with the widespread transition to remote work.
Zoning	Forbes-Fifth absolutely needs to be UC-MU, agree with Brennan. We need more mixed use, not less.
Zoning	Shadow Study. Not sure if this goes here or somewhere else... When is a Shadow Study required? Always? Sometimes? When a Shadow Study is done and reported, are there any consequences about the amount or timing of the shadows?? Where can I find that information?
Zoning	I thought one of the goals in the Oakland Plan was to attract permanent residents, families to Oakland. Families are not attracted to apartment living.
	Comprehensive document in a widely diverse area. Testiment to the hard work. Number of comments show that alot of people are engaged. You're not going to make everyone happy.
	Strong - West Oakland and South Oakland - leaving the zoning as is. Good.
	Central oakland rezones are the right idea. Performace points are ggreat.
	Mobility is strong. Life between buildings; public realm.
	The process was super deliberate and thorough. Kuddos. It was systematic for so long and then felt rushed at the end. I don't think that anything could fix that.
	The content has very little fault. Substance is useful.
	In favor of the Land Use Strategy. Glad it will be in future round of zoning and we will be more involved in that rezoning effort. In favor of innovation and employment districts. Want to see programming for small business districts.
	Want to see more in Melwood area - a baby Strip; opportunity for avant guard theater.
	Wants to ensure the EMI remains. Master planning is important.
	Perception that implementation is rushed; that City is pushing through City stuff through commissions.
	Community process is great. Implementation table is great. Intention is to continue to advocate that CMU continues to play a role.
Zoning	Research shows that inclusionary zoning is counterproductive. By making it more expensive to build new housing it restricts supply, making the existing housing stock more expensive. Pittsburgh and Oakland should not pursue inclusionary zoning.
Zoning	More about Craft Ave apt buildings 294, 300, 306 and parking lot on Craft Ave. Right now these buildings are R1-A-VH. Maybe not exactly right for them, but putting them in UC-MU is wrong and opens the Oakcliffe neighborhood and residences to much more development and uses. Why was it put in UC-MU and when can you get it back into neighborhood zoning where it belongs?
Zoning	Shifting some Craft Avenue Properties should be removed from UC-MU The maps are unclear, but it looks like properties at 294, 300 and 306 Craft Avenue (and associated parking lot) are proposed to be included in UC-MU. If that is the case, that is wrong. That would permit very very tall buildings next to single family homes and condo. Please make the street names more visible so that we can be sure that we are correct in our assumption about proposed zoning for those buildings along Oakcliffe side of Craft Avenue.
Zoning	Can points yield different height bonuses? There's some concern that bonus points (eg for energy efficiency, etc.) make it too easy to achieve bonus height. Where base max and bonus max are only ~60' apart, a project needs only 4 points to achieve max, easily won with LEED and other measures - so extra affordable housing, which isn't a marketable plus, won't ever be utilized. Could points be worth only 10'? 8'?

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
Zoning	I thought one of the goals in the Oakland Plan was to attract permanent residents, families to Oakland. Families are not attracted to apartment living.
Zoning	The proposed zoning intent statements are weak indeed compared to OPR intent statement. Why would the Oakland community support such a step back with a statement that no longer includes an intent to protect the character of less intensive uses from impacts of more intensive uses? That no longer includes an intent to allow non-residential and residential uses to co-exist without conflict? The UC-E intent statement says nothing about neighborhood-serving businesses, neighborhood character. Also to say that transit is encouraged is weak given that Fifth/Forbes is currently a major transit corridor in Oakland, the city, the region. The UC-MU statement neglects to mention neighborhood-serving retail. It mentions “to transition from smaller scale residential adjacent” but no statement about minimizing impact to those areas, protecting those areas, valuing those areas as contributing to the unique character of Oakland. This is not acceptable. The UC-MU statement includes descriptions of how things will be done (requiring open space, sidewalk width, etc.) but actually these don’t belong in an intent statement – they do not describe intent. The intent statement for R-MU contains several conflicting statements. It states an intent to encourage restored historic homes but the sentence prior to that states that the intent is just to have multifamily buildings for rental only. It is only in this section that we see an intent for neighborhood-serving retail – why not have retail in the other proposed districts serve the neighborhood? there is nothing in the zoning that helps to achieve the intent of encourage historic home restoration. When during the planning process was it determined that only rental would occur in this area?
Zoning	<p>Typos and/or errors throughout the proposed zoning language document:</p> <p>p. 2 – the word “for” missing in first sentence of intent statement after the word “employment”</p> <p>p. 2 – height c. – words written out are “sixty eight-five” and then the number in parenthesis is “85” correction needed</p> <p>p. 2 – c. 1) height bonus – text states “to exceed height of sixty (60) feet” but map shows 85 feet as base height.Is the base height 60 feet in UC-E district?Corrections needed.</p> <p>p. 3 – remove extra word “to” in last sentence.</p> <p>throughout the document there is a place holder “Sections (TBD)” I will list the pages here:p. 2, p. 4, p. 6,</p> <p>p. 6 – 2) i) “sixty-five (45)”typo – please correct</p> <p>p. 6 – 2) ii) “eighty-five (65)” typo – please correct</p> <p>this might be acceptable for a very early draft, but planners state their intention to have an action on this draft, which is a problem that people cannot see a corrected draft before hearing/action.</p>

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
Zoning	It would be helpful to define the term “step-back” in the planning materials and in the zoning code.A review of municode chapter 926, 220 – 224 shows the term “setback” defined.The term “step-back”, however, is not defined in the zoning code nor have I seen educational materials for Oakland Plan that define the term. There are some helpful drawings in the April 5 briefing materials; where would one find those on the Oakland Plan engage site?
