

General (Including Vision)	
Strategy Name	Comment
	Response
	Can the comment period and schedule be extended since the plan was just issued on March 8?
	Thank you for your comment. This was addressed by extending the public comment period through May 1, 2022.
	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???
	Thank you for your comment. This was addressed by extending the public comment period through May 1, 2022.
	where will the public meetings be held
	Question addressed on EngagePGH
	Vision Statement: Less descriptor of Oakland, ... will send language
	Thank you for your comment.
	Residents means homeowners. Think about language. maybe instead of residents including students, employees, ... to live, work, play, pray, etc....
	Thank you for your comment.
	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.
	The Oakland Plan Equity Strategy identified students as an underrepresented and marginalized group. This language use is intentional.
	Strategies by Topic seems to be empty. Is it meant to be that way??
	The Strategies by Topic page has been updated
	Hi! 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. 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 ? The reservoir above Oakland. Everyone looks at it from Oakland... 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. 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. :) How do we bridge this gap & not gentrify by focusing on one neighborhood & not the other How does city planning want or plan to bring all of our neighborhoods together... 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 Thank you for your time BA
	The Greater Hill District Master Plan is currently undergoing an Update.
	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, Jon Lefkovitz
	This comment references OBID's marketing campaign signs and we have forwarded this comment to them.
	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.
	The drafted vision statement was created and vetted in partnership with Oaklanders and the Steering Committee throughout the planning process. // No change needed
	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
	Thank you for your comment. The City is rolling out a Rental Registration Program in May 2022 that will inspect rental properties on an annual basis. Also, the Zoning Proposal will encourage redevelopment that addresses negative externalities associated with single-family home conversions while still meeting the need for single-family housing. Finally, the Land Use Strategy (in the development chapter) identifies specific areas where a variety of housing types and scales will be provided. // No change needed
	Comment on above: 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
	The Zoning Proposal allows for denser housing (affordable or market-rate) in some areas of Central Oakland that can be listed for sale or rent. // No change needed
	Comment on above: 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.
	The City is rolling out a Rental Registration Program in May 2022 that will inspect rental properties on an annual basis.
	Comment on above: There needs to be a lot of improvement. Parking is a big problem. Trash is another big problem. Landlords that do not take care of their properties. I have lived in Oakland all my life and OAKLAND is going down hill.
	Threaded conversation. See above
	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.
	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
	Various City departments and agency partners will have community engagement activities as specific projects and programs are implemented. Also, both EngagePGH and the City website will keep the community informed on the plan's progress. // No change needed

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	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 t 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	This area between Robinson and Birmingham is part of the Uptown Ecolnnovation District Plan and not is covered the Oakland Plan // No change needed
	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.	Thank you for your comment.
	Comment on above: Elena is so very right. Elderly residents who want to "age in place" are an important part of our Oakland neighborhood. We welcome the new and temporary residents and fight many battles to keep our community vibrant and vital. The elderly must be mentioned in the vision statement. Furthermore existing residents need to be retained -- we keep it safe and report problems. Students and new residents do not know how to do that or are too busy to do that. Please recognize the elderly and long term residents in the Vision Statement.	Thank you for your comment.
	Comment on above: The Isaly facade is to be saved, and the old Health Dept on Forbes (is that the Croatian Union Building?), and very recently Carlow announced they are changing course and will save St Agnes. But you are very right. A good bit more preservation is in order. When building heights are allowed to be sky high, they will be, and even more wholesale demolition and replacement are on the way.	Thank you for your comment.
	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.	The drafted vision statement was created and vetted in partnership with Oaklanders and the Steering Committee throughout the planning process.
	Elena is so very right. Elderly residents who want to "age in place" are an important part of our Oakland neighborhood. We welcome the new and temporary residents and fight many battles to keep our community vibrant and vital. The elderly must be mentioned in the vision statement. Furthermore existing residents need to be retained -- we keep it safe and report problems. Students and new residents do not know how to do that or are too busy to do that. Please recognize the elderly and long term residents in the Vision Statement.	Thank you for your comment.
	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.	Thank you for your comment.
	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.	Thank you for your comment.
	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.	Thank you for your comment.
	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.	Thank you for your comment.

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
Vision Statement	OBID - Proposed Vision Statement	The drafted vision statement was created and vetted in partnership with Oaklanders and the Steering Committee throughout the planning process. // No change needed
	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.	
	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:	
	<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; 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Create vibrant and attractive pedestrian-scaled commercial areas through increased greenery, public amenities, public art and community-focused events and activities; 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provide wealth-building opportunities and promote entrepreneurship access for all through Oakland’s innovation and technology economies; 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Increase residential serving retail, restaurants, and businesses from healthcare to groceries; 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Enhance the community livability by offering a range of green and attractive public places accessible to all; 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Build community by supporting everyone from short- and long-term residents, employees and business owners, students and local and destination visitors; 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provides varied and pleasant mobility options for connection among people and resources; 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Promote a safe, environmentally sound resilient community; and 	
	Could there be a new updated plan for community to see before goes to the PC?	Question addressed in public meeting
	Will action teams reconvene? The staff has changed significantly on the action teams.	Question addressed in public meeting
	Steering Committee did not even see the draft point system - City Planners and their partners made it. Same with Uses.	Thank you for your comment.
	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.	Thank you for your comment.
	Older residents was mentioned very early at action teams, but par for the course that was filtered out as a specific goal.	Thank you for your comment.
	maybe should I stop commenting because I don’t see this going anywhere.	Thank you for your 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.	Thank you for your comment.
	Walnut Capital and tail wagging dog. Unlikely to revise brand new UCMU that goes into place.	Thank you for your comment.
	still no tutorial about engage page	Thank you for your comment.
	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.	Thank you for your comment.
	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.	Thank you for your comment.
	Language and other accessibility barriers – no translation and accessibility issues not as good as had hoped	Thank you for your comment.
	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.	Thank you for your comment.
	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.	Thank you for your comment.
	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.	Thank you for your comment.
	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.	Thank you for your comment.
	Difficult to navigate the engage page. Agreement amonst 2 Open House attendees	Thank you for your comment.
	What accountability measures are there to implement projects and programs.	An email explaining the implementation process was sent to OPDC staff
	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	Thank you for your comment.
	CMU wants a more intensive process for north Oakland zoning.	Thank you for your comment.
	Partial ED plan for Oakland. There are great recommendations.	Thank you for your comment.
	The process was very intentional throughout but rushed in its release.	Thank you for your comment.
	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.	Thank you for your comment.

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	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.	Thank you for your comment.
	How will comments from the Open Houses be incorporated into the plan?	All public comments have been compiled into a comment review document to be shared publicly and with decision-makers. Action Teams staff will recommend changes to the Planning Commission based on comments and the criteria outlined in the Hearing and Action presentation (https://pittsburghpa.gov/dcp/planning-commission)
	Why is the Historic Architectural Inventory not incorporated/addressed in the Oakland Plan?	Reference to it will be included in a recommended change in the Community chapter.
	Comment on above: Probably to avoid having to explain why this plan makes it easier to tear them down.	Threaded conversation.
	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.	Supportive
Vision	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	The drafted vision statement was created and vetted in partnership with Oaklanders and the Steering Committee throughout the planning process. // No change needed
	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?	The drafted vision statement was created and vetted in partnership with Oaklanders and the Steering Committee throughout the planning process. // No change needed
	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.	Threaded conversation. See above
	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. 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.	Similar to previous Comments
	I would like to see large, separate bike lanes connecting most streets in Oakland, even if this means reducing street parking.	Thank you for your comment.
	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. 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. 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: 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.	The drafted vision statement was created and vetted in partnership with Oaklanders and the Steering Committee throughout the planning process. // No change needed

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	<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>This comment references a separate legislative action, not the Oakland Plan</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>Threaded conversation.</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>	<p>Threaded conversation.</p>
	<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 lifelong 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 a 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>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>
	<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.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>
	<p>Comment on above: Absolutely RIGHT ON , Zoe. I agree with all of this.</p>	<p>Threaded conversation.</p>
	<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>	<p>The Plan's goals and policies are adopted by the Planning Commission and the City will work with institutions, local partners, and the community to accomplish the projects and programs. This is important because</p> <p>1. Development activities will be evaluated for conformance with the adopted plan</p> <p>2.It will provide direction on investment activities, particularly by public agencies</p> <p>3.It will increase our ability to apply for and receive grants</p>

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	<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>1.Thank you for your comment</p> <p>2.Three focus groups made up of Steering Committee members and topic-based professionals were created to develop standards for Housing, Workforce Development, and Urban Design that support the Zoning Proposal. Visit the Development Action Team archive for a reference to Zoning changes as an intended outcome of the plan (https://engage.pittsburghpa.gov/oakland/archive-development-action-team)</p> <p>3.Thank you for your comment</p> <p>4.Supportive</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>	<p>5. Supportive.</p> <p>6. Supportive.</p> <p>7. ADDITION: adding DOP as a potential Partner</p> <p>8. CORRECTION: Spelling of Melwood Ave.</p>
	<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>Thank you for your comments.</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>13. Thank you for your Comment</p> <p>14. Reference to this will be included in a recommended change in the Community chapter</p> <p>15. Supportive</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>	<p>Threaded conversation.</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>Threaded conversation.</p>

Community

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	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!	The Bus Rapid Transit Project (BRT) will serve each neighborhoods listed. The plan includes bike and pedestrian enhancements in the mobility chapter of the plan. // No change needed.
	Comment under M comment: 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.	Thank you for your comment
	Comment under M Comment: 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.	Thank you for your comment
	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.	1.The Development chapter encourages the preservation of low-density residential areas through the Land Use Strategy and development that supports and compliments Oakland's outstanding architecture. It also identifies affordable housing in goals, policies, and strategies 2.In the Community Chapter policy C2, Cultural heritage and preservation, one of the main tenets listed is “Preserve Oakland’s distinct character.” This includes historic preservation of buildings as well as the reuse and repurpose of building elements and artistic features 3.Development chapter goal D2.C, “Buildings that belong in Oakland,” addresses this idea and acknowledges the importance of building design in Oakland’s heritage. No change needed
	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.	Development chapter goal D2.C (Buildings that belong in Oakland) addresses this idea. Threaded comment.
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	Supportive. Consider adding "activities for both senior citizens and students" to "What we heard"
	I would not agree that employees and visitors are residents of Oakland. Please revise accordingly.	Make clarification.

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	<p>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.</p>	<p>Both the Community Action Team and the Steering Committee discussed the importance of place and access in addition to civic engagement around community programs and livability. The Neighborhood Plan Guide lays out the topics/categories. Civic engagement is a part of community programs and livability.</p> <p>During Action Team meetings, many called for access to key services such as schools, daycare, and senior services in Oakland which would make it more enticing to live and work in Oakland, making it a neighborhood of choice while ensuring access in 20-minutes to basic needs. Existing Policy under C1. Community programs and livability to Strengthen civic engagement.</p> <p>Agree that C1.D Vital riverfront areas does seem out of place and should move to Infrastructure I2C.</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>There are several cross-cutting themes between the chapters. The conversations in the Community Action Team were around using historic preservation as an opportunity for economic inclusion // No change needed.</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>ADDITION: Add goal addressing connective programming</p> <p>This idea is addressed by the Community chapter’s goal C4.B “Open Dialogue on Community Health”</p>
	<p>Goal C.5.A - while the concept has merit, as written this is too vague and broad to be of much use.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>The list of topics was pulled from the Neighborhood Plan Guide (NPG), but this comment will be taken into consideration when the NPG process guide is updated.</p> <p>The goals don’t call out any organizations.</p> <p>The rental registration program is identified in policy C8.</p> <p>CHANGE: Remove language after "access to resources" in Goal C8.B.</p> <p>ADDITION Connective programming goal. Goal language is meant to be aspirational and nonspecific</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>ADDITION: Add goal on connective programming.</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>There are several cross-cutting themes between the chapters. This was discussed during Action Team process and with the Steering Committee // No change needed.</p>

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	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.	There are several cross-cutting themes between the chapters. This was discussed during Action Team process and with the Steering Committee // No change needed.
	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.	Thank you for your comment
	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.	Thank you for your comment
	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.	Supportive. No change
	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.	ADDITION: add to "What We Heard" in Design guidelines in the Development Chapter.
	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?	The nighttime safety policy includes multiple ideas for other chapters that can be used to build a safer community. This includes multimodal mobility options at night, but extends beyond mobility to include things service buttons and access to emergency care equipment with appropriate emergency response // No change needed.
	C.4 Policy - public safety - engagement. Yes, that belongs in this chapter.	Supportive. No change
	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.	Community Service Hubs are one strategy to help realize Oakland's identified need for open spaces, recreation facilities, and supportive programming. Point taken on police and fire stations; these were originally included as they are a type of requested facility, but this is not reflected in Action team notes so broader reference will be noted as "other facilities" should there be other facility-type requests in the future. We have service areas for certain things but not all and we want to make sure when they get updated service areas we can address them.
	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.	This was discussed during Action Team process and with the Steering Committee // No change needed.
	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.	In addition to others identified in the policy, Action Teams notes indicate that 29 percent of students face food insecurity. Program C-15 (Organize around food access) proposes a shared action committee. Also, C-22 discusses a staffing increase for local non-profits to address many issues, including food access. // No Change Needed

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>1.No Change Needed 2.Make suggested change, but reference “City Code” since multiple codes address occupancy</p>
	Comment on wwilson Comment: I see today in the PG that Rental Registry is still (or again) being challenged. Doubt we will ever see it fully.	Thank you for your comment
Connect students to supportive programs	c.8 project - funding would be needed if this involved staff time.	Thank you for your comment
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.	This program emphasizes the importance of building relationships between “long-term residents, students, business owners, and employees.” // No Change needed.
Community building events	<p>In response to wwilson comment: 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>	While these ideas were presented in the planning process, they were not identified as specific actions in implementation. // No Change Needed
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.	UPDATE: Update strategy C-10 to reference OPDC's existing programs.
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 wrtitten 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>	<p>ADDITION: Add reference to Oakland Historic Architecture Inventory Report</p> <p>Historic Architecture is referenced in the Development chapter’s Land Use Strategy – desired character references for both the Lower Density Residential and Cultural District.</p>
Honor Oakland's heritage	In response to wwilson comment: 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	<p>This comment references a separate legislative action.</p> <p>The houses on Halket Street are identified as low and medium integrity in the Oakland Architecture Inventory Report</p>
Honor Oakland's heritage	In response to Read_this_please comment: 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.	The houses on Halket Street are identified as low and medium integrity in the Oakland Architecture Inventory Report
Honor Oakland's heritage	In response to Oakland_Resident comment: 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.	Thank you for your comment. It’s important to note that historic designation does not take interiors into consideration.
Honor Oakland's heritage	In response to Oakland_Resident comment: Architectural consultants for this plan suggested they be considered for historical designation based on their architecture.	The houses on Halket Street are identified as low and medium integrity in the Oakland Architecture Inventory Report

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
Honor Oakland's heritage	<p>In response to ezaitsoff comment: 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>	Thank you for you comment. Please see the comment responses above
Organize around food access	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.	ADDITION: Add program language that includes supportive service for people experiencing food insecurity and meals-on-wheels for seniors.
Arts and design committee, Live-work spaces for artist, Public art walks, Support diversity in the artist community	Let's consolidate C.5, C.13, and C. 17 to have this organized a bit better. Further comment on wwilson Comment: C.21 consolidated with these also	These were identified as separate programming opportunities by the Action Teams // No change needed
Targeted anti-displacement program	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>CHANGE: Specify stay in their homes AND stay in the neighborhood</p> <p>ADDITION: Add a sentence to existing programs denoting that deeper study should identify existing programs in addition to related needs</p>
Free access to cultural institutions	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.	Supportive. No change.
Free access to cultural institutions	Comment on SH Comment: 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.	Supportive. No change.
Community Service Hubs	if this community center had some restaurants or vendors inside I'd be there a all the time	Supportive. No change.
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.	Supportive. No change.
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.	ADDITION: Note support of OPDC's successful program model School to Career
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?	Answers available in the "project goals and components" dropdown. OPDC and OTF are identified as the project leads. Supportive.
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.	Change recommended

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
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.	This statement is included in the “What we heard” section. ADDITION: Add "OPDC offers a home repair program for seniors and is an administrator for the URA HAP" to what we heard.
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.	ADDITION: add to "What we heard"
Oakland as civic laboratory	Remove OnePgh as an implementer and funder.	Remove.
	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.	This comment is considered the Infrastructure chapter’s strategy I-10: Greenway Expansion // No Change Needed
	consider a NID for Central Oakland - this should be a project or program recommendation	An NID was not discussed during the planning process. // No change needed
	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.	An acronym list will be added to the Oakland Plan's Appendix. NID is not referenced in plan but stands for Neighborhood Improvement District.
	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.	Each section within the chapters serves a different purpose: Goals are meant to be aspirational and non-specific; policies are meant to be more measurable; projects & programs go into specific detail on accomplishing goals & policies. Some projects and programs go into deep detail because they were researched and thoroughly discussed in Action Team meetings, but all the strategies identified are important to accomplishing the Plan’s goals. These strategies serve as a starting point and will continue to be refined by project leads throughout implementation.
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.	Foundations, grants, and the Community Reinvestment fund were identified as funding streams for increased staffing. Each organization must ask for this funding, but the plan provides reasoning for why these organizations should provide monetary aid.
Senior services	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. 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.	1.Thank you for your comment 2.The who would be determined by the project leads: OPDC, People’s Oakland, and institutions
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.	CHANGE: Include Oakland entrepreneurs for live-work spaces in C-13 Affordable housing is addressed in other areas of the plan such as missing middle housing and the Land Use Strategy.
Community service hubs	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. The proposed use of the Herron Hill Pumping Station and its surrounding property is a great opportunity for our community.	Supportive. No change.

