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Competition Schedule
Specific details of the schedule are subject to change. Please refer to the main page of the competition website, uli.org/hines for relevant updates.

About the Sponsors

Learn more about Hines at https://www.hines.com/about. Follow Hines on Twitter, Facebook, LinkedIn, Instagram, and YouTube. Learn more about Urban Land Institute (ULI) at https://uli.org/about/. Follow ULI on Twitter, Facebook, LinkedIn, Instagram, and YouTube.

Students and graduates, consider becoming ULI members! ULI members have access to:

- ULI Member Directory
- ULI Navigator
- ULI Knowledge Finder
- ULI Case Studies
- ULI Bookstore discounts including textbooks

Associate Membership:

- Under 35 or Government, Nonprofit, and Academia
  - 50 percent discount
- Students
  - 75 percent discount

About the Competition

The ULI Hines Student Competition, now in its 20th year, is one of the core education initiatives of the Urban Land Institute. The competition offers eligible students the opportunity to form multidisciplinary teams and engage in a challenging exercise in responsible land use. It is part of ULI’s ongoing effort to raise interest among young people in creating better communities, improving development patterns, and increasing awareness of the need for multidisciplinary solutions to development and design challenges.

The late Gerald D. Hines, founder and chairman of the Hines real estate company, was the 2002 recipient of the $100,000 ULI Prize for Visionaries in Urban Development. A firm believer in the power of people and fostering transformative values, Hines declined the prize money and endowed the program with an additional $3 million, ensuring its longevity and legacy for future generations of practitioners.

“The purpose of the competition is to raise awareness, particularly among the next generation, of the important role that high-quality urban design plays in creating not just beautiful buildings, but living environments,” Hines said.

The competition encourages cooperation and teamwork among future real estate developers and investors and the many allied professions, such as architecture, landscape architecture, planning, finance, historic preservation, law, and public policy, among others. Since the competition began in 2003, more than 10,250 students on more than 2,050 teams have participated, including 380 students who have made it to the finals.
The Competition Host City: Oakland, California

This year’s competition is focused on a site in Oakland, California. Oakland is the county seat of Alameda County, California, and its largest city, as well as the eighth-largest city in California, with a population of 440,646 as of the 2020 census (2019 American Community Survey one-year estimates). The city measures 78 square miles—28 percent of which is water—spreading from the flatlands along the estuary to the west, up into the foothills to the east. Oakland includes Lake Merritt, a 140-acre tidal lagoon east of downtown.

Oakland’s position as a port city in the East Bay, and its relationship to the city of San Francisco across the San Francisco Bay, have guided its fortunes in significant ways. Oakland became the West Coast terminus of the first transcontinental railroad around 1869, and its original shipping wharves—built along the Oakland Estuary in 1852, the year of Oakland’s incorporation as a town—were dredged to establish a deep-water port in 1874. City boosters prepared for growth in multiple successive city plans, aiming to succeed San Francisco as the leading West Coast city. Although that goal never materialized, Oakland was a major employment center due to the booming shipbuilding and automotive industries before and during World War II and continues to be a significant regional employment hub.

Employment opportunities and migration patterns have created a diverse, culturally rich community in Oakland. The population of Black and African American citizens in Oakland grew from 3 percent prior to WWII, to around 12 percent after the war. The Second Great Migration, from about 1940 to 1970, saw African Americans from around the United States moving out of the South to urban areas in the Northeast, Midwest, and West, including Oakland and the Bay Area, escaping conditions in the South and drawn by the employment opportunities. In the 1850s, Chinese immigrants ventured to California to work on the Central Pacific Railroad, and many settled in Oakland. According to the Oakland Wiki, a thriving Latino community that was majority Mexican was established in West Oakland from 1910-1950, many escaping the Mexican Revolution. Native American communities remain in the Bay Area despite displacement from their ancestral lands; the Indigenous population in the Bay Area is around 18,500 and roughly 3,900 in Oakland.

In Oakland, the number of manufacturing jobs shrank relatively abruptly after World War II, and both jobs and people began leaving the urban centers for the suburbs, as the automobile began expanding access to these outlying places. These trends, combined with racially-based restrictions in hiring and homeownership, such as redlining, disproportionately affected communities of color in Oakland, a place rapidly losing capital investment and services. In response to these constraints, Oakland fostered a strong tradition of local and national organizing and activism. These trends and more are explored in the recommended reading list. The important history of racial disparities, activism, and urban development in Oakland merits a thoughtful look at the vision and goals the city has outlined for its future in the planning documents shared in this brief.
Figure 2 – A 1937 redlining map of Oakland, published by the Homeowner’s Loan Corporation. Areas colored red (primarily in West Oakland and along the estuary) were ranked as D-grade, or high risk, due to the presence of African Americans and other minority groups. Such a rating prevented mortgage lending and other forms of investment. Source: HOLC (1937), accessed from ResearchGate.

Notice to Competitors

UNDER NO CIRCUMSTANCES SHOULD YOU COMMUNICATE REGARDING THE COMPETITION WITH HINES, THE CITY OF OAKLAND, ALAMEDA COUNTY, THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, OR OTHER REGIONAL MUNICIPALITIES, THE NONPROFIT AND PUBLIC AGENCIES INVOLVED, THE PROPERTY OWNERS OR EMPLOYEES OF THE PROPERTY OWNERS, CONSULTANTS WHO ARE WORKING OR WHO HAVE WORKED ON THE PROJECT, THE COMPETITION JURY, OR OTHER ASSOCIATED ENTITIES. DO NOT CALL ULI’S HEADQUARTERS IN WASHINGTON, D.C., ULI SAN FRANCISCO, OR OTHER ULI DISTRICT COUNCILS, UNLESS THOSE DISTRICT COUNCILS ALREADY HAVE OFFERED TO BE A RESOURCE TO YOUR TEAM. IF ULI LEARNS THAT YOU HAVE TRIED TO COMMUNICATE IN THE MANNER DESCRIBED HERE, ULI MAY DISCARD YOUR SUBMISSION AND THE JURY WILL NOT REVIEW IT.
The Competition Site and Study Area: Downtown Oakland

The competition Site and Study Area are in downtown Oakland, California, specifically in the southwest part of downtown often referred to as Old Oakland.