Zoning	I oppose the UC-E height of 210 feet adjacent to Coltart Street.This creates a negative impact on that part of Coltart Street. The green buffer and height reduction zone do not make enough positive impact to address the massive scale causing a negative impact to Coltart.Also, McKee Place is higher than Coltart to begin with, making the impact even more severe.There should be a height map change for that portion of the UC-E from Sennot Street alley to Louisa Street with 85 feet the maximum allowed, similar to the proposal adjacent to Niagara Street.This would be a proper transition from the 210 feet along Forbes to the residential area.
Zoning	The zoning boundary for UC-E along Boulevard of the Allies, forbes, McDevitt Place seems to extend beyond Boulevard of the Allies but not follow either streets or property lines on the Oakcliffe side of the boulevard. The existing zoning boundary line there follows Ophelia Street and a property line.What is the reason for the proposed UC-E drawn across/through parcels?Is this a mistake or intentional?That will be hard for the community to understand and for the city to administer. Consider further explanation to the public or revising to correct this. It would create a strange condition for a sliver of a parcel to be 210 feet there . . . Comment on this comment: Thank you for pointing this out Wanda. Oakcliffers have been asking for better maps all through this process. Overlays are a great tool, but not if you can't tell their boundaries or read street names.
Zoning	Consider a change to the zoning map in the area of Fifth/Robinson so that the west portion of fifth Avenue except the apartment building is not included in UC-E. The line should not be extended so far back into the hillside, which is steeply sloped and landslide prone. Consider extending the H district there instead.
Zoning	Graphics prepared for the April 5 briefing include section drawings of many conditions at question with the zoning revisions; they are helpful illustrations.I do not see a section illustration, however, of the proposed build-out condition at Halket Street and Coltart with UC-MU, both 185 feet and 120 feet.This was a specific request of the commission and concern on the part of the community.Where can we find this section drawing for our review?Height on Halket should be capped to 85 feet to create a similar condition as proposed adjacent to Niagara Street.The conditions are the same; they should be treated the same.Reduce the allowed maximum height on Halket street.A green buffer and step back will not be enough to mitigate the negative impact of the allowable height there.
Zoning	Planning staff stated that these zoning districts could become used in other places in the city, but on p. 3 the text mentions “Along Fifth Avenue and Forbes Avenue.”On p. 5: “Along Boulevard of the Allies.”Given this confusion, why not have the intent statements be clearly about Oakland.We have that now with OPR intent statements.
Zoning	Is “sideway” a specific term in the zoning code?How is it different from “sidewalk?”“Sideway” is found on p. 3, p. 5, p. 8.Type or new term?

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
Zoning	<p>Why not edit the OPR zoning districts?Why eliminate them altogether? Comment on this comment: The issues that resulted in OPR zoning are still here. As a matter of fact, the protection that an Oakland Public Realm gives is needed now more than ever. Its intent is:</p> <p>1) to enact and implement new zoning districts to enhance and protect Oakland's special character;</p> <p>2) to protect the character of less intensive uses from impacts of more intensive uses;</p> <p>3) to provide a guide to non-residential and residential development in order to encourage growth that will be both pedestrian friendly and compatible with the existing neighborhood;</p> <p>4) to encourage mixed use developement that allows non-resident and resident uses to co-exist without conflict.</p> <p>The proposed zoning the the Oakland Plan does none of the above. Protecting existing residential neighborhoods and helping existing permanent residents are given very little consideration. The OPRs should be edited, not thrown out.</p>
Zoning	<p>p. 5, d) - green buffer paragraph – does “adjacent” refer to a property to the rear as well as to the side?Please clarify/define specifically.We want the requirement to apply to properties to the rear. It includes “rear yard” further in the paragraph, but clarity would help here.</p>
Zoning	<p>p. 5 – figure TBD for build-to zone – where can one find this?</p>
Zoning	<p>Reconsider height map for UC-MU along Boulevard of the Allies east of Bates (from Juliet to Dawson).This area should be 85 feet, not 185 feet.It is adjacent to residential areas in a similar condition to Niagara. It would not be appropriate to allow buildings of 185 feet in that condition.</p>
Zoning	<p>The UC-MU will result in unprecedented demolition – wholesale clearing of massive swaths of the Oakland community. 1.Consider a demolition review overlay zone to address demolitions being planned and how to address the impact on the community. 2. Consider a demolition surcharge fee to generate funds for the community reinvestment fund to support affordable housing and other community needs.The zoning change will have incredibly negative impacts on the neighborhood – property speculation, demolition,</p>
Zoning	<p>The R-MU will result in unprecedented demolition – wholesale clearing, loss of neighborhood character, negative impacts (noise, dust) of demolition, price escalation in the neighborhood due to property speculation.We need strategies to encourage preservation and restoration of homes in this area.Also incentives for some of the homes in the area to be affordable rental – supporting landlords to make improvements and then accept Housing Choice Vouchers, for instance.What tools can we incorporate along with this zoning change to support restoration of existing architecture?Otherwise, we will end up with new buildings next to continually deteriorating homes and a community devoid of sense of place with massive demolition taking place.The interesting character of the architecture in this area will be completely lost forever.We need to consider a zoning district that is perhaps drawn in a more strategic way.This big block of a zoning district does not seem appropriate.Some of the streets are small – not suited to 95 foot buildings.Other infrastructure concerns with changing a large area from smaller scale residential to much more dense residential – water and sewer lines in particular.I think we need to re-think the boundaries and adjust to nodes for larger scale development with other areas protected and eligible for restoration incentive program funds.Or, consider an overlay with SP for multi-family encouraged. We need ways to address the planning of new development in context with existing housing that is not being demolished. We need more thought put into the redevelopment of this area.</p>

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
Zoning	1. p. 8 whole-building life cycle assessment – I think this should be required for demolitions. 2. And p. 19 – review threshold for demolitions – we need thorough review process for demolitions in these zoning districts. 3. Any demolition of a primary structure should be reviewed as demolition will become such a huge issue in the neighborhood as a result of these zoning changes.
