

# **Berkeleyans for a Livable University Environment**

www.berkeleyblue.org

email: blue@igc.org

July 7, 2006

Jennifer Lawrence McDougall, AICP  
Principle Planner  
Environmental Planning and Capital Projects  
300 A & E Building  
University of California  
Berkeley, CA 94704

Dear Ms. McDougall:

The members of Berkeleyans for a Livable University Environment (BLUE) have serious concerns about the proposed developments described in the University of California's Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Southeast Campus Integrated Projects. We have registered these concerns after a careful review of the Draft EIR and consultation with a number of experts. We believe that each one of these issues is important enough to raise critical questions about the appropriateness of proceeding with the current plans. When we consider these issues all together, however, the evidence is overwhelming that the current DEIR should be withdrawn, the projects should all be reconsidered separately, and then a separate EIR should be conducted for each project that the University, in partnership with the community, feels is appropriate to undertake. We feel that there are many better ways to further the University's academic mission that will not result in additional harm to the residential neighborhoods surrounding the campus.

Our concerns center on the following 15 issues:

## **1. Operating a stadium on top of an earthquake fault**

There is a consensus among geological scientists and structural engineers that there is inherent unavoidable danger in building or operating any structure that is located directly on top of an active earthquake fault, particularly one with as high a probability of a severe rupture as the Hayward Fault. Yet, the University of California plans to continue operating a major sports venue, California Memorial Stadium, directly on top of the Hayward Fault. In addition, current plans call for the stadium to be renovated so that it can continue in use at the same location.

- a) When did UC first become aware of the seismological risks at this site?
- b) What specific data is UC using to assess the current earthquake risks at this site? Has this information been evaluated by an independent expert?
- c) What is the projected likely risk of death or injury due to a fault rupture to humans who may occupy this site on an average weekday?
- d) What is the projected likely risk of death or injury due to a fault rupture to humans who may occupy this site during an average-attendance football game or other event?
- e) What is the projected likely risk of death or injury due to a fault rupture to humans who may occupy this site during a full capacity football game or other event?
- f) What specific plans does UC have to evacuate the stadium in the event of a natural disaster, such as a fault rupture—considering the fact that city resources will likely be occupied elsewhere? Have these plans been reviewed by an independent disaster preparedness expert?
- g) In light of the fact that serious fires often accompany seismic events—and in light of the fact that the stadium is adjacent to wooded land that is subject to periodic wildfires—what specific plans does UC have to respond to a major fire at the California Memorial Stadium site—considering the fact that city resources will likely be occupied elsewhere?
- h) Has UC fully informed all users of this stadium facility (including administrators, faculty, staff, service workers, students, members of the general public, NCAA officials, law enforcement officers, and all other users) of the earthquake risks at this site?
- i) Has UC fully informed all users of the stadium facility of the proper emergency procedures to follow in the event of a major earthquake?
- j) What specific engineering design has been developed to renovate or rebuild the stadium at this site? If none has been selected, what designs are currently under consideration? (Please provide as detailed a description as possible, with schematics, illustrations, blueprints, and all supporting data and calculations included.)
- k) Is UC aware of any structural design or retrofitting that would completely eliminate the risk of structural damage or collapse in the event of an earthquake?

- l) What are the projected deaths and injuries to humans in a rebuilt and/or retrofitted stadium under the separate conditions listed in (c), (d), and (e) above?

## **2. Building new structures in the Alquist-Priolo fault zone**

There are legal restrictions that are intended to prevent the construction of any new structures—or the substantial renovation of existing structures—directly on top of, or within 50 feet of, an active fault trace. UC has claimed that its planned projects are exempt from these restrictions because:

- (1) in the case of the stadium, it asserts that the cost of the proposed work on the stadium is less than 50% of the value of the stadium;
- (2) in the case of the proposed athletic training facility, it asserts that it is not located within 50 feet of any fault trace; and
- (3) in the case of the proposed parking structure, it asserts that the proximate fault trace is not active.

It should be noted that, setting aside the legal merits of UC's claims for exemption, the proposed actions of the University certainly violate the spirit of the Alquist-Priolo legislation. The Hayward Fault, which traverses the entire hillside area here, is known to present the greatest seismic hazard in the East Bay. The question is not if there will be a major quake on the Hayward Fault, but how soon it will occur. For the University to proceed to intensify development at this location rather than scaling back its activities here shows that it is willing to sacrifice public safety in the pursuit of its own development goals—which have the appearance of being largely commercial in nature.