The competition Site consists of four blocks—about 12 acres, inclusive of public rights-of-way—outlined in red in the image to the left. The Site boundaries are 7th Street to the north, Broadway to the east, 6th Street to the south and Martin Luther King Junior Way to the west.

The Study Area consists of about 93 acres, inclusive of public rights-of-way, outlined in green. The Study Area boundaries are 9th Street to the north, Webster Street to the east, 4th Street to the south, Market Street to the west (between 4th and 7th streets), and Castro Street to the west (between 7th and 9th streets).
The Site falls within Census Tract 403100, with a total population of 1,830, 70 percent of whom are people of color (POC) and 42 percent of whom are low-income. The Study Area falls across four census tracts. You can find out more about the specific demographic makeup of the community in these census tracts using the Oakland Geographic Equity Toolbox.

Figure 6 – Base image and illustration courtesy of city of Oakland.

Figure 7 – View of the site looking north from Broadway. Image source: Oakland Police Department Police Administration Building Feasibility Study, 2017.
Figure 8 – A view of the competition site looking west from Washington Street.

Figure 9 – A view of the competition site looking east down 7th Street from where I-980 crosses Castro Street.
Recommended Reading and Listening

See the links below to access recommended reading to become familiar with the city of Oakland’s history. Some of these resources will be available in the Google Drive folder, titled 2022 ULI Hines Student Competition – Student Resources. For the books and some journal articles, we recommend searching your university library since we cannot provide copies.


- **Centering Racial Equity in Homeless System Design**, January 2021, from EveryOne Home, City of Oakland, City of Berkeley, and Alameda County Health Care Services Agency.

- **Downtown Oakland Specific Plan** (DOSP) (Public Review Draft), August 30, 2019, including updates described on the city website. Of particular importance: Vision & Goals (pages 15–53), including Equity Framework (pages 18–22), A Brief History of Racial Disparities in Oakland (pages 32–33), Vision (page 35) and Key Policies (pages 23–29).

- **East Bay Yesterday podcast episode 80** with host Liam O’Donoghue, interviewing Mitchell Schwarzer, author of *Hella Town: Oakland’s History of Development and Disruption*, September 2021.

- **Four Plans That Shaped Downtown Oakland’s First 100 Years**, The Urbanist, Issue 540, February 2015.

- **Race, Space, and Struggles for Mobility**: Transportation Impacts on African-Americans in San Francisco’s East Bay, Urban Geography, August 2013.


The University of California Berkeley Centers for Educational Justice & Community Engagement provides important information about the Native American communities that inhabited Oakland and the surrounding areas, as does the Bay Area Equity Atlas.

**ULI Reading**

These resources are available to students for the competition. Some resources, such as the Home Attainability Index and Case Studies, are typically available only to ULI members.

- **Emerging Trends in Real Estate ® United States and Canada 2022** – September 2021, PwC and the Urban Land Institute.

**ULI Terwilliger Center 2021 Home Attainability Index** – March 2021.

**ULI Award Winners in Oakland**

- **Casa Arabella** – 2021 ULI Americas Awards for Excellence winner. Located four miles east of the site.

- **St. Joseph’s Campus** – 2015 ULI Global Awards for Excellence winner. More online from Bridge Housing.
**Madison at 14th Apartments** – 2010 ULI Americas Awards for Excellence winner. More online from [Satellite Affordable Housing Associates](#).

**ULI Panels and Case Studies in Oakland**

**Creating the Environment for Retail by Defining Broadway** – 2011-2021, Urban Land Institute, Daniel Rose Fellows. View the study visit panel’s [presentation](#).

**Fruitvale Village I** – January 1, 2005. Fruitvale Village I is a four-acre (1.62-hectare) mixed-use, mixed-income, transit-oriented development located next to the Fruitvale Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) station in the Fruitvale district about 4.5 miles (7.2 kilometers) southeast of downtown Oakland, California.

**Preservation Park** – January 1, 1996. A 55,604-square-foot redevelopment project bringing together sixteen 19th-century Victorian residences from scattered locations to a two-block urban site adjacent to the Oakland City Center mixed-use redevelopment project. Located just under a half mile north of the site.
The Competition Challenge

The competition challenge reflects much of reality; however, ULI has changed certain details in this brief for the purpose of the competition. The competition is an educational exercise; ULI does not anticipate that anyone will build what participating teams propose for the site.

The city of Oakland, California (the city), has identified a site in Downtown Oakland as a development opportunity. Together, the city and Alameda County own four blocks in the area and have selected your team as master developer to provide a vision and proposal to transform the Site into a thriving, mixed-use, mixed-income neighborhood. As master developer, your team has entered into an agreement with the city to evaluate the benefits and financial possibilities of redeveloping these parcels as one comprehensive development site. As the master developer, you can propose to acquire land from, or lease from, the city and county, and/or establish a Public Private Partnership, or determine other mechanisms by which to redevelop.

The site includes four city blocks: 1) Jefferson Square Park – a designated local historic landmark, 2) the Alameda County Sheriff’s Department building, 3) the County Courthouse, and 4) the Oakland Police Administration Building (PAB). Assume that all buildings on blocks 2, 3, and 4 are no longer viable for their current use.

