

Albany City Council and Waterfront Task Force

MEETING NO.	7
DATE	December 4, 2011

- **Agenda**
- **Report to Council**
- **Overview of Pros, Cons, and Opportunities for Proposed Second Campus**
- **What We Don't Know**
- **Pro/Con Compilation Grid**
- **Revised Info Grid**



CITY OF ALBANY

**Special Meeting of the
City Council
And
Golden Gate Fields/Albany Waterfront Task Force**

Sunday, December 4, 2011

6:30 p.m.

**Albany Community Center
1249 Marin Avenue, Albany, CA**

6:30 p.m.

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. WORK SESSION

The City Council will meet in a work session with members of the Golden Gate Fields/Albany Waterfront Task Force. The purpose of the work session is for the City Council to hear and discuss an overview of what the Task Force has learned to date about the proposal by the owners of Golden Gate Fields for that property to be the location for the second campus of the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory along with associated development.

and The City Council will hear from members of the Task Force and staff, as well as from the City's consultant for the Task Force process – Fern Tiger Associates, the representatives of the owners of the Golden Gate Fields Property – The Stronach Group.

There will be an opportunity for public comment.

All written materials presented to the Task Force before, during, and after its meetings are available at the website www.voicestovision.com, and at City Hall.

All meetings of the Task Force can be viewed on the city website www.albanyca.org, under KALB, Community Videos, Golden Gate Fields Task Force.

This December 4th work session will be broadcast live on KALB – Comcast Channel 33, and web streamed at www.albanyca.org, KALB, Watch KALB Live.

4. ADJOURNMENT

The next regular meeting of the Albany City Council will be Monday, December 5th. The agenda and packet can be found at www.albanyca.org.

(The Council meeting packet is available for public inspection at the Albany Library (526-3720), the Fire Department and the City Clerk's Office. The agenda and supporting staff reports for this work session can also be found at www.voicestovision.com. If you have any questions pertaining to any agenda item or Council meeting procedure, please contact the City Clerk's Office at 528-5710.)

Agenda related writings or documents provided to a majority of the City Council regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection in the lobby of City Hall.

The City of Albany is dedicated to maintaining its small town ambience, responding to the needs of a diverse community, and providing a safe, healthy and sustainable environment.

To view the live televised Council meetings go to Channel 33. Please note that if you provide your name and address when speaking before the City Council it will become part of the official public record, which will be posted on the Internet and broadcast on Channel 33.

NOTICE – Please Read

“Pursuant to Government Code Section 65009, if you challenge a decision of the City Council in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at a public hearing described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the City Council at, or prior to, the public hearing.

The decision of the City Council is final as of the date of its decision unless judicial review is initiated pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.5. Any such petition for judicial review is subject to the provisions of California Code of Civil Procedure 1094.6.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), and State Law, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Administration Office 510-528-5710. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting (28 CFR 35.102.104 ADA Title II)". Upon request, we will provide written agenda materials in appropriate alternate formats, of disability related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services to enable individuals with disabilities to participate in public meetings. Please deliver a written request, including your name, mailing address, phone number and brief description of the requested materials and preferred alternative format or auxiliary aid or service at least two (2) days before the meeting. Request should be sent to: City Clerk, 1000 San Pablo Avenue, Albany, CA 94706.

Background

The 22-member Albany Waterfront Task Force – appointed by members of the City Council and the School Board (plus the chairs or designees of Planning and Zoning, Transportation, Waterfront, Sustainability, and Parks and Rec committees) – has met six times since October 9, 2011.

The mission of the Task Force – as set by the Council – is to *ensure the collection, review, and dissemination (to the Albany community) of adequate, factual information and data related to potential development by The Stronach Group at the Albany Waterfront (GGF site)*. But more than this – as discussed at the September City Council meeting – the Task Force structure provided the developer an opportunity to present the project and intentions in a public setting – enabling the city and the community to see and hear about any changes to their thinking and direction, over the course of the Task Force’s work. With this in mind, the developers have been asked prior to each session to present new information.

The first session (October 9) focused on determining the core questions, data, and reports (or other information formats) the Task Force felt were important to receive in order to fulfill the Council’s directive (developing a comprehensive report noting the strengths (pros), challenges (cons), and opportunities afforded by the proposed development being put forth by The Stronach Group (owners and developers of the Golden Gate Fields property that spans the cities of Albany and Berkeley). These requests were divided into relevant topics/themes (site plan; ownership/ Measure C/ entitlement processes/ CEQA; environmental impacts, economic and fiscal impacts; traffic; open space; etc. and one or more of these topics became the focus of each of the subsequent four meetings:

- October 16: Site Plan – including parking, heights, land uses, etc. [presentation by the developer, with q&a following]
- October 30: Ownership, Legal, CEQA – including Measure C, entitlement processes, initiative process and related impacts on Measure C and CEQA [presentations by City Attorney, community development director, Sierra Club]
- November 6: Proposed Voter Initiative [presentations by The Stronach Group and Albany City Attorney]; Environmental Impact was included on this date, but minimal information was presented
- November 13: Economic and Fiscal Impacts for Albany City and Schools [presentations by AUSD Superintendent, Albany City Manager, attorney from Goldfarb & Lipman, working with city of Albany, Economist from EPS/Sacramento, working with developer, and Economist from Strategic Economics/Berkeley, working with city of Albany]

In preparation for the November 20th meeting, Task Force members reviewed a xx-page document that noted; “What We Know,” “What We Think We Know,” and “What We Still Need to Know” (see attached). This document summarized the information provided and reviewed through November 13th.

Armed with this array of information, Task Force members weighed in on their individual sense of “pros, cons, and opportunities” three days prior to the November 20th meeting. The “pros, cons, opportunities” form was divided into 9 topic areas, including two overarching topics: “LBNL at Golden Gate Fields” and “Overall Proposal for Development of LBNL plus Additional Development

at GGF.”

Prior to each meeting, the developers were asked if they needed time to present any new information, changes to the site plan, etc. LBNL was also asked to meet with the Task Force. Additionally, several questions were posed to the City of Berkeley.

Task Force members received packets of information related to the discussion topic, prior to each meeting; and notes were prepared and disseminated following each session. Additionally, the packets included correspondence, links to relevant websites, and other information provided by the consultants, as well as other Task Force members and the public.

Attached are two documents that summarize and encapsulate the status of the Task Force’s knowledge and thinking (with the understanding that to truly delve into the depth of the Task Force’s work would require reviewing each of the packets and notes from the six Task Force sessions – all of which is posted on www.voicestovision.com; meetings can be viewed on line on the City of Albany website, www.albanyca.org):

- Overview of Pros/ Cons/ Opportunities (based on the individual and collective thinking of the Task Force – November 20th meeting)
- Summary of Open Questions and Missing Information, as of November 29, 2011
- “What We Know, What We Think We Know, What We Don’t Know” (included in the packet for November 20)
- Complete list of Pros/Cons/Opportunities (through end of November 20 meeting; includes additions from that meeting)

Overview of the Task Force’s Thinking

Over the six sessions, the breadth and depth of the project and the information needed to best understand it, have emerged as both complex and difficult to analyze in a piecemeal fashion. Site planning impacts fiscal concerns; addressing LBNL’s needs at the site affects site planning; locating LBNL on the property impacts revenues; decisions about land use in Berkeley impacts land use in Albany (and vice versa); land uses affect environmental issues; etc.

The project and the site were reviewed with reference to the developer’s position that LBNL was the anchor for the rest of the planning of the site. Without LBNL, the developer felt there was no project. But while LBNL is the catalyst for The Stronach Group’s proposal and brings certain benefits to the community, over the course of the Task Force’s work, it has become increasingly clear that the location of LBNL on the site simultaneously creates many challenges – from timing driven by the Lab to fiscal impacts and loss of community control. To some, the Lab creates the synergy and market draw for the Stronach Group’s proposed commercial development; for others the Lab necessitates an unacceptable level of development in order to generate the City’s and AUSD’s much-needed revenue.

As in many previous discussions and debates about the waterfront – over the past years – an overarching conversation focused on the value of open space and what the community is willing to accept (in terms of development, scale, height, traffic, environmental impacts, etc.) in order to get that open space, and how that all impacts city and school revenues.

But, over and above the strengths, challenges, and opportunities directly related to particular thematic categories of information, the Task Force noted the reality that should LBNL locate at

GGF, the federal and state governments would likely become the largest employer within the City of Albany – meaning that large swings in employment, revenue, and even environmental quality would be vulnerable to policies and priorities set from a distance.

The impetus for this project rests with a request for qualifications from LBNL to Bay Area landowners to submit proposals for the Lab’s Second Campus. The Lab’s process involves a competition-like effort to select one site out of six finalist locations. To many, the Albany site stands alone – not only for its spectacular views and location, but also for its singularly complicated and integrated components: two cities requiring citizen votes to approve; the potential loss of revenue; private property moving into public ownership; relocating an existing business and jobs; the reality that the proposal must include more than LBNL in order to be financially viable; and the conversion of a site that has been the focus of community discussion over many years.

The big picture – or the points of information that the Task Force coalesced on most included the following “pros:”

- The proposal includes the preservation of Codornices Creek and open space along the shoreline, and closes the gap in the Bay Trail.
- The proposal provides a significant increase in parkland/open space at the waterfront.
- The developers have stated that there would be shuttles from the site to BART and other public transportation locations (but the Task Force notes the importance of obtaining guarantees for this in any entitlement process).
- Having a science-focused campus with both a public lab and potentially private labs provides the opportunity for benefits to Albany students, including internships.
- Development of the site establishes the waterfront in Albany as part of the city.

And the following “cons:”

- The proposal concentrates all of the non-taxable activities (LBNL at 2M sq ft) in Albany.
- Given the complicated nature of ownership, multiple jurisdictions, and the inclusion of a federally-funded entity, it remains unclear as to who will “lead” the CEQA process.
- The City and community potentially lose much or most control over zoning and revenue potential, once UC and LBNL are located at the site.
- Government would become the largest employer in Albany, restricting the city’s control over policies and priorities.
- UC/LBNL’s status permanently reduces the city’s and schools’ tax base.
- The idea of a citizen’s initiative (as opposed to the Measure C vote) reverses the normal process of development where there is a proposal from a developer, followed by environmental review, followed by review/approval by city government, followed by a vote of the citizens. “Doing this by initiative turns the process on its head, and is akin to signing a contract containing many blank spaces – never a good idea!”
- A vote at this time would be without the benefit of full CEQA review and many may not trust the appearance of removing Measure C from the process.
- The fast pace of thinking about a possible plan for the site is not conducive to really good planning.

- While all parties (city, community, LBNL, TSG) have some degree of “win,” TSG wins the most (by vastly increasing the value of the property).

Beyond these somewhat specific points related to the known information, numerous opportunities have been cited by the Task Force:

- The potential for the entitlement to include provisions for the city of Albany to receive a portion of any profits if and when TSG sells the property after it is rezoned (given the enormity of the increased value).
- Albany could become known as a leader in scientific research and green technology.
- Albany could become a waterfront community, not just a community with a waterfront.
- There is the potential for world-class architecture and sustainable design at the Albany waterfront.

The Task Force also notes the importance of the community and the city to be good stewards of the future of the property by:

- Ensuring a full CEQA process.
- Facilitating a public/private collaboration to explore all options and balance the desire for open space with the real need for revenue.
- Creating a development agreement that is carefully crafted and includes specific amenities, open space areas, revenue sources, full explanation of the work done at LBNL, and maximum benefit for everyone both economically and environmentally.

As noted, given the complexity and timing of the process, the Task Force continues to have many lingering questions and requests for information – which are included in the packet.

Finally, it should be understood that it is our perception, backed by the statements made by the Task Force members and visible if viewing the tapes of the meeting – that while some members are more supportive and some less supportive of the full project as currently described by the developers, each member has worked diligently to articulate both potential strengths and challenges associated with the project.... the physical realities and the community approval process.

Albany Waterfront Task Force // Overview of Pros, Cons, and Opportunities for the Proposed 2nd Campus Development at Golden Gate Fields

The following Chart of Strengths (Pros), Challenges (Cons), and Opportunities was compiled from the worksheets collected from each Task Force member. At the November 20 Task Force meeting, members reviewed the list of all Pros and Cons and Opportunities¹ that were submitted prior to the meeting (see Task Force Meeting November 20 handouts and packet). During the meeting, Task Force members added other information and discussed the aggregate list.

Task Force members also noted priority pros and cons. This attachment indicates the collective Task Force sense of Pros/Cons/Opportunities. Items noted with an asterisk () were cited most often by Task Force members as priorities. If multiple Task Force members “disagreed” with a statement, it is noted. Items not noted as priorities are not included in this Overview, but remain in the full list distributed to Task Force members and posted on the Voices to Vision website.*

The full list of Pros/Cons including those put forth by the public at the November 20 meeting are included in this packet.

1

It should be noted that in some cases items noted as strengths might be considered opportunities because members included things that might be possible at the site, but which have not been committed and/or are currently unknown as to the status (e.g. a crossover for pedestrians/bikers to the site). Additionally, while the majority of the Task Force was using information provided through the public process, some members – having attended open houses hosted by the developers, held at Golden Gate Fields – believed some site improvements were already committed, though they were not included in plans presented to the Task Force. As best as possible, this final compilation attempts to note some of these discrepancies (and/or moves some strengths into opportunities if they have not been presented as “real” at this point.