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
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>	ADDITION: Add mention that after-school could provide part-time jobs for college students to “What We Heard”
	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.	Supportive. This is identified in the Community Chapter within Program C-18. Resident representatives
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.	ADDITION: Add to What we heard.
C-6, Community building events	Please add short-term residents.	ADDITION: 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.	<p>REMOVE: Specific Pitt representative (Arts and Design Faculty)</p> <p>ADDITION: add Pitt Art Committee representation</p> <p>ADDITION: Add goals sentence to “What We Heard”</p> <p>ADDITION: Identify Grants as a funding source</p>
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).	Thank you for your comment: Programming from Pitt is noted in the “What We Heard” section. // No Change Needed
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?	Funding could be provided for additional studies and Pitt's investment in it's own historic assets.
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.	Thank you for your comment
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.	Change recommended
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?	Thank you for your comment
C-19, Scale up childcare services	What funding would be sought from Pitt?	Change partners to Institutions instead of lists
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.	Thank you for your comment
	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.	Thank you for your comment
	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.	Addition: Add strategy. Building 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)	Thank you for your comment
	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.	Thank you for your comment
C-7, community service hubs	PID would like to be included as a partner	Thank you for your comment
C-8	PID would like to be included as a partner	ADDITION: Add to Implementation Table
C-12, Improve after school opportunities	PID would like to be included as a partner	ADDITION: Add to Implementation Table

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
C-14, Oakland as civic laboratory	What is this and how is it funded? Oakland commercial districts should be eligible as well.	It would be funded by small micro-grants for community-led projects that support innovative, inclusive, resident-serving urban experiences including commercial districts since they are integral to a resident-serving urban experience
C-22	Will this incude residents who rent as well? How is home repair program being funded? It should not ne funs for residents only - small businesses should be eligible as well.	<p>Yes, renters are a type of resident, and all residents are included.</p> <p>Program C-10 (Homeowner Rehab Program) is funded by public agencies and community non-profits. The small business version of this strategy can be found in the Development chapter in strategy D-24, and in additional services in D-21 and D-22. // No Change Needed</p>
	<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>1.Program C-15 (Organize around food access) identifies the need for a grocery store</p> <p>2.Thank you for your comment</p> <p>3.Program C-14 (Oakland as a civic laboratory) highlights murals as a mini-grant idea.</p> <p>4.Supportive</p> <p>5.Thank you for your comment. Currently, a grocery store is listed with a mid-point timeframe but could happen sooner</p> <p>6.Thank you for your comment</p> <p>7.Supportive</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.	Thank you for your comment
	Comment on Read_This_Please comment: 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.	Thank you for your comment
	<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>	Thank you for your comment

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	"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?	1.Places for long-term residents are identified in the Land Use Strategy (Lower Density Residential and Medium Density Residential). 2.Thank you for your comment. Goal C1.B (Twenty-minute neighborhood) says all Oakland residents should have access to resources that meet their basic needs within a 20-minute walk from their homes. Also, goal C1.C (Neighborhood of choice) discusses the importance of excellent access to healthcare, educational opportunities, entertainment, and cultural resources to make Oakland uniquely desirable for people at all stages of life. Both goals speak to making sure Oakland has excellent educational opportunities. 3.Thank you for your comment 4.Performance Points are an additional tool with Inclusionary Zoning to work towards achieving affordable housing goals. Other efforts such as the Community Land Trust will help fill this need as well.
	Comment on Kathy Boykowycz comment: I agree with Kathy.	Thank you for your comment
	Comment on Kathy Boykowycz comment: I agree with Kathy.	Thank you for your comment
	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. Here are some scenarios that would be illegal if the code was enforced as written. 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. Again, same four bedroom house, four adult refugees living together to save money, they too would be in violation. 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. The list of four non-family members combinations is virtually endless - all of which would be in violation of the city code. 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. Some would argue that there are safety concerns - okay, same four bedroom house, how are the safety concerns 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 racists, anti-affordable housing, anti-non-traditional family, xenophobic, policies. Historically these homes have always had many more individuals living in them. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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.	1.Revisions to the Occupancy Code were not discussed during the planning process 2. Students were identified as an underrepresented group in the Equity Strategy and were intentionally engaged throughout the process to ensure their needs were identified and provided for in the plan 3.Program D-19 (Land Use Strategy) in the development chapter calls for density in some areas to meet needs throughout the community
	Comment on Oakland_Resident comment: 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.	Thank you for your comment. Please see the comment responses above

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	<p>Comment on Oakland_Resident comment: Why such emphasis on STUDENTS? These ideas might be good from a landlord, developer, or student perspective, but not what I want for the 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>	Thank you for you comment. Please see the comment responses above
	<p>Comment on Read_this_1 please comment. There are a couple of issues comited in this thread. Let's take them apart</p> <p>- 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.</p> <p>- 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.</p> <p>- 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.</p> <p>- 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.</p> <p>- 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 anxitiety and mental health disorders from the all time being spent online. We to create more community spaces for people to gather.</p> <p>- 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.</p> <p>- Landlords - I have lived in Pittsburgh 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.</p> <p>- 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 think the entire area of Oakland should be zoned for much higher buildings. There are incredible views along Lawn street and Fraiser that could be developed into a whole series of incredible river</p>	Thank you for you comment. Please see the comment responses above
	<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>This idea fits in with Strategy C-6 (Community-building events).</p> <p>The University of Pittsburgh, OBID, and OPDC are identified as the project leads for this strategy. We encourage you to reach out to these organizations to get involved.</p>
	<p>Comment on Oakland_Resident comment: 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>	Thank you for you comment. Please see the comment responses above
	<p>Comment on Oakland_Resident comment: 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>	Thank you for you comment. Please see the comment responses above

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	<p>Comment on Read_This_Please comment: 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>Thank you for you comment. Please see the comment responses above</p>
	<p>There is too much emphasis on creating family housing in this plan. We need more and better student housing.</p>	<p>The Land Use Strategy in the Development chapter provides multiple housing types for a variety of household types // No change needed</p>
	<p>Comment on Oakland_Resident comment: 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>	<p>Thank you for you comment. Please see the comment responses above</p>
	<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>	<p>CHANGE: Include artists, entrepreneurs, and creatives (This clarifies and supports the existing strategy)</p>
	<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.</p>	<p>This process intentionally engaged a variety of stakeholders throughout Oakland, and this plan was created to equally address what we heard from all groups, organizations, and individuals</p>
	<p>In response to Read_This_Please comment: 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.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>The City cannot legally revoke Occupancy Permits that have already been issued</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>This is identified in strategy C-22 (Support resident access to resources)</p>
	<p>Comment on ezaitsoff Comment: Yes, please include financial backing for Community Organizations and for a local resident newspaper for various neighborhoods. And free convenient meeting space is critical.</p>	<p>Strategy C-22 (Support resident access to resources) calls for increased staffing at non-profits. The “among others” language could include a newspaper.</p> <p>Each strategy will likely evolve as they are implemented</p>

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	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.	Various projects and programs throughout the plan address increased access to riverfronts. For example, goal C1. D (Vital Riverfront Areas) addresses this need, and it's also included in the plan's Mobility and Infrastructure chapters
	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.	See the response in cell I102
	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.	Thank you for your comment
	Oakland pretty segregated, need policies and programs to specifically address this, e.g. welcoming new immigrants, Black homeownership, engaging with police, etc.	Thank you for your comment. There are several goals, policies, projects, and programs throughout that address these issues.
	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	Thank you for your comment
	Aging in place; Needs to acknowledge existing programs like home repair supports;	Policy C6 (Public Health) mentions Center Universal Design, which discusses aging in place. Additionally, program C-10 (Homeowner Rehab Program) and many strategies in the development chapter acknowledge existing programs.
	I don't think there is enough for the older residents of Oakland - I consider them another marginalized group.	<p>The Equity Strategy did not identify seniors as a marginalized/underrepresented group.</p> <p>Seniors are identified in program C-20 (Senior Services) and in policy C5 (Design public facilities for diverse ages and abilities). They are also mentioned in other strategies throughout the plan</p>
	Hoarding, neglect, isolation among residents due to mental health – chapter needs to address this more	Thank you for your comment. This was not addressed in Action Team meetings.
	Emergency care equipment in Oakland should have mental health phone number hot lines etc.	Thank you for your comment
	Community centers / public facilities – lots of interest and opportunities, plan is sparse on this (SJ counters with Community Hubs)	Thank you for your comment
	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.	<p>The Equity Strategy did not identify seniors as a marginalized/underrepresented group.</p> <p>Seniors are identified in program C-20 (Senior Services) and in policy C5 (Design public facilities for diverse ages and abilities). They are also mentioned in other strategies throughout the plan</p>
	want to be sure that tailor programs specifically to Oakland and not just to generic neighborhood.	Thank you for your comment

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	<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	<p>Community programs and livability address place and access in addition to civic engagement. This was discussed throughout the Action Teams process and with the Steering Committee. // No Change Needed</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>The Steering Committee reviewed the goals and policies with the larger vision in mind.</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>The plan calls for many programs to address the lack of public art:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•C-5. Arts and design committee•C-13. Live-work spaces for artists•C-14. Oakland as civic laboratory•C-17. Public art walks•C-21. Support diversity in the artist community
	<p>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.</p>	<p>“What We Heard” identifies grants as a funding source and says ongoing initiatives and specifics will be an outcome of the committee’s formation. The Office of Public Art is identified as a project partner.</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>CHANGE: Edit strategy language change to include report.</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>CHANGE: edit strategy language to include programming including "pursue financial resources to support preservation and restoration of historic assets."</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>ADDITION: Add Connective programming goal</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>ADDITION: Add Connective programming goal</p>

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	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.	Goal is C6.C Challenge institutional racism. Institutional racism is recognized and addressed to reduce inequality and the wealth gap between white people, Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC), and other marginalized communities.. There are many strategies to address Goal is C6.C Challenge institutional racism such as: C-6 Community building events, C-18 Resident representatives, C-21 Support diversity in the artist community, C-23 Targeted anti-displacement program. Additionally, there are housing and job opportunity strategies throughout the Development chapter. We recognize that a singular strategy alone can address a systemic issue. We also understand resources need to be forth toward community dialogue and expertise to educate and discuss racism. Adding a strategy to build capacity to engage, include, connect.
	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.	The plan includes programs to connect residents and build bridges between students and long-term residents: <ul style="list-style-type: none">•C-6. Community-building events•C-8. Connect students to supportive programs•C-17. Public art walks•C-18. Resident representatives
	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.	Change recommended
	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.	Many goals, policies, projects, and programs in the Plan work to identify and address many neighborhood stresses.
	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.	Potential locations for a Community Service Hub have been identified and two City-owned facilities are prioritized for rehabilitation or replacement. These strategies serve as a starting point for implementation. Additional details will be determined through further engagement.
	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. <ul style="list-style-type: none">oThese programs are resource-intensive. More resources are needed.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.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.	CHANGE: update language in strategies C-10 (Homeowner rehab program) and C-23 (Targeted anti-displacement program)
	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.	CHANGE: Update strategies to reference existing OPDC programs
	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.	CHANGE: Revise strategy C-15 (Organize around food access) to acknowledge previously recommended addition

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	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.	CHANGE: Edit C-9 (Emergency care equipment) to include "support mental and physical health supports throughout Oakland."
	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.	Noting support of OPDC's successful program model School to Career in Goals and components of the C-12. Improve after school opportunities strategy.
	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.	Thank you for your comment. C-16. Partnership for health and safety could be the venue to address this.
	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.	ADDITION: Add Oakwatch as a project partner in strategy C-16 CHANGE: Make relevant changes regarding occupancy in City Code and education to landlords
	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.	Thank you for your 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.	ADDITION: Add law enforcement and Oakwatch to strategy C-16. Partnership for health and safety
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!	Supportive. Answered
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).	Supportive. Answered
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.	Supportive.
Improve after school opportunities	We need to integrate more students into the community. Activities to bring students and residents together.	Supportive.
Support Diversity in the Artist Community	Appreciate the connections of providing places for artist to make a living.	Supportive.
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.	Supportive. Answered
Resident representative	Idea of paid position from the nhood is wonderful.	Supportive.
Resident representative	Support with childcare and financial services. Make it easier to hear voices of all.	Supportive.
Resident representative	Get more participate on weekends and if there's food/support/ welcoming atmosphere.	Supportive.
Resident representative	Like this. What does this mean? Embedded within community and build capacity or to serve as engagement opportunities for orgs with capacity.	Supportive. Answered
Resident representative	How many representative are envisioned? Directed by community organizations, funded by institutions and foundations.	Supportive. Answered
Resident representative	Strengthening and formalizing existing groups? Plus, creating additional channels for engaging harder to reach populations.	Supportive. Answered
Resident representative	School-based representatives may be needed here (general, not a specific school). Ie a community resource instead of a PTA.	Supportive.
Homeowner rehab program	This is important to SONG.	Supportive.
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.	Supportive. Answered
Connect students to supportive programs	Public schools are also an opportunity for connections to local leadership in industries.	Supportive.
Connect students to supportive programs	Internship opportunities can be folded into this.	Supportive.
Connect students to supportive programs	Regional effort to retain local talent and graduates. Events with local industries.	Supportive.
Connect students to supportive programs	Oakland is wonderful. This is important. Oakland can be a place to transition through different phases of life.	Supportive. Answered
Community Service Hubs	North Oakland - We need one!	Supportive. Answered
Free Access to Cultural Institutions	Museums already moving in this direction.	Supportive. Answered
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	Supportive. Answered
Free Access to Cultural Institutions	Great to see this. I've attended the museums since my childhood.	Supportive. Answered
Support protests and public assembly activities	Would this involve venues? ie. Schenley Plaza. Would this help organizations create events in those areas. Yes. Exactly.	Supportive. Answered
Community Service Hubs	Where is this now? Who hires?	Supportive. Answered
Community Service Hubs	Would project partners work with their City Councilor to move forward? Yes. DCP is facilitating body for it.	Supportive. Answered

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
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 Committ	Supportive. Answered
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 commun	Supportive. Answered
Community Service Hubs	Pumping Station is priority. Cleanups planned for this summer.	Supportive. Answered
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.	Supportive. Answered
Homeowner rehab program	Community organizations expressed concern about preserving existing residents and homes. CBA to execute on a larger scale.	Supportive. Answered
Honor Oakland's heritage	Who? Preservation Pittsburgh, foundations, institution. Annual events, reoccurring.	Supportive. Answered
Honor Oakland's heritage	Preservation is important in Oakland.	Supportive. Answered
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.	Supportive. Answered
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.	ADDITION: Add to what we heard
	Why is the Historic Architectural Inventory not incorporated/addressed in the Oakland Plan?	CHANGE: Reference the Historical Architectural Inventory Report
	Comment on above: Probably to avoid having to explain why this plan makes it easier to tear them down.	Threaded conversation.
	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.	Supportive

Development

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	<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</p> <p>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>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>
Design guidelines	<p>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.</p>	<p>Consider adding to "What we heard" to Design Guidelines.</p>
Design guidelines	<p>Comment on B Trimble Comment: 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!</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>The Oakland Plan Equity Strategy identified students as an underrepresented and marginalized group. This language use is intentional.</p>
	<p>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</p>	<p>Add materials to "What we heard" to Design Guidelines. Previous similar comment referred to Zoning.</p>
	<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>Policy C8 in the plan’s Community Chapter addresses the enforcement of the Rental Registry Program // No Change Needed</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>The proposed Land Use Strategy encourages redevelopment in some parts of Central Oakland to address the negative externalities associated with the single-family home conversions while preserving single-family housing throughout the neighborhood to meet the needs of families.</p> <p>The Land Use Strategy (Development Chapter) identifies specific areas to provide a variety of housing types and scales to meet the needs of many.</p> <p>TO ADD: a Housing Diversity goal</p>

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	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.	Thank you for your comment
	<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>	The Performance Point system provides an incentive for property owners to forward neighborhood goals such as contributing to the Community Reinvestment Fund to comply with the Equitable Development point.
	<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?? - 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 of 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 a follower.</p>	This refers to a separate legislative action // No change needed
	<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 be 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</p>	Thank you for your comment. This was addressed by extending the public comment period through May 1, 2022.

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	<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>	<p>1.This refers to separate legislative action 2.ADDITION: materials to “What we heard” in design guidelines. 3.Thank you for your Comment</p>
	<p>Comment on OaklandChild Comment: 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>	<p>1. Ordinance 2021-1906 is a separate legislative action not addressed in the Oakland Plan 2. Please check out the Engagement Summary report that provides a summary of engagement throughout the planning process. https://engage.pittsburghpa.gov/oakland/oakland-appendix 3. Thank you for your comment, we were luckily able to correct the link and we’re grateful for your participation. These meetings had representation from community groups such as OPDC and OBID. 4. Thank you for your comment</p>
Community Reinvestment Fund	<p>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.</p>	<p>Donating to the Community Reinvestment fund is one of three options to earn the Equitable Development performance point(s). The performance points system is a tool to accomplish community goals through development but does not allow developments to exceed the maximum height allowed with bonuses.</p>

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
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.	Thank you for the comment.
Land Use Strategy	<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>	The proposed building height for developments adjacent to single-family dwellings is 85-feet max, with bonuses. Additionally, some height reductions have been proposed on the east side of Bates and south of Boulevard of the Allies to reduce the effects you mentioned on the eastern residential portion of South Oakland. (Comment referred to zoning).
Land Use Strategy	Comment on Read_This_Please Comment: 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.	In reference to Mixed Use District height, "away from Oakcliffe area" refers to scaling down the maximum height adjacent to residential.
	Likes intentionality of recognizing that students are residents	Supportive. No change.
	Likes transit-oriented housing (Oakland used to be a transit hub)	Supportive. No change.
	Likes that plan has a strong emphasis in growing and supporting missing middle housing. This will also attract more households w children.	Supportive. No change.
	Glad there's opportunity in the plan for employment and growth in employment	Supportive. No change.
	Keep Inclusionary Zoning in the plan!	Supportive. No change.
	Important to acknowledge the fact that the employment area is right next to a residential area and seek a balance.	Supportive. No change.
	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.	ADDITION: Add policy: Student Housing. Student housing is safe and affordable and as close to campus as possible or on-campus where possible.
	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.	This is identified in the Community Chapter within Program C-18. Resident representatives
	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.	Thank you for your comment
	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.	This supports the "Project goals and Components" section where it is mentioned that a conflict of interest will be addressed in the establishment and maintence of this board // No change
	A denser, more vibrant Oakland that more people have an easier time getting to will more easily support a full-service grocery store.	Supportive. No change.
	Zoning Use Table: Remove campus uses from new zoning districts. The concern is that universities will continue to expand in residential areas of Oakland.	Thank you for your comment
	Zoning Use Table: Remove firearm sales and check cashing from new zoning districts.	Thank you for your comment
	Encourage higher-density student housing closer to campus.	Thank you for your comment // No change needed
	Encourage more student housing on campus.	Addresses in another comment
	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.	Addresses in another comment
	Instead of completely closing Zulema, what about reducing it in size?	Thank you for your comment
	General concern about new proposed building heights.	Thank you for your comment

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	High-rise housing is transitional housing and will not attract new families to the area.	The Missing Middle Housing and Land Use Strategy attempts to provide a variety of housing types for the variety of housing demands that exist in the neighborhood. Many areas will remain low-density residential
	Oakland will have a problems attracting families without a walkable neighborhood school.	Thank you for your comment
	Did Pitt do a housing study?	This comment was addressed in one of the Open House meetings
	How does Oakland Crossings going to Planning Commission interact w/ the Oakland Plan going to Planning Commission?	This comment was addressed in one of the Open House meetings
	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?	This comment was addressed in one of the Open House meetings
	RE: Walk to Work Program, are institutions going to be recruiting their employees to livein Oakland?	This comment was addressed in one of the Open House meetings
	How will commercial activity be regulated?	This comment was addressed in one of the Open House meetings
	Is there a specific vision for food stands and farmers markets?	This comment was addressed in one of the Open House meetings
	Is there opportunity on Community Reinvestment Board for resident representation?	This comment was addressed in one of the Open House meetings
	Question re: clarification between zoning boundaries and land use on the map	This comment was addressed in one of the Open House meetings
	Question re: viability of mixed-use buildings in the Innovation District	This comment was addressed in one of the Open House meetings
	Question re: relationship between Plan, including Land Use Strategy, and zoning proposals	This comment was addressed in one of the Open House meetings
	Not enough emphasis on availability of housing for family, long-term residents.	Several areas of the neighborhood will remain low-density residential to preserve existing residents.
	Incentivize missing middle housing the way that high-rise units are incentivized.	Removal of barriers is part of the goals and components of the Missing Middle Strategy.
	Consider disincentives for demolishing existing middle-type housing.	POTENTIAL ADDITION: Strategies to preserve missing middle type housing
	Question re: how the Plan has or has not driven the Zoning	This comment was addressed in one of the Open House meetings
	Question re: performance point system.	This comment was addressed in one of the Open House meetings
	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)?	This comment was addressed in one of the Open House meetings
	Desire for more specific guidelines about use of good-quality materials in Oakland Developments	These guidelines exist in the RIV legislation.
	Question re: lack of metrics in the Plan	This comment was addressed in one of the Open House meetings
	Question re: Intent for Oakland Cultural District	This comment was addressed in one of the Open House meetings
	D1.B Land use addresses community needs.: this statement is so vague it has no meaning.	Land use addresses community needs and responds to growth // No change needed
	D1.A Development review system: what is the goal statement here? I guess to implement the plan. But maybe we could have more aspiration.	Thank you for your comment