The City and County are seeking a vision for the area that will increase connectivity to surrounding neighborhoods, provide much needed neighborhood services, address critical issues of equity and housing affordability in the city and region, and have a positive economic impact both locally and regionally while increasing the sustainability and resilience of the Study Area, the surrounding community, and the city at large. You should provide specific ideas for making the freeway underpasses more humane and increasing accessibility from the site to West Oakland, Jack London Square, Chinatown and other adjacent neighborhoods. Your development should provide at least one solution within the boundaries of the Study Area for housing, or otherwise supporting, unsheltered residents in Oakland.

Your team may choose to acquire and develop additional property inside the Study Area if doing so will further your vision and proposal. Such property may be publicly or privately owned, so you would need to factor the acquisition costs into your proposal. You may not acquire parcels outside the Study Area as part of the 10-year period. You can recommend and/or visualize a long-term conceptual plan for redeveloping parcels outside of the Study Area outside of the 10-year period, but this is not a requirement of the competition.

The Oakland Planning & Building Department released the Public Review Draft of the Downtown Oakland Specific Plan (DOSP) in August 2019 and had hoped to adopt the plan in summer 2020. The city adjusted that goal in response to community engagement and the pandemic and is now targeting adoption by the end of 2021 or later. For the purposes of this competition, assume the Public Review Draft of the DOSP has been adopted including updates described on the city website.

Within the Study Area, consider that there are parcels that may have properties that are of historical importance or otherwise are important to the community. Consider the city’s Culture Keeping goals, as outlined in the Downtown Oakland Specific Plan (DOSP), and its Historic Preservation goals, when considering whether and how to redevelop additional parcels.

For the purposes of this competition, you may redevelop Jefferson Square Park, however, you must keep at least the current amount of public open space somewhere within your development. Consider that the park is one of the original public squares laid out for the city in 1852.
Police Administration Building

As part of this challenge, you must propose how the city might fund, in full or in part, relocating all existing Police Department functions to a new, consolidated Police Administration Facility (PAF) at an alternative City-owned site, such as the Hegenberger site, described in documents below and located near the Oakland Arena and Ring Central Coliseum. Relocation of the current PAB to the proposed PAF will be a very expensive undertaking. For the purposes of this challenge, assume the cost to build the new facility is at least $500 million. You do not need to design or visualize the new PAF. The recommended financial strategies for the city to finance a new PAF can be a separate schedule and can assume a timeframe that exceeds the 10-year horizon intended for the main project.

For more information on the PAB and PAF you can reference two studies, available in the Google Drive folder:

1. **Oakland Police Department Police Administration Building Feasibility Study**, November 10, 2017 (2017-1110 PAB Report.pdf). Includes a Preliminary Space Needs Assessment, a Real Estate Analysis that addresses the value of the existing PAB facility if it were sold, cost estimates for the new PAF, as well as an overview of possible public financing opportunities to partially fund a new facility.
2. **Police Administration Building Feasibility Study, 633 Hegenberger Road Site Evaluation I**, May 2, 2018 (PAB Feasibility Study Hegenberger Site May 2 2018.pdf). This document studies a couple of options for accommodating the facility at the site, including updated project costs.

Local and Regional Data

Further data are available on the region, the city, and downtown from a variety of sources. Learn more about the city and downtown then and now at Visit Oakland and the Oakland Tourism Business Improvement District (OTBID), Oakland BID Alliance, The Lake Merritt-Uptown and Downtown Oakland Community Benefit Districts, the Jack London Improvement District, the Oakland Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce (e.g., Annual Survey of Voter Attitudes), the Oakland Indie Alliance, and the Oakland Chinatown Chamber of Commerce, et al.

Oakland Art Murmur offers an interactive map of creative venues around the city, including the Oakland Asian Cultural Center, at the NW corner of 8th and Broadway.

The U.S. Census Bureau, including Quick Facts provides important demographic data. The Bay Area Equity Atlas, tracks the state of equity across the region. SPUR, a nonprofit public policy organization offers research and policy reports for the region in their Reports Library, including the recent report, The Bigger Picture: Ten Ideas for Equitable Transportation in Oakland.

Development Context

Urban Planning

The Urbanist explores early Oakland planning in the article **Four Plans That Shaped Downtown Oakland’s First 100 Years**, Issue 540, February 2015:
• The Kellersberger survey and grid (1852);
• The Robinson Plan, which emphasized civic infrastructure but was not implemented (1906);
• The Hegemann Report (1915), which resulted in the implementation of much of the Robinson Plan and included a regional vision for connecting to Berkeley; and
• The Bartholomew Plan, which ushered in planning for the automobile (1928)

The city has several neighborhood and citywide plans available online from the City of Oakland Planning & Building department.

In April 2021, Oakland kicked off an update to City of Oakland General Plan. The state of California requires these plans to have certain Elements on land use, circulation, housing, conservation, open space, noise, and safety, and jurisdictions may include other Elements as they see fit. Since 2016, cities with disadvantaged communities must adopt environmental justice policies or an Environmental Justice Element. The Environmental Justice element is under development for Oakland.

Historic Resources
Oakland’s Historic Preservation efforts include designating historic landmarks (approximately 140-150) and preservation districts (nine, with about 1,500 buildings), as well as a Local Register of Historical Resources that recognizes important buildings and districts even if they have not been designated. There is a Historic Preservation Element in the General Plan. The Grove Street Residential district includes Jefferson Square Park on the site and other parcels in the Study Area. The Old Oakland district and 7th Street Residential District include parcels in the Study Area.

Housing and the Unhoused
In Oakland, some parts of the General Plan are newer than others. The Housing Element (2015-2023) offers an inventory of sites suitable for residential development in Oakland; an assessment of financial and programmatic resources; and an analysis of constraints, both governmental and non-governmental, to housing production in Oakland.

