CITY OF ALBANY
WATERFRONT COMMITTEE
STAFF REPORT

Meeting date: September 7, 2011
Prepared by: JB

ITEM/ 5-2

SUBJECT: **Proposal for second campus of Lawrence Berkeley National Lab on Golden Gate Fields property.**

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

For information and discussion.

BACKGROUND

The Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) is a US Department of Energy sponsored research facility operated by the University of California. The LBNL main campus is located in the Berkeley Hills above the UC Berkeley campus. LBNL research involves in a wide range of energy, bioscience, climate change, and physics-related research initiatives. (Currently, LBNL is not involved in weapons-related research.)

In January 2011, LBNL issued a request for proposals from owners of property in the East Bay interested in being considered as the location for a second campus. LBNL is seeking a site that can ultimately accommodate 2 million square feet of office and laboratory space. Currently several of the LBNL research institutes are located off-campus, and the goal of the first phase of the second campus is to consolidate approximately 500,000 square feet of off-site facilities that LBNL currently leases.

LBNL received 21 proposals, from which six sites were selected for further consideration. The Golden Gate Fields (GGF) property in Albany and Berkeley is one of those six sites. If selected by the University, the GGF proposal would involve the closure of the racetrack, and construction of a series of new buildings and associated infrastructure. In addition to meeting the requirements of the University, GGF is proposing to development additional office, laboratory, hotel, and retail space. According to presentations made by GGF representatives, the additional development is required in order to fund the cost of infrastructure and to be able to provide an economically competitive proposal to the University.

Next Steps

The development team has a deadline of September 30 to submit information to the University. The University will review the materials from the six finalists, and is expected to make an announcement of a preferred site in November 2011. A final decision by the University is

anticipated following completion of an environmental review required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

In addition to the Visions to Vision 2 community outreach efforts currently underway, the City is working with fiscal consultants to understand in detail the financial implications of the proposal on city and school district revenues and operations. In addition, as more detailed design information becomes available, city staff will be able to evaluate the land use and engineering issues involved with the project. The work products coming out of the Voices to Vision process will be an important tool in the evaluation of the proposal. Ultimately, a Measure C vote will be required for elements of the project in Albany that are beyond the University's land use authority.

Attachments

Attached are a series of background documents that may be of interest to the Committee.

1. Request for Qualifications prepared by LBNL
2. Economic Impact Study of the Berkeley Lab prepared in March 2010 – Among other things, the project describes some of the businesses that have spun-off from LBNL
3. PowerPoint presentation prepared by LBNL representatives and presented at the August 3, 2011 public meeting -
4. Summary of Current City General Plan and Zoning Requirements – This document includes text of Citizens Waterfront Approval Initiative (Measure C)
5. Excerpt from April 2010 Voices to Vision Final Report -
6. Voices to Vision 2 Developer Interview
7. Voices to Vision 2 Developer Background
8. Voices to Vision 2 Developer Session Summary
9. Voices to Vision 2 Developer Community Questions and Answers
10. Golden Gate Fields Development Team Presentation
11. Golden Gate Fields Development Team Section Drawing and Explanation

Questions and Answers from *Voices to Vision*

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
Voices to Vision 2 (V2V2) - 2011	
1. How can Albany residents get information and participate in the process?	The City of Albany is hosting a series of informational and participatory sessions about a proposal for the LBNL Second Campus at GGF, along the lines of the original Voices to Vision sessions. It is being called "Voices to Vision 2" (or V2V2). The first set (identical information and activities at each session) was held on July 30, July 31, August 1, and August 2 at the Albany Community Center. More than 340 people participated. (Additionally, LBNL hosted a public meeting in Albany on August 3 at 7:30 p.m. at the Community Center. This was independent of Voices to Vision.) On August 29th, ***Voices to Vision*** is hosting a Q&A with the developer and the city. Other sessions are expected to be held in September, and possibly in October. The city has hired Fern Tiger Associates, the firm that designed and facilitated ***Voices to Vision*** (2008-2010), to conceive and manage the community process. There will be numerous ways for the community to learn more about the proposal for a second campus for LBNL at Golden Gate Fields (which includes more than just LBNL). It is hoped that these sets of sessions will enable the community to understandi the proposal as it becomes more detailed, and as it changes as a result of community input. Every effort is being made to ensure that Albany voices are heard. The Stronach Group, owners of GGF, will reimburse the city for these services and for city time spent on this project. For continued information about ***Voices to Vision*** 2 and ongoing responses to questions being posed about the project, visit www.voicestovision.com.
2. How can residents who do not have a computer keep up with *Voices to Vision 2*?	The *Voices to Vision 2* phone number is 444-4567. Residents without access to the Internet can leave questions or comments on voice mail. Please leave your contact number so that we can get back to you.
3. Does the city of Albany have a signed contract with the Stronach Group to pay for the services of the consultant, Fern Tiger Associates and also for any city costs incurred in this process?	Yes. The costs of all professional services, direct expenses, and city costs will be completely paid by the Stronach Group, per a signed agreement.
4. Will Albany residents have input into what happens on the Berkeley portion of the site? Will Berkeley residents have input into what happens on the Albany portion of the site?	The *Voices to Vision 2* sessions will look at the entire property. It is one project that straddles two jurisdictions. However, whatever decisions need to be made with regard to compliance with zoning issues will be addressed by each city independently.
5. Have the developers read the Voices to Vision report?	The developers received copies of the report and also a presentation to understand the context, the process, and the results.