Zoning	p. 9 – mobility improvement trust. Define this. Who manages it? What are the funds used for? A search in municode brings up this term in the RIV district, but I could not find a definition. Search on the city website generates no results. For this to be included in zoning in Oakland we need to know more about it.
Zoning	Green buffers, p. 15 (and p. 7) – This merits more review and consideration. We need to think more carefully about how the green buffers will work in context of residential neighborhood where multifamily new construction is being built next to existing lower-density residential. 1. What if the adjacent homeowner does not want a green buffer for pedestrian access right next to their house? 2. What if a green buffer is not well maintained and becomes a smelly mosquito infested nuisance next to someone’s house? 3. Can we state that parking is not allowed in green buffers? In a residential context, this is more complicated. Comment on this comment: I share the same concerns as Wanda in regard to Green Buffers. The desirable name sounds good, but it is misleading as the reality is that they do not have to be "green". A "Green" Buffer for pedestrian access can be a concrete path. This is especially relevant since the Residential Compatibility Standards now provided in OPR-D will be lost and replaced with a Height Reduction Zone that offers a fraction of the protection.
Zoning	Performance points in UC-E – p. 17. Concern that equitable development and affordable housing will not be utilized. For instance, a developer could get six points for zero carbon and two for public art and achieve the eight points needed to get the maximum height. While the zero carbon is good, there is no value capture supporting community needs.
Zoning	p. 17 – “workforce development” is listed in the bonus points list but the 915.07.D. 12 is actually named “equitable development” on . 21. Revise for consistency.
Zoning	p. 17 – 18 – UC-MU performance points – similar concern with the unlikelihood of equitable development points being selected. In the 185 feet area, we may have more chance of affordable housing points being used, which is good.
Zoning	p. 17 – in the zero energy or zero carbon item, you list “. . . D. 1.a – 1.d points as listed” but it seems that only 1.a – 1.c are the actual items, so revise to correct the reference to “d”?
Zoning	p. 18 – R-MU performance points – Here it is even more clear that a developer can achieve maximum height without using the points the community would really like to see, which is affordable housing. For example to get the four point required for 95 feet, they could do 1 point for public art, one point for building reuse (which for that point is actually just designing your building to be compatible with those nearby, not actually reusing a building), one point for rainwater, and one point for energy conservation code (an efficient building, which they would want to do anyway I would think to save money on operating costs). That is the four points needed. No affordable housing. All market rate. Wholesale demolition of the community for more market rate housing. IZ would apply if over 20 units, but the bonus points do not support us there – only IZ. Given this, we need to reconsider the mapping of this district. Maybe it should be nodes.
Zoning	The plan should clarify language regarding the following terms: “city equitable development trust fund”, “community reinvestment fund”, “community reinvestment board”. Their use is confusing throughout the document. It is not clear whether they are interchangeable.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
Zoning	<p>I have many concerns about the equitable development performance points and whether they will support the Oakland community’s needs. It is not clear how signing a lease with a workforce group equates to equitable development absent any other requirements. Also, how much square footage is required to meet that requirement? Then, the definition on p. 20 also includes “or a local, non-franchise business owned and operated by a city resident” If this was more specific to Oakland – an Oakland resident, maybe this would be a benefit to our community, but I do not agree that bonus points should be given to anyone just for having a lease in a new building. There is no guarantee that that serves the needs of the Oakland community. How is that residency requirement verified and enforced? For how long would they have to be a city resident? Who monitors that over time? for the commitment to percentage of jobs in the building hired from underrepresented groups, as defined on p. 20, this does not serve Oakland residents. So, it is difficult to see how this is a benefit to the Oakland community in exchange for the density of development and associated impacts that the community experiences. Hiring underrepresented groups is a good thing to do, but does not serve Oakland residents, especially low-income members of our community. Who check and verifies who actually works on those payrolls? Is an audit conducted? Who pays for the audit? Is the report made public? Can a tenant in the building say that people are consultants to reduce the number of underrepresented groups that they have to hire? (I only have 5 people on my payroll, see?) Do the hires from underrepresented groups only have to be from a particular census tract at the time of hire? They can then move? If the recertification occurs, they no longer then qualify if they’ve moved to a non-qualifying census tract? Or gotten a four-year degree? What department within City of Pittsburgh will carry out this certification and recertification? Getting funds up front is preferred. Enforcement is a huge concern. P. 22 describes a description of enforcement for equitable development point but it is a huge concern that enforcement simply won’t happen. If the city would choose to enforce, it can be a monumental task for the law department to file the required court filings to make this happen. It seems more likely that the city would drop the ball somewhere along the way and simply not enforce. Thus, I suggest editing this to allow points only for an up-front financial contribution to a fund specific to Oakland needs for affordable housing, community needs such as food/health, and financial empowerment such as job training/placement for Oakland residents specifically.</p> <p>Comment on this comment: Wanda make very good points. Read her note and listen to what she is saying.</p>