Oakland’s inviting climate, diversity, and vibrant cultural life make it an appealing place to live. Emerging Trends in Real Estate 2022 notes Oakland/East Bay in the top 50 regions in its U.S. Markets to Watch lists, both in Overall Real Estate Prospects and Homebuilding Prospects. However, housing supply has not kept up with the city’s almost 13% population growth over the past decade, with most of the 5% increase in housing going to market-rate units. The city provides some support for Affordable Housing Development.

The escalation in home prices has intensified the homelessness crisis. Between 2017 and 2019, homelessness increased by 43% in Alameda County. The San Francisco Chronicle Homeless Project explores the homelessness crisis in Oakland. The Oakland City Auditor has provided a Performance Audit of the City of Oakland’s Homeless Shelter Management Intervention & Activities.

Transportation
Downtown Oakland is accessible by bike, bus, train, automobile, and ferry. Regional transit provider Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) has three stops downtown, and the easternmost block of the site is approximately a 7-minute walk to the Oakland 12th Street Station. As part of the Link 21 plan, a second transbay line from Oakland to San Francisco is possible in the future.

Amtrak offers passenger service at Jack London Square and freight rail stops at the Port of Oakland. AC Transit’s East Bay bus routes radiate out from downtown, and the San Francisco Bay Ferry’s Oakland & Alameda Ferry Route connects Oakland to eight other ferry terminals via the Jack London Square Ferry Terminal located at the foot of Clay Street.
The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is the transportation planning, financing and coordinating agency for the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area, and has plans underway for the West Oakland Link, a proposed 1.1 mile-long elevated pedestrian and bicycle pathway, and various projects related to the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge and Bay Bridge Trail connecting to Oakland.

The city has both the Oakland Bike Plan, updated in 2019, and the Oakland Pedestrian Plan, updated in 2017. Lyft operates the Bay Wheels bikeshare in Oakland, while Oakland is developing a permit program and shared mobility principles to manage privately-owned motorized scooter and other share mobility services.

Interstates I-580, I-980, I-880 and State Route 24 pass through and around downtown. The two-mile Interstate I-980, built between 1960 and 1985, divided downtown from West Oakland, and displaced primarily Black residents. Community members, with the support of the current mayor, have been advocating to replace I-980 with a boulevard. Connect Oakland provides more information on the history of the highway spur and the initiative to replace the interstate and reconnect neighborhoods. The city’s 7th Street Connection Project recently announced funding for plans to upgrade connections between West Oakland and the Study Area. The city recently was awarded a RAISE Grant to extend bus only lanes on Broadway from the 12th Street BART station to Jack London Square and to extend buffered bike lanes on Martin Luther King Jr. Way between 2nd Street and San Pablo Avenue.

Baseball Downtown
Oakland’s Major League Baseball team, the Oakland A’s, have long had their home field at the Oakland Coliseum, about 6 miles east of the site in downtown Oakland. The team has been seeking a new location, however, and, in 2018, proposed a waterfront ballpark district at Howard Terminal, owned by the Port of Oakland, and a plan to redevelop the Coliseum site. The proposal includes an option for an aerial gondola that connects to the ballpark from Old Oakland and would pass over the site. See the draft EIR, particularly Chapters 3 and 5, to learn more about the gondola proposal. In 2021, the City and County voted to help fund the new ballpark at Howard Terminal, however they have not yet approved plans for the ballpark, and the Oakland A’s are also considering a move to Las Vegas, Nevada. The Coliseum site redevelopment also is tenuous, however the City did award redevelopment rights to African American Sports and Entertainment Group (AASEG) in November. For this competition, you can determine whether either proposal becomes a
reality during the ten-year period of your development proposal or beyond, and therefore affects your proposed development.

Adjacent Neighborhoods/Places
The Downtown Oakland Specific Plan (DOSP) provides an overview of neighborhoods in downtown. Learn more about West Oakland in the Final West Oakland Specific Plan and the area around the Lake Merritt BART Station in the Lake Merritt Station Area Plan.

Figure 10 – Source: DOSP

Area Developments
The city outlines major development projects on its website and provides a map of approved, planned, and completed projects. Various maps in the DOSP displays current and proposed development. The San Francisco Business Times East Bay news offers additional information on current and proposed projects.

Notable developments near the site include:

- **County Broadway Properties** - In August, 2019, Alameda County directed the General Services Agency to prepare a Request for Proposals (RFP) to qualified developers to ground lease the County’s Oakland Broadway properties located on either side of Broadway between 4th and 5th Streets (401 Broadway, 430 Broadway, and 499 5th Street) for a mixed-use development, utilizing Government Code Section 25539.4, which specifies that a minimum of 80% of the development be developed as housing and that a minimum of 40% of the housing units be affordable to very-low and low-income households. In 2021, the team of
Related California/East Bay Asian Local Development Corporation (EBALDC) was selected to redevelop the site.

- In December, the Oakland City Council approved a five-story building with 57 residential units, at 578 7th Street, including 16 units for moderate-income households.
- The Key at 12th – Ellis Partners redeveloped an empty lot at 12th and Broadway and renovated an adjacent historic building into an 18-story Class A office tower. The building is complete and occupied.

