

V2V2 August 29th Session Comment Cards

(By category)

Site Plan/Proposed Project (Program, LBNL, Development, Scale, Open Space)

- 110 ft tall buildings block the view, except for those on the bay side of the buildings.
- Density of lab “campus” and other proposed uses seems insufficient to support “real” pedestrian environment—retail is too distributed.
- It is unlikely that somebody getting off work at the labs would walk to the south end of the site to have coffee, dinner, etc. The distance is too great. So retail would have to be automobile-served—not good.
- ¼ to ½ mile radius and walkability “index” has not been provided.
- Opens spaces between buildings way too big. Better to create streets and more urban plan. It will be more walkable and feel like Albany and surrounding communities. Sprawling Silicon-Valley-type layout is not appropriate. Think Emeryville, Portland Pearl District, not San Jose office park. Strategic height/slender towns would improve aesthetics.
- It would have been much less impact to have the racetrack plus “mall” than “campus” plus “mall”... and better revenue!
- The problem with the design is that it divides Eastshore Park in half. It needs to be more efficient.
- Not enough open space (space between buildings does not count).
- Building is too close to the water.
- No building should be higher than existing structures within the same view corridor. This includes the grandstand or light poles in different areas.
- Too many buildings.
- Building too tall, exceeds grandstand height.
- I’m concerned about the height of proposed buildings, insufficient real open space, and insufficient retail and revenue for city and school district.
- I can only support this project when it meets open space at 75%.
- Preserve waterfront for recreational and natural use.
- Do not block already established views. I prefer a bay cleanup and a substantial beach for regional enjoyment. If there is no way to prevent a lab on the shoreline property, then require a beach stretch along with the lab and other amenities on the shoreline.
- Regarding LBNL at GGF and “70% of participants were supportive”—I was probably one of those at that point, but now feel that with no open discussion and the prepared maps, that I did what many did—rearrange what was handed to me instead of feeling free to reject the plans.
- Waterfront needs housing—need 24 hour presence.
- It’s wonderful that the city has provided an opportunity for Albany citizens to provide input on the shoreline through the V2V process. However, only a small percentage of citizens participated in the process. The V2V doc should be used as a guiding document, not a rigid template. Good public policy requires a degree of flexibility/give and take.
- V2V showed that Albany wants 75% open space at the waterfront. If LBNL prefers the GGF site, then V2V’s preference should be honored, and development limited to 25% of the site. LBNL needs can be accommodated in this 25%.

- Cluster the buildings so that they don't take up so much of the site.
- It looks like a big industrial park.
- I would like to see development that is more Asilomar-like. Conference center/hotel — revenue-generating, much less density, more wilderness, permaculture.
- "One in a million" chance for Albany to have something worthwhile at GGF. The plan has plenty of open space for this 40-year resident of Albany (and a 40-year member of the Sierra Club). Albany should not have to provide more open space than other East Bay cities (as a percentage of city waterfront property).

Financial (Taxes, Revenues, City Costs, Etc.)

- Please compare the loss of racetrack money to that which will be raised by new development.
- It seems that we (the city) could get more revenue and more open space without LBNL being involved.
- Albany not only needs the racetrack funding, but a large increase in new funding to survive.
- Financial implications need to be clear.
- I oppose the LBNL project because it would devote too much of the buildable area of the site to a non-tax revenue generating development. To meet Albany's revenue needs from that site, the site will be quite developed.
- Lack of property/sales tax revenue to Albany long-term.
- The racetrack has provided a large share of Albany money to both city and schools.

Messages to the Developers and LBNL

- I feel by coming in with such a large development you will lose the support of those who may have been in favor of an LBNL project. The property owners appear too greedy.
- Your vision is all about what's best for LBL and what a great institution it is. I worked at both UC Berkeley and LBL and have fond feelings for both. But I feel that the Albany waterfront is an inappropriate site for this lab, and will not enhance Albany's land use. It would totally change the atmosphere from open space to large buildings blocking views, and not conducive to strollers, children, dogs, etc.
- I think a 3D model and views from multiple points are needed to visualize this development from the hills and on-site (both day and night views).
- Please thank the presenters who took their time to answer our questions tonight. I apologize on behalf of the Albany community for the behavior of a few audience members who were rude and strident. Not everyone in the audience lives in Albany.
- I hope we will be able to find a way to get LBL lab. The developers seem highly skilled and thoughtful. It's the most interesting project we've ever had.
- The challenge developing on the waterfront is balancing the concerns regarding development, open space, and revenue. Given that this plan already is at a deficit on the revenue side due to the LBL tax exemption and appears to exceed the previous controversial proposal from Caruso. Seems that this LBL proposal moves in the wrong direction on both fronts. This seems a blatant disregard for the intent of the residents of Albany.
- Please go to another location that is willing to accept you with open arms, such as Alameda or Richmond locations. That's our vision.
- Lab will find community support through the entitlement process. People want to work with a partner with shared values like LBNL. This is a great opportunity for sustainable (in every sense) development, local science education, better public access to shoreline. Albany Hill Park is a poor scale comparison because people don't know it. Use Memorial Park.
- Concerned about Measure C potentially being overridden.

Environment/ Energy Issues

- Concerns about environmental impact/nuclear waste.
- FAQ #45 regarding the site's energy needs appeared to be quite vague, relatively unimpressive, and noncommittal, especially considering that LBNL conducts extensive pioneering research and analysis related to energy efficiency and renewable energy. Building a new LBNL campus seems like a rare, valuable opportunity to implement state-of-the-art energy supply and demand measures, and strategies, and projects. The California Public Utilities has started an initiative to develop policies and programs for zero net energy buildings. LBNL should strongly consider creating such a showcase at its new campus, wherever it is site. (P.S. Tonight's remarks from a panelist were striking different from the written response. Which characterization is the actual LBNL/developer position?

Traffic

- When we consider the traffic problems such a large development would cause on the already extremely congested I-80 corridor, it is clear that LBNL is the wrong proposal for this site.
- Transit has not been addressed!
- Concerned about traffic through Buchanan and Gilman (also 80!).
- With expected increase in populations and traffic we must save the GGF for expanded recreational use for all our future generations.

The Q&A Session Format/Logistics

- Please use a clearer, cleaner PA system.
- Please have responders stand to answer.
- I like the 4-question format.

From the Evaluation Forms

Would you attend another large format Q&A Session?

- Yes 76%
- No 11%
- Maybe 5%
- No response 8%

Comments from Evaluation Forms

Logistics/Format

- Only if the sound and lighting are improved. (Approx. 20 comments about poor sound system)
- Let's hope they have some real answers next time.
- Weekends much better though; during the week it can be too early to leave work or can go too late for a weeknight
- Needs to be shorter! (Approx 5 comments that session was too long)
- Recommend that the moderator read the questions from collected cards rather than giving audience members a chance to speechify and rant.
- Need more balance in the program—then it would be more useful—not just the developer.
- Would prefer smaller sessions.
- These are better than the smaller V2V sessions.
- Please prohibit clapping or shouting agreement, and stick to your 1 person/ 1 question restriction.
- Grouping question type was a good idea
- But I like the open house better
- Too many people were allowed to ramble on, make rants, applaud, insult, etc. Ask speakers to identify where they live; too many clearly have axes to grind no matter what the facts.

Content

- But only if there are going to be some solid answers. I don't like wasting my time, neither should you!
- Thank you so much for having these sessions!
- I'd come back if there is new information

Miscellaneous

- Hopefully they will withdraw
- Sometimes the panelists didn't really listen to the questions
- Developer should have somebody more straightforward and less evasive

Would you attend another session more like the previous Voices to Vision participatory sessions, if they were held in the next 5-6 weeks?

- Yes 70%
- No 8%
- Maybe 10%
- No response 12%

Comments

- Voices to Vision was more informative than the LBNL presentation
- Especially if it would entertain (?) a comprehensive more Albany-friendly approach
- More useful than another Q&A
- Continued opportunity for information would be helpful
- I'm very interested in this proposal and eager to participate. V2V2 is a very useful and enlightening process
- Absolutely
- More time for comments
- If there is new information
- The residents don't really have a say
- I think such sessions are great
- I won't come unless the developer says they will reduce the height and footprint first
- I'd only come if they were less structured with more Q&A, and more opportunity to address fundamental land use issues, not just "validate" LBNL/TSG proposal by "installing" development
- Citizen concerns will not be addressed in a real way—especially a reflection of LBNL in Albany
- I prefer the Q&A format.