# DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED

# MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING OF
CITY OF ALAMEDA ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 2011
7:00 PM

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Chair Harrison called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Present: Chair Harrison. Commission Members: Dahlberg, McKean, Reeves, Richards, Robillard, and Ryan

Absent: Commission Members: None

Vacancies: (2)

Staff: Eric Fonstein and Rosemary Valeska

2. MINUTES

2.a. Minutes of the Regular Meeting of January 20, 2011

Motion (Dahlberg), seconded, and unanimous to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of January 20, 2011 as submitted.

3. CONSENT CALENDAR

(None)

4. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS – PUBLIC

(None)

5. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

(None)

6. NEW BUSINESS

6.a. Presentation by Argosy University

Mr. Fonstein recapped the staff report provided in the agenda packet regarding the City's partnership with Argosy in presenting a series of workshops for the business community. He introduced Richard Boorom, PhD, who is the new president of Argosy University's Alameda campus. Dr. Boorom stated that the university was founded during the 1970's under the name, American School of Professional Psychology. In the early 2000s, they merged with some other institutions to form Argosy University.

Argosy has been at the Marina Village location for almost four years. They have approximately 1,000 students and over 100 faculty and staff members. They offer Masters and Doctorate programs in psychology, business, and education and they are looking at starting undergraduate programs. Argosy is working with the College of Alameda so that COA students can apply their credits towards the completion of a Bachelor's degree at Argosy. Alameda is Argosy's only facility in northern California and it is running out of space. They are looking for a second site in another part of the Bay Area. Argosy is also establishing an on-line program. Commission Member McKean asked where the students come from. Dr. Boorom responded that most of the students are local, some are from other parts of the country, and some are from other countries. The Bay Area attracts international students. Commission Member Dahlberg asked if the funding was private. Dr. Boorom replied that it is. Eighty percent of the students receive financial aid through federally funded financial assistance programs. Some students have employers who contribute funds. Dr. Boorom added that Argosy is a regionally accredited institution. Commission Member Dahlberg asked if Argosy had athletic programs. Dr. Boorom replied no, as the students are mostly adults. This is a commuter campus and there are no on-campus residences. The students have jobs. Dr. Boorom added that he looked forward to future partnering with the City. The Chair asked why Argosy was not looking for another site in Alameda. Dr. Boorom responded that Argosy is looking for larger market potential like Sacramento or by SFO. He added that Argosy might lease space for overflow next to the Alameda campus and that they were exploring their options. Mr. Fonstein commended Argosy's conference facilities. The Chair thanked Dr. Boorom for his presentation. This item was presented for information, only; no EDC action was requested.

6.b. Update regarding the Alameda Reuse and Redevelopment Authority's response to the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratories Request for Qualifications for a second campus site

Mr. Fonstein cited the benefits that would result by LBNL locating its second campus at Alameda Point. The Lab wants to be involved in the community. Local students could interface with Lab scientists. The Lab represents clean technology and sustainable development.

The following materials were provided to the Commission Members and were recapped by Mr. Fonstein:

- 2/15/11 City Council Agenda Report: Adopt a Resolution of Support for the Alameda Reuse and Redevelopment Authority's Response to Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory's Request for Qualifications for a Second Campus at Alameda Point. (The City Council adopted this resolution on February 15.)

- 2/11-17, 2011 *SF Business Times* article: "East Bay cities ready pitch to Lawrence Berkeley lab"

