

EXHIBIT 2

STAFF RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

October 24th Planning Board Workshop – Review and Comment on Draft Main Street Neighborhood Specific Plan

At the October 24th meeting, the Planning Board raised a number of issues and questions regarding the Plan. A summary of those comments and staff's responses are provided below.

1. The term “primarily residential” throughout the document is a shift from what other documents say when referring to Main Street.

Response: Staff agrees and has changed the language to referring to the Main Street Neighborhood (MSN) as a mixed-use neighborhood with diverse types of housing and neighborhood serving commercial, agricultural and open spaces and uses supportive of the Historic District.

2. Universal Design should be called out more prominently.

Response: Staff agrees and added a Universal Design and Visitability section in the Administration and Enforcement section referencing the pending citywide ordinance currently in draft form. Staff has also eliminated provisions in the Plan that are in conflict with the new ordinance.

3. Show the public storm water detention basin as residential instead of using a new color for a single category that has only one use in the plan.

Response: Staff agrees and the color has been changed to the color used for Residential Mixed Use.

4. The Plan creates a blank slate where any number of uses are permitted, however it would be helpful to have more explicit guidance for the development community on the strategies to get what we want.

Response: Staff added additional guidance to create an architecturally diverse and unique mixed-use built environment with varying heights, building types and design aesthetics that are visually appealing and add interest to the pedestrian environment.

5. Would like to see more encouragement about sustainability, such as solar, re-use of materials, plantings verses grass, net zero energy standards.

Response: The Plan contains a Sustainability section which addresses all of the above strategies. Additionally, the Administration and Enforcement section contains a section on Sustainable Design and Bay Friendly Landscape requires that all new building and renovation projects complies with Green Building Requirements.

6. There should be some flexibility in building heights, but also some principles that guide implementation and exceptions.

Response: Staff agrees and included language that allows the Planning Board to grant exceptions to the building height as part of any Design Review application if the Board is able to make a finding for 1) additional ceiling height for a well-designed ground floor commercial or institutional space in a vertically mixed-use building; or 2) as necessary and appropriate to improve the architectural design of the building.

7. The plan should create more affordable “workforce” housing that will be in the affordable range for middle-income families.

Response: Staff agrees and we’ve added a section on affordable and workforce in the Development Standards and Guidelines section of the Plan that requires 10% of units be designed to be affordable to households with income between 120% and 180% of area wide median income.

8. The feasibility of middle-income housing in the range of \$250,000 - \$300,000 should be considered.

Response: Analysis by the City’s financial consultant looked at a range of market-rate housing types from single family to apartments and found that the hard construction costs (not including soft costs or infrastructure) of each product type was higher than \$250,000. As a result, it would not be feasible to build market rate units and sell them for \$250,000-\$300,000 unless they were heavily subsidized.

9. Comments about the impact of flooding in the phasing of development and how the perimeter levee will be built on existing streets to achieve the 24 inches of sea-level rise?

Response: Flooding impacts are more severe north of W. Midway and will be addressed primarily in the Phase 2 development, as discussed in Chapter 6, Phasing Principles. To build the perimeter levee on existing streets, the road would need to be elevated to create a high point that reaches the required minimum elevation of the levee. This would be accomplished as part of the reconstruction of Main Street. The road profile would be altered to have the high point with gentle slopes returning to the lower existing elevations on either side of the high point.

10. Concern about current residents living in the non-historic market rate housing and the desire to give them the first opportunity for any new housing developed.

Response: Disposition of these properties will be part of future disposition decisions made by the City Council.

11. Concerns about pedestrian and bicycle safety on the streets as designed

Response: Staff agrees and has tried to balance the needs and requirements for a safe and comfortable multi-modal street network with best practices from the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) and CalTrans to inform standards and guidelines, such as widths of bike paths, cycle tracks, sidewalk, raised medians for protection from cars, and landscaping and bioretention areas to collect and treat stormwater runoff.