**Detailed Assignment**

**Goals and Deliverables**

The city has asked you as master developer to do the following:

1. **Understand regional forces**—social, historical, demographic, political, and economic, among others.
2. **Analyze the competition site** in relation to its surroundings.
3. Propose a **land acquisition plan** for any parcels you decide to redevelop that are outside the Site and inside the Study Area.
4. Ascertain the **current “as-is” (pre-entitled) market value of the four block Competition Site plus any additional properties** you may wish to redevelop within the Study Area.
5. Determine the **type of redevelopment** the market would support.
6. Provide an **implementation plan** that outlines strategic partnerships and community engagement.
7. Propose a **market-feasible development program and financial pro forma** for the **Competition Site** plus any additional parcels. This program should identify all phasing within the site and provide market-driven assumptions and feasible sources of financing.
8. Ascertain the **value of the total redeveloped site**, including land and buildings, at the end of a 10-year period.
9. Determine the **subsidies** (if any) that would make redevelopment feasible and the **sources** of those subsidies.
10. **Outline a structure that allocates risk adjusted returns to each entity involved** – the developer, city, county, and any other partners – if sold at the end of ten years (2033).
11. **Outline a strategy for the city to finance a new PAF** at a different site.
12. Propose a **site plan** for the **Competition Site**, including any additional properties you may recommend the City/County acquire.
13. Propose an **urban design scheme** for the **Study Area** that connects it to surrounding areas. Describe specific connections or integrations between the Study Area and surrounding neighborhoods.
14. Detail the **concept designs for key development components** within the 10-year hold.
15. **Offer minimum levels of affordable/workforce housing. In your proposal, a minimum of 25 percent of new residential product**, both for sale and rental, must be units affordable for low- to moderate-income households. The units should have two or more bedrooms and be dispersed throughout the project. These requirements apply to every phase of development.
16. **Follow an anti-displacement approach to redevelopment.** If you acquire additional parcels in the Study Area, you should estimate the number of residents and business tenants currently inhabiting the parcels you are redeveloping and plan to house the same residents and businesses within the redevelopment in units of equivalent or better quality and size.
17. Leverages this opportunity to **create benefits to the community that are of high priority to the city**.
18. **Maintain, at least, the amount of open space** currently on the Site.
19. Provides solution(s), within the Study Area, to **housing or otherwise supporting unsheltered residents**.
**Essential Presentation Elements**

All submissions should include the following five general elements, and you may include other elements that you think are necessary to tell your story:

1. Planning context and analysis;
2. Site plan;
3. Urban design;
4. Site-specific illustrations of new development; and
5. Development schedule and finances.

**Detailed Guidance on the Essential Presentation Elements**

1. **Planning context and analysis**
   
   Illustrate planning context and analysis with diagrams and/or annotated plans at a scale. Describe overall patterns and concepts for local and regional issues the team considers relevant. These might include, for example, the following:
   
   - land use;
   - circulation (pedestrian, vehicular, transit, bicycle, parking, etc.);
   - open space, waterways, and other natural systems;
   - environmental, sustainability, and resilience considerations;
   - image and character of the area;
   - social and economic concerns;
   - community planning and infrastructure concepts; and
   - private-sector development concepts.

2. **Site plan**
   
   Your site plan should communicate the following:
   
   - blocks and streets;
   - land and building uses;
   - location of transit line(s) and stops/terminals;
   - public infrastructure, including stormwater;
   - connections to neighboring blocks; and
   - general concepts for landscape and open space.

   You must account visually for pads (either improved or unimproved) that are not fully developed within the 10-year hold, but you do not need to depict them in detail.

3. **Urban design**
   
   Your urban design scheme might address the following:
   
   - overall design characteristics and aesthetic values;
   - building typology and architecture;
   - public realm enhancements;
   - circulation and access (pedestrian, vehicular, transit, bicycle, parking, etc.) to and within the Study Area;
• infrastructure;
• landscape, open space, waterways, and/or natural systems; and
• environmental stewardship, sustainability, and resilience.

4. Site-specific illustrations of new development
Your presentation should include annotated illustrations that zoom in on the site. These illustrations might be plans, elevations, sections, or three-dimensional views (perspective/axonometric).
• Clearly identify which phase each illustration is describing.
• Illustrate massing and scale for the public and private realms.
• Illustrate public space components, including how they will be programmed and used.

5. Development schedule and finances
• ULI has provided a generic pro forma template in the Google Drive folder. In this template, adapted from the ULI publication *Mixed-Use Development Handbook, Second Edition* (2003), worksheets do not link to one another and the cells do not contain formulas. If you use this template, you must familiarize yourself with their logic and internal relationships and build your own links. This template is a guide and starting point. You may modify the template, add, or delete line items (e.g., you may not have office space in your development program), and create assumptions (e.g., cap rate, net present value discount rate, vacancy rate, etc.) as you deem necessary. You do not need to fill in information about a product type in the template if that type is not part of your development program.
• Save your pro forma workbook as an Excel file for digital submission.
• You must complete and submit the summary tab from the pro forma template ULI provides, even if you use your own pro forma. Depending on the data you input, you may need to reformat the summary tab to fit it to 11” × 17”.
• Should you use your own pro forma, ULI encourages you to also provide your own summary.
  o The jury will first examine the summary from the ULI template because it gives the jury the basic information it needs to compare your development to other developments.
  o The jury may also evaluate your supplemental summary if they wish.
• Your pro forma summary (or summaries) must be easy to read and speak for themselves; the jury likely will not have time to review the rest of the worksheets in your pro forma.
• Whether or not you include your own version of the pro forma, you must be ready to justify the rationale and process behind your numbers and assumptions. You may find it helpful to include an assumptions tab in your pro forma.

**Assumptions**
For the competition, your team should consider the following guidance.

• **Start of development.** Year 0 (planning, entitlements, etc.) is 2022–2023; the start year—the first year you may begin construction or actual redevelopment—is 2024. This is a shortened time frame for the purposes of this competition. In reality, planning, design, and the entitlement process likely would take 3 to 4 years or more.
• **Topography.** Your design should respond to the existing features of the topography or account for the costs and sources of funding needed to alter the topography.
• **Complete neighborhoods.** Proposals should give priority to mixed-use, mixed-income development.
• **Market-feasible costs and pricing.** Although the competition uses a fictional scenario, your team should aim to create a financially feasible plan for the site. Unless you are given a cost or an assumption, come up with a market-appropriate amount that you can justify in your pro forma (e.g.,
current sales price for land in the area, market rents for various uses, project costs, etc.). If your program requires a subsidy, the subsidy amount should be realistic and from a viable source.

