Berkeley Global Campus at Richmond Bay
Richmond Community Work Group Summary Notes
Thursday, December 18, 2014

A. Summary of key decisions made by the Working Group on Dec 18:

- Next Meeting of the Working Group is Thursday, February 12th at 6:30 PM, same location.
- Monthly meetings of the full Working Group will be on the second Thursday of every month.
- Mission/Charter: An ad-hoc sub-committee will develop a revised draft for WG review in early January with a goal of a final review and adoption at the Feb 12 meeting. Ad-Hoc Committee is headed by Diane Aranda and includes: Jane Fischberg, Cristina Hernandez, Tamisha Walker, Kate Spohr and Ruben Lizardo.
- The Working Group agreed to take up a discussion of displacement/housing issues after WG deliberation of the four community benefits that UCB/LBNL committed to address per recommendations of the Working Group.
- Schedule for Working Group discussion is: 1. Procurement. 2. Education 3. Workforce Training, 4. Local Hire, 5. Displacement/Housing
- Working Group assignments include:
  - Ad-Hoc mission/charter committee will complete and send revised draft to full WG with at least two weeks to review before February 12 meeting.
  - Full WG will participate in mission/charter draft review between January and Feb 12 as needed.

B. Summary Notes:

I. Mission/Charter--We had another productive discussion on the Working Group's Mission & Process. Good suggestions emerged to strengthen the draft the UCB/LBNL team shared at the September meeting.
   - It was agreed that an ad-hoc sub-committee of the Working Group will work with the suggestions made at the October and last night's meeting to develop a revised draft to be discussed and adopted (hopefully) at the February Meeting. Diane Aranda, Jane Fischberg, Cristina Hernandez, Tamisha Walker, and Kate Spohr volunteered to serve on this sub-committee, with Ruben representing the UCB/LBNL team.
   - The group will meet in early January and get their proposed revision to the full working group two weeks prior to the February Meeting.

II. Working Group Deliberations on Community Benefits--Lots of good discussion on this, both in regard to adding a discussion on the displacement/housing, the approach to the deliberations needed to develop recommendations, and the schedule.

- The Working Group Members agreed to work with the UCB/LBNL Team to organize initial presentations and discussions on the four community benefits included in the UCB/LBNL Joint Statement of Commitment; and to add an additional discussion to focus on the concerns raised by Richmond-based partners about displacement.
- There was general consensus that each topical discussion would include presentations that would help Working Group Members get a good baseline picture of the current
situation, existing strategies, and viable proposals to leverage the Berkeley Global Campus project to improve conditions in Richmond. For example, in regard to Local Procurement we would want data on the current spend with Richmond based businesses, description of the existing efforts in Richmond to build capacity of businesses to participate in the UCB/LBNL and other Anchor’s procurement processes, and recommendations on strategies to improve UCB/LBNL’s procurement in Richmond.

• The UCBLBNL Team agreed to work with all Working Group Members with an interest in each topic to develop the plan for the initial discussion. The schedule for the discussions is as follows:

   1. **Procurement** (February)

   2. **Education** (March)

   3. **Workforce Training** (April)

   4. **Local Hire** (May)

   5. **Housing/displacement** (June)

**III. Working Group Facilitation & Communications**

• At least one WG member suggested a need for a community co-chair.

• Others expressed a need for notes to be taken and dispersed in a timely manner, highlighting decisions and WG tasks.

• Others voiced a need for better define roles and responsibilities for UCB/LNBN conveners and staff as well Working Group Members. For example, current UCB/LNBN conveners can facilitate meetings, ensure notes are taken and sent out, provide reminders, provide tools and bring experts/presenters to WG meetings to support work of WG, but all WG members need to provide input and follow-through on tasks as agreed. Several WG members called for stepped up follow through among WG.

• **Suggestions from Working Group members to improve future meetings:**
  
  o Microphone for future meetings
  
  o Name cards for Working Group members
  
  o Add “assume good will” to the ground rules

• **Community members in attendance were invited to add to the discussion.**
  
  o Develop and distribute a project timeline that includes key milestones related to UCB planning and development; and the related projects that are key to success (e.g., South Shoreline Specific Plan, local, state and federal grants and programs, etc.)

**IV. Anchor Richmond Report & Discussion:** our CCISCO, ACCE, Safe Return Project, and Haas Institute partners provided the Working Group with an overview of the community engagement and leadership and research project that led to development and release of Anchor Richmond Report.

• Melvin Willis (ACCE), Cristina Hernandez (CCISCO) and Eli Moore (principal author for Haas) led the presentation and discussion.
• They were joined by at least 10-15 community leaders, some of whom played an active role in the project.
• Working Group Members had the opportunity to raise questions about the data and findings and recommendations.
• The discussion was passionate and all the partners agreed to follow up with Working Group members who raised concerns about the data and findings.

Prepared by: JL; TM; RL