12. Widening of streets with 8 feet of parking is not consistent with the MIP and makes the streets wider.

Response: The City Engineer agrees that parking widths will be seven feet for local streets, with some flexibility for collector streets with retail where eight feet widths are need for retail to facilitate deliveries in higher intensity commercial spaces. Staff will look at delivery spaces for larger vehicles.

13. Shared street is the same width as the other streets.

Response: The Orion Shared Street around the three sides of the Central Gardens and the Neighborhood Shared Streets have rights of way measuring 54 feet and 50 feet respectively, which is less than the other streets in the neighborhood, which range from 60 feet to 81 feet.

14. In Figure 3.4 – What is a transit node?

Response: The transit node is a multi-modal transit center where people can easily transfer from one mode to another. Examples include Bike/bus to ferry, ferry to ride hailing services, etc.

15. Every street that says it is consistent with the MIP has been widened.

Response: The MSN Plan builds upon the framework of the MIP and incorporates best practices from NACTO and CalTrans to inform standards and guidelines, such as widths of bike paths, cycle tracks, sidewalk, raised medians for protection from cars, and landscaping and bioretention areas to collect and treat stormwater runoff.

16. Need more creative ways to calm traffic, like chicanes, rather than by adding parking which widens the street.

Response: Staff agrees and has added a discussion of chicanes as an alternative method for calming traffic, specifically around the Central Gardens (Chapter 3, Section 3.3 – Multimodal Transportation and Circulation Network). The discussion includes the limitations and trade-offs that might be necessary to include them in the Orion Shared Street area.

17. Concerns about the maintenance costs of green infrastructure

Response: Maintenance costs for streets, including green infrastructure are generally part of a larger package of public or private services that are paid for by new City tax revenue and/or by property owners as part of a special tax district.

18. Show Singleton Avenue cutting through the neighborhood between Ploughshares and the APC Farm

Response: Staff has added the Singleton Avenue cut-through.

November 1st City Council Meeting – Review and Comment on Draft Main Street Neighborhood Plan

Major comments raised by the City Council and staff's responses are as follows:

Affordability

19. Need a statement about goals for affordability (defined)

Response: Staff agrees and has added the Inclusionary Housing requirements in the Plan and a Staff agrees and a requirement that 10% of units be designed to be affordable to households with income between 120% and 180% of area wide median income. (see Chapter 5, Section 5-54 Development Standards and Guidelines).

20. Displaced middle-income residents should have a way to stay in the neighborhood

Response: Staff agrees and has added requirements for workforce/middle-income housing to the Plan (see above).

21. There should be mostly middle-income housing with smaller amounts of affordable and luxury housing.

Response: Staff agrees and has added goals for affordable housing and workforce housing for all new developments in Chapter 5, Section 5-54 Development Standards and Guidelines. The City Council will ultimately decide on the desired mix of housing types and sizes through the disposition process. Feasibility may include consideration of trade-offs for infrastructure (e.g. size of park and open space, bicycle paths, green

infrastructure); development impact fees (for sports complex, etc.); and size and type of housing.

22. Need a definition for workforce housing

Response: The Alameda Municipal Code does not include a definition of “workforce” housing, but the Housing Land Trust Fund of San Francisco defines “workforce housing” as “Affordable housing for households with earned income that is above the income limits for deed restricted or subsidized housing, yet insufficient to secure quality housing in reasonable proximity to the workforce

In the MSN Plan, workforce housing is defined as either rental or ownership housing that is in the range of 120-180% AMI, which is above the range for “affordable” housing which carries deed restrictions.

23. Wants to see an analysis for how different types and quantities of units that will be able to pay for the infrastructure costs. Include for-sale and for-rent middle income units

Response: Staff agrees. A feasibility analysis of the different mixes of housing types and size and costs is included in the City Council staff report.

24. Not supportive of infill housing in the Historic District

Response: The infill guidelines are limited to the replacement of the five existing non-historic buildings within the Beehive portion of the Historic District and possibly a small number of NCO Quarters at the east end of Corpus Christie Road. The guidelines are not intended to facilitate new construction in and around the historic structures, except for where there is a missing element in the historic fabric.

