

The purpose of this report is to provide information to the Oakland Alameda County Coliseum Authority regarding potential of seven sites to accommodate a future home for the Oakland Athletics. This report documents the Phase I and II Scope of Work per the Agreement between Oakland Alameda County Coliseum Authority and HOK Sport, Inc., dated October 11, 2001.

We believe site location is the most critical issue to the success of a ballpark. From our review in 1987 of 26 sites for Oriole Park at Camden Yards, to our subsequent work with 22 Major League Ballclubs, we have gained an intimate knowledge of the special nuances that make a great site. A great site can reinforce and structure on-site and off-site development, and they can energize a City's edge or complete its downtown. Each ballpark should be designed to support its neighborhood by meshing seamlessly with its activities and environment.

Ballparks should create unforgettable and unique experiences as part of the romance with each city. We believe ballparks must be the right size and the right location to provide the right result. We have prepared this report so that readers will understand and ultimately support our evaluations.

SITES

All seven sites are located in Alameda County and are described as follows:

URBAN

- Howard Terminal
- Uptown
- Oak to 9th
- Laney College

SUBURBAN

- Coliseum
- Fremont
- Pleasanton

Each site was evaluated and developed in accordance with the Phase II Scope of Work, which included: on-site development, ballpark footprint and off-site development including parking options. During Phase I a specific ballpark program and site requirements were reviewed and approved with public officials and the Oakland Athletics. These requirements were focused on a 42,000-seat ballpark for Opening Day 2006.

None of the sites studied are problem free or without certain risks associated with a public project of this scale. The central question of this report is which of the seven sites, after all analysis and factors are weighed, offers the best potential for a successful project.

In order to provide an appropriate evaluation, HOK Sport has developed specific site requirements for Urban and Suburban sites.

PROCESS

The review team visually inspected each site to determine specific issues and to test assumptions. Included in the review team were: Parsons Brinckerhoff (Traffic, Transit, & Parking), Rutherford and Chekene (Structural, Civil, Geotechnical and Environmental), and Clark Construction Company, Inc. (Construction Cost and Scheduling). The review team met with many city and county members, including: Dan Marks and Chris Smith of Fremont; Chris Gray, Pat Cashman and Stewart Cook of Alameda County; Adolf Marinelli of Pleasanton; Ron Winter of Trumark/Assyst Corporation; Allen Mullen and Joseph Azar of Ruggeri, Jensen & Azar & Associates; and Rosie Rios, Jeff Chew, Kathy Kleinbaum, Eric Uddenberg and Frank Fanelli of the City of Oakland.

EVALUATION FACTORS

The site selection matrix and five criteria categories were initially created in 1987. Since that time, this matrix has been used to analyze and rank potential sites for sports facilities including baseball parks, football stadiums, and arenas in both urban and suburban settings. Analyses of the site issues explored by these five categories have consistently proven to be an objective way to rank potential sites. Each site was evaluated based on the following factors:

- Urban Design: establishes the relationship with the city and considers the overall fan experience.
- Traffic, Transit and Parking: determines the convenience a site offers for automobiles, buses, transit and pedestrians within acceptable levels.
- Site Factors: influences the overall cost and difficulties in developing projects of this scale.
- Cost: establishes the funding limitations.
- Timing: determines the momentum a site offers to the Athletics and the timing of increased revenue.

RESULTS

The results of these evaluations are as follows:

- From an Urban Design factor, the Uptown Site rated the highest with Howard Terminal a close second.
- From a Traffic, Transit and Parking factor, the Uptown Site again rated the highest with the Coliseum and Fremont sites rating a close second and third.
- From a Site factor, the Uptown site rated the highest due to the amount of in-place infrastructure. The Fremont Site was a close second.
- From a Cost and Schedule factor, the Uptown Site was the most favorable when site acquisition, site development, construction, traffic and parking costs were applied. The Coliseum site was a close second.