

## **LBNL COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP (CAG)**

---

### **CAG Meeting Summary**

Thursday, January 20, 2011

7:00 pm – 9:30 pm

North Berkeley Senior Center

#### *CAG Members Present:*

Rebecca Daly, UC Berkeley (student)  
John DeClerq, Berkeley Chamber of Commerce  
Marcos Gandara, Community member  
William Gilbert, Claremont Elmwood Neighborhood Association (CENA)  
Paul Licht, UC Botanical Garden  
Dan Marks, City of Berkeley Planning Department  
Dean Metzger, Berkeleyans for a Livable University Environment (BLUE)  
Phil Price, LBNL (employee)  
Phila Rogers, Community member  
Carole Schemmerling, Strawberry Creek Watershed Council  
Rich Sextro, Berkeley resident  
Elizabeth Stage, Lawrence Hall of Science  
Anne Wagley, Community member

#### *CAG Members Absent:*

LeRoy Blea, Berkeley Community Health Commission  
Whitney Dotson, Community member  
Mark McCleod, Buy Local Berkeley

### **Welcome and Introductions**

Daniel Iacofano of MIG welcomed Community Advisory Group (CAG) members, community members and staff, and provided a brief introduction to the evening's primary topics of discussion.

The evening was devoted to a discussion of future process and procedure, including how the CAG organizes and operates effectively, and how this process can help ensure that the CAG has an impact on the Lab as it pertains to community. The Lab and MIG will take cues from the CAG to build upon suggestions made to date. There have been preparatory meetings held with CAG members that inform the evening's discussion. Memos summarizing these conversations were available at the meeting and were sent to CAG members. They are also available on the CAG website ([www.lbnl-cag.org](http://www.lbnl-cag.org)).

Two new CAG members joined the group: John DeClerq, new Co-CEO of the Berkeley Chamber of Commerce, and Rich Sextro, community member and former LBNL employee.

### **Update on Currently Proposed and Possible Future Capital Construction Projects**

Jerry O'Hearn provided a brief description and overview of the status of following planned LBNL capital improvement projects:

- Seismic Phase 3
- Solar Energy Research Project (SERC): the NEPA document is complete and copies of the document are available for those interested
- User Test Bed Facility
- BELLA
- Seismic Phase 2
- Computational Research and Theory facility (CRT)
- Old Town Demolition
- Bevatron Demolition

CAG member requests and concerns related to the projects reviewed include:

- The need to buffer noise impacts of the Bevatron demolition
- A request to provide a map that illustrates all project locations
- More conversation about the User Test Bed Facility and opportunity to influence the visual design
- The need to discuss CRT
- More information about BELLA, including the location of construction, environmental impact, and environmental testing and mitigations
- Provide clarification on the SERC NEPA document
- Clarification of “truck routes” and related parking and traffic impacts, and the use of Blackberry Canyon access to construction sites

Elizabeth Stage recommended organizing future meetings by key issues related to a number of projects, rather than focusing discussion on individual projects. For example, the BELLA project footprint is such a small area. Projects with impacts involving truck routes and parking include CRT, Seismic Phase II, Old Town Demolition and Bevatron.

Daniel shared that the Lab and MIG are working to build the agenda of meeting topics for 2011 and will post all possible meeting topics for 2011 once complete.

### **CAG Member Recommendations to Improve Future Meetings and Process**

Following the capital improvement projects update, the group transitioned to a discussion about future CAG meetings and process, and key areas of concern to be addressed in the coming year. Following is a summary of the four topics covered during this discussion:

- CAG composition and attendance
- Meeting preparation and process
- Potential meeting topics
- Upcoming meeting

CAG member questions and comments regarding each topic are summarized in the following sections.

### **CAG Composition and Attendance**

Two key areas of concern facing the CAG in the coming year include group composition and consistent attendance at CAG meetings. Concerns about group composition center on questions about stakeholder representation on the CAG and whether there are additional stakeholder groups missing.

