

LBNL COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP (CAG)

CAG Meeting Summary

Thursday, March 17, 2011

7:00 pm – 9:30 pm

North Berkeley Senior Center

CAG Members Present:

Andreas Cluver, Building & Construction Trades Council of California

John DeClerq, Berkeley Chamber of Commerce

Whitney Dotson, Community member

Marcos Gandara, Community member

Paul Licht, UC Botanical Garden

Mark McLeod, Buy Local Berkeley

Dean Metzger, Berkeleyans for a Livable University Environment (BLUE)

Phil Price, LBNL (employee)

Phila Rogers, Community member

Carole Schemmerling, Strawberry Creek Watershed Council

Elizabeth Stage, Lawrence Hall of Science

Wendy Cosin, City of Berkeley Planning Department (alternative)

CAG Members Absent:

LeRoy Blea, Berkeley Community Health Commission

Rebecca Daly, UC Berkeley (student)

Dan Marks, City of Berkeley Planning Department

Rich Sextro, Berkeley resident

Anne Wagley, Community member

Welcome and Introductions

Daniel Iacofano of MIG welcomed Community Advisory Group (CAG) members, community members and staff, and briefly reviewed the revised CAG documents resulting from the January 11, 2011 CAG meeting. He explained that at the previous meeting the CAG had decided on a more discursive meeting format with less emphasis on formal presentations. As a result revisions had been made to the CAG Organizing Framework, as well as the new schedule of meetings and topics for discussion.

The evening's agenda included a presentation from Dr. Paul Alivisatos, Director of LBNL, highlighting his vision for the future of the Lab, as well as presentation and discussions about transportation program developments and Lab construction-related transportation. Presentations supplementing these conversations were available at the meeting and had been sent to CAG members in advance. They are also available on the CAG website (www.lbnl-cag.org).

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 – Concept Design may begin 2010
- Solar Energy Research Project (SERC) – In design; CEQA/NEPA Approved
- User Test Bed Facility – In preliminary design
- BELLA – In construction
- Computational Research and Theory facility (CRT) – Bidding Phase
- Seismic Phase 2 – B74 in construction; B25 in demolition; GPL bidding phase
- Old Town Demolition – In demolition
- Bevatron Demolition – In demolition

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

- Accuracy on CRT building location on the map.
- *Lab Comment:* The aspect ratio may be a bit off, but the location is accurate.
- The Lab's interest in receiving community input on these projects.
- *Lab Comment:* Lab requests and encourages comments on Seismic Phase 3 and SERC the Test Bed in early stages of design.
- Request for more detailed project plans and surrounding plans (with more detailed maps) to be sent to CAG members in order to make more intelligent comments.
- Interest in seeing how many are employed, how they commute and how they impact the community around us.
- Interest in further discussion of second campus at the May 9 meeting, especially if the location will be in Berkeley.
- Request for more CAG input into the meeting topics. Daniel stated that it would be discussed at the end of the night's meeting.
- Request for update on process of considering suggested new CAG members.
- Interest in work force development data, in regards to dollar amount of projects and breakdown of work hours.
- A benefit of construction is the opportunity to put Berkeley folks to work on these projects.

Brief Update on Status of Second Campus Planning Process

Sam Chapman updated the CAG members on the status of the Second Campus planning process. He informed the CAG that the scheduled call for submissions in response for the RFQ had taken place March 4. Sam reported that the Lab received over 20 proposals, which are currently under review, and that they have a target goal of mid- to late-April to make a decision on a short list of roughly 3-5 proposals. The Lab will update CAG members at the May 9, 2011 CAG meeting and, if it is available, share the short list of sites with the group.

CAG members inquired as to whether there was a system built-in for the process of public comment. Sam responded that once they identify the short list, the Lab intends to undertake public outreach in the communities where short listed sites are located to share plans and provide an opportunity for comments and dialogue.

Presentation on Vision for the Future of LBNL

Paul Alivisatos, LBNL Executive Director, began his presentation by thanking the CAG members for their participation in this process and added that the Lab is sincerely interested in engaging the community by sharing information and hearing community concerns and opinions.

The presentation included an overview of the history of the Lab and how it is intertwined with the history of Berkeley and the greater East Bay. Founder E.O Lawrence is credited with originating “team science,” which brings scientists from different disciplines together to tackle problems. His work changed the culture of science. Berkeley Lab has continued this tradition of team science. Scientists associated with LBNL have won 11 Nobel Prizes and continue to undertake many projects in the legacy of Lawrence.

