Berkeley Global Campus at Richmond Bay

Community Working Group Meeting #12
January 28, 2016, 6:00-8:00

Action Items and Summary Notes

Please note the presentation, original agenda, and all support materials are available at the Chancellor’s Partnership with Richmond webpage. This meeting was facilitated by Jamillah Jordan of MIG with graphic recording and note taking by Fiona Cahill of MIG.

Decisions and Action Items

- The CWG reviewed and approved the Education and Local Procurement Subcommittee recommendations. With this decision the CWG has a full set of adopted recommendations for these two arenas, as well as, Local Hire/Workforce Training, and Affordable Housing.
- The CWG reviewed and approved (with additions) a MIG developed outline for the final report (which will include an introduction and the adopted recommendations) the CWG will submit to UC Berkeley and the LBNL by early March.
  - The CWG approved the establishment of a Review Committee that will work with MIG to finalize the narrative for the final report. CWG Members named to the Committee include: Tammeil (Education), Roxanne (Procurement), Edith (Housing); Tamisha, Aram and Jane (Local Hire and Workforce Training, and Bill to represent the City).
  - The CWG agreed to the following steps: upon MIG’s completion of a first draft, the Committee will review the draft, the MIG Team will revise per feedback, and the revised draft will be presented to the CWG for a final vote.
- The CWG agreed to hold a special meeting at City Hall on Wednesday, February 10th to hear from Raise up Richmond Coalition attorney Julian Gross. Mr. Gross will offer a perspective on attributes that must be included in the Richmond Compact, if it is to serve as an “enforceable” Community Benefit Agreement (CBA). Roxanne agreed to provide assistance to organize the session.
- The CWG reviewed the next steps in the process to develop the Richmond Compact (see the revised process map). The CWG proposed an additional meeting to present its recommendations to campus and LBNL leadership. Ruben and Armando agreed to follow up on this request.
- Although no regular CWG meetings have been scheduled at this time (pending the completion of the final report/recommendations and a decision on the additional meeting to present to campus and LBNL leadership), CWG members are asked to hold the regular meeting dates for March (24), April (28) and May (26) as place holders for the follow up meetings.
I. Welcome and Introductions

- Roll Call
- Partner Updates

- UC Berkeley: Ruben welcomed Roxanne Carrillo Garza (LISC, Healthy Richmond) who serves an alternate for California Endowment’s Diane Aranda and Stan Anderson is the new President of the Richmond Neighborhood Coordinating Council (replacing Don Woodrow); and noted that Aram Hoddess, who represents the CC Construction and Building Trades Council, would also represent the CC Count Labor Council (per Margaret Hanlon Gradie).

- LBNL: Armando announced that the Lawrence Berkeley National Lab has a new Director. The UC Board of Regents appointed Michael Witherell, who currently serves as UC Santa Barbara’s Vice Chancellor for Research. Meanwhile, outgoing LBNL Director Paul Alivisatos was named to serve as UC Berkeley’s Vice Chancellor for Research.

- Roxanne proposed that the CWG hold a special meeting in February to hear from Raise up Richmond Coalition attorney Julian Gross. Per past memos circulated to the CWG Julian has expertise in the development of Community Benefit Agreement (CBA)’s. Kate seconded the proposal. The CWG agreed to move this item to New Business section of the agenda.

- Jenny Mulholland-Beahrs, UC Berkeley’s Founder and Director, California Outdoor Engagement Coalition shared information about the first annual Every Kid in a Park Richmond partnership between UC Berkeley, West Contra Costa Unified School District, the National Park Service, Rosie the Riveter Trust and Groundwork Richmond! This is an opportunity to connect and discuss future partnerships. Please reach out to Jenny Mulholland-Beahrs (j.mulholland-beahrs@berkeley.edu) if you want to be involved or visit outdoor-engagement.cnr.berkeley.edu

- Marcus Walton announced the WCCUSD Superintendent Dr. Harder will retire as of June 30. The Board will engage in a lot of open discussion with the community. And the district’s LCAP committee has begun meeting. People who want to learn more about district priorities should attend.

• Today’s Agenda
  • Welcome & Introductions
  • Brief Recap of Dec. 10th CWG Meeting
  • CWG Process Overview
  • Summary Update on Education & Procurement Subcommittee Recommendations
  • Review & Refine Outline for Narrative Introduction to CWG Recommendations
  • New Business
  • Next Steps
II. Brief Recap of December 10th CWG Meeting

- The CWG voted on and approved the vast majority of recommendations the four Subcommittees put forth.
- The Local Hire/Workforce Training and Housing Subcommittee recommendations were adopted, with only a few notations for minority opinions expressed about 1-3 aspects of the recommendations.
- The CWG voted in support of the overall recommendations presented by the Education and Local Procurement Subcommittees. However, they asked these two Subcommittees to
  - Return with answers to questions raised about 1-2 elements of their recommendations.
  - Come back with more specific justifications for any specific financial investments that were proposed.

III. CWG Process Overview

- Jamillah provided a review of key milestones and outcomes that included MIG coming on as the facilitator, the many subcommittee meetings, the November 30th Community Briefing, and the December 10 CWG meeting at which the CWG voted to approve the recommendations which included deep community input. See the revised process map for more about the timeline.

- Ruben reminded attendees that if the final additions to the recommendations are agreed to tonight, the campus will need a month or two to review and predicted that the university and the Lab could return in late April to report on what leadership can agree to.