Zoning	<p>Any funds generated by performance points in Oakland must be earmarked specifically to support programs for Oakland residential community, especially the needs of low-income residents such as affordable homeownership, affordable housing, public space improvements, and community services (food, health).</p>
Zoning	<p>Use Table: 1. Remove college or university campus from both UC-E and UC-MU. That use should be permitted in EMI only. And be thoroughly vetted through a ten-year master plan that EMI requires. 2. Reconsider allowing correctional facility limited in UC-MU. 3. Remove educational classroom space from both UC-E and UC-MU. That use in Oakland should be permitted in EMI only. 4. Remove the conditional use for excavation/grading/fill, major from all zones or describe to the community the legal reason that it is included. 5. Remove firearms business establishment from UC-E and UC-MU. 6. Remove hospital from UC-E and UC-MU. That use should be permitted in EMI only here in Oakland. 7. Remove parking structure limited from R-MU. 8. Remove the conditional use for utility general from R-MU. 9. Also remove conditional use for transit facility from R-MU.</p>

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
Zoning	<p>1. I would like to second Karl Zimmerman's comment of why the carve outs. I think this could be better handled via proper definitions in the IO-Z overlay to which zoning types this applies. (For the universities, excluding dormitory/sorority/fraternity seems sufficient to this non-expert zoner.)</p> <p>2. I'm not sure how this effectively applies to community houses or assisted living facilities. I say this of my own ignorance – I presume the "rental" cost of assisted living, for example, is dominated by the staffing for the assisted living which is driven by market forces outside of the real estate cost. Would this imply (continuing my assumption) that non inclusionary staffing costs would need to be distributed across the remaining 80% of the units. That doesn't seem practical in numerous ways, especially with how health care is reimbursed. If my assumption is correct, then no assisted living can rationally be developed in Oakland in the future. This forces people to move away from potentially their existing neighborhood as they age.</p> <p>I would prefer more INCLUSION across all of Oakland with more precision in the zoning use classes this applies.</p>
Zoning	<p>maybe this goes here.... I put it in Development area of Oakland Plan too.</p> <p>Seems that the city is considering affordable housing new-build units to be kept as affordable for 35 years. Not sure where I read that, but I believe that it is true. That is must too short of a time. Affordable housing units should be kept that way for perpetuity -- not just for 35 years. Currently there is an affordable housing development in East Liberty where tenants are being evicted -- it only had to be affordable for 35 years. The buildings are currently owned by some East Liberty community organization (corner of Rippey and South Negley Ave,) and being sold to some developer. All of the tenant must leave. Thirty-five (35) years is not a long time to live in a family home -- it is unfair to evict somebody whose home has been an affordable unit.</p>
Zoning	<p>Comment on above: I agree with Read_This_Please that a real commitment to solving the affordable housing crisis is to require it into perpetuity, not 10, 20 or 35 years. Otherwise, the lack of affordable housing is left for the next generation to deal with.</p>
Zoning	<p>Comment on above: After the DAM, I looked at the Zulema Park workshop slides. I want to comment on the Site Layout A. There is an illustration that shows a tall (10-18 stories) building across from Magee Hospital down at the part of the street that abuts the current Panera. It was suggested at the DAM, that my referring to that tall building as "silly" height might not be agreed to by others. So I will offer another term to indicate the discrepancy between extremely tall buildings (as those proposed in parts of UC-MU at LACKING HEIGHT EQUITY. (I realize that we often use the term equity in reference to fairness in housing, employment opportunity, etc. but this height disparity is also a type on inequity) Any recognition and acceptance of HEIGHT EQUITY would never consider putting 8 - 15 story (or whatever ridiculously height) within 20 or 30 or 40 feet of 2 story homes like your diagrams show. A ten foot set back does not allay the HEIGHT INEQUITY. I don't care what other cities or communities have used and been satisfied with -- Oakland deserves to be unique and to set standards, not just be be a follower.</p>
Zoning	<p>I would like to see “incentives” built into the zoning code as requirements, rather than as “bonus” points. I think it is deceptive to list height restrictions that are then more than doubled by “bonus” points - example 65ft height restriction could become 185ft if all bonus points are applied. Many of the “bonus” items are things that should be incorporated into all future development in Oakland</p> <p>- Great point: requirements are good. Bonus points are no - KathyG is absolutely correct on this. Oakland is a highly desirable area for developers. Rather than use that as leverage for requirements, this plan makes it easier for them.</p>
Development	<p>Zoning Use Table: Remove campus uses from new zoning districts. The concern is that universities will continue to expand in residential areas of Oakland.</p>
Development	<p>Zoning Use Table: Remove firearm sales and check cashing from new zoning districts.</p>

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
Development	Technical aspects of this proposal should limit architectural designs or materials that cheapen the quality of Oakland. Besides limiting EIFS, there should be guidance on limiting the amount of glass curtain wall on structures as this material doesn't provide any contextual design elements to this area. Examples of poor use of materials and large expanses of glass would be the Oxford Building at 3501 Forbes Ave. and the Falk Medical Building at 3601 Fifth Ave. The facades on these building do not positively impact pedestrians or others that see this building every day. Having a mixture of materials while still limiting glass area could still allow daylighting, but negatively impact the visual impact to the community.