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	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.	Update Goal to include material and public realm language.
	Goal D3.A Welcoming Oakland.: this belongs in the community chapter. Not in the Development chapter. Please relocate this.	This goal is related to Equitable development and investment // No change needed
	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.	These priorities are addressed throughout the goals and policies within the Development Chapter // No change needed
	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.	Thank you for your comment. Goals are general and this one is about ensuring physical structures and uses consider marginalized groups
	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.	Planning process showed strong desire to support minority and women-owned businesses. In response, proposing projects seeking bonus height through the Performance Points System would have to show they have made best efforts to contract Minority and Women Business Enterprises as part of their project consistent with the City/URA standards (18% minority and 7% women). The URA has committed that their expert MWBE staff will be responsible for compliance. Update goal D3.C Inclusive hiring to include contracting. Additionally, program D-15. Diversity, equity, and inclusion principles implements.
	<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>	ADDITION: Housing Diversity goal
	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.	Goal D2.A discusses building performance (i.e. utilities, materials, resources), compared to D4.B which covers maintenance and healthy buildings. While these goals are similar, they address different components. // No Change Needed
	Policy D. 1 - hillsides: I'm glad to see this statement included. It is much needed.	Supportive. No change.
	Policy D 3 Access and influence. : this should be moved to the community chapter. please revise.	The Neighborhood Plan Guide identifies opportunity, job access, and equitable economic development as part of Development. // No change needed

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	Response to wwilson comment "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.	The Neighborhood Plan Guide identifies opportunity, job access, and equitable economic development as part of Development. // No change needed
	Policy D. 4 there should be a policy to encourage homeownership in Oakland.	Same as previous 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>	ADDITION: Add policy: Student Housing. Student housing is safe and affordable and as close to campus as possible or on-campus where possible.
	In response to AndreaBoykowycz comment: 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.	Related to above. Threaded conversation
	In response to AndreaBoykowycz and Karl Zimmerman comments: 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.	Related to above. Threaded conversation
Environmentally sensitive areas	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.	Recommended for removal
Missing middle housing	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>ADDITION: Adding this comment to “What We Heard”</p> <p>The "Project Goals and Components" section does reference a necessary linkage to the CLT so this will be a part of the study.</p>
Oakland town center	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. - Absolutely. Many designs were discussed for the Isaly's site at that workshop.	There are several workshop options listed on the workshops page. Also, it's important to note that all projects will require additional engagement as they're implemented
Sustainability for existing buildings	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.	The Energy Strategy is one piece of a larger strategy that brings in PLI & Zoning as an avenue to require more sustainable upgrades to buildings // No Change Needed
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?	The Zoning Proposals establish requirements (green buffers+) and incentives (performance points) for sustainability in new buildings. No change.

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
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>	<p>The UC-E and UC-MU proposed zoning districts are focused on creating/supporting compact, walkable, pedestrian-oriented, and mixed-use areas centered around high-quality transit networks // No Change Needed</p>
Employer assisted housing	<p>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.</p>	<p>ADDITION: reference that the Community Land Trust may be considered</p>
Neighborhood sustainability identity	<p>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.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment</p>
Opportunities for Hispanic businesses	<p>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.</p>	<p>This proposed strategy encourages entrepreneurship opportunities for an underrepresented and marginalized group identified by the Oakland Plan Equity Strategy // No Change Needed</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>The CLT is currently identified in strategies: D-6 Missing middle housing, D-19 Land use strategy, recommended for addition to D-16. Employer assisted housing. Also, proposing to add Goal D4.C Housing Diversity to promote owner-occupancy for a range of incomes.</p>
	<p>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>	<p>The Land Use Strategy identifies areas for low-density residential. // No Change Needed</p>
	<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>	<p>Supportive. No change.</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>Supportive. No change.</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>Supportive. No change.</p>
	<p>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!</p>	<p>Supportive. No change.</p>
	<p>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/</p>	<p>Supportive. No change.</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment</p>
	<p>we also need resources to provide incentives for landlords to accept housing choice vouchers - and TA re: improvements so units pass inspections.</p>	<p>The Oakland Plan process didn't explore incentives, but the Housing Authority of the City of Pittsburgh (HACP) provides technical resources to landlords. // No Change Needed</p>
	<p>Does TA stand for "true affordability"?</p>	<p>It stands for Technical Assistance</p>

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	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.	Thank you for your comment. Eminent Domain is not proposed in the plan
	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.	<p>The Steering Committee was made up of 31 members from various organizations and backgrounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •5 resident organizations: Bellefield Area Citizens Association (BACA), Oakcliffe Community Organization (OCO), Schenley Farms Civic Association (SFCA), South Oakland Neighborhood Group (SONG), and West Oakland Neighborhood Council (WONC) •3 neighborhood corporations: Oakland Planning & Development Corporation (OPDC), Oakland Business Innovation District (OBID), and Oakland Transportation Management Association (OTMA) •6 University Representatives (3 employees, 3 decision-makers) •4 Cultural Institutions •UPMC officials •InnovatePGH representatives •8 Elected and/or government officials
	<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.</p> <p>Sorry the piece was supposed to be linked. It's about some innovative development thinking/strategy in ALI: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5aGHLUwvico</p>	<p>1.General support for Land Use Strategy's medium- and high-density proposals (3-4 & 4-5 stories without bonus, respectively. 7 & 8 stories max with bonus, respectively)</p> <p>2.Thank you for your comment. Please visit the Infrastructure and check out I-25, which discusses a more frequent recycling pilot designed to reduce landfill waste. Commercial and multi-unit family dwellings with six or more units are responsible for hiring a private hauler for both waste & recycling.</p> <p>3.In the community chapter, C-5 calls for an Arts & Design committee to review potential art investments</p> <p>4.Thank you for your comment</p> <p>5.In the Community chapter, C-15 (Organize around food access) calls for a grocery store in Oakland</p> <p>6.Green space investments and others mentioned are proposed throughout the plan</p>

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	<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>	Threaded conversation (See Above)
	Comment on above: 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.	Threaded conversation (See Above)
	<p>Comment on above: 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>	Threaded conversation (See Above)
	<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>	The 35-year distinction is based on previous work conducted by the Affordable Housing Task Force and existing Inclusionary Zoning legislation. This distinction must be changed at a citywide level. // No Change
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).	The Fund will receive monies from the Equitable Development Performance Point, which includes affordable housing, entrepreneurship/employment opportunities, and workforce development. Guiding policies, objective goals, and criteria will be developed for fund expenditures and will be managed by DCP, governed by a board, and approved by City Council. // No Change Needed

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
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>	<p>1.Thank you for your comment 2.Thank you for your comment. This phrasing was pulled from notes taken throughout the process: “Identify new ways residents can engage productively with development projects. Report many bad experiences and when they try to intervene in ZBA and court cases they are unsuccessful and frustrated.”</p> <p>We have heard from residents that they want to find a productive place in the review process where they can influence and have an impact on decision-making.</p> <p>CHANGE: remove some mentions of “productive” in “What We Heard.” 3.RECOMMENDATION: an MOU between project partners to foster agreement on guidelines and processes. 4.ADDITION: Add to “What We Heard” 5.ADDITION: Add to “What We Heard”</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.	ADDITION: Add to “What We Heard”
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.	Thank you for the comment. You are correct, there are not strategies to address student affordability as that is undefined for the reasons noted in the comment. Understanding your comment, we are proposing a policy that includes student affordability.
Land use strategy	Project goals and components - housing strategy: again, to reiterate: you call out in the third bullet specifically "affordable dorm and apartment housing" Nothing in the zoning proposal (IZ or bonus points) will achieve that.	Inclusionary Zoning will lead to affordable multi-family housing, not dorms TO REMOVE: “dorm”
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.	Many tools are needed to provide affordability, and we recognize one of those tools is the CLT. CLT is listed on the LUS slides - all types except Innovation and Cultural districts, and in the Missing Middle strategy. Proposing to add CLT reference to Employer assisted housing strategy.
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.	There are consistent and appropriate goal and character references throughout the residential district types. The proposed R-MU allows for neighborhood-serving commercial uses on the ground floor, which is more flexible in application than suggested

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
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.	ADDITION: Add “promotion of owner occupancy” to the end of the first sentence. Community Land Trust is part of the programming for all types except for Innovation and Cultural districts.
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.	Thank you for your comment. ADDITION: Add “active ground floor spaces that support both employees and residents" to character reference.
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.	Green buffers, step-backs, and height-reduction areas are all proposed to mitigate impacts. It’s also addressed in the intent statement in the UC-MU district of the Zoning Proposal. // No Change Needed ADDITION: Under technical aspects of the proposal in the project goals and components section, add a sub-bullet stating “Include best practices to address a variety of development siting scenarios"
Provide low-cost commercial space	it would be a mistake to utilize oakland community reinvestment fund resources because those funds should benefit Oakland residents.	By providing low-cost commercial space, we can support capital-constrained innovation businesses that provide benefits to Oakland residents and contribute to a dynamic neighborhood economy. // No Change Needed
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.	Institutions, and ALL their employees, are key to this strategy of the plan. By ensuring affordable housing adjacent to these institutions that are tied to Oakland, we indirectly benefit the neighborhood. // No change needed
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??	Oakland Town Center is an identifier used throughout the planning process. An official name will be determined as the project progresses.
	OBID is suggesting adding the following goal to be added under D1 Land Use Policy and Regulations: 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.	This comment is addressed by these Development Chapter goals: •D1.B: Land Use addresses community needs •D1.C: Framework to provide community amenities
	In response to OBID comment: 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.	Threaded conversation.
	OBID is suggesting the following goal to be added under D2 Urban Sustainable Design: 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.	The existing goal (D2.C Buildings that belong in Oakland) arose from the Goody Clancy urban design study. This proposal would be counter to that as these buildings do not speak to the unique context of Oakland. This was a conversation during Steering Committee Meetings around building typologies.
	In response to OBID: There is no recognized geographic Pittsburgh Innovation District. It is self-identified for self-promotional purposes.	Threaded conversation.

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	<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>The need for access to career services and opportunities for existing residents was identified throughout the planning process. If entrepreneurs are existing Oakland residents, they are covered by “residents.” Also, accessibility to affordable housing was identified as a need for low-income employees and students in Oakland. If innovators are identified as “low-income,” they are covered by this reference. // No change needed</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>Check out the current policy in the Development Chapter’s D1, Managed Density. This policy addresses several land-use typologies // No Change Needed</p>
	<p>In response to OBID: There is no recognized geographic Pittsburgh Innovation District. It is self-identified for self-promotional purposes.</p>	<p>Threaded conversation (See Above)</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>	<p>This comment was previously addressed.</p>
	<p>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>	<p>Threaded conversation.</p>
	<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>1.This comment was addressed previously 2.The groups identified in the current policies were identified by the Equity Strategy as underrepresented and marginalized groups. These policies were created to intentionally address these groups // No Change Needed</p>

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	<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>	<p>1.ADDITION: Add Pittsburgh Innovation District to D-2 project partners</p> <p>2.CONSIDERATION: Consider edit to D-8</p>
	<p>Comment on above: 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.</p>	<p>Threaded conversation (See Above)</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>Threaded conversation (See Above)</p>
	<p>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</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. It's imperative that neighborhood plans are representative of the variety of neighborhood voices.</p>
	<p>Comment on above: 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.</p>	<p>Threaded conversation (See Above).</p>
	<p>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).</p>	<p>Threaded conversation (See Above).</p>

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	<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>	<p>1.Thank you for your comment</p> <p>2.The public comment period and comment review process were extended to allow more time for a thorough review of the comments we received, which will allow for a robust set of recommendations for the Planning Commission</p> <p>3.Thank you for your comment</p> <p>4.Thank you for your comment</p> <p>5.To develop standards, Steering Committee members and topic-based professionals created three focus groups covering Housing, Workforce Development, and Urban Design and Development</p> <p>6.The Planning Commission has not made a recommendation on the Oakland Plan yet.</p> <p>7.Thank you for your Comment</p>
	<p>Comment on above: 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?</p>	<p>All comments we've received throughout the process have been added to a comment log in the appropriate chapter</p>
	<p>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."</p>	<p>The projects and programs are not adopted and are a starting point of a to-do list. The goals and policies are adopted. These examples would be addressed by the IMP and Zoning processes, rules and regulations. The reference to hillsides is "limit" but not "prohibit".</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>PROPOSED CHANGE: Replace the word “must” with “should.”</p> <p>PROPOSED CHANGE: Reference, but not require, the Community Land Trust</p> <p>PROPOSED CHANGE: “may” is being proposed to allow for flexibility while acknowledging that a successful local program is a tool to increase the number of affordable. Housing units</p>

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	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 aways possible.	DCP and the City are identified throughout the programs and projects as leads, partners, and funders. Some of the items mentioned in this comment are related to staffing. The other implementation pieces, especially related to mobility chapter and public service / open space investments are budgetary decisions made on an annual basis.
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?	Proposed change: Change first sentence to: Establishing a committee that focuses on local business tenanting, shares experiences and resources, defines goals and tracks progress.
D-14, Community reinvestment board	How is this prioritized with other uses of the investiment fund?	<p>The selected Board will create guiding policies, objectives, goals, and criteria for fund expenditures. The fund itself will receive monies from the Equitable Development Performance Point which includes donations for affordable housing, entrepreneurship, employment opportunities, and workforce development.</p> <p>The Board will make spending recommendations, which will be approved by City Council.</p>
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.?	Yes.
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?	Guidelines express further sentiment about design process while the CDAP and RCO add knowledge and review process.
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.	As proposed, each organization identified as a partner (i.e. UPMC, OBID, OPDC) would create its own Employer Assisted Housing program to allow for different strategies. A larger convening group, such as the Oakland Task Force, would be a forum to share updates, waitlist information, potential partnerships with proposed developments, and more.
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.	To be removed as this already exists through various departments and datasets.
D-17, Equitable development committee	Good goal. How is equitable development defined and administered?	Developments are evaluated by the burdens, benefits, and outcomes for underserved communities. Using this information, the proposed committee will work collaborative with local partners to launch new initiatives and share opportunities. The identified project leads are Partners4Work and the Pittsburgh Innovation District.
D-18, Global district	This would be so exciting and a real reflection of the community.	Supportive.
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.	Thank you for your comment. This is addressed in the Zoning proposals.
D-5, Inclusionary zoning	Good goal. Relationship to the IMP?	EMI districts are excluded from the Inclusionary Zoning overlay.

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
D-20, N'hood sustainability identity	Definition required. University has very big goals here. What is the purpose of the committee	The committee could use the Oakland Plan to apply for and become an EcoDistrict, since this planning process followed the Neighborhood Plan Guide (which aligns with EcoDistrict protocol). Becoming an EcoDistrict could result in further grant funding opportunities.
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.	Supportive.
D-23, Revolving loan program	What funding would be sought from the University of Pittsburgh?	We plan to follow the Harvard Local Housing Collaborative model to create a share institutional and public gap investment revolving loan program. Further study is needed to identify the best roles and funding amounts.
	Affordability: 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.	<p>Incentives for landlords were not explored as part of the Oakland Planning process.</p> <p>HACP provides technical resources to landlords that you can check out here: https://hacp.org/doing-business/landlord-resources/</p> <p>No Change Needed</p>
	Affordability: 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.	<p>NEW PROPOSED GOAL: Housing Diversity</p> <p>The Community Reinvestment Board will create guiding policies, objectives, goals, and criteria for fund expenditures. The fund itself will receive monies from the Equitable Development Performance Point which includes donations for affordable housing, entrepreneurship, employment opportunities, and workforce development.</p>
	Affordability: 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.	<p>There are existing goals & policies that address affordable housing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Goal D4.A: Jobs and housing for all •Policy D4: Frontline and low-income worker housing <p>We are also proposing a new goal that addresses Housing Diversity</p>
	Affordability: 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.	ADDITION: Add policy: Student Housing. Student housing is safe and affordable and as close to campus as possible or on-campus where possible.
	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.	The Land-Use Strategy identifies several areas in the neighborhood that will remain low-density residential. Zoning changes would not be supported in those areas.

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	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.	Throughout the planning process, the need for the preservation of important buildings and the importance of placemaking was discussed. The Community chapter addresses both topics TO ADD: Add a reference to the Oakland Historic Architecture Inventory Report in program C-11: Honor Oakland’s heritage.
	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.	ADD: “The study should also examine what tools, if any, should be used to provide an ongoing supply of affordable units” to “What We Heard” in Variety and Strong Urban Design’s strategy summary
	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.	Agreed. Engagement will take place as the project moves forward.
	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.	Many of the plan’s goals and strategies work together to address this: <ul style="list-style-type: none">•D2.A: High-performing buildings•D2.C: Buildings that belong in Oakland•D-2: Design Guidelines
	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.	TO ADD comment to What we heard in Design Guidelines strategy.
	Sustainability and Open Space: High performing buildings are an essential goal	Supportive
	Sustainability and Open Space: Steeply sloped, landslide prone hillside areas should not be viewed as development sites.	In the infrastructure chapter, Strategy I-4 addresses hillside development.
	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.	The Equity Strategy was a central tenet of this planning process and many of these priorities are addressed throughout the plan
	Equity: The plan includes a proposed community reinvestment fund, which is a great idea, but needs more detail. 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. 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. 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.	A Community Reinvestment Board has been proposed in conjunction with the fund. The Board will be composed of Oakland-based nonprofits, Oakland residents, small business owners, and workforce development and career service professionals. This public-facing board will create guiding policies for the fund to address neighborhood needs and will make spending recommendations to City Council. The Community Reinvestment Fund (CRF) provides developers with an alternative for compliance with the Equitable Development performance point, which is tied to workforce development and housing opportunities. At this time, it’s impossible to determine how much money the fund will generate.

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	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.	NEW PROPOSED GOAL: Housing Diversity ADDITION: add Homeownership language to Employer Assisted Housing via the CLT ADDITION: add “Promotion of owner occupancy” to the Land Use Strategy
	Confusion re: Affordable housing for students. Would like more clarity that undergraduate students would not be eligible for affordable housing as defined by HUD.	This is difficult to address as the background of students varies
	Pressure on housing market. Affordability and specific groups, POC, others. Low-income folks.	Several goals, policies, and strategies to address.
	Value Capture to help affordable housing,	There are value capture tools that already exist in the plan such as Affordable Housing Performance Points and Inclusionary Zoning. // No Change Needed
	CRF – need to define uses of that fund and where to target those funds	The Community Reinvestment board will create guiding policies for the fund to address neighborhood needs and will make spending recommendations to City Council.
	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	Thank you for your comment
	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.	Thank you for your comment
	What area’s are being preserved for low density? That needs to be explicit to developers and Planning Commission.	The areas that will remain low-density residential are identified the Land Use Strategy
	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.	Thank you for your comment
	need to have replacement of housing stock and avoid tearing down housing.	Thank you for your 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.	Thank you for your comment
	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.	Thank you for your comment
	yES!! we need a hardware store and other normal shops — not more restaurants.	Thank you for your comment
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.	Previously addressed.
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	Previously addressed.
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.	Previously addressed.

