

Berkeley Global Campus

AT RICHMOND BAY

**Community Working Group
Review Committee for Recommendations Narrative
Friday, February 26, 2-4 pm
City Manager's Conference Room
450 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond**

Summary Notes and Action Items

Please note the presentation and draft narrative are available on the [Chancellor's Partnership with Richmond webpage](#). This meeting was facilitated by Jamillah Jordan of MIG, who also provided graphic recording.

Decisions and Action Items

- Review Committee members will share copy edits with Jamillah by March 4th.
- Aram will provide additional language for the Context section of the Workforce Training/ Local Hire (WFT/LH) narrative and review the “Recommendations” section to ensure the language is correct.
- Bill will provide language on the evolution of the BGC project, from LBNL’s 2nd Campus to the BGC; he will include language highlighting the City of Richmond’s broad support for the project, as well as information about the role of anchor institutions in high impact developments.
- Marcus suggested providing more information about the demographics of the city, and the various institutions in Richmond ready to partner with UCB and the Lab.
- Workforce Training/ Local Hire:
 - Aram agreed to: provide a definition for “project stabilization agreement (PSA);” to provide language about the types of workers that will be needed on the BGC;
 - Clarity is needed to indicate if the PSA applies to public and/or private developers (bottom of page 10); the total for local hire at 30% and the rest being a subset; the total allocation for WFT is \$2 million annually, not \$4 million.
 - Noe will review this section for clarity.
- Housing/Displacement:
 - Jamillah will provide more language about the potential for the BGC to cause housing displacement without appropriate mitigations.
- Education:
 - Lou will add the initial landscape/priority spreadsheet to appendix.
- Procurement:
 - Noe will add the PPT presentations shared by Roxanne to the appendix.
- MIG will update the “Next Steps” section to reflect the CWG perspective on the recommended process moving forward including delivery of the recommendations, negotiations and securing a Richmond Compact.
- MIG will provide a new draft for CWG review by mid-March. The CWG will have time to review and provide final edits. Revised draft will be ratified by email.
- There are no upcoming CWG meetings scheduled at this time.

Berkeley Global Campus

AT RICHMOND BAY

CWG members in attendance:

Amanda Elliott (Procurement), Aram Hodess (Local Hire/Work Force Training), Bill Lindsay (all), Edith Pastrano (Housing), Jane Fishberg (LH/WFT), Marcus Walton (Education), Tamisha Walker (Local Hire/Work Force Training)

Facilitated by Jamillah Jordan, MIG

Staffed by Jen Loy, UCB, GCR

I. Welcome and Agenda Review

Jamillah welcomed everyone and provided a review of the agenda items and objectives. The primary objective is to discuss the Draft Narrative for the Recommendations (Narrative) prepared by MIG on behalf of the CWG at the global level. Jamillah invited participants to share copy-edits and word-smithing comments via email.

II. Review Structure of Report

Jamillah provided a brief review of the structure of the Narrative, distributed a table of contents for easy review and asked for high-level, general comments on the structure of the report. All complimented the work of MIG to create a comprehensive report that represented the CWG process and key recommendations. Below are high-level notes and action items from this discussion.

- Aram suggested that more context was needed in the recommendation section to further develop the rationale for why the CWG is prioritizing recommendations these recommendations (Edith and Tamisha agreed). Specifically, he suggested more information about the uncounted unemployed who are not captured at the official, current 6% or less unemployment rate in Richmond.
- **Action item:** More context-building language will be added. Participants will assist by contributing specific language to include in the Narrative (more info below).
- Jane suggested the following: 1. The CWG discuss prioritization of recommendations. And 2. That in “next steps” section there be an opportunity for negotiation with the university leadership and representatives of the CWG. (See Next Steps outlined below)
- Bill reiterated that he thought the Narrative does a good job explaining the rationale and narrative. But suggested two additions: 1. During the overview, the CWG should provide a few paragraphs about the evolution of the project from the 2nd campus to the BGC. And 2. Include information from the Special Meeting of the CWG about high impact development and the role of anchor institutions. Aram agreed and suggested adding the 100% support of the community that the project enjoyed as Richmond was selected.

Berkeley Global Campus

AT RICHMOND BAY

III. Review “Next Steps” Section of Report

- Bill suggested that the Next Steps section should be re-written from the CWG perspective and should include CWG recommended next steps, from delivery of the Recommendations to negotiation and securing a compact. (See the next steps section for suggested text.)

Action Item: Bill offered to provide a draft to MIG about the evolution of the project and high impact development/role of anchor institutions; Marcus suggested providing more information about the demographics of the city, and the institutions in Richmond ready to partner with UCB and the Lab. Jamillah will edit Next Steps section using suggested language captured at the end of the meeting.