Development	<p>While an Oakland Town Center (D-7) sounds great, it feeds directly into development by Walnut Capital (WC) called Oakland Crossing. While on the surface, that may appear to be a good thing, it serves to keep resident voices quiet in the future, which I believe is NOT a good situation.</p> <p>I am not sure what the Oakland Town Center legislation/zoning would mean, but we DO NOT need a tiled street as shown in the numerous representation of WC dream development. We DO NOT need a huge tv screen running all day like the visual pollution that WC provides at Bakery Square. Nor can we neighboring communities tolerate the extreme downtown-type signage that WC proposed in one of their last versions of Ordinance 2021-1906. I suspect that WC will use an Oakland Town Center idea/regulations as a way to promote their invasive vision without public input. WC has already modified their proposal to include some verbiage from your draft Oakland Plan -- how can this be when this Oakland Plan has not yet been fully vetted for public input and how did the city allow the Oakland Plan wording get into what WC is now proposing in ... can it still be called 2021-1906??</p> <p>- After the DAM, I looked at the Zulema Park workshop slides. I want to comment on the Site Layout A. There is an illustration that shows a tall (10-18 stories) building across from Magee Hospital down at the part of the street that abuts the current Panera. It was suggested at the DAM, that my referring to that tall building as "silly" height might not be agreed to by others. So I will offer another term to indicate the discrepancy between extremely tall buildings (as those proposed in parts of UC-MU at LACKING HEIGHT EQUITY. (I realize that we often use the term equity in reference to fairness in housing, employment opportunity, etc. but this height disparity is also a type on inequity) Any recognition and acceptance of HEIGHT EQUITY would never consider putting 8 - 15 story (or whatever ridiculously height) within 20 or 30 or 40 feet of 2 story homes like your diagrams show. A ten foot set back does not allay the HEIGHT INEQUITY. I don't care what other cities or communities have used and been satisfied with -- Oakland deserves to be unique and to set standards, not just be be a follower.</p>
Development	<p>I gotta admit, I don't know what I am supposed to be reacting to here. That slide presentation?? Well, here goes: Height along Boulevard of the Allies is absolutely silly. How can you think that an 18 story building would be appropriate on the old Islays site or on the old Hyacinth Church site, or where Fagnelli Plumbing and the electric substation exist today? There are 2 1/2 story homes next to and across the street from property with this proposed zoning. With OPR-D, we at least had a sort of reasonable set back to make the street adjacent parts of a new tall (but NOT so tall as 18 stories) more on the scale of neighboring residential structures. Think about it. 18 stories -- even if there is a 10-foot set back that can be covered with balconies (permitted I think) right next to homes. Yes. Some of us live there and resent this right that you have to make our streets impossible for family life.</p> <p>A little "green buffer" that is mentioned is a moot point in my book.</p> <p>Has all of your Steering Committee walked through Oakcliffe with this plan in place to understand what you are now proposing to permit? I suspect not. Please do that before you go further with this document.</p>

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
Zoning	thinks these parcels should be residential RiA-VH (existing), not UC-MU (proposed). The signage and lighting associated with redevelopment of these apartments could be businesses with signage and lighting next to residential. APN: 28-P-9 – 3229 Joe Hammer Sq. – Use is multi-family APN: 28-P-27 – 300 Craft Ave – Use is multi-family APN: 28-P-33 – 306 Craft Ave – Use is multi-family APN: 28-P-36 – corner of Kennett Sq & Craft Ave (no address) – Vacant
Zoning	Buchanan Ingersoll and Rooney on behalf of five Oakland Property Owners managed by Robb Real Estate Company. Currently Zoned OPR - A and R2-H. Oakland Proposal is to change this UC-E "which would essentially rezong four thriving residenital blocks from residential to commercial use" per the letter. As per letter, it will also harder to redevelop for either commercial or residenial uses so far from Fifth and Forbes.
Zoning	Zoning: Buildings currently zoned residential should not be rezoned to UC-MU. The justification that they do not conform to their current zoning category, for example, the apartment buildings at 300 Craft Ave, 306 Craft Ave and 3229 Joe Hammer, as well as a parking lot at the corner of Craft Ave and Kennett St, does not justify the myriad of uses UC-MU would allow in a residential neighborhood, not to mention the increased massing that would be allowed as the buildings in UC-MU can be 400 feet long. These properties are adjacent to 2 story row houses and 2 story condos. So what that they are "nonconforming uses" right now? We were told at an Oakcliffe meeting that only the OPR-D properties in Oakcliffe would be changed; apparently that was not true. It took an eagle-eyed neighbor to discover this as it is very difficult to see street names and buildings on the provided maps. Halket Street and Welsford are other streets zoned as residential and proposed to become UC-MU.
Zoning	Comment on above:This is critical to Oakcliffe and 3229 Joe Hammer, 300 Craft, 306 Craft and parking lot beside this property MUST NOT be transferred to UC-MU. These properties must stay in the Zoning established for the rest of the residential Oakcliffe and a "non-conforming use" or something like that. Other items like illegal parking lots and 2-family conversions have historically been granted by some shady mechanism -- make some mechanism legal for keeping these buildings zoned like their neighboring residences.
Zoning	Zoning: The UC-E zoning on the Blvd of the Allies needs to be changed to UC-MU at 85 feet maximum height. 210 ft buildings across from a residential neighborhood does not make sense. This proposed region goes from Craft Ave, includes the Hampton Inn down to the former KFC site. The other side of the Blvd of the Allies along there is proposed to be UC-MU at 85 feet maximum; the other side of Craft Ave has Magee Hospital, which is only 5 stories; a generous estimation of height would be 75 ft.
Zoning	Comment on above: I agree with zaitsoff. UC-E near to Blvd Allies/Oakcliffe is not appropriate. It permits buildings that are much too high.
Zoning	Uses: The following need to be removed from UC-MU and UC-E as they should be in EMI (Educational, Medical, Institution), subject to the EMI process: 1. college or university campus, 2. educational classroom space, 3.hospital 4. The following needs to be removed from R-MU and UC-MU as its definition is too broad: transit facility 5 The following need to be removed from R-MU: parking structure (limited)

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
Zoning	Comment on above: I agree. It seems that transit facility might become a bus layover point or other things that we cannot imagine today, so this needs to be removed from R-MU and UC-MU. Without proper constraints, one cannot imaging what might be construed and built. Take it out.
Zoning	The point system for adding height to already-large buildings should concentrate on rewarding design improvements that will be readily visible and useful at street level. (Setbacks on sidewalks, ground-floor transparency, planting, seating, etc.) From a pedestrian point of view, it makes little difference if a building is 12 stories or 16: what the daily user notices and appreciates is what is at eye level. Also should reward minimizing the building's shadow.