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
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.	Previously addressed.
D-13	PID would like to be included as Implementor	Listed as Project Partner. // No change.
D-1	PID would like to be included as Implementor	PID is identified as a part of the Community Reinvestment Board in the "What we heard" section. The City is responsible for creating the fund // No Change Needed.
D-2	PID would like to be included as Implementor	ADDITION: add PID as Partner
D-15	PID would like to be included as Implementor	ADDITION: add PID as Partner
D-16	PID would like to be included as Implementor	ADDITION: add PID as Partner
General Thoughts	Given limited human / fiscal resources, suggestion to rethink the project priorities and focus on low-hanging fruit in the 0 - 2 years	Thank you for your comment
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	Thank you for your comment
General Thoughts	We need to understand the level of approval process for the uses (Zoning admin approval vs. Zoning Board)	This is identified on the Proposed Use Table in the Zoning proposals.
General Thoughts	we are seeking to acheive more residential uses in the UCE and RMU	The RMU currently allows for residential, and UC-E allows 50 percent of the Gross Floor Area to be residential, affordable housing. // No Change Needed
General Thoughts	RMU should allow for more flexible work from home scenarios to attract startups	A limited amount of officees are permitted in R-MU.
D-14 Community reinvestment board	There should be Oakland organizations listed (inc OBID and OTF)	ADDITION: Add Oakland organizations to project partner as they are listed in the Goals and Components
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.	ADDITION: Add this comment to What we heard and Project goals and components.
D-5 Inclusionary zoning	Should there also be an Affordable Housing bonus?	Affordable Housing is a bonus point option for increased height
D-22 Provide low-cost commercial space	Move this timeframe to 0-2 years	Make change
D-21 Opportunities for Hispanic businesses	Move this timeframe to 0-2 years	Make change
D-24 Support local businesses	Move this timeframe to 0-2 years	Make change
D-12 Wayfinding for neighborhood businesses	Move this timeframe to 0-2 years	Make change
	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.	The Community Reinvestment Board makes recommendations on how the funds in the Community Reinvestment Fund is spent. The City Equitable Development Trust Fund will be the actual fund that holds monies from Oakland and other City neighborhoods funding from the Equitable Development Bonus Points. The funding from Oakland will be earmarked and only go to programs/projects in Oakland.

Mobility

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
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.	<p>This would require a change to PennDOT’s project scope, which currently plans to widen Bates Street as part of their plan for Hazelwood Green.</p> <p>While the City does not have the authority to change PennDOT’s project scope, these concerns will be added to the “What We Heard” section of project M-9.</p>
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.	Supportive. No change needed
Reimagine Boulevard of the Allies	awesome	Supportive. No change needed
McKee Place Complete Street	i think this would make mckee and louisa much safer to walk and bike on. i hate cares	Supportive. No change needed
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 Healthyrider 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!	Supportive. No change needed
Centre Avenue & Craig Street Pedestrian Safety and Transit Improvements	Comment on Jadena Comment: I agree! As someone who frequents this intersection and used to utilize the bikes often, I'm excited to see these new changes implemented!	Supportive. No change needed
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.	Supportive. No change needed
Centre Avenue & Craig Street Pedestrian Safety and Transit Improvements	<p>This proposal is very vital to the overall well-being of the daily commenters which frequent this intersection.</p> <p>Overall, this intersection needs to prioritize the pedestrians over the transit of cars to ensure proper safety protocols are in place. As a frequent pedestrian, commuting in this area is very unsafe and proves to be difficult due to the short walking times provided. Additionally, biking in this area is incredibly dangerous, as well as using Spins. There have been many times where I have almost been hit while riding a bike.</p>	Supportive. No change needed
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 Semple 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. 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>	<p>Further study and engagement would be a key part of the project’s implementation, and key concerns are documented for consideration under project M-10.</p> <p>DCP also reached out to the church’s pastor and pastor representative.</p>
Reimagine Boulevard of the Allies	Comment on John's comment: 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.	Refers to above comment. No change needed
Complete the Fifth Avenue Bikeway	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.	Supportive. No change needed
Build Up OTMA	Agree we need to enhance OTMA. We have many transportation issues that are unique to Oakland.	Supportive. No change needed
Integrated Shuttle and Transit Mobility Study	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 turning where there is no signal. The same is true at the intersection of N Dithridge and Bayard. It would make more sense for shuttles to travel on Craig, Bigelow, or Bellefield - all of which are wider and have traffic signals.	<p>Project M-7 (Integrated Shuttle and Transit Mobility Study) will analyze and provide recommendations related to shuttles and public transit in Oakland. Program M-33 identifies intersection/corridor areas of safety concern, including at or along one or more parts of Dithridge, Centre, and Bayard.</p> <p>ADDITION: Add note about a concern for shuttles on neighborhood streets and request for shuttle access for all residents (regardless of institutional affiliation) to “What We Heard” in Project M-7.</p>

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
Integrated Shuttle and Transit Mobility Study	Comment on KathyG Comment: Agreed. This is a persistent issue and you lay out a very clear remedy, Kathy. Let's make these changes.	Refers to above comment. See response to earlier comment.
Integrated Shuttle and Transit Mobility Study	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.	Refers to above comment. See response to earlier comment.
Manage On-Street Parking	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	CHANGE: Clarify the “Manage On-Street Parking” strategy to describe the expected impact of the change on parking availability and enforcement
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.	ADDITION: Add relevant language to “What We Heard” under programs M-33 (Pedestrian Safety Improvements) and M-39 (Traffic Calming Corridors). The Pedestrian Safety Improvements map identifies Dithridge at Centre for possible corridor improvement. This section is also identified for potential traffic calming on the Traffic Calming Corridors Improvements map (found in program M-39).
	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!	1.The neighborhoods listed will be served by the BRT 2.There are many bike and pedestrian enhancements listed in the plan 3.The Curbside Management Toolkit will help address needs for pick-up & drop-off locations 4.Industry best practices suggest that accommodating bicyclists in the roadway serves multiple constituencies and overall equity CHANGE: Tweak Curbside Management Toolkit to clarify that areas other than commercial areas are considered for curbside management
	Comment under M comment: 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.	Specific allocations of roadway space across multiple modes will be evaluated at the project level on a case-by-case basis. // No change needed.
	Comment under M Comment: 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.	Transit service improvements between Oakland and outer areas have been identified across multiple mobility projects such as M-21 through M-25. Additionally, the plan includes goals, policies, and strategies to address parking management.
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 be only by 75% of resident request!	Thank you for your concern about Hybrid Parking Permits. We have clarified the Manage On-Street Parking Program to indicate the expected impact on parking availability and enforcement. Community engagement will be an integral part of the approval and implementation process. Comments about non-resident parking permits refer to the RPP program, which is separate from the Oakland Plan and managed by the Pittsburgh Parking Authority.
Curbside Management Toolkit	Curbside Management - can this strategy be expanded to include residential areas. More explicitly apply this to all streets in Oakland.	CHANGE: Adjust the Curbside Management Toolkit to clarify which aspects of the program include residential areas.
	Design standards for sidewalks (residential and commercial; tree pits, materials, etc) are necessary.	The City's ROW Manual takes these design standards into account already for sidewalk construction. ADDITION: Add language acknowledging design standards and their ongoing enforcement to program M-37
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.	ADDITION: Add that parking studies should occur at a “representative time” and follow industry best practices
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.	Reiterates the Plan's intention // No change needed
	Comment on M Comment: 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.	Specific allocations of roadway space across multiple modes will be evaluated at the project level on a case-by-case basis. // No change needed.
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 more room or space for them, or even more alternative routes for them, they will get around easier and won't cause as much traffic or chaos.	Supports Bike Route Improvements. No change needed.

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	<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>Thank you for your comment</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 developemnts like this. We can't let it slip past us</p>	<p>These recommendations for Forbes Ave. and for an expansion of the light rail would need to be reviewed at a city-wide scale because of their implications across multiple neighborhoods. The Oakland Plan and its implementers don't have the capacity to accommodate a request of this scale. Also, light rail expansion was previously considered, and the design of Forbes and Fifth Avenues has already been established.</p> <p>Recommendations for bike boulevards or cycle tracks will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis depending on the specific context of their location.</p>
	<p>Comment on snharan comment: 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>Thank you for your comments. Making Fifth and Forbes two-way streets would require substantial study and rework. A change like this would also need to be reviewed at a city-wide scale due to the implications across multiple neighborhoods. The Oakland Plan and its implementers don't have the capacity to accommodate a request of this scale</p>
	<p>Comment on Read_This_Please's comment on snharan comment: 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>The BRT includes changes to Fifth Avenue. Additionally, the Pedestrian Safety Improvements map designates Fifth and Forbes as corridors for safety improvements. Larger changes to the direction of traffic flow on these streets would also need to be reviewed at a city-wide scale due to the implications across multiple neighborhoods.</p> <p>Decisions about one-way vs. two-way streets are best managed on a case-by-case basis rather than creating a city-wide policy.</p>
	<p>Comment on Karl Zimmerman comment on Read_This_Please comment : 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>Duplicated comment. No change needed</p>
Centre Avenue & Craig Street Pedestrian Safety and Transit Improvements	<p>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 .</p>	<p>This area of concern is identified for review in M-33 (Pedestrian Safety Improvements) and M-39 (Traffic Calming Corridors) as within both a traffic calming corridor and pedestrian safety improvement corridor, per those programs. Language has been added to "What We Heard" in M-33.</p>
Centre Avenue & Craig Street Pedestrian Safety and Transit Improvements	<p>Comment on Tbeck45 Comment: 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</p>	<p>Clear sight distances would be evaluated when making pedestrian or intersection improvements. Concerns about sightlines have been added to "what we heard" for program M-33 (Pedestrian Safety Improvements).</p>

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
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.	Thank you for your comment
	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	The City is working on a conversion to LED lighting. Also, comments have been added to programs M-33 and M-39 that suggest a review for safe and adequate lighting during public and private development projects. More than this would require further study, resources, and vetting before including it in the plan. ADDITION: Add the desire for lighting to “What We Heard” under program M-33
	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	Supportive. Several strategies address sidewalk condition and maintenance. No change needed
	Entry points/wayfinding signage for trails, steps	Supportive. The Improve City Steps program already identifies wayfinding near steps. DOMI is listed as implementer, since DOMI would implement this in coordination with future projects.
	Trail connection to Eliza Furnace Trail	Supportive. Project M-9 (Reimagine Bates Street) already recommends consideration of a bike connection from Bates Street to the 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.	Supportive. No change needed
	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).	The Port Authority of Allegheny County (PAAC) has clarified “Rapid Transit Access” and “Local Transit Access” under Transit Services & Stations. Additionally, the NEXTransit plan recommends studying potential updates along Second Ave. from Downtown to Hazelwood and linking to the Downtown-Uptown-Oakland-East End BRT.
	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!).	Goal M6A and Policy M1 (Fewer trips with only one passenger) have been clarified to address car-sharing and reduced parking demand by residents. Also, policy M6 (Reduce Parking Demand) identifies resident parking demands. Making a policy or goal about vehicle ownership could lead to future policy implications for owned vehicles that are not used or stored in Oakland, which is why the preferred language focuses on private vehicle parking and use in Oakland.
	Comment on AndreaBoykowycz Comment: Free loop buses for resident are desperately needed. Bring back the Oakland Loop!	Project M-7 (Integrated Shuttle and Transit Mobility Study) will study this the need for loop buses in Oakland.
	Comment on AndreaBoykowycz Comment: also, consider reducing the # of permits allowed per housing unit here in Oakland	ADDITION: Add Language to M-31 that recommends examining the pricing and number of parking permits.
	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.	Thank you for your comment. In the existing Neighborhood Plan Guide framework, Transportation Demand Management (TDM) encompasses many other topics addressed by the guide. TDM is included with transit because the planning process identified transit as the primary mode of choice to reduce single-occupancy vehicle trips but should be reviewed further in the context of other topics.
	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.	Goals M6.A and M6.B address concerns around off-site parking. CHANGE: Revise language to clarify the intent of policy M6 (Off-Site Parking) in alignment with the Plan.
	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.	Supportive. No change needed
	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.	Supportive. No change needed
	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 frequently. It was often very challenging for me to navigate campus, and is still tricky. I have significant issues with my legs that make the steep curbs, degrading sidewalk ramps, and uneven pavement a HUGE obstacle. Not only was it difficult for me to get to and from classes as a student, now as an adult with disabilities it is a challenge to physically get to all of the appointments I have in Oakland. There are broken buttons, there are ramps that are too steep or too shallow, etc. Absolutely thrilled that the disability community is being considered in Pittsburgh's future!	Supportive. No change needed
	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.	Supportive. No change needed

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	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.	Supportive. No change needed
	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.	Supportive. No change needed
	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>The planning process did not explore full elimination of parking minimums with stakeholders and the community at a level necessary to implement such a change, particulatly at this final phase of the Plan. The 50% reduction in parking minimums is a significant policy action oriented towards mode shift, while considering parking demand and car use in the interim. In-lieu payments for developments providing less than parking minimums offer opportunities to strengthen funding for alternative transportation options through a mobility improvement trust. In addition to the zoning changes regarding parking requirements, project M-13 "Transit Parking Offset" is another potential mechanism by which developers may reduce parking and that will be explored further as part of subsequent zoning code changes and/or implementation of the DOMI Mobility Trust Fund.</p> <p>The DOMI mobility improvement trust is referenced in the Plan's zoning code changes. It is described below: Traditionally, developers have been responsible for constructing and installing improvements in the public right-of-way (ROW) needed to support their development or mitigate transportation impacts. This system does not offer a way to contribute to broader mobility improvements that could improve access to the site and community.</p> <p>The DOMI Mobility Trust Fund allows developers to pay a fee in lieu of providing parking spaces required by zoning ordinances. For instance, if a development calls for 52 spaces, and the developer wants to provide 49, they will pay into the fund for the 3 spaces that they are not providing. This revenue is used to fund mobility projects in the same neighborhood where the funds were gathered. Through the funds generated, the City can implement projects and programs that enable multi-</p>
	<p>Comment on Jonathan Salmans comment: 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>	<p>Similar to the comment above about parking minimums. See response to that comment.</p>
	<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 Pittssburgh. 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>1. The Oakland Plan policy uses the Port Authority's safety and design guidelines. Changes to these guidelines should be a system-wide consideration rather than a neighborhood-level change.</p> <p>2. There are existing bike lanes from Neville to Bayard to Bigelow to Schenley Drive. There are also lanes in Schenley Park by Phipps Conservatory. The proposed Fifth Avenue Bikeway connection would further enhance bike connectivity.</p> <p>3. The Forbes Ave. bridge and adjacent intersection accommodate many travel modes and vehicular access requirements thanks to traffic engineering and design review. When an opportunity arises (ie: bridge repair or reconstruction) and priority thresholds are met, DOMI will reevaluate best practices for ensuring adequate pedestrian space on the bridge.</p> <p>ADDITION: Add to "What We Heard" and the project components section of project M-36 (Sidewalk connections and accessibility improvements)</p> <p>4. ADDITION: Add illustrations and information about traffic calming treatments to program M-39. This includes raised crosswalks and intersections, which the City explores on a case-by-case basis. The Crosswalk design colors are pulled from the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices.</p> <p>5. Many parts of the plan discuss accessibility at the goal, policy, and project/program level. This includes sidewalk width and opportunities to incorporatate bike infrastructure.</p> <p>6. Addressing utility poles is part of program M-28 (Eliminate obstructions to improve accessibility).</p> <p>7. Goal M6.B (Transition parking) ties into some of these comments. Also, program M-31 (Manage On Street Parking) considers carshare as an alternative for people using a private vehicle.</p>

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	<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 eventuell see the line electrified with above street wires in accordance with city sustainability goals.</p>	<p>The Plan includes recommendations for this topic. A bus lane could also be constructed as part of the BRT. // No Change Needed.</p>
	<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>	<p>The City regularly reviews tree removal and preservation as part of infrastructure and development projects.</p> <p>We encourage you to direct your other comments to 311.</p>
Traffic calming corridors	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.	Supportive. No change needed
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. 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>	<p>ADDITION: Portions of this comment have been added to the "What we Heard Section" of program M-31 (Manage On-Street Parking).</p> <p>Also, items have been added for consideration under program M-31's goals and components.</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 nightttime 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> <p>After-hours enforcement of RPPP parking would be helpful, however. If the only way to do that is with a PED, so be it.</p>	<p>The DOMI parking study that would be part of implementing program M-31 would help determine if a PED is viable.</p>
Bus Stop Enhancements	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!	Supportive. No change needed
Reimagine Robinson Street	Great ideas and illustrations for addressing a pressing, persistent problem.	Supportive. No change needed

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
Reimagine Boulevard of the Allies	<p>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.</p> <p>Many of our parishioners live in the suburbs. This means that they need a reliable place to park while attending services. It has been the custom of the city to allow parking in the outer lanes of BOTH sides of the Boulevard on our block AND the block from Ward to Dawson, as well, on Sundays during services, additionally for other special times during Lent, etc. The placement of the bike lanes alongside our church also will cause problems for funerals, as attendees park on the outside lane awaiting the procession. Dawson Street isn’t an option for this due to its narrowness.</p> <p>Speaking of Dawson, part of the plan is to place curb bump outs for pedestrians. As it currently is, Dawson is bidirectional with parking on BOTH sides. The street is narrow. I have witnessed many near misses AND actual accidents at this intersection! If the bump outs are needed, then I suggest that Dawson be made one way going north (as it currently is on the southern side of the Boulevard). Ward Street is one way, going south from Semple, across the Boulevard all the way to its terminus. Dawson can become bidirectional at Semple.</p> <p>Again, I am in favor of bike lanes (as a user), but question the placement alongside our church. Can they be placed on the east bound side? How will they connect with Schenley Park once it crosses the bridge? I understand that the intersection of Bates and the Boulevard is problematic, but Bates DOES connect with the Eliza Furnace trail, so putting the lanes on that side may make better sense.</p> <p>I do understand the various problems which arise when changes are planned, but as a long-standing stakeholder in the area, I needed to “plead my case”.</p> <p>Thank you-Robert</p>	<p>Program M-16 (Bike Route Improvements) has an illustrated map identifying proposed bike routes. Further study and engagement would occur as part of project implementation. Key concerns are documented as appropriate for consideration in project M-10.</p>
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.	Further study and engagement would occur as part of project implementation. Key concerns are documented as appropriate for consideration in project M-10.
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,	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>ADDITION: Add for consideration on the Boulevard/Zulema workshop page under the D-7 (Oakland Town Center) in the development chapter.</p>
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>	<p>Widening Bates Street is part of PennDOT's plans for the Hazelwood Green. The City does not have authority to change PennDOT's scope.</p> <p>ADDITION: Add concerns about Bates St. widening to "What We Heard" in project M-9.</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	Supportive. No change needed
McKee Place Complete Street	Comment on Justi comment: I might be inclined to agree with you, however, what do you have at stake in this decision	Thank you for your comment
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.	<p>Parking would be removed primarily at corners where it shouldn't be.</p> <p>ADDITION: add language that DOMI will study traffic impacts of the proposed change.</p>
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?	Supportive. No change needed
Centre Avenue & Craig Street Pedestrian Safety and Transit Improvements	looks like some much-needed improvements and is clearly described and illustrated.	Supportive. No change needed
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.	<p>The Oakland Plan Steeting committee, including OPDC, will be engaged as part of the process.</p> <p>ADDITION: Add language about board diversification and importance of a stronger connection with neighborhoods/residents to "What We Heard"</p>
	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 of which ones sooner? [discussion in virtual open house in response]	Thank you for your comment. Timelines are listed under individual projects in the plan. // No change needed
	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	Thank you for your 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]	Thank you for your comment. A large-scale proposal like a rail system would require City-wide vetting.
	When bus lines change due to BRT, how to ensure also meeting other neighborhood bus connectivity needs? [discussion in virtual open house in response]	Relates to PAAC long-range planning. No change needed

Strategy Name	Comment	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]	Recommendation will be part of BRT. No change needed
	Do you have more information on the BRT route? [discussion in virtual open house in response]	This was addressed in one of the plan's virtual open houses
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.	This was addressed in one of the plan's virtual open houses
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.	ADDITION: Add Appropriate details to potential funding sources
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.	ADDITION: Add Language to "What we Heard" and to "Project goals and components."
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	Thank you for your comment
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.	ADDITION: Add Language to Reimagine Bates Street summary.
	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.	ADDITION: Add Language to program M-16 in the "What we Heard" and "Project goals and components."
	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.	ADDITION: Add strategy summary for project and document this request in Project M-30 (Improve City Steps)
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).	FROM THE PLAN: "Consider the above improvements as linked to other proposals seeking to expand the existing hillside trail network in surrounding areas and the trail network to the riverfront. This includes further study and design of the proposed trail from Lawn Street down the Oakcliffe Greenway to the Eliza Furnace Trail and Second Avenue." ADDITION: Add clarifying language to "What We Heard" in Reimagine Bates Street.
Reimagine Bates Street	Please protect Bates Street parklet (southeast corner of Bates/Blvd of the Allies) during PennDOT widening project	ADDITION: Add Language to "what we heard" in project M-9.
Reimagine Bates Street	Eliza Furnace trail access is important	Statement supporting what is in project M-9. No change needed
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.	ADDITION: Add comment to "What We Heard."
Reimagine Bates Street	What is the timeline for Frazier St steps reconstruction?	Thank you for your comment
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.	Language about a direct bike connection is included in the plan. No change needed.
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.	Distinct/separate from Oakland Plan. No change needed.
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.	Juno steps repair is listed in Reimagine Boulevard of the Allies project summary. This has been added to to the Improve City Steps strategy as well.
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.	Thank you for your comment
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)	Supportive. No change needed
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.	Program M-36 (Sidewalk connections and accessibility improvements) notes the need for improvements at this location. // No change needed.
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.	ADDITION: Add Relevant input to "What We Heard" in project M-12. Clarifying information was also provided during the meeting.