Topic One: SITE PLAN / PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS

(Based on most recently submitted Site Plan from The Stronach Group, included in 10/16/11 Task Force Packet)

Strengths (Pros)	Challenges (Cons)
Open Space / Parking	
* Preservation of creek watershed and open space along shoreline.	
* Closes gap in Bay Trail, creating continuous north/south route.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buildings are grouped together “closer” to the freeway which leaves park open space in tact along the shoreline. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location of FSF on east side preserves open space at the most valuable habitat (Codornices / tidal marsh); eliminating Buchanan Ext. levee and replacing with causeway to increase tidal action possible. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan preserves Fleming Point as dedicated open space and “daylights” the creek. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Piece of Fleming Point would become a grass covered parking structure. <i>(Some disagreement.)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creation of parkland atop parking hides parking and increases open space in a valuable part of the site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where to put 5,000 cars? It is not clear where the parking is going and the impact on the site plan.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amount of open space (70%) <i>(includes campus open space and connectors).</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of housing (bad for the park; no eyes on the park means continued homeless problems and discouraging to people who want to walk, bike to park; will not feel like part of Albany). <i>(Some disagreement as to benefit/challenges of housing in Albany at this site.)</i>
Proposed Land Uses	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient private development (sq. ft. bldgs) to make inclusion of LBNL economically viable while still providing park along waterfront and creek. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Concentration of non-taxable space in Albany.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More than six times larger total building square footage than any previous development proposal for the site. <i>(Some disagreement as to appropriateness of scale of the project.)</i>

Strengths (Pros)	Challenges (Cons)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed amount of development is massive. Too big, too dense. Large square footage for buildings and parking. <i>(Some disagreement.)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hotel provides economic benefit through taxes (if successful). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Berkeley gets a lively village with housing, restaurants, and shops; Albany gets a blank faced office park with lab buildings the size of Target facing the shoreline. <i>(Some disagreement.)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate types of retail to rest of site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project is essentially an office park. <i>(Some disagreement.)</i>
Public Access / Connection to Rest of Albany	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creation of pedestrian/bike bridges over freeway <i>(would be a strength – if TSG pursues this “desire” through to implementation; currently not included in site plan)</i>; bike route along east and west sides of site <i>(Note: some Task Force members appear to think the bike path on the eastern part of the site is no longer in the plan.)</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear whether pedestrian/bike over-freeway bridges will actually be built.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More public access (with amenities). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not enough streets; no real street structure to support a pedestrian environment. No parallel north/south street for pedestrians inland of the planned waterfront road to provide more protected, intimate pedestrian route closer to eastside park space.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Connecting Solano to the shoreline and continuation of street line out to pier (pier will provide excellent views of beach, bulb, and Berkeley hills, to west). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appears to have insufficient pedestrian-oriented convenience retail and will thus generate more traffic than necessary (although difficult to tell with master plan level of detail).
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No similarities in layout/scale to rest of Albany (leads to a feeling of disconnectedness). No areas of fine grain/smaller building footprints (especially near park/trail). <i>(Some disagreement.)</i>
Size / Scale of Proposed Development	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most buildings 65 - 85' high. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Height of hotel; out of scale with rest of project at 120' tall. <i>(Some disagreement.)</i>

Strengths (Pros)	Challenges (Cons)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scale of buildings (horizontal as well as vertical) very large for Albany; needs to be mitigated with design to introduce human-scaled structures and more windows/ doors along edges of open space and streets. <i>(Some disagreement.)</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts view of the Bay and beyond for some hill residents.
Other	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well thought out, well-vetted; appears to meet the desires and needs of LBNL. <i>(Some disagreement.)</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If design is limited by external factors (LBNL?), could be negative influence. <i>(Some disagreement.)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan considers and responds to sea level rise. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost could be an issue; details of how this is executed are critical (amount of parking, structures and urban façade).
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not appropriate to location. <i>(Some disagreement.)</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Skyscraper campus (a small portion of which is for “green development” but other labs can be used for anything UC sees fit). <i>(Some disagreement.)</i>

Task Force members also noted opportunities that the project might create such as the opportunity to:

- Be visionary about design of structures on site – perhaps an international design competition.
- Realize a park in the foreseeable future while maintaining existing revenue to city and schools.
- Ensure public transportation and bike connections to decrease car traffic.
- Connect shoreline to the city ;
- Build an extraordinary/creative facility with LEED buildings that use renewable energy.
- Create open space that is accessible to all.
- Make shoreline a comfortable place for families and children.
- Build housing to satisfy need and requirements
- Create access to the waterfront through overpasses and other means

Topic Two: PUBLIC OPEN SPACE

(Based on most recently submitted Site Plan, included in 10/16/11 Task Force Packet)

Strengths (Pros)	Challenges (Cons)
* Vastly increases the area of the waterfront open to the public.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This open space is a <u>regional</u> benefit paid for by Albany (via loss of tax revenue and loss of control of future use and/or development).
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Open space” isn’t particularly meaningful measured just in area; needs to be specific to the land and in relation to the development. <i>(Some disagreement.)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shoreline portion of the land is all park; creates a waterfront park that the community can use. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ownership of the open space is unknown
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opening and protecting Codornices Creek/wetlands; as well as providing public access. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development <i>could</i> make existing open space more usable and safe. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of 24-hour human presence, (eyes on park) detract from usability, particularly the ability to use shoreline after dark. <i>(Some disagreement.)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Range of open space and landscape types on the site, respecting existing habitats. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adjoining development should be compatible with usable open space.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Goals for open space as outlined in V2V are largely met with this plan. <i>(Some disagreement.)</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When comparing open space proposed to existing situation, plan is extraordinarily positive. <i>(Some disagreement.)</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There should be more park and less building development. <i>(Some disagreement.)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developer to cover costs of park development <i>(but unclear how/if open space costs – development and maintenance – are included in infrastructure costs – necessitating more building to create park).</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Permanently removes commercially- zoned land from tax rolls; trade-off between revenue and open space.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of information on what is included in “infrastructure costs”

Strengths (Pros)	Challenges (Cons)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development <i>could</i> provide funding to develop new parkland and ongoing operational funding for both new and existing parkland. <i>(Currently unknown, how much development and maintenance will be funded by developer)</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact of open space ownership on tax revenues unclear; responsibilities and costs for maintenance of dedicated new and existing open space unknown.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Because the development is so big, the open space areas seem to be in the shadow of the buildings, roads, parking – leftovers rather than featuring the natural setting, which is a primary value of the location. <i>(Some disagreement.)</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open space will be visually impacted by the new construction.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimal connection through stables area to open space south of Gilman. <i>(Some disagreement.)</i>

Task Force members also noted opportunities that the project might create such as the opportunity to:

- Preserve the majority of the site.
- Create east/west pedestrian and bicycle connectors at two to three more locations.
- Comfortable community gathering spaces with outdoor spaces immediately adjacent to sheltered indoor spaces.
- Have a truly significant park adjacent to the Albany Bulb which in turn would hopefully be upgraded so that the Bulb could be safe to use and enjoy.
- Make the waterfront accessible for more people to enjoy recreation, observe nature, learn about birds, tides, water, health.
- Evaluate the value of public open space and to weigh these against the huge economic benefit to the developer and the costs to other quality of life aspects for the city (traffic, pollution, safety, demographic changes, and relation to state and federal entities within the city limits but not necessarily answerable to city government).
- Create inboard Bay Trail (shown in earlier plan) on east side of site to create recreational loop around property when combined with coastal Bay Trail.
- Enhance the location, and improve the environmental well-being and value of the land.
- Shift maintenance burden to landowner and away from taxpayer.
- Become part of SF Bay Water Trail through non-motorized boating facilities, such as floating dock, storage, and campground.

Topic Three: ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Strengths (Pros)	Challenges (Cons)
* Daylighting Codornices Creek and wetland restoration/ protection. Buffers to the creek watershed and shore.	
• All CEQA requirements will be met. <i>(Some disagreement; many questions posed related to the timing and certainty of this statement.)</i>	* Unclear as to lead agency at this time.
	• Intensity of use and related impacts(traffic, pollution, etc.).
• Public- private partnerships may provide important advances in alternative energy and environmental technologies.	• To date, no info has been presented on any actual or proposed alternative energy projects for this LBNL campus.
	• Independent monitoring of scientific procedures as specified by law and best practices.
	• Information about environmental issues related to Lab work unknown.
	• Incompatibility between Lab (where sensitive research is conducted) and heavily used public open space. <i>(Some disagreement.)</i>
• TSG asserts all construction will be LEED certified.	
• Project will include sustainable and renewable energy including wind and solar.	
• Live-work at waterfront is an environmentally-sensitive and attractive option. It reduces commuting while providing a beautiful environment in which to live and work. <i>(Note: live-work is not currently in plan for Albany; residential is planned for Berkeley)</i>	• Live-work at waterfront would only be available to the scientists, engineers, administrators who could afford Bay view condos. The service workers who help make the amenities are not likely to be able to live there, even if some of the housing was reserved as “affordable.” We would be creating a park whose principal beneficiaries are the wealthy. <i>(Some disagreement.)</i>
• Putting jobs (and hopefully housing) in urbanized areas near transit like this site is environmentally sound and consistent with AB32. <i>(Some disagreement with housing.) (Note: Residential is not currently in plan</i>	

Strengths (Pros)	Challenges (Cons)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The city would get a park (but it would get that from any development at this site). 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commitment to removing existing infrastructure/ buildings (e.g., grandstand) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sea level rise has been addressed. 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It doesn't matter how "green" development is, if it is out of scale for the site. Large square footage of buildings. <i>(Some disagreement.)</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Buildings too tall; development too dense. <i>(Some disagreement.)</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Height of buildings will block the view, in large part, from the freeway and Albany proper.

Task Force members also noted opportunities that the project might create such as the opportunity to:

- Make the setting accessible for more people to enjoy recreation, observe nature, learn about birds, tides, water health.
- Integrate with Plateau and Bulb.
- Enhance the existing location and improve the environmental well-being and value of the land.
- Be a model development relative to addressing Climate Change; could be studied internationally.
- Have the City might revisit its own options in using part of the Bulb for energy generation (wind, solar, or tidal).
- Invite TSG to submit a proposal to the City – absent the Lab.
- Improve the property for the benefit of all, both human and animal.
- Include housing and live-work at the site

Topic Four: T R A F F I C

Strengths (Pros)	Challenges (Cons)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Shuttles connecting to BART and other public transportation. Need operational guarantees in development agreement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Size of the LBNL development and number of employees will create traffic problems.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bike paths for riders of varying abilities throughout property. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connecting pedestrians, bicyclists, cars and shuttles via two relatively narrow access points.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hidden parking in Phase Two. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lots of parking needed; and more desired in similar development by merchants, etc.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perimeter road allows for easy park access, connection, views to waterfront, parking, labs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of street grid reduces walkability within site and thus will increase traffic off-site. <i>(Some disagreement.)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elegantly smooth connection by road from Buchanan Street through site, and connects with Gilman making easy access by bus and car. <i>(Some disagreement.)</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plans shown to date appear to assume most employees arrive by car; instead, project should be designed to be accessed primarily by transit/bike.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some Task Force members see NO pros related to traffic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic horror: 5,000 car commuters accessing the site, AC buses and jitneys through the site, delivery vehicles, servicing 200-room hotel and 18-20 labs and related commercial enterprises; vastly increase traffic on Buchanan and Gilman.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The I-80 corridor is one of the most heavily traveled in northern CA. Idling cars waste tremendous amounts of fuel and contribute directly to air pollution and consequent health problems. Further, freeway congestion already overflows onto city streets and a development of this scale is likely to make this issue much worse. The EIR for the Santa Fe development proposal for this property concluded that there were NO adequate mitigations for this environmental impact. It is especially troubling that TSG has decided to defer their studies of this problem and calls into question both their competence and their integrity. <i>(Some disagreement with last sentence.)</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fear that traffic problems will be horrendous, with no way to substantially mitigate them. <i>(Some disagreement, including note that Target did not create feared traffic jams and that current LBNL sites have high degree of alternate transportation use.)</i>

Task Force members also noted opportunities that the project might create such as the opportunity to:

- Create pedestrian/bicycle access; over freeway and rails flyover at the freeway which would greatly aid Albany residents' use of the shoreline park.
- Consider how the city can encourage non-auto ways to move people around: Shuttle to BART, up/down/to Solano, City Hall, Community Center, UC Village? Safer boulevards?
- Develop inboard Bay Trail (shown in early site plan) on east side of site in addition to coastal Bay Trail – to connect Buchanan to Gilman with direct route.. To serve commuting cyclists, shoppers, and those coming to ball fields
- Find ways to incentivize public transit to employees.
- Design of a model sustainable employment center design by radically reducing parking and supporting links to Berkeley ferry, BART, Transbay bus, etc.
- Identify ways to obtain an Amtrak or BART station for Albany by increasing demand (*some disagreement*)
- Ensure better and safer cycling access
- Incentivize car pooling and energy-efficient cars for employees.
- Develop creative parking podiums to hide cars and use land above as park.
- Investigate the potential for all potential car - alternate means of arriving and departing the location.
- Reduce traffic with development of public transportation
- Create something that has a more varied traffic pattern.