#### *CAG Member Questions and Comments*

Following is a summary of CAG member comments and questions related to group composition:

- Three members suggested that a representative from the UC Berkeley facilities office join the CAG. A group member suggested UC planner Chris Adams as a potential CAG member.
- *Lab comment:* There is a good working relationship with UC Berkeley, but a representative was not initially invited due to concerns that substantial CAG discussion then might focus on issues related to UCB rather than the Lab. However, given that topics related to UCB surface during group meetings, Sam agreed to discuss UCB participation with a UCB representative.
- Rebecca Daly requested that the Lab send CAG materials in advance of meetings, so that she can talk with and gather input from other graduate students prior to the meeting. Otherwise, her comments and observations only represent her opinions and not those of graduate students as a whole.
- Other members also suggested that materials be sent out before the meeting, so that appropriate speakers can be invited to present on key topics. In addition, members can solicit opinions from others about topics.
- Invite a nature or wildlife representative to join the CAG.
- *Lab comment:* Invitations have been sent to Department of Toxic Substances Control, Regional Water Quality Control Board, and the BAAQMD, and followed up with a phone call. State agencies said that they have limited staff, have been coping with furloughs and have limited capacity to send a representative. They said they might send a representative to meetings where a particular topic is related to their work. (Note: RWQCB did have a representative at the November CAG meeting.)
- Improve communications with neighborhoods surrounding the Lab. Anne Wagley researched and reported findings about best practices from similar DOE CAG groups, but did not explicitly recommend that the CAG follow the examples provided. Suggestions included speaking with the Lawrence Livermore CAG about their representation and structure. The EPA also has a structure for monitoring CAGs, particularly for superfund sites.
- CAG members need to arrive at meetings prepared and that they should pledge to engage actively in the meetings.

- There was general agreement about tightening enforcement of the attendance policies. Attendance should be more strictly enforced according to the original agreement and participation commitment. If a member misses two CAG meetings unexcused, then they should be removed from the group. Members should clearly communicate with the group if they are unable to attend.
- Once member remarked that attendance is frequently good, and did not understand concerns raised about attendance. She suggested keeping an attendance record and designating a knowledgeable second if members cannot attend.

### **Meeting Preparation and Process**

The next topic included discussion about advanced notice of the meeting agenda and the need for community members to have opportunities to speak and participate. The CAG wants to have time to discuss the issues, and suggests streamlining meeting operations so that they can delve more deeply into substantive material with sufficient time to discuss issues.

#### *CAG Member Questions and Comments*

Following is a summary of CAG member comments and questions related to meeting preparation and process:

- One group member asked if there is a way to identify members who have strong knowledge of a topic area, and to bring them into the group discussions. In response, another group member offered an example about how it might be helpful to invite a representative from the Creeks Council when the CAG discusses surface water issues at the Lab.
- Preparing for meetings and digesting technical information takes a lot of time. Distributing meeting packets early can allow for extra time to review background materials in preparation for the meeting.
- An agenda committee of two or three people should be created to maintain consistency in planning CAG meetings. The Lab could send CAG members communication stating the topic of the meeting and the CAG could invite interested individuals to the meeting. Then CAG members could vet the credibility, publications and public speaking of the person, rather than asking Sam or Daniel to do it. This could also allow for different points of view on a topic. Dean was nominated as a committee member.
- A key concern was that some CAG members are only representing themselves because they have significant knowledge of the topic area. Daniel referenced the CAG charge and suggested revisiting it to ensure that it does not imply that one person “represents” others. Rather, CAG members should be more active networkers.
- The Lab should do a better job of tying up loose details from meetings, particularly since issues are of broad community interest. For instance, the geology of the hill is being reviewed, and a member would like to give an update in March.

### Potential Meeting Topics

The next item of discussion was about potential future meeting topics, and opportunities to address issues of concern and community participation. It is acknowledged that building projects fall into this category. CAG members provided suggestions for additional topics.