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
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.	ADDITION: Add Language to "What We Heard" under project M-12
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.	Thank you for your comment. Mode conflicts are captured by project M-12. // No change needed.
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.	ADDITION: Add language to "What We Heard" under project M-12.
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.	ADDITION: Add language to "What We Heard" under project M-12.
Bike Route Improvements	Are you also looking at dedicated bike signals and turn lanes? [discussion at virtual open house]	ADDITION: Add Language to program M-16 (Bike Route Improvements), and program M-5 (Complete the Fifth Ave Bikeway).
Bus Stop Enhancements	I broadly support Bus Stop Enhancements proposal. BRT also will affect existing bus stops.	Supportive. No change needed
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.	Supportive. No change needed
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.	Program M-27 discusses enforcement. // No Change Needed.
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]	Staff provided response in the meeting. Program M-27 addresses the underlying matter.
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.	Program M-27 references curb management to improve access for people with disabilities. ADDITION: Add language about access for people with disabilities in residential areas as well. The program includes considerations about using side streets for some deliveries as appropriate.
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.	Supportive. No change needed
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.	Program M-31 includes language about enforcement. ADDITION: Add language about conducting studies during representative times to Progam M-31.
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.	Thank you for your comment
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]	ADDITION: Add Language to "What we Heard" in program M-33 (pedestrians safety improvements).
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.	A change of this scale on Forbes Ave would need substantial study and rework. Additionally, it must be vetted before adding it to the Plan. The Oakland Plan aligns with the comment's desire for more pedestrian-friendly spaces. The plan includes repurposing select areas of the right-of-way and considering shared streets.
Sidewalk connections and accessibility improvements	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. Challenged with getting State commitment on dedicated pedestrian all-stops with signals, given high vehicle capacity using routes, especially near off/on ramps. Improved pavement markings and stop bars were implemented. Bigelow Blvd is an example of changes. Multimodal improvements: slowing speeds, pedestrian visibility, accommodating transit, etc. have been and are important.	Thank you for your 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.	Implementation ideas and case study examples are identified in the "Sidewalk Improvement Program for Homeowners" program. Design standards are part of the City ROW Manual.

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
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.	South Craig Street is listed on Traffic Calming map as an area for potential improvements in M-39 (Traffic Calming Corridors). ADDITION: Add Language to "What we Heard" under M-39.
Transportation Demand Management	TDM is important also for lessening pedestrian-vehicle collision risks.	ADDITION: Add Language to "What we heard" in M-40 (TDM)
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.	ADDITION: Add Language to "What we heard" in M-40 (TDM)
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).	ADDITION: Add Language to "What we heard" in M-40 (TDM)
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 to engage institutions, foundations, employers, small businesses, and cultural destinations to create an incentive program to encourage people to try other modes (e.g. transit pass, money to purchase e-bike with tax incentives, etc.). There needs to be a regional TDM collective goal. Consider regional TDM action plan established by SPC, which looks at 10-county region for TDM at broader perspective beyond just downtown and Oakland (look to SPC strategy document).	ADDITION: Add Language to "What we heard" in M-40 (TDM)
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.	This bike connection is located primarily in Uptown/Bluff, though part of it connects into South Oakland. It is listed in both the Bike(+) Plan and the Ecoinnovation District Plan. Language has been added to the "What we heard" section of program M-16 (Bike Route Improvements) to document the community interest at this location bordering or at the very edge of Oakland. Language added to program M-16 also notes consideration of bike connections to South Oakland.
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.	Added note about chute in "what we heard" of Bike Route Improvements strategy summary, and also added language about studying improved connections between the Junction Hollow Trail and Eliza Furnace Trail.
Reimagine Bates Street	It's key to have a bike connection from Bates Street to the Eliza Furnace Trail	A direct bike connection is proposed in the Reimagine Bates Street strategy.
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.	Requests change in PennDOT project scope. PennDOT plans to implement widening as part of their own authority, tied to plan for Hazelwood Green. City does not have authority to change this. Concerns are added to the "what we heard" section of Project M-9.
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.	A direct bike connection is proposed in the Reimagine Bates Street strategy.
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.	Supportive. No changes needed
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.).	Language added to project M-12 "what we heard" section, and language also included in "project goals and components" section for consideration.
Transportation Demand Management	There is not enough in the Plan about reducing car ownership in Oakland	Clarifications have been added to Goal M6A and to Policy M1 - "Fewer trips with only one passenger" that address reduced parking demand by residents. Policy M6 - "Reduce Parking Demand" identifies reducing parking demand among residents. Making policies or goals about vehicle ownership more generally could create policy implications for vehicles owned but not used or stored in Oakland. Preferred language should focus on private vehicle parking and use 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.	Intersection safety is addressed by both program M-33 (pedestrian safety improvements) and M-39 (traffic calming corridors), which captured many community comments from the planning process identifying locations requiring analysis and/or safety improvements. Other programs/projects also do so, such as M-11 (Reimagine Robinson Street) and M-10 (Reimagine Boulevard of the Allies). Additional material illustrating and describing common treatments the City applies as part of pedestrian safety improvements and traffic calming improvements have been added to M-33 and M-39 for clarification. The City regularly monitors its traffic signal systems and intersection design with an eye to safety.
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.	Language has been added to Reimagine Boulevard of the Allies and Reimagine Bates Street that identifies pending details about the bicycle connection along Bates between Boulevard and McKee, cross references between the "Reimagine Bates Street" strategy and the "Reimagine Boulevard of the Allies Strategy," adds language about the Bates and Boulevard intersection, and provides additional context about implementer authorities.

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
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.	Program M-36 (Sidewalk Connections & ADA Improvements) lists trash receptacles in its "what we heard" section and in its project remedy table. Language has been added to the "what we heard" section and "project goals and components" section of M-36 related to scooters and sidewalk obstructions.
Sidewalk connections and accessibility improvements, Partnerships for micromobility solutions	Need clear parking areas for Spin scooters, especially where in heavy use.	Language about scooters and sidewalk management has been added under program M-36 (Sidewalk Connections & ADA Improvements) and in the description of M-32 (Partnerships for Micromobility solutions). Program M-27 (Curbside Management Toolkit) includes references to scooter and micromobility parking zones.
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.	If implemented, program M-31 (Manage On-Street Parking) would study Oakland RPP program subscription levels and help better diagnose the underlying sources of the parking challenges. Language has been added in M-31 for citywide consideration of additional possible policy mechanisms to explore.
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.	This is added to the "what we heard" section of Manage On Street Parking strategy. However, this will not be incorporated into the recommendations of the strategy because it could result in targeting of a specific group (students), running counter to equity principles of the plan.
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.	Create a strategy summary for program M-30 (Improve City Steps) whose recommendations are primarily to implement the City steps plan, and include in the "what we heard" section the specific Oakland steps community members highlighted. Project M-10 (Reimagine Boulevard of the Allies) has existing language that identifies the Juno Street Steps for repair. Project M-1 (Bicycle and pedestrian connection to the riverfront) includes language about the Rock Alley Path. Project M-9 (Reimagine Bates Street) identifies Frazier Street Steps and Rock Alley path. Language has been added to project M-9 to identify the Ayer/Hodge/Mackey steps as being heard in the process and to clarify/reiterate that the Rock Alley Path was an item heard in the process.
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.	Relevant language has been added to the "what we heard" section of project M-12.
Connecting to the North and South Hills	Port Authority needs to continue actively looking for a north-south connection.	Supportive of existing program M-25. No changes needed.
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.	Comment will be noted and added for consideration on the Boulevard/Zulema workshop page that is linked from Development Chapter project D-7: Oakland Town Center.
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.	Comment will be noted and added for consideration on the Boulevard/Zulema workshop page that is linked from Development Chapter project D-7: Oakland Town Center.
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.	Comment will be noted and added for consideration on the Boulevard/Zulema workshop page that is linked from Development Chapter project D-7: Oakland Town Center.
	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.	Comment is unclear. Does this mean underground passages below busy streets? Underground road crossings present significant safety and maintenance issues, can make installation of pedestrian signals more difficult, and would require substantial study and rework that the plan's action team and steering committee review process has not examined sufficiently to add at this late phase of the planning process. The underlying interest the commenter expresses in improving pedestrian and bike+ connectivity and safety at and across the Boulevard is addressed in project proposals.
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.	An underlying element of this statement supports project M-6 "Educate all users about good travel behavior."
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.	An underlying element of this statement supports project M-6 "Educate all users about good travel behavior."
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.	An underlying element of this statement supports project M-6 "Educate all users about good travel behavior."

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
Sidewalk connections and accessibility improvements, Partnerships for micromobility solutions	Scooters! Enforcement!! They are on the sidewalks for days!	Language about scooters and sidewalk management has been added under program M-36 (Sidewalk Connections & ADA Improvements) and in the description of M-32 (Partnerships for Micromobility solutions). Program M-27 (Curbside Management Toolkit) includes references to scooter and micromobility parking zones.
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.	Language about scooters and sidewalk management has been added under program M-36 (Sidewalk Connections & ADA Improvements) and in the description of M-32 (Partnerships for Micromobility solutions). Program M-27 (Curbside Management Toolkit) includes references to scooter and micromobility parking zones.
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?	Language about scooters and sidewalk management has been added under program M-36 (Sidewalk Connections & ADA Improvements) and in the description of M-32 (Partnerships for Micromobility solutions). Program M-27 (Curbside Management Toolkit) includes references to scooter and micromobility parking zones.
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	Language about scooters and sidewalk management has been added under program M-36 (Sidewalk Connections & ADA Improvements) and in the description of M-32 (Partnerships for Micromobility solutions). Program M-27 (Curbside Management Toolkit) includes references to scooter and micromobility parking zones.
Manage on-street parking	Anybody living in Oakland understands that Hybrid would be a disaster for residents.	Program M-31 (Manage On-Street Parking) gives details about the rationale for exploring hybrid parking in RPP zones and the way it could help address some of the on-street parking challenges in Oakland identified during the planning process. Updated language in M-31 identifies some potential citywide policy tools to also consider exploring in the future.
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.	The underlying substance of this comment appears to support the need for significant TDM.
Manage on-street parking	Note that CMU Master Plan calls for many new buildings but "no net new parking"	Statement. No change needed
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.	Consideration was given to this approach, and it was concluded that it will not be incorporated into the Plan, as it would target a specific group (students) and would not meet equity goals.
Manage on-street parking	Enforcement, enforcement, enforcement.	Enforcement is evaluated in program M-31 for parking.
Reimagine Bates Street, Reimagine Boulevard of the Allies	There's no left turn inbound to Bates street.	Language has been added to the "What we heard" section of project M-9. The issue will be examined as part of PennDOT's scope of work.
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.	Comment will be noted and added for consideration on the Boulevard/Zulema workshop page that is linked from Development Chapter project D-7: Oakland Town Center.
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.	Assume closed streets were due to institutional expansion. Topic for Institutional Master Plans as they are updated. No change needed. This comment will be noted and added for consideration on the Boulevard/Zulema workshop page that is linked from Development Chapter project D-7: Oakland Town Center.
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.	Comment will be noted and added for consideration on the Boulevard/Zulema workshop page that is linked from Development Chapter project D-7: Oakland Town Center.
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.	The "Integrated shuttle and transit mobility study" identifies "neighborhood connectivity" as a goal. It does not explicitly endorse a loop since the study results would best determine if that is needed. However, the interest in a loop or resident access to shuttles is registered under "what we heard" of the strategy.
	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 not own a car as it is to own a car. A lot of the existing language in the goals, policies, and programs concerns reducing demand for parking by commuters and visitors, but there needs to be a similar emphasis on reducing demand for residents. I put a comment on the engage page about this.	Clarifications have been added to Goal M6A and to Policy M1 - "Fewer trips with only one passenger" that address the core substance of this comment related to carshare and to reduced parking demand by residents. Policy M6 - "Reduce Parking Demand" identifies reducing parking demand among residents. Making policies or goals about vehicle ownership more generally could create policy implications for vehicles owned but not used or stored in Oakland. Preferred language should focus on private vehicle parking and use in Oakland.

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
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)?	If implemented, program M-31 (Manage On-Street Parking) would study Oakland RPP program subscription levels and better diagnose the underlying sources of the parking challenges. Language has been added in M-31 for citywide consideration of additional possible policy mechanisms to explore. Review has determined that the Oakland Plan will not include address registration for vehicles of all people living in RPP zones. Vehicle registration for an address typically is tied to one's permanent residency. While on its face inserting a car registration policy into the Oakland Plan may appear neutral, its underlying effect could be to target a specific sub-group (e.g. students), which runs counter to the equity principles of the plan.
	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.	This comment is largely repeated from elsewhere. It has been reviewed for consideration and select language has been added to strategies as appropriate.
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?	Some of the concerns raised here relate to citywide changes made to the RPP program and municipal code in 2021 separate from the Oakland Plan. Information responsive to this comment was provided in the public meeting. Program M-31 (Manage On-Street Parking) gives details about the rationale for exploring hybrid parking in RPP zones and the way it could help address some of the on-street parking challenges in Oakland.
	Would you reconsider instances where there was bus stop consolidation as part of this effort	Refer comment to PAAC re: their decision-making about bus stop locations.
Reimagine Robinson Street	Does this limit parking to the one side of Robinson? [Staff provided verbal clarification on the proposal in the meeting]	Staff resolved in meeting. Parking is maintained on both sides of Robinson, per proposal.
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]	Staff resolved in meeting. Traffic light at Fifth is proposed.
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.	There would be further analysis as to which side of the street the Boulevard of the Allies cycle track would be located on, considering which direction tends to receive more traffic. The current proposal for a cycle track on the north side of the Boulevard is based on the available info as of now. The strategy (M-10) states that further community engagement and analysis will be required to finalize the cycle track alignment. Staff provided a similar response in the meeting.
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??	Staff provided detailed responses in the meeting and information can be found in the municipal code.
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.	Staff have inquired about the Parking Enhancement District for the South Side as an example to review and study for lessons learned, as the proposal for Oakland is explored further. The Oakland Plan proposal does not immediately implement a hybrid zone, but provides it as a suggestion, and identifies further areas of research and analysis, and more community process would be part of future steps. Staff provided a similar response in the meeting.
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.	The TDM measures are meant to serve both residents and commuters traveling in/to Oakland. The BRT is meant to lessen the need for parking in the neighborhood with more people taking BRT and less people driving in private cars. Staff provided a similar response in the meeting. Additionally, it should be noted that with BRT, it will be more costly to park in Oakland and take bus downtown than to drive and park downtown.
Manage on-street parking	but enforcement of parking is only one with one or two circuits around the neighborhood right now. will that change>	The Plan recommends that the RPP areas be Hybrid, but the only way that can be changed is through separate legislation, which would include its own public process beforehand. More information about enforcement revenue is in Program M-31 (Manage On-Street Parking).
Manage on-street parking	We saw how successful that public process was for getting us the new RPP ordinance....she said sarcastically...	Program M-31 (Manage On Street Parking) has language added highlighting the need for public process / community outreach as part of implementation.