Topic Five: ECONOMIC / FISCAL IMPACTS

Strengths (Pros)	Challenges (Cons)
	* City/community potentially lose much/most control over zoning and revenue potential once UC and LBNL are there.
	* UC Regents/federal government becomes the largest employer in the city limits; both are notoriously unresponsive to local concerns and not bound by local governments; large swings in employment, revenue, environmental quality vulnerable to policies and priorities set far away.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TSG’s awareness of the need to maintain funding for AUSD and the City during construction and into the future. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City and schools would not receive enough revenue given scale of development.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TSG has stated they will cover the short fall in parcel taxes to AUSD. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Making District “whole” is not sufficient, as District had cuts.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inability of Albany to retain legal and other necessary counsel sufficient to negotiate fair agreement with TSG (for city and schools).
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will negatively affect city and AUSD revenues without adequate mitigation measures and special arrangements.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potentially increases revenues to the city’s General Fund net \$300,000 per year. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The increase in revenue to the city of only \$300,000 (at full buildout) is very disappointing considering how massive the buildings will be.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economically, it’s a wash (or so they’d like to tell us). Lack of information makes that claim subject to change as the project develops. Sketchy replacement of fiscal streams, named by developers’ financial analyst not entirely trustworthy, nor confidence-inspiring. <i>(Some disagreement.)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Potential</i> to increase demand for housing, spurring appreciation of real estate and higher tax base. <i>(Some disagreement.)</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Could</i> generate increased economic activity in city as a whole, e.g. Solano Ave., San Pablo Ave. by significantly increasing daytime population of Albany. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Potential</i> to increase revenue for local businesses. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Could</i> generate revenue for operation and 	

Strengths (Pros)	Challenges (Cons)
maintenance of existing city-owned and state-owned parkland at the waterfront; could generate revenue for operations of newly created parkland.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 75 acres of parkland at no charge to city. <i>(Some disagreement; unclear how/if open space development and maintenance costs are included as infrastructure/ development costs, thereby creating need for more buildings to fund infrastructure).</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land owned by UC and parkland removed from tax rolls.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creates 4,500 jobs! 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase in city services and costs estimated at about \$1.8 million. (Costs could include: new fire station, public safety services, infrastructure, maintenance, etc.)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased prestige for Albany. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Full build-out will not occur for many years.

Task Force members also noted opportunities that the project might create such as the opportunity to:

- * Insist on receiving a portion of the profits TSG receives if TSG sell the property after it is re-zoned and the property has increased 3 to 5 times its current value.
- Find the value and balance between open space and revenue.
- Create employer/city partnerships to train young workers for a variety of different jobs (technical and scientific, service
- Create special tax district or Mello Roos district.
- Consider how to mitigate negative fiscal impacts to city and AUSD.
- Consider if the city can negotiate a better return by refusing to agree to the proposal unless the city gets more money (with TSG agreeing to a lower rate of return.)
- Build something MUCH smaller, get MUCH more revenue.
- Establish an endowment fund to support AUSD staff positions, “push-in” programs to place LBNL employees in AUSD classrooms (e.g., Bayer and Rosa Parks School, 5th grade prep for state science test).
- Include housing in the mix of uses in order to meet City’s housing obligations (929 units by 2035) and require construction of new schools as part of the plan.
- Study whether hotel revenues could be higher than predicted
- Understand impact and potential for private research facilities.
- Employ people.
- Integrate development into existing commercial enterprises in Albany
- Carefully consider replacing declining track revenues with new uses/ more stable revenue stream. (Look historically at GGF revenues to city.)
- Question: Could the city do just as well with a much smaller development, no Lab, and more open space? Has the city considered inviting proposals from the developer with these assumptions?

Topic Six: O W N E R S H I P

Strengths (Pros)	Challenges (Cons)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Private development stays on the tax rolls. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * UC/LBNL interests exempt from taxation; reduce tax base for city and schools; permanent loss of revenue.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Once UC and LBNL are on the site, city/community lose much/most control over zoning and revenue potential
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tax implications and decisions related to ownership of the open space.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> History of conflict between UC and City of Berkeley. Trusting UC and getting everything in writing in legal commitment to City. <i>(Some disagreement.)</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Federal/state entities non-responsive to local concerns.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This section (ownership) doesn't seem to matter as the legal opinions presented show that any scenarios involving the Lab remove the parcels from the tax rolls. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Massive building, minimal revenue. Sketchy replacement of fiscal streams.

Task Force members also noted opportunities that the project might create such as the opportunity to:

- * Secure a Development Agreement that is fair to city, AUSD, and developer.
- Clarify what would happen should UC decide in the future to convert the land to other purposes.
- Create a procedure to monitor potentially taxable uses of equipment at a Lab, especially in any public / private partnerships.
- Determine (if Lab does not move to Albany) if City can purchase this land via a bond measure?
- Meet City and AUSD income goals while dedicating parkland to the Eastshore State Park now.
- Request that owners cede land to AUSD/city for fee-based, revenue generating activities run by city/schools such as parking concession, (including Cal football and shuttle).
- Study examples of privately-owned parks that are open to the public to see if it makes sense for parts of property.
- Ask Park District to contribute to purchase parkland (up to \$30 million from WW funds).

Topic Seven: INITIATIVE PROCESS (VOTE) FOLLOWED BY CEQA AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT PROCESS (NO VOTE), WITHOUT MEASURE C VOTE

Strengths (Pros)	Challenges (Cons)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approval of a complex document like a development agreement might be more appropriately handled by elected representatives than by a vote of the people since voters are likely to make choices based on advertising campaigns rather than a close reading of the development agreement. <i>(Some disagreement.)</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Reverses normal process of development, namely: 1) proposal from the developer; 2) environmental review; 3) review/approval from city government; 4) vote by citizens. Doing this by initiative turns process on its head, and is akin to signing a contract containing many blank spaces – never a good idea!
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meets the timeline imposed by LBNL. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Voting now is without the benefit of full CEQA review, and many may not trust the appearance of removing Measure C from the process.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides a general vote on the project, which is largely the point of Measure C. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows for CEQA process after Initiative vote. <i>(Some disagreement, including sense that this would be too late in the process.)</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Better to give the community the chance to vote after the CEQA results are known; without CEQA review first, an Initiative by the developer negating Measure C would be very bad for Albany.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initiative vote will occur without full information even though EIR will be done later.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Early citizen involvement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confusion over the process.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No benefits to Albany citizens, great benefit to TSG. <i>(Some disagreement.)</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potentially divisive approach, surfacing same old nasty divides in the community.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AUSD should be a party to the Development Agreement since the School District is integral to Albany’s culture.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If vote is approved, and then this LBNL development does not come to Albany, community could get some other unfortunate development at the site.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Depending on how the initiative is written, zoning could run with the land without a guarantee that the proposed project is the one that happens.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The effect of the Initiative will be to re-zone the property, raising the possibility that if the city wants open space after the re-zoning it will have to pay for it.

Strengths (Pros)	Challenges (Cons)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People don't like initiatives. <i>(Some disagreement.)</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A blatant work-around of Measure C. <i>(Some disagreement.)</i>

Task Force members also noted opportunities that the project might create such as the opportunity to:

- * Craft Initiative with specific amenities, open space areas, revenue sources, assurance of full CEQA process, full explanation of the work done at the Lab.
- Address a vulnerability in Measure C in the General Plan or by specific ordinance (being aware of the dangers of being accused of “takings” – but that’s a good topic for their legal advisers).
- Petition for a Referendum on the actions of the City Council.
- Complete CEQA-related documentation (i.e. individual studies) prior to vote without completing the formal CEQA process, so that voters can have sufficient information.
- Delay the vote to allow more time for information to be prepared.

Topic Eight: LBNL AT GOLDEN GATE FIELDS

Strengths (Pros)	Challenges (Cons)
* Hoped-for educational opportunities for AUSD, including internships for AHS students.	* Large development at the waterfront, with minimal direct income to the city and schools.
• Destination for green technology; becoming part of leading edge research	• No tax revenue and increased city costs for services for the Lab.
• Good match for Albany; associates Albany with its professed educational values.	• Loss of city control over activities at the site (no zoning controls, limited ability to influence environmental effects).
• Potential for developing valuable new scientific knowledge and technologies through public/private synergies that might benefit ALL citizens and peoples of the world.	• Not clear GGF is the best location for this enterprise; may be superior uses for this site.
• <i>Hopefully</i> other companies that see a benefit in being in close proximity to the Lab will be attracted to Albany, attracting spin-off labs and businesses that pay taxes.	
• Potential impact on local taxes from: restaurants convenience shopping, hotel.	• Largely a single use or very limited mix of uses on the waterfront.
• Benefit to image of Albany as ‘Home of World Class LBNL Energy Research;’ potential to attract jobs.	• Developer’s vision of cutting edge eco-technology and research, modern fuels, etc., could be more the developer’s fantasy than what LBNL is primarily about.
	• Non-taxable land and buildings. Consumes open space and does not provide local revenues.
• Attracts scientists to conferences at the hotel.	
	• UC/LBNL reluctance to address TF; resultant lack of information frustrating. <i>(Some disagreement.)</i>
	• Potential for serious environmental degradation from laboratory accidents, earthquakes, or other catastrophic events. Doesn’t make sense to locate this near a major transit corridor and in an environmentally-sensitive (wetlands and bay) area. <i>(Some disagreement.)</i>
	• Many unknowns at this time.

Strengths (Pros)	Challenges (Cons)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ensuring that environmental safeguards and monitoring systems will be in place.

Task Force members also noted opportunities that the project might create such as the opportunity to:

- Become a leader in scientific research in green technology.
- Approach Lab to compensate the city for their services.
- Serve as a living laboratory.

Topic Nine: OVERALL PROPOSAL FOR DEVELOPMENT OF LBNL PLUS ADDITIONAL DEVELOPMENT AT GGF

Strengths (Pros)	Challenges (Cons)
	* Fast pace of planning is not conducive to good planning or evolution of a plan that reflects a fully mixed-use plan appropriate for and as an extension of Albany.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Plan, as presented “pencils out” for all parties. That is, all parties have some degree of “win” and all appear to do better than before. 	* The developer “wins” the most: the value of their land goes from \$47.5 Million to either \$300 Million (an increase of 638%) or \$500 Million (an increase of 1,063%), while the city gains a net of \$300,000 more to its general fund (an increase of 68.9%), at full build out. The city also gains access to the waterfront as a park which has an unknown “dollar” value, but which is a valuable consideration. Whether this is considered a fair trade will likely be decided by the voters.
* Opportunity to make Albany feel connected to its shoreline.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current site plan does not adequately connect city to shoreline. <i>(Some disagreement.)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opportunity to create significant new “funded” parkland and make existing parkland more usable. <i>(Note: Funding /ownership of park/open space not fully known)</i> 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> World class scientific facility in Albany. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Possibly the best opportunity to see something positive occur on the waterfront, especially given current economic times and conditions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This development is not suited to the location. <i>(Some disagreement.)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opportunity for us to learn details about tax revenue, to contemplate what might work here for landowners and the community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To learn more about what might work for owners. Understand they need to go all out in advocating for this development in this process, but feels a bit like a missed opportunity. <i>(Some disagreement.)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Destination for green technology. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scientists come to conferences at the hotel. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Doubletree Hotel featured in last week’s discussion sounds like a great fit hotel for that location. I believe a similar standard chain hotel would be a waste of this GGF location, which is not a sea of industrial, urban loft, big box, mall development as is Emeryville.

Strengths (Pros)	Challenges (Cons)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Spinoff labs and businesses, because of LBNL. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opportunity for significant economic development and increase in revenues to city. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Large public ownership/lease does not allow for maximum revenue generation.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No indication so far that intent is for world-class design. <i>(Some disagreement.)</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many unknowns at this time.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Elimination of race track jobs for a segment of our community which may have a difficult time finding work. <i>(Some disagreement.)</i>

Task Force members also noted opportunities that the project might create such as the opportunity to:

- * Ensure the maximum benefit for everyone, both economically and environmentally.
- * Collaborate with public and private sector to explore all options and balance the desire for open space with the real need for revenue. (Note: The amount of revenue currently received from GGF will not be adequate for the future.)
- * Select a world-class architect and to achieve sustainable design at the Albany waterfront.
- * Become a waterfront community, not just a community with a waterfront.
- Discuss other possible plans and uses, should LBNL not select Albany, and work toward creating a Specific Plan to guide development into the future.
- Design something unique and beautiful, featuring the location and to create a great hotel that is more upscale and revenue-producing along with a brilliant conference center with several revenue-bringing options.
- Invite TSG to submit proposals without the Lab.
- Create synergy between private and public investment.
- Create world-class urban park.

Albany Waterfront Task Force
 Golden Gate Fields/ The Stronach Group Proposal
 Second Campus for LBNL and Additional Development

Task Force List: **What We Don't Know** (but think is important to understand)

Note: The Task Force is operating on site plan information provided by the developer on October 16th. The “project” as described at that time included (in Albany - on 107 acres) 2M sq ft for LBNL + parking and an additional .9M sq ft for a combination of commercial labs/offices, small retail, and a hotel+ parking (Total built area / sq ft in Albany = 2.9M sq ft + parking) + open space comprised of (and described as) a waterfront park and a park at the eastern edge of the site at Codornices Creek. Additional “open space” included areas within the “LBNL Campus” and “connectors.” The project, as described also plans for the FSF (Future Science Facility) – described as a linear accelerator that would be underground at the eastern edge of the site. The entire site would be elevated to accommodate for sea level rise. Heights were described as 60-80' and the potential for the hotel to be as high as 120'.

The Berkeley portion of the site (29 acres) was described as including approximately 1.6M sq ft of commercial development to include a hotel, office/labs, and residential + parking (not included in the current sq ft, as well as waterfront open space.

The plans shown to the Task Force also included completion of the Bay Trail.

A presentation on November 13 discussing economic impacts used a scenario with a total square footage in Albany of approximately 2.6M sq ft + parking as compared to the 2.9M sq. ft + parking, but this presentation did not include a new site plan.

