

PUBLIC OUTREACH MEETING #3
POINT MOLATE LAND USE ALTERNATIVES
Wednesday, November 17, 2010
MEETING NOTES

Approximately 45 people attended this meeting. The project consultant, Design, Community & Environment (DC&E) provide a summary of the proposed land use alternatives submitted by the public and described the evaluation of the alternatives that was completed. Then, the meeting was opened up for questions and comments, which are noted below.

Questions

- ◆ Was DC&E asked to evaluate Casino and other DEIS/R alternatives per criteria? Answer: No.
- ◆ Alt 4: What assumptions about future price of cannabis?
- ◆ Sports complex in Hercules – may not get built in.
- ◆ #13: People in Richmond may not have qualifications -- would it be safe to assume local residents could not fill them?
- ◆ Job training, service workers, etc.
- ◆ University campus, single-use university campus? Could that be incorporated into one of the DEIS/R alternatives? YES, but only an extension-type campus.
- ◆ Methodology – in the report?
- ◆ How is religious facility defined?
- ◆ IMPLAN – publish industry data classifications?
- ◆ What did we assume about land cost?
- ◆ If the alternative has negative land value, would the City have to pay the developer?
- ◆ Did we circulate an RFP to university campuses to solicit interest in the site?
- ◆ Is there regional demand for office and lab space?
- ◆ Resource to figure out acronyms?
- ◆ Could medical cannabis be combined with some other uses? e.g. wildlife park?
- ◆ Why did we assume use of Bldg 1, rather than Bldg 6?
- ◆ Can we find out how Casino San Pablo did with respect to local jobs vs. what it promised?
- ◆ How do the green/hotel components come together? What type of jobs?

- ◆ Will the EIS/R alternatives be evaluated using the same criteria?

Comments

- ◆ Casino San Pablo did not provide the promised number of jobs – can't work in a casino if you have a felony. Also, early jobs may be local but have high turnover.
- ◆ Process puts economic value front and center; natural, bayfront piece of land. Afraid of intense use on the site. Alternatives should be balanced between intensity and open space.
- ◆ Transportation bottle-neck – need to mitigate intersection at 580. Chevron has a transportation artery going through the area.
- ◆ Economics focus is flawed. Nature is an important value.
- ◆ Should not be buildings over 3-4 stories, no parking structures over 3 stories.
- ◆ Presidio trust model: Hold in trust by City and leased out.
- ◆ No giveaways to developers.
- ◆ Pixar maybe could be coaxed back to Richmond.
- ◆ Why is there such a focus on Pt. Molate for economic development when there is so much infill?
- ◆ How does medical marijuana facility meet base reuse plan?
- ◆ Did you calculate footprints of mixed use submittals to compare to the DEIR/S?
- ◆ Priority of base closure is economic development. Create employment.
- ◆ Closed a base in Alameda but preserved space for the Least Tern.
- ◆ Navy: when the reuse plan was created it was not etched in stone. Viewed it as a means to transfer property to the City. Did not expect the property to develop for 20 years.
- ◆ The City should ask for more ideas from a professional.
- ◆ Assumptions for medical marijuana are very optimistic – contributes local employment.
- ◆ Some ideas may not have been brought forward: amusement park, fairyland.
- ◆ Historic buildings and natural environment reminiscent of S.F.:
 - Should do something like that in Pt. Molate.
 - Capture natural assets.
 - Nowhere nice to visit in Richmond, to enjoy, spend money, appreciate.
 - Doesn't look like responsible land use.
- ◆ Would Casino match the criteria?

- ◆ If earning millions of dollars is not enough, how can we believe in the honorable intent of the developer?
- ◆ University Campus: CSUEB changed name in order to expand into Contra Costa County – but CSUEB campus is too far away, so prohibitive for residents to attend.
- ◆ How many jobs would a satellite campus create?
- ◆ College campus would build capacity and reputation of Richmond.
- ◆ Report recognizes that Pt. Molate site is not uniquely suited to medical cannabis; property could be seized.
- ◆ Transit hub – have to be realistic that it would have to be water-borne – Ferry to SF.
 - Ferry makes no sense for the area.
- ◆ Look at increased demand for social services.
- ◆ What is LBNL looking for?
- ◆ Is there anything planned for traffic mitigation?
- ◆ Lots of wonderful ideas came forward
- ◆ City of Richmond owns the land and the City makes a decision about what happens.