Zoning	<p>Regarding the Fifth and Forbes Avenue corridors, OBID has the following comments and questions:</p> <p>1. Further define “limits on new residential development.” OBID would like to see mechanisms to incentivize housing that is compatible with innovation uses and affordable/ workforce housing while limiting multi-family housing geared to undergraduate students without creating cold office nodes of 8am-5pm weekday pedestrian traffic. This needs to allow for and encourage an appropriate mix of commercial uses to provide for a more innovative live/work/play environment that activates the gateways of Oakland. (ie Portal Place).</p> <p>2. How will limiting residential redevelopments be done in multiple phased projects? Will each phase be allowed some percentage, or the total fully built out project be allowed a certain percentage of residential vs commercial uses? How is hospitality viewed in the Plan given innovation companies will attract more out of town workers that will want to stay near their “Pittsburgh Office” when travelling in from their Silicone Valley office?</p> <p>3. As for building heights, shouldn’t a building height minimum be more valuable than a maximum? Maximums are counter intuitive to the overall goals of creating taller builds for more jobs and allowing more open space.</p>
Zoning	<p>OBID suggests expanding the intent of the RMU District to include the following:</p> <p>Residents and entrepreneurs have access to career services and opportunities that allow them to work in their neighborhood. All Oakland employees, students, artists, entrepreneurs, and makers have access to affordable housing that allows them to walk to work or school.</p>
Zoning	<p>Pitt has tried to encourage employees to live in Oakland previously. It would be interesting to see data on how many actually moved to Oakland and continue to live there (after obtaining a degree) as their permanent residence. It's a great goal, but I remain skeptical as to its efficacy.</p> <p>As an example: At a meeting where there has new a Pitt employee speaking on behalf of the university, we asked if she moved into Oakland and why not. Response was, there was nothing to "meet our needs of yard", etc. Sadly, I always suspect that it is not the lack of yard space, I always suspect it is too much student housing, too much rubbish, and lack of parking.</p> <p>Give them grants for a downpayment for 5 years and see what happens.</p>
Zoning	Comment on above: 6. above assumes that employees will stop driving into Oakland. Pitt has a study in their Institutional Master Plan showing the low impact of their robust Transportation Demand Management Plan. This type of data is what should be used for decision making, not wishful thinking that will result in dangerous situations and people risking a ticket in poorly enforces Residential Parking Permit areas.
Zoning	Comment on above: "ezaitsoff " is entirely correct. Use data not somebody's guess about what will happen.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
Zoning	The performance points system needs a total review and rewrite, or a possible abandonment. There are too many questions about enforcement, amounts paid to the Public Benefits Fund, what points are given for, multipliers allowed, etc. A maximum height building can be built using allowances that don't benefit Oakland residents while their desired benefits don't happen. This is what happens when City Planners and "their partners" develop it. The performance points system also takes away a citizen's right to have a say at the Zoning Board of Adjustment, as it makes the extra height, given by easily obtainable points, "by right".
Zoning	Comment on above: Yes, too many irrelevant silly things that are given bonus point so that a building can grow taller and taller. I think the bonus points were based on those in Uptown where development is sorely needed. We aren't the same neighborhood and need to take the LEAD on what are appropriate bonus points for Oakland. In fact, why have bonus points at all, except that it appears to be a mechanism to eliminate community voices at Zoning Board of Adjustment hearings. I believe that bonus points are what developers want NOT what is good for residents.
Zoning	Why should Oakland residents support a plan that has so many steps backward for them? Residential areas losing the protection of OPR districts alone will be disastrous to the character of the neighborhoods. Too-high buildings that favor developers will be permitted despite being adjacent to residences. 210 ft high buildings across from the Oakcliff neighborhood is unacceptable. It needs to be 85' to match what is happening across the street and the context of what is already there - the Hampton Inn and Magee Hospital. The residential areas adjacent to the proposed rezoned areas are not taken into much account.
Zoning	Comment on above: This is all so true. If you want to keep existing residents, involve them and listen to them. We are here day in and day out -- not just 8 hours, 5 days a week.
Zoning	<p>Performance Points:</p> <p>The financial penalties for non-compliance with the point system after extra height was permitted and built need to be higher and assessed every year. Otherwise it is just the cost of doing business to get extra height desired.</p> <p>Up front fees assessed for not being able to comply but wanting height anyway need to be reviewed for impact and legitimacy. Are they enough to make a difference, or again, just the cost of doing business?</p> <p>Could anything substantial really come out of the fund, for example, building a new community center, as we get surrounded by monstrous buildings? The fund is not even clearly outlined in this plan. While the defined zoning with its point system would be a definite, benefits to residents are only ideas with no funding. Nothing is guaranteed to get done, while the new zoning would be guaranteed.</p>
Zoning	Comment on above: I agree with this. How will you guarantee compliance and organize fines?
Zoning	I made comments through the 311 system and they are not here. What was the 311 process supposed to be? Are ANYONE'S 311 comments here? How can we comment on their comments?
Zoning	<p>Comment on above: I don't see my 311 comments anywhere either.</p> <p>Actually when I made a called 311 to make a comment yesterday, the person who answered the phone said " you ought to call your Council person." Boy did that make me feel confident about the 311 process.</p>
Zoning	The intent statement of the OPR better articulates the need to balance old and new, more intensive uses and less intensive uses, residential and commercial. The intent statements of the UC-E and UC-MU zones should be revised to make clear that this balance is important to the Oakland community.
Zoning	The UC-E and UC-MU statements omit mention of neighborhood-serving businesses, which are integral to the purposes for which each has been designed.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
Zoning	Encouraging home restoration (both for the sake of historic preservation and to reduce energy load) is a neighborhood priority not clearly articulated either in the draft Oakland Plan or these zoning proposals. Oakland needs viable strategies to encourage and support residential restoration projects (particularly for older apartment buildings in the proposed R-MU zone).
Zoning	Older buildings can be “naturally affordable” – support and incentives should be available for landlords to invest in properties and accept public subsidy for affordable rental.
Zoning	Consider a demolition review overlay zone to address the impact that planned demolitions will have on the community, with a demolition surcharge fee to that can support preservation incentives on other properties, or generate funds for the Community Reinvestment Fund, which will support affordable housing and other community needs.
Zoning	The review threshold for demolitions should be one structure, rather than five; and demolitions should require a whole-building life cycle assessment.
Zoning	City agencies should provide review and coordination of demolition activity. We need a task force of city agencies in the demolition review overlay zone to be a single-source for accountability of negative impacts that the community will suffer.
