

Golden Gate Fields Task Force: Preparation for November 20 Meeting
(includes all comments received from Task Force members as of November 19th at 10 PM)

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

Top Strengths (Pros)	Top Challenges (Cons)	Top Opportunities
<p>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</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>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</p>
<p>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</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>Opportunity to make shoreline a comfortable place for families and children; to make recreation including non-motorized boating accessible without automobile use</p>
	<p>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</p>	<p>Opportunity for a wide variety of outdoor environments from open vistas to intimate gardens to outdoor rooms to performing arts venues</p>
	<p>Rather than enhance topography (cf built environment of Telegraph Hill) the building profiles erase hill of Fleming Point</p>	<p>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)</p>

Top Strengths (Pros)	Top Challenges (Cons)	Top Opportunities
	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
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

Top Strengths (Pros)	Top Challenges (Cons)	Top Opportunities
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	
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.

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

Top Strengths (Pros)	Top Challenges (Cons)	Top Opportunities
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.
	“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.

Top Strengths (Pros)	Top Challenges (Cons)	Top Opportunities
	Connections between this site and the rest of Albany remain difficult, possibly expensive and long-term.	

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.

Top Strengths (Pros)	Top Challenges (Cons)	Top Opportunities
		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
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.

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

Top Strengths (Pros)	Top Challenges (Cons)	Top Opportunities
	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
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.

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.

Top Strengths (Pros)	Top Challenges (Cons)	Top Opportunities
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.
	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		

Top Strengths (Pros)	Top Challenges (Cons)	Top Opportunities
	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
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.	

Top Strengths (Pros)	Top Challenges (Cons)	Top Opportunities
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.
		If LBNL goes elsewhere, is it time to ask whether or not City can purchase this land via a bond measure?

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.	

Top Strengths (Pros)	Top Challenges (Cons)	Top Opportunities
	If city approves, and then this LBNL development does not come to pass, could get some other unfortunate development at the site.	
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.

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.	

Top Strengths (Pros)	Top Challenges (Cons)	Top Opportunities
	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.	
World class scientific facility in Albany	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	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.

Top Strengths (Pros)	Top Challenges (Cons)	Top Opportunities
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.		

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>

Top Strengths (Pros)	Top Challenges (Cons)	Top Opportunities
Creation of funded parkland	Maximizing revenue	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.
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		
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.

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.