<p>What We Don't Know – by Category</p> <p>Open Questions and Missing Information (as of 11/20)</p> <p>* indicates question is a <i>priority</i> for Task Force members</p> <p>** indicates question is a <i>high priority</i> Task Force members</p>	<p>From Whom the Task Force Thinks the Information Needs to Come</p>
<p>Site Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Will the final site plan relate closely to the Conceptual Master Plan shown on 10/16? * When will a final land use plan be developed, presented, and confirmed (prior to Initiative, or in conjunction with EIR and proposed Development Agreement)? • What is the amount of acreage allocated for each use, including roads, walkways, infrastructure, etc.? • Do drawings shown in Master Plan, presented on 10/16 portray square footage delineated and intended to be built? • Can/will proposed development be further compacted? • Will “height zones” restrict the amount of building square footage at certain heights? 	<p>TSG</p>

What We Don't Know – by Category Open Questions and Missing Information (as of 11/20) * indicates question is a <i>priority</i> for Task Force members ** indicates question is a <i>high priority</i> Task Force members	From Whom the Task Force Thinks the Information Needs to Come
Phasing * What happens if LBNL does not build beyond Phase One? * What happens if LBNL is not awarded the linear accelerator project? * What are the timing and final land uses/ building amounts for Phase One (beyond LBNL) as well as timing for subsequent phases? * What happens if private development beyond Phase One is not determined by the developers to be feasible?	TSG
Site Selection <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would LBNL select the GGF site without community support? 	LBNL
Parking Requirements: Cities and LBNL * How many parking spaces will be required by LBNL, City of Albany, City of Berkeley?	Albany, Berkeley, LBNL
Parking Requirements: Site Plan * Are parking area shown in conceptual master plan sufficient for the number of cars required by the cities of Albany and Berkeley and by LBNL? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would final parking structure(s?) block views? 	TSG
Changes to LBNL 2nd Campus in the future * What would happen if, in the future, UC decides to fence off, or severely restrict access to the part of the site where its buildings are situated? * What happens if UC sells the land at a later date and/or uses the property for non-educational uses? * Assuming a Development Agreement is successfully negotiated between The Stronach Group and the city of Albany, will that Agreement be transferable to a new landowner, or do the entitlements rest with the current owner? * What land values that will be used to determine transfer tax responsibility if all or part of the property is sold?	Albany
LBNL * What type of research does LBNL plan on conducting at the 2 nd campus? beyond Phase One? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the risks to public health and safety, as well as mitigations and monitoring plans? • Is it accurate to say that LBNL is a federal agency, funded by DOE and managed by UC? 	LBNL

What We Don't Know – by Category Open Questions and Missing Information (as of 11/20) * indicates question is a <i>priority</i> for Task Force members ** indicates question is a <i>high priority</i> Task Force members	From Whom the Task Force Thinks the Information Needs to Come
Infrastructure Costs * Are open space costs (land value, development, maintenance as public park) included in the infrastructure costs being estimated as “costs” to TSG? * Could you provide a breakdown of infrastructure costs by component; and what the most current estimate is for the total infrastructure costs? * What portion of the infrastructure supports LBNL, and how much will LBNL pay toward infrastructure costs?	TSG
Views * When will other views from Albany Hill and from requested public locations, including Bulb, Beach, Freeway be shown? • When will TSG be providing requested depictions of views based on more current site plan and height distribution?	TSG
Architecture and Design Aesthetics * How will aesthetics and architectural quality be defined and ensured? (Will Design Guidelines be developed with the City of Albany in advance of any permits? Will LBNL buildings conform to Design Guidelines? Will Design Guidelines be included within the body of the Development Agreement?) * What the architecture will look like and who the architects for the project will be (Does LBNL select its own architects? Does TSG select architects for the private portions? Does a chain hotel select its architect?)	TSG, Albany, Berkeley, LBNL
Open Space Calculations * Is surface parking included in the open space calculations? • Are roads included in the open space calculations and set back calculations?	TSG
Ownership of Open Space and LBNL Portion of Site ** When will the ownership/lease arrangements between UC and TSG will be determined and revealed to the public? ** When will the issue of ownership of public open space be decided? What will be the format for ownership of the public open space? • Will open space be developed as a public park?	TSG
Bay Trail Court Action * When will the resolution of pending court action related to Bay Trail property be revealed?	Albany

<p>What We Don't Know – by Category</p> <p>Open Questions and Missing Information (as of 11/20)</p> <p>* indicates question is a <i>priority</i> for Task Force members</p> <p>** indicates question is a <i>high priority</i> Task Force members</p>	<p>From Whom the Task Force Thinks the Information Needs to Come</p>
<p>Voter Initiative</p> <p>* When will the language and/or the proposed content for the developer's Initiative be shared with the community, TF, or the City?</p> <p>* What happens if the voter initiative passes in one city (Albany or Berkeley) and does not pass in the other city (Albany or Berkeley)?</p>	<p>TSG</p>
<p>Development Agreement</p> <p>* What role would the Initiative have if the City and TSG cannot come to a successfully negotiated Development Agreement ?</p>	<p>Albany</p>
<p>CEQA Process</p> <p>* Can/will the Initiative language ensure full CEQA review and allow for City Council discretion to not approve a project that meets criteria included in an Initiative but is found through the CEQA process to have deleterious impacts?</p>	<p>Albany</p>
<p>“Plan B” – TSG Perspective</p> <p>* Does TSG have other plans for the site at this time (if LBNL does not select GGF as the preferred site for its second campus)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What plans might be contemplated by the owners if LBNL selects another site? • Is there a feasible scenario for development without LBNL? 	<p>TSG</p>
<p>“Plan B” – City of Albany Perspective</p> <p>* What is the fiscal impact of a project of similar scale (4.5 million square feet of building plus associated parking) if all of the development was taxable (best and highest use)?</p>	<p>Albany</p>
<p>Environmental and Safety Hazards (LBNL)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the potential environmental and safety hazards? • How will (can) potential hazards be mitigated? • What is LBNL's record re: environmental impacts/pollution in Berkeley? • What toxics will be generated and how will they be disposed? • How will (can) potential hazards be mitigated? 	<p>LBNL, Berkeley</p>
<p>Traffic</p> <p>** What are the anticipated traffic impacts (including impacts on air quality and public health) of the proposed project? When will they be known?</p> <p>** Will any traffic studies be done and analyzed prior to the Initiative vote?</p> <p>* How will traffic impacts be mitigated?</p>	<p>TSG, Albany</p>

What We Don't Know – by Category Open Questions and Missing Information (as of 11/20) * indicates question is a <i>priority</i> for Task Force members ** indicates question is a <i>high priority</i> Task Force members	From Whom the Task Force Thinks the Information Needs to Come
Renewable Energy * What commitments will be made to integrated renewable technologies prior to Development Agreement negotiations?	LBNL
AUSD * Might revenues for AUSD be <i>higher</i> than those currently generated by GGF? * Will TSG compensate AUSD for existing parcel taxes that expire? • How are future parcel taxes proposed to be handled at GGF site? • What is the relationship between LBNL and AUSD?	TSG, Albany
Economic / Fiscal Impacts * When will TSG (or the city) provide information as to feasibility of non-LBNL project options? * What is the economic value of new public open space at the waterfront? * How would bond repayment obligations be handled by the owners of the GGF site, if revenues are not provided through the siting of a public laboratory? • When will a feasibility / market studies of a hotel and other proposed uses in Albany be conducted and provided for analysis by Albany's economic consultant? • Is a development with less building bulk and height feasible?	TSG

Questions Sorted by Party Task Force Believes Can Answer

The Stronach Group

Site Plan

- * Will the final site plan relate closely to the Conceptual Master Plan shown on 10/16?
- * When will a final land use plan be developed, presented, and confirmed (prior to Initiative, or in conjunction with EIR and proposed Development Agreement)?
- What is the amount of acreage allocated for each use, including roads, walkways, infrastructure, etc.?
- Do drawings shown in Master Plan, presented on 10/16 portray square footage delineated and intended to be built?
- Can/will proposed development be further compacted?
- Will “height zones” restrict the amount of building square footage at certain heights?

Phasing

- * What happens if LBNL does not build beyond Phase One?
- * What happens if LBNL is not awarded the linear accelerator project?
- * What are the timing and final land uses/ building amounts for Phase One (beyond LBNL) as well as timing for subsequent phases?
- * What happens if private development beyond Phase One is not determined by the developers to be feasible?

Parking Requirements: Site Plan

- * Are parking area shown in conceptual master plan sufficient for the number of cars required by the cities of Albany and Berkeley and by LBNL?
- Would final parking structure(s?) block views?

Infrastructure Costs

- * Are open space costs (land value, development, maintenance as public park) included in the infrastructure costs being estimated as “costs” to TSG?
- * Could you provide a breakdown of infrastructure costs by component; and what the most current estimate is for the total infrastructure costs?
- * What portion of the infrastructure supports LBNL, and how much will LBNL pay toward infrastructure costs?

Views

- * When will other views from Albany Hill and from requested public locations, including Bulb, Beach, Freeway be shown?
- When will TSG be providing requested depictions of views based on more current site plan and height distribution?

Architecture and Design Aesthetics

- * How will aesthetics and architectural quality be defined and ensured? (Will Design Guidelines be developed with the City of Albany in advance of any permits? Will LBNL buildings conform to Design Guidelines? Will Design Guidelines be included within the body of the Development Agreement?)
- * What the architecture will look like and who the architects for the project will be (Does LBNL select its own architects? Does TSG select architects for the private portions? Does a chain hotel select its architect?)

Open Space Calculations

- * Is surface parking included in the open space calculations?
- Are roads included in the open space calculations and set back calculations?

Ownership of Open Space and LBNL Portion of Site

- ** When will the ownership/lease arrangements between UC and TSG will be determined and revealed to the public?
- ** When will the issue of ownership of public open space be decided? What will be the format for ownership of the public open space?
- Will open space be developed as a public park?

Voter Initiative

- * When will the language and/or the proposed content for the developer's Initiative be shared with the community, TF, or the City?
- * What happens if the voter initiative passes in one city (Albany or Berkeley) and does not pass in the other city (Albany or Berkeley)?

“Plan B” – TSG Perspective

- * Does TSG have other plans for the site at this time (if LBNL does not select GGF as the preferred site for its second campus)?
- What plans might be contemplated by the owners if LBNL selects another site?
- Is there a feasible scenario for development without LBNL?

Traffic

- ** What are the anticipated traffic impacts (including impacts on air quality and public health) of the proposed project? When will they be known?
- ** Will any traffic studies be done and analyzed prior to the Initiative vote?
- * How will traffic impacts be mitigated?

Schools

- * Might revenues for AUSD be *higher* than those currently generated by GGF?
- * Will TSG compensate AUSD for existing parcel taxes that expire?
- How are future parcel taxes proposed to be handled at GGF site?

Economic / Fiscal Impacts

- * When will TSG (or the city) provide information as to feasibility of non-LBNL project options?
- * What is the economic value of new public open space at the waterfront?
- * How would bond repayment obligations be handled by the owners of the GGF site, if revenues are not provided through the siting of a public laboratory?
- When will a feasibility / market studies of a hotel and other proposed uses in Albany be conducted and provided for analysis by Albany's economic consultant?
- Is a development with less building bulk and height feasible?

L B N L

Site Selection

- Would LBNL select the GGF site without community support?

Parking Requirements

- * How many parking spaces will be required by LBNL?

About LBNL

- * What type of research does LBNL plan on conducting at the 2nd campus? beyond Phase One?
- What are the risks to public health and safety, as well as mitigations and monitoring plans?
- Is it accurate to say that LBNL is a federal agency, funded by DOE and managed by UC?

Architecture and Design Aesthetics

- * How will aesthetics and architectural quality be defined and ensured? (Will Design Guidelines be developed with the City of Albany in advance of any permits? Will LBNL buildings conform to Design Guidelines? Will Design Guidelines be included within the body of the Development Agreement?)
- * What the architecture will look like and who the architects for the project will be (Does LBNL select its own architects? Does TSG select architects for the private portions? Does a chain hotel select its architect?)

Environmental and Safety Hazards (LBNL)

- What are the potential environmental and safety hazards?
- How will (can) potential hazards be mitigated?
- What is LBNL's record re: environmental impacts/pollution in Berkeley?
- What toxics will be generated and how will they be disposed?
- How will (can) potential hazards be mitigated?

Renewable Energy

- * What commitments will be made to integrated renewable technologies prior to Development Agreement negotiations?

CITY OF ALBANY

Parking Requirements

- * How many parking spaces will be required by City of Albany?

Changes to LBNL 2nd Campus in the future

- * What would happen if, in the future, UC decides to fence off, or severely restrict access to the part of the site where its buildings are situated?
- * What happens if UC sells the land at a later date and/or uses the property for non-educational uses?
- * Assuming a Development Agreement is successfully negotiated between The Stronach Group and the city of Albany, will that Agreement be transferable to a new landowner, or do the entitlements rest with the current owner?
- * What land values that will be used to determine transfer tax responsibility if all or part of the property is sold?

Architecture and Design Aesthetics

- * How will aesthetics and architectural quality be defined and ensured? (Will Design Guidelines be developed with the City of Albany in advance of any permits? Will LBNL buildings conform to Design Guidelines? Will Design Guidelines be included within the body of the Development Agreement?)
- * What the architecture will look like and who the architects for the project will be (Does LBNL select its own architects? Does TSG select architects for the private portions? Does a chain hotel select its architect?)

Bay Trail Court Action

- * When will the resolution of pending court action related to Bay Trail property be revealed?

