

# Memorandum

---

**to** Sam Chapman and Jeff Miller, LBNL  
LBNL Community Advisory Group (CAG)

**from** Daniel Iacofano, MIG, Inc.

**re** January 7 Ad Hoc Group Meeting

**date** January 13, 2011

---

## OVERVIEW

On January 7, 2011, CAG members Anne Wagley, Carole Schemmerling, Dean Metzger, Phila Rogers, Phil Price, and Mark McCleod met with Jeff Miller, Sam Chapman, and Armando Viramontes of LBNL, and Daniel Iacofano and Nicole Lewis of MIG. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss process improvements in follow-up to the November 22, 2010 meeting with Daniel. The meeting took place at MIG offices. CAG member recommendations outlined in Daniel's December 13 memo helped frame the discussion.

Ad hoc group member and LBNL comments and recommendations, and resulting action items, are summarized below.

## Meeting Process and CAG/LBNL Staff Communication

- Distinguish between members of the CAG and the public during meetings. The current meeting process and structure does not adequately make this distinction.
- Provide advance notice of meeting topics to the CAG and the community.
- Plan substantive agendas that encourage more meaningful, interactive dialogue and balanced participation

## CAG Composition and Attendance

### *Agency Representatives*

- Invite agency representatives, but do not include regulatory agencies as formal CAG members.
  - Regulatory agencies identified by the CAG have been invited to participate on the CAG and attend CAG meetings. Agency resources are limited in this regard.
  - If an agency representative attends, provide them with meeting information in advance and request that they sit the table with the CAG to encourage their participation in the discussion.
-

### *Neighborhood Representatives*

- The adjacent neighborhoods most impacted should be represented at the meetings. These include Panoramic, Dwight Hillside, NorthEast and Daley Scenic Park neighborhoods.
- Neighborhood association representatives do not need to be members of the association board. However, they are responsible for sharing process information with the association.
- Potential new CAG members should undergo the same interview process as current CAG members.
- One of the CAG's objectives is to consult the Lab on ways to address potential impacts to the local community. Therefore, CAG composition should be based on the geographic location of Lab facilities. In other words, a second campus may require a second CAG.

### *CAG Member Attendance*

- Re-affirmation of CAG member commitment is needed.
- Regular attendance and preparation for meetings under the approach proposed here is critical to the success of the process and should be a required part of the process.
- Excused absences are permissible.

### **CAG Meeting Preparation**

- Give CAG members a meeting packet and "homework" in advance of meetings. This will make for more substantive conversation and contributions.
- Consider establishing an agenda-setting task force that includes CAG members.
- Incorporate presentations from other groups, including regulatory agencies and environmental and community organizations such as the Urban Creeks Council.
- Study other CAG processes, such as Brookhaven's Community Advisory Council. Look at their agendas for ideas of how to improve LBNL CAG agendas. Invite representatives to talk to the CAG about their process.
- Berkeley community meeting schedules have changed, which may impact the CAG schedule/ability of members and the community to attend.

### **Potential CAG Meeting Topics for 2011**

The following topics were identified in addition to the meeting topics identified in MIG's December 13, 2010 memo to the Lab and CAG members:

- Air quality
- The Lab as an engine of economic development/a workforce development organization
- Computational Research and Theory (CRT) project impacts and mitigations

- Long-term protection for Upper Strawberry Canyon
- Brainstorm session: “a basket of mitigations”
- Second campus (the CAG requests updates and opportunities to consult the Lab over the course of the planning process)
- Update/follow-up meetings on other topics, including transportation and remediation.

Additional comments and suggestions were as follows:

- Focus meetings on individual development projects so the CAG can weigh in on ways to mitigate specific project impacts to the community.
- Discuss capital and other projects well in advance of their implementation to maximize potential CAG impact.
- The Computational Research and Theory project CRT remains emblematic of key community issues and concerns, including building in open space, on a steep slope and at tremendous cost to the public, while opportunities exist to establish this facility as a possible anchor for the second campus.
- The legacy of distrust between the Lab and the community continues to have a significant impact on relations today. For this reason, it is critical that the Lab listen thoughtfully and consider CAG concerns about issues the community feels are important, even if Lab experts concur that CAG opinion stands in contrast to established technical and scientific findings.

## **ACTION ITEMS**

- Reformat CAG meetings:
  - Establish a new meeting format that balances presentations and contributions of the Lab and CAG.
  - Do away with personal introductions at the beginning of each CAG meeting.
  - Allow public comment at the end of the meeting to provide CAG members more opportunity for substantive, uninterrupted discussion.
- Give CAG members a meeting packet and “homework” at least two weeks in advance of each CAG meeting.
- Design a more detailed, substantive meeting agenda for distribution.
- Share the meeting agenda with CAG members and the community at least two weeks in advance.
- Solicit written comments from members of the public in advance of the meeting and include comments in CAG packet for advance consideration.
- Send a general letter to all CAG members:
  - Inform members of new meeting format and meeting packet.

- State expectations regarding CAG member attendance, preparation and participation.
- Request that members re-affirm their commitment to the process.
- Follow up with Dean Metzger for names of potential new CAG members.
- Consider Chris Adams and Joe Eaton as CAG candidates.
- Revisit the regular meeting time of the CAG and consider changing based on changes to regularly scheduled Berkeley community meetings.
- Review CAG Operating Principles and, if necessary, update based on outcomes of January 7 and January 20 conversations.