Zoning	The green buffer and height reduction setbacks in the UC-MU and UC-E zones do not offer sufficient protection for low-density housing on Coltart Street, Niagara Street, and South Oakland. oThe height maximum in the UC-MU on Halket Street should be capped at 85’ to create a similar condition as proposed adjacent to Niagara Street.
Zoning	1. The green buffer and height reduction setbacks in the UC-MU and UC-E zones do not offer sufficient protection for low-density housing on Coltart Street, Niagara Street, and South Oakland. 2. Reconsider the height map for UC-MU along the south side of the Boulevard of the Allies east of Bates (from Juliet to Dawson). This area should be 85 feet, not 185 feet. It is adjacent to residential areas in a similar condition to Niagara. It would not be appropriate to allow buildings of 185 feet in that condition. 2. Consider 120 feet on the north side of the boulevard from Welsford to Dawson.
Zoning	1. The green buffer and height reduction setbacks in the UC-MU and UC-E zones do not offer sufficient protection for low-density housing on Coltart Street, Niagara Street, and South Oakland. 2. The proposed height of UC-E on McKee adjacent to the residential district on Coltart is not appropriate. Change the height on that side of McKee to 85’.
Zoning	The height maximum in the UC-E in the area between Sennot and Louisa Street should step down – and should be lower than 210’. This would be a proper transition from the 210’ along Forbes to the residential area. 210’ all the way to Louisa does not make sense from an urban design point of view. We need a height map change there to transition between UC-E and R-MU.
Zoning	Green buffers merit more review and consideration: how will these work in the R-MU context, where multifamily new construction is being built next to existing lower-density residential?
Zoning	The zoning boundary for UC-E along the Boulevard of the Allies/Forbes/McDevitt Place seems to extend beyond Boulevard of the Allies but not follow either streets or property lines on the Oakcliffe side of the Boulevard. Is this a mistake or intentional? That will be hard for the community to understand and for the city to administer.
Zoning	Consider a change to the zoning map in the area of Fifth/Robinson so that the west portion of Fifth Avenue except the apartment building is not included in UC-E. The line should not be extended so far back into the hillside, which is steeply sloped and landslide prone. Consider extending the H district there instead.
Zoning	Any funds generated by performance points in Oakland must be earmarked specifically to support programs for the Oakland residential community, especially those that address the food, health, and housing needs of low-income residents.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
Zoning	All three zones include performance points for a variety of goals (including green/sustainable building performance, public art, etc.), and there is a concern that developers will choose to utilize bonus points that enhance market value or reduce operating costs rather than those intended to deliver support for equity, workforce development, and affordable housing. There is a significant risk that development will not generate affordable housing or funds to support needs of Oakland residents.
Zoning	Equitable development performance points appear to be difficult to enforce appropriately, and it is not clear that the benefits required to achieve them will deliver for Oakland residents. The definition of local business is broad enough to include any city-based enterprise; and diversity in hiring practices is obviously a benefit to the region but does not specifically serve Oakland residents. It would be best to remove the hiring and leasing benchmarks for these bonus points, leaving solely the monetary contribution to the community reinvestment fund.
Zoning	College or university campus, hospital, and educational classroom space uses must be removed from both UC-E and UC-MU. In Oakland, those uses should be permitted only in the EMI zones.
Zoning	Remove the conditional use for excavation/grading/fill, major from all zones, or describe to the community the legal reason that it is included.
Zoning	Remove firearms business establishment from UC-E and UC-MU.
Zoning	1. The Pittsburgh Innovation District feels the “Urban Center- Employment District” area in the zoning code should not be labeled as such. We suggest naming this zone as the “Pittsburgh Innovation District” or "Innovation District" to solidify the presence and endorse the critical role of the Pittsburgh Innovation District in Oakland.
Zoning	2. The Pittsburgh Innovation District believes the R3-M and R1A-H zones will prohibit the optimal growth and outcomes of the UC-E/Innovation District. We believe these zones should be included as part of the UC-E/Innovation District zoning to allow for the Pittsburgh Innovation District to develop without being handcuffed by the limitations that come with building around R3-M and R1A-H and include bonus opportunities to incentivize innovation assets in these zones.
Zoning	3. The Pittsburgh Innovation District asset believes the current proposed bonus point system is not as bold, visionary, or helpful as it should be to densify the Innovation District zone with much-needed innovation assets. We suggest more time and opportunity to construct a bonus points system to incentivize developments that deliver lab, office, maker space, etc. to the UC-E/Innovation District zone. We desire a more targeted bonus points system for this zone to assist the Pittsburgh Innovation District in reaching its full potential as a world-class destination for research, technology, and innovation.
Zoning	4. The Pittsburgh Innovation District believes the proposed building heights are underwhelming and are not tall enough, especially after considering setback requirements and proposed bonus height requirements. We suggested increasing the building heights in the UC-E/Innovation District zoning to 7 (not 5) stories/ 100 (not 85) feet without bonus, up to 20 (not 15) stories/ 145 feet (not 120) with max bonus. This will help developers achieve realistic building dimensions to deliver much needed innovation assets to the District. Specifically, lab developers need more height than what is proposed to achieve a realistic building proforma.
Zoning	5. The Pittsburgh Innovation District does not support building step backs being required on side streets where a building exceeds 65' in height and sidewalks being required to be 20 feet wide within the UC-E/Innovation District zone. We suggest removing step back requirements on side streets and require sidewalks to be 15 feet wide so developers can achieve realistic building dimensions.
Zoning	6. The Pittsburgh Innovation District believes developers should be able to “pay” for parking alternatives such as bus passes or into a multimodal support fund in lieu of providing the maximum parking spaces on a development site in order to help the District become a more progressive multimodal destination.