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	<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 ? 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>The Greater Hill District Master Plan is currently undergoing an Update as a separate process from the Oakland Plan.</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>Supportive of project M-4 (Centre/Craig safety improvements). Concerned re: sightlines and parking at the Dollar Way/Centre location, which is identified within a corridor area for traffic calming (M-39) and for pedestrian safety improvements (M-33). Language about sightlines and about Dollar and Centre location has been added to "what we heard" section of M-33. Direct response with constituent may be needed to direct them to share photos with 311.</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>Underground road crossings tend to present significant safety and maintenance issues, can make installation of pedestrian signals more difficult, and they would require substantial study and rework that the plan's action team and steering committee review process has not examined sufficiently. The underlying interest the commenter expresses in improving pedestrian and bike+ connectivity and safety at and across the Boulevard is addressed in project proposals.</p>
	<p>Instead of completely closing Zulema, what about reducing it in size?</p>	<p>Comment will be noted and added for consideration on the Boulevard/Zulema workshop page that is linked from Development Chapter project D-7: Oakland Town Center.</p>
M-14, Address enforcement biases	<p>Work with subject experts might be the approach.</p>	<p>This comment is largely addressed by the program's recommendation to work with university faculty. Clarifying language has been added about "subject experts."</p>
M-15, all-weather walkability	<p>What role would the university have in this other than volunteer support?</p>	<p>The project is to start in 5-10 years and more details will be defined in the lead-up to its implementation. While the university's role would need to be defined through those future conversations, some potential examples might include: fulfilling relevant IMP commitments and property owner responsibilities, organizing volunteers, and directing maintenance staff to perform snow shoveling services at non-university properties neighboring campus buildings in specific cases where property owners face significant constraints on performing their duties. Institutions are also listed as a potential funding source, which would require further discussion.</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>	<p>Proposed routes and relevant analysis of land ownership and potential easements/acquisitions needs to be studied further. Upon implementation, the City would discuss land acquisition and easement issues with affected property owners, if any.</p>
M-16, bike route improvements	<p>Good program to support and create greater bicycling connections within the neighborhood.</p>	<p>Supportive. No change needed.</p>
M-17, build transportation planning capacity	<p>This works and should be made to work even better by connecting to peoples needs.</p>	<p>Supportive. No change needed.</p>
M-2, Build up OTMA	<p>This is a very good goal to tie into other goals like environmental and community.</p>	<p>Supportive. No change needed.</p>
M-19, Bus stop enhancements	<p>Good program to support transit and provide needed amenities within the neighborhood.</p>	<p>Supportive. No change needed.</p>
M-3, Central Oakland and Pitt bicycle connection	<p>Good project to create greater bicycling connections within the neighborhood.</p>	<p>Supportive. No change needed.</p>

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
M-4, Centre Avenue and Craig Street peestrain and transit safety improvements	Project is needed at this challenging intersection. Use of green infrastrutre area seems out of place on the western side of the street. Possibility to explore other practices that could be implamented on more of the street than just that one side.	There is no alternative location where green infrastructure could feasibly have the space to be installed at the intersection, due to a bus stop and the roadway configuration at the other corners. The green infrastructure would occupy a space that is already a no-parking zone anyway, and its presence would provide multiple benefits. No change.
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.	Updated language has been provided to provide some further clarification about what this program entails.
M-5, Complete the Fifth Avenue bikeway	Good project to create greater bicycling connections within the neighborhood and into other neighborhoods.	Supportive. No change needed.
M-21, Connecting east-west within the city	Good program to support and create greater transit connections.	Supportive. No change needed.
M-22, Connecting to eastern corridor growth	Good program to support and create greater transit connections.	Supportive. No change needed.
M-23, Connecting to regional and national transportation	Good program to support and create greater transit connections.	Supportive. No change needed.
M-24, Connectin go thte Mon valley communities	Good program to support and create greater transit connections.	Supportive. No change needed.
M-25, Connecting to the North and South Hills	Good program to support and create greater transit connections.	Supportive. No change needed.
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.	Program M-27 includes language describing how curbside management tools would be applied to neighborhood/residential areas. Some clarifying language updates have been made to the program description and summary sheet.
M-28, Eliminate obstructions to improve accessibility	Good program to support and promote greater accessibility.	Supportive. No change needed.
M-29, Enforce sidewalk standards	Good program to support and promote greater accessibility.	Supportive. No change needed.
M-30, Improve city steps	Good program to support and promote greater accessibility.	Supportive. No change needed.
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 volumns for making this a one way instead of a two way street? How would it effect people currenty 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?	Language has been added clarifying that DOMI will study the traffic impacts of the proposed change. The project currently accounts for key driveway entrances in its concept design, and any implementation of the project would require further analysis of traffic and the physical space, which would entail a review of driveway entrances. The project also encourages engagement with affected property owners and the community.
M-32, Partnerships for micromobility solutions	Good program to engage stakeholders in mobility related issues.	Supportive. No change needed.
M-33, Pedestrian safety improvements	Good program to create greater pedestrian safety throughout the neighborhood.	Supportive. No change needed.
M-34, Performance-based parking	How is a performance based parking defined?	Performance-based parking is defined in the strategy summary.
M-35, Reduce curb cut creation	Good program to support and promote greater accessibility and safety.	Supportive. No change needed.
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?	Due to PennDOT ownership of its portion of Bates Street, the Oakland Plan has focused on identifying community interests and concerns related to PennDOT's widening project so public agencies can communicate those to PennDOT. Along Bates north of Boulevard of the Allies, a bicycle connection between Boulevard and McKee is proposed, but further study is needed to define that more clearly. Additional language has been included in project M-9.
M-10, Reimagine Blvd of the Allies	Good project that will help adress safety along this corridor.	Supportive. No change needed.
M-11, Reimagine Robinson Street	Good project that will help adress safety along this corridor.	Supportive. No change needed.
M-12, Safe multimodal connection from Fifth avenue to the Junction Hollow Trail	Good project that will help adress safety along this corridor.	Supportive. No change needed.
M-36, Sidewalk connections and accessibility improvements	Good program to support and promote greater accessibility and safety.	Supportive. No change needed.
M-37, Sidewalk improvement program for homeowners	Good program to support and promote greater accessibility and safety.	Supportive. No change needed.
M-38, Support frontline and shift workers	Good program that aligns with other mobility related recommendations.	Supportive. No change needed.
M-39, Traffic calming corridors	Good program that helps create a safer pedestrian environment.	Supportive. No change needed.
M-13, Transit parking offset	Who would be responsible for providing passes and incurring the cost?	This project may be part of subsequent zoning code changes and/or part of the yet-to-be-implemented DOMI Mobility Trust Fund. It would be a mechanism for reducing parking requirements. The details will be explored further as part of implementation. Note that Program M-40 (Transportation Demand Management) calls for providing City resources for verification and compliance review of developer programs over the long-term.
M-18, Transit pass purchasing	Many Institutions in Oakland already have transit insentivized for students, faculity, and staff. While this is a good program, what are the mechanisims to get private entities onboard.	PAAC is actively working to develop and engage customers in transit pass programs that work for a variety and scale of organizations. Partnership building and information-sharing as part program M-40 (Transportation Demand Management) would demonstrate the value of TDM to private entities.

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
M-40, transportation demand management program	<p>OTMA already doing this to some extent and this seems like a duplication of other recommendations.</p>	Thank you for your comment. In the existing Neighborhood Plan Guide framework, Transportation Demand Management (TDM) encompasses many other topics addressed by the guide. TDM is included with transit because the planning process identified transit as the primary mode of choice to reduce single-occupancy vehicle trips but should be reviewed further in the context of other topics.
M-41, Walking is healthy informational campaign	<p>Good program to help promote health and support better pedestrian systems Oakland-wide.</p>	Supportive. No change needed.
	<p>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</p>	Some degree of overlap/redundancy in service between private shuttles and public transit was identified during the planning process during existing conditions research and it is one among multiple factors informing the need for project M-7 (Integrated shuttle and transit mobility study). M-7 also identifies other items of research that extend beyond only the potential replacement of shuttles or combining of shuttles. M-7 is located within the Mobility Chapter and identifies implementers and partners that work on mobility/transportation issues.
	<p>Enforce RPP, no hybrid. This will not help us, will allow parking.</p>	If implemented, program M-31 (Manage On-Street Parking) would help diagnose the underlying sources of the parking challenges. Program M-31 gives details about the rationale for exploring hybrid parking in RPP zones and the way it could help address some of the on-street parking challenges in Oakland identified during the planning process. Language has been added in M-31 for citywide consideration of additional possible policy mechanisms to explore.
	<p>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.</p>	There may not be a perfect topic under which to list Transportation Demand Management within the existing framework of the Neighborhood Plan Guide (NPG). There are several cross-cutting themes between the topics. Arguably, Transportation Demand Management subsumes multiple other topics of the NPG. Transit has been framed during the Oakland planning process as the primary mode of choice (and therefore one could argue the leading alternative mode) to reduce single-occupancy vehicle trips. Goal M1.C -- "Transit is a mode of choice" identifies buses as the "safest, most comfortable, and enjoyable way to get where you’re going" and the policy "M1. Fewer trips with only one passenger" highlights this core goal of TDM. These are just a few examples of how the elements of TDM make up significant parts of the plan. While there may not be one overarching topic or goal titled "TDM," there is a layered set of goals, policies and strategies that serve to advance TDM throughout the Plan, in addition to the specific TDM program (M-40). This TDM program (M-40) specifies explicitly the importance of linking Development and Community considerations to TDM. That being said, we acknowledge that the Neighborhood Plan Guide's framework of topics merits further review.
	<p>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).</p>	This comment largely repeats the comments above or responded to elsewhere.
	<p>Transportation Demand Management (TDM): Second, public transit options must be strengthened – both intra- and inter-neighborhood routes (more on these strategies below).</p>	This comment appears largely supportive of the plan, as intra-neighborhood routes are addressed by project M-7 (Integrated Shuttle & Transit Mobility Study), and inter-neighborhood routes are covered in other strategies such as M-21, M-22, M-23, M-24 and M-25.
	<p>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.</p>	Language re: concerns about shuttles has been added to the "what we heard" section for project M-7 (Integrated Shuttle & Transit Mobility Study). Goal M1.A. recognizes that both public transit and institutional shuttles play a role in Oakland's economic development and the life of its residents, both of which are key values identified in the planning process. Students served by the shuttles are among the residents of Oakland. The concerns raised in the comment are best examined through the in-depth study outlined in project M-7, and this study is first necessary in order to detail the appropriate balance between shuttles and transit; M-7 also plans to "examine the feasibility of shuttle use by Oakland residents and visitors who are not affiliated with institutions where gaps occur." Goal M1A and project M-7 therefore strike a balance among multiple constituencies and among values expressed during the planning process, and outline steps for further study.

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	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.	Comment is repeated from above. see response above.
	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.	Intra-neighborhood connectivity is something addressed within project M-7 (Integrated Shuttle & Transit Mobility Study). Select details have been added to the "what we heard" section of project M-7.
	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.	The policies "rapid transit access" and "local transit access" under Transit Service & Stations have been clarified per PAAC. PAAC's NEXTransit plan also recommends studying potential transit upgrades on Second Ave from Downtown to Hazelwood and linking to the Downtown-Uptown-Oakland-East End BRT.
	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.	supportive of 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.	Select language has been added to the "what we heard" section for the transit/shuttle study strategy
	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.	No change needed. supportive of plan. pedestrian safety is addressed as separate strategy from bike routes improvement strategy, which should address comment.
	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.	Relevant language has been added to the "what we heard" section of project M-12. The project components recommend DOMI convene and engage stakeholders and community groups during the remaining design process. DOMI has indicated geotechnical and budgetary concerns are major factors in final design decisions.
	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.	Supportive of Project M-4. No change needed. Program M-33 (Pedestrian Safety Improvements) identifies Neville/Fifth and Craig/Fifth for consideration when doing improvements, and project M-16 (Bike Route Improvements) in its map identifies this corridor (including those intersections) for bike infrastructure improvements.
	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.	Language has been added to Project M-8. DOMI will study the traffic impacts of the proposed change.
	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.	The connection between S. Neville and Centre Ave is captured in program M-16 (bike route improvements).
	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).	M-30 (Improve City Steps) has had a strategy summary created and language has been added to the strategy summary documenting this request. Language has also added to the "What we heard" section of project M-9 (Reimagine Bates Street). Project M-10 (Reimagine Blvd of the Allies) includes repair of the Juno Street Steps as a recommendation.
	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.	Program M-36 (Sidewalk Connections & ADA Improvements) lists trash receptacles in its "what we heard" section and in its project remedy table. Additional relevant language has been added to the "what we heard" section.
	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.	Policy M6 "Off-site parking" language has been clarified. A reduction in parking demand is advanced by multiple tenets of the Plan. For example, Goal M6A includes language calling for "the minimum space dedicated to parked vehicles" and Policy M6 - "Reduce Parking Demand" calls for reducing parking for residential, visitor, and commuter purposes.

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	<p>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>	<p>Policy M6 "Off-site parking" language has been clarified. The Plan tackles parking and single occupancy vehicle trips at multiple levels, including with TDM (program M-40); one interim approach that is grounded in best practices research and responds to underlying community concerns about limited on-street parking availability heard during the planning process is to take steps detailed in programs such as M-31, that are likely to redirect some vehicles from on-street parking to off-street parking. Goal M6B "Transition Parking" calls for actions that will allow for transitioning parking structures into other non-auto uses in the future.</p>
	<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> <p>oThe city could and should consider reducing the number of permits allowed per housing unit in Oakland.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>oThe city likewise could and should consider restricting eligibility for permits to cars registered to addresses within the RPPP area.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>The comment, "Residents of buildings that provide off-street parking spaces should not be eligible for RPPP permits" would present policy complications when it comes to, in a fair manner, trying to make determinations about what constitutes sufficient off-street parking spaces across dfferent homes and households. For example, fairness issues would complicate an attempt to define what counts as sufficient off-street parking, given the diverse array of household types who have differing interests related to vehicles and parking and have differential levels of access to off-street parking. The comment has been considered but is not incorporated as a recommendation in the Oakland Plan. The other elements of this set of comments are repeated elsewhere in this comment table and have responses above/below.</p>
	<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>Project M-10 (Reimagine Boulevard of the Allies) has had language added to reference the Oakland Town Center scenarios of the Development Chapter, and some language has been added in the "what we heard" section of Project M-10. Note that program M-39 (Traffic calming strategies) identifies the need for specializied traffic calming analysis along lengthy stretches of Boulevard of the Allies including at the intersections referenced, and program M-33 (Pedestrian safety improvements) identifies the intersections of Boulevard and Bates and Bates and Zulema for potential consideration.</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>Project M-7 (Integrated Shuttle and Transit Mobility Study) will examine neighborhood connectivity. It also includes in its "what we heard" section that some seniors from South Oakland are concerned about lack of transit connectivity to other parts of Oakland and lengthy walks involved.</p>
	<p>In response to Carol I comment: 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>Comment reiterates previous comment. See response above.</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>Requests shuttles be prohibited on neighborhood streets and/or shuttles should allow all residents (regardless of institutional affiliation) to use them. Project M-7: Integrated Shuttle and Transit Mobility Study will analyze and provide recommendations related to shuttles and public transit in Oakland. Additions are made to the "What We Heard" section of Project M-7.</p>
	<p>In response to KathyG comment: I agree, more (free or at least affordable) access to one shuttle system would be very helpful!</p>	<p>Requests shuttles be prohibited on neighborhood streets and/or shuttles should allow all residents (regardless of institutional affiliation) to use them. Project M-7: Integrated Shuttle and Transit Mobility Study will analyze and provide recommendations related to shuttles and public transit in Oakland. Additions are made to the "What We Heard" section of Project M-7.</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>Relevant language has been added to the "What We Heard" section of Program M-33 (Pedestrian Safety Improvements). Dithridge at Centre and Dithridge at Bayard are designated for potential pedestrian safety improvements on the Pedestrian Safety Improvements map, where they are identified under possible corridor and intersection improvements, respectively.</p>
	<p>When describing commercial corridors OBID suggests the following phrase:</p> <p>Vibrant commercial and innovation corridors</p>	<p>When the plan is merely trying to identify areas, for clarity purposes the Plan chooses to be simple and descriptive in using the term "commercial corridors." There may be other locations in the Plan where qualitative modifiers could be considered, if appropriate. For example, "Vibrant commercial corridors" is listed as the language in Development Goal D5A.</p>

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	In response to Georgia Petropoulos comment: 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.	Statement not directly related to plan language. No change made.
	OBID is suggesting the following edit to the goal listed under M6 Parking/ M6.B Transition Parking: 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.	This language amendment is not appropriate for a goal which should be implementable by many actions. The content of this recommendation is covered by multiple specific strategies already. No changes made.
	In response to Georgia Petropoulos comment: 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.	There are select examples around the US and in other countries where parking garages have been converted to alternative uses, such as office, housing, hotel, small business hub, artist studio, or other spaces. This can be more feasible when designed and built with that flexibility in mind from the beginning.
	In response to Georgia Petropoulos comment: 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.	The Oakland Plan accounts for parking demand while also working to propel a shift towards alternative travel modes that can affect mode share. While the Pitt IMP accounts for expected changes to the mobility system of Oakland in its analysis, changes in the Oakland Plan not accounted for in the Pitt IMP may also affect outcomes. Pitt is one of many stakeholders in Oakland.
	The Pittsburgh Innovation District suggests the following alterations to the Goals of the Mobility Chapter: (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.	This language amendment is not appropriate for a goal which should be implementable by many actions. The content of this recommendation is covered by multiple specific strategies already. No changes made.
	In response to mmadden comment: 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.	repeat comment. see response to the same comment earlier in table.
	The Pittsburgh Innovation District suggests the following alterations to the Programs of the Mobility Chapter: (edited) M-18. Transit pass purchasing 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. When to start: 3-5 yearsProject lead(s): PAACProject partner(s): institutions, major employers, OBID, OTMAPotential funding source(s): Institutions	The intent is to create a program that allows transit pass purchases at a discount. The source of the funding is not a component and limiting it only to developers is inconsistent with the initial statement about it being available to employers, developers, and other organizations. No change made.
	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.	repeat comment. see response to the same comment earlier in table.
	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.	Students are valued members of the Oakland community and should be treated respectfully in the planning process. The diverse interests of students form an important part of the Oakland Plan, and students were identified as an underrepresented / marginalized group in the Plan's Equity Strategy. Students served by the shuttles are among the residents of Oakland. The concerns raised in the comment are best examined through the study outlined in project M-7, which will explore concerns around intra-neighborhood connectivity. M-7 also plans to "examine the feasibility of shuttle use by Oakland residents and visitors who are not affiliated with institutions where gaps occur."
	In response to Read_This_Please comment: 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.	Project M-7 will explore concerns around intra-neighborhood connectivity. Project M-27 (Curbside management toolkit) recommends an inventory of curbside spaces to strategically locate pick-up/drop-off locations and other adjustments to curbside space at relevant locations. Paratransit service (ACCESS) is also available to individuals who have mobility impairments.
	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 and 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.	Stacked parking ultimately would depend on a private developer pursuing it. There is a case where this has happened in the City. It should be noted that this is a very expensive parking option and therefore would need to be viable to private developers. There are opportunities the Plan recommends to more efficiently use existing off-site parking and generally to try to reduce parking demand.

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	<p>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</p>	<p>The Oakland Plan process didn't explore the full elimination of parking minimums with community stakeholders, but a 50 percent reduction in minimums will push Oakland towards a mode shift. In the meantime, the plan will consider parking demand and car use</p> <p>A mobility improvement trust will strengthen funding for alternative transportation options. The trust will be funded by in-lieu payments from developments that don't meet parking minimums.</p> <p>Project M-13 (Transit Parking Offset) provides another option for reducing parking in developments. Future zoning changes and/or the implementation of the DOMI Mobility Trust Fund will explore this option.</p> <p>The Plan's zoning code hanges reference the DOMI mobility improvement trust. This is outlined below: Traditionally, developers have been responsible for constructing and installing improvements in the public right-of-way (ROW) needed to support their development or mitigate transportation impacts. This system does not offer a way to contribute to broader mobility improvements that could improve access to the site and community.</p> <p>The DOMI Mobility Trust Fund allows developers to pay a fee in lieu of providing parking spaces required by zoning ordinances. For instance, if a development calls for 52 spaces, and the developer wants to provide 49, they will pay into the fund for the 3 spaces that they are not providing. This revenue is used to fund mobility projects in the same neighborhood where the funds were gathered. Through the</p>
	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.	A 50 percent reduction in minimums will push Oakland towards a mode shift. In the meantime, the plan will consider parking demand and car use
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???	This comment is taken under consideration. The specific measures installed to protect bike lanes, where appropriate, need to consider the specific context of the roadway where installation is occurring. Flex posts costs less and are a way to test geometry and design of safety improvements before committing to permanent bollards. Budgetary constraints shaped by City and institutional funding commitments shape available options. The graphics in the project alternatives show a vertical barrier and leave room for more study/design as to the precise bollard type. The project has a 5-10 year timeline because of other anticipated construction by institutions, which will heavily impact the affected streets for multiple years.
McKee Place complete street	more raised crossings across McKee would slow one way traffic and reduce right hook pedestrian/bike crashe	A design and engineering study necessary for implementing the Plan will review best practices for ways to slow traffic and minimize safety and mode conflict risks. Other parts of the Plan identify raised intersection crossings as one of many tools, and it could be considered for the McKee Place Complete Street project during a design study.