Development Agreement

- * What role would the Initiative have if the City and TSG cannot come to a successfully negotiated Development Agreement ?

CEQA Process

- * Can/will the Initiative language ensure full CEQA review and allow for City Council discretion to not approve a project that meets criteria included in an Initiative but is found through the CEQA process to have deleterious impacts?

“Plan B” – City of Albany Perspective

- * What is the fiscal impact of a project of similar scale (4.5 million square feet of building plus associated parking) if all of the development was taxable (best and highest use)?

Traffic

- ** What are the anticipated traffic impacts (including impacts on air quality and public health) of the proposed project? When will they be known?
- ** Will any traffic studies be done and analyzed prior to the Initiative vote?
- * How will traffic impacts be mitigated?

Schools

- * Might revenues for AUSD be *higher* than those currently generated by GGF?
- * Will TSG compensate AUSD for existing parcel taxes that expire?
- How are future parcel taxes proposed to be handled at GGF site?
- What is the relationship between LBNL and AUSD?

CITY OF BERKELEY

Parking Requirements

- * How many parking spaces will be required by City of Berkeley?

Architecture and Design Aesthetics

- * How will aesthetics and architectural quality be defined and ensured? (Will Design Guidelines be developed with the City of Albany in advance of any permits? Will LBNL buildings conform to Design Guidelines? Will Design Guidelines be included within the body of the Development Agreement?)
- * What the architecture will look like and who the architects for the project will be (Does LBNL select its own architects? Does TSG select architects for the private portions? Does a chain hotel select its architect?)

Environmental and Safety Hazards (LBNL)

- What is LBNL's record re: environmental impacts/pollution in Berkeley?

Golden Gate Fields Task Force: Follow-up to November 20 Meeting

(includes all comments received from Task Force members and Public as of end of November 20th meeting)

Top Strengths (Pros)	Top Challenges (Cons)	Top Opportunities
SITE PLAN / PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS		
		Site is spectacular – SF based shoreline appreciated internationally. Be visionary about design of structures on site – perhaps an international design competition. (Redding, CA had Calatrava design bridge to park, and now draws many visitors.
Plan provides sufficient sq. ft. to make inclusion of LBNL economically viable while still providing park along waterfront and creek	More than six times larger footprint than any previous development	Chance to realize park in the foreseeable future while maintaining existing revenue to city and schools
Preserves Fleming Point as dedicated open space and “daylights” the creek	Piece of Fleming Point would become a grass covered parking structure	Consider what is minimum sq ft of mixed use that would make a project economically viable while keeping the city “whole” financially and dedicating a portion (approx 70%) to open space
Buildings are grouped together “closer” to the freeway which leaves park open space in tact along the shoreline	Proposed amount of development is massive	
	Berkeley gets a lively village with housing, restaurants, and shops; Albany gets a blank faced office park with lab buildings the size of Target facing the shoreline	Opportunity to create a human-scaled environment that makes the outdoor spaces and vistas comfortable and accessible through appropriate indoor shelter and activities
Connecting Solano to the shoreline and continuing street line out to pier is good; pier will provide excellent views of beach, bulb, and Berkeley hills, as well as to west; community center facing plaza is good	Not enough streets; no real street structure to support a pedestrian environment, just a single north/south road; no areas of fine grain/smaller building footprints (especially necessary near park/trail); no similarities in layout/scale to rest of Albany, which will lead to a feeling of disconnectedness	Through good design to make Albany feel physically connected to shoreline; mimicking aspects of existing Albany urban fabric could increase sense of connectivity across the freeway a la Elmwood/Rockridge connection along College Ave under freeway

Top Strengths (Pros)	Top Challenges (Cons)	Top Opportunities
Location of FSF on east side preserves open space at the most valuable habitat, i.e. Codornices / tidal marsh; expansion of tidal marsh is good; eliminating Buchanan Ext. levee and replacing with causeway to increase tidal action could be considered	Lack of housing is bad for the park; no eyes on the park means continued homeless problems is discouraging to people who want to walk, bike to park; no housing will mean it will not feel like part of Albany	Opportunity to make shoreline a comfortable place for families and children; to make recreation including non-motorized boating accessible without automobile use
	Open space lacks definition and sense of enclosure; plazas between lab buildings are too large and open-ended; community plaza may be too large for its purpose; need more intimate outdoor spaces given the often-cold and windy environment; need more use of buildings' southern exposures	Opportunity for a wide variety of outdoor environments from open vistas to intimate gardens to outdoor rooms to performing arts venues
	Rather than enhance topography (cf built environment of Telegraph Hill) the building profiles erase hill of Fleming Point	Opportunity to emphasize height of Fleming Point; opportunity to avoid flat roofs with articulated roof lines (a la Stapleton Airport) and an iconic building of structure atop Fleming Point (a la Geary, Calatrava)
	Scale of buildings (horizontal as well as vertical) is very large for Albany and needs to be mitigated with design to introduce human scaled structures and more windows/ doors along the edges of open space and along streets	cf Vancouver waterfront with human scaled townhouses presenting a friendly face to street at base of large buildings
	There should be a parallel north/south street for pedestrians inland of the planned waterfront road to provide a more protected and intimate pedestrian route closer to the eastside park space	This street could be a greenway providing a lot of parking a la Key Route Boulevard by H.S.; or a linear park like Commonwealth Ave in Boston; or, in parts, a shopping street like Solano Ave/ Fourth St in Berkeley

Top Strengths (Pros)	Top Challenges (Cons)	Top Opportunities
Well thought out, well vetted, appears to meet the desires and needs of LBNL. As much as we can glean of what is wanted without specific knowledge.	To my perception, the planned development is essentially an office park.	This location offers magnificent opportunities for something capitalizing on and enhancing its placement on the shore of the SF Bay, with world class views, proximity to SF and entire Bay Area.
	Too big, too dense, not appropriate to location	Build a remunerative development that features the gorgeous setting (eco conference center, hotel, spa, restaurant.....)
Amount of open space	Large sq ft for buildings and parking	East/west integration across freeways/RR to tie area to rest of Albany
	Concentration of non-taxable space in Albany	
70% open space	Height of hotel	Build extraordinary and creative facility with buildings that are LEED certified and use renewable energy
Most buildings 65 - 85' high	Impacts on the view of the Bay and beyond for some hill residents	Open space that is accessible to all
Planning for sea level rise		
Appropriate types of retail to rest of site		
Hotel with tax for economic benefit		
	Skyscraper campus (a small portion of which is for "green development" but other labs can be used for anything UC sees fit)	Physical characteristics of site are phenomenal and would like to see a development move into the site as race track under utilizes the site
	Hotel out of scale with rest of project at 120' tall	

Top Strengths (Pros)	Top Challenges (Cons)	Top Opportunities
Parkland atop parking is a nice move toward hiding parking as well as increasing usable open space in the most valuable spot.	Cost could be an issue; details of how this is executed are critical (amount of parking, structure and urban facade).	Plan provides a good basic framework for a variety of possible uses.
Preservation of creek watershed and open space along shoreline.	All housing in Berkeley along with half the retail seems lopsided.	Public access and a variety of recreational opportunities are possible.
	Where to put 5,000 cars? It is not clear where the parking is going and the impact on the site plan.	
		Bike/ped bridge would be a strength if it were built, but so far there is no commitment, so it's really an opportunity.
		LBNL is both the catalyst and the biggest liability (economic).
Public Comments (at November 20th Task Force Meeting)		
		"Get the length of the FSF correct: it is 3,000', not 1,800'... which is what makes current and future site plans so inflexible."

Top Strengths (Pros)	Top Challenges (Cons)	Top Opportunities
PUBLIC OPEN SPACE		
	Adjoining development should be compatible with <u>usable</u> open space – perhaps some housing? There should be some housing in Albany, not all in Berkeley. There should be more planning and visioning done about the type of open space at the site.	
The shoreline portion of the land is all park	Would like to see more park and less building development	Having a truly significant park adjacent to the Albany bulb which in turn would hopefully be upgraded so that the bulb could be safe to use and enjoy. (Because of the great number of people camping at the Bulb now, it is an unsafe place, and I never go there.)
Vastly increases the area of the waterfront open to the public	This open space is a <u>regional</u> benefit (amenity) paid for by Albany (via loss of tax revenue and control of future use and/or development	A chance for the Council and the citizens to evaluate the value of public open space and to weigh these against the huge economic benefit to the developer and the costs to other quality of life aspects for the city (traffic, pollution, safety, demographic changes, and relation to state and federal entities within the city limits but not necessarily answerable to city government)
		Opportunity for comfortable community gathering spaces with outdoor spaces immediately adjacent to sheltered indoor spaces
		Opportunity to become part of SF Bay Water Trail through non-motorized boating facilities, such as floating dock, storage, and campground
When I asked what “open space” means at a public meeting, developers said “That’s for the community to determine.” Saw some more specifics including bits of bio-remediation-type plans since.	Because the development is so big, the open space areas seem to be in the shadow of buildings, roads, parking. Leftovers rather than featuring the natural setting, which is a primary value of the location.	Sensitively designed development encompassing all the natural features of the site – Fleming Point, the coastline, the views. And requiring less infrastructure/ expense for developers.

Top Strengths (Pros)	Top Challenges (Cons)	Top Opportunities
	“Open space” isn’t particularly meaningful measured just in area. Needs to be specific to the land and in relation to the development.	Opportunity to enhance the existing location, improve the environmental well-being and value of the land.
		Opportunity to make the setting more accessible for more people to enjoy recreation, observe nature, learn about birds, tides, water, health
Protection of Codornices Creek corridor and public access to it	Minimal connection through stables area to open space south of Gilman	Creation of east/west pedestrian and bicycle connectors at two to three more locations
Commitment of Fleming Point and area behind beach to public open space		
70% of site park paid by developer	Removed from tax rolls	Input by community as to design
Opening of Codornices Creek/wetlands	Trade-off between revenue and open space	Accessible area to be enjoyed by all
Various types of open space	Who maintains open space?	
Range of landscape types on the site, respecting existing habitats	Who will own the open space?	
Goals as outlined in V2V are largely met with this plan.	Impact on tax revenues unclear, also maintenance of dedicated open space as well as other lands (bulb, neck, etc.).	Long-term preservation of the majority of the site, if structured properly.
	Connections between this site and the rest of Albany remain difficult, possibly expensive and long-term.	
	Connections between this site and the rest of Albany remain difficult, possibly expensive and long-term.	

Top Strengths (Pros)	Top Challenges (Cons)	Top Opportunities
I want to understand how open space enhances hotel and other uses, and how it adds value to those uses.		
When comparing open space proposed to existing situation, plan is extraordinarily positive.	Has there been a commitment to provide the open space to the Park District? If not, it's a con, because it's unclear.	
Public Comments (at November 20 th Task Force Meeting)		
		<p>“Open space’ is a semantic trap. An alley can be open space but not park land. In terms of contiguous parkland, under 50 acres is far short of goals expressed in Voices to Vision. Separate Eastern corridor is walled by freeway and sound-reflecting buildings.”</p>

Top Strengths (Pros)	Top Challenges (Cons)	Top Opportunities
ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES		
The city would get a park (but it would from any development).	Buildings too tall; development too dense.	
	Incompatibility between Lab where sensitive research is conducted and heavily used public open space.	
Public - private partnerships may provide important advances in alternative energy and environmental technologies	To date, no info has been presented on any <u>actual</u> or proposed alternative energy projects for this LBNL campus.	City might revisit their own options in using part of the Bulb for energy generation (wind, solar, or tidal)
TSG asserts all construction will be LEED certified	It doesn't matter how "green" development is, if it is out of scale for the site.	Another chance for the city to invite TSG to submit proposal absent the Lab.
Live-work at waterfront is an environmentally-sensitive and attractive option. It reduces commuting while providing a beautiful environment in which to live and work.	This benefit would only be available to the scientists, engineers, administrators who could afford Bay view condos. The service workers who help make the amenities are not likely to be able to live there, even if some of the housing was reserved as "affordable." We would be creating a park whose principal beneficiaries are the wealthy.	
	Height of buildings will block the view, in large part, from the freeway and Albany proper.	
		Opportunity to enhance the existing location, improve the environmental well-being and value of the land.
		Opportunity to make the setting more accessible for more people to enjoy recreation, observe nature, learn about birds, tides, water, health
Protection of wetlands	Large sq ft of buildings	Integration with Plateau and Bulb

Top Strengths (Pros)	Top Challenges (Cons)	Top Opportunities
Substantive environmental analysis will occur	Ensure the disposal of potential toxic materials as specified by law and best practices	Improvement of the land for the benefit of all, both human and animal
All CEQA requirements will be met	Independent monitoring of scientific procedures as specified by law and best practices	
Project will include sustainable and renewable energy including wind and solar	Unclear as to lead agency at this time	
Daylighting Codornices Creek/ wetland restoration		
Range of landscape types on the site, respecting existing habitats		
Planning for sea level rise		
Buffers to the creek watershed and the bayshore.	Intensity of use; corresponding external impacts as a result of these (traffic, pollution, etc.).	Potential to be a model development relative to addressing Climate Change.
	Environmental issues around lab work have not been clarified.	
		Integration with Plateau and Bulb.
Creates open space.		
Commitment to removing existing infrastructure/ buildings (e.g., grandstand)		