Zoning	7. The Pittsburgh Innovation District suggests removing the Molnar Portal Site from the UC-E/Innovation District zoning. By decoupling the site from this zone, the developer can utilize this location as a hub for Innovation District parking and transit in conjunction with the BRT. Additionally, it will allow for increased height given its lower geographic setting and as a site for additional market rate housing
Zoning	The plan should clarify language regarding the following terms: “city equitable development trust fund”, “community reinvestment fund”, “community reinvestment board”.their use is confusing throughout the document. It is not clear whether they are interchangeable.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
Zoning	Map Issues: colors are an issue, can't see streets
Zoning	Recommend language that excludes contextual heights.
Zoning	Have fines be annual for points system on top of revoking building permits.
Zoning	Concerns that the plan is being driven by Zoning, not the other way around. Wants to ensure that it's tied to Oakland's Vision.
Zoning	Concerns about student displacement in this area - 200 block of Atwood, west side (wants this area to be R-MU to preserve existing uses)
Zoning	Mix of uses in the R-MU adds a little bit of vibrancy
Zoning	Prefers to see the Oakland Plan proposal generally for UC-MU instead of the proposal from the Mayor / Walnut Capital.
Zoning	Concern that Walnut Capital's proposal will determine the Oakland Plan UC-MU zone.
Zoning	justification around the parcels on Blvd of the Allies being UC-E
Zoning	Should the former Lawn & Ophelia Park be rezoned as P?
Zoning	Want to see height mapped for the EMI districts
Zoning	Why isn't the points system being applied to North Oakland yet?
Zoning	New height limits allow for tall buildings to be built but not skyscrapers, creating more of a mixed use area
Zoning	Millie: wants to see height here at no more than 100'.
Zoning	Sees the need for the increased height and supports it
Zoning	Millie: Feels like Forbes is already like a wind tunnel and doesn't want any more height.
Zoning	Millie: does not want this area to be UC-E and wants height capped at 100'.
Zoning	Glad to see uses similar to existing OPR zoning classifications
Zoning	Concern of allowance of large TV screens a la Bakery Square - how can these be regulated?
Zoning	Glad to see that Commercial Parking has been removed
Zoning	Special Exception for Educational Classroom Space seems too lax in this district and in UC-MU
Zoning	Firearms Business should not be an allowable use (x2)
Zoning	Helicopter pads as allowable use - concern as to allowing that in UC-MU
Zoning	Does not want to see College or University campus as an allowable use, even as Conditional Use (in either UC-E or UC-MU)
Zoning	Wants 30' front setbacks through all zoning districts
Zoning	400' building length is the equivalent to 8 train boxcars and concern that it's too long.
Zoning	Millie: thinks building length should be no more than 100' or 200'.
Zoning	Concern about utilizing the Mobility Trust Fund to be able to reduce the parking requirements further.
Zoning	Concern that zero energy or other bonuses could be used to hit a height cap before being required to use the affordable housing bonus
Zoning	Understands that the system is set up to be a system of points and trying to stack things coming from the Plan; however, wants developers to have to do some of both
Zoning	Question / concern about how developers try to see how many points they can get vs how their building is integrated in the community
Zoning	Concern that the points system is giving developers too much of a carrot
Zoning	Once UCMU gets in by Walnut Capital, even if Oakland Plan approved, changing the Walnut Capital version with the new criteria is not likely.

Plan Strategy Name (if applicable) or Zoning	Comment
Zoning	concerned that Walnut Capital can cite an agreement with Gainey and close Zulema Street.
Zoning	DCP turned down Walnut Capital to make more spot zoning, and to do on McKee too, with recommendation to go through before Oakland Plan is going through.
Zoning	It is very difficult to see what is in each zones street names are not really visible. But it looks like 300, 306 Craft Ave. and 3229 Joe Hammer Sq (4 story apartment buildings) and a parking lot beside 306 Craft Ave have been included in UC-MU. This means that these properties can be used for heights of 85'. and possibly a 400 ft long (zoned) mass of building. I live across the street in a 2 story condo that is only 35 years old. 85 by 400 feet of lego blocks is not a pleasant view.
Zoning	I have heard that Oakland Plan has some portions (like bldg length/height/bonus pts) from other neighborhoods - like Riverfront or Uptown. That's a really bad idea. Oakland is NOT the Riverfront. We cannot handle buildings that are 400 feet long. We are NOT Uptown and deserve our own private look at bonus points -- not inheriting theirs.
Zoning	Why wasn't the Steering Committee involved with the development of the Use Table for Oakland? It is a facet of zoning that will have a huge effect on the quality of life of residents. So many important issues could have been discussed and dealt with, so many questions could have been answered. It seemed there was an arbitrary deadline for ending Steering Committee meetings that was before its work was completed. What is the justification for having City Planning do it?
Zoning	Why wasn't the Steering Committee involved with the development of the Point System for Oakland? So many important issues could have been discussed and dealt with, so many questions could have been answered. It seemed there was an arbitrary deadline for ending Steering Committee meetings that was before its work was completed.
Zoning	Further define “limits on new residential development.” OBID would like to see mechanisms to incentivize housing that is compatible with innovation uses and affordable/ workforce housing while limiting multi-family housing geared to undergraduate students without creating cold office nodes of 8am-5pm weekday pedestrian traffic. This needs to allow for and encourage an appropriate mix of commercial uses to provide for a more innovative live/work/play environment that activates the gateways of Oakland. (ie Portal Place). How will limiting residential redevelopments be done in multiple phased projects? Will each phase be allowed some percentage, or the total fully built out project be allowed a certain percentage of residential vs commercial uses? How is hospitality viewed in the Plan given innovation companies will attract more out of town workers that will want to stay near their “Pittsburgh Office” when travelling in from their Silicone Valley office? As for building heights, shouldn’t a building height minimum be more valuable than a maximum? Maximums are counter intuitive to the overall goals of creating taller builds for more jobs and allowing more open space.
Zoning	Residents and entrepreneurs have access to career services and opportunities that allow them to work in their neighborhood. All Oakland employees, students, artists, entrepreneurs, and makers have access to affordable housing that allows them to walk to work or school.