25. There is a growing need for assisted living and it should be included in the creation of a diverse community

Response: Staff agrees and included assisted living as a conditional use under Commercial and Retail in the Land Use table.

Phasing of Development

26. Concern about the 67 units needed by the Collaborating and whether they should be built by another developer with a different housing product.

Response: The 67 units built by the Collaborating Partners will benefit the City by helping the market rate developer meet their Very Low/Low units and contribute towards meeting the requirements of the Renewed Hope Settlement Agreement. In return the developer would pay for the infrastructure and site prep needed for construction of the Collaborating Partners development and the entire south of Midway

area. The ultimate disposition of the land proposed will be part of a future disposition discussion

27. Would like to see development opportunity for Big Whites to be refurbished individually with preferential status for people who currently live there.

Response: Disposition of these properties will be part of future disposition decisions made by the City Council.

28. Other development should occur simultaneously with the Collaborating Partners' construction of their campus

Response: Market rate housing development is needed to help fund infrastructure construction for the Collaborating Partner's site and so will be developed simultaneously.

Urban Agriculture and Sustainability

29. Wants to see discussion about the feasibility of agricultural practices in areas of possible contamination.

Response: Staff has added the following verbiage: "Although there are no current restrictions, each project should perform appropriate due diligence on the suitability of property for the desired use."

30. Use a "green" approach by reusing as many building and materials as possible

Response: Staff agrees and has included the reuse of building materials in the Plan, which is consistent with the MIP mandate for sustainable practices.

Access & Mobility

31. Would like to see more greenbelts and protected bikeways with greenbelts on both sides;

Response: All protected bikeways in the Plan located on primary and secondary bike routes have landscaping on the both sides. Street trees have been added to the plan along all of the interior streets.

32. Protected bikeways should be built in the first phase

Response: Costs for protected bikeways are assumed to be included in included in Phase 1 (South of W. Midway) cost estimates.

33. A path directly to the ferry terminal should be included

Response: Staff agrees and have added bicycle/pedestrian connections to Main Street in all figures in the Plan.

34. Would like to see more curvy streets and not just streets along the grid

Response: It is possible with interior streets that would be designed as part of a specific development plan for a specific project.

35. Include some non-motorized streets

Response: Staff agrees and has included the pedestrian/bike paths that connect interior streets to Main Street and create a north-south connection through the Central Gardens park.

36. Preference would be to not have bikes next to parking and cars; more set back to comfortably accommodate cars

Response: All of the primary and secondary streets, except West Tower Avenue (under agreement for Site A) have protected bikeways, separating bicycles from parking and cars in the travel line by a raised median or landscape/bioretenion areas.

37. Delivery truck routes should be shown on the map to ensure streets widths can accommodate them.

Response: Staff agrees and has added a figure showing the truck routes.

Land Use

38. Encouraging to see neighborhood-serving retail like cafés and boutiques where people don't have to drive

Response: Staff agrees

39. No big box retail

Response: Staff agrees and they are not included as a permitted or conditional use.

40. Agrees with the blend of heights throughout the Plan Area

Response: Staff agrees

41. Agreement with a mixed use neighborhood

Response: Staff agrees

November 10th Recreation and Park Commission Meeting – Review and Comment on Draft Main Street Neighborhood Specific Plan

42. How are we assessing demand and viability for community gardens

Response: An assessment of the demand for community gardens will be a requirement of any development plan and be reviewed by the Recreation and Park Director

43. What are the mechanisms for the on-going maintenance of community gardens

Response: Alameda Point Collaborative has committed to maintain and operate the community gardens at the Central Gardens.

November 17, 2016 Transportation Commission Meeting – Review and Comment on Draft Main Street Neighborhood Specific Plan

No Comments.

February 2, 2017 Historical Advisory Board – Review and Comment on Draft Main Street Neighborhood Specific Plan

No Comments.