Top Strengths (Pros)	Top Challenges (Cons)	Top Opportunities
T R A F F I C		
	Size of the LBNL development and number of employees will create traffic problems	
None	The I-80 corridor is one of the most heavily traveled in northern CA. Idling cars waste tremendous amounts of fuel and contribute directly to air pollution and consequent health problems. Further, freeway congestion already overflows onto city streets and a development of this scale is likely to make this issue much worse. Please consider that the EIR for the Santa Fe development proposal for this property concluded that there were NO adequate mitigations for this environmental impact. It is especially troubling that TSG has decided to defer their studies of this problem and calls into question both their competence and their integrity.	Consider what the city might do to encourage or develop other ways to move people around the urban environment: Shuttle to BART? Shuttles up and down Solano? Safer boulevards?
	I fear the traffic problems will be horrendous and there will be no way to substantially mitigate them.	A pedestrian/bicycle flyover at the freeway would greatly aid Albany residents' use of the shoreline park
Haven't heard the details	Having hundreds/thousands of workers arriving and departing at the same time sounds like a challenging impact to me.	To build something that has a more varied traffic pattern.
		To explore all potential car - alternate means of arriving and departing the location.
	Traffic volume will increase	Pedestrian - bicycle access
	Parking	Shuttle service connector to BART, Solano, Albany City Hall, Community Center, UC Village
Shuttles connecting to BART and other public transportation	Lots of parking needed	Build overcrossings for bikes and pedestrians over freeway and rails

Top Strengths (Pros)	Top Challenges (Cons)	Top Opportunities
Bike paths for riders of varying abilities throughout property	More parking is desired in similar development by merchants, etc.	Create shuttle routes to local shopping areas
Hidden parking in Phase Two		Incentivize public transit to employees
		Incentivize car pooling and energy-efficient cars for employees
		Build creative parking podiums to hide cars and use land above as park
	Traffic would be a horror with 5,000 car commuters accessing the site, AC buses and jitneys rerouted through the site, not to mention delivery vehicles, servicing a 200-room hotel and 18-20 labs and related commercial enterprises. This traffic would be routed very close to the beach sites and would spoil the outdoor beach experience for many nature lovers.	
Perimeter road allows for easy park access, connection and views to waterfront, parking, labs.	Connecting pedestrians, bicyclists, cars and shuttles via two relatively narrow access points.	Creatively making the connections, and leveraging the funding to do so.
	Traffic impact on Ocean View School drop-off and pick-up.	Reduce traffic with development of public transportation.
Public Comments (at November 20th Task Force Meeting)		
	LBL has other site choices... it is not harmed by Richmond site choice, but commercial traffic to and from future TSG development without LBL will be more manageable compared to combined commercial/LBL site at GGF.	Recommend traffic management; bike/ped bridge should be at (?) Codornices Creek; redesign Buchanan access will satisfy need for north entrance; Codornices Creek access will supplant Gilman Street “nightmare”

Top Strengths (Pros)	Top Challenges (Cons)	Top Opportunities
ECONOMIC / FISCAL IMPACTS		
	City and schools would not receive enough revenue for such a large development.	
	School district needs substantial new revenue due to ongoing cuts.	
Creates 4,500 jobs!	Increase in city services and costs (at 1/2 cost per city resident but still about \$400/person per year x 4,500 = \$1.8 million.	Potential employer/city partnerships to train young workers for a variety of different jobs (including technical and scientific, as well as service)
Increase revenues to the General Fund a net \$300K per year at minimum	There is an interesting, though unspoken, and perhaps unknowable, aspect to inviting the federal government and the UC Regents to become the largest employer within the city limits. Both of these entities are notoriously unresponsive to local concerns and are not bound by local governments. This might mean that large swings in employment, revenue, and even environmental quality would be vulnerable to policies and priorities set far away.	Could the city do just as well with a much smaller development, no Lab, and more open space? Has the city considered inviting proposals from the developer with these assumptions?
	The increase in revenue to the city of only \$300K (at full buildout) is very disappointing considering how massive the buildings will be.	Can the city negotiate a better return by refusing to agree to the proposal unless the city gets more money? (TSG would have to agree to a lower rate of return)
		The city should insist on receiving a portion of the profits TSG receives if TSG sell the property after it is re-zoned and the property has increased 3-5 times its current value.
Not seeing any top strength economic benefit “pro.”	Hella massive building, minimal revenue. Sketchy replacement fiscal streams, named by developers’ financial analyst not entirely trustworthy/ confidence-inspiring.	Build something MUCH smaller, get MUCH more revenue.

Top Strengths (Pros)	Top Challenges (Cons)	Top Opportunities
	City/community potentially lose much/most control over zoning and revenue potential, once UC and LBNL are on the site.	Something commercial rather than UC- or LBNL-connected.
	Will negatively affect city and AUSD revenues without mitigation measures and special arrangements.	Employment opportunities
		Opportunities to establish endowment fund to support AUSD staff positions, “push-in” programs to place LBNL employees in AUSD classrooms, just as UC research professors teach undergrad classes.
More revenue for city	Land owned by UC and parkland removed from tax rolls	Create special tax district or Mello Roos district
75 acres of park land at no charge to the city	Costs to city (new fire station, public safety services, infrastructure, maintenance, etc.)	Mechanisms to mitigate negative fiscal impacts to city and AUSD must be considered and implemented.
TSG has stated they will cover the short fall in parcel taxes to AUSD	Reduction of parcel tax payments to AUSD	Find the value and balance between open space and revenue.
Public art fee paid on private development	Not a lot of new revenues to the city	
Increase in jobs	Full build-out will not occur for many years.	
Increase in revenue for local businesses		
	Economically, it’s a wash (or so they’d like to tell us). Lack of information makes that claim subject to change as the project develops.	
TSG’s awareness of the need to maintain funding for AUSD and the City during development and into the future.	Revenue potential of another mix of fully taxable uses.	Include housing in the mix of uses in order to meet City’s housing obligations (929 units by 2035) and require construction of new schools as part of the plan.

Top Strengths (Pros)	Top Challenges (Cons)	Top Opportunities
	Inability of Albany to retain legal and other necessary council sufficient to negotiate fair agreement with TSG (for city and schools).	
EDSET program could benefit.	Further reduction of parcel tax payments to AUSD, because when Plateau/Beach land sold, it resulted in loss of approximately \$200,000 in parcel taxes	
		If structured properly – with taxes, development agreement, etc. – could result in increasing revenue, not just a little better, but a dramatic increase commensurate with the scale of the development.
		If structured properly, could replace declining track revenues with new uses/ more stable revenue stream. (Look historically at GGF revenues to city.)
Public Comments (at November 20 th Task Force Meeting)		
	“Has anyone asked whether, if LBL chooses Richmond site, a developer there might propose, and LBL might consider, commercial development (such as a hotel or convention center) in competition with TSG?”	
	“Are projected revenues long term based on best case scenario (i.e., \$300,000 at full buildout assumes much over 10+ years and given future inflation, is very small and speculative. Need more revenue opportunity than may be possible?”	

Top Strengths (Pros)	Top Challenges (Cons)	Top Opportunities
OWNERSHIP		
	UC/LBNL interests exempt from taxation.	
This section (ownership) doesn't seem to matter as the legal opinions presented show that any scenarios involving the Lab remove the parcels from the tax rolls.	Permanent loss of revenue	The city should clarify what would happen should UC decide in the future to convert the land to other purposes (like faculty housing), and should develop a procedure to monitor potentially taxable uses of equipment at a Lab, especially in any public/private partnerships.
	Hella massive building, minimal revenue. Sketchy replacement fiscal streams, named by developers' financial analyst not entirely trustworthy/confidence-inspiring.	
	City/community potentially lose much/most control over zoning and revenue potential, once UC/LBNL are on the site.	
	Federal/state ownership non-responsive to local concerns	
Private development stays on the tax rolls.	UC ownership reduces tax base for city and schools.	Development Agreement must be fair to city, AUSD and developer.
	Who will own the open space - tax implications as well as maintenance issues.	
	Berkeley has found UC to be a difficult neighbor and frankly I don't trust UC to do anything that is not down in a legal document. In short, we'd lose control of our one resource to a non-tax paying entity who is accustomed to muscling their way around.	
We have a reasonable understanding of the issues.	Potentially conflicting goals of ensuring ongoing tax income and dedication of open space into public ownership.	Meet City and AUSD income goals while dedicating parkland to the Eastshore State Park now.

Top Strengths (Pros)	Top Challenges (Cons)	Top Opportunities
		If LBNL goes elsewhere, is it time to ask whether or not City can purchase this land via a bond measure?
		Ask Park District to chip in on purchase (up to \$30 million from WW funds).
		Study examples of privately owned parks that are open to the public to see if it makes sense for parts of property.
		Owners could cede land to AUSD/city for fee-based activities such as parking concession (including Cal football and shuttle).

Top Strengths (Pros)	Top Challenges (Cons)	Top Opportunities
INITIATIVE PROCESS (VOTE) FOLLOWED BY CEQA AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT PROCESS WITHOUT MEASURE C VOTE		
	Seems better to give the community the chance to vote after the CEQA results are known.	
	Have concerns that the effect of the Initiative will be to rezone the property, raising the possibility that if the city wants open space after the rezoning it will have to pay for it.	
	School District should be a party to the Development Agreement since the School District is integral to Albany’s culture.	
NONE to citizens, great benefit to TSG	This reverses the normal process of development, namely 1) proposal from the developer 2) environmental review 3) review/approval from city government 4) vote by citizens. Doing this by initiative turns the process on its head, and is akin to signing a contract that contains many blank spaces – never a good idea!!	TSG has highlighted a vulnerability in Measure C that the city council might wish to consider addressing, either in the General Plan or by specific ordinance (being aware of the dangers of being accused of “takings” – but that’s a good topic for their legal advisers).
	Without CEQA review first, an Initiative by the developer negating Measure C would be very bad for Albany.	
This is an upside-down plus: Albany may clearly vote “No” and move on to something more viable.	Funky. Potentially confusing to casual voters.	
	Potentially very divisive, surfacing same old nasty divides in the community.	
	If city approves, and then this LBNL development does not come to pass, could get some other unfortunate development at the site.	

Top Strengths (Pros)	Top Challenges (Cons)	Top Opportunities
Makes GGF site more attractive to LBNL	Initiative vote will occur without full information	Carefully crafted initiative will need to be written with specific amenities, open space areas, revenue sources, assurance of full CEQA process, full explanation of the work done at the Lab.
Meet the timeline imposed by LBNL	People don't like any initiatives	
Citizen involvement early in the process	Fear of the unknown	
Developer pays for the EIR	EIR done later in the process	
Full CEQA process occurs	Confusion over the process	
	City Council has final say – risk of becoming a political crisis.	
	TSG's initiative is a blatant work-around of our Measure C and shows us just how far TSG is willing to go.	
Provides a general vote on the project, which is largely the whole point of Measure C.	Vote now is without the benefit of full CEQA review, and many may not trust the appearance of removing Measure C from the process.	Citizens always maintain the right to petition for a Referendum on the actions of the City Council.
May be too late for Initiative process to be started?	Content of initiative unknown.	

Top Strengths (Pros)	Top Challenges (Cons)	Top Opportunities
LBNL AT GOLDEN GATE FIELDS		
Potential for developing valuable new scientific knowledge and technologies through public - private synergies that might benefit ALL citizens and peoples of the world	Even if true, it is not clear that GGF is the best location for this enterprise. There may be superior uses for this site.	City could approach Lab regarding their willingness to compensate the city for their services.
	No tax revenue AND increased city costs for services for the Lab.	City could begin discussions with LBNL re: site specific Advisory Board, asking it to have some actual power in decisionmaking around safety at the Lab.
	Loss of city control over activities at the Lab (no zoning controls, limited ability to influence environmental effects).	
	Potential for serious environmental degradation from laboratory accidents, earthquakes, or other catastrophic events. Doesn't make sense to locate this near a major transit corridor and in an environmentally-sensitive (wetlands and bay) area.	
Hopefully some internships at the Lab for Albany High students	Hopefully other companies that see a benefit in being in close proximity to the Lab will be attracted to Albany (on the east side of the freeway).	
Not seeing advantage	Not a believer in the prestige aspect of placing Lab here. Education connections, internships for AHS students exist already. Potential for more education sharing not dependent on this location.	
	Also perceive the developer's vision of cutting edge eco-technology and research, modern fuels, etc., as much more the developer's fantasy than what LBNL is primarily about.	

Top Strengths (Pros)	Top Challenges (Cons)	Top Opportunities
World class scientific facility in Albany; prestige to city	Non-taxable land and buildings	Albany becomes a leader in scientific research in green technology
Attracts spin-off labs and businesses	Large development at the waterfront	Create unique partnerships between public and private sectors for the greater good.
Attracts scientists to conferences at the hotel	Ensuring environmental safeguards and monitoring systems are in place	
Destination for green technology	Many unknowns at this time	
Educational opportunities for AUSD	Elimination of race track jobs for a segment of our community which may have a difficult time finding new work.	
	UC/LBNL reluctance to address the Task Force and the resultant lack of information has been frustrating, to say the least.	
Good match for Albany; associates Albany with its professed educational values	Consumes open space and does not provide local revenues.	Will LBNL be an isolated island west of freeway, or will it be a participating and contributing member of Albany? If the latter, will need to connect LBNL employees to the life of the community and LBNL as an institution will need to make a commitment to be an integral part of Albany.
Benefit to image of the City of Albany as 'Home of LBNL Energy Research' and potential attraction of jobs.	Largely a single use or very limited mix of uses on the waterfront.	Potential for the rest of the City of Albany (City, Residents and Businesses) to serve as a living laboratory for energy efficiency study.
Corresponding impact on local spending – restaurant strength, convenience shopping sales tax, and hotel tax income.		
	LBNL and SLAC closed, secured sites. How to ensure open campus, long term?	LBNL wants to locate in a welcoming community, but haven't heard yet that they want to contribute... could be a con, but also an opportunity.