- **Planning and Zoning Code.**
  - You may use the current zoning or propose new zoning. If your team proposes changes to existing zoning, clearly state your rezoning proposal, and address the potential ramifications of any changes.
  - The [Oakland Planning Code](#), regulates planning and zoning for the city.
  - The provisions of Chapters 17.07 through 17.158 of the Oakland Planning Code constitute the city’s Zoning Regulations.
  - [Planning and Zoning Map](#) for the city.
  - Parcels you are required to address currently fall within the Open Space Neighborhood Park - OS (NP) (Block 1) and the Central Business District Mixed Commercial (CBD-X) (Blocks 2-4).
  - We encourage you to review and consider changes recommended in the draft [Downtown Oakland Specific Plan](#) (DOSP). Also review the proposed [Zoning Incentive Program](#) on the [DOSP Update page](#).

- **Redevelopment tools.**
  - [Opportunity Zones](#). A small portion of the Study Area is in the West Oakland Opportunity Zone. A map of Opportunity Zones is available online from the [HUD Open Data Site](#).

- **Infrastructure costs.**
  - You must include costs for infrastructure on private parcels in your financing proposal.
  - You must include costs for public infrastructure in your financing proposal if you use that infrastructure to achieve a building premium. That means if you propose public infrastructure that clearly goes above and beyond what the municipality typically provides in the area, then you should include it in your budget, and identify sources of funds to cover the cost of that infrastructure. For example, if the city is not typically paying for rain gardens for stormwater management in the area, and you are proposing rain gardens, then you should include the cost of rain gardens in your budget and identify a source of funds for them. If you propose infrastructure that is normal practice for the area (e.g., something like paving a public road), you do not need to include the cost of the infrastructure in your budget.
  - You could propose that the city pay for the additional infrastructure costs (beyond normal practice), but if that results in extravagant costs that are obviously outside of the city’s funding or operating capacity or won’t lead to obvious returns for the city, the jury is likely to observe that problem, and it could hurt your proposal.

- **Existing uses and tenants.** Assume no current tenants on the required four blocks. If you decide to acquire additional parcels, assume any current tenants’ leases expire at the end of December 2022 with the option to renew on a month-to-month basis. You may find it optimal to retain all, some, or none of those tenants, and you may change lease rates as you deem appropriate when you sign a new lease or bring on a new tenant. If you apply new lease rates, they should reflect market rates.

- **Rights-of-way and circulation patterns.** You may change street and circulation patterns. You may choose to close or create public streets within your development blocks. If you close a public ROW and develop the space, you need to buy the land from the city at fair market value.

- **Construction costs.** You can use tables from [RSMeans](#) or a resource of equivalent quality as a guideline to estimate your construction costs. Assume you are using union labor and try to get specific estimates for California. Unfortunately, ULI is not able to offer access to RSMeans. RSMeans Online offers 30-day free trials. Your university program or library may be able to provide access to cost information, digital or other, or a lower-cost student access (rent or buy) version may be available [online](#).
• Taxes.
  o Real property tax. Use the 2021-2022 Alameda County real property rate of 1.3741%.
  o Proposition 13 is an amendment to the California Constitution passed in 1978 that required property taxes – residential and commercial – be taxed at no more than 1 percent of their full cash value and limited annual increases of assessed (taxable) value to the inflation rate or 2 percent, whichever was less.
• Inflation. Assume that all costs are subject to an inflation rate compounded at three percent per year.
• Brownfields and Remediation. You do not need to address remediation of hazardous materials within the Site and Study Area as we do not have details on type and extent of possible contamination. The U.S. EPA Cleanups in My Community Map indicates no notable sites within the Site or Study Area.
• Demolition costs. In your pro forma you must account for the cost of demolition of existing structures where they currently exist (assuming you wish to demolish them) if you demolish them within the 10-year period of your pro forma. In real life, these costs vary greatly depending on former land use type. Teams may choose to assign costs to demolish parcels based on an assessment of existing structures and land uses or apply a general cost per square foot to the entire site.
• Property owners. Please identify all land that you may choose to acquire using the generic identifier “developable parcel.” Other than the city and county, do not refer to the name of the real-world owner of any parcel in your proposal.

**Competition Resources**

The following list includes all the items available for download from the Google Drive folder or elsewhere and serves as a checklist for you to ensure you receive all the resources:

• The challenge brief (this document) is available as a PDF.
• The pro forma template is available as an Excel file.
• The Q&A document is available as a Google Doc. During the competition period, ULI will post responses to team inquiries on this document in the Google Drive folder. Please plan to check it daily.
• Geographic Information System (GIS) files of the site and its surroundings.
  o Resources also are available on the City of Oakland’s Open Data Platform.
  o During the competition, participants have free access to ArcGIS Online, ArcGIS Urban, and ArcGIS Business Analyst tools via esri, as well as to high resolution 3D models and aerial imagery of the site via nearmap. On January 4, registered participants received instructions on how to login to ArcGIS and access these tools. If you have not received these instructions, please email HinesCompetition@uli.org. Participants are not required to use these tools and do not need to use them to be successful in this competition.
• Photos and videos of the site and some parts of the study area, including ground-level and aerial imagery and aerial video, are available through the ULI Awards account on flickr.com. Details on how to access geolocation data for these photos are available as a Word document.
• The example Bay Area cost catalogue is available as a PDF. These are example costs acquired in fall 2020 by graduate level students interviewing construction companies working in the Bay Area. These are simply potential examples to guide your own cost estimates. You can and should do your own research to inform your cost estimates.
• Various reports will be available in the Google Drive folder. You are not required to review these documents, and you should plan to do additional research to inform your proposal.
Downloading Competition Resources

- You may download competition resources for distribution only among your team members, faculty advisers, and professional advisers.
- You may share resources and collaborate across teams, if team members aren’t directly contributing content to one another’s proposals (so that we don’t have to worry about someone asking for credit for part of another team’s proposal).
- You may use competition resources only for this competition. You may not use, copy, or distribute these resources for any other purpose without written permission from ULI.