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
6. How will *Voices to Vision 2* benefit Albany residents and other stakeholders?	*Voices to Vision 2* provides Albany residents with the opportunity to understand the developer's intentions and rationale, and to have meaningful input into both the design and the uses for the site, ensuring that if this project moves forward it can reflect Albany's values. The developers have read the ***Voices to Vision*** report and are aware of both current Waterfront District zoning and the community process that will need to be employed if the project is to move forward. By engaging the community in a fashion similar to ***Voices to Vision***, Albany residents and others will be fully informed about the benefits and drawbacks of the emerging proposal.
7. During the "Facts" exercise, why wasn't there a table to discuss community detriments, given that there was a table to discuss community benefits?	Many people noted concerns and opposition to the project at the Land Use, Benefits, and LBNL topic tables. The purpose of that part of the session was to gather questions that the community hoped would be answered. Throughout the two-hour session, participants were encouraged to submit questions and concerns on any topic, on the cards provided at the tables. ***Voices to Vision*** believes there were numerous opportunities to note opposition to the proposed project or concerns about detrimental aspects of either LBNL or the project.
8. How many people participated in the July 30, 31, August 1, 2 *Voices to Vision* sessions?	More than 300 people participated in the recent ***Voices to Vision*** 2 sessions that were conducted on July 30, 31, August 1, and 2. Of those, about a dozen were non-residents.
9. Was either the first *Voices to Vision* or *Voices to Vision 2* videotaped?	***Voices to Vision*** attempted to create a comfortable place for participants to consider issues related to Albany's waterfront. No sessions were taped, so that participants could engage easily with neighbors and other residents. The sessions would have been difficult to tape since individuals and table groups were working on exercises simultaneously. Videos would have caught snippets of discussions at some tables but could not capture the entire process. Those snippets, out of context, could provide misinformation about participants' discussions.
10. Where can one find the V*oices to Vision* report?	The 2010 Voices to Vision report, including a full appendix can be accessed at www.voicestovision.com. The report, with recommended guidelines, is about 100 pages; the appendix is about 650 pages.
11. If *Voices to Vision* established recommendations that are incompatible with the current proposal, why is the proposal being considered?	***Voices to Vision*** was a community process, funded by the city of Albany (2008-10). During that process, the community expressed its "desires" for the Albany portion of the waterfront. The resulting report and "recommended guidelines" indicate and substantiate these desires. ***Voices to Vision*** was not a specific plan for how to develop the waterfront. The guidelines explain that some of the desires of the community do not necessarily meet market synergies and that neither a comprehensive market feasibility study nor an analysis of infrastructure and development costs were performed to ensure that the "vision" could become reality. That said, the guidelines set realistic development standards, determined appropriate uses that would gain community support, assessed the appropriate locations for open space and for development, and confirmed community desires for adequate revenues and particular community benefits. ***Voices to Vision*** is a strong framework through which to view any potential development proposal and to determine what if any tradeoffs the residents of Albany are comfortable with.

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
12. How does the developer's proposal match the recommended guidelines of *Voices to Vision* with regard to height and open space?	Based on the site plan and other information presented by the developer at the August 3, 2011, their proposal is consistent with ***Voices to Vision*** in the following ways: • adds significant new public open space, a minimum of 53 acres in Albany • places the open space at the northern end of the site contiguous to the existing public open space • creates the 300' setback at Fleming Point • puts development at the south and east of the site • addresses sea level, liquefaction, tsunami, earthquake • considers Codornices Creek • attempts to create revenue for the city through uses anticipated by the community (e.g. hotel) • commits to fund the city for tax revenues lost during construction. It differs from the community vision defined during ***Voices to Vision***, because the plan: • adds a use that was never contemplated during Voices to Vision (labs - both public and private) and potentially adds uses such as offices • contemplates developing a home for an institution that doesn't pay taxes • has buildings taller than the recommended guidelines (guidelines indicate maximum 40'; plan shows buildings up to 80' above podium parking) • brings more development than contemplated (somewhere between 2-3M sq ft in Albany + additional in Berkeley) • provides less open space than the Albany community "desires" Voices to Vision (2009/10) recommended buildings that would be three stories (40'). The developer's current proposal shows a range of heights based on use, with some lower than 40' and others significantly taller than 40'. Most buildings that are proposed to be taller than 40' are actually three stories, but they are laboratory buildings and the floor to ceiling heights of labs are taller than floor to ceiling heights for residential or office buildings. Lab floors are often 16'. It should be noted that the developer's proposal creates "podium" parking, so the buildings would sit on a newly-created, landscaped ground plane that is about 27' from the current ground level. With regard to open space, the developer's current proposal shows a contribution of 53 acres of new, dedicated public open space in Albany -- assuming full build out of both LBNL and the developer's desired additional uses. (LBNL would occupy about 33 acres of the Albany site and private development would be up to 16 acres in Albany.) Within the LBNL site (33 acres), there are 10 acres of "campus open space" that are shown as flowing seamlessly from the public open space (but are not calculated in the 53 acres of public space). LBNL says that the site will be open to the public, meaning that these additional 10 acres would be available to the public. For more information on these questions, see "The Proposed Project: LBNL at GGF" in the Q&A section of the website.

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL)	
13. What is Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL)?	Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) is a member of the national laboratory system supported by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) through its Office of Science. It is managed by the University of California (UC) and is charged with conducting unclassified research across a wide range of scientific disciplines with an emphasis on advancing the scope of human knowledge and seeking technical solutions to some of the greatest problems facing humankind, including carbon reduction and other issues related to climate change. LBNL's primary campus is located on a 202-acre site in the hills above the UC Berkeley campus.
14. Why is LBNL looking to develop another campus?	This second campus is intended to consolidate programs that are currently in leased spaces throughout the East Bay. The new campus will also provide room for Lab growth.
15. What process is LBNL using to select the site for the second campus?	A Request for Qualifications (RFQ) was issued in January 2011; in May, six finalists were named. The Golden Gate Fields (GGF) site is one of those six. (Other sites are in the cities of Richmond, Berkeley, Emeryville, Alameda, and Oakland). Each of the "finalists" are compiling information and data requested by the Lab. A decision on the preferred site is scheduled to be announced in late November.
16. Why did LBNL host a meeting in Albany on August 3?	LBNL has hosted informational meetings focused on each of the six finalist sites. At each session, LBNL explained its needs and schedule related to the second campus site. They included time for the developer of each site to present their proposal, and for each community to make comments and to ask questions. The LBNL session was held on August 3, 2011 at the Albany High School gym. The August 3rd session can be viewed through the city of Albany's site - www.albanyca.org/index.aspx?page=928. The LBNL presentation can also be viewed at the LBNL second campus site.
17. What kind of research will LBNL do on this second campus site?	For more information about LBNL's plans, visit www.lbl.gov/community/second-campus. LBNL's first phase for the second campus will be approximately 500,000 sq. ft. that will enable the Lab to consolidate programs that are currently located throughout the Bay Area (not at the LBNL campus above UC). These projects include the Joint BioEnergy Institute (JBEI), the Joint Genome Institute (JGI) and much of LBNL's Life Sciences Division.
18. What criteria is LBNL using to select a site for the second campus?	LBNL outlined its criteria in the RFQ (request for qualifications) document #0103. Some of the attributes noted in the RFQ and by the Lab in its presentations include a location that is 20 to 25 minutes from the original campus, land capacity to accommodate potential future growth, and easy access to public transportation and other amenities.
19. What benefits does LBNL provide to the city in which it places its second campus?	LBNL, in its presentation and on its website, states that it provides numerous indirect economic benefits including jobs, positive impact on local businesses, and the creation of spin-off enterprises. Beyond this LBNL states that it brings educational partnerships to local schools. LBNL has produced an economic impact study that is on its website.
20. Which of the six finalist sites is the best site for LBNL?	*Voices to Vision* takes no position on what is the best location for LBNL, nor what is best for Albany. Ofcourse, the developers of each site believe they have the best location, deal, and site for LBNL.
21. Who will provide and pay for security at the LBNL site?	According to LBNL, its "current plan is for the Second Campus to be an open facility without a perimeter fence, utilizing a combination of security staff and physical security controls. The law enforcement response would depend on the existing jurisdiction and its response protocol, unless an Automatic Aid Agreement or Memorandum of Understanding is negotiated in advance."

