

Community Advisory Subcommittee (CAS) Applicants Residents Focus Group

September 16, 2025, 6:00 - 7:00 pm



Attendees

Staff: Lakshmi Rajagopalan (Presenter), Khalilha Haynes (Presenter), Timothy Green

Community Members (link or copy sign-in sheet):

- Donna Griggsmurphy, D3
- David Hartful, D3
- Aaron Smith, D6
- Aaron Eckhouse, D2
- Gail Truman, D1
- Avery Harmon, D2
- Mara Benitez, D2
- David Lew, D2
- Jack Fleck, D4
- Akiko Kelley, D4
- Herine Palacios, D3
- Natalie Musick, D1
- Alexis Stewart, Martinez
- Naomi Schiff
- Treajané Brown

participants engaged: about 15

Meeting Purpose and Goals

Solicit feedback on the Options for Stabilization and Growth. Participants grouped and invited to attend specific meetings based upon their role. This meeting gathers perspective on the Options from CAS Applicants Residents.

Summary of Engagement

Plan Options Presentation + Discussion

Summary of Feedback

David Lew:

How are we attracting potential companies to locate in these proposed areas?

Staff: we'll be diving into what business attraction strategies make sense as we start developing the General Plan Elements next year. although we



definitely want to hear any strategies or case studies you want to share now

What about public education sites in communities across Oakland?

Staff: We coordinate with OUSD to ensure their land is zoned to meet their needs.

Prefers Options A & B to distribute investment across the city. This will require strategic engagement with investors.

Staff: We have various working groups to engage stakeholders. EWD is also working on a strategic plan.

Aaron Smith: Likes Option B particularly for the transit connectivity. Interested in express buses, priority lanes, etc. Concerned about Option C because of risk of all investment flowing into one district at the detriment of others.

David Hartful:

Likes Option A. It would be good got low wage workers. Having your job walking distance will improve their quality of life and reduce traffic for commuters.

Is there a plan to increase adult education along with this?

Herine Palacios:

Concerned about Option C because waterfront neighborhoods tend to be exclusionary. Likes Option A for distributing destinations across the city. Likes Option B particularly for the transit connectivity. Interested in express buses, priority lanes, etc. Concerned about what the proposed R&D areas would displace, including unhoused people living in industrial areas.

Staff: The goal for the R&D districts would be to transition industrial zones to cleaner, less impactful uses. The current maps are conceptual.

Could the waterfront just be added as another mini center just as it is in Option A?

Staff: Yes

Is there a way to see who the city receives all feedback from? A digestible list of people the city is referring to for guidance (besides residents)?

Mara Benitez: Option A the idea of Oakland being more walkable sounds good. Again I may have missed it - what is the vision for incorporating public recreational and educational outdoor and indoor green spaces for youth and children in any of the options.

Staff: We have various working groups to engage stakeholders.

Naomi Schiff:



Concerned about attractiveness of large flashy projects that tend not to pan out. Very skeptical about R&D. I see R&D near the marshy edge of bay could be a barrier rather than facilitating access; better to improve connections from neighborhoods to shore. Don't build wealthy housing on Parcel N at Estuary Park; rather, make shore access more robust by connecting from neighborhoods.

Natalie Musick: Likes Option C because it concentrates development & funding in one area, which seems more feasible. Likes preservation of green spaces and Option C best recognizes this. This would be an attractive destination as the regional rail network develops.

Aaron Eckhouse:

Excited about Option A for land use and Option B for transportation vision.

Are there opportunities to simplify the zoning, especially for residential.

Staff: Yes, staff is very supportive of this.

Option C I hope gets carried through in whatever final form it takes is the Sausal Creek greenway; I love the idea of enhancing public access to more of Oakland's creeks!

We have to think about who are the private actors that will implement this plan.

Jack Fleck:

How does the general plan update incorporate the Equitable Climate Action Plan? Will there be an attempt to include an electrification plan with the just approved AB 39?

Staff: Much of it is already in the EJ and Safety elements. It will be further integrated in Phase 2.

Likes all the options. Concerned about making BART slower if a stop is added.

We should prohibit new gas stations.

EJ delegated air quality issues to LUTE.

Treajané Brown:

There's a lot of opportunity with the R&D concept if it's done thoughtfully. How do we include community input in the decisions for what corporations to invite?

Concerned about the current pace of change and 20 years being too long of a horizon.

Staff: We have State requirements but there is certainly debate in the planning field about the appropriate timeframe.

Concern about unhoused community. Are there zoning mechanisms to provide land to unhoused people?

Staff: Community land trusts are a strategy that the City has been slow to adopt. We are open to suggestions.