Criteria for Judging

The jury will select **four finalist teams** that it deems have best satisfied the Goals and Deliverables of the challenge outlined previously and the criteria described here. The jury, at its discretion, will award an unspecified number of **honorable mentions** for outstanding submissions in one or more of these criteria. Specifically, proposals should strive to meet the following criteria:

- **Integrate planning and design decisions with economic feasibility, including market-level returns on investment** for private investors and lenders:
  - public investments in infrastructure and public facilities should have clear value for the owners; and
  - the development proposal and planning and design concepts should support and reinforce both public planning goals and financial returns for the owners.
- **Demonstrate awareness of design issues** contributing to a development that supports the vision specified in this brief.
- **Demonstrate attention to factors affecting the risks and feasibility of the project**, including:
  - development and construction costs;
  - future expenses and revenues from operations and land sales; and
  - effects of project phasing on risks and feasibility.
- **Work together as a team**: a primary goal of this competition is to provide a means and demonstration of integrating real estate with allied disciplines. The jury will consider how successfully your team worked together, as evidenced by the consistency and coherency of your proposal. You may have an excellent pro forma, but if your vision is weak and your site plan is confusing your proposal will not advance to the finals. Likewise, you may have an excellent vision and stunning graphics, but if your pro forma is a mess, your proposal will not advance.
- The jury may, if it wishes, use additional criteria in making its final decisions.

Jury Evaluation Process

ULI strives to conduct a thorough, fair, and rigorous jury evaluation process, yet teams need to consider the realistic constraints on, and limitations of, the jury. ULI receives many submissions (100 on average), and jurors have very limited time to review each one. Jurors will not have extensive time to delve into every detail of every proposal, nor will they have the capacity to provide lengthy, detailed feedback. Teams should make their presentations as clear and easy to understand as possible. The jurors ULI selects are leaders in their fields and generously donate their time to the competition. Just as in the real world, in which developers and designers have a finite window to present their proposals, your team should strive to make a meaningful first impression by packaging your solution in a compelling and succinct fashion that invites additional analysis of the proposal. The following is a typical process; however, it might not be the exact process the 2022 jury uses:
• The Competition Jury meets twice, once in February to review all submissions and again in April for the final presentations.
• About one week before the jury meets in February, all jurors receive all digital files from each complete submission. The jurors do not have to review every submission, although some jurors do. ULI will indicate to each juror which subset of submissions they should review.
• During the February meeting, the jury has approximately 12 hours over three working days to review all the submissions, select the four finalists and any honorable mentions, and provide feedback to the finalists. To accomplish this task on such a tight timeline, the jury breaks out into groups of three. Each group includes one juror from the host area, at least one juror who can review the financing proposal, and at least one juror who can review the design.
• The jurors take several minutes in their groups to review each team’s submission and provide verbal feedback, which a ULI staff member captures, to share the feedback with the student team later. Each breakout group selects the best submissions in their group to go to review by the whole jury.
• The full jury discusses the merits of approximately one-quarter to one-fifth of the total number of submissions as a group. They consider whether and how each submission met the criteria.
• Each juror casts votes for the four submissions they think should be finalists. The submissions with the most votes become the finalists.
• The jury discusses the feedback they want ULI staff to provide to each finalist team.
• The jury selects honorable mentions and discusses why they merit this honor.
• Only after selecting the finalists and the honorable mentions does ULI staff reveal to the jury which school(s) submitted each proposal.

Presentation Requirements
• ULI developed the presentation requirements for the benefit of both competitors and the jury. These requirements ensure that the jury will have enough information to evaluate and compare proposals.

Required Presentation Materials
1. One print-quality presentation sheet in PDF, in horizontal landscape format, with, at least, your site plan, urban design, and site-specific illustrations. This sheet can be any of the following sizes: 64” × 36” (2,304 square inches) or 68” × 33” (2,244 square inches) or 72” × 36” (2,592 square inches). The jury will primarily review your slide deck but will refer to your presentation sheets as well. We will not print these boards; the jury will review them digitally. We request these board-sized documents to give you more room to be creative and so you or ULI can print out the boards later, if desired.
2. One web-quality presentation sheet in PDF.
3. One web-quality presentation sheet in JPG or PNG.
4. One pro forma in Excel. You can include your PAF financing proposal in this pro forma or submit it separately.
5. One 11” × 17” PDF of the summary tab from the ULI pro forma template. You can orient this in landscape or portrait format; the template is in portrait format.
6. One 11” × 17” PDF of a supplemental summary from your own pro forma (OPTIONAL). You can orient this in landscape or portrait format.
7. One pro forma in Excel for your PAF proposal (OPTIONAL). You must submit an Excel document outlining your PAF financing proposal, however where you submit it is optional. Submit it either with your main pro forma (item 4), or separately here.
8. One 11” × 17” PDF digital slide show in horizontal landscape format. The digital slide show must follow these rules:
The slide show can contain only images and information on your presentation sheet. You are not permitted to create new images exclusively for the slide show. You can display the images and information at different scales and in a different order than on your presentation sheet.

Digital slides may not be animated. Do not include video.