- a) What dollar amount has UC determined is the current actual value of California Memorial Stadium?
- b) To determine this amount, what dollar amount, if any, was subtracted from the base value to account for the stadium's location on top of an earthquake fault?
- c) To determine this amount, what dollar amount, if any, was subtracted from the base value to account for the deterioration of the current structure?
- d) To determine this amount, what dollar amount, if any, was subtracted from the base value to account for its location on top of a culverted creek?
- e) What other deductions were made, if any, from the base value in reaching

- the final estimate?
- f) Has UC's estimate of the current value of the stadium been reviewed by an independent auditor? If so, what were the results of this review?
  - g) What is the projected total cost of the stadium project?
  - h) If UC does not have final figures for the value of the stadium and/or the total cost of the project, is the University claiming to be exempt from the provisions of Alquist-Priolo on some other basis? If so, what specifically is the basis for their claim to be exempt?
  - i) In the case of the proposed athletic training facility, please provide all data and other records documenting the assertion that it is not within fifty (50) feet of an active fault.
  - j) In the case of the parking structure, please provide all data and other records documenting the assertion that the fault trace that is present is not currently active.

**3. The possible liability of the University of California due to knowingly placing individuals at substantial risk**

The University of California acknowledges that there are significant risks of injury or death due to fault and fire danger at the stadium's hillside location. Even so, the University continues to knowingly place administrators, faculty, staff, service workers, students, members of the general public, NCAA officials, law enforcement officers, and others at substantial risk due to requiring and/or inviting their active presence in structures and in areas that are inherently unsafe due to their location in an active fault zone.

We believe that this may be constitute negligence on the part of the University, and may in the future subject state taxpayers to finance an incalculable amount of payments to satisfy legal settlements against the University due to injury or death from foreseeable accidents.

- a) What specific hazards at this site have been identified?
- b) What specific steps have been made to inform all users of this site about each known hazard at this site?
- c) What is UC's estimate of the total cost of claims that may be made against it in the event of a major disaster at the stadium site?
- d) Where would the funds come from to settle or litigate claims against UC in

the event of a major disaster at the stadium site?

#### **4. The failure to explore viable alternatives**

The University of California has an obligation to seek out and study all viable alternatives to its development plans. This is one of the most important requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act. Unfortunately, UC has failed to do so regarding these projects. Instead, they have suggested a few alternatives that they knew they would discard because they initially set up the criteria to be inappropriately restrictive. One way they did this was to combine essentially unrelated development projects together into one proposal. In fact, the construction and use of the facilities at the law and business schools will have no connection at all to the stadium and the athletic training center. Therefore, UC does not need a single alternate site to accommodate all of these functions. For that matter, the athletic training center need not be adjacent to the stadium, either. It is not intended to serve only football players, but all Cal athletes. And, the parking lot could be located elsewhere in the city—or, better yet, eliminated entirely—without impacting any of the individual projects.

In terms of considering alternatives, these projects should each be considered separately, because indeed they are entirely separable. We believe that a court of law will recognize that UC “stacked the deck” in considering alternatives in order to insure that no alternate location would meet all of the criteria for their planned expansion.

Two viable alternatives that require further study are:

- (1) the possibility of building a new UC football stadium at the site currently occupied by Golden Gate Fields, and
- (2) the possibility of playing Cal football games at the Oakland Coliseum.

Either of these sites would better accommodate the crowds, traffic, and noise that are inherent parts of all sporting events. Most important, neither of them presents the significant seismic hazard that exists at the current stadium location.

- a) In light of its obvious self-interest in this matter, will UC engage an independent consultant or panel of experts to review the project alternatives presented in the current DEIR?
- b) Will UC engage an independent consultant or panel of experts to evaluate the possible use of the Oakland Coliseum site for Cal football games?

## **5. Calling these projects “integrated” serves other purposes**

The University of California has chosen to characterize these fundamentally unrelated projects as “integrated” because it also serves a promotional purpose. UC wants the public to assume that no single part of this massive proposal can be eliminated without harming the whole plan. That is simply untrue. Each one of the construction projects is entirely separable. In fact, the history of the fundraising efforts for the work on the stadium suggests that this is the case. Early efforts to raise money for work on the stadium fell far short of the funding needed. Nothing, not even the growing success of the football team, altered those results. It was decided that fundraising efforts for the stadium had to be combined with other funding goals in order to raise sufficient capital. The alumni of both the law and business schools were regarded as likely sources of donations to move the project forward. Hence, the projects became integrated primarily for financial purposes, not for academic or administrative purposes.