Top Strengths (Pros)	Top Challenges (Cons)	Top Opportunities
		<p>It's abundantly clear that this site is the best for LBNL/UC. Berkeley should realize it's their best bet to keep the Lab... this provides leverage for Albany.</p>
		<p>Have a vague feeling that it's a good match (re: education) between LBNL and AUSD. But concern that LBNL is now 20 minutes away and I don't think we've had a super strong relationship. Also, need to be realistic re: AUSD staff time needed to create meaningful relationship.</p>
		<p>For many of us, we are the lab... with ourselves, friends, and family working there.</p>

Top Strengths (Pros)	Top Challenges (Cons)	Top Opportunities
OVERALL PROPOSAL FOR DEVELOPMENT OF LBNL PLUS ADDITIONAL DEVELOPMENT AT GGF		
<p>The Plan, as presented “pencils out” for all parties. That is, all parties have some degree of “win” and all appear to do better than before.</p>	<p>The developer “wins” the most: the value of their land goes from \$47.5 Million to either \$300 Million (an increase of 638%) or \$500 Million (an increase of 1,063%), while the city gains a net of \$300,000 more to its general fund (an increase of 68.9%). The city also gains access to the waterfront as a park which has an unknown “dollar” value, but which is a valuable consideration. Whether this is considered a fair trade will likely be decided by the voters.</p>	<p>The city might invite TSG to submit proposals absent the Lab.</p>
<p>Opportunity for us to learn details about tax revenue, to contemplate what might work here for landowners and the community.</p>	<p>This development is not suited to the location.</p>	<p>Great potential for something other!</p>
	<p>Wish we could hear more what might work for owners. Understand they need to go all out in advocating for this development in this process, but feels a bit like a missed opportunity.</p>	
	<p>The Emeryville Doubletree Hotel featured in last week’s discussion sounds like a great fit hotel for that location in Emeryville. I believe a similar standard chain hotel would be a waste of this GGF location, which is not a sea of industrial, urban loft, big box, mall development as is Emeryville.</p>	<p>Something unique and beautiful and well designed. Truly featuring the location. Great hotel that is more upscale and revenue-bringing? Brilliant conference center with several revenue-bringing options?</p>
<p>Creation of funded parkland</p>	<p>Maximizing revenue</p>	<p>Collaboration of the public and private sector to explore all options and balance the desire for open space with the real need for revenue. The amount of revenue currently received from GGF will not be adequate for the future.</p>

Top Strengths (Pros)	Top Challenges (Cons)	Top Opportunities
World class scientific facility in Albany	Ensuring environmental safeguards and monitoring systems are adequate and in place.	There is unlimited potential at the site and care must be taken to ensure the maximum benefit for everyone, both economically and environmentally.
Spinoff labs and businesses	Elimination of race track jobs for a segment of our community which may have a difficult time finding work.	Educational opportunities for AUSD
Retail which is appropriate to the site	Many unknowns at this time	
Scientists come to conferences at the hotel		
Destination for green technology		Albany could become a waterfront community, not just a community with a waterfront.
This could be possibly the best opportunity to see something positive occur on the waterfront, especially given these economic times and conditions.	Fast pace of planning is not fully conducive to good planning or evolution of a plan that reflects a fully mixed-use plan appropriate for and an extension of Albany.	Should lab decide against GGF site, opportunity is created to discuss other plans and uses, and work toward creating a Specific Plan to guide development into the future.
Public Comments (at November 20th Task Force Meeting)		
		“Cost/benefit analysis: Benefits to us are mixed at best... thus “competition” may not be relevant term. This isn’t like rooting for your team at a football game.”

Other Comments

- Reflections on our process: The citizens on the task force, and the facilitators of the process have approached this job with dedication, intelligence and general fair-mindedness. The task force (TF) has been given a puzzle with complex, interlocking pieces, and with several key pieces missing. This makes a coherent response difficult. An important principle is that absence of information is information about the process.

The lab has not responded to requests for information about their environmental safety record, their willingness to help defray municipal infrastructure and service costs, nor their possible future plans for the site. The city of Berkeley has not responded to requests to discuss revenue sharing agreements, nor to disclose details of their financial arrangements with the lab. The developer has not undertaken the studies necessary to evaluate the environmental impacts of increased traffic, and they have indicated that the preliminary environmental studies that they have done cannot be shared due to agreements with the lab. Neither has the developer made good their promise to share the language of a proposed “citizens’ initiative”. Yet we as a task force are charged to prepare a report.

Information that is withheld raises questions about the integrity of the party withholding the information, their reliability as a source of information, and their motives (political or pecuniary). This unavoidably colors their perception by the community and is reflected in my assessment of the pros, cons and opportunities.

- I've been to all TF meetings, six GGF open houses, and talked to my neighbors about the project and, although I've tried to weigh the pros and cons of this particular project, I've found the cons to out number the pros by far. UC/LBNL reluctance to address the TF and the resultant lack of information has been frustrating to say the least. The TSG economist actually said not to believe in the numbers he'd presented because even he didn't have all the facts.
- As we discovered in V2V1 Albanians love living here because it has a small town feel in an urban area. We're proud of not having parking meters and we always vote to tax ourselves to improve our schools. Now we're asked to approve the sale of much of our waterfront property to UC to create a skyscraper campus, a small portion of which is to be used for green development but other labs which could be used for anything UC sees fit.

Golden Gate Fields Task Force – Index of Information // Updated: November 22, 2011

Information requested/ Questions	Where to find information	Status
SITE PLAN / PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Master Plan documents presented by developer at their 10/10/11 Open House 	<p>TF Packet for 10/16/11 Meeting</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land uses (currently intended by developers to be added to existing uses in Albany and in Berkeley – uses beyond what are currently allowed through Albany Measure C and Berkeley Measures N and Q)) 	<p>TF Packet for 10/16/11 Meeting (TSG Master Plan; uses as of 10/16/11); TF Packet for 10/30/11 Meeting, page 8 Albany Measure C: TF Packet for 10/30/11, page A9 Berkeley Measures N/Q: TF Packet for 10/30/11 Meeting, page A10 and additional information provided at mtg.</p>	<p>Plan still being developed by TSG; to be available in next no final proposal presented to City (per presentation by Tim Youmans (EPS/ consultant to TSG) at 11/16/11 TF meeting)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acreege and square footage calculations for open space, buildings, infrastructure, parking (Square footage calculations are gross building area, including internal corridors, etc. per Oct 30 FT Packet/ p. 9) 	<p>TSG Site Plan included in TF Packet for 10/16/11 Meeting and TSG Parcel Exhibit page A24 of Oct.-30 Packet</p>	<p>Still need square footage calculations for each building, parking, infrastructure (Oct 16. meeting notes/ in Oct 30 Packet)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calculation of parking needed to comply with current zoning; calculation of parking sq. ft./ acreage anticipated 		<p>Not provided. TSG has stated that it plans to do project as PUD, enabling TSG to deal with parking calculations differently; TSG will also rely on TDM studies (Oct 16. meeting notes/ in Oct 30 Packet)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Anticipated building heights and locations on site 	<p>TF Packet for 10/30/11 Meeting, page 6</p>	<p>Height zone diagram not yet provided</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FAR studies (floor area ratios) 	<p>Some explanation of overall square footage and acreage provided at 10/16/11 TF mtg. In TF Packet for 10/30/11, Packet; page 6</p>	<p>Studies not provided</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Property/land survey 		<p>Not provided (but shown in TSG PowerPoint at 11/6/11 TF meeting)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site sections from various locations 	<p>TF Packet for 10/16/11 Meeting</p>	

Information requested/ Questions	Where to find information	Status
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site and building elevations 		Not available; only master planning drawings being developed at this time
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Architectural drawings 		Not available; only master planning drawings being developed at this time
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Massing drawings from locations at the site and also Albany Hill and Freeway 		Not provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Views from public locations (Pierce Street, Bulb, Beach, Freeway, Albany Hill, etc.) 	Views from Pierce Street <i>TF Packet for 10/30/11 Meeting, page B2</i>	Other requested views not provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simulated skyline from any point in Albany (based on algorithm) 	Some skyline views provided (views from Pierce Street); <i>TF Packet for 10/30/11 Meeting, page B2</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phasing Plan 	Some information provided at TF meetings; <i>TF Packet for 10/30/11 Meeting, p. 8; 11/13/11 TF meeting</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is Phase One financially feasible? 	<i>TF Packet for 10/30/11 Meeting, p. 9</i>	According to TSG, market feasibility studies to be done in “the reasonable near term.” <i>(Nov. 13 TF meeting)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan for toxics disposal (as related to Master Plan) 	<i>TF Packet for 10/30/11 Meeting, p. 8</i>	FTA has sent an invitation to LBNL to attend a Task Force meeting; no response to date.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure costs (by component) 	<i>TF Packet for 10/30/11 Meeting, p. 8</i>	Costs being revised as master plan revised?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Status of Fleming Point/ dimensions of landscaped area on Fleming Point that is above parking deck 	<i>TF Packet for 10/30/11 Meeting, p. A24</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why is housing located in Berkeley; wouldn't it make sense to have some housing in Albany to enhance “eyes on the park”? 	<i>TF Packet for 10/30/11 Meeting, p. 8</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why is the hotel 120' tall (approximately 12 stories)? 	<i>TF Packet for 10/30/11 Meeting, p. 9</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If/ where will co-generation facilities located? 	<i>TF Packet for 10/30/11 Meeting, p. 9</i>	

Information requested/ Questions	Where to find information	Status
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What kind of non-motor vehicle connections are being designed to accommodate access to the site? 	<p><i>TF Packet for 10/30/11 Meeting, p. 9</i></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is TSG still considering bike/pedestrian connection over freeway at Codornices Creek? 	<p><i>TF Packet for 10/30/11 Meeting, p. 9</i></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are plans for LEED certification? 	<p><i>TF Packet for 10/30/11 Meeting, p. 9</i></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How will aesthetics and architectural quality be addressed? 	<p><i>TF Packet for 10/30/11 Meeting, p. 9</i></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How has the value of changes to zoning been calculated by TSG? How will the cities of Albany and Berkeley benefit in relation to increased value of property? 	<p><i>TF Packet for 10/30/11 Meeting, p. 10</i></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How would the Master Plan accommodate less building than anticipated? (e.g., if LBNL builds less than 2 million SF, what would site plan/development scheme look like? 	<p><i>TF Packet for 10/30/11 Meeting, p. 10</i></p>	<p>TSG has not studied this issue (<i>TF Packet for 10/30/11 Meeting, p. 9</i>)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What would happen if LBNL does not get the contract for the FSF (future science facility/ linear accelerator)? 	<p><i>TF Packet for 10/30/11 Meeting, p. 10</i></p>	<p>No answer provided</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can TSG estimate the amount of excavation and describe the nature of construction (piles, foundations, etc.) below grade? 	<p><i>TF Packet for 10/30/11 Meeting, p. 10</i></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How will title to property be held? 	<p><i>See Ownership section</i></p>	<p>Pending negotiations with UC</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will there be an on-site solar program? 	<p><i>TF Packet for 10/30/11 Meeting, p. 10</i></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How much of the infrastructure is deemed a federal project? 	<p><i>TF Packet for 10/30/11 Meeting, p. 10</i></p>	<p>No answer provided</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has TSG considered creating a Specific Plan rather than a Master Plan? 	<p><i>TF Packet for 11/13/11, p. 8</i></p>	

Information requested/ Questions	Where to find information	Status
OWNERSHIP		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legal opinion on implications of ownership vs. leasing arrangements (including taxes and future decisionmaking about subsequent zoning/planning changes at the waterfront) 	Background Information / Questions from Task Force and others; <i>page A2 of TF Packet for 10/30/11 Meeting Packet and Presentation at 11/13/11 TF meeting</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legal opinions about the role(s) of LBNL vs. UC vs. DOE (re: ownership of land/buildings, and related issues) vs. developer 	Background Information / Questions from Task Force and others; <i>page A2 of TF Packet for 10/30/11 Meeting Packet and Presentation at 11/13/11 TF meeting</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legal opinions about the role of the city of Albany (and city of Berkeley?) in determining/ approving/ monitoring specific uses at the site (i.e. type of science, materials, development, etc. in private and in public labs) 	Background Information / Questions from Task Force and others; <i>page A2 of TF Packet for 10/30/11 meeting</i> <i>page 8 of TF Packet for 11/13/11</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How can Albany be assured guarantee that promises/mandates/contracts made by the developer and/or LBNL are adhered to (especially given cost of taking legal action if Development Agreement mandates are not fulfilled)? 	Memo from City Attorney <i>page A8 of TF Packet for 10/30/11</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the history of disputes (legal actions, Council recommendations, etc.) between LBNL and the city of Berkeley (and between UC and the city of Berkeley)? [request that consultants and/or city of Albany ask for information from city of Berkeley] 	<i>“What We Know” (November 20 TF packet); last page includes info re: legal actions related to LBNL’s Long Range Development Plan and legal challenges to CEQA review of projects within LRDP</i>	requested from city of Berkeley (who responded that all is available thru Google)


