

LBNL COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP (CAG)

CAG Meeting Summary

Thursday, September 22, 2011

6:00 pm – 8:30 pm

North Berkeley Senior Center

CAG Members Present:

Christopher Adams, Berkeley Community Member
John DeClercq, Berkeley Chamber of Commerce
Wendy Cosin, City of Berkeley Planning Department
Whitney Dotson, Community member
Marcos Gandara, Community member
Emily Marthinsen, UC Berkeley
Mark McLeod, Buy Local Berkeley
Phil Price, LBNL (employee)
Phila Rogers, Community member
Carole Schemmerling, Strawberry Creek Watershed Council
Rich Sextro, Community member
Elizabeth Stage, Lawrence Hall of Science

CAG Members Absent:

LeRoy Blea, Berkeley Community Health Commission
Andreas Cluver, Building & Construction Trades Council of California
Rebecca Daly, UC Berkeley (student)
Paul Licht, UC Botanical Garden
Dean Metzger, Berkeleyans for a Livable University Environment (BLUE)
Anne Wagley, Community Member

Welcome and Introductions

Daniel Iacofano of MIG welcomed Community Advisory Group (CAG) members, community members and staff. The evening's agenda included the on-going update on proposed and possible future capital construction projects, fire protection at the Lab, as well as presentations and discussion of each of the seven candidate sites for the Second Campus. Presentation materials are available on the CAG website (www.lbnl-cag.org).

Update on Capital Construction Projects

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

LBNL COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP (CAG)

Project	Status
BELLA	In construction; conventional facilities nearly finished at Building 71.
Bevatron Demolition	About 90% complete; should be complete by December 2011.
Computational Research and Theory facility (CRT)	In design; aim to go to bid in December 2011/January 2012.
Old Town Demolition	Phase I should be complete next week. This completes work until further funding is made available.
Seismic Phase 2	Broken ground on general purpose laboratory; Interior remodel of Building 74 60% complete, to be complete in Spring of 2012; slope stabilization around Building 85 started; a variety of demolition projects nearly complete.
Seismic Phase 3	Hope to start concept design in FY 2013; funding potentially available in FY 2014, may hire architect next summer; specific scope details have yet to be established, including location of new general purpose laboratory.
Solar Energy Research Center (SERC)	Design is complete; approval to bid project this fall.
User Test Bed Facility	In final design; will demolish trailers in front of Building 90 and put in four test beds to test existing and future technologies for energy efficiency; hope to go into construction in January 2012.

CAG Member Questions and Comments

The following is a summary of CAG member requests and concerns related to Lab capital projects recently proposed or underway:

- What types of medical services are provided in Building 26, the Medical Services and Environmental Health and Safety offices? How often do employees request medical services on campus?
- *Lab Comment:* The medical services provided at Building 26 are almost exclusively first aid in nature, as any severe cases go to the hospital. Lab staff will need to check on the average number of visits.
- Has the external paint color for the User Test Bed Facility been identified?
- *Lab Comment:* The external paint color has not been chosen, but it is likely to be a muted color, much like the color of other buildings in that general location.

LBNL COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP (CAG)

- Will any of these buildings be home to nano research? And, if so, will they have chemical fume hood exhaust stacks on them?
- *Lab Comment:* None of these buildings will house nano research except for the SERC facility, but all in a media that will not be able to escape into the environment. Building 74 will have two stacks. Because of the high performance computing, CRT will exhaust air through registers in the ground on the east side of the building, away from the building.
- What kind of noise impacts will these buildings have?
- *Lab Comment:* Any noise impacts will be within the Lab standard and comply with the City of Berkeley ordinance.
- How are noise impacts measured?
- *Lab Comment:* The Lab generally looks at sensitive noise receptors, such as homes or public thoroughfares, to measure noise. At this point in time, all noise research is analytic since the buildings are not yet complete. Analytic results will be compared against ambient noise and existing standards.
- The CRT facilities should not be built on the proposed site, which is currently pristine and unbuilt, but rather on an infill site.

Fire Protection

Gary Piermattei, LBNL Fire Marshall, briefed the CAG on Lab procedures, protocols and plans regarding fire prevention and management at the Lab. The East Bay hills “Tunnel Fire” of October 1991 provided an impetus to study the history and nature of wildland fires in the area and re-examine the Lab’s approach to wildland fire management and prevention. The result has been a new, far more diligent approach that focuses in part on holistic vegetation management and “living with fire,” rather than “fighting fire.” The new California Building Code created a chapter that specifically reflects this approach, and uses the term “ignition resistant” to describe the new way of constructing buildings near urban wildland interfaces.