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
The Proposed Project: LBNL at Golden Gate Fields (GGF)	
22. What else is planned for the site beyond LBNL?	The LBNL project is described as being in multiple phases. Phase One includes about 500,000 sq. ft. plus parking; future phases could add an additional 1.5 million sq. ft. plus parking. GGF sits on 136 acres (about 107 acres in Albany and about 29 acres in Berkeley). From what has been discussed during this preliminary period, the developers appear to be considering commercial labs, a hotel, some retail, a science- and site-focused "interpretive center," and possibly housing, at the combined Albany/Berkeley property.
23. What does the developer's proposal for LBNL at GGF look like?	The developer's presentation (from the August 3 LBNL meeting in Albany) can be viewed on the city of Albany's website. The developer's proposal situates LBNL's full buildout (2 million square feet) on 33 acres. These 33 acres include 10 acres of campus open space. Additionally, the developer anticipates adding about 16 acres for other tax-producing uses, within Albany (most likely commercial labs, offices, and possibly a hotel). The developer's proposal shows the addition of 53 acres in Albany, of new public open space at the site, much of it contiguous to the 88 acres of public open space adjacent (Bulb, Plateau, Neck, Beach) to the GGF site.
24. Will the project conform to the recommended guidelines established during *Voices to Vision*?	The developers are aware of the ***Voices to Vision*** process, and were briefed extensively about community concerns. It should be noted, however, that ***Voices to Vision*** only studied the 100+ acres in Albany and the property includes approximately 29 additional acres in Berkeley. The developers appear committed to providing new public open space, and to the most advanced principles of sustainability. GGF's development team includes LEED certified architects, landscape architects, field ecologists, archaeologists, economists, engineers, hydrologists, and others. (See page 3 for more information.)
25. What about the economic impact on existing Albany businesses, traffic on Buchanan and Gilman streets, transport of hazardous materials, potential of sea level rise and earthquake?	Like the community, the city has many questions that are not answered at this early stage of the process. Because we know the community has many questions, we are trying to find out as much as possible, and believe that the series of city-hosted sessions and the LBNL meeting will begin to reveal a lot more information.
26. How many square feet is the proposed development?	The first phase of the LBNL project will be about 500,000 sq.ft. plus parking, but over time, LBNL needs the option to build up to two million sq. ft. plus parking. Additionally, the developer appears to want to construct other buildings with diverse uses. The amount of that development is not known yet.
27. What percent of the site does the project occupy? How many acres will the LBNL project use and how many more might the other development use?	It is not possible to know how many acres the LBNL project (or the other proposed buildings) will occupy, since this all depends on the final design, and especially on the height of the buildings. The total footprint for the two million square feet needed by LBNL (when fully built out), assuming buildings of three floors appears to be about 23 acres, including circulation, parking, and related infrastructure necessary to create a "campus-style" environment plus 10 acres of campus open space. The built percentage of the total property (136 acres, including the Albany and Berkeley parts of the site) is impossible to calculate until more is known about the land uses being proposed, beyond LBNL.

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
28. What other uses are being contemplated by the Stronach Group, beyond LBNL?	In an interview conducted by the city's consultant, Fern Tiger Associates, (see "Interview with Developers of Golden Gate Fields" posted to this site) the developers described their vision of a "Green Tech Collaborative," which includes LBNL, commercial laboratories, and/or a hotel, and/or some retail, and/or housing as possible additional development on the site. They also expressed interest in hearing from the community through the series of engagement opportunities hosted by the city of Albany in July, August, September.
29. Who has stated that the new LBNL campus will be an "open" campus?	LBNL has stated that it intends to have the second campus designed as an open campus. From what is known, this means that the buildings themselves may be locked, but that the campus open spaces will not be gated, and will be available for the public.
30. It appears from the site plan, that access from the western part of the public open space to the eastern part of the public open space is through the campus open space. Will the "campus open space" be "dog-friendly?"	*Voices to Vision* cannot answer this question, but will make every effort to get the response from LBNL.
31. Will the Stronach Group give the land to LBNL? Will LBNL own the buildings?	The financial and ownership arrangements will be proposed and negotiated by the developers and LBNL over the coming months. It is expected that this will be decided when the developer submits their final proposal to LBNL and UC in late Fall. There are numerous ways that the financial and ownership agreements can be structured, including sale of the property and buildings, lease options, lease-to-own, etc.
32. How many acres will LBNL occupy on the site? How does this compare to the *Voices to Vision* recommended guidelines?	The developer's current plan situates LBNL on 33 acres of the Albany portion of the Golden Gate Fields site, which includes about 10 acres of "campus open space." The developer states that if they use all of the developable areas they have noted on the site plan (16 acres), there will be 53 acres of new, public open space in the Albany portion of the property. [Campus open space is the land between LBNL buildings which will be open to the public. These spaces are east/west continuations of the 53 acres of new public space.] Albany residents who participated in ***Voices to Vision*** hoped for about 75 acres of new, public open space, primarily located in the northern and western areas of the site. ***Voices to Vision*** recommended a 300' setback at Fleming Point (which is in the developer's plan), and open space at the north end, contiguous to the 88 acres of public open space already preserved. (The developer's plans show most of the new open space at the northern and western parts of the site, but also some at the eastern edge.) During ***Voices to Vision*** Albany residents also indicated a preferred buildable zone (67 acres) outside of which there would not be any built structures (except public rest rooms). The developer's proposal does not appear to have any buildings outside of this zone. The recommended guidelines from ***Voices to Vision*** indicate the community would like to have only 27 acres of built area; the developer's proposal is for about 50 acres, which includes 33 acres for LBNL and 16 acres of private development (commercial labs and/or a hotel and/or offices and/or residential). On the Berkeley portion of the site, approximately 19 acres are shown as developable with about 10 acres as new public open space.