- Edith read a paragraph (written by Eli Moore of the Haas Institute) that she suggested be added. While some attendees had seen it previously, at least Marcus and Amanda had not. A summary of the language is: the University must demonstrate its commitment through amount of resources, not number of recommendations they adopt; the most impactful recommendations are the most expensive and should be adopted. It also suggests that the University is planning to adopt the least expensive recommendations as a strategy.
 - Bill strongly objected to this proposal stating: 1. The proposed language goes beyond the purview of the Review Committee; 2. He does not agree that higher cost means greater impact; and if the City received this kind of proposed language he would be offended: it suggests that the university intends to game the system. Amanda and Marcus agreed that big changes like this would have to go before the CWG. Marcus added that if finances were the main goal, the CWG should have just asked for a check and skipped the rest of the CWG process.
- Broadly, the group agreed that the CWG needs to develop a strategy for the negotiation process and the future steps to get to a Compact, including: Who drafts? What stakeholders sign?

IV. Summary Review of Each Subcommittee Section and Appendixes

Jamillah reminded the participants that the objective of this portion of the meeting was to reflect on the high-level outcomes of the subcommittee deliberations and the process as a whole. Participants were invited to send copy edits in track-changes to Jamillah.

A. Local Hire/Workforce Training

Participants complimented the section overall.

- Aram agreed to: provide a definition for “project stabilization agreement (PSA);” to provide language about the kinds of jobs the CWG projects will be on the BGC;
- Clarity is needed to indicate if the PSA applies to public and/or private developers (bottom of page 10); the total for local hire at 30% and the rest being a subset; The total allocation for WFT is \$2 million annually, not \$4 million.

Berkeley Global Campus

AT RICHMOND BAY

- Jamillah will ensure that Noe reviews this section for clarity.

B. Housing and Displacement:

Participants complimented the section overall.

- Aram requested more context: the CWG members suggest that the BGC may displace Richmond residents; Jamillah will provide more language about cause and effect.
- Edith expressed her fear that the minority opinion will not have enough weight; Jamillah will provide a sentence that adds details to the minority opinion process and the amount of support the minority opinions received.

C. Education

Participants complimented the section overall, in particular noting that the subcommittee did a good job drafting language for the Narrative.

- Jen suggested adding the initial landscape/priority spreadsheet to appendix to ensure that work by community and University is not lost; participants agreed.
- Marcus agreed with Tamisha that in the future, a recommendation can be made about who to involve in the Partnership.

D. Procurement:

Participants complimented the section overall.

- Roxanne forwarded language to Jamillah that will be included.

V. Next Steps

The participants further explored Bill's suggestion that the next steps section should be written from the CWG's perspective but will still include Raise Up Richmond's attorney Julian Gross's language that the CWG agreed to include (at the February Special Meeting)

Proposed steps include:

1. Transmit the final report approved by the CWG to UCB and the Lab
2. CWG presents the recommendations in-person campus leadership (UCB and LNBL), which will provide the opportunity to clarify and discuss, including context and content.
3. Campus leadership will take the time needed to thoughtfully reflect on the recommendations and provide a formal response to CWG.
4. Their response would be presented to the CWG as a whole.
5. The CWG will identify a subcommittee to negotiate with campus leadership, maintain contact with the CWG. (TBD: negotiating parameters, representatives of the CWG; legal counsel needs [Bill suggests once deal points have been identified].)

Berkeley Global Campus

AT RICHMOND BAY

6. The CWG will work on their own draft of the Compact.

Next Steps following today's meeting include:

- Review Committee members will share copy edits with Jamillah by March 4th.
- Aram will provide additional language for the Context section of the Workforce Training/ Local Hire (WFT/LH) narrative and review the "Recommendations" section to ensure the language is correct.
- Bill will provide language on the evolution of the BGC project, from LBNL's 2nd Campus to the BGC; he will include language highlighting the City of Richmond's broad support for the project, as well as information about the role of anchor institutions in high impact developments.
- Marcus suggested providing more information about the demographics of the city.
- Workforce/ Local Hire:
 - Aram agreed to: provide a definition for "project stabilization agreement (PSA);" to provide language about the types of workers that will be needed on the BGC;
 - Clarity is needed to indicate if the PSA applies to public and/or private developers (bottom of page 10); the total for local hire at 30% and the rest being a subset; the total allocation for WFT is \$2 million annually, not \$4 million.
 - Noe will review this section for clarity.
- Housing/Displacement:
 - Jamillah will provide more language about the potential for the BGC to cause housing displacement without appropriate mitigations.
- Education:
 - Lou will add the initial landscape/priority spreadsheet to appendix.
- Procurement:
 - Noe will add the PPT presentations shared by Roxanne to the appendix.
- MIG will update the "Next Steps" section to reflect the CWG perspective on the recommended process moving forward including delivery of the recommendations, negotiations and securing a Richmond Compact.
- MIG will provide a new draft for CWG review by mid-March. The CWG will have time to review and provide final edits. Revised draft will be ratified by email.

To be determined: A celebration after the Richmond Compact is signed.