LBNL wants to see local community of support for the second campus. Mr. Fonstein stated that he has received letters of support from the following entities: Assembly Member Sandre Swanson, Alameda Chamber of Commerce, Bladium, Greater Alameda Business Association, Makani Power, Park Street Business Association, VF Outdoor, West Alameda Business Association, Alameda Association of Realtors, Legacy Partners, Alameda Point Collaborative, Alameda Unified School District, Boys & Girls Club, and College of Alameda. Mr. Fonstein stated that on February 28, the Planning Board would be considering a resolution that would streamline the permit approval process for LBNL. ARRA voted unanimously to offer the land to LBNL at no cost. Commission Member Richards asked if anyone could submit a letter of support. Mr. Fonstein responded that they were looking for letters from organizations representing a cross section of the community rather than letters from individuals. Commission Member Reeves asked if Kiwanis and Rotary were asked to provide letters. Mr. Fonstein responded that they were approached but indicated that they do not have a history of providing letters of support for land use issues; however, individual members have indicated interest. Commission Member McKean asked about the level of infrastructure required. Mr. Fonstein stated that we would involve AMP; the lab wants to be carbon-neutral. Commission Member McKean asked if any electricity subsidies were being considered. Mr. Fonstein stated that we will see if we are short-listed first, then we can discuss rates. Commission Member McKean asked if the Lab would contribute to the tax base. Mr. Fonstein responded that as a public educational institution, the Lab would not pay property tax; however, since the lab would be at Alameda Point, we would not be taking property off the tax rolls. The benefit would be from businesses clustering around the lab as well as the increased demand for retail. Commission Member Ryan stated that he had no questions or comments. The Chair asked if Richmond was part of the East Bay Green Corridor and Mr. Fonstein responded that it was. The Chair stated that even though our main issue is distance from U.C. Berkeley, we are more centrally located in the Bay Area. Commission Member Reeves mentioned crime statistics. Mr. Fonstein stated that the RFQ does ask about safety. He added that the Richmond Field Station has no amenities like we have with Webster Street. The Chair asked which city is our main competitor besides Richmond. Mr. Fonstein responded Emeryville, Oakland, and Berkeley. Commission Member Dahlberg asked if we had considered offering to pay the moving expenses. Mr. Fonstein responded that we could explore that. There is substantial equipment in the currently leased spaces. Commission Member Dahlberg asked if anyone has stated what those costs might be. Mr. Fonstein stated that it is not discussed in the RFQ. Commission

Member Richards asked if we were "spying" on the other cities. Mr. Fonstein responded that other cities have to give public presentations, too; therefore, we can see what they are offering. The Chair asked what we can do as a city to "push it over the edge." Mr. Fonstein stated that it is the things that have been cited: the site is ready to go, land at no cost, AMP, community amenities, public safety, does not abut a residential area - they are looking at Alameda. Commission Member McKean stated that they will need huge infrastructure that does not currently exist – a "plug and play" site would be an instant attraction. Mr. Fonstein stated that LBNL would work with the City on infrastructure. Commission Member Richards stated that he hoped we were not offering them waterfront property, as they don't need it. He would like to see a marina in that area. Mr. Fonstein responded that the site would not be right on the water. We asked LBNL if the campus would be secured and they said no, only the buildings. Commission Member Dahlberg asked if survey teams have been sent out to the site. Mr. Fonstein responded no – we have to first see if we make the RFQ short list. Commission Member McKean asked when LBNL wants to break ground. Mr. Fonstein responded that they want to start during 2013-14 with completion by December 2015. Commission Member Robillard asked about the potential impacts on the proposed VA facility. Mr. Fonstein responded that he would look into that. Commission Member Richards asked if Treasure Island was within a 20-minute travel time of the main Berkeley campus. Mr. Fonstein responded that the RFQ asks for travel times at different times of the day. The Chair thanked Mr. Fonstein for his presentation. This item was presented for information, only; no EDC action was requested.

7. REPORTS

(None)

8. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

8.a. Upcoming EDC Agenda Items

Mr. Fonstein noted that the presentation by the AMP General Manager would need to be rescheduled from March to April. Also, Planning would like to schedule a joint Planning Board/EDC meeting on Monday, March 28 regarding the Webster Street Vision Plan. This meeting will probably take place on Webster Street.

9. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS – COMMISSION MEMBERS AND STAFF

(None)

10. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was unanimously adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosemary Valeska
EDC Recording Secretary

RV

G:\econdev\EDC\MINUTES\2011\2011-02-17 EDC minutes.doc
F: EDC/Minutes #5