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
33. Would LBNL be creating or testing nuclear weapons at this second campus? What safety standards does LBNL follow? What is LBNL's safety track record with CalOSHA?	Please visit LBNL's website, www.lbl.gov, for information related to the work of the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory. The Lab has set up a site related to the second campus.
34. Why is LBNL considering the Albany GGF site for the second campus?	LBNL received 21 responses to its initial Request for Qualifications in February 2011. Based on a set of criteria, the Lab narrowed the list to six possible sites, including the one at Albany's waterfront. The other five sites under consideration include Alameda Point, Richmond Field Station, Brooklyn Basin (Oakland), Aquatic Park North (Berkeley), and Aquatic Park (Berkeley/Emeryville). Some of the criteria that make the GGF site attractive include proximity to LBNL's current campus, a more than adequate amount of land to enable future growth, availability of nearby amenities, and views that can create a pleasant campus.
35. Does LBNL want to be part of the developer's proposed "green tech collaborative?"	*Voices to Vision* cannot answer this question.
36. When will the developers (The Stronach Group) reveal the proposal it submitted to LBNL to the community?	*Voices to Vision* cannot answer this question.
37. What is "The Green Technology Collaborative?"	Initially the developers referred to the creation of "The Green Technology Collaborative." At the August 3rd presentation the developers called their proposal "The Technology Collaborative."
38. Is there potential for generating electricity on the site from solar and wind sources?	*Voices to Vision* cannot answer this question comprehensively, but the developers have stated that solar thermal, solar electric (photovoltaic, BOPV), wind turbines, biodiesel, and biofuels will be included as integrated renewable technologies on the site.
39. What is the total size of the proposed LBNL footprint for the second campus if it locates at GGF?	The developer's current plan shows an aggregate footprint of about 23 acres of buildings for LBNL, sitting on a 33-acre campus. This area could accommodate two million square feet of lab and related office space. Many people questioned why *Voices to Vision* switched between acres and square feet. The reason is that if buildings are greater than one floor, more square feet will fit into fewer acres.
40. Will the race track remain, if LBNL locates at GGF?	No. If LBNL selects the GGF site, the racetrack will be demolished. The owners of GGF have said they would open a new track in northern California and hope to help current employees preserve their jobs.
41. Does the two million square feet include private uses or only LBNL?	The two million square feet referred to throughout *Voices to Vision* is the amount of space that LBNL anticipates needing over the course of many years.
42. Has the developer indicated how much development (combined LBNL and private development) is needed?	The developer has not yet indicated the aggregate size of the project. But if all of the developable areas noted by the developer are built out in Albany, and if 53 acres are to remain as new public open space (as stated by the developer), the built area would include about 49 acres (33 acres for LBNL and the remainder for private development.

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
43. Is this proposed project for LBNL and other uses larger than the "Caruso project" that was proposed a few years ago?	Voices to Vision does not have direct information about the Caruso proposal from 2005-6, but according to the information reviewed, Caruso was planning to develop about 35 acres on the site, but his project retained the race track which occupies about 54 acres of the site. So, the Caruso project might have taken as much as 90 acres of the site.
44. How much will the developer be investing in the site?	The developer has said that the investment needed for the "backbone infrastructure" will be more than $100M.
45. How will energy needs for the site be addressed?	The developers state that they "*will use conventional electrical and natural gas energy supplemented by renewable sources such as wind turbines and solar panels.*" They are *"investigating the use of WAPA power which is produced in the northwest by extensive hydrological means rather than burning fossil fuels, and exploring other sustainable practices such as air and water heat exchanges to reduce the amount of electricity and natural gas which will be consumed. Finally, the buildings will be designed to maximize natural lighting, passive solar heat gain for winter, and natural ventilation."*
46. How can a 3,000 ft. long accelerator be put into a landfill?	According to the developers: *"Although much of the Golden Gate Fields site was formerly a landfill, it has not been that over the longer period of time. Organic matter has largely decomposed and non-organic matter has settled. Extensive geotechnical borings and studies have enabled an understanding of the profiles of the underlying bedrock and soils. We are confident that we can build the Future Scientific Facility on a solid foundation."*
47. How would the facilities be made earthquake- and tsunami-safe?	According to the developers, "*All structures will be designed to comply with current building code requirements to meet earthquake and seismic hazards and impacts. Regardless of who owns the buildings, Stronach Group, LBNL, or DOE, the buildings will need to meet code. Earthquake mitigation is part of the detailed structural design of the buildings. With regard to the impact of tsunami, we have reviewed extensive hydrological modeling of tsunami affects in San Francisco Bay, and because of the relatively small Golden Gate opening to the ocean and the relatively expansive body of water in the Bay, the projected effects of a tsunami are actually quite modest at the Golden Gate Fields site. Hence, tsunami preparedness will be incorporated into the civil engineering for the site and will include elevation of the building pads. If necessary, secondary measures like seawalls and berms will be developed if the overall sea level rise over time requires these measures."*
The Stronach Group / Golden Gate Fields	
48. Who are the developers for the Golden Gate Fields site?	The Stronach Group, the owners of Golden Gate Fields Racetrack, are the developers of the site and are responsible for the submission to LBNL and any applications to the city for development.
49. What will happen to the track if the proposed development is built at the Albany site?	The horse track, grandstand, and all related facilities will be demolished to make room for the new development. The owners are committed to horseracing and are working to identify another site in Northern California for the track.
50. Why is the parking lot north of the racetrack frequently empty?	As recently as the 1980s, the GGF parking lots were often full. The Plateau north of Buchanan Street had to be used for overflow parking. Since then, attendance at GGF – and the need for parking – has decreased due in large part to the popularity of off-track sites where people can bet on live horse races via simulcast and also due to the increase in on-line wagering.