Paul invited those CAG members who hadn’t had a chance to tour the lab to do so. He also highlighted a few of the Lab’s world-class facilities, including: the Advanced Light Source, Joint Genome Institute (which sequences microbes and plants) and the National Center for Electron Microscopy which has the highest resolution electron microscope in the world;

Paul reviewed Carbon Cycle 2.0, a major initiative for the Lab and probably its largest team science project. The Lab’s goal with Carbon 2.0 is to perform the science that will allow us to have a stable carbon cycle in the future; If CO₂ is emitted into the atmosphere, we need another process to take it out, or not burn the fossil fuel in the first place. Looking at the Lab as a whole, more than half of Lab scientists are engaged in research around this activity. Paul invited people to see a technical talk he gave to LBNL scientists summarizing what Lab scientists know about climate impacts of CO₂ emissions, which is available at www.carboncycle2.lbl.gov. Through Carbon 2.0 the Lab is engaged in work on various projects that address carbon emissions including: combustion, carbon capture and storage, biofuels and artificial photosynthesis. He also added that the best thing we can do to deal with the problem is to use a lot less energy through energy efficiency. Solar and energy storage projects in the developing world are also a fundamental part of the solution due to their projected growth. The Lab has been involved in projects such as the Darfur Stove and UV Waterworks, both of which provide developing countries with solutions that use energy much more efficiently.

Paul concluded by addressing the Lab’s community outreach work, a critical part of which relates to science education. Currently every 5th grader in the East Bay is given an opportunity to visit the Advanced Light Source Synchrotron. The Lab is also developing a new campaign called “Cool Your School,” which they hope will engage East Bay students in science and give them more information about how they can get involved in issues of energy and environment in the future.

CAG member requests and concerns related to the Vision for the Future presentation:

- Phil Price mentioned that he personally works on LBNL projects like those mentioned in Paul’s presentation, including carbon sequestration and commercial building energy efficiency.
- Mark McLeod asked whether work was being done between scientists and economists in terms of solutions that might be provided to developing countries and how that work is funded.

- *Lab Comment:* There are a number of economists and policy people at the Lab, and those numbers are likely to grow. We'd like to multiply our work many times over and create projects that make economic sense and will be used in developing countries.
- Paul Licht pointed out that Lab has a big PR issue to get these messages out to the community. He stated that the positive should outweigh the negative when it comes to the Lab's work and reputation.
- Carole Schemmerling stated that the nuclear work the Lab has done has not been kind to its reputation, especially in the area of contamination. She added that she hoped that the issue of contamination is as important for the lab as the final product and hopes that these good projects don't cause contamination.
- *Lab Comment:* The Lab's Sustainability Plan is something that the CAG will review and discuss at a future meeting.

Discussion on Transportation

Jerry O'Hearn began his presentation by reviewing management of construction traffic. The scope of the program is to manage and minimize the impacts of site construction traffic and parking, including the number of trucks coming onto the site and truck travel within the site. Jerry explained that Matt Vail, Chief Construction Manager, takes part in all weekly team meetings and tracks all truck trips (projected and actual). He also added that the Lab has limits on truck trips (an average of 49 per day on and off the hill) and makes a point to adhere to these.

Jerry informed the group that for smaller projects contractor trucks can park on-site within the bounds of the project site, while for larger projects they usually park off-site and are brought up on shuttles. Although not specifically in their contract, we strongly recommend that contractors use University Avenue to access the campus from Interstate 80, especially when driving large trucks. In terms of weight of loads, the Lab follows Caltrans requirements, which limit loads to 20,000 lbs/axle with a maximum weight of 80,000 lbs. He added that most site related truck loads weigh far less than that. The largest truck at the Lab in the last seven years moved a transformer and weighed roughly 150,000 lbs, but that truck had to go through a City of Berkeley and Caltrans permitting process. In regard to impacts on sewers, Jerry stated that Lab considers and addresses impacts in CEQA documents. Through the CEQA process the Lab also did traffic modeling that extended from the Lab to I-80 and includes traffic from both the City of Berkeley and Berkeley campus. This modeling addressed impacts of construction traffic and operations (post-construction). As a result of the CEQA process, the Lab is prepared, once the City of Berkeley is ready, to do their part in upgrading intersections in order to mitigate the impact of Lab traffic. Jerry concluded by stating that their goal was not to exceed 49 truck trips/day or 980 truck trips/month and that, while they had occasionally exceeded their daily goal, they have kept all monthly truck trips at 980 or below.