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
Reimagine Boulevard of the Allies	<p>I am a parishioner at St. George Orthodox Cathedral, which 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 lines 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 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 typical 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 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>	<p>Conversation held, clarifications provided. The Church would like to be consulted during the design process.</p> <p>ADDITION: Add language to "what we heard" under project M-10 (Reimagine Boulevard of the Allies) and to the project goals and components section.</p>
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>	<p>These suggestions and the needs voiced are carefully considered in Project M-11 (Reimagine Robinson Street) and account for an array of Robinson St. comments.</p> <p>ADDITION: Add language has to M-11 about how street trees in the verge could help prevent cars from parking on sidewalks, as well as more clarifying language related to curb heights.</p>
Bus stop enhancements	please increase the number of buses on the 64 route	This route is outside of Oakland and does not serve Oakland, so it falls outside of the scope of this specific neighborhood plan. Comment will be referred to PAAC for consideration separate from Oakland Plan.
Transit oriented deveopment and commercial corridors and nodes	Vibrant commercial AND INNOVATION corridors	The name of the topic was established by the Neighborhood Plan Guide. Goal D5A captures the title "vibrant commercial 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 and circulation between buildings can be efficiently reprogrammed for non-auto uses. DEVELOPRES THAT PROVIDE LESS SPACES THAN REQUIRED BY ZONING ARE ABLE TO PAY FOR PARKING LATERNATIVES SUCH AS BUS PASSES OR INTO A MULTIMODAL SUPPOT FUND.	This language amendment is not appropriate for a goal which should be implementable by many actions. The content of this recommendation is covered by multiple strategies
	When Anderson Bridge is finally rebuilt, add a pedestrian/bike path from Parkview elevation down into Junction Hollow.	M-10 (Reimagine Blvd of the Allies) has existing language about the Juno steps. The program M-30 (Improve City Steps) has had language added to include Juno Street Steps repair as an item heard/requested from the community. Program M-30 has existing language recommending bike runnels on City step projects.

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	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.	<p>Policy M6 - "surface parking" reads "Surface parking. Prohibit all new surface parking lots and paving of yards and other landscaped areas to serve as parking. Systematically eliminate illegal paved surface parking in residential areas."</p> <p>If there are specific site concerns, please call 311. Program M-31 (Manage On-Street Parking) details the rationale for exploring hybrid parking in RPP zones and the way it could help address some on-street parking challenges in Oakland.</p>
M-16	PID would like to be included as Implementor	ADDITION: add as implementing partner
M-17	PID would like to be included as Implementor	ADDITION: add as implementing partner
M-7	PID would like to be included as Implementor	ADDITION: add as implementing partner
M-15	How will this be paid?	The program lists the following potential funding sources: City Capital Budget, institutions, grants. Additional details beyond this need to be explored as part of implementation conversations. Further discussion may be warranted with institutions to clarify their role.
M-20	There is confusion around this - please provide more detail as to how this program will work.	Language describing the program and the program name has been updated to provide additional clarity about its intent and scope. Full scope details would need to be worked out as part of Plan implementation.
M-25	What are Oakland institutions listed? Are they expected to financially support this? They have expressed concerns for this.	This is connected to and supporting relevant PAAC's NEXTransit projects, which are hyperlinked. Oakland institutions are listed as partners for coordination purposes so that improved transit service may consider up to date information about employee commuters' travel time and frequency. For example, Pitt's IMP has a strategy to coordinate with PAAC on an ongoing basis to improve transit access to campus. The Oakland Plan identifies funding sources as PAAC at this time. Further discussion can be had with institutions if needed.
M-26	How is this above current requirements? This seems unnecessary and looks like an extra unnecessary burden.	There is not currently a formalized and robust construction coordination program that meets all the elements outlined in M-26. Implementing this could be beneficial to all entities involved, including developers, owners, construction contractors, community members, businesses, and other community stakeholders. Making the program a requirement, rather than an optional service, recognizes that the benefits of improved construction coordination more than make up for the burdens of implementing it. OTMA's role in helping implementing this program could become more robust as its capacities grow as outlined by project M-2 (Build up OTMA).
M-7	This section needs much further discussion. Why are institutions listed as funder?? Line 1 should be its own goal.	<p>The study was discussed during the planning process, institutions were contacted about it, and there was discussion about it during the Steering Committee work session period.</p> <p>There has been stakeholder interest in the study. For example, Pitt's Institutional Master Plan (IMP) expresses a commitment to partnering with public agencies and community groups on a transit and shuttle study.</p> <p>Goal M1.A (Maximize the value of shuttles and transit) ties into this study. The goal states "Public and institutional transportation services are part of an efficient system that serves both economic development and resident needs." Further discussion will be had if new issues arise, but we are confident in the outlined scope.</p>
M-10	This should include OBID	Added as implementing partner.
M-29	This should be ALL owners including residential	ADDITION: Add clarifying language to all property owners while accommodating that fact that program M-37 proposes City financial support for select qualifying homeowners and property owners.
M-33	This is low hanging fruit that can be achieved quickly and we should move the implementation timeframe to 1 - 2 years	Implementation time frames of "when to start" depend on the project and location, but existing language in the strategy summary of M-33 (Pedestrian safety improvements) shows many locations are identified for 0-2 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.	<p>Program M-27 (Curbside management toolkit) addresses how to balance curbside needs, including small business owners and other users.</p> <p>Existing language in program M-40 (Transportation demand management) states "Consider a waiver or reduction of the commercial parking tax for institutions to open their garages to residents and visitors."</p>

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
M-13	This is vague	This project may be part of later zoning code changes and/or part of the future DOMI Mobility Trust Fund. It would be a mechanism for reducing parking requirements. The details will be explored further as part of implementation.
Community building events	<p>In response to wwilson comment: 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>	<p>Project M-7: Integrated Shuttle and Transit Mobility Study will analyze and provide recommendations related to shuttles and intra-neighborhood connectivity of public transit in Oakland.</p> <p>ADDITION: Add Language to "What We Heard" under Project M-7.</p>
	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	ADDITION: Add clarifying language to program M-31 (Manage On Street Parking) to describe the expected impact of the change on parking availability and enforcement. There have been concerns raised during the planning process about visitors/non-residents parking in the RPP district. Currently, there is no price on parking to discourage them from doing so, and limited means of enforcement after the parking duration cap. If program M-31 is implemented, it would add a price to discourage such visitor parking.
	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.	Thank you for your comment
	<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>	Specific incidents of bad behavior by travel users of any mode should be addressed in the moment as an enforcement issue. The project "Educate all users about good travel behavior" (M-6), updated language for program M-32 "Partnerships for micromobility solutions," and programs focused on pedestrian safety (M-33) and sidewalk connections and accessibility (such as M-36) aim to improve accessibility and address some of the concerns raised about safety and obstruction issues on sidewalks. Bike infrastructure is designed so pedestrians and cyclists can safely share the right of way when users follow rules of the road and right of way.
	M-7 - seems like 2 different studies. See SJ - OBID Working Group Meeting	Project M-7 involves a study of both shuttles and public transit services because the project is focused on how in combination these services can best serve Oakland.
	concerned that Walnut Capital can cite an agreement with Gainey and close Zulema Street.	<p></p> <p>This refers to potential actions taken outside of the Oakland Plan.</p>
	I would like to see large, separate bike lanes connecting most streets in Oakland, even if this means reducing street parking.	This comment supports multiple Plan recommendations. Expanding the bike network is an important part of the Oakland Plan, identified in multiple parts of the plan, including Program M-16 (Bike Route Improvements) and in its goals and policies.

Infrastructure

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	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.	CHANGE: Clarify Locally-Grown means 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.	During project development, often plants are regionally sourced for ROW projects. The Robinson Street project also has mobility components available for review here: https://engage.pittsburghpa.gov/oakland/strategy-reimagine-robinson-street
	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.	Supportive. No Change.
	I'm liking the plans so far. Interested to dig deeper and see what other community input is.	Supportive. No Change.
	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.	Supportive. No Change.
	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.	Thank you for your comment
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.	Thank you for your comment
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!	Supportive. No Change.
	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.	ADDITION: Add bird-safe glazing to Development chapter strategy D-2 (Design guidelines).
	I5 should make mention of PLANS to maintain an increasing tree canopy in Oakland. Simply "ensuring retention efforts" won't do.	I5.C (Value trees as infrastructure) identifies the importance of collaboration in tree maintenance “to support their continued health and function”
	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.	Community gardens were discussed as part of large-scale developments and other open spaces. Oakland Place could also be a location for a community garden, but the bigger discussion point here is the need for volunteers. The primary goal is to take care of the existing community gardens before adding more, and this can be accomplished by creating a network for volunteer opportunities.
	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. 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.	Supportive. No Change.
	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. 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.	Supportive. No Change.
	I am excited by goal I8—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.	Supportive. No Change.
	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.	Supportive. No Change.
	I have planted several trees already in Oakland and I would love to see an expansion of the tree canopy. It can has 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. I support the comprehensive electric vehicle strategy! My community recently installed a electric vehicle solar station and it added a great resource to our community!	Supportive. No Change.

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	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!	Supportive. No Change.
	"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 "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. "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. "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. "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. "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. I-1 - DC fast charging costs will probably be lower if they are sited next to substations. 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 to ensure *now* is the time to try that, rather than in a few years when electricity emissions are cleaner. Separately - help HOAs in old buildings with radiators switch too. 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.	1. Supportive 2. Proposed Zoning could lead to this type of requirement for apartments 3. Supportive 4. I-17 identifies student Climate Corps. 5. ADDITION: Add a note to “What We Heard” about rooftop gardens 6. Thank you for your comment 7. Thank you for your comment 8. I-5 (Energy strategy) includes residential components
Energy strategy		C-PACE is expanding to multifamily buildings which will hopefully lead to further energy improvements in residential buildings.
Encourage More Community Gardens	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. 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. 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.	Community gardens were discussed as part of large-scale developments and other open spaces. Oakland Place could also be a location for a community garden, but the bigger discussion point here is the need for volunteers. The primary goal is to take care of the existing community gardens before adding more, and this can be accomplished by creating a network for volunteer opportunities. ADDITION: Add reference in “What We Heard” to relocating Plant2Plate garden and rooftop gardens as well as hydroponic/aquaponic systems
Green street network	i don't like green plants on my grey sidewalks. it would destroy the urban look	Thank you for your comment
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.	Supportive. No Change.
	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.	Thank you for your comment. Waste disposal was not discussed in Action Team or Steering Committee meetings. There are no changes proposed in the plan, but this could be discussed in another process enacted on a citywide scale.
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 projects 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.	ADDITION: Add note on coordination to 4th bulletpoint in "What We Heard"
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.	Nonprofits such as Tree Pittsburgh don't regulate development. The City is reviewing citywide codes to potentially update steep slope and hillside codes.

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
I-05, Energy strategy	The 2030 District is already working on this. What more are expected from the implementers?	The Energy Strategy addresses how Oakland can clean the grid and improve energy efficiency across all building types rather than just institutions. Institutions are identified in the funding strategy and results/commitments have not been determined yet.
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.	The EMI is not included in the current/proposed Zoning Proposals and the IMP addresses energy goals
I-12, Open Space expansion	Open space goals are in IMPs. Would this apply to EMI zoning districts?	The EMI is not included in the current/proposed Zoning Proposals and the IMP addresses this
I-16, Bates basin sustainable renovation	For new greenway trails and restoratoin of forest pathways, Landforce would be a good partner organization.	ADDITION: Add to implementation table
I-19, Comprehensive tree strategy	Should this also include forest restoration?	Yes, forests are considered Open Space.
I-21, Establish pollinator conversion programs	Past efforts to de-lawn should be taken into consideration on future projects.	Thank you for your comment
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.	Yes, What we heard notes expanding existing models/programs amongst the universities.
	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	The Plan aligns with existing IMPs on the first two bullet points. Also, this is addressed in Goal D2.A (High-performing buildings) and strategies D-9 & D-10
	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.	Supportive.
	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.	Agreed. The city is working to generate a citywide map for this.
	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	Mackey Street is not an alley and redirecting water into St. James Place could be detrimental to buildings along the private way. The bike and pedestrian components of the Rock Alley projects are referenced in the Mobility chapter. Also, strategy I-10 (Greenway Expansion) suggests incorporating tree retention and hillside stabilization in the Lawn Street Greenway.
	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?	De-pave is defined as removing impervious surfaces. Also, stormwater fees will offer credits for owners who manage stormwater on their property
	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.	Supportive.
	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.	Supportive.
	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?	Community gardens were discussed as part of large-scale developments and other open spaces. Oakland Place could also be a location for a community garden, but the bigger discussion point here is the need for volunteers. The primary goal is to take care of the existing community gardens before adding more, and this can be accomplished by creating a network for volunteer opportunities.
	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.	ADDITION: Add to what we heard in I-20. Encourage more community gardens

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	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.	ADDITION: Add to what we heard in I-20. Encourage more community gardens
	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.	The Energy Strategy addresses how Oakland can clean the grid and improve energy efficiency across all building types rather than just institutions. Institutions are identified in the funding strategy and results/commitments have not been determined yet.
	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.	Thank you for your comment
	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 Strategy will include recommendations for this.
	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.	Thank you for your comment. This was not discussed during Action Team process or with the Steering Committee. // No change needed
	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.	Thank you for your comment. This was not discussed during Action Team process or with the Steering Committee. // No change needed
	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.	Thank you for your comment. I-26 (Reduce student landfill waste) identifies some of these issues // No change needed.
	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.	The Land Use Strategy identifies areas throughout Oakland for increased density to reduce negative externalities like waste management. In general, these comments were not discussed with the Action Teams and the Steering Committee but could be discussed with neighborhood organizations during implementation. // No Change Needed
	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.	ADDITION: add "Incentive programs for landlords to accommodate cardboard recycling stations on their properties may be another opportunity." to “What We Heard” under student landfill waste
	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).	ADDITION: add to "What We Heard" under student landfill waste
	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.	Thank you for your comment. The Plan addresses this under program I-28 (Support and expand compost efforts) // No Change Needed
	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.	Previously addressed.
	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	Maintenance of and additions to the tree canopy are addressed by •I-19: Comprehensive Tree Strategy •I-22: Hillside stabilization and protection
	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.	The Mobility chapter of the plan identifies multimodal investments that will couple with greening. Enforcement is addressed by program I-24 (Reduce impervious areas). Thank you for your tree pits 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.	Thank you for your comment
	When Anderson Bridge is finally rebuilt, add a pedestrian/bike path from Parkview elevation down into Junction Hollow.	Thank you for your comment

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
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.	Sidewalk issues are noted in the "What We Heard" section.
	is there a physical copy?	Hard copies of the plan are available at Oakland Planning & Development Corporation (OPDC), The Corner, Friendship Community Church, and Frazier Fieldhouse at Dan Marino Field
Comprehensive electric vehicle strategy	flexible co-op charging	Supportive. No Change.
Data at community service hubs	fieldhouse effort is currently successful	Supportive. No Change.
	Energy burden. creative thinking is needed to address the split incentive between owners and tenants.	ADDITION: Add owners to "What We Heard" as a group to engage under Resident Energy Education.
Encourage more community gardens	support	Supportive. No Change.
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>	Supportive. No Change.
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.	The timeframe for this project could be moved up, depending on funding streams and the implementation leaders
Reduce landfill waste	recycling pilot? when could we start? bi-weekly is a barriers to student participation	Supportive. Timeframe is identified as 3-5 years.
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>	The Land Use Strategy addresses grants and enforcement. Grandfathering would be reviewed as part of enforcement
Resident Education	make sure education are also targeted to owner of residential buildings so they can improve their tenants space	ADDITION: Add to "What We Heard"
	NO mention of the 2030 district which is surprising because GBA led conversations.	Previously addressed.
	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.	A call for an expansion of waste and recycling efforts is addressed in program I-28 (Support and expand compost efforts)
	Stormwater management needed more of something (?)	Thank you for your comment. Stormwater management is a multi-faceted issue that will require many tools, projects, and programs to manage on a large scale.
	Define depave oakland. Like concept of green alley but want more details, how is that identified and where should these be located?	<p>De-pave is defined as removing impervious surfaces.</p> <p>Potential project locations were discussed throughout the process and will likely be coupled with projects and programs in the Mobility chapter.</p>
	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.	Open spaces are currently defined as city-owned facilities like parks and greenways. Strategy I-20 discusses the possibility of expanding this definition to institutional land or new development green spaces
	Comprehensive tree canopy – like that and want more case study.	Thank you for your comment

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	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 maintainece, what replace with, what guidance for property owners, etc.	Strategy I-4 (Develop strict hillside development code) discusses how Oakland will use Zoning Code updates to address future hillside development Strategy I-10 (Greenway expansion) will provide additional guidance on how to stabilize hillsides
	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.	Thank you for your comment
	not rushing to get more trees since don’t understand City guidance on that.	Thank you for your comment
	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.	Thank you for your comment
	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.	Thank you for your comment
	Maintenance of tree canopy should definitely be included.	Tree canopy maintenance is addressed in strategy I-19 (Comprehensive Tree Strategy)
I-5	Add businesses and commercial property owners to assist reducing energy burden.	Change recommended
I-19	Add OBID; we need more trees in commercial areas as well.	ADDITION: Add OBID as project partner
I-21	OBID should be here -w e have lawns in commercial district areas as well	ADDITION: Add OBID as project partner
I-7	OBID should be a partner re: Euler Way	ADDITION: Add OBID as project partner
I-9	Should include OBID as a partner for both commercial corridors - who manages this Trust Fund?	The City will manage the funds, but there will be a board or commission to make spending recommendations to City Council
I-24	OBID as partner to help.	ADDITION: Add OBID as project partner
	<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>	ADDITION: Add container and rooftop gardens, hydroponic/aquaponic systems, etc. as spaces for community gardens” and that those spaces could be in parking garages

Zoning

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	<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>	<p>1.The Fifth and Forbes corridor is focused on industries that rely on in-person work and benefit from their proximity to complementary businesses/industries. Limited multi-unit residential is permitted in this corridor, either fully affordable or limited to 50% of gross floor area.</p> <p>2.Modify the zoning mat to make a block R-MU rather than UC-E</p>
	Comment on Karl Zimmerman Comment: some very good points in the comment above	Thank you for your comment
	Comment on Karl Zimmerman Comment: 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.	Expanding campuses would require a zoning change to the EMI and an update to the existing IMP. These changes would be required to go through the City's full review process (Planning Commission, City Council, etc.)
	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?	The proposed Green Buffer and height reduction zone are more targeted than the current standards and are residential-compatible in the actual urban context. Areas of Oakland are solely zoned residential and do not permit offices, universities, and hospitals.
	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?	This calculation is already allowed by the Zoning Code
	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.?	The Development chapter recommends that community organizations in Oakland work collaboratively to develop Design Guidelines that could include material requirements and other design details.
	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.	<p>Thank you for your comment regarding building length.</p> <p>The proposed Zoning includes Urban Open Space requirements that will encourage pedestrian pass-throughs. Additionally, green buffers can serve as pedestrian access.</p>
	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.	Thank you for your comment
	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.	The UC-MU zoning change was made separately from the Oakland Plan Process. // No change needed
	Please remove firearms sales from the permitted uses in the new zoning districts.	The Planning Commission also requested this change and it has been removed
	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.	The Fifth and Forbes corridor is focused on industries that rely on in-person work and benefit from their proximity to complementary businesses/industries. Limited multi-unit residential is permitted in this corridor, either fully affordable or limited to 50% of gross floor area.
	Forbes-Fifth absolutely needs to be UC-MU, agree with Brennan. We need more mixed use, not less.	The Fifth and Forbes corridor is focused on industries that rely on in-person work and benefit from their proximity to complementary businesses/industries. Limited multi-unit residential is permitted in this corridor, either fully affordable or limited to 50% of gross floor area.
	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?	This comment was addressed on the EngagePGH page
	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.	Thank you for your comment // No Change
	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.	Supportive. No change.
	Strong - West Oakland and South Oakland - leaving the zoning as is. Good.	Supportive. No change.
	Central oakland rezones are the right idea. Performace points are grreat.	Supportive. No change.
	Mobility is strong. Life between buildings; public realm.	Supportive. No change.