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
51. What kind of research will LBNL do on this second campus site?	For more information about LBNL's plans for the second campus, visit www.lbl.gov/community/second-campus. LBNL's first phase for the second campus will be approximately 500,000 sq. ft. This will enable the Lab to consolidate programs that are currently located throughout the Bay Area (not at the LBNL campus above UC). These projects include the Joint BioEnergy Institute (JBEI), the Joint Genome Institute (JGI) and much of LBNL's Life Sciences Division.
52. What is the schedule and time frame for both selection of a site and also for construction?	Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory expects to receive final proposals from the six finalist sites at the end of September. The Lab has said it will make a decision as to the preferred site at the end of November. LBNL's schedule shows construction beginning early in 2013 and occupancy late 2015 or early 2016. The developer's plans for any private development on the site would likely parallel this timing.
53. Who are the architects for the proposed project at GGF?	The Stronach Group has hired McDonough + Partners (offices in Charlottesville, VA and San Francisco, CA) as the team's sustainability architects; RMW Architects (offices in San Francisco, San Jose, Sacramento, and Orangevale, CA); and SWA Group as landscape architects (offices in San Francisco, Sausalito, Los Angeles, Laguna Beach, Houston, Dallas, and Shanghai).
54. What is the Stronach Group and what is their involvement as developers?	According to the letter sent to the community from the Stronach Group, as well as responses in the Interview with the Developer, The Stronach Group (TSG) is a family-owned company which owns Golden Gate Fields and other race tracks across North America. They also own Magna E-Car, BionX, and other companies that focus on the development of electric vehicles. In these documents, the Stronach Company also states that it has a 50-year history of involvement with property ownership and development. TSG is the developer for the project related to LBNL at GGF.
55. How much information about this proposal has been shared with GGF employees?	*Voices to Vision* cannot answer this question. We are requesting this information from the Stronach Group.
56. What experience does the Stronach Group, the privately-owned family company, have with the development of scientific facilitites?	The developers state:***"****Scientific facilities are buildings with specialized equipment inside. The Stronach Group has an extensive history developing similar specially-equipped facilities as auto parts manufacturing facilities, world-wide, and these incorporate many of the same issues related to manufacturing and testing equipment, robotics, process gases, and other requirements. We have assembled a world-class team with extensive experience building some of the most critically tolerant and expansive science research facilities for the semiconductor and biological life sciences industry.****"***
Ownership	
57. What parcels comprise the Eastshore State Park?	The area known as "the Plateau" – the large, elevated section north of Buchanan Street; "the Beach" where people frequently play with their dogs; the shorelines of "the Neck" which connects the Bulb to the rest of the waterfront; the "mudflats" that are fed by Codornices Creek; and the shoreline to the north along I-580 are all part of the Eastshore State Park.
58. Who owns Eastshore State Park?	The Eastshore State Park (ESP) is owned jointly by the California Department of Parks and Recreation (CDPR) and the East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD). While CDPR owns 88% and EBRPD owns the other 12%, EBRPD is the lead agency for acquisition, planning, and management. It coordinates its activities closely with CDPR.

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
59. Who owns the Bulb?	The city of Albany owns the Bulb. In 1985, an agreement was signed with the state to enable this parcel to be incorporated into the Eastshore State Park.
60. What parcels make up the Albany waterfront?	The Albany waterfront includes approximately 190 acres of dry land plus the tidelands within the Albany city limits west of I-80 and I-580. There are five major parts of this property: Golden Gate Fields Racetrack; the Eastshore State Park; the Albany Bulb; the Albany Waterfront Trail (which parallels Buchanan Street west of I-80); the Bay Trail (which runs along the narrow strip of the northern shoreline parallel to I-580); and Buchanan Street and its extension out to the Bulb.
61. Will the Stronach Group continue to own the land, and pay property and parcel taxes or will LBNL own its 33 acres?	Details of the financing for the project are unknown. The Stronach Group has said that it plans to continue to own the property and to enter into lease arrangements.
62. What are the ownership options? Will LBNL want to own the property on which its buildings will sit?	The financial and ownership arrangements for the LBNL buildings and for that portion of the site will be proposed and negotiated by LBNL and the Stronach Group in the coming months. It is expected that this will be part of the developer's final submittal to the Lab and UC in the Fall.
Public Open Space at the Albany Waterfront	
63. What is the Eastshore State Park?	The Eastshore State Park, which was formally established in 2002, includes a group of distinct park lands on the East Bay shoreline of the San Francisco Bay. The Park extends 8.5 miles from the foot of the Bay Bridge in Oakland to the Marina Bay neighborhood in Richmond, and contains 260 acres of dry land and 2,002 acres of tidelands. Some of the land that comprises the Albany waterfront is part of the Eastshore State Park.
64. How did the Eastshore State Park come about?	Eastshore State Park is the result of decades of citizen efforts, starting in the 1960s, to stop garbage dumping in the Bay; to oppose commercial development on the shoreline and to preserve it for public use; and to create environmental benefit on the shoreline. These efforts received crucial support from voters, elected officials, the East Bay Regional Park District, the Coastal Conservancy, and other influential entities at key moments leading to the State Park designation.
65. Are different parts of ESP designated for different uses?	The Albany section of the ESP includes "management zones" that identify areas designated for preservation (sensitive areas not suitable for regular human contact); conservation (areas suitable for low-intensity uses such as hiking); and recreation (areas suitable for higher intensity uses such as parking and facilities). The northern shoreline is designated as a preservation area. The Beach, Bulb, and shorelines of the Neck are designated as conservation areas. On the map included in the Eastshore State Park General Plan, the Plateau is designated as a recreation area (sports fields), however the plan explains that if an appropriate operator is not identified, "the Plateau will be maintained and improved for informal recreation and/or conservation purposes." In 2008, a burrowing owl habitat was created at the Plateau as a mitigation related to the construction of the Tom Bates Regional Sports Complex.
66. What and where is the Bulb?	The Bulb is the peninsula of land extending more than half a mile into the Bay from the end of Buchanan Street. It is connected to the rest of the waterfront by a narrow spit of land called the Neck. The Bulb was created gradually from 1963 to 1983 by a landfill operation that placed construction debris progressively further out into the Bay.
67. Is the Bulb part of the waterfront?	Yes. Albany's Waterfront District and *Voices to Vision* define the waterfront as the land west of highways I-80/I-580 within the city limits.

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
68. Who creates the art on the Bulb?	Most of the sculptures, paintings, and structures concentrated on the northern shore of the Bulb have been created using objects and materials found at the site. Osha Neumann, an attorney and muralist, with help from his son-in-law, Jason DeAntonis, is credited with having created many of the more substantial sculptures at the site.
69. Why hasn't the Bulb been incorporated into the Eastshore State Park?	The California Department of Parks and Recreation (CDPR) has specific requirements for land to be accepted as part of a state park. Uneven ground, protruding metal, off-leash dog walking, unregulated art projects, construction debris, and homeless encampments have been listed as obstacles to having the Bulb incorporated into the Eastshore State Park. The land must also be managed according to state park standards prior to being accepted.
70. Are there homeless people living on the Bulb?	In the mid-1990s, there were more than 75 people living in homemade structures on the Bulb. In 1999, as part of the effort to incorporate the Bulb into the Eastshore State Park, Albany passed an ordinance banning camping on the property. The city gradually enforced the ban and moved many of the Bulb residents into shelters and temporary housing. Albany residents indicate they continue to see people living illegally on the Bulb, but the numbers appear to be small.
71. How much new acreage will be put towards new public open space if the Stronach Group develops the site?	According to the Stronach proposal, 53 acres of new public open space will be at the Albany waterfront. This is in addition to the 88 acres already dedicated as open space – owned and maintained by Eastshore State Park and the city of Albany.
72. How does the Stronach proposal for open space compare to the 2010 *Voices to Vision* recommendation?	The 2010 ***Voices to Vision*** report recommended 75 acres of new public open space in Albany. The Stronach proposal shows 53 acres of new public open space in Albany plus 10 acres of campus open space in Albany. (See page 3)
73. Will the Stronach Group be donating the 53 acres of new open space or will it remain privately owned?	***Voices to Vision*** is unclear as to the ownership arrangements for the new open space. Similarly, ***Voices to Vision*** has no information currently as to who will pay for construction and maintenance of this new open space.
74. How is "open space" being defined?	The Stronach Group proposal shows two different kinds of "open space:" Permanent public open space – land that is maintained as open and freely accessible by the public for scenic and/or recreational uses (specifically, this will be 53 acres that include the area to the north of the development, contiguous to the already dedicated public open space to the north of the property, the area from the shoreline to the project property (set back is 300' from Fleming Point), and an area to the east of the proposed project. Campus open space - space that is still open and publicly accessible, but framed by the buildings proposed to be developed at the site (totaling an additional 10 acres).
75. Is the *Voices to Vision* recommendation for 75 acres of new public open space feasible?	***Voices to Vision*** was a process intended to identify what the Albany community hoped could be done at the waterfront. The visioning process included desires for open space, revenue, buildable areas, land uses, and other recommendations based on communty thinking. Market feasibility for the recommendations was not part of the process.
76. Since LBNL will not provide tax revenue for the city of Albany, is this a good tradeoff for open space?	Albany residents will need to determine if locating LBNL at the waterfront is good for the city and the community. ***Voices to Vision*** is attempting to provide sufficient information and opportunities for discussion for the community to make this determination about LBNL and related development.

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
77. Could improvements to the Bulb be included in a Development Agreement?	A development agreement is a particular form of entitlement, that involves negotiations between the landowner and the city. Often community benefits are part of this agreement and both parties can bring ideas to the table.
78. Would the public have access to the LBNL campus? How could that be guaranteed?	According to LBNL, their campus will be open to the public, although buildings may be locked. The developer has included about 10 acres of "campus open space" – comprised of large landscaped plazas that link the proposed eastern and western public open space areas (that run from the northern most part of the site to the southernmost part) on the site. The developers have described the plan as a "highly walkable and pedestrian-scaled campus that can support access from adjacent communities."
Site/Surroundings	
79. How accessible is the Albany waterfront to wheelchairs and people who have difficulty walking?	The Bay Trail parallel to I-580 north of Buchanan Street and the 2,000-foot Albany Waterfront Trail parallel to Buchanan Street west of I-80 to just west of the "Cove," are paved sections of the public waterfront. There are two wheelchair-accessible viewing platforms that overlook the mudflats, serving as prime bird-watching spots. The Plateau and Bulb both have wide fire roads, but they are currently unpaved and difficult for anyone who isn't a strong walker.
80. What is the nature of the waterfront land?	Much of the area where I-80 is located today was tidal marsh. The area was filled in to create the present shoreline. The only part of the original shoreline that still exists in Albany is the hill called Fleming Point, where the Golden Gate Fields grandstand sits.
81. How was the waterfront we see today created?	From the 1880s to 1983, the Albany waterfront was shaped by landfill operations that replaced tidal marsh with solid ground. The area that is now the southern end of the racetrack was filled from the late 1880s to the early 1900s. To create the grandstand in the early 1940s (which includes the northern part of the racetrack and the northern parking lot), the top of Fleming Point was removed and used as fill material. Most of the area north of the Golden Gate Fields parking lot – now the Eastshore State Park and the Albany Bulb – was filled in the 1970s and early 80s, predominantly with construction and demolition debris.
82. Are there any creeks or streams on the Albany waterfront?	Codornices Creek flows down from the hills above Albany, crosses beneath I-80 just south of Target, and turns north to flow between the racetrack and the highway where it is joined by Village Creek, before emptying into the Bay through culverts underneath Buchanan Street. The outflow of Cerrito Creek marks the northern edge of the Albany waterfront. Marin Creek also empties into the Bay underneath Buchanan Street.
83. Has Codornices Creek always followed the channel it follows today?	According to historic maps and Friends of Five Creeks, an environmental group dedicated to the protection and restoration of creeks in the East Bay, Codornices Creek didn't originally flow into the Bay. It was absorbed by the wet, gravelly, flat lands before reaching the tidal marsh at the edge of the Bay. The section of Codornices Creek on the waterfront is entirely man-made to redirect the creek around the racetrack. Restoration projects on portions of Codornices Creek are underway and some are completed in both Albany and Berkeley. None of these restoration projects are located west of I-580.

