
From: Maybrun, Molly </o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=bd6357114be240b2827dde3268b58a8a-maybr9m>
To: Jewett, Yuriko@BCDC; Noah Rosen; Gaffney, Andrea@BCDC
CC: Lavine, Ethan@BCDC; Veronica Rivera; Richard Kennedy; Ziad Shehab; Grace Howard; Andrea Gardner
Sent: 3/1/2021 12:44:54 PM
Subject: Re: Howard Terminal Draft BCDC Exhibits

Thanks Yuri. Just FYI, the 4/5 meeting is listed as cancelled on the BCDC website.

For my calendar, what time is that meeting?

Thanks!
Molly

From: Jewett, Yuriko@BCDC <yuriko.jewett@bcdc.ca.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 1, 2021 12:33 PM
To: Noah Rosen <nrosen@athletics.com>; Gaffney, Andrea@BCDC <andrea.gaffney@bcdc.ca.gov>
Cc: Lavine, Ethan@BCDC <ethan.lavine@bcdc.ca.gov>; Veronica Rivera <vriviera@fieldoperations.net>; Richard Kennedy <rkennedy@fieldoperations.net>; Ziad Shehab <zs@big.dk>; Grace Howard <ghoward@athletics.com>; Maybrun, Molly <MMaybrun@oaklandca.gov>; Andrea Gardner <agardner@portoakland.com>
Subject: Re: Howard Terminal Draft BCDC Exhibits

[EXTERNAL] This email originated outside of the City of Oakland. Please do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and expect the message.

Hi Noah,

Also, just a reminder to please use **TRACK CHANGES** when updating the staff report .doc. Much appreciated on this end!

And cc'ing Molly and Andrea Gardner for good measure.

Thanks,

Yuri Jewett (*she/her*)
Shoreline Development Analyst
Direct: (415) 352-3616 | yuriko.jewett@bcdc.ca.gov

San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission
Bay Area Metro Center
375 Beale Street, Suite 510
San Francisco, California 94105
Main: (415) 352-3600 | www.bcdc.ca.gov



From: Jewett, Yuriko@BCDC <yuriko.jewett@bcdc.ca.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 1, 2021 8:27 AM
To: Noah Rosen <nrosen@athletics.com>; Gaffney, Andrea@BCDC <andrea.gaffney@bcdc.ca.gov>

Cc: Lavine, Ethan@BCDC <ethan.lavine@bccdc.ca.gov>; Veronica Rivera <vriviera@fieldoperations.net>; Richard Kennedy <rkennedy@fieldoperations.net>; Ziad Shehab <zs@big.dk>; Grace Howard <ghoward@athletics.com>

Subject: Re: Howard Terminal Draft BCDC Exhibits

Hi Noah and Team,

I'm following up on items needed for the BCDC Design Review Board meeting scheduled for April 5, 2021.

EXHIBITS

Now that the DEIR has been released to the public, we will need an updated exhibit package ASAP. It's challenging for us to provide a thoughtful review with missing pages. Please let us know when we can expect a revised submittal. Happy to set up a call with Andrea to further clarify. In general, staff has the following comments:

Please revise exhibits to better match presentation given in October 2019.

Consolidate renderings onto single pages.

Combine previous/current views and plans onto single pages.

Add:

- Cross sections of open spaces including street sections
- Details about Athletics Way Plan/Section/Circulation
- Phasing Diagram
- Event configuration diagrams
- Spot elevations on plan enlargements
- Larger context and circulation diagrams
- More information about development and land use scenarios

STAFF REPORT

For a second pre-application review, it's best to have the project team provide the first round of edits instead of a new summary altogether. Attached is a .doc of the previous staff report. Please update the sections noted in the comments as needed.

Appendix A - On December 2, 2020, staff provided consolidated comments and questions from the first pre-application review for your consideration. Please provide a response to these items so they may be included as Appendix A to the staff report. The initial email is below. I have also attached the same information in .doc format consistent with the staff report to help expedite.