Because each of these projects is separate, we believe that each one requires a separate Environmental Impact Report to conform with CEQA guidelines.

- a) Will UC withdraw the current proposal and obtain a separate EIR for each of these projects?
- b) Can UC specify the interconnections among each of these separate projects?
- c) Can UC supply the administrative and/or academic need for any connection among these separate projects?

## **6. The failure to account for cumulative impacts**

The neighborhoods to the south and east of the campus have recently been impacted severely by intensive UC development. There have been new multiple-story residence halls constructed on Channing and Durant, as well as massive high-rises added to the Unit 1 and Unit 2 sites. In addition, the new dining commons facility and the student services building were recently completed. Besides that, construction is in progress for the new 1,000 plus automobile parking structure at the Underhill site.

All of this has already added significantly to the traffic, noise, air pollution, parking problems, and other detriments that diminish our quality of life.

In the current DEIR, UC does not even begin to take an accurate accounting of these factors individually—let alone assess how they have harmed the environment cumulatively. Moreover, the impact of the new parking structure at Underhill cannot be assessed yet, because the facility is not even in operation. We believe that UC's process of evaluating impacts needs to be redesigned completely to better match the reality that residents face every day: our quality of life has diminished dramatically due to UC's activities, and yet UC continues to maintain that there have been few significant impacts. It is only possible for UC to continue making such unwarranted assertions because they systematically avoid making any reasonable efforts to account for these detriments.

Another aspect of assessing impacts is establishing proper baselines. UC has failed to do this in an adequate and fair way. Instead, they have selectively chosen data that minimize the possible impacts of their new developments, and have piecemealed many projects so as to mask their true impacts.

It appears that the current DEIR has adopted data from the 1990 LRDP as the baseline to assess current environmental impacts. This is itself inappropriate because there were many projects built that were not included in that plan. For example, all of the Underhill Area projects were not considered at all in the 1990 LRDP. By the same token, conducting separate LRDPs for the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory and the campus makes it difficult to assess the cumulative impacts. And it has been noted that the current SCIP project proposals were not even included in the 2020 LRDP—even though it is clear the plans were far along at the time the LRDP was prepared.

- a) Are any of the data listed in the 1990 LRDP used as a baseline to determine additional impacts in the current DEIR?
- b) Are the impacts of the high-rise housing structures at Units 1 and 2 included in the cumulative impacts in this DEIR? If so, how?
- c) Are the impacts of the Channing residence halls included in the cumulative impacts in this DEIR? If so, how?
- d) Are the impacts of the new UC housing at College and Durant included in the cumulative impacts in this DEIR? If so, how?
- e) Are the impacts of the new dining commons building included in the cumulative impacts in this DEIR? If so, how?

- f) Are the impacts of new student services building included in the cumulative impacts in this DEIR? If so, how?
- g) Are the impacts of the new 1000+ car parking lot at Underhill included in the cumulative impacts in this DEIR? If so, how?
- h) Are the impacts of the proposed downtown hotel and conference center included in the cumulative impacts in this DEIR? If so, how?
- i) Are the impacts of the planned Citris building included in the cumulative impacts in this DEIR? If so, how?
- j) Are the impacts of Stanley Hall included in the cumulative impacts in this DEIR? If so, how?
- k) Are the impacts of the developments proposed in the 2020 LRDP included in the cumulative impacts in this DEIR? If so, how?
- l) Are the impacts of the developments proposed in the upcoming LBNL LRDP included in the cumulative impacts in this DEIR? If so, how?
- m) Are the impacts of the proposed Brower Center included in the cumulative impacts in this DEIR? If so, how?

## **7. The detrimental impacts of intensified use of the stadium**

The current proposal calls for up to eight additional capacity events to be held at the stadium. Residents here are already suffering significant harm and inconvenience due to the current level of use of the stadium—which has increased significantly from even three years ago. Before, typically, only the Big Game with Stanford caused citywide disruption due to the capacity crowds. Of course, along with large crowds comes added cars, noise, litter, disruptive parties, graffiti, and other problems. And these problems typically begin hours before the game starts, and end hours after. Now, according to the University’s own figures, most of the games attract 50,000 or more patrons. All of a sudden, we have to deal with four or five “big games” per season, not just one. This alone has made life much more complicated for residents here, who have to plan carefully to avoid getting caught for hours in traffic or being unable to park anywhere within a half mile of home. Many residents who need or desire peace and quiet on game days are forced to leave their residences—they have no other choice. Residents should not be obligated to bear this burden. The current level of usage of the stadium already exceeds the ability of the residents here to manage their lives without making significant sacrifices.

Another change that has caused difficulties for the residents near the stadium is the fact that the game times are now variable and unpredictable. Whereas all of the games used to start at 12:30 PM every Saturday and be concluded by the late afternoon, now they may start at just about any time UC decides it can get the best television contract for the event. This makes it impossible to plan in advance, as the game contracts are often finalized just days before the games are played. UC should not proceed with any new construction at all until adequate mitigations are developed to deal with the severe impacts already experienced by residents due to the current level of usage of the stadium.

- a) Please list and explain all specific steps that have been taken by UC in the past to mitigate each of the abovementioned impacts: increased traffic, noise, litter, parking problems, student disruptions, etc.
- b) Please specify all efforts to evaluate the effectiveness of each of these mitigation measures.
- c) Please list and explain all specific mitigation measures that are planned to address the increases in severity of the problems that will occur with increased use of the stadium.
- d) What is the likelihood that these new measures, if any, will be effective in mitigating these problems?
- e) What method will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of these mitigation measures in the future?

## **8. Additional problems posed by nighttime events at the stadium**

All of the problems that occur during the daytime games will also occur during night games, but the impacts may be even greater on the residents. First of all, residents will not be able to count on having peace and quiet in the evening any longer, which is a significant detriment. This is a time when meals are planned and family gatherings take place. When earsplittingly loud football games are played at this time, it will preclude the quiet enjoyment of these experiences. Families and individuals will not be able to plan these events with any certainty that they will be comfortable.

Also, games that begin in the evening on Saturday almost always are in conflict with other major evening events in Berkeley, which exacerbates the parking, traffic, noise, and litter problems that occur. With Zellerbach Hall, Haas Pavilion, and the Greek Theater all in close proximity to the stadium, there will be recurring congestion problems.

It must also be noted that the Residential Permit Parking restrictions on neighborhood parking are not enforced after 5:00 PM. Therefore, during evening games, residents would have absolutely no protection for their on-street neighborhood parking places. This would lead to even greater difficulties for residents in the area.

In addition, whenever you have a large number of cars parked for a nighttime event that lasts several hours, it is guaranteed that you will have increased problems with property crime as perpetrators break into parked cars on dark neighborhood streets. There may be an increase in assaults as well, because large numbers of patrons will have to walk back through unfamiliar neighborhoods to return to their automobiles.

Finally, the glare from the lights at the stadium will be visible to residents from blocks away or even further. This will affect the character of the neighborhoods near the stadium, and it will prevent many residents from enjoying the calmness that accompanies the darkness of nighttime.

- a) Please list and explain all specific mitigation measures that are planned to address the increases in severity of the existing problems—as well as address the additional problems mentioned above—that will occur with increased use of the stadium.
- b) What is the likelihood that these mitigation measures, if any, will be effective in mitigating these problems?
- c) What method will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of these mitigation measures in the future?
- d) Please provide a map of the city showing the likely boundaries of impact of the noise from the stadium, including the cannon fire, and the glare from the stadium lights.

## **9. The failure to identify adequate mitigations for the completed projects**

All of the developments that UC has undertaken during the past fifteen years have significantly diminished the quality of life for residents near the campus. After the construction projects are completed, the new structures invariably bring new automobile traffic into the area, increased truck traffic due to deliveries, increased garbage and recyclable pick-ups, increased noise, increased trash on the streets, and increased latenight disturbances. Even though residents have requested help with these issues repeatedly, UC has made no significant effort to address these problems.

The massive construction projects have also resulted in: a loss of the tree canopy as mature trees are felled one by one to make way for the construction cranes; a loss of green open space; a loss of views; and a loss of neighborhood cohesion as long-term residents move out in ever-increasing numbers to more comfortable surroundings.

To address these problems at this point, it is not enough for UC to speak about the current projects. Rather, it must address the impacts of all of its recent expansion. One particular issue that demands immediate attention is the major parking difficulty caused by events held at the Haas Pavilion. Every single night there is a basketball game, residents throughout the Southside all the way to Derby Street have difficulty finding any on-street parking. This is one example of a problem that is in desperate need of mitigation measures; this issue and others similar to it, should all be resolved to the satisfaction of the community before any new UC construction is allowed anywhere in Berkeley.

- a) Is UC willing to meet with community members to develop and implement effective mitigations for the problems specified above?

#### **10. The failure to identify adequate mitigations for construction impacts**

The University of California continues to assert that vague “Continuing Best Practices” are sufficient mitigations for the impacts of their construction work. Yet, it offers no evidence that these measures have ever met any of the goals they are purported to address. In addition, there is no monitoring of the work sites to ensure that even these minimal mitigation measures are followed. Time and again, UC has failed to plan for even the most commonplace and predictable of work site requirements—instead letting the burden fall on nearby residents who have to contend with uncomfortable and dangerous conditions for years.

Recently, there have been a number of violations recorded at the Underhill job site. Sadly, these violations fall along the same lines as the complaints for the work previously done at the Unit 1 and Unit 2 sites. It seems that UC, rather than adhering to any industry-accepted best practices, is accustomed to following the “worst practices” that its contractors can get away with. It is unconscionable that it consistently places the burden of environmental damage, diminished quality of life, and substantial inconvenience on the residents of the city of Berkeley.

- a) Is UC willing to meet with community members to develop and implement effective mitigations for construction impacts?

## **11. The loss of historic resources**

California Memorial Stadium has recently been landmarked by the State Office of Historic Resources. If UC follows through with its proposed plans for the renovation of the stadium, we will lose this valuable historic resource. UC's current proposal includes designs for luxury boxes above the current rim of the stadium, as well as permanent lighting. Both of these structural changes would substantially alter the façade of the stadium and create an eyesore for the public.

In addition, the construction of the athletic training facility would require the uprooting of a grove of over one hundred mature live oaks. This grove has a long history as a meeting place, and its removal would permanently damage the Piedmont Avenue streetscape, another historic landmark. Finally, the projects require that the two Cheney houses will be moved or demolished. This would further diminish the historical resources in this area.

## **12. The cost to taxpayers to develop these facilities, maintain these facilities, and repair any damaged structures**

Although the University of California asserts that these projects will be completed with private funds, it is undeniable that California taxpayers will shoulder a significant burden of the total costs. For one thing, all of the planning for these projects has been done by the regular full-time University staff, subject to the oversight of top administrators. All of the reports that have been prepared and models and illustrations that have been developed have all been financed by taxpayers. Likewise, the hiring of outside consultants has been financed by the taxpayers. It is also true that all of the maintenance and infrastructure costs of the completed structures will be paid for by the taxpayers. In short, these projects have already cost the taxpayers a significant amount of money, and will continue to do so for the foreseeable future.

When the Hayward Fault ruptures, it is known that there will be significant damage to the stadium. Who will be responsible for paying for the repairs? Without a doubt, the taxpayers will be called on to provide funds for this work.

Given that taxpayers will bear a significant part of the costs of developing and eventually repairing these structures, we believe it is inappropriate to proceed with any of these plans without first allowing the public to express its opinion through a direct statewide vote on the wisdom and appropriateness of investing so much money in development on top of—or immediately adjacent to—a major earthquake fault.

### **13. The failure to provide mechanisms for monitoring and/or evaluation**

The plans put forth in the current DEIR fail to include any meaningful mechanisms for review and/or evaluation of planning decisions, construction practices, or proposed mitigations to determine if they are meeting stated goals.

- a) Is UC willing to meet with community members to develop and implement effective methods to monitor and evaluate the above items?

### **14. The past performance of UC regarding agreements**

To assess the likely adherence to terms stipulated in any contract or agreement, it is necessary to assess the veracity and reliability of all parties to the agreement. To that end, we request a full accounting of any and all agreements—both informal and formal—that UC has made with the City of Berkeley or its agents, local residents, neighborhood groups, or other individuals regarding land use, development, zoning, construction, transportation, or any other issue.

### **15. The limits on public participation in this process**

While UC claims that this has been a public process, in fact the University has severely limited the degree of citizen participation. They have not designed this process to allow for any meaningful citizen control or input regarding the conception, planning, or execution of these projects; nor did they adopt any citizen-developed recommendations for mitigations.

Please consider the following excerpt from *The Practice of Local Government Planning, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition*, edited by Charles Hoch, Linda Dalton, and Frank So. (Published by the International City/County Management Association © 2000)

#### **Traditional citizen participation: The trouble with public hearings**

Citizen participation in planning has a long history. For decades, state enabling statutes have required that public hearings precede official decisions on land use, environmental protection, and urban revitalization. In most states, hearings must be held for plan adoption, zoning changes, variances, special use permits, planned unit developments, planned residential developments, rights-of-way takings, condemnation, major capital improvements, and most redevelopment activities.

Most federal programs that require planning also require evidence of an open, participatory process—which has traditionally meant holding a public hearing. In 1978, the Federal Regional Council published *Citizen Participation*, a 140-page guide to the requirements of all federally assisted programs. Although the glossary described thirty-nine innovative techniques for encouraging public involvement, the publication did not inspire widespread experimentation; most jurisdictions continued to hold public hearings and only public hearings.

The old-style processes of involving the public—particularly public hearings—often result in perfunctory, stilted, “go through the motions” styles of engagement. By any stretch of the imagination, these practices rarely provide meaningful public participation or engagement. Typically, they are organized and run from the top down and are scheduled at the end of the process, immediately before adoption of the measure being considered. If citizens come at all, they often leave the hearing feeling ineffectual, co-opted, or manipulated; they often leave believing that “the fix was in.”

When a comprehensive plan is prepared using the old style of public involvement, a draft plan is drawn up by a consultant or by planning commission staff, with only incidental or ritualistic input from citizens or interest groups during the process. An initial meeting might be held to announce and “explain” the project. A citizen attitude survey might be mailed out to a sample group. Volunteer working committees might be appointed. But the coup de grace is a final public hearing held by the planning commission or city council at the end of the process to “hear comments.” Sometimes cosmetic changes are made to the draft reflecting comments made at the hearing. However, the basic foundation of the plan, its value structure, its assessment of problems and opportunities, and its consideration of options are set early in the program by a limited number of people acting in what they believe is the public interest. Plans prepared in this way remain intact, for the most part unaffected by the public hearing process.

Old-style hearings fail as a medium for meaningful citizen participation for a number of reasons. In many cases, they involve experts explaining or seeking support for a completed plan. Planning is done *to* or *for* the public, not *with* the public. Citizen participation is pursued more to “grease the skids” for ultimate public acceptance of the project than to inform the substance of the plan...

Additionally, public hearings may seem intimidating to individuals who may have strong and legitimate feelings but who lack the knowledge, confidence, or verbal skills to talk in front of a group. And public hearings can be logistically difficult for some to attend by reason of location, time of day, child care conflicts, or employment.

Traditional public hearings do little to foster consensus because there is seldom an opportunity for citizens to discuss and debate the issues

between themselves. The typical format offers the public the opportunity to testify, one after the other, before the board or commission holding the hearing, with little or no facilitation or topical organization.

As noted, public hearings are often scheduled at the end of the process to respond to draft documents or plans that have already been drawn up; they rarely occur at the front end of the process, where input can better shape the direction and value structure of the project. In short, the old-style public hearing mentality often represents a form of public engagement that is too little and too late. (pps. 425-426)

### **The need for a true consensus-building process in Berkeley**

We believe that it is time for the University of California, City officials, and community members to meet together as equal partners to develop a new working relationship to resolve our differences. It is a tragic waste that so much time and effort has been spent by citizens in trying to achieve goals that could be met in ways that are mutually beneficial to all.

To encourage this development, we attach a list of twelve consensus-building principles that could form the framework of a new partnership. We stand ready to work alongside you in addressing the problems that we all face in this beautiful, but highly congested, urban center.

Thank you for your consideration of these ideas.

Signed,

Doug Buckwald

on behalf of Berkeleyans for a Livable University Environment (BLUE)

## **Twelve consensus-building principles**

Based in part on material in *The Practice of Local Government Planning, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition*  
(Published by The International City/County Management Association, © 2000)

1. Involve all interested groups and individuals as early in the planning process as possible.
2. Be inclusive, making sure to conduct sufficient outreach efforts to reach individuals who may not be aware of the project being considered, or may not understand how it will impact them.
3. Tailor the process so that it is appropriate for the people involved and the project being considered.
4. Make sure that the first several meetings are focused on sharing information rather than making decisions, and make sure that all suggested options are considered.
5. Provide leadership that is collaborative and fairly represents all interested parties.
6. Identify and nurture mutual interests.
7. Share accurate and complete information with all participants.
8. Make sure that all discussions and deliberations are handled in an open and fair way; it is often helpful for professional mediators to facilitate meetings to insure that the process is equitable and all will feel that the outcome reflects their interests and concerns.
9. Schedule regular “process evaluation” sessions so that any problems with group interaction may be addressed early enough to minimize major conflicts later in the process.
10. Maintain momentum so that stakeholders feel that progress is being made.
11. Validate results to make sure that any decisions reached will conform to the relevant legal and financial constraints.
12. Use the media throughout the process to keep the entire community informed about the options being considered and the decisions reached.