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	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.	Thank you for your comment
	The content has very little fault. Substance is useful.	Supportive. No change.
	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.	Supportive. No change.
	Want to see more in Melwood area - a baby Strip; opportunity for avant guard theater.	Supportive. No change.
	Wants to ensure the EMI remains. Master planning is important.	Supportive. No change.
	Perception that implementation is rushed; that City is pushing through City stuff through commissions.	Thank you for your comment
	Community process is great. Implementation table is great. Intention is to continue to advocate that CMU continues to play a role.	Supportive. No change.
	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.	Plan recommendation for Inclusionary 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?	This question was originally addressed on EngagePGH. These properties are proposed for the UC-MU district because their existing uses fit within the proposed uses for this district and do NOT conform to the R1A-VH district. // No change needed
	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.	These properties are proposed for the UC-MU district because their existing uses fit within the proposed uses for this district and do NOT conform to the R1A-VH district. // No change needed
	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'?	Comment originally addressed on EngagePGH: We are working with the Green Building Alliance and local energy modelers to better align the current draft of Performance Points for Zero Energy or Zero Carbon Buildings with other Performance Points.
	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.	Thank you for your comment // No Change
	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?	Thank you for your comment. Minor edits made to Intent Statements.
	<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>	Corrected.

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	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?	The stepback graphic is now included in the legislation.
	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.	Height in UC-E east of Coltart (south of Fresco Way/Sennott Street) reduced to 120 feet maximum.
	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.	Corrected.
	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.	Split-zoned parcels are not a best practice, so the proposed change follows the previous OPR boundary. The Existing Steep Slope Overlay and Landslide Prone regulations will address hillside issues.
	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.	The Planning Commission made a positive recommendation for 120 feet on Halket Street at the meeting on March 22, 2022. The height in UC-E, east of Coltart and south of Fesco Way/Sennott Street, was reduced to a 120-feet maximum
	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.	If these base districts are expanded to other areas, other streets may be added. // No change needed
	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?	Corrected.
	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: 1) to enact and implement new zoning districts to enhance and protect Oakland's special character; 2) to protect the character of less intensive uses from impacts of more intensive uses; 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; 4) to encourage mixed use developement that allows non-resident and resident uses to co-exist without conflict. 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.	The Oakland Public Realm needed a significant overhaul. Creating new base districts allows us to utilize zoning best practices that can be easily expanded to other areas of the City. This approach makes these districts more familiar to residents, applicants, Commissions, and staff.
	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.	Added clarification "This provision applies to parcels abutting another parcel with a smaller structure, not across a Street or Way. "
	p. 5 – figure TBD for build-to zone – where can one find this?	Added.
	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.	Maximum height with bonus reduced to 120 feet.
	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,	1.There are demolition thresholds proposed in the Zoning Code that will trigger Planning Commission review and approval 2.A demolition surcharge wouldn't be located in the Zoning Text and is not considered in the Oakland Plan

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	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.	The Land Use Strategy is intended to balance redevelopment opportunities for the new development of safe, affordable housing and the preservation of existing pockets of single-family dwellings housing long-term residents. While the R-MU has a bonus for preserving structures, some demolition is to be expected in redeveloped areas.
	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.	1. Whole Building Life Cycle Assessment can provide insight into the entire impact of a project but is most useful when compared to new construction 2. Demolitions that require a Planning Commission hearing will also require a Development Activities Meeting 3. The demolition threshold will aim to review demolitions that are medium-scale and larger
	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.	Traditionally, developers have been responsible for constructing and installing improvements in the public right-of-way (ROW) needed to support their development or mitigate transportation impacts. This system does not offer a way to contribute to broader mobility improvements that could improve access to the site and community. The DOMI Mobility Trust Fund allows developers to pay a fee in lieu of providing parking spaces required by zoning ordinances. For instance, if a development calls for 52 spaces, and the developer wants to provide 49, they will pay into the fund for the 3 spaces that they are not providing. This revenue is used to fund mobility projects in the same neighborhood where the funds were gathered. Through the funds generated, the City can implement projects and programs that enable multi-modal transportation and reduce the need for employer-provided, business, resident, and visitor parking. The DOMI Mobility Trust Fund will be held by the Controller’s Office and will be overseen by a commission consisting of members who are representative of the mobility and infrastructure community, thus ensuring a transparent and public distribution process. Funds can be used for projects including, but not limited to: -Bicycle and scooter parking, a bike or scooter share program improvements, or bicycle valet program. -Pedestrian-related improvements that increase safety, including lighting and street amenities. -Transit amenity improvements, such as new bus shelters or other infrastructure, or ongoing maintenance of existing amenities such as shelters, stops, and/or bus lanes. - Creation of a “shared mobility hub” or a central location in neighborhoods and areas that are transit-oriented. The City will continue to work with the community to ensure that the fund is used in a way that best serves the needs of the community.
	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.	1. The property owner could testify in opposition to the buffer at Planning Commission. 2. A dissatisfied neighbor could file a 311 complaint regarding the maintenance of the buffer. 3. Yes, we have clarified language clarifying that parking is not allowed in the green buffer.
	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.	If the Inclusionary Housing Overlay remains in the Zoning Proposal, housing developments with 20+ units would be eligible for that bonus point. Each proposal works to best balance and equalize the points potential. Additionally, the Development memo discusses the importance of high-performing buildings
	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.	Corrected
	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.	Thank you for your comment
	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”?	Corrected

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	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.	If the Inclusionary Housing Overlay remains in the Zoning Proposal, housing developments with 20+ units would be eligible for that bonus point. Each proposal works to best balance and equalize the points potential. Additionally, the Development memo discusses the importance of high-performing buildings
	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.	The Community Reinvestment Board/Fund are included in other sections of the plan and are not mentioned in the Zoning Proposal.
	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 anyonejust 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. Comment on this comment: Wanda make very good points. Read her note and listen to what she is saying.	If this performance point is enacted as currently written, DCP will develop a process guide to address these questions. Additionally, we will monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of these performance points and amend/eliminate points that are not meeting their intended goals.
	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).	Thank you for your comment
	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.	1. College or University Campus has been removed. 2. Removed 3. Educational classroom space is limited to mixed-use buildings and may not be more than half of the GSF 4. This conditional use is included in every base zoning district. It is most often used for large-scale grading/filling prior to development approval and requires approval from both the Planning Commission and City Council 5. Firearm use has been removed. 6. Removed 7. No Change 8. No Change
Inclusionary 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>	Thank you for your comment
Inclusionary 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>	Based on previous work by the Housing Task Force and existing IZ legislation, the 35-year timeline will remain unchanged unless it’s changed Citywide // No Change Needed
	Comment in response to Read_This_Please IZ Comment: 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.	Based on previous work by the Housing Task Force and existing IZ legislation, the 35-year timeline will remain unchanged unless it’s changed Citywide // No Change Needed

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	<p>Comment on Read_This_Please Comment: 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 a follower.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment</p>
	<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</p> <p>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>	<p>According to our work with the Law department, DCP would be subject to legal challenge if these were requirements instead of incentives.</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.	Removed.
	Zoning Use Table: Remove firearm sales and check cashing from new zoning districts.	Removed.
Design guidelines	<p>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.</p>	<p>The Development chapter recommends that community organizations in Oakland work collaboratively to develop Design Guidelines that could include material requirements and other design details.</p>
	<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 a follower.</p>	<p>Separate legislative action. Proposed signage standards would not allow "High Wall Signs" like permitted downtown.</p>
Land Use Strategy	<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>	<p>The Plan proposes a building height maximum of 85 feet (including bonuses) for properties abutting these single-family homes. Also, proposed height reductions on the east side of Bates St. and South of Blvd of the Allies will reduce this effect on the eastern residential portion of South Oakland.</p>
	<p>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.</p> <p>APN: 28-P-9</p> <p>– 3229 Joe Hammer Sq. – Use is multi-family</p> <p>APN: 28-P-27 – 300 Craft Ave – Use is multi-family</p> <p>APN: 28-P-33 – 306 Craft Ave – Use is multi-family</p> <p>APN: 28-P-36 – corner of Kennett Sq & Craft Ave (no address) – Vacant</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Please note that the Residential Compatibility Standard for lighting is proposed to apply here.</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>Recommending change of these properties to R-MU</p>

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	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.	These properties are proposed for the UC-MU district because their existing uses fit within the proposed uses for this district and do NOT conform to the R1A-VH district. // No change needed
	Response to ezaitsoff comment: 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.	These properties are proposed for the UC-MU district because their existing uses fit within the proposed uses for this district and do NOT conform to the R1A-VH district. // No change needed
	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.	Proposed Change: In UC-MU, change the proposed maximum height East of Bates Street to 120 feet with bonuses.
	Comment on ezaitsoff comment: I agree with zaitsoff. UC-E near to Blvd Allies/Oakcliffe is not appropriate. It permits buildings that are much too high.	Thank you for your comment
	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)	1. Removed 2. Educational classroom space is limited to mixed-use buildings and may not be more than half of the GSF 3. Removed 4. Transit Facilities are Conditional Uses in all residential and mixed-use Base Zoning Districts 5. No Change
	Comment on ezaitsoff comment: 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.	Transit Facilities are Conditional Uses in all residential and mixed-use Base Zoning Districts
	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.	Design Standards proposed in the Zoning Code text, Urban Open Space Requirements, and design guidelines to be developed with help assure a pedestrian friendly public realm.
	Regarding the Fifth and Forbes Avenue corridors, OBID has the following comments and questions: 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). 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? 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.	1.UC-E permits affordable housing and housing that is less than half of a building's GSF 2.Housing would be created per building through a multiple-phase project 3.Building minimums and maximums are permitted
	OBID suggests expanding the intent of the RMU District to include the following: 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.	Thank you for your comment
	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. 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. Give them grants for a downpayment for 5 years and see what happens.	Thank you for your comment. This would not be addressed by the Zoning Proposal

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	Response to mmadden comment: 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.	Thank you for your comment
	comment on ezaitsoff comment: "ezaitsoff " is entirely correct. Use data not somebody's guess about what will happen.	Thank you for your comment
	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".	The City will continue to edit and update the Performance Points and enforcement provisions to ensure the system’s effectiveness. The points are weighted to balance cost and benefits and are designed not to be automatically obtainable, and this system has been successfully implemented in the Uptown Public Realm and Riverfront districts.
	comment on ezaitsoff comment: 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.	Each project will still be required to participate in Development Activity Meetings, present at Planning Commission Hearings, and must be assessed for compliance with the approved Master Plan before receiving Planning Commission approval.
	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 Oakcliffe 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.	Thank you for your comment
	comment on ezaitsoff comment: 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.	Thank you for your comment
	Performance Points: 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. 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? 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.	The proposed legislation would amend the existing enforcement provisions to clarify when compliance is required and when fees will be accessed.
	comment on ezaitsoff comment: I agree with this. How will you guarantee compliance and organize fines?	The proposed legislation would amend the existing enforcement provisions to clarify when compliance is required and when fees will be accessed.
	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?	The Oakland Plan team received comments sent by 311 and added them to their relevant chapters.
	comment on ezaitsoff comment: I don't see my 311 comments anywhere either. 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.	The Oakland Plan team received comments sent by 311 and added them to their relevant chapters.
	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.	Thank you for your comment
	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.	This change has been added
	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).	This comment would not be addressed in the Zoning Proposal
	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.	This comment would not be addressed in the Zoning Proposal
	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.	Demolition thresholds are proposed in the Zoning Code that will trigger Planning Commission review and approval.
	The review threshold for demolitions should be one structure, rather than five; and demolitions should require a whole-building life cycle assessment.	The demolition threshold is aimed at reviewing medium-scale demolitions and larger.
	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.	Demolition activity review/coordination is not addressed in the Oakland Plan, and cannot be addressed in the Zoning Text
	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.	Planning Commission had already made a positive recommendation on the height regulations on Halket Street.
	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.	1.The Planning Commission made a positive recommendation for the Height Reduction and Green Energy Buffer 2.The height maximum in this area, with bonuses, has been reduced to 120 feet 3. The height maximum in this area, with bonuses, has been reduced to 120 feet

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	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’.	1.The Planning Commission made a positive recommendation for the Height Reduction and Green Energy Buffer 2.The height maximum in this area, with bonuses, has been reduced to 120 feet
	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.	The height maximum in this area, with bonuses, has been reduced to 120 feet
	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?	A green buffer of 15 feet will be required between the taller structure and the shorter structure.
	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.	We have reached out to GIS to correct this boundary
	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.	The proposed changes follow the previous OPR boundaries and split zoned parcels are not a zoning best practice. The existing Steep Slope Overlay and Landslide Prone regulations will address hillside issues.
	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.	Thank you for your comment
	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.	The Development memo discusses the importance of high-performing buildings, and if the Inclusionary Housing Overlay remains in the Zoning Proposal, housing developments with 20+ units would be eligible for that bonus point.
	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.	Thank you for your comment
	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.	College and University uses have been removed, Hospital has been removed. Educational Classroom Space is limited to a less than half of a mixed use structure.
	Remove the conditional use for excavation/grading/fill, major from all zones, or describe to the community the legal reason that it is included.	This conditional use is included in every base zoning district. It is most often used for large-scale grading/filling prior to development approval and requires approval from both the Planning Commission and City Council
	Remove firearms business establishment from UC-E and UC-MU.	Removed
	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.	These are new base zoning districts, which could be located anywhere in the City. Innovation District should be kept where it’s currently located.
	2. The Pittsburgh Innovation District believes the R3-M and R1A-H zones 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.	Later phases will look at other rezoning opportunities.
	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.	It’s difficult to enforce use-based performance points because uses change over time. Additionally, base districts can be expanded into other areas of the City and a use-based performance point may not be desirable in other areas.
	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.	The maximum height allowed along Fifth and Forbes, including bonuses, is 210 feet. Performance Points offer options of community-related benefits to reach this bonus height. We are not increasing the minimum without bonuses currently.
	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.	Buildings can be stepped back at ground level, providing a wider sidewalk/Urban Open Space. Sidewalks on side streets have a minimum requirement of 10 feet in the UC-E.
	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.	Paying into a multimodal support fund is available.
	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	This would leave out some of OPR-D, which is not a desirable planning decision. Additionally, the new proposed zoning can accommodate these uses and will treat this site equally with others in the same corridor.
	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.	The Community Reinvestment Board/Fund are included in other sections of the plan and are not mentioned in the Zoning Proposal.
	Map Issues: colors are an issue, can't see streets	Thank you for your comment
	Recommend language that excludes contextual heights.	This language was added.
	Have fines be annual for points system on top of revoking building permits.	Thank you for your Comment // amended the enforcement language to clarify fines and compliance.
	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.	Thank you for your comment
	Concerns about student displacement in this area - 200 block of Atwood, west side (wants this area to be R-MU to preserve existing uses)	Thank you for your comment
	Mix of uses in the R-MU adds a little bit of vibrancy	Thank you for your comment

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	Prefers to see the Oakland Plan proposal generally for UC-MU instead of the proposal from the Mayor / Walnut Capital.	Thank you for your comment
	Concern that Walnut Capital's proposal will determine the Oakland Plan UC-MU zone.	Thank you for your comment
	justification around the parcels on Blvd of the Allies being UC-E	Question addressed in Oakland Plan Open House
	Should the former Lawn & Ophelia Park be rezoned as P?	No, Lawn & Ophelia is not designated as a City Park.
	Want to see height mapped for the EMI districts	EMI districts are not mapped. They are included in each Institutional Master Plan because they are site-specific, and no max height is listed if a parcel is not slated for development
	Why isn't the points system being applied to North Oakland yet?	Question addressed in Oakland Plan Open House
	New height limits allow for tall buildings to be built but not skyscrapers, creating more of a mixed use area	Thank you for your comment
	Millie: wants to see height here at no more than 100'.	Thank you for your comment
	Sees the need for the increased height and supports it	Thank you for your comment
	Millie: Feels like Forbes is already like a wind tunnel and doesn't want any more height.	Thank you for your comment
	Millie: does not want this area to be UC-E and wants height capped at 100'.	Thank you for your comment
	Glad to see uses similar to existing OPR zoning classifications	Thank you for your comment
	Concern of allowance of large TV screens a la Bakery Square - how can these be regulated?	Residential Compatibility regulates light and noise levels adjacent to residential zoning districts.
	Glad to see that Commercial Parking has been removed	Thank you for your comment
	Special Exception for Educational Classroom Space seems too lax in this district and in UC-MU	Added requirement for Educational Classroom to be located in a Mixed-Use building and not be greater than 50 percent of the GSF of the building.
	Firearms Business should not be an allowable use (x2)	This use has been removed.
	Helicopter pads as allowable use - concern as to allowing that in UC-MU	This use has been removed.
	Does not want to see College or University campus as an allowable use, even as Conditional Use (in either UC-E or UC-MU)	This use has been removed.
	Wants 30' front setbacks through all zoning districts	A 30' front setback is not conducive to a successful and dense urban center. This will be addressed with Sidewalk width minimums and Urban Open Space.
	400' building length is the equivalent to 8 train boxcars and concern that it's too long.	Thank you for your comment
	Millie: thinks building length should be no more than 100' or 200'.	Thank you for your comment
	Concern about utilizing the Mobility Trust Fund to be able to reduce the parking requirements further.	The Mobility Trust Fund is designed to implement programs and infrastructure that reduce the need for parking spaces by providing commuters and visitors with additional multi-modal options.
	Concern that zero energy or other bonuses could be used to hit a height cap before being required to use the affordable housing bonus	If the Inclusionary Housing Overlay remains in the Zoning Proposal, housing developments with 20+ units would be eligible for that bonus point.
	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	Energy and MWBE compliance are required pre-requisites for bonus points in these districts
	Question / concern about how developers try to see how many points they can get vs how their building is integrated in the community	Energy and MWBE compliance are required pre-requisites for bonus points in these districts. Also, these projects must complete the design review process prior to appearing before Planning Commission.
	Concern that the points system is giving developers too much of a carrot	Performance Points are designed so they're not automatically obtainable and are weighted to balance costs and benefits
	Once UCMU gets in by Walnut Capital, even if Oakland Plan approved, changing the Walnut Capital version with the new criteria is not likely.	Thank you for your comment
	concerned that Walnut Capital can cite an agreement with Gainey and close Zulema Street.	Thank you for your comment
	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.	Separate legislative action.
	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.	Thank you for your comment
	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.	While the Zoning Text proposes elements from other zoning districts, other elements such as performance points and open space requirements are crafted specifically for the Oakland Plan.
	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?	The Use Table has been available for review and comment since the public comment period opened on March 7, 2022.

Strategy Name	Comment	Response
	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.	The Performance Points were developed through a series of workshops with [WHO]. The Steering Committee helped create the plan goals and the Land Use Strategy, which are responsible for implementing the proposed zoning and performance points system.
Central Oakland btwn Louisa and Dawson	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.	Thank you for your comment