Information requested/ Questions	Where to find information	Status
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who will control site changes and any future zoning changes after modification to current zoning at GGF (what, if anything, can be done if changes are made over time)? 	Memo from City Attorney <i>page A8 of TF Packet for 10/30/11</i>	
PUBLIC OPEN SPACE		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the proposed acreage/ location of new public open space at the site? 	TSG Site Plan included in <i>TF Packet for 10/16/11 Meeting</i> and TSG Parcel Exhibit <i>page A24 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	Site Plan still in progress
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the proposed ownership plan for open space? 	Task Force Meeting Notes from 10/16/11 <i>page 10 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i> Email from TSG <i>page A25 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would the new open space become part of the Eastshore State Park? 	Email from TSG <i>page A26 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who bears long term responsibility for maintenance of open space at the site? 	Background Information / Questions from Task Force and others; <i>page A2 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the anticipated timing of open space development? Will all public open space be developed in conjunction with Phase One? 	Email from TSG <i>page A27 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who will decide what type of open space will be developed? 	Email from TSG <i>page A27 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How would the proposed open space integrate the Albany waterfront with the Eastshore State Park? 	Email from TSG <i>page A27 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What would it cost to buy, develop, and maintain the amount of open space being proposed by the developer? 		Unknown

Information requested/ Questions	Where to find information	Status
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the status of the acquisition of land by EBRPD to create the Bay Trail at GGF site? 	Background Information / Questions from Task Force and others; <i>page A2 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
CEQA / DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT / MEASURE C		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Berkeley Waterfront Zoning Ordinance 	Memos from Berkeley City Manager to Berkeley Mayor and City Council <i>page A10 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Election timing requirements 	Voter Initiative Process Overview <i>page A21 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i> Albany Voter Initiative: TSG Potential Initiative Calendar <i>page A23 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measure C initiative language 	<i>page A9 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could/should a full EIR/CEQA process take place prior to a Measure C election? 	Memo from City Attorney <i>page A6 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the impact of a Measure C vote/decision prior to a complete EIR/Development Agreement process and certification? Will Albany residents vote on the Development Agreement later in the process? (In other words will there be two elections for the same issue?) 	Memo from City Attorney <i>page A7 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How might the information requested for an EIR differ from what is being asked by the Task Force? 	Memo from City Attorney <i>page A6 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the relationship between the EIR and a Voter Initiative? 	Memo from City Attorney <i>page A6 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If Measure C votes takes place before the EIR, how does that impact the EIR? 	Memo from City Attorney <i>page A7 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	

Information requested/ Questions	Where to find information	Status
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who pays for the EIR? (Is it always the developer? Would the city ever pay for an EIR?) 	Memo from City Attorney <i>page A7 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What, if any, controls can the city or community retain if the scope of the project is approved through a Measure C vote, but then LBNL or the developer needs changes? 	Memo from City Attorney <i>page A8 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the mechanisms for long term monitoring of development agreement mandates? 	Memo from City Attorney <i>page A8 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What benefits are being proposed for Albany schools? Could existing STEM programs be expanded? 	Email from TSG <i>page A26 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What other benefits/ mitigations are being proposed? 	Email from TSG <i>page A26 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the benefit/detriment to the city/community of changing current zoning to allow new uses? 	Task Force to consider Memo from City Attorney <i>page A8 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can AUSD be a party to the Development Agreement? (Or is the Development Agreement between the City and the Land Owner? If the latter, then how can AUSD be assured funds?) 		Answer not provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When will proposed/draft Initiative language be available? 	<i>11/13/11 TF Packet, p. 7</i>	TSG stated on 11/6/11 that Initiative in draft form would be available for review and discussion, hopefully by "next week," but not certain. Draft Initiative not provided as of 11/16
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How important is Berkeley's approval for the project to move forward? 	<i>11/13/11TF Packet, p. 8</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What would be the timing for the amendments to zoning and general plan and the EIR? 	<i>11/13/11 TF Packet, p. 8</i>	According to TSG, this will be determined after Initiative

Information requested/ Questions	Where to find information	Status
ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Anticipated hazards resulting from LBNL uses and uses by private labs and proposed mitigations 	<p>“What We Know” section re: <i>environmental concerns (11/20/11TF Packet)</i></p>	<p>LBNL invited to attend Task Force meeting; have not responded</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seismic studies used to determine construction at GGF site 		<p>Baseline studies done by TSG team; full reports not provided due to confidentiality issues in releasing submittals to LBNL; further analysis to be done as part of CEQA review (after Initiative vote)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wind studies used to determine construction at GGF site 		<p>Baseline studies done by TSG team; full reports not provided due to confidentiality issues in releasing submittals to LBNL; further analysis to be done as part of CEQA review (after Initiative vote)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Geotechnical studies used to determine construction at GGF site 		<p>Baseline studies done by TSG team; full reports not provided due to confidentiality issues in releasing submittals to LBNL; further analysis to be done as part of CEQA review (after Initiative vote)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sea level rise projections used to determine construction at GGF site 		<p>Baseline studies done by TSG team; full reports not provided due to confidentiality issues in releasing submittals to LBNL; further analysis to be done as part of CEQA review (after Initiative vote)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Biological survey(s) developed by TSG consultants, related to wetlands, wildlife, etc. 		<p>Baseline studies done by TSG team; full reports not provided due to confidentiality issues in releasing submittals to LBNL; further analysis to be done as part of CEQA review (after Initiative vote)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Anticipated toxic materials to be at site: potential impacts, and plans for disposal 		<p>LBNL invited to attend Task Force meeting; have not responded</p>

Information requested/ Questions	Where to find information	Status
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is LBNL's record re: environmental impacts/ pollution in Berkeley? 		LBNL invited to attend Task Force meeting; have not responded
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What mitigation efforts will be made to address light pollution? 		
T R A F F I C		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic/ air quality studies with all background data 		Baseline studies done by TSG team; full reports not provided due to confidentiality issues in releasing submittals to LBNL; further analysis to be done as part of CEQA review (after Initiative vote)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic projections/ traffic impact study (including relationship to phasing of project), including impacts on Buchanan and Gilman streets, local streets, and freeway 		Baseline studies done by TSG team; full reports not provided due to confidentiality issues in releasing submittals to LBNL; further analysis to be done as part of CEQA review (after Initiative vote)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TDM plan proposed by LBNL/ proposed by developer 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the anticipated hours of operation for LBNL? For other land uses? 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What will be the frequency / route of shuttles between GGF and other LBNL sites? (Can only LBNL employees use the LBNL shuttles?) 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the current CalTrans designation of the I-80 corridor? 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there any plans by CalTrans for interchanges or other changes in vicinity? 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have there been any discussions by the developer with AC Transit or BART re: adding stop(s), etc.? 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What commitment will TSG make to permanently 		

Information requested/ Questions	Where to find information	Status
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> fund shuttles from GGF to San Pablo and Solano avenues, and to Fourth Street, etc.? 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are plans for non-motorized access to the site (walking, bicycles)? 	10/30/11 TF Packet, p. 9	
ECONOMIC IMPACTS		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fiscal analysis (including existing and anticipated sales, parcel, property, transfer, ad valorem, and other taxes based on various scenarios related to land uses (in Albany and Berkeley), size of development, etc. including a no-LBNL scenario, and a scenario that includes the same square footage of LBNL but with a taxable tenant/ owner 	Notes from TF Meeting 11/13/11 include analysis of 4.5 million square foot scenario; also includes information re: current tax revenues from GGF	Analysis provided for single scenario only (4.5 million including LBNL); no analysis of “no-LBNL” scenarios (similar square footage of taxable uses and/or less square footage taxable uses); full report not provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have there been studies made regarding fiscal impacts in a “worst case scenario” no entitlements and eventually no racetrack)? Which tax streams would disappear if there was neither development nor racing at GGF? Would property taxes and parcel taxes still be paid? 		Note provided; see above
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the projected property tax revenues from the current TSG development proposal? How much of that would go to the Albany schools? 	Notes from TF Meeting 11/13/11 include analysis of 4.5 million square foot scenario	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the projected sales tax revenues from the current TSG development proposal, and would any of that go to AUSD? 	Notes from TF Meeting 11/13/11 include analysis of 4.5 million square foot scenario	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How do the projected property tax revenues from the proposed TSG development proposal compare to existing property tax revenues from the race track? 	Notes from TF Meeting 11/13/11 include analysis of 4.5 million square foot scenario; also includes information re: current tax revenues from GGF	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there any other projected taxes or revenue 	Notes from TF Meeting 11/13/11	

Information requested/ Questions	Where to find information	Status
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> sources (e.g., transfer taxes, development fees) that AUSD could expect from the TSG proposal? 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What about new bond measures? If UC owns the property where the Lab is located, will bond measures be paid? 	Notes from TF Meeting 11/13/11	Would need additional analysis
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If LBNL does not select the GGF site and TSG still proposes some development, what will be the projected property tax and other tax revenues? (Is there a “back up” development plan in the works?) 	11/13/11 TF Packet, p 8	Not studied
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Economic Impact Study (including effect on local businesses and property values) based on various scenarios 	Notes from TF Meeting 11/13/11; presentation from TSG consultant (EPS) includes opinion re: economic impact	Not provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Market Feasibility Studies (labs/ office/ hotel(s)) 	Notes from TF Meeting 11/13/11; presentation from TSG consultant (EPS) includes opinion re: market feasibility of hotel	According to TSG, market feasibility studies to be done in “the reasonable near term.” (Nov. 13 TF meeting)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City services (analysis of impacts and costs to city) 	Notes from TF Meeting 11/13/11; presentations by Albany City Manager and TSG consultant (EPS)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure costs (also listed in Site Plan) 	10/30/11 TF Packet, p. 8	Costs being revised as master plan revised?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete economic reports including assumptions used by economists, explanation of “models,” sources, etc. 	Notes from TF Meeting 11/13/11; presentations by TSG consultant (EPS) and City of Albany consultant (SE)	Full reports not submitted
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What will be TSG’s financial commitment to the City of Albany and AUSD prior to occupancy of Phase One project (during construction years)? 	Notes from TF Meeting 11/13/11; presentation from TSG consultant (EPS)	

Information requested/ Questions	Where to find information	Status
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What will be TSG's/ LBNL's long term financial commitment to the city of Albany and AUSD? 	<p>Notes from TF Meeting 11/13/11; presentation from TSG consultant (EPS)</p>	<p>Full reports not submitted</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How can the community and the city ensure that the economic studies prepared by TSG consultants are transparent in terms of methodology and assumptions, as well as analysis? (Will the city and the community be able to access the complete economic reports in a timely manner?) 	<p>Notes from TF Meeting 11/13/11; presentations by TSG consultant (EPS) and City of Albany consultant (SE)</p>	<p>Full reports not submitted</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there examples of similar size/ scale waterfront developments around the Bay that would provide insight into the value and cost (i.e., change in land value following development; cost of development)? If so, please provide info. 		<p>To date, no examples have surfaced.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What would be the economic impact on city and schools if less development was constructed than what is either planned or ultimately approved? 		<p>Analysis provided for single scenario only (4.5 million including LBNL); no analysis of "no-LBNL" scenarios (similar square footage of taxable uses and/or less square footage taxable uses)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What will the new value of the property be, based on the proposed zoning changes to the property? with new entitlements? after construction of the building? 	<p>11/13/11 TF meeting notes (TSG Economic Consultant presentation and answers to questions)</p>	<p>Full analysis not provided</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If TSG agrees to pay AUSD and the city for any tax revenue losses, based on "today's" taxes, will that agreement be transferred to a new owner should TSG sell the property? 		<p>Answer not provided</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Definitions or explanations of different taxes and revenues that fund city 	<p>11/13/11 TF Packet, page 12 and presentations at 11/13/11 meeting</p>	

Information requested/ Questions	Where to find information	Status
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Definitions or explanations of different taxes, revenues, bonds that fund the school district Implications of different ownership scenarios with regard to city and school revenues (e.g., land owned by TSG vs. land owned by UC; buildings owned by UC vs. buildings owned by TSG; land owned by Parks District vs. land owned by TSG, etc.) 	<p>Presentation by AUSD Superintendent Marla Stephenson at TF Meeting 11/13/11</p> <p>11/13/11 TF Packet, p. 19 and presentation/handout by city consulting attorney (Goldfarb & Lipman LLP)</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feasibility of (and history/track record) of “spin-off” activities from federal labs (potential private businesses that would require or desire to be co-located with LBNL 		Not provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parking needs re: taxable buildings and development (project is proposed to be 4.5 million square feet total plus parking; 3 million square feet in Albany plus parking); Is project calculated as potentially 6 million square feet (including parking) for tax purposes? 	<p>RAFT</p>	Not provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact fee information/ Are there “impact fees” that go toward AUSD and/or the City of Albany? What are they? 	<p>11/13/11 TF Packet, page A5 and notes from TF Meeting 11/13/11; presentations by Albany City Manager and AUSD Superintendent</p>	
<p>Additional questions</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could the property be subdivided and re-zoned so that there were different land uses allowed in distinct parts of the property (or would the entire waterfront district have the same new zoning 	<p>Background Information / Questions from Task Force and others; page A3 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</p>	

Information requested/ Questions	Where to find information	Status
restrictions, if approved by the voters)?		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If LBNL does not locate at the site, would the property owners be allowed to build out the entire proposed development (4.5 million square feet)? 	Background Information / Questions from Task Force and others; <i>page A3 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is LBNL's commitment to Albany's process? 	Background Information / Questions from Task Force and others; <i>page A3 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What public agency would serve as the "lead agency" for the EIR?? 	Background Information / Questions from Task Force and others; <i>page A3 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If LBNL were to carry out the project at GGF "for its portion of the site," who would be the lead agency for CEQA purposes (EIR)? 	Background Information / Questions from Task Force and others; <i>page A3 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	

DRAFT