Each team is limited to 20 slides that must follow this outline:

1. **Team code and proposal title** (in any order). Do not include information that would identify any team member or school. You can include an image from your presentation on this slide, but it’s not required.

2. **One narrative summary**, no more than 500 words, which describes your design and development plan, including information on the topics below.
   - Within this summary, include an even briefer summary statement of your proposal in 50–75 words or less.
   - Use your summary to highlight how your proposal:
     o increases connectivity to surrounding neighborhoods
     o provides neighborhood services
     o addresses critical issues of equity and housing affordability in the city and region
     o has a positive economic impact both locally and regionally
     o increases the sustainability and resilience of the Study Area, surrounding neighborhoods, and the city.

3. **One narrative summary**, no more than 500 words, which describes your financing plan, including the PAF financing strategy.

4. **Your whole site plan** on one slide. To improve legibility, you may display a less detailed version of the site plan from what appears on your presentation sheet.

5. **Community benefits** from your proposal – Narrative information, organized with bullet points, on how your proposal:
   - Provides the required affordable housing.
   - Offers specific ideas for making the freeway underpasses more humane and increasing accessibility from the site to adjacent places.
   - Provides solutions, within the Study Area, for housing or otherwise supporting unsheltered residents.
   - Maintains the minimum open space.
   - Achieve other benefits you are offering.

6. Use the remaining slides to communicate images and information from your presentation sheet and tell the story of your development.

9. **One 11” x 17” web-quality JPG or PNG displaying your site plan.**

10. **At least one 340-pixel × 340-pixel graphic vignette of an iconic project image from your presentation sheet.** Typically, this vignette is from your site plan or illustrations. Please do not submit your logo or proposal title as the vignette and do NOT include your team code on this image. ULI may use these vignettes to feature finalists and other selected entries online after the competition period concludes.


**Notes on Graphics**

- Competitors have discretion to select which graphic techniques they use.
- Maps, plans, and illustrations may be at any scale.
- Maps, plans, and illustrations to scale should include a graphic scale and an arrow indicating north.
• Sections should include a graphic scale.
• On presentation sheets, aim to represent your big ideas with graphics rather than with a lot of text. Make sure there is just enough text so that the jury understands what they are seeing. Text works best to label charts, graphs, images, or timelines, or to provide succinct descriptions where needed.

**Submission Process**

**Deadline**

ULI must receive all digital submissions by 11:59 p.m. Pacific Standard Time on Monday, January 24, 2022. We suggest you review and understand the online form AND plan to complete it well ahead of this deadline. ULI staff will not be available to answer questions or assist you after 9:00 p.m. Eastern Standard Time on January 24.

**Rules for Submission**

- **You will submit only digital files**, as outlined below. Please do not mail anything to ULI.
- Submit all files via the 2022 ULI Hines Student Competition portal at [www.uli.org/hines2022](http://www.uli.org/hines2022) using the form titled “Submission Materials.” This form will be accessible by January 11, 2022, the day after the competition commences.
- The person who submitted the team application should also be the one to login, upload documents, and submit your team’s final proposal. If other team members need to upload documents, the person who submitted the application will need to log in and add team members using the Manage Collaborators function.
- **One corner of every document except the vignettes MUST display your team’s eight-digit code**, which takes the form “2022-####.”
  - Your code was automatically generated when you registered to participate at the submission portal at [www.uli.org/hines2022](http://www.uli.org/hines2022). Whomever registered the team should log in to the portal, click on My Applications, select Complete, and you will find your code under “Application #”.
- **DO NOT include any marks—other than your eight-digit code—that identify your team or universities on any of the sheets you submit, either in digital or in hard copy. No mascots, no university buildings, no references an alum would recognize, etc. If you include identifying marks on any sheets, ULI will discard your submission and the jury will not review it.**
- ULI will not accept—and the jury will not review—any supplemental diagrams or information that you do not present directly on the sheets described above under “Required Presentation Materials.”

**Notification of Receipt**

You will receive an automatic email and system notification once you hit submit, confirming that we have received your submission. About five days after the submission period ends, ULI will send a message to your team to let you know if your submission is complete and eligible for jury review.

**Finalist Requirements**

Once ULI announces the four finalist teams, ULI will share additional program rules and guidelines for the finalist stage of this competition with those teams.
ArcGIS

Esri has prepared for you an Urban Model in ArcGIS Online of the 2022 ULI Hines competition site, to facilitate use of ArcGIS tools for the competition. This model supports early-stage analysis and site design. ULI does not require you to use the ArcGIS tools or Nearmap mesh to participate in the competition. If you would like to use them, hands-on workshops and Q&A sessions will be available to all participants.

Please note: the space use type parameters related to cost, value, tax rate, and other important assumptions in the Urban Model in ArcGIS Urban are simply for illustrative purposes and are not accurate for the selected city and site. Those who use ArcGIS Urban will need to update the underlying metrics that esri added to the model. Identifying the right metrics is part of the research you will need to do to be successful in the competition. If you have questions about how to do this, please watch the recordings of the introductory webinar in December, workshops on January 5, or Q&A session on January 6 – recordings are available at uli.org/hines.

Questions

Please make sure you are monitoring your email during the competition period, as we may send email updates, new resources, or corrections.

ULI will periodically post questions and answers to the Q&A document in the Google Drive folder. ULI reserves the right to edit submitted questions before posting them. ULI also reserves the right to not answer every question it receives and to not post redundant questions or remarks ULI deems inappropriate or irrelevant. Please plan to check this document daily.

During the 15-day competition, teams may send questions in writing via email to hinescompetition@uli.org.

You will have a chance to provide feedback on the competition in February after the general competition is complete and again in May after the finals are complete.

Thank you for joining us in this year’s competition!
Best of luck,
ULI Hines Student Competition