- The CWG Charter: Decision Making, Voting and Conflict Resolution
  - “The WG will work toward consensus recommendations and proposals whenever possible. If consensus is not possible, majority vote will prevail.”
  - “Where consensus cannot be reached, minority opinions will be transmitted to decision makers in writing. WG recommendations and proposals will be directed to the appropriate leadership body at UCB and LBNL for final decision.”
  - “The voting mechanism shall be a quorum of at least two thirds of currently seated members, and in no case fewer than eleven.”
  - “For content conflicts, for example, in the case where the majority of the WG is in favor of making a recommendation to UCB/LBNL, dissenting members may submit a minority position recommendation to UCB/LBNL.”
IV. Summary Update on Education Subcommittee Recommendations

- Kate Spohr provided a review of the subcommittee process including the framework and priorities that guided their work (see presentation slides here). And reviewed the Direction from CWG at the December 10, 2015 Meeting, Conduct further discussions regarding: Alignment with the Richmond Promise; and specific funding amount for the Richmond Youth and Adult Opportunity Fund. Ahead of the CWG meeting, the subcommittee shared 2 documents with the CWG and the public: Education Narrative - with proposed edits; Education Fund Cost Proposal. Kate and Yuritzy Gomez (CCISCO) explained the intent of the work. Yuritzy also passed out a document with information about programs referenced in the cost proposal rational.

- Following are highlights from the facilitated question

- In response to a question, Armando and Ruben explained funding restrictions and sources at the Lab and the University. The Lab receives 95% of its 800m from the Federal government, which means these monies are under enormous regulations regarding spending. The university has 3 funding sources: state funding; student fees; and fundraising. With budget cuts on the near horizon Ruben noted that it will be difficult, if not impossible for the university to make commitments for large financial contributions; but expressed optimism that by working in partnership with campus and local stakeholders, the university could partner in fundraising to support many of the goals identified by this group.

- Tammeil acknowledged the challenges public universities and colleges face, while noting that it is important for colleges and universities use their limited funding on their priorities; at Contra Costa Colleges this can mean reprioritizing the utilization of existing funding; she encouraged the university to look for ways to do so.

- Public comments included: support for the cost explanation and a request to add as a minority report an email about the importance of pre-school education and a suggestion that the BGC house a pre-school.

- The CWG expressed support for including the revised Education Narrative (with language about alignment with the Richmond Promise) and the Education Fund Cost Proposal with the full recommendations; and adding the minority report/email about preschool. (16 CWG members in support).

V. Summary Update on Procurement Subcommittee Recommendations

- Amanda Elliot, Bernita Naylor, Roxanne Garza (Healthy Richmond) provided a recap of the subcommittee process, highlighting the wide ranging collaboration and expertise that the approved recommendations were drawn from (see presentation slides here). The team also provided an updated procurement spreadsheet, which included details on partners, beneficiaries and expected outcomes of recommendations CWG members requested.
Joel Mackey asked for clarification about the business sectors highlighted in the recommendations that proposed BGC procurement policies apply to sectors beyond construction. The team noted that the intent was not to limit the policies to the three sectors (food, design services and solar); the proposed policies should apply to all sectors that UCB and LBNL do business with; finally that the subcommittee was recommending that UCB and LBNL put a priority on engaging local food, design services, and solar companies.

After very limited discussion that included compliments on the work and points of clarification, the CWG agreed that the updated procurement spreadsheet should be included in the full recommendations.

VI. Outline for Narrative Introduction to CWG Recommendations and New Business

Jamillah provided an overview of the narrative introduction that will accompany the recommendations from the CWG to the Chancellor and the Director of the Lab. The CWG received the Draft Outline for Introduction to CWG Recommendations ahead of the CWG meeting. This will be the final product, produced by MIG with input from the CWG. This is a CWG product, not a University or Lab product.

Some CWG members suggested that CAB language (provided by the Raise Up Richmond Coalition attorney Julian Gross) be included in the CWG’s recommendations. Specifically that the CWG recommend that the Richmond Compact include the five attributes Mr. Gross maintains are needed to ensure the agreement is enforceable. (See the memo From Law Offices of Julian Gross that was distributed on December 10, 2016.)

Some CWG members strongly agreed that the context and rational sections are critical. Jamillah reminded the CWG that most of information has already been drafted by the subcommittees and approved by the CWG. (See documents created for the November 30th Community Briefing and the drafts of the recommendations that were approved by the CWG on December 10th).

A mini group of the CWG (with representation from each subcommittee and City) was established to review the draft. Working with MIG, this mini group will provide a new draft to the CWG for an up or down vote. The mini group will be made up of: Tammie (Education), Roxanne (Procurement), Edith (Housing); Local Hire and Workforce Training (Tamisha, Aram and Jane with an emphasis on WFT); and Bill to represent the City. The proposed timeline is to complete the draft of the introduction & report by the end of February.

Ruben reminded participants that any delay in getting the narrative done, will delay the University and the Lab’s ability to develop a response.

CWG members and community discussed different options for meeting with the Vice Chancellors and leadership, including a formal presentation of recommendations and a CWG meeting that includes the leadership to discuss the Richmond Compact and legally binding agreements. The CWG agreed to propose a formal meeting with Leadership to present the
recommendations from the CWG and to meet again after Leadership has had time to review. (15 CWG members agreed)

- The CWG agreed to hold a special meeting at City Hall on Wednesday, February 10th to hear from Raise up Richmond Coalition attorney Julian Gross. Mr. Gross will offer a perspective on attributes that must be included in the Richmond Compact, if it is to serve as an “enforceable” Community Benefit Agreement (CBA). (16 CWG in favor, 12 can attend). Roxanne agreed to provide assistance to organize the session.