MEETING LOGISTICS

Due to State mandated budget cuts, we no longer issue meeting minutes for advisory board meetings. The meeting audio will be available for download and staff will provide a short summary document. In addition, we recommend project proponents take their own notes.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,

Yuri Jewett (*she/her*)

Shoreline Development Analyst

Direct: (415) 352-3616 | yuriko.jewett@bccdc.ca.gov

San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission



From: Jewett, Yuriko@BCDC
Sent: Monday, December 2, 2019 4:49 PM
To: Noah Rosen <nrosen@athletics.com>; Maybrun, Molly <MMaybrun@oaklandca.gov>; Gilchrist, William <wgilchrist@oaklandca.gov>
Cc: McCrea, Brad@BCDC <brad.mccrea@bcdc.ca.gov>; Gaffney, Andrea@BCDC <andrea.gaffney@bcdc.ca.gov>; Lavine, Ethan@BCDC <ethan.lavine@bcdc.ca.gov>
Subject: 10/7 DRB Meeting Minutes + Next Steps

Dear Noah and Team,

We look forward to reviewing the DEIR and the draft Preliminary Development Plan scheduled to be released in January 2020 for the Oakland A's project at Howard Terminal.

Below is a summary of consolidated questions, notes, and comments from both the BCDC Design Review Board (Board) and staff from the October 7 meeting and our subsequent staff discussions. We also agree with the City staff notes compiled shortly after the DRB meeting and are interested in understanding what Oakland's Design Review Committee (DAC) has to say regarding the project as things move forward.

The Board would like to see the project again and we have tentatively scheduled the project for the March 2020 meeting. We kindly request the project team plan to present how the project fits in with the overall planning that is ongoing in the City, particularly the adjacent communities.

The DRB schedule is as follows:

January 24, 2020 – 5pm Draft Design Exhibits due in digital format, along with an updated project description.
February 24, 2020 – 10am Final Exhibits due with ADA compliant pdf and 20 printed/bound copies
February 27, 2020 – Mailing Date – documents posted to website (BCDC staff action only)
March 9, 2020 – 5:30pm DRB Meeting

Additionally, BCDC staff would like to meet with the project team in January 2020 to ensure a productive DRB meeting in March.

The October 7 Design Review Board approved meeting minutes can be found online here:
<https://www.bcdc.ca.gov/drb/2019/1007Minutes.pdf>

GENERAL NOTES

- The ballpark development in general was well received by the Board. Comments that it is reticent of an Olympic plan were voiced and the Board is looking forward to seeing the next level of design in detail.
- One Board member asked if the project has a bird-friendly design. Please address the general topic of wildlife compatibility with the project at the next scheduled meeting.

CONNECTIONS TO THE WATERFRONT

- Both the Board and staff are concerned with how the project will address compatibility with existing Port operations. Please consider adding grade separated crossings to avoid mobility conflicts and ensure the public's safety to access the site on both game and non-game days.
- The rail crossings are problematic in relation to moving people to the waterfront and moving goods to and from the port. How will the project address these circulation conflicts? How can the project improve or remove these conflicts?

- One Board member requested a rendering to show how the project would engage with the Jack London neighborhood beyond the entrance of the ballpark.
- Neighborhood connections are critical to understand, both the Board and staff would like to see in more detail how the adjacent neighborhoods, specifically social vulnerable areas, would be invited to enjoy the waterfront. Historically, the adjacent community youth could easily access the pier. In regards to improving the conditions of the surrounding neighborhoods, how can the project improve the social vulnerability of the surrounding communities? What social vulnerability mapping color will this new neighborhood look like? How can the project shift the social vulnerability map color of the adjacent communities without causing displacement?
- The connection down Market Street to the water is an important connection. How will pedestrians and cyclists move along the street from the adjacent communities to the waterfront? What are the street sections and views to the water?

