Source: Harley Ellis Devereaux, 2010.
9. Zoning
The front portion of the project site (up to 100 feet from University Avenue) is located in the General Commercial (C-1) Zoning District, and the remainder (rear 20 feet) is located in the Multiple Family Residential (R-3) Zoning District. The project would request modification or waiver of the following requirements:

♦ Zoning regulations specify that 30 percent of the land area and 75 percent of the frontage on University Avenue must be used for commercial uses. As a civic, non-profit use, this project would not include any “commercial” space.

♦ The rear portion of the building must be exempted from the R-3 rear setback requirement of 15 feet.

♦ The new building does not provide any parking, where 13 parking spaces (1 space per 500 square feet of publicly accessible floor area) would otherwise be required.

The project complies with the requirement of the C-1 District that buildings on the north side of University Avenue shall not cast a shadow more than 20 feet onto any lot in a residential zone at noon on the winter solstice.5 This is shown in Figure 9.

10. Access and Circulation
The proposed project would have one main entrance for pedestrians along University Avenue. In addition, there would be one secondary entrance accessible through a gate at the southeast corner of the site. All entrances would be wheelchair accessible. Existing AC Transit bus stops serviced by Lines 800, 802, 51B and 72 are located on University Avenue and San Pablo Avenue within a one-block radius of the project site.

11. Parking
The proposed project would not provide any parking spots on the site to serve the library, as is the case for the existing library. Parking spaces in front of the library would be altered, but not removed. A metered parking space would be relocated west along University Avenue in front of the building, and the existing blue-striped curb space for handicapped parking in front of the building would be maintained with new ramps to be installed per City of Berkeley standards. Loading and drop-off would occur from a white curb zone approximately 60 feet in length in front of the building adjacent to and east of the metered parking space. There would be six bicycle racks on the southeast side of the new building in the entry plaza to accommodate 12 bicycles. Bike parking would also be provided for library staff behind a locked gate.

12. Tree Removal/Protection
The project would remove the group of redwood trees at the northeast corner of the site. According to the City Arborist, this location does not provide adequate space for the long-

---

5Berkeley Municipal Code, Section 23E.36.070.C.1.a
Source: Harley Ellis Devereaux, 2010.
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term growth of the redwood trees, and the trees could damage the substructures at the library and neighboring property. Also, according to the City Arborist, the trees are not old growth trees, or from stump sprouts or seeds from old growth trees, and they were likely planted in the 1970s during the most recent additions to the library.

One of the two existing redwood trees in the northwest corner of the site would be retained and incorporated into the design of the building. According to the City Arborist, the other tree would not likely survive the project due to the removal of roots during excavation. Therefore the Arborist has recommended that this tree be removed if the proposed design is to be implemented. The tree could be saved by raising the building’s floor to reduce the amount of excavation; however, this would require a longer wheelchair ramp, which would reduce the amount of usable space at the front and/or require that the building’s entry be moved to the side of the building.

At the direction of the City Arborist, the two existing tulip and poplar trees on University Avenue in front of the existing library would be removed and replaced with three new trees such as London plane trees. The existing trees are considered a nuisance because they drop litter on the sidewalk.

13. Landscaping and Drainage
There would be a new 750-square-foot entry landscaped plaza with a ramp, seating and trellis on the southeast corner of the site. Planters at the front and back of the building would filter stormwater before it reaches the street. There would be a rear view garden in the northwest corner of the lot under one of the two existing redwood trees.6

14. Lighting
The new building would include low-energy, fluorescent or LED light fixtures and would conform to Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) requirements and standard conditions of approval to prevent light pollution.

15. Energy-Efficiency and Green Components
In 2003, the City of Berkeley adopted Resolution No. 62,284-N.S., which requires that all eligible City-sponsored projects that enter design and construction after 2005 meet a minimum LEED Silver rating.7 The West Berkeley Branch design is expected to achieve a minimum of LEED-Gold certification.

One of the goals of the project is to create a zero net energy (ZNE) design that uses no net energy over the course of typical year for heating, cooling and electricity. This project would have 160 solar photovoltaic panels and 18 solar thermal panels on the roof of the building. In addition, the design would use daylighting to reduce energy loads for lighting. Natural

---

6 Entrances from the children’s area and multi-purpose room shown in Figure 5 are outdated; no public access will be allowed to the area behind the building.

7 LEED is an internationally-recognized green building certification system established by the U.S. Green Building Council.
ventilation would be provided in all the occupied spaces. Based on the current design and LEED checklist, the building would also have some operable windows for cooling air.

16. Site Operations
The operating schedule and number of full-time employees at the new library is expected to be the same as for the existing library. The West Branch Library’s hours are Monday and Tuesday from 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.; Wednesday and Thursday from 12:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.; and Friday and Saturday from 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. The new library would have nine full-time employees.

F. Required Permits and Approvals
The proposed project would require the following permits and approvals:
- Use Permits to demolish the existing structure and build a new one.
- Use Permits to reduce the rear setback requirement and waive the requirements for parking and ground-floor commercial space.
- Preliminary and Final Design Review by the Design Review Committee (Preliminary Design Review is advisory to the Zoning Adjustments Board, prior to action on the Use Permit; Final Design Review is a separate, non-advisory action after approval of the Use Permit)
- Demolition Permit under BMC Section 3.24.240.B.2 to demolish a listed “Structure of Merit.”
- Waiver of affordable housing and child care impact fees (applicable to projects creating more than 7,500 square feet of new floor area).

Applications for the Demolition Permit under BMC Section 3.24.240.B.2 and Preliminary Design Review were filed with the City’s Planning Department in July, 2010. The project sponsor intends to file a Use Permit application for demolition of the existing library and construction of a new library in September or October, 2010.

G. Standard Conditions of Approval
The City of Berkeley has a standard set of procedures designed to minimize the environmental issues associated with construction projects. The following would be relevant to the West Berkeley Branch Library Project.

1. Air Quality
Compliance with BAAQMD Basic Control Measures for reducing construction emissions of PM10:
- Water all active construction areas at least twice daily. Watering should be sufficient to prevent airborne dust from leaving the site. Increased watering frequency may be
necessary whenever wind speeds exceed 15 miles per hour. Reclaimed water should be used whenever possible.

- Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard (i.e. the minimum required space between the top of the load the top of the trailer).
- Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.
- Sweep streets (with water sweepers using reclaimed water if possible) at the end of each day if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent paved roads.

2. Cultural Resources

Archaeological Resources
If an archaeological resource is accidently uncovered during demolition or construction activities for the proposed project, the project applicant shall be required to notify the City of Berkeley immediately and all excavation work within 10 feet of the find shall cease immediately. A qualified archaeologist shall be consulted to determine the necessity for monitoring the remaining excavation and to evaluate any cultural resource exposure during construction. Construction activity shall resume upon consultation with the City of Berkeley and upon implementation of the recommendations of the archaeologist. Cultural resources include, but are not limited to: railroad ties, foundations, privies, shell and bone artifacts, ash and charcoal. Identified cultural resources shall be recorded on the DPR 523 (historic properties) forms.

Paleontological Resources
If a paleontological resource is accidently uncovered during demolition or construction activities for the proposed project, the project applicant shall be required to notify the City of Berkeley immediately and all excavation work within 10 feet of the find shall cease immediately. A qualified paleontologist or archaeologist shall be consulted to determine the necessity for monitoring any excavation and to evaluate any paleontological resource exposed during construction. Construction activity shall resume upon consultation with the City of Berkeley and upon implementation of the recommendations of the paleontologist or archaeologist.

Human Remains
In the event that human skeletal remains are encountered during demolition or construction activities for the proposed project, the project applicant shall immediately notify the County Coroner and the City of Berkeley. If the County Coroner determines that the remains are Native American, the Coroner shall contact the California Native Heritage Commission, pursuant to subdivision (c) of Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code. In addