



---

# Albany Waterfront Task Force

MEETING NO.	<b>6</b>
DATE	<b>November 20, 2011</b>



**GOLDEN GATE FIELDS TASK FORCE  
REGULAR MEETING**

**ALBANY SENIOR CENTER  
846 Masonic Avenue  
Sunday November 20, 2011 – 7:00 p.m.**

**1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

**2. DISCUSSIONS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON MATTERS RELATED TO THE FOLLOWING ITEMS:**

- 2-1.** Brief updates or comments from Task Force members regarding new information and follow-up questions.
- 2-2.** Identify and discuss benefits, challenges, and opportunities, as well as additional information needed, related to the proposal for the second campus of the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory and associated private development and open space on the Golden Gate Fields property at the waterfront, in preparation for the City Council Workshop on December 4, 2011.

**3. PUBLIC COMMENT**

For persons desiring to address the Task Force on an item that is not on the agenda please note that each speaker is limited to two (2) minutes. The Brown Act limits the Task Force's ability to take and/or discuss items that are not on the agenda; therefore, such items are normally referred to staff for comment or to a future agenda.

- 4. NEXT MEETING**— City Council Workshop – Sunday, December 4, 2011, 6:30 p.m.,  
Community Center Main Hall, 1249 Marin Avenue

**5. ADJOURNMENT**

*The Task Force packet is available for public inspection at City Hall. The agenda and supporting staff reports, as available, can be found at [www.albanyca.org](http://www.albanyca.org) or [www.voicestovision.com](http://www.voicestovision.com). Please note that if you provide your name and address when speaking before the Task Force it will become part of the official public record, which will be posted on the Internet. Agenda related writings or documents provided to a majority of the Task Force members regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection in the City Clerk's Office, 1000 San Pablo Avenue, Albany CA.*

**Proposed Development at the Albany Waterfront (LBNL 2<sup>nd</sup> Campus at the Golden Gate Fields site)**

What We know (as of 11/17)	What We Think	What We Don't Know (as of 11/17)
<b>Site Plan (as of 10/16 developer presentation); per 11/13 TF meeting, site plan being revised<sup>1</sup></b>		
<b>Land Uses (Presented 10/16)</b>		
<p><b>Current</b>  <b>Conceptual Master Plan: Uses+ Building Areas</b>  <u>Albany:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LBNL (public Lab, incl. 1,800' long, underground linear accelerator: FSF) = 2.05 Million SF + parking</li> <li>• Private labs/ offices/ R&amp;D = 561,000 SF</li> <li>• Retail/ restaurant; 150,000 SF</li> <li>• Hotel; 161,000 SF</li> </ul> <p>Subtotal Albany: 2.9 Million SF<sup>2</sup> + parking</p> <p><u>Berkeley:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residential; 728,000 SF</li> <li>• Private lab/ office/ R&amp;D; 645,000 SF</li> <li>• Retail/ restaurant; 50,000 SF</li> <li>• Hotel; 161,000 SF</li> </ul> <p>Subtotal Berkeley: 1.58 Million SF + parking</p> <p><b>TOTAL: 4,501,000 SF + parking</b></p>	<p style="font-size: 2em; opacity: 0.5;">DRAFT</p> <p>If project requires parking for 5,000 cars, as has been discussed, it is estimated that this will require 1.5 million square feet (beyond the 4.5 million square feet of buildings), based on 300 SF per car.</p>	<p>Amount of acreage allocated for each use, including roads, walkways, infrastructure, etc.</p> <p>Whether drawings shown in Master Plan, presented on 11/16 portray square footage delineated and intended to be built</p> <p>If a final site plan will relate closely to the Conceptual Master Plan shown on 10/16</p> <p>If proposed development will further compacted</p> <p>When a final land use plan will be developed, presented, and confirmed (prior to Initiative, or in conjunction with EIR and proposed Development Agreement?)</p>
<p>TSG hopes Phase One in Albany will include: LBNL's projected 500,000 SF (to situate programs currently housed in various East Bay cities); a hotel with conference facilities; road; and related infrastructure.</p> <p>Phase One in Berkeley will include: 400 residential units and related infrastructure.</p> <p>TSG has structured much of the site plan around LBNL's need for space to locate a proposed 1,800 ft long FSF (Future Science Facility - linear accelerator) on the site, which has strict requirements (proposed to be placed underground in the eastern part of the site parallel to the Freeway); no buildings or roads can be constructed on top of the FSF.</p>	<p>LBNL will occupy Phase One buildings (500,000 sq ft in Albany) in 2016.</p> <p>TSG will conduct market studies to determine and specify additional development and timing.</p>	<p>Timing and final land uses/ building amounts for Phase One (beyond LBNL) as well as timing for subsequent phases</p> <p>What happens if LBNL does not build beyond Phase One</p> <p>What happens if private development beyond Phase One is not determined by the developers to be feasible</p>

<b>What We know (as of 11/17)</b>	<b>What We Think</b>	<b>What We Don't Know (as of 11/17)</b>
LBNL is in competition with other laboratories to get the contract for the linear accelerator; timing for a decision from DOE is not known.		What happens if LBNL is not awarded the lineal accelerator project
<p>The developer is proposing land uses in both Albany and Berkeley that are not permitted by current zoning; TSG's proposals require votes of residents in both Albany and Berkeley.</p> <p>Proposed new land uses in Albany: Public labs, private labs, offices, R&amp;D, retail, restaurants, hotel.</p> <p>Proposed new land uses in Berkeley: Residential, retail, and labs/offices<sup>3</sup></p>	If only LBNL was constructed at the site, it is likely that The Stronach Group would not need to have a vote of Albany residents. But, The Stronach Group has stated that the project is not feasible without private development – to supplement infrastructure costs and to make the project “work” financially for TSG (and for Albany, in terms of revenue)	If LBNL would build at the GGF site without community support
<b>Heights</b>		
The 10/16 presentation mentioned building “height zones;” heights above grade range from 65'-90' for most buildings, with a 120' hotel planned at northeast corner of Fleming Point.	In Albany, the hotel is proposed to be the only building taller than 90'	Whether height zones restrict amount of building sq. ft. at certain heights
<b>Parking</b>		
Current Conceptual Master Plan (10/16) shows 4 levels of parking under “re-built” 7.6 acre area of Fleming Point in addition to parking at grade level throughout the site.	Parking typically takes 300 sq. ft. per car; if 5,000 cars need to be accommodated, it could require approximately 1.5 million SF for parking beyond the 4.5 Million SF of buildings described	<p>How many parking spaces will be required by LBNL, City of Albany, City of Berkeley,</p> <p>Whether parking area shown in conceptual master plan is sufficient</p> <p>Whether final parking structure(s?) would block views</p>
<b>LBNL</b>		
It is the intention of TSG and LBNL that the LBNL Second Campus be an open facility without a perimeter fence, utilizing a combination of security staff and physical security controls.	The Master Plan is being designed with the assumption that LBNL will be an open facility.	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.

<b>What We know</b> (as of 11/17)	<b>What We Think</b>	<b>What We Don't Know</b> (as of 11/17)
<p>LBNL is a member of the national laboratory system supported by the U.S. DOE through its Office of Science. It is managed by the University of California and is charged with ‘conducting unclassified research across a wide range of scientific disciplines with an emphasis on advancing the scope of human knowledge and seeking technical solutions to some of the greatest problems facing humankind, including carbon reduction and other issues related to climate change.’”</p>	<p>Information about LBNL’s safety and environmental track record is difficult to obtain.</p>	
<p>Phase One of LBNL’s 2<sup>nd</sup> campus is planned to accommodate relocation of the Joint BioEnergy Institute (JBEI), the Joint Genome Institute (JGI) and much of LBNL’s Life Sciences Division.</p>	<p>The site will not be used for nuclear weapons (creation or testing).</p>	
<p style="text-align: center; font-size: 48px; opacity: 0.5;">D R A F T</p>	<p>The LBNL second campus is not scheduled to house a UC Berkeley Synthetic Biology Institute (SBI), in Phase One. Projects planned for subsequent phases of the Second Campus have not been announced.<sup>4</sup> LBNL operates under its “Integrated Environment, Safety &amp; Health Management Plan,” published October 2009 (Revision 7). Recently, Gary Andersen was appointed Chair of the Institutional Biosafety Committee (IBC), which provides institutional assurance of safety by reviewing research with biological materials that may pose safety, health, or environmental risks.<sup>5</sup></p>	<p>What type of research does LBNL plan on conducting at the 2<sup>nd</sup> campus. Beyond Phase One? What are the risks to public health and safety, as well as mitigations and monitoring plans?</p>

What We know (as of 11/17)	What We Think	What We Don't Know (as of 11/17)
<b>Infrastructure</b>		
<p>TSG has provided estimates for infrastructure costs: ranging from \$135 million to \$300 million, including \$135 million associated with parking (Other costs include: roads, sewer, water, grading, raising the site level 36" to address sea level rise, landscaping, and utility connection fees). TSG has stated that LBNL will pay a portion of the total infrastructure costs, but neither that amount, nor the percentage, is known.</p>	<p>Infrastructure costs vary, depending on final site plan.</p>	<p>Breakdown of infrastructure costs by component; and what the most current estimate is for the total infrastructure costs</p> <p>Whether open space costs (land value, development, maintenance as public park) are included in the infrastructure costs being estimated by the developer</p> <p>What portion of the infrastructure supports LBNL, and how much LBNL will pay toward infrastructure costs</p>
<b>Views</b>		
<p>One view from Albany Hill has been presented. ( Oct 16 Packet)</p> <p>Views from Pierce Street have been provided ( Oct 30 Packet)</p>	<p style="font-size: 48px; opacity: 0.3; letter-spacing: 0.5em;">D R A F T</p>	<p>Other views from Albany Hill and from requested public locations, including Bulb, Beach, Freeway have not been shown</p> <p>Depictions of views based on more current site plan and height distribution</p>
<b>Design/Construction Standards</b>		
<p>According to TSG, the baseline for LBNL buildings is LEED Gold, which would be the intended minimum for private development as well. Other levels of LEED certification are also being investigated.</p>	<p>Site standards for all buildings will include some level of LEED certification</p>	<p>What the architecture will look like and who the architects will be</p> <p>How aesthetics and architectural quality will be defined and ensured</p>
<b>Land Development</b>		
<p>According to TSG, the site is being developed based on information related to 100 year plan which anticipates 55" of sea level rise, which means that the site will require a great deal of fill.</p>		
<p>Construction is not expected to involve pile driving (but rather, drilling).</p>		
<b>Public Open Space</b>		
<p><u>Albany</u> (location; area; % of 107-acre Albany area):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Waterfront Park (on grade): 32.3 acres (30%)</li> <li>• Waterfront Park (over pkg. structure): 7.6 acres (7%)</li> </ul>		<p>Whether roads are included in the open space calculations</p>

What We know (as of 11/17)	What We Think	What We Don't Know (as of 11/17)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Codornices Creek: 22.2 acres (21%)</li> <li>• North/South walkway: 7.5 acres (7%)</li> <li>• East/West connectors: 5.4 acres (5%)</li> </ul> <p><u>Berkeley</u> (location; area; % of 29-acre Berkeley area):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Waterfront Park (on grade): 5.8 acres (20%)</li> <li>• Codornices Creek: 1 acre (3%)</li> <li>• North/South walkway: 0.6 acres (2%)</li> <li>• East/West connectors: 4.2 acres (14%)</li> </ul>		Is surface parking is included in the open space calculations
The Codornices Creek open space is located above the (potential) underground LBNL FSF (Future Science Facility - linear accelerator).	TSG has stated that while vehicle traffic cannot be placed on top of the FSF due to vibration concerns, a park above the accelerator is safe for pedestrians and does not disrupt FSF operations	
		Format for ownership of the public open space
<b>Bay Trail</b>		
The current plan (10/16) incorporates an extension of the Bay Trail through Albany and Berkeley. Two bike/ ped routes are indicated: one along the Codornices Creek/I-80 on the east side of the site; another along the shoreline. <i>Current status: Pending condemnation action in court. EBRPD is seeking to acquire rights to land along the shoreline for a Bay Trail. TSG has not agreed, as far as the City knows, to come to resolution at this time.</i>		Resolution of pending court action.
<b>Land Valuation</b>		
Valuation of the GGF site would increase, depending on the entitlements associated with the property. Current valuation of the full site is estimated at approx. \$47.5 M (per 11/13 TF meeting). Potential value with entitlements and/or constructed buildings could be three to five times as much as this. Full costs would include purchase, development, and maintenance. <sup>6</sup>	Re-zoning to allow for mixed use and additional uses not currently allowed in zoning for Albany waterfront will significantly increase the value of the property.	

What We know (as of 11/17)	What We Think	What We Don't Know (as of 11/17)
<b>Ownership</b>		
<p>TSG is currently negotiating arrangements with LBNL regarding owning vs. leasing related to the LBNL portion of the site (2 Million sq feet of buildings on unknown amount of acres); TSG is planning to retain ownership of private development.</p>	<p>Even if UC leases buildings (vs. owning the land and the buildings), the land/ buildings will be treated as “public” for issues related to taxation and “control” since the project would be considered “in furtherance of UC’s educational missions.”</p>	<p>When own/lease arrangements between UC and TSG will be determined</p> <p>Timing to understand final decisions re: ownership of public open space be decided</p> <p>What happens if UC sells the land at a later date and/or uses the property for non-educational uses</p> <p>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?</p> <p>The land values that will be used to determine transfer tax responsibility if all or part of the property is sold</p>
<b>Voter Initiative / Measure C / CEQA / Development Agreement</b>		
<p>Measure C (approved by Albany voters in 1990) requires not just City Council approval – but a vote of the electorate (Albany residents) – as a final step in any zoning amendments, general plan amendments, specific plan, and/or development agreement at the waterfront.</p>		
<p>A land owner or citizens can sponsor an Initiative to modify Measure C, through a signature drive. The process would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• preparation of the Initiative language;</li> <li>• filing of notice of intent (NOI) with the City Clerk;</li> <li>• an Initiative title and summary from the City Attorney;</li> <li>• publishing the proposed Initiative;</li> <li>• gathering sufficient signatures; and</li> <li>• submitting Initiative petitions for verification by County.</li> </ul> <p>If the proponents have sufficient qualified signatures, the City Council places the Initiative on the ballot. A citizens’ Initiative does not require CEQA review prior to election. [If the City Council places a measure on the ballot without a signature effort a full CEQA review would be required prior to an election.]</p>		

<b>What We know</b> (as of 11/17)	<b>What We Think</b>	<b>What We Don't Know</b> (as of 11/17)
<p>Assuming that the GGF site is selected as LBNL's "preferred site" in late November, the landowner/ developer (The Stronach Group) plans to sponsor a voter initiative, by collecting signatures and bringing a ballot measure to Albany and Berkeley voters in June 2012. To meet this election date the process noted above must be complete 88 days prior to the June election.</p>	<p>While proposed Initiative language has not been presented to the TF or the City, it appears that approval of this Initiative will place final project approval in the hands of the City Councils of Albany and Berkeley, and not with a vote of citizens. It will be incumbent upon the City Council(s) to determine if the proposal(s) meet the requirements of the Initiative.</p>	<p>Neither the language nor the proposed content has been shared with the community, TF, or the City yet. 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>The City of Albany, the City of Berkeley, UC, and/ or DOE could be the lead agency on any CEQA review.</p>	<p>The City of Albany believes it should be the lead agency for any CEQA review given the impact the project will have on the City and community, and the fact that the majority of the project is within Albany's boundaries.</p>	
<p>The Stronach Group views the project as a single project that spans two cities, not a separate project in Albany and a separate project in Berkeley.</p>	<p>Based on the developer's comments at TF sessions, TSG states that the zoning needs to change in both cities (Albany and Berkeley) in order for the project to move forward.</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>If TSG's voter Initiative does not get the required number of valid signatures, or if TSG's voter Initiative does not get 50% plus one vote on the June ballot, Measure C remains in tact with no changes to waterfront zoning.</p>	<p style="text-align: center; font-size: 2em; opacity: 0.5;">DRAFT</p>	<p>Whether the developer/landowner has other plans for the site at this time.</p>
<p>TSG has stated that it will create an Initiative to approve a Master Plan for the site (including Albany and Berkeley portions of the GGF property), and that later there will be contracts created as Development Agreement(s).</p>	<p>The Development Agreements between TSG and the City of Albany (and the City of Berkeley) will include community benefits which may be delineated in the Initiative, as well as others negotiated later, following a full EIR process.</p>	<p>What role would the Initiative have if the City and TSG cannot come to a successfully negotiated Development Agreement ?</p>

What We know (as of 11/17)	What We Think	What We Don't Know (as of 11/17)
<b>Environmental Issues</b>		
<p>TSG's Environmental/ Technical Team includes field ecologists, geotechnical engineers, structural engineers, civil engineers, coastal engineers, building systems engineers, traffic engineers, EMI/EMF consultants, and vibration consultants. Baseline studies have been done to determine potential to accommodate LBNL program requirements; CEQA studies have not been done. TSG is unable to release full reports conducted to date due to LBNL confidentiality issues.</p>	<p>Substantive environmental analysis is not anticipated to take place until CEQA review of the project (which would take place after a Voter Initiative).</p>	<p>Potential environmental and safety hazards are not known at this time; information on these issues will be researched during the CEQA process. How will (can) potential hazards be mitigated?</p>
<p>TSG has stated that its team includes traffic engineers and experts in Transportation Demand Management (TDM), but no analyses or plans have been presented.</p>		<p>Traffic impacts of the proposed project How traffic impacts will be mitigated Whether any traffic studies will be done and analyzed prior to the Initiative vote</p>
<p>According to TSG, this project will not include facilities that generate radioactive waste.</p>		<p>What toxics will be generated and how will they be disposed? How will (can) potential hazards be mitigated?</p>
<p>TSG has stated that solar thermal, solar electric (photovoltaic, BOPV), wind turbines, biodiesel, and biofuels will be included as integrated renewable technologies on the site.</p>		<p>What commitments will be made to integrated renewable technologies prior to Development Agreement negotiations</p>
<p>TSG has stated that they will use conventional electrical and natural gas energy supplemented by renewable sources such as wind turbines and solar panels. They have also stated that they are investigating the use of WAPA power which is produced in the northwest by extensive hydrological means rather than burning fossil fuels, and they are exploring other sustainable practices such as air and water heat exchangers to reduce the amount of electricity and natural gas which will be consumed. Finally, the buildings will be designed to maximize natural lighting, passive solar heat gain for winter, and natural ventilation.</p>		

<b>What We know</b> (as of 11/17)	<b>What We Think</b>	<b>What We Don't Know</b> (as of 11/17)
<p>Landfill at the GGF site consists (according to 1989 EIR) of construction debris and landscape wastes (with elevated levels of some environmental toxins – particularly ammonia, consistent with degrading organic waste) but not in concentrations known to be harmful to life in the Bay. In 2005, the Regional Water Quality Control Board stated “no threat to water quality has been identified or is anticipated based on existing water and analysis” and did not require the site to be sealed or capped before being considered safe for human and wildlife contact.</p>		
<p>The small bay off the northern Albany shoreline is designated as the Albany State Marine Reserve. In this bird sanctuary, boat traffic and human contact is restricted to protect wildlife, especially shore birds that feed at the mudflats. From mid-October to March, the Albany waterfront serves as resting and feeding grounds for numerous migrating birds.</p>	<p>TSG’s field ecologist will need to ensure that the master plan reflects the importance of this habitat.</p>	
<p>According to the 2001 Eastshore State Park Resource Summary, the only “relatively-native” vegetation community at the Albany waterfront is a small area of northern coastal scrub on Fleming Point.</p>	<p>TSG’s landscape architect presented plans that propose a range of landscape types throughout the site. It is assumed that landscaping will respect existing habitats.</p>	
<p>The 2001 Eastshore State Park Resource Summary lists dozens of species of shore birds, and numerous mammals, reptiles, and insects. At least 16 types of rare, threatened, or endangered wildlife have been observed. The mudflats are home so American avocets. The tidal marshes, ponds, and wetlands also contain a variety of marine life.</p>	<p>The current master plan indicates wetlands restoration at the north end of the site, as well as daylighting of Cordornices Creek, in a Riparian Forest.</p>	
<p>Directly across from the Golden Gate, the Albany waterfront is buffeted by strong winds coming off the San Francisco Bay. According to the 1989 Albany Waterfront Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), daytime winds are predominantly from the west and southwest, shifting to off-shore winds from the east at night. The air is calm only 10% of the time, with average wind speeds from the southwest reaching 13.7 mph.</p>	<p>TSG’s design team has reviewed prevailing winds and taken this information into account in their master plan.</p>	

What We know (as of 11/17)	What We Think	What We Don't Know (as of 11/17)
<b>Economic / Fiscal Impacts</b>		
<p>Annual City of Albany revenues from Golden Gate Fields: \$1,047,200 (including wager taxes, ad valorem property taxes, special taxes and assessments, and sales and business license taxes). Of that, \$470,700 goes to General Fund (3.5% of General Fund).</p>		
<p>TSG estimates that GGF's current contribution toward Albany General Fund is \$573,000, with a net revenue (accounting for General Fund expenditures) of \$435,000.</p>		
<p>TSG has done fiscal impact analyses of numerous land use scenarios, including one that is close to matching the current site plan (A revised site plan is in development stage but has not been presented to the public). What has been presented in terms of economic/fiscal impact is based on a plan that includes: 2 million square feet for LBNL (no tax revenues for the city or schools), 365,000 square feet private labs/ offices, 10,000 square feet retail, and a 200-room hotel. (The analysis assumes that no taxes will be generated from land/buildings used by UC or LBNL for the 2 million square feet.)</p> <p>At full build out – the projected gross General Fund Revenues are \$1,775,000; anticipated expenditures are \$1,040,000; with net General Fund Surplus of \$735,000 (or \$300,000 more than current estimated net General Fund revenue).</p> <p>The City of Albany's total parcel tax revenue is \$500,000. Analysis of the current scenario reduces this amount to \$324,000, for a reduction of \$176,000.</p>	<p>The site offers enormous potential – in terms of economic benefits and public open space. The GGF land use proposal is likely to include more than 6 million square feet, once parking for 5,000 cars and infrastructure needs are developed. While LBNL could become an economic “engine,” it also requires 2 million square feet plus parking that does not generate tax revenue due to its status as a public entity, resulting in an additional 1 million square feet plus parking in Albany and 1.5 million square feet plus parking in Berkeley to support the developer's investment and to maintain/ increase revenues to the cities of Albany and Berkeley and the schools.</p>	<p>What 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>Whether there is a feasible scenario for development without LBNL</p> <p>Whether a development with less building bulk and height would be feasible</p> <p>What plans might be contemplated by the owners if LBNL selects another site</p> <p>Will TSG provide information as to market studies and feasibility of non-LBNL project options</p>
		<p>Economic value of new public open space at the waterfront</p>

What We know (as of 11/17)	What We Think	What We Don't Know (as of 11/17)
A hotel is contemplated for Phase One of the project in Albany.	TSG notes that a study 4-5 years ago found a need for a 200-room hotel and anticipates that the 4.5 million square foot development proposed will generate market demand for a hotel. They also note fairly low vacancy rates at the Double Tree at the Berkeley Marina. TSG has stated that they” will have much better information within the reasonable near term.”	Feasibility / market analysis of a hotel in Albany (no market studies conducted)
Current assessed valuation of Golden Gate Fields: \$47,500,639 (Alameda County Assessor’s Office). Increases in assessed property value would be reflected in ad valorem property taxes and general bond capacity, but would not impact school district funding.	The property valuation would significantly increase with new entitlements beyond current waterfront zoning, TSG indicates that when the first 500-600,000 square feet of the project is built, the valuation will triple; when full build-out is complete, the land value could reach \$300 to \$500 Million.	
AUSD receives 14% of its revenues from local parcel taxes (Measure I, which expires in 2015, accounts for 3%; Measure J, which does not expire, accounts for 11%). Golden Gate Fields pays \$161,717 in Measure I parcel taxes and \$592,971 in Measure J parcel taxes. These parcel taxes translate to 10 teachers.	DRAFT	
TSG has stated that it will cover the shortfall in parcel taxes to AUSD (based on current amounts), resulting in no net gain or loss to the district. It has been noted that	The district is not currently “whole” as state funding has been severely reduced and existing parcel taxes are being used for “basics” that had originally been used for “enrichment.”	How would future parcel taxes be handled at GGF site? Might revenues for the district be <i>higher</i> than those currently generated by GGF?
Golden Gate Fields will contribute \$80,000 in 2011-12 toward bond repayment. If Golden Gate Fields is taken entirely off tax rolls, other property owners would have to take on an additional (estimated) \$5 per \$100,000 assessed value.		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?

<b>What We know</b> (as of 11/17)	<b>What We Think</b>	<b>What We Don't Know</b> (as of 11/17)
<p>Mechanisms to mitigate negative fiscal impacts on city of Albany and AUSD are being considered by the developer, but these have not been shared with the city or the TF. TSG has stated that the revenue flowing to AUSD from GGF parcel taxes would be maintained at <i>current levels</i>. TSG has stated that it will maintain the revenue flowing to the City of Albany at current levels until such a level is achieved through taxes on new development, at which point GGF “subsidies” would cease.</p>	<p>A Mello-Roos special tax district would be the most likely mechanism for funding certain capital expenditures and services. There is some chance that Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILOT) could be received from UC, but this appears to be unlikely.</p>	
<p>AUSD’s has restriction as to the total amount of bonds it can issue based on the total tax base of the city. The debt capacity is 2.5% of the total assessed value of all properties, less bonds outstanding. If Golden Gate Fields is taken entirely from tax base, AUSD’s current bonding capacity would be reduced from \$6.9 million to \$5.7 million.</p>		
<b>Other Revenue Issues</b>		
<p>The developers would like the cities of Albany and Berkeley to work together to create a revenue sharing agreement.</p>	<p>Revenue sharing discussions between Berkeley and Albany are unlikely to occur until (at the earliest) a time when the number of potential sites for LBNL’s Second Campus are narrowed and there is just one site located in Berkeley.</p>	
<p>Regional economic impacts include construction, employment, direct income. Of the estimated 7,000 jobs at the built-out site, around 1,000 would be moved from other locations in the region.</p>		

What We know (as of 11/17)	What We Think	What We Don't Know (as of 11/17)
<b>Other</b>		
<p>In 2007, UC Regents approved a Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) for LBNL and certified the program-level EIR. In 2008, the Alameda County Superior Court ruled for project opponents, who filed a CEQA challenge with respect to an argument that the final EIR should have been recirculated due to the surfacing of new information that was raised for the first time in the EIR's responses to comments, and therefore not fully considered; otherwise the Court ruled for the UC Regents. Both sides appealed, and the First District Court of Appeals ruled for the regents.<sup>7</sup></p>		
<p>Legal actions related to CEQA review of projects within the LRDP have included challenges to: Computational Research and Theory (CRT) facility, a 140,000 square foot structure located in Blackberry Canyon; Helios/ Solar Energy Research Center (SERC); LBNL's Berkeley Lab Laser Accelerator (BELLA).<sup>8</sup></p>		

1. Developer stated site plan is being revised/modified, but no new version of site plan has been presented to TF or to City
2. Sq. Ft. shown in conjunction with economic impacts on 11/13 to TF does not match this amount of build out
3. Berkeley Waterfront Measures N and Q anticipate a hotel located on the eastern part of the site
4. "Is Public Health and Safety Being Considered in the Construction of LBNL's New Biolab in Berkeley?" Jeremy Gruber, Tina Stevens, and Becky McClain, The Berkeley Daily Planet, 8/8/11, [www.wiserearth.org](http://www.wiserearth.org)] Beyond the potential safety concerns related to the potential location of the SBI, the authors pose a series of questions related more generally to hazards and public health, suggesting that current biolab regulation and oversight is not adequate.
5. [earthsciences.typepad.com/blog/2011/11/andersen-is-lbnl-biosafety-chairman.html](http://earthsciences.typepad.com/blog/2011/11/andersen-is-lbnl-biosafety-chairman.html)]
6. EBRPD purchased ball fields property for \$8.5 million, after appraisers estimated value at \$12.1 million for 16+/- acres. Development of Crissy Field, including the creation of a 20-acre tidal marsh, a 29-acre open space grassy meadow, a 1.5-mile promenade and the Crissy Field Center (outdoor learning center) relied on a \$34.5 million capital campaign.
7. "Late Objections Doom Opposition to Lab Expansion," Josh Stephens, 4/27/10, California Planning & Development Report
8. "Legal Actions and Developments," [www.savestrawberrycanyon.org](http://www.savestrawberrycanyon.org)

**Golden Gate Fields Task Force – Index of Information // November 16, 2011**

<b>Information requested/ Questions</b>	<b>Where to find information</b>	<b>Status</b>
<b>SITE PLAN / PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Master Plan documents presented by developer at their 10/10/11 Open House</li> </ul>	<i>TF Packet for 10/16/11 Meeting</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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))</li> </ul>	<i>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.</i>	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)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acreage 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)</li> </ul>	<i>TSG Site Plan included in TF Packet for 10/16/11 Meeting and TSG Parcel Exhibit page A24 of Oct. 30 Packet</i>	Still need square footage calculations for each building, parking, infrastructure (Oct 16. meeting notes/ in Oct 30 Packet)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Calculation of parking needed to comply with current zoning; calculation of parking sq. ft./ acreage anticipated</li> </ul>		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)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Anticipated building heights and locations on site</li> </ul>	<i>TF Packet for 10/30/11 Meeting, page 6</i>	Height zone diagram not yet provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FAR studies (floor area ratios)</li> </ul>	<i>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</i>	Studies not provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Property/land survey</li> </ul>		Not provided (but shown in TSG PowerPoint at 11/6/11 TF meeting)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site sections from various locations</li> </ul>	<i>TF Packet for 10/16/11 Meeting</i>	

<b>Information requested/ Questions</b>	<b>Where to find information</b>	<b>Status</b>
• Site and building elevations		Not available; only master planning drawings being developed at this time
• Architectural drawings		Not available; only master planning drawings being developed at this time
• Massing drawings from locations at the site and also Albany Hill and Freeway		Not provided
• 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
• 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>	
• Phasing Plan	Some information provided at TF meetings; <i>TF Packet for 10/30/11 Meeting, p. 8;</i> <i>11/13/11 TF meeting</i>	
• 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>
• 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.
• Infrastructure costs (by component)	<i>TF Packet for 10/30/11 Meeting, p. 8</i>	Costs being revised as master plan revised?
• 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>	
• 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>	
• Why is the hotel 120' tall (approximately 12 stories)?	<i>TF Packet for 10/30/11 Meeting, p. 9</i>	
• If/ where will co-generation facilities located?	<i>TF Packet for 10/30/11 Meeting, p. 9</i>	

<b>Information requested/ Questions</b>	<b>Where to find information</b>	<b>Status</b>
• What kind of non-motor vehicle connections are being designed to accommodate access to the site?	<i>TF Packet for 10/30/11 Meeting, p. 9</i>	
• Is TSG still considering bike/pedestrian connection over freeway at Codornices Creek?	<i>TF Packet for 10/30/11 Meeting, p. 9</i>	
• What are plans for LEED certification?	<i>TF Packet for 10/30/11 Meeting, p. 9</i>	
• How will aesthetics and architectural quality be addressed?	<i>TF Packet for 10/30/11 Meeting, p. 9</i>	
• 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?	<i>TF Packet for 10/30/11 Meeting, p. 10</i>	
• 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?		TSG has not studied this issue ( <i>TF Packet for 10/30/11 Meeting, p. 9</i> )
• What would happen if LBNL does not get the contract for the FSF (future science facility/ linear accelerator)?	<i>TF Packet for 10/30/11 Meeting, p. 10</i>	No answer provided
• Can TSG estimate the amount of excavation and describe the nature of construction (piles, foundations, etc.) below grade?	<i>TF Packet for 10/30/11 Meeting, p. 10</i>	
• How will title to property be held?	<i>See Ownership section</i>	Pending negotiations with UC
• Will there be an on-site solar program?	<i>TF Packet for 10/30/11 Meeting, p. 10</i>	
• How much of the infrastructure is deemed a federal project?	<i>TF Packet for 10/30/11 Meeting, p. 10</i>	No answer provided
• Has TSG considered creating a Specific Plan rather than a Master Plan?	<i>TF Packet for 11/13/11, p. 8</i>	

Information requested/ Questions	Where to find information	Status
<b>OWNERSHIP</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Legal opinion on implications of ownership vs. leasing arrangements (including taxes and future decisionmaking about subsequent zoning/planning changes at the waterfront)</li> </ul>	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"> <li>Legal opinions about the role(s) of LBNL vs. UC vs. DOE (re: ownership of land/buildings, and related issues) vs. developer</li> </ul>	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"> <li>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)</li> </ul>	Background Information / Questions from Task Force and others; <i>page A2 of TF Packet for 10/30/11</i> <i>page 8 of TF Packet for 11/13/11</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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)?</li> </ul>	Memo from City Attorney <i>page A8 of TF Packet for 10/30/11</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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])</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>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)?</li> </ul>	Memo from City Attorney <i>page A8 of TF Packet for 10/30/11</i>	
<b>PUBLIC OPEN SPACE</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What is the proposed acreage/ location of new public open space at the site?</li> </ul>	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"> <li>What is the proposed ownership plan for open space?</li> </ul>	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"> <li>Would the new open space become part of the Eastshore State Park?</li> </ul>	Email from TSG <i>page A26 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Who bears long term responsibility for maintenance of open space at the site?</li> </ul>	Background Information / Questions from Task Force and others; <i>page A2 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What is the anticipated timing of open space development? Will all public open space be developed in conjunction with Phase One?</li> </ul>	Email from TSG <i>page A27 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Who will decide what type of open space will be developed?</li> </ul>	Email from TSG <i>page A27 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How would the proposed open space integrate the Albany waterfront with the Eastshore State Park?</li> </ul>	Email from TSG <i>page A27 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What would it cost to buy, develop, and maintain the amount of open space being proposed by the developer?</li> </ul>		Unknown

Information requested/ Questions	Where to find information	Status
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What is the status of the acquisition of land by EBRPD to create the Bay Trail at GGF site?</li> </ul>	Background Information / Questions from Task Force and others; <i>page A2 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
<b>CEQA / DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT / MEASURE C</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Berkeley Waterfront Zoning Ordinance</li> </ul>	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"> <li>Election timing requirements</li> </ul>	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"> <li>Measure C initiative language</li> </ul>	<i>page A9 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Could/should a full EIR/CEQA process take place prior to a Measure C election?</li> </ul>	Memo from City Attorney <i>page A6 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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?)</li> </ul>	Memo from City Attorney <i>page A7 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How might the information requested for an EIR differ from what is being asked by the Task Force?</li> </ul>	Memo from City Attorney <i>page A6 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What is the relationship between the EIR and a Voter Initiative?</li> </ul>	Memo from City Attorney <i>page A6 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If Measure C votes takes place before the EIR, how does that impact the EIR?</li> </ul>	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"> <li>Who pays for the EIR? (Is it always the developer? Would the city ever pay for an EIR?)</li> </ul>	Memo from City Attorney <i>page A7 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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?</li> </ul>	Memo from City Attorney <i>page A8 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What are the mechanisms for long term monitoring of development agreement mandates?</li> </ul>	Memo from City Attorney <i>page A8 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What benefits are being proposed for Albany schools? Could existing STEM programs be expanded?</li> </ul>	Email from TSG <i>page A26 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What other benefits/ mitigations are being proposed?</li> </ul>	Email from TSG <i>page A26 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What is the benefit/detriment to the city/community of changing current zoning to allow new uses?</li> </ul>	Task Force to consider Memo from City Attorney <i>page A8 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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?)</li> </ul>		Answer not provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>When will proposed/draft Initiative language be available?</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>How important is Berkeley’s approval for the project to move forward?</li> </ul>	<i>11/13/11TF Packet, p. 8</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What would be the timing for the amendments to zoning and general plan and the EIR?</li> </ul>	<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
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Anticipated hazards resulting from LBNL uses and uses by private labs and proposed mitigations</li> </ul>	<i>“What We Know” section re: environmental concerns (11/20/11TF Packet)</i>	LBNL invited to attend Task Force meeting; have not responded
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Seismic studies used to determine construction at GGF site</li> </ul>		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"> <li>Wind studies used to determine construction at GGF site</li> </ul>		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"> <li>Geotechnical studies used to determine construction at GGF site</li> </ul>	<span style="font-size: 48pt; color: lightgray; opacity: 0.5;">DRAFT</span>	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"> <li>Sea level rise projections used to determine construction at GGF site</li> </ul>		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"> <li>Biological survey(s) developed by TSG consultants, related to wetlands, wildlife, etc.</li> </ul>		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"> <li>Anticipated toxic materials to be at site: potential impacts, and plans for disposal</li> </ul>		LBNL invited to attend Task Force meeting; have not responded

Information requested/ Questions	Where to find information	Status
<b>T R A F F I C</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic/ air quality studies with all background data</li> </ul>		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"> <li>Traffic projections/ traffic impact study (including relationship to phasing of project), including impacts on Buchanan and Gilman streets, local streets, and freeway</li> </ul>		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"> <li>TDM plan proposed by LBNL/ proposed by developer</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What are the anticipated hours of operation for LBNL? For other land uses?</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What will be the frequency / route of shuttles between GGF and other LBNL sites? (Can only LBNL employees use the LBNL shuttles?)</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What is the current CalTrans designation of the I-80 corridor?</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are there any plans by CalTrans for interchanges or other changes in vicinity?</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have there been any discussions by the developer with AC Transit or BART re: adding stop(s), etc.?</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What commitment will TSG make to permanently fund shuttles from GGF to San Pablo and Solano avenues, and to Fourth Street, etc.?</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What are plans for non-motorized access to the site (walking, bicycles)?</li> </ul>	10/30/11 TF Packet, p. 9	

D R A F T

Information requested/ Questions	Where to find information	Status
<b>ECONOMIC IMPACTS</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> </ul>	<p><i>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</i></p>	<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); full report not provided</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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?</li> </ul>		<p>Note provided; see above</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What are the projected property tax revenues from the current TSG development proposal? How much of that would go to the Albany schools?</li> </ul>	<p><i>Notes from TF Meeting 11/13/11 include analysis of 4.5 million square foot scenario</i></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What are the projected sales tax revenues from the current TSG development proposal, and would any of that go to AUSD?</li> </ul>	<p><i>Notes from TF Meeting 11/13/11 include analysis of 4.5 million square foot scenario</i></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How do the projected property tax revenues from the proposed TSG development proposal compare to existing property tax revenues from the race track?</li> </ul>	<p><i>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</i></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are there any other projected taxes or revenue sources (e.g., transfer taxes, development fees) that AUSD could expect from the TSG proposal?</li> </ul>	<p><i>Notes from TF Meeting 11/13/11</i></p>	

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

Information requested/ Questions	Where to find information	Status
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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?)</li> </ul>	<i>Notes from TF Meeting 11/13/11; presentations by TSG consultant (EPS) and City of Albany consultant (SE)</i>	Full reports not submitted
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>		To date, no examples have surfaced.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What would be the economic impact on city and schools if less development was constructed than what is either planned or ultimately approved?</li> </ul>	<span style="font-size: 48px; opacity: 0.3;">DRAFT</span>	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)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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?</li> </ul>	<i>11/13/11 TF meeting notes (TSG Economic Consultant presentation and answers to questions)</i>	Full analysis not provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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?</li> </ul>		Answer not provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Definitions or explanations of different taxes and revenues that fund city</li> </ul>	<i>11/13/11 TF Packet, page 12 and presentations at 11/13/11 meeting</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Definitions or explanations of different taxes, revenues, bonds that fund the school district</li> </ul>	<i>Presentation by AUSD Superintendent Marla Stephenson at TF Meeting 11/13/11</i>	

Information requested/ Questions	Where to find information	Status
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.)</li> </ul>	<i>11/13/11 TF Packet, p. 19 and presentation/handout by city consulting attorney (Goldfarb &amp; Lipman LLP)</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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)</li> </ul>		Not provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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?</li> </ul>		Not provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact fee information/ Are there “impact fees” that go toward AUSD and/or the City of Albany? What are they?</li> </ul>	<i>11/13/11 TF Packet, page A5 and notes from TF Meeting 11/13/11; presentations by Albany City Manager and AUSD Superintendent</i>	
<b>Additional questions</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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 restrictions, if approved by the voters)?</li> </ul>	Background Information / Questions from Task Force and others; <i>page A3 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If LBNL does not locate at the site, would the</li> </ul>	Background Information / Questions from	

Information requested/ Questions	Where to find information	Status
property owners be allowed to build out the entire proposed development (4.5 million square feet)?	Task Force and others; <i>page A3 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is LBNL’s commitment to Albany’s process?</li> </ul>	Background Information / Questions from Task Force and others; <i>page A3 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What public agency would serve as the “lead agency” for the EIR??</li> </ul>	Background Information / Questions from Task Force and others; <i>page A3 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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)?</li> </ul>	Background Information / Questions from Task Force and others; <i>page A3 of 10/30/11 TF Packet</i>	

D R A F T

**Subject:** Re: Following Up  
**From:** "Ari Huber" <ari.huber@stronachgroup.com>  
**Date:** 11/17/2011 8:08 AM  
**To:** "Fern Tiger" <fern@ferntiger.com>, "Cleve Livingston" <clivingston@bclsllaw.com>, "Wei Chiu" <wchiu@newellrea.com>  
**CC:** "Beth Pollard" <bpollard@albanyca.org>, "Liz Newman" <liz@ferntiger.com>

Fern,  
Any revisions will not likely substantially change the analysis that has been presented. We are still working on refinements and as such do not have something ready to be released. I will be in town next week.  
Best,  
Ari

On 11-11-16 12:02 AM, "Fern Tiger" <fern@ferntiger.com> wrote:

Hi Ari:

Over the past few weeks, at the Task Force sessions, your team has mentioned that a new site plan was in the works and that the draft initiative would also be forthcoming. The sense of the Task Force was that the draft initiative might be ready for the November 13th session or the November 20th session. Both Wei and Tim mentioned that the site plan was being re-worked and would be ready shortly. I'm writing to find out if either of those pieces will be ready in the next day or so for inclusion in the posted packet for this Sunday's meeting. We would need it by Wednesday evening or Thursday morning at the latest.

I'm writing because at this Sunday's session the Task Force will be preparing its thoughts for the December 4th Council session (sort of an update on what the TF is thinking as of this point). If there is new information it would be good to get it to us for the session. If not, the report will be based on the existing information that has been provided by TSG, the economists, attorneys, the city, and other reference materials.

Please let me know as soon as possible as we are in the midst of completing the packet.

Thanks.  
Hope all is well.

Fern

PS -- I'm in New Orleans, headed to Chicago. In Oakland Thursday through Thursday.

This e-mail, and any documents or data attached hereto, is intended for the intended recipients only. It may contain confidential and/or privileged information and no rights have been waived by the sender. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby NOTIFIED that any dissemination, distribution, retention, archiving or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify me at the telephone number shown above or by return mail and delete this communication and any copy immediately. Stronach Group provides no assurances that this e-mail and its attachments are virus free; you are responsible for scanning all e-mails and attachments for viruses. Stronach Group disclaims all liability for damages caused by any virus which may be transmitted by this email. Thank you.

**Subject:** LBNL Q&A  
**From:** Fern Tiger <fern@ferntiger.com>  
**Date:** 09/01/2011 8:38 AM  
**To:** Sam Chapman <stchapman@lbl.gov>  
**CC:** Robert Hatheway <hatheway@berkeley.edu>, liz newman <liz@ferntiger.com>

Hi Sam -

Following a lively Q&A with the developers and the city of Albany (focused on four key topic areas -- the site and proposal, economic impacts, entitlements, and community benefits) that we facilitated on Monday night, several people asked if a similar kind of Q&A might be able to be scheduled with LBNL. Naturally, there were questions posed that neither the developer nor the city could answer. And of course I will send those to you and then post the responses on the website, but the "live" direct question and response format enabled the audience (of more than 250) to gather a lot of information in one setting.

Just curious if anything like this could be possible. I realize you've done your sessions in each community, but questions were not really the focus of those sessions; rather LBNL sought comments and only took questions in writing to be answered on the website. It's natural that communities would have questions since many people don't really know that much about LBNL..

Anyway, just a thought.

I will feed you some of the questions that we need to answer on [www.voicestovision.com](http://www.voicestovision.com).. but I do think that a Q&A could be healthy.. or at least worth considering. Happy to chat.

I trust all is well.

Fern

**Subject:** Invitation to Meet with Albany Waterfront Task Force  
**From:** Fern Tiger <fern@ferntiger.com>  
**Date:** 10/24/2011 11:20 PM  
**To:** Robert Hatheway <hatheway@berkeley.edu>, Sam Chapman <stchapman@lbl.gov>  
**CC:** Beth Pollard <bpollard@albanyca.org>, liz newman <liz@ferntiger.com>  
**BCC:** Fidel Contreras <fidel@ferntiger.com>

Hi Bob and Sam -

As I believe you know, the Albany City Council and Albany School Board have jointly appointed a 22-member Task Force which is looking quite comprehensively at the proposed project for the Albany Waterfront, including the LBNL project. We (Fern Tiger Associates) are facilitating this process as the next step necessary for the Albany community to be informed and engaged in understanding all aspects of this potential project -- physical issues, economic impacts, legal and entitlement options, environmental and traffic impacts, Measure C, CEQA, etc.

The Task Force has met twice and will convene for the third session this coming Sunday. For detailed information related to the handout packets for each session, minutes, and follow up data visit [www.voicestovision.com](http://www.voicestovision.com). Minutes for the October 16th session will be posted on Wednesday, along with handouts for the October 30th session.

Additionally, the City Council has requested we facilitate two Council workshops to enable them to become familiar with the information that the Task Force is reviewing. These dates have not yet been set.

The Task Force has asked me to invite you to attend one of the meetings. I would be happy to provide you with the list of questions that we think can only be answered by LBNL, in advance of the meeting. The Task Force meetings operate under Brown Act rules, so there are comments from the public after each agenda item. The Task Force has been diligent in its efforts to understand the complexities of the project, and would welcome your participation.

We meet on Sunday evenings 7 - 9 pm, for a series of seven sessions. The upcoming meetings are set for October 30 (that agenda is already set to look at ownership, CEQA, entitlement processes, and open space), November 6, November 13, November 20. Please let me know if we can set a date, so that we can work around your schedule.

Thanks in advance for considering this proposal. If you have questions, please call me directly.  
Fern Tiger

510-208-7700