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
84. Is there cultural or aesthetic value to the waterfront?	The 1989 Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) states that "no known cultural resources are recorded within the site's boundaries." This statement strikes many Albany residents and others who visit the waterfront as inconceivable, but the statement may be technically correct. The finding of "no known cultural resources" means that there is nothing on the site that meets the legal definition of an "object of historical or aesthetic significance" to trigger special protections under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) which governs the preparation of EIR reports. That said, the aesthetic value of the waterfront land in Albany is appreciated by many who note the unique qualities of the site, including the unrestricted and commanding views of the Golden Gate. Many people describe their experience at the Albany waterfront as "spiritual," although some find it difficult to attribute cultural significance to the location of a former landfill. And there are undisputed cultural and historic attributes. Fleming Point was a landmark for Spanish settlers in the Peralta period. The pier served as the location of a water-taxi service that brought San Franciscans to Golden Gate Fields. Today, waterfront visitors find value in the creation and appreciation of the art on the Bulb; the pleasure of calm in a hectic urban landscape; and the serenity of watching shorebirds and wildlife.
The Bay Trail	
85. How will the GGF/LBNL proposal affect the Bay Trail? Will the developers complete the Bay Trail?	It is our understanding that the current plan incorporates the extension of the Bay Trail through Albany. The plans that the developer showed at the August 3rd public session indicated that the Bay Trail would be completed throught Albany and Berkeley.
86. Who manages the Bay Trail?	The plan for the Bay Trail includes a 500-mile continuous bike and recreational path that will encircle the San Francisco and San Pablo bays. A little more than half of the trail has been completed. In Albany, it currently runs north of Buchanan Street to the Richmond city boundary, but doesn't yet connect to the portion in Berkeley. The Bay Trail as a whole is coordinated by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). The Albany section is maintained by the city of Albany.
87. How would the Bay Trail be connected through the site?	According to the presentation by the developer, and the site plans shown during ***Voices to Vision***, the plan is to provide and develop at least two bicycle and pedestrian routes through the site connecting existing sections of the Bay Trail. One would be a direct route along Codornices Creek and I-80 on the east side of the site; the other would be along the shoreline.
88. Is the proposed Bay Trail at GGF compatible with the Eastshore State Park (ESP) general plan?	According to the Eastshore State Park General Plan, "the Bay Trail represents a very important element in linking the non-contiguous parts of the Eastshore Park project." The Plan encourages completion of Bay Trail segments, which this proposed project would accomplish.
Legal / Land Use	
89. If Albany is the selected site, will Albany voters exercise their rights through a Measure C vote?	The proposed development includes uses (beyond LBNL) that are not currently allowed in Albany's Waterfront District. Measure C, passed by Albany voters in 1989, requires any necessary zoning changes to be approved directly, by a majority of Albany voters.

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
90. What, if any, regulations constrain development on the waterfront?	There are numerous regulations that impact development at the waterfront. City zoning regulations restrict commercial uses; state and federal environmental regulations protect water and air quality, and delicate wildlife habitat; and the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) regulates development within 100 feet of the shoreline and Codornices Creek. Also, Albany's voter-approved Measure C ensures that any development which proposes change to current zoning requires a vote of the citizenry.
91. What are the permitted zoning uses of the Golden Gate Fields property?	The GGF property is part of the Waterfront District which restricts allowable uses (subject to appropriate use permits) to: park and recreation facilities; utilities (major, minor and underground); bars; commercial recreation, including horse racing; marinas and boat launching ramps; parking (nonresidential); restaurants; and waterfront- and sports-related commercial sales and services.
92. Can the currently-permitted uses (zoning) be changed?	Yes. The currently-permitted uses in the Waterfront District could be changed by a majority vote of Albany residents. This is a very unique situation. Ordinarily, the city council (following review by the planning commission) has the authority to change zoning regulations to accommodate development. In 1989, Albany residents approved Measure C, which restricted the council's authority on this land. Measure C "froze" zoning on the waterfront and required that any land use changes be approved directly by a vote of Albany residents.
93. What rights does The Stronach Group have to develop its waterfront property?	The Stronach Group (TSG) has the right to develop the Golden Gate Fields property in a manner consistent with current zoning, Measure C, and planning and environmental regulations. TSG would have to comply with the same review process as all proposed developments in Albany.
94. Are areas of the privately-owned portion of the waterfront suitable for development?	The Albany Waterfront Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) of 1989 divides the waterfront into five areas – each with different degrees of geologic stability and suitability for large-scale development.
95. What public agencies have jurisdiction over the Albany waterfront?	At least 15 state and regional agencies, plus the city of Albany, have some level of jurisdiction and responsibility for the waterfront, including: Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG); Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD); Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC); California Air Resources Board; California Department of Transportation (Caltrans); California Department of Fish and Game; California Department of Parks and Recreation; California Horse Racing Board; East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD); East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD); Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA); Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC); San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board; State Lands Commission; and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.
96. Wouldn't a Measure C vote be needed for all the private development at the site? When would that happen and how would an EIR fit into the schedule?	Because the developer is planning for at least some uses not currently permissible at the waterfront, a Measure C vote would be triggered. The Council could submit a ballot measure to the voters at a general or special election. Prior to doing so, the City would have to comply with CEQA. If a citizen's initiative is submitted to the City, the Council would be required to place the citizens initiative on the ballot in conformance with the Election Code statutes. A citizen's initiative, unlike a City Council measure, would not require a pre-election CEQA review.

