

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

---

### **CAG Meeting Summary**

Thursday, July 14, 2011

6:00 pm – 8:30 pm

North Berkeley Senior Center

#### *CAG Members Present:*

Christopher Adams, Berkeley Community Member

Rebecca Daly, UC Berkeley (student)

John DeClercq, Berkeley Chamber of Commerce

Marcos Gandara, Community member

Paul Licht, UC Botanical Garden

Emily Marthinsen, UC Berkeley

Mark McLeod, Buy Local Berkeley

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

Phila Rogers, Community member

Carole Schemmerling, Strawberry Creek Watershed Council

Rich Sextro, Community member

Anne Wagley, Community member

Michael Caplan, City of Berkeley (alternate)

Brooke Smith, Lawrence Hall of Science (alternate)

#### *CAG Members Absent:*

LeRoy Blea, Berkeley Community Health Commission

Andreas Cluver, Building & Construction Trades Council of California

Whitney Dotson, Community member

Phil Price, LBNL (employee)

### **Welcome and Introductions**

Daniel Iacofano of MIG welcomed Community Advisory Group (CAG) members, community members and staff. Due to the attendance of new CAG members and alternates, each member gave a brief self-introduction for the benefit of the group.

The evening's agenda included the on-going update on proposed and possible future capital construction projects, as well as presentations and discussion on the Second Campus and Lab wildlife and habitat protection and management. The final agenda item was a presentation by CAG member Phila Rogers on the protection of Strawberry Canyon. Presentation materials are available on the CAG website ([www.lbnl-cag.org](http://www.lbnl-cag.org)).

### **Update on Currently Proposed and Possible Future 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:

- BELLA – In construction and on schedule for Fall 2011 completion
- Bevatron Demolition – In demolition with probable Fall 2011 completion date

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

---

- Computational Research and Theory facility (CRT) – In design stage and likely to go to bid Fall 2011
- Old Town Demolition – Phase I funded and in demolition; Phase II remains unfunded
- Seismic Phase 2 – In construction
- Seismic Phase 3 – Currently no funding; design work could begin in 2012/2013
- Solar Energy Research Center (SERC) – In design stage; out to bid late Summer 2011 with construction starting in Fall
- User Test Bed Facility – In design stage

### **Second Campus Update and Discussion**

Jim Krupnick, LBNL Chief Operating Officer, presented on the status of the second campus initiative. Some twenty-five percent of Lab staff currently work off-campus in West Berkeley, Emeryville, Oakland and Walnut Creek. The goal of building a second campus is to strategically consolidate specified off-site programs into a single second campus location, which would enable the Lab to reduce physical barriers to scientific collaboration, provide more science at a lower cost and allow the Lab to host future scientific programs that the main site is not able to accommodate.

In its request for qualifications (RFQ) process, the University listed several site selection criteria, including: land capacity of up to 2 million square gross feet to accommodate future growth; proximity to main LBNL Campus; compatibility with local neighborhoods; availability of surrounding amenities; accessibility to public transit; low development costs; and availability of lower-cost utilities.

Over 20 different proposals were submitted for the RFQ and the selection process narrowed it down to the following sites:

- Alameda Point in the City of Alameda
- Berkeley Aquatic Park West in West Berkeley
- Brooklyn Basin in the City of Oakland
- Emeryville/Berkeley which includes properties currently occupied by the Lab in Emeryville and West Berkeley
- Golden Gate Fields in the cities of Berkeley and Albany
- Richmond Field Station in the City of Richmond (site currently owned by the University of California)

The next step in the site selection process is to hold community meetings in the neighborhoods of each of the potential sites in order to better understand the impacts and benefits a second campus might have on the surrounding community. The meetings will take place in July and August and will be followed by due diligence research on each short-listed site. The Lab intends to select a preferred site by November 2011 and will spend 2012 – 2013 conducting an environmental review of the site. If all goes well, construction on the new second campus could begin by 2014, with occupancy by 2016. Recent information, as well as details on exact locations of the short list of potential sites, can be found at the LBNL Second Campus Website: <http://www.lbl.gov/Community/second-campus/>

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

---

### *CAG Member Questions and Comments*

The following is a summary of CAG member requests and concerns related to the Second Campus presentation:

- Is the building under construction at Hearst Avenue and Oxford Street considered to be an office site?
- *Lab Comment:* The building under construction on Hearst and Oxford is a UC Berkeley building and will not be occupied by the Lab.
- Are the groups that responded to the RFQ private or public entities?
- *Lab Comment:* A mix of private and public entities submitted proposals. The City of Alameda submitted the Alameda site proposal, but they are working closely with a developer. Oakland, Berkeley and Golden Gate Fields proposals were submitted by private developers. The Richmond Field Station site is owned by UC.
- How does the proposal process work for the Richmond Field Station?
- *Lab Comment:* UC Berkeley controls the site for UC and is making it available for Lab use. They will create a basic Master Plan as part of their proposal.
- A portion of the Richmond Field Station site was once considered to be wetlands or environmentally sensitive and, for that reason, undevelopable. Is that no longer the case?
- *Lab Comment:* A fair portion of the site is not buildable, but that was taken into consideration in the proposal, and the site could still provide enough developable land to make it a contender for a future second campus.
- The Richmond Field Station site includes a few permanent UC facilities such as the Regional Library Storage Facility. What will happen to these buildings?
- *Lab Comment:* The second campus will most likely not take up the entire Richmond Field Station site, so these UC facilities could stay or could also potentially move to new locations.
- The CAG expressed varying opinions about the West Berkeley Aquatic Park site. Some expressed that it is an environmentally delicate area and that building could have a negative impact. It was also noted that the City of Berkeley has not yet identified a solution to the environmental problems and that it was likely that some type of construction would eventually happen on the site.
- The Lab should consider the potential impacts a tsunami could have on any location, including Golden Gate Fields and Berkeley Aquatic Park.
- For the Golden Gate Fields site, would community members still have access to the Albany bulb and the dog park located there?
- *Lab Comment:* Several parts of the Golden Gate Fields site would be protected and accessible, including the Albany bulb and Shoreline Park.
- Several sites will have environmentally sensitive areas or features. Are these called out in the application to the Lab?

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

---

- *Lab Comment:* Yes, addressing environmental sensitivities was a requirement of the request for proposals.
- Berkeley Chamber of Commerce is very excited in regards to the potential Berkeley sites.
- How can the CAG be the most useful in this process? Is there a way to harness the energy of the CAG to help illuminate some of the issues that may arise with some of these sites?
- *Lab Comment:* The community meetings scheduled for the six sites came directly from CAG members suggestions at the September 2010 CAG meeting. *Proximity to UC's main campus* is important. The Lab should consider UC students and faculty who work at the Lab when selecting the second campus. The Oakland and Alameda sites seem to be outliers, while Richmond, Berkeley and Emeryville sites are more accessible.
- *Lab Comment:* The goal of the second campus is to bring scientists together, so there will be a strategy for grouping sciences at specific sites. The Lab also intends to create a shuttle service that will transport people between the sites.
- Since over fifty percent of LBNL employees live in Berkeley, Berkeley sites would offer shorter commutes and result in lower associated green house gas emissions. Berkeley sites also have the advantage of keeping jobs local.
- Some of these sites, if selected, will come off of the tax role (for example Aquatic Park is American Soils property). This could have a high impact on the local community in terms of property taxes and fees and assessments.
- The Lab should consider the impact that the second campus may have on small, local businesses at the selected site. Will the second campus be a closed or open campus?
- *Lab Comment:* The Lab's intent is to have the second campus site be an open campus.
- It would be helpful to have an analysis that compares the cost of removing properties from the tax roles and the economic benefits that could come to businesses around the periphery of the second campus.
- *Lab Comment:* Economic analysis has been done in terms of the impacts the Lab has on the city of Berkeley, as well as the county and the state, although this type of analysis has not been one done specifically for the second campus.
- The Lab should focus on how it can contribute to economic health of businesses near the selected second campus site.
- *Lab Comment:* The Lab has strict requirements to do a certain percentage of their procurement through small businesses, women owned businesses, veteran owned businesses, etc. It is the Lab's intent that services offered on campus, such as food services, would utilize small local businesses.
- What is the economic multiplier for money spent by the Lab in Berkeley?
- *Lab Comment:* Both direct and indirect multipliers are 1.5 for every dollar spent.

## LBNL COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP (CAG)

---

- The American Soils parcel at Aquatic Park has low value and the portion of the Golden Gate Fields site that lies in Berkeley is a parking lot. Therefore, it's unlikely that there would be a great loss to the tax roles if one of these sites were selected.
- Mitigating the storm water/sewer run-off in Aquatic Park would be of great benefit to the surrounding community.

Daniel Iacofano concluded the discussion by emphasizing that the second campus selection process is a *raison d'être* for the CAG in that it provides an opportunity for community input on both process and site selection. The second campus initiative will be discussed at the next CAG meeting, to be held September 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2011.

### Wildlife and Habitat Protection and Management Discussion

Jeff Philliber, LBNL Environmental Planner, presented on the Lab's on-going efforts to protect and manage the habitat and wildlife found on the campus. Jeff began by reviewing a list of natural resources found at the Lab, identifying the geomorphology, water resources, plant life and animal inhabitants of the Lab campus. For a complete list of all of the various natural resources that are likely present at the Lab, please reference the "Natural Resources at the Berkeley Lab Site" presentations found in the July 14 Meeting section of the CAG website, [www.lbnl-cag.org](http://www.lbnl-cag.org).

Human activities on the Lab include normal operations, capital projects (construction or demolition) and vegetation management. Within normal operations, there are between 2,000 and 3,000 people on-site at any given time, but generally they remain within the developed portion of the campus, which makes up roughly a third of the entire campus. Vegetation management is necessary for the health of the habitat and is almost exclusively done by hand or by goats, although there are occasional exceptions made when it is necessary to use herbicide on non-native species such as eucalyptus stumps and poison oak.

The Lab strives to adhere to, and go beyond, all regulatory laws regarding natural resource protection. Both the Department of Energy and the University have policies, such as sustainability and LEED building policies, which exceed the requirements of the law. The 2006 Long Range Development Plan focuses on in-fill development for capital projects, rather than expanding into currently undeveloped areas of the Lab campus. Through long-range development planning the Lab also identifies and employs mitigation measures to ensure further protection of environmental resources. The Lab also employs biologists to identify special status species (those that are threatened, endangered, etc.) on campus, such as Lee's spider and Alameda whipsnake, in order to ensure that mitigation measures are taken during any building or demolition project.

### *CAG Member Questions and Comments*

CAG members raised the following questions or concerns related to the Lab's habitat and wildlife management and protection:

- The birds listed as "likely" species, as well as newts and the adult Alameda whipsnake, are almost certainly on Lab property as they have been seen on adjacent parcels of land and throughout Strawberry Canyon.

- The UC Botanical Garden has produced a field guide, which is available in the gift shop, detailing local animals which are found throughout the East Bay hills.
- There is a need for the Lab to look beyond its campus boundaries to neighboring areas such as Strawberry Canyon. The total Strawberry Canyon footprint is 1,000 acres and the Lab occupies roughly 200 acres of this. It would be beneficial to see the Lab put resources into the protection of Strawberry Canyon as a whole.
- What measures does the Lab take in terms of deer population control?
- *Lab Comment:* The current deer population does not pose a significant problem to the Lab, partially because of the fence around Lab property. If deer do make it into the fenced area they are left to migrate through the campus. The Lab has paid attention to plants found near Lab buildings, avoiding those that may draw deer and subsequently mountain lions.
- There is a concern about the removal of all eucalyptus trees as there are some animals and insects that have adapted to this tree.
- *Lab Comment:* The Lab does not intend to clear-cut all eucalyptus trees, but instead seeks to control them.
- Is there coordination between the Lab and the UC campus in regards to wildlife management and protection?
- *Lab Comment:* There is coordination on the Environmental Health and Safety (EHS) level, but there are definitely more opportunities to improve communication between UC and the Lab.

### **Presentation by CAG Member on Strawberry Canyon Protection**

CAG Member Phila Roberts presented on the history and current day status of the Strawberry Canyon wildlife corridor, which lies adjacent to the LBNL Campus. The purpose of the presentation was to give context to CAG members about the rich natural resources that surround the Lab in order to support future discussion regarding Lab plans and projects that may affect the canyon as a whole.

Currently there are a few concerns regarding the effects of UC and Lab activities on Strawberry Canyon. One concern is that Lab property fences have moved since 1987 and, in some cases they've been expanded into Ecological Study Areas (ESA). There is also a concern in regards to the UC Proposed Hill Campus Land Use 2020 Plan, which indicates that Chapparral Hill could possibly be used for future expansion. This would negatively impact the health of the canyon and its watershed. Finally, there is some concern regarding the tree removal Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) will soon release. One scenario FEMA was considering would involve the removal of 100,000 pines, eucalyptus and acacia. Phila encouraged CAG members to attend the public meetings that will accompany the release of the EIS.

The presentation concluded with a list of recommendations for the Lab on how to strengthen its role in protecting Strawberry Canyon and its watershed. Recommendations to the Lab included the following:

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

---

- Consider the Lab a part of the larger ecological setting (following the example of Fermilab and Brookhaven National Labs)
- Expand the existing Ecological Study Area (ESA) as recommended in the “UC Berkeley Hill Campus Working Paper”
- Possibly include Strawberry Canyon and its watershed in the UC Natural Reserve System
- Support a complete survey of Canyon flora and fauna
- Engage the academic (and environmental) community to use the Canyon as a living laboratory

CAG members raised the following questions or concerns related to the presentation on Strawberry Canyon Protection:

- Most wildlife in Strawberry Canyon should also thrive in the Lab boundaries, including the 120 species identified in the Botanical Gardens field guide.
- Monterey pines located on the Lab campus and within Strawberry Canyon are reaching their life expectancy and therefore present a major potential fire risk.
- *Phila Roger's Comment:* Fire mitigation is certainly important, but clear-cutting all trees in order to prevent fire is not a good idea and can bring in invasive species such as French broom.
- Long-range planning is essential in managing trees as they age. The Lab and UC should proactively manage Monterey pines as they age in order to prevent accidents that may occur.
- The will of the institutions, coupled with funding, is necessary in carrying out long-range plans to protect and manage the aging tree population both on and around the Lab campus.

### **Public Comment**

- Pile driving construction techniques could address seismic concerns and allow for concentrated land use.
- All Lab facilities should be concentrated to a single site, served by transportation such as a dedicated trolley line or electric car line.
- Keeping jobs in Berkeley should be a priority.
- Maps and information on which where the Strawberry Canyon creeks are piped to protect from land slides should be shared with the CAG and discussed at a future meeting.
- It would be preferable to have the CRT project as an anchor for the second campus, rather than on the current campus.
- There could be cultural concerns with the Aquatic Park site because there are shell mounds at that location.
- Interest was expressed for information on the 800 Lab employees that are employed off-site; including the percentage which reside outside Berkeley and how much green house gas emissions they produce.
- The State Department of Toxic Substances Control should be included on the list of regulatory agencies that the Lab consults in habitat and wildlife protection and management.

- A request was also made for sampling plans for all of the Old Town demolition project buildings, specifically related to the soil, ground water and surface water sampling plans and sampling results. She would like to receive this information prior to the September CAG meeting, as well as information regarding Bevatron and Building 51 sites.
- When planning the second campus design, the Lab should consider whether future construction could be moved from the main campus in order to help in the preservation of Strawberry Canyon.
- The Emeryville site may have issues as a potential Second Campus site due to the Amtrak right of way, the density of development already on the site and the low elevation above sea level.

### **Next Steps**

Paul Licht offered the Berkeley Botanical Gardens as a potential future meeting place. CAG members agreed that the Botanical Gardens could make a good potential meeting venue, especially in the context of Strawberry Canyon, although questions were raised about the accessibility of the gardens. It was decided that further discussion was needed before scheduling a CAG meeting at the Botanical Gardens. The CAG agreed that the next meeting should include further update on the LBNL second campus initiative. The next CAG meeting will take place on Thursday, September 22, 2011, at the North Berkeley Community Center (1901 Hearst Avenue, Berkeley) beginning at 6:00 pm.