MASTER PLAN

- The Board questioned whether or not the road network would support the approximately 3000 residential units proposed for the development, as well as the many visitors the project hopes to draw. Please consider showing more detail of the mixed-use portion of the development detailing how the land uses of the project will be a “good neighbor” to the other surrounding areas already in place.
- Please provide clarification as to why the Block 20 is significantly larger than the rest of the proposed development. One Board member specifically asked this question.
- The Board noted that the neighborhood has a “gritty and maritime character” and that element should continue to resonate in the design.
- The Board and Staff would both like to understand the three-dimensional character of the proposed development in relation to the waterfront parks and views. Please provide additional 3D views of the development for the next review.
- How does this project become a great neighborhood?
- Who lives there? How will they get around? Is there sufficient space and network to serve the ballpark and the Development? Will there be additional open spaces within the development parcels?
- Staff believes the waterfront park experience should include the rooftop park and the waterfront parks. How do they all work together to create a single notion of the Howard Terminal waterfront park?

BALLPARK PHASE 1 DEVELOPMENT

- The Board noted that the ballpark will block views to the waterfront when approaching the site from the north at Martin Luther King, Jr. Way. As a result, they emphasized that MLK Plaza will be critical arrival point and that the Vistra Building is a landmark. How will MLK plaza welcome the public to the site and lead people to the water?
- Please provide additional plans/sections/details on Athletics Way and how it will be inviting to the public on non-event days. How will it feel and function as a public street?
- Where will balls go if there’s a home run? Will they fall into the public waterfront park?
- Please ensure that all proposed uses for blocks 7/8 are trust-consistent uses as the parcel falls within the filled lands area of the property.
- What is the overall public programming and activities for the rooftop, concourse (Athletics Way, and ground levels (Waterfront Parks)? What programs will be offered at the rooftop park to ensure they don’t compete with what is being offered on the ground level public realm?

ROOFTOP PARK - Programming and Invitations to the Public

- Will the park be open at night for stargazing? Evening strolls? Fireworks? What are the anticipated hours of operation?
- With approximately 96 event days (approximately 25%) scheduled per year, it will be critical to draw the public to the rooftop area and communicate that it is available for use on non-game days. What is the range of programs and activities available to the public on the rooftop park?
- Please provide more detail at Rickey Plaza and the transition to the rooftop park. How will the public move through these spaces on a typical day and an event day? Where will the fences, gates and security be located on event days and stored away on non-event days?

GAME DAY/EVENT DAY

- Please map city-wide impacts for game-day events so we can understand how this will affect people’s ability to access and enjoy the nearby waterfront destinations.

- How will Fan Fest work in Jack London Square and around the ballpark and still allow the non-fan public to enjoy the waterfront ?
- Please consider other alternatives for the Bay Trail route on game day. Staff has particular concern with the proposed route and the “pinch point” created near the Vistra building.

WATERFRONT PARK and BAY TRAIL

- Please provide a more resilient design approach to address sea level rise. The wharf is only resilient to 2050 and more could be done to ensure that this critical connection for circulation and public space remain in place as sea levels rise.
- Both the Board and staff agree that keeping the industrial cranes in the project is an integral part of the history of the site.
- Please clarify how additional interpretive elements proposed for the waterfront park will be incorporated.
- Staff requests that the project consider widening the Bay Trail to accommodate up to 24 feet; similar to that of the Bay Trail near the SF Giants ballpark. Areas where the public and the ticket holders will both be circulating needs additional consideration for how these areas will feel to the public on game days. How can they serve to invite the public to the waterfront and manage the queuing and security requirements of entering a baseball game?
- At Rickey Plaza/Pier Park: Is a mounded green space that acts as an edge between the plaza and pier park the best transition for this area or should it be a less defined edge to invite people to the water?
- Please show more detail of Pier Park/Beach. How will the design connect to Overlook Park to create a unified open space?
- The Board requested a detailed rendering be provided for their review to better understand the scale of the 100-foot-wide connection at Water Plaza. With required EVA and other limitations, they expressed concern that the width is not sufficient.
- Please provide more detail of Overlook Park and the proposed land uses at Blocks 7/8. How will the design address the grade changes associated with this portion of the site and provide an invitation to the public along all sides? Both the Board and staff are concerned with the hotel parcel at Blocks 7/8 and noted that a 400 room hotel will also feature meeting spaces and other amenities. We would like to see a detailed plan and/or rendering to better understand the scale of the building's design as it relates to the surrounding open space and edge condition of the waterfront for both base line and maritime reservation scenarios.