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
Environmental Concerns	
97. Will an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) have to be done for the proposed development? Who pays for that?	If the Golden Gate Fields is the selected site, an EIR will be required for both the LBNL project and for any other development on the site. It is expected that the developer (The Stronach Group) will pay the full cost for the EIR, including any related staff time for the city.
98. Since the Albany waterfront is comprised primarily of landfill, is there a concern about toxins?	The 1989 Environmental Impact Report (EIR) found elevated levels of some environmental toxins (particularly ammonia, consistent with degrading organic waste), but not in concentrations known to be harmful to life in the Bay. The landfill materials consisted primarily of construction debris and landscape wastes. In 2005, the Regional Water Quality Control Board stated "no threat to water quality has been identified or is anticipated based on existing monitoring and analysis" and did not require the site to be sealed or capped before being considered safe for human and wildlife contact.
99. Are there any wildlife preserves on the waterfront?	The small bay off the northern Albany shoreline is designated as the Albany State Marine Reserve. In this bird sanctuary, boat traffic and human contact is restricted to protect wildlife, especially shore birds that feed at the mudflats.
100. Why are there so many birds at the waterfront?	The Bay Area is on the Pacific flyway for hundreds of thousands of birds. From mid-October to March, the Albany waterfront serves as resting and feeding grounds for numerous migrating birds. Where and when birds rest on the waterfront depends on the wind and tides. The Old Pier is a favorite roosting spot for birds at high tide, as is the west lagoon.
101. When is the best time to see birds at the waterfront?	The best time to see birds at the waterfront is 20 minutes after high tide in the mudflats at the mouths of Codornices and Marin creeks, from the viewing platforms on the Albany waterfront and the eastern edge of the Plateau.
102. Are the plants on the waterfront native?	According to the 2001 Eastshore State Park Resource Summary, the vegetation on the Plateau and Bulb is designated as "ruderal scrub" (mostly non-native shrubs and grasses), and is dominated by coyote-brush. French broom and cotoneaster are also common, as are native grasses and wildflowers in varying densities. The only "relatively-native" vegetation community is a small area of northern coastal scrub on Fleming Point.
103. Is there wildlife at the waterfront?	Despite its proximity to a major urban highway system, there is a surprising abundance and diversity of wildlife on the waterfront. The 2001 Eastshore State Park Resource Summary lists dozens of species of shore birds (including oyster catchers and terns), raptors (including kites, harriers, and barn owls), and numerous small mammals, reptiles, and insects. At least 16 types of rare, threatened, or endangered wildlife have been observed in the Park, including the California least tern, which was seen nesting in the Albany mudflats in 2000. The mudflats are also home to American avocets, and cormorants are found in the lagoon at the west end of the Bulb. The tidal marshes, ponds, and wetlands also contain a variety of marine life including barnacles, gum plant, pickleweed, and eelgrass that is a critical component of habitats for small fish.
104. What happens to the waste from the horses at GGF?	Nearly all of the straw bedding containing solid waste is recycled at a northern California mushroom farm. Wastewater runoff from the barn area is sent through a series of chlorinated aeration ponds located in the infield of the racetrack.

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
105. What are the weather conditions at the waterfront?	Directly across from the Golden Gate, the Albany waterfront is buffeted by strong winds coming off the San Francisco Bay. According to the 1989 Albany Waterfront Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), daytime winds are predominantly from the west and southwest, shifting to off-shore winds from the east at night. The air is calm only ten percent of the time, with average wind speeds from the southwest reaching 13.7 mph. While those who windsurf or fly kites often take advantage of these atmospheric conditions, walkers tend to bundle up, especially when the fog rolls in, as it does during the summer months. Maximum temperatures average in the low- to mid-70s during summer and in the mid-50s in the winter. Air quality at the site is high with clean, cool air blowing in from the ocean.
Financial	
106. Since LBNL is a government institution and does not pay taxes, how will Albany maintain its revenue?	The City of Albany, Albany Unified School District, and the Albany Library receive a total of approximately $1.7 million annually from Golden Gate Fields. During the 2010 *Voices to Vision* process, residents of Albany were very clear that any changes to the site should provide two important things to the city and the community: new public open space and revenues that replace the current taxes paid by GGF and support any new or expanded costs for city services. Discussions are underway to ensure that the developers identify how the city will retain its current tax levels throughout the construction period and after LBNL occupies the site (should Albany be the selected location for LBNL). Discussions are also underway, and the city has retained an economist, to understand the impact of the developer's proposal on city services.
107. If the developer's plan is approved, will the city of Albany receive any tax revenues during the years of construction?	The developers have said that it is their intention to preserve the current level of funding for the city, schools, and library during the construction period, when horse racing will no longer take place at GGF.
108. What revenue sources fund the city's budget?	Revenues which fund the city's General Fund budget come from a number of sources including: property taxes; sales taxes; franchise and other taxes (including wagering taxes); licenses and permits; fines; investment earnings; service charges; and revenues from other agencies.
109. How does Golden Gate Fields generate revenue for the city?	Golden Gate Fields (TSG) generates taxes for the city through property taxes, sales tax, business license fees, and wager taxes. There are two types of property taxes: ad valorum and parcel taxes. Sales taxes are levied on all meals served and on merchandise sold at the racetrack. Unlike other businesses, GGF also generates tax revenues through a wager tax.
110. What is the value of the Golden Gate Fields property?	A property such as the 107-acre site owned by TSG (GGF) is difficult to value. It includes a racetrack and open land, and is located directly on the San Francisco Bay, with views of the Golden Gate Bridge, Headlands, and surrounding cities. But the property has development and environmental constraints which could impact its value. Most property values are based on recent sales or valuations of "comparable" properties. There are no properties in the Bay Area which match the description of GGF, and which need voter support to be developed in ways other than current zoning dictates.
111. How can the community trust the numbers being used to understand tax revenues, infrastructure costs, and other economic concerns if these numbers are coming from the developer?	The numbers used during the July/August sessions came from the developer, as stated clearly by *Voices to Vision* at every session. Since that time, the city has retained its own economic consultant who is conducting both a peer review process and an independent analysis of the assumptions and the economic impacts prepared by the developer. Since the city's consultant was only hired recently, information will be forthcoming over the coming weeks.

Conceptual Master Plan
Open Space