Prevention and management tactics described include:

- Creating a buffer between us and our valued resources, and the fire, and creating a defensible space that will allow firefighters to stop a fire before it spreads too far.
- Keeping combustible vegetation away from structures and building and maintaining ignition resistant structures on campus.
- Selectively removing fire-prone eucalyptus trees and replacing with and encouraging more native species, including oaks and bays, to restore the area to its more native landscape.
- Removing ladder fuels (for example, shrubs below trees and tall grasses) so as to prevent fire from spreading to the tree canopy, which leads to crowning fires.
- Thinning trees, spacing them 25 to 30 feet apart, so the radiant heat from one burning tree will not ignite a neighboring tree.

LBNL COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP (CAG)

- Enhanced emergency planning focused on before and after an event, regular monitoring, and constant reinforcement of a strong, safety-oriented culture.

The Lab has significantly reduced combustible fuels and flame heights since 1995, and today there is a high level of protection for facilities. Over 99% of the areas inside of Lab buildings are accessible by sprinklers and protected by fire alarm systems.

The Berkeley Lab Fire Station works with neighboring communities through a process called automatic aid to help each other during major and regional fire events. This allows for quick decisions and the ability to assemble a large response team when needed. Gary showed a map of LBNL/Berkeley Fire Department Automatic Aid District that delineates areas of first, second and third response.

CAG Member Questions and Comments

- After the 1991 fire, European annual Rye Grass Seed was dumped in a lot of the burn areas. This is a typical act in Southern California and elsewhere, which has caused further ecological issues.
- What water sources does the Lab use for fighting fire? It is recommended that the Lab consider a gray water system to help with fire management, instead of only relying on East Bay Municipal Utility District.
- *Lab Response:* The main source of fire protection water comes from Berkeley water mains. Generally, municipal systems are designed to meet fire protection needs over residential or domestic needs. The Lab will need to look into whether gray water is a part, or could be a part, of the fire protection system.
- It's recommended that the Lab advocate for better cell phone reception, especially on Panoramic Hill. This area is a dead zone for cell phones, and a necessary service area in the case of fires.
- The City of Berkeley has a new system for land based fires which allows the City to run 6 miles of hose from the Bay to the hills.

Second Campus Update

Horst Simon, LBNL Deputy Director, gave an update on the planning process for the Lab's Second Campus. The primary goals of this effort are to consolidate programs now scattered over the East Bay, control costs and increase productivity, and create a space to grow and create new facilities in an open campus environment that is less constrictive than the hillside campus location.

Over 20 different proposals were submitted in response to the Second Campus RFQ, and the selection process narrowed it down to the following seven finalist sites:

- Richmond Field Station (Richmond)
- Golden Gate Fields (Berkeley and Albany)

LBNL COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP (CAG)

- Aquatic Park West (Berkeley)
- Aquatic Park (Berkeley)
- EmeryStation (Emeryville)
- Brooklyn Basin (Oakland)
- Alameda Point (Alameda)

The Aquatic Park site and the EmeryStation site were submitted as part of a single proposal. However, each site represents a separate option.

Dr. Simon presented the concept plans as provided for each site, for both Phase I of the project (initial 300,000+ square feet of development) and Phase II (full build-out to proposed 2 million square feet). The Lab entertained proposals which encompassed Phase I as well as full buildout , and must look at what is the best and most affordable option in the near-term.

The Lab is currently in the due diligence and negotiation phase of the process. It has requested additional information from each developer, including information related to campus integration with the surrounding community, environmental issues, and any other points that required further clarification.

Much of the information provided in the proposals is confidential information, both because of the nature of negotiations and for the privacy of the developers. The Lab's goal will be to select a preferred site by November. At that point, the Lab will be able to provide the CAG with more detailed information about the selection process and the selected site proposal.

Recently, the Lab held six large-scale town hall meetings in the local communities where each of the proposed sites is located. This process resulted in a show of overwhelming community enthusiasm for some of the potential locations, and also allowed the Lab to learn about some of the local issues surrounding each site.

CAG Member Questions and Comments

Second Campus Overall

- Some of the proposed locations are close to areas of great interest and concern for the Golden Gate Audubon Society. Aquatic Park is a very important stopover for migrating birds. For all sites, we've encouraged the Lab to preserve as much bird habitat and make as bird-friendly as possible.
- *Lab Comment:* The Lab is certainly considering impact on birds in its decision making.
- It's very important to explain clearly what the difference is between these plans and related graphics, so that CAG members can form intelligent and informed opinions and decisions about which proposals they support. Providing plans at the same scale, or clearly explaining how the scales differ, is important. Providing information about scale relative to height is extremely important as well.

LBNL COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP (CAG)

- The RFQ distributed by the Lab named specific factors desired for the second campus site, but some of the potential sites do not meet all the criteria. It is important that there is transparency around the second campus site selection process, and the CAG will be interested in learning how the decision is being made.
- *Lab Comment:* Much of what has been submitted within the proposals is confidential information, both because of the nature of negotiations as well as for the privacy of the developers. The Lab's goal will be to select a preferred site by November and, at that point, they will be able to reveal more of selection process and information gathered in studies being conducted by the Lab.
- As a matter of fairness and transparency, and to help the CAG and the community better understand this process, the Lab should be very clear about the basic criteria that must be met by the final site, if these criteria in fact differ from those set forth in the RFQ. Concern was shared regarding the perceived looseness with which Lab selection criteria were applied. This process must be correct, honest and straight-forward.
- *Lab Comment:* These sites have been selected because they fit the criteria more so than the others that were not selected. However, none of these sites meet all criteria. At the same time, the extent to which each site meets our criteria is proprietary information at this stage, and we do not wish to reveal this information to competitors.
- For all sites, are there local ordinances in place that require community approval of this project?
- *Lab Comment:* The City of Albany and the City of Berkeley both require public votes before Lab development at the Golden Gate Fields site.
- What are the key mental models for secondary development, beyond UC Mission Bay? Is this mental model pertinent to all six sites?
- *Lab Comment:* Overall, yes. UC Mission Bay is a model of how to redevelop an urban area for research and development and in the process turn this area into a magnet for secondary development.
- How has the Lab responded so far to how it would be able to protect against any kind of tsunami?
- *Lab Comment:* We asked all sites for a numeric characterization of tsunami risk. The same organization is conducting this study for all sites. Some sites have less risk, some have more.

Richmond Field Station

- The Richmond location should receive serious consideration due to the fact that it is a property already owned by UC. Building the second campus elsewhere would take valuable property off the tax role.
- Will existing UC buildings remain on-site if the proposed plan is accepted?
- *Lab Comment:* The EPA building will remain, but it remains to be seen what will happen with the other existing buildings.

LBNL COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP (CAG)

- Has the City of Richmond indicated an area appropriate for local business development in proximity to the Second Campus?
- *Lab Comment:* The area close to the new nearby residential community does have some restaurants and the City has indicated that there is potential opportunity for further secondary development.
- Given the geological and environmental issues posed by proposed development on the seven finalist sites, the Richmond Field Station is the only site I support.
- Is it a necessary criteria that somewhere down the line the University or Lab buys the land?
- *Lab Comment:* No, it is not. While ownership of the land is desirable, this is not a hard and fast requirement. The real estate transaction is subject to negotiations at the point that we select a preferred site.

Golden Gate Fields

- Is the developer required to indicate how they plan to develop the southern section of this site, near Berkeley?
- *Lab Comment:* The developer has proposed a concept for this portion of the site, and has had meetings with the community to discuss this. These plans have been made public, but they are still evolving as their conversations with the community continue.
- Much of this site is a marsh. Do your criteria consider geotechnical safety, as well as the environmental problems engendered by building at a location such as this? Learning from Japan's experience, this does not appear a site to build on responsibly, especially given that much of this particular site is fill.
- *Lab Comment:* Extensive geotechnical investigations are taking place with the assistance of consultants. On this particular site, a portion is fairly solid rock and, as East Bay geology goes, is a relatively good site for building anything. The marsh site is not being considered for development.

Aquatic Park West (West Berkeley)

- The allowable building height for this campus is 100 feet. This creates a virtual wall, and I don't think this is very useful for the City. Also, we have enough trouble in the park maintaining the park's natural environment. This is a terrible plan.
- What is the proposal for secondary development at Aquatic Park West?
- *Lab Comment:* There is an expectation that the presence of additional people would create additional business for the neighborhood. It is envisioned that secondary development could happen in West Berkeley, but there is no explicit plan or location identified.
- There is community concern that secondary development of this nature could push out local artists and artisans rather than support their success.
- Based on the criteria listed by the Lab, it seems that this site has three clear strikes against it, including its ability to meet the criteria that employees, residents and guests are safe when

LBNL COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP (CAG)

coming and going to work and, given its proximity to the railways, to protect facilities from sources of vibration.

- Is the concern about vibration specifically related to the Next Generation facility? Given that this facility would not be built at this site given its size requirements, is vibration here such a concern?
- *Lab Comment:* The concern about vibration is a concern related to this facility. However, noise is of equal concern for all sites.
- Concerns were expressed related to accessibility of this site, and communication between the existing facility and this facility given access barriers and challenges, including severe existing congestion in the area.

Aquatic Park Center

- What is the plan for secondary development related to this site?
- *Lab Comment:* Since this is already in an urban environment, the model for secondary development is similar to that related to the Aquatic Park West location. There is an expectation that secondary development would happen in the general location, either by this developer or others.
- Like the Aquatic Park West location, this site is also close to railroad track but perpendicular: would this mitigate the potential vibration associated with the railway?
- *Lab Comment:* Presumably, yes, but this is not yet confirmed.
- Does this project include habitat restoration or enhancement?
- *Lab Comment:* No, it does not.

EmeryStation (Emeryville)

- No comment

Brooklyn Basin (Oakland)

- This site seems a very bad choice from both an environmental perspective and as a matter of access and convenience to the existing Lab location.

Alameda Point (Alameda)

- The world's most successful colony of the endangered least tern is in Alameda, but this particular site is probably ok if appropriately developed.
- All environmentalists have a dream of this site being returned back to the wetland it once was.
- One CAG member voiced support for natural habitat integrated into this site design, rather than creation of a vacuous urban facility.

The following site selection criteria were noted during this meeting. These represent key criteria from the CAG point of view:

LBNL COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP (CAG)

- Land cost
- Tax roll impacts
- Cost of development
- Habitat
- Geology stability
- Potential for collateral development
- Building height
- Impact on local small businesses and potential displacement
- Access
- Tsunami risk
- Minimum building density
- Vibration
- Noise
- Transparency of site selection process
- Adherence to RFQ criteria

Public Comment

- This is a huge opportunity for Richmond. The Richmond community is unified in support of this project, which is not a common occurrence in the City. The community is welcoming, cutting edge businesses are there, and the City's vision for future transportation and amenities is in line with the values and desires of the Lab.
- The problem with Lab construction is that this is a very expensive endeavor that will require a lot of other private development to pay for it. If you turn the land around the Golden Gate Fields site into housing and industry to pay for this, much of the aesthetic quality of the site that sparks the imagination will go away. Explore other ways to develop this site that might foster the integration of science, aesthetics and the humanities in this location.
- The Golden Gate Fields site is eligible to be listed on the Federal register of historic places as a cultural site. National Historic Preservation Law requires a study to be done, and to my knowledge this has not been done but will be done as part of the environmental study. The study should be done at the front end so you can preserve some of the things that make the site significant.
- The kind of science and research taking place at the Lab is not necessarily respectful of nature. We need to protect nature and the Berkeley waterfront.
- Seven sites have been chosen that meet the Lab's requirements, but no one seems to be willing to discuss the costs. Cost information must be forthcoming so the CAG can make an informed decision.
- Please take into consideration other critical costs associated with these proposals, such as the cost associated with the loss of jobs at Golden Gate Fields. If the Lab is located at

LBNL COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP (CAG)

another location, those jobs will be retained and the jobs the Lab plans to add will provide a net benefit to the community.

- There seem to be three sites that provide a benefit in terms of Lab accessibility: Golden Gate fields is the best from a geotechnical standpoint. The sizable seismic rock there will serve as a physical anchor for the building.
- Locating the Second Campus in the West Berkeley community puts the campus in direct competition with the established community, which is working hard to build and further develop. This community is aware of this threat, and feels that the West Berkeley Plan is being altered, or threatened.
- The Lab is doing a good job of reaching out to greater community, but it would be beneficial for the Lab to consider including direct neighbors as early in the process as possible. West Berkeley is frustrated with the past few years of process with the City of Berkeley. If you do choose a Berkeley site, get to know the neighbors.
- It seems that you are trying to consolidate some leases on buildings you have now in order to grow in the future. Did you come up with the consolidation with your own Board, or did you hire an outside consultant?
- *Lab Comment:* We did this on our own, based on simple math if you add up the money we were spending leases and add in the fact that we couldn't continue to grow on hill, consolidating leases and creating a Second Campus makes economic sense.

Next Steps

The next CAG meeting will take place on Thursday, November 10, 2011, at the North Berkeley Community Center (1901 Hearst Avenue, Berkeley) beginning at 6:00 pm.