CAG Member Questions and Comments

CAG members raised the following questions or concerns related to construction traffic:

- Paul Licht asked for clarification on whether construction will ever go up Centennial.
- *Lab Comment:* The Lab discourages using that route because of the construction at the stadium.

- Wendy Cosin inquired as to whether there had been discussion regarding street maintenance and impacts to University Avenue, which was just repaved.
- *Lab Comment:* At a previous CAG meeting impacts to streets were discussed and the Lab's impacts were reported to be very small by a City of Berkeley representative, in single digits. Jerry's calculations indicate the number is as low as 2-3% and therefore not a significant impact to city streets..
- Dean Metzger inquired as to how off-site parking was chosen.
- *Lab Comment:* Off-site parking is chosen project-by-project based on availability of parking lots.
- Dean asked if there are any incentives for workers not to drive personal vehicles.
- *Lab Comment:* Currently no incentives are provided, but the Lab is interested in looking for ways to encourage construction workers to get away from single occupancy vehicles.
- Dean inquired as to whether the Lab was financially involved with the repaving of University Avenue.
- *Lab Comment:* Jerry stated that to his knowledge the Lab was not involved.
- Dean asked whether truck impacts onto Hearst Avenue were taken into account.
- *Lab Comment:* Jerry responded that he needed to check the EIR for precise locations, but that the Lab has committed to paying its fair share for upgrading four intersections in Berkeley.
- Dean followed-up with a question about how the Lab calculates the weight of the trucks coming to and from their sites.
- *Lab Comment:* The materials coming to the sites were materials that, by nature, would not exceed the 80,000 lb limit set by Caltrans. In the rare case of heavier materials, a special permitting process is followed. Both the load and the truck are weighed and recorded before leaving the site.
- Phil Price pointed out that it is possible that no single user has more than 3 percent of trucking impacts going up the hill. So, if everyone says their load isn't significant, then there is no one to take responsibility for road repair.
- Daniel asked whether the Lab has mitigated impacts through EIRs before.
- *Lab Comment:* The 2006 Long-Range Plan included mitigated impacts, but Jerry said he would have to check for information prior to that.
- Carol pointed out that the Molecular Foundry never went through an EIR.
- *Lab Comment:* Jerry stated that the project went through the CEQA process resulting in a neg dec (negative declaration).
- Carol said that it was not a full CEQA.
- Dean stated he was very curious about whether there were programs at the Lab to get employees out of their cars.

Jim Dahlgard from the facilities division of LBNL gave the CAG members an update on transportation. He began by answering Dean's question, stating that currently the Lab does not offer a financial incentive to employees that take alternative transportation. He also stated that the Lab is in the process of developing a survey which will incorporate some of Dean's written questions and collect some significant new information.

LBNL COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP (CAG)

Jim addressed the bus injury accident that happened March 7th at Shattuck and Center. He stated that the City of Berkeley is investigating, and a report will be issued in about a week. Jim explained that the Lab contracts its bus service to MV Transportation. After the accident the lab re-evaluated MV Transportation and found that they require over 100 hours of training before anyone drives a bus, as well as providing remedial training and on-going safety training. On the day of the accident the safety inspector for MV was at the scene immediately. Additionally, MV provided special training to all drivers the day after the accident.

Jim gave a LBNL transportation overview stating that most employees take buses to the Lab, although some walk and a few bike to work. There is 1 parking space for every 2 people who work at the Lab, which encourages alternative transportation. At least 50 percent of our staff take at least some form of alternate transportation to get to work. Most employees don't drive single occupancy vehicles. The lab recently converted to an outside bus contract and, after conversion, they saw a 15 percent increase in ridership. Ridership has also been going up more recently. They believe this is due to the increase in the price of gas. He added that buses use B20 fuel (biodiesel), run from 6:20am – 7:30pm and include amenities like Wi-Fi and bike racks. There are 58,500 single trip riders per month and 3,000 bicycles per month. The lab also has a "Next Bus" system to make it easier for employees to access the bus schedule via phone and internet.

Next, Jim gave an overview of the Lab's vehicle fleet, explaining that they had reduced the fleet by 36 vehicles since 2005 and that many of the current vehicles use alternative ethanol fuels. The Lab's fleet also includes 59 "GEM" electric vehicles, which have charging stations throughout the lab. The fleet vehicles are monitored by GPS tracking to assess utilization.

Another program that encourages alternative modes of transportation is an after-hours taxi service for employees who may need to leave the Lab after regular bus service is concluded for the night. This service is used by approximately 675 riders a month. It transports people to the BART station or along the LBNL bus line.

The Lab also uses Zimride, a Lab-paid service to match carpoolers based on location and car-travel preferences. 678 employees have registered for this service. As an added incentive the Lab will give preferred parking to carpoolers with three or more occupants.

Some 45% of employees live within a five mile radius to Lab. Some 35% of Berkeley residents drive their personal vehicles to work, but, when surveyed, only 65 people of those that drive said they would be willing to take the bus if the route changed. Consequently, the Lab determined that further expansion was not warranted.

CAG Member Questions and Comments

CAG members raised the following questions or concerns related to transportation:

- Phil Price stated that he bikes and takes the shuttle to the Lab every day and that the increase in ridership is having a noticeable impact. Although it's good that more people are riding, he has observed several times when people (bikers or groups of riders) are unable to get on the bus because it is at full capacity. He pointed out that the EIR for the Long Range Development Plan required expanded service to meet the increased demand. He inquired as to whether there were plans to increase service.

- *Lab Comment:* If there really is a need, the Lab will investigate costs and make a proposal to increase service.
- John DeClerq suggested talking to MV to get statistics on vacant seats or number of people standing during trips.
- Paul Licht advocated for coordinating campus and shuttle buses.
- *Lab Comment:* One of the challenges is site access because IDs are required to enter the Lab.
- Phil added that there will always be empty buses for part of the day.
- Andreas Cluver inquired as to whether the contracted bus drivers were represented by a union.
- *Lab Comment:* The MV bus drivers are represented by the Teamsters.
- Mark McLeod pointed out that the University has a very successful incentive program for their students to use AC Transit.
- John suggested that construction managers could ask the Building Trades Council if there were workers of specific trades that could take transit.

Daniel wrapped up the discussion by asking for details on the transportation survey the lab is preparing. Jim will provide an update when more information is available.

Discussion to Confirm Meeting Topics for 2011

Daniel introduced and reviewed the proposed meeting topics and explained that they were derived from the discussion that took place at the January 2011 CAG meeting. He reminded the group that they probably wouldn't have agreement on every topic, but he hoped that there could be something in the schedule for everyone. Additional meetings would be a possibility, but Daniel noted that scheduling meetings more frequently than every two months is difficult.

Following is a summary of member comments and suggestions for schedule and upcoming topics:

- Move topic of Sustainability to May 9
- Move topic of Forest Canopy and Wildlife Habitat (including Upper Strawberry Canyon) to July 14
- Move topic of Surface Water and Creeks to September 22
- Move topic of Air Quality and Nano Technology to November 10
- Change CAG meeting time to 6:00 – 8:30 pm, instead of 7:00 – 9:30 pm
- Request a discussion of Seismic Phase III before September 2011
- Add User Test Bed Facility as a topic

Daniel invited the CAG to provide recommendations for invitations to potential new CAG members. CAG member comments, recommendations and responses included the following:

- Phila recommended that an invitation be made to residents who live just a few doors from the Lab boundary because she would like to see more active representation from the northeast neighborhoods. She remarked that she would like to communicate more actively to the neighborhood and would like assistance in distributing information to them.

LBNL COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP (CAG)

- Another CAG member asked if a representative of the Claremont-Elmwood Neighborhood Association (CENA) participated in the CAG.
- *Lab Comment:* There had previously been one on the CAG, but that he left the group.
- As a follow-up, the group discussed that it would be helpful to plot where CAG members live on a map, so that the group can identify where gaps in neighborhood representation exist. One group member pointed out that the La Loma neighborhood located northwest of the lab is not represented at this time.
- *Lab Comment:* In response to prior requests to have a representative from UC Berkeley on the CAG, the lab initiated conversations with UC Berkeley staff about participating in the CAG. UC Berkeley staff members expressed concern about what would be expected of a UC Berkeley representative and how they can best bring expertise to the group. Should it be someone involved in capital projects, or a generalist? The CAG discussed inviting someone involved in long range planning and fire mitigation. Daniel suggested that targeted invitations to experts can be made according to the session calendar.
- Two group members recommended inviting Chris Adams to represent the La Loma neighborhood. As a former planner with the UC Office of the President, he would bring key experience to the table.
- *Lab Comment:* They will be in touch with him in the next week or two.
- One group member recommended inviting Emily Marthinsen to the group representing UC Berkeley.
- *Lab Comment:* They will contact her directly.
- Another group member recommended inviting Carole Thornton to represent West Berkeley.
- One group member again suggested that outside experts be invited to participate in appropriate meetings.
- Elizabeth Stage commented that there is a difference between “being from” and “speaking for” an organization. Some UC employees are not in a position to make commitments on behalf of the institution, and participation in the CAG may put them in an awkward position. There is a difference between sharing expertise which is widely distributed and having the authority to speak for an organization. She recommended that the CAG be careful in its recommendations for invitations.
- She also proposed the Claremont Conservancy as an interesting group to approach when discussing Strawberry Canyon, because it is multi-jurisdictional and multi-disciplinary.
- Another group member recommended inviting a representative from the West Berkeley Alliance, particularly if the second campus will be located in West Berkeley.

Daniel then invited CAG members to raise other issues or make general comments,

- CAG members expressed some concern about what would happen to the CAG once decisions related to the second campus are made. Daniel responded that it isn't possible to know the answer to that question yet, because no decisions have been made at this point.
- The topic of workforce development was raised as an opportunity for the Lab to engage disadvantaged youth in Berkeley. One CAG member suggested that the Lab create policies to partner with workforce development groups and play an important role in Berkeley. A second CAG member concurred and stressed that workforce development is a regional issue and that it is important for the Lab to engage with the community.
- One member questioned if the CAG would become too large and unwieldy based on new member invitations. Daniel responded that 15 to 20 people is a manageable group, and that there is room for the CAG to grow before it reaches that point.
- John Declerq suggested that the Lab present a 15-20 minute annual report to the CAG about Lab growth and business development. He is hoping that future Lab growth will result in a second campus.

Daniel summarized the CAG's discussion pointing out that upcoming CAG meeting topics would remain the same, but move to different dates. In addition, the Test Bed and Seismic Phase 3 discussions will be added to the next two meetings.

Public Comment

- Richard Poe, Virtual Development Corporation, one of 20 groups that have applied for developing the second campus. Wherever the Lab locates, the fact that the community works together and allows the Lab to grow is a positive thing. He complimented the group and group members.
- Pamela Sihvola stated that she lives 500 meters from the former National Tritium Labeling Facility and had several comments and questions, including:
 - She was one of neighbors impacted by tritium emissions. She formed the Committee to Minimize Toxic Waste to push the Lab to be a responsible steward. She is not happy with the legacy of the Lab with respect to clean-up and monitoring of emissions. She requested project graphics before the CAG meeting so CAG members and the public can understand the status of projects and the CAG can have input.
 - Would like the CAG and community to have input regarding radiation monitoring for BELLA and around Building 71. She also asserted that the monitoring station near Building 71 has disappeared.
 - She mentioned SERC and the Molecular Foundry and raised concerns about research with unbound nano particles. The monitoring of these projects should be part of the project conversation and a topic for community input.
 - She inquired as to the percentage of the Lab's overall budget that is dedicated to Carbon Cycle 2.0.
 - In light of the nuclear crisis which followed the earthquake in Japan, she requested that the Lab consider geographical diversification as a risk mitigation. Why put all facilities in the same seismic region?

LBNL COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP (CAG)

- Federal Guidelines for Advisory Groups require meeting agendas, a charter and a diversity of stakeholders. She expressed concern that community and neighborhood interests will be minimized. She would like to know the annual budget of this group and what its charter and purpose is.
 - She also believes that LAB scientists are parking on Grizzly Peak and biking to the Lab, which is creating traffic issues.
- Jim, a Community Member, stated that the parking problem on Grizzly Peak is incredible. Have heard parking discussed for 12 years, he hopes that this time it will actually be addressed. He stated that his daughter is a Berkeley graduate student and her program pays for fares on AC Transit. He added that Paul Alivisatos has said some wonderful things, including that pollution needs to be addressed.
- A Community Member pointed out that if you have a group of 1,000 employees, then AC Transit will supply an Ecopass for \$49 a year (and with a larger group it would cost even less).
- Jennifer pointed out that the Lab is high-up on a Homeland Security list as a target for terrorism. She stated that she would like to see more information and discussion around this issue.
- A Community Member recommended adding an extra meeting regarding the fact that hiring procedures prohibit youth from participating in employment activities. Best solution is to recognize apprentice and training programs for the trades' crafts.

Next Steps

The next CAG meeting will take place on Monday, May 9, 2011, at the North Berkeley Community Center, beginning at 6:00pm.