PHASE TWO BASELINE SCENARIO

- Block 18/19 needs more detail and design development. Please clarify the programs and uses and how they relate to the waterfront park and inviting the public to the west end of the site. How does this area relate to the adjacent industrial maritime uses?
- Block 7/8 hotel needs careful consideration for how it meets and invites the public on all sides. Design of this block should be different for the Baseline and MSR scenarios.
- As one moves to the west, what is the experience and use of the park? What are the invitations to go to the west end of the park?

PHASE TWO MARITIME RESERVATION SCENARIO

- The turning basin could be a major draw to the public. How can the design make this an asset?
- Given the significant change in the footprint of the developable area, does the grid pattern of the development need to remain the same? How can the urban design be more responsive to the proposed waterfront edge and surrounding context? If the exact shape and size of the turning basin is not defined, how can this design approach be articulated in design principles?
- The ballpark feels tight up against the waterfront in this scenario. How can this be adjusted? How does the design and character of blocks 7/8 change in this scenario?
- Please continue developing design options for the waterfront edge condition in the maritime reservation scenario that respond to the change in condition from a wharf edge to an earthen shoreline. How can the edge be varied to invite people to the water?
- If the proforma for the MSR scenario remains the same as the baseline scenario, please demonstrate how the equivalent waterfront public access and open space can be provided in both scenarios. We recommend reducing the development footprint on parcel 12 to create a more balanced open space area in both development scenarios.

Please let us know if you have any questions.

Kind Regards,

Yuri Jewett (*she/her*)

Shoreline Development Analyst

Direct: (415) 352-3616 | yuriko.jewett@bcdc.ca.gov

San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

Bay Area Metro Center

375 Beale Street, Suite 510

San Francisco, California 94105

Main: (415) 352-3600 | www.bcdc.ca.gov



From: Jewett, Yuriko@BCDC <yuriko.jewett@bcdc.ca.gov>

Sent: Friday, February 19, 2021 12:46 PM

To: Noah Rosen <nrosen@athletics.com>; Gaffney, Andrea@BCDC <andrea.gaffney@bcdc.ca.gov>

Cc: Lavine, Ethan@BCDC <ethan.lavine@bcdc.ca.gov>; Veronica Rivera <vriviera@fieldoperations.net>; Richard Kennedy <rkennedy@fieldoperations.net>; Ziad Shehab <zs@big.dk>; Grace Howard <ghoward@athletics.com>

Subject: Re: Howard Terminal Draft BCDC Exhibits

Hi Noah,

Received. Thank you.

Have a great weekend,

Yuri Jewett (*she/her*)

Shoreline Development Analyst

Direct: (415) 352-3616 | yuriko.jewett@bcdc.ca.gov

San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

Bay Area Metro Center

375 Beale Street, Suite 510

San Francisco, California 94105

Main: (415) 352-3600 | www.bcdc.ca.gov



From: Noah Rosen <nrosen@athletics.com>

Sent: Friday, February 19, 2021 12:33 PM

To: Jewett, Yuriko@BCDC <yuriko.jewett@bcdc.ca.gov>; Gaffney, Andrea@BCDC <andrea.gaffney@bcdc.ca.gov>

Cc: Lavine, Ethan@BCDC <ethan.lavine@bcdc.ca.gov>; Veronica Rivera <vriviera@fieldoperations.net>; Richard Kennedy <rkennedy@fieldoperations.net>; Ziad Shehab <zs@big.dk>; Grace Howard <ghoward@athletics.com>

Subject: Howard Terminal Draft BCDC Exhibits

Yuri and Andrea,

I hope you are both doing well and staying healthy.

Attached are the draft exhibits for the 4/5 DRB meeting. We're aware that we are exceeding the page limit, but given how quickly things moved, we did not have time to finalize formatting for the draft exhibits submittal deadline. We'll continue working on that while you review, then we can finalize the exhibits prior to the meeting.

All the best,

Noah

Noah Rosen

Sr. Manager, Project Development

(510) 746-4406

Oakland Athletics

Oakland Coliseum|7000 Coliseum Way Oakland CA 94621