### CAG Member Comments

The following is a summary of CAG member comments related to potential future meeting topics:

- **Natural history.** Investigate possibilities for long-term environmental protection from a Lab and natural history perspective, particularly in Upper Strawberry Canyon. As the major tenant in the canyon, the Lab has impact.
- **Climate action plan, energy use and environmental management,** including water, noise, air quality and a discussion of nano particles. Invite the EPA and BAAQMD to participate. Discussion could focus on site development at the Lab, where it will be going in 2020, and how it will impact erosion, groundwater, surface water runoff and creeks. Bring in local creek experts and discuss mitigations (general or specific CEQA and NEPA documents) and the designation of a conservation zone.
- **Creek and land contamination.** Discussion could focus on what is impacting the canyon and the environment generally. Clean-up measures are a particular concern. Consider inviting the DOTC to give a presentation on the issue.
- **Eucalyptus trees.** Discussion could include how to manage them.
- **Transportation demand management (TDM) at the Lab.** Discussions could include long-range planning to minimize traffic and changes to the Long-Range Development Plan (LRDP). Key topics include: how the LRDP is affected by the new approach; what is coming up in the next 10 years; planning for new sites; community engagement; and programmatic and employment impacts.
- **Land use.** Discussion can include development of a second site as well as site development concepts more broadly.
- **Site development.** This is a key topic, because it is important to communities and varies on a site by site basis. Construction timing, disruptions and impacts are particular issues.
- **Claremont/Elmwood neighborhood safety impacts.** Traffic comes through the neighborhood to the Lab and the UC. This has an impact on roads and safety, and there is the perception among the community that truck traffic is not controlled. Discussion topics could include truck routes through neighborhoods and communication with the City of Berkeley.
- **Taxes and payments in lieu of taxes (PILOT).** Topic could include a discussion about whether the Lab can make contributions to the community in lieu of not paying property taxes.
- **Community outreach and engagement.** Topic can include discussion regarding how to increase community education about key issues, and how to effectively communicate planning to the public. Topic can include a discussion of what the Lab's role should be in the community.

### Upcoming Meeting

The final topic of the evening included discussions about how to approach the upcoming CAG meeting on the 17<sup>th</sup>. Because transportation and the LRDP were discussed during previous meetings, Daniel requested guidance from the group to determine what the meeting topic should be. Following is a summary of member comments and suggestions for upcoming topics:

- **New truck concerns.** Discussion could focus on determining truck routes and related impacts, and include overall transportation concerns.
- **Surface water and creeks.** This topic could also include contamination and clean-up concerns. This may be a good opportunity to hear from the Urban Creeks Council.
- **Second site.** There may be more information to discuss by May.
- **Sustainability.** This could be a discussion topic for half a meeting in May.
- **A broader scope.** Open up the topic to include discussion of the Lab's plans and related impacts, and how to tie up loose ends from prior discussions.
- **Lab's global vision.** This is a new discussion topic. It will be helpful to know the Lab's vision for the next 10 years. This could also be incorporated into a discussion about the second site.
- **Health issues.** Discussion about the panoramic hill breast cancer clump and contamination. This may be a topic that should be opened up to the public.

### Public Comment

- There should be a designated conservation area. A second campus should not be built unless it can help the community.
- The CAG should select a Committee chairman to overcome process and organizational problems.
- Berkeley citizen's think of the canyon as a natural resource; one that is very fragile. Is further development in the Canyon the right approach?
- Please clarify the purpose and mission of the group. After reading the Federal guidelines, it seems important to follow them. In addition, how much money has been spent on the CAG process? There should be a clear purpose and transparency. A suggested topic for the next meeting is to establish and agree on the ultimate goal of the group.

### Next Steps

The next step is to consolidate and summarize the meeting notes, and determine key meeting topics and what resources are needed to support discussion. This summary will be circulated once complete. The Lab and CAG will also examine and adjust the group's charge and processes to improve clarity moving forward.

## **LBNL COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP (CAG)**

---

The next CAG meeting will take place on Thursday, March 17, 2011 at the North Berkeley Community Center, beginning at 7:00pm.

**Staff note:** The second campus RFQ was released on January 3, 2011. It is available at: <http://www.lbl.gov/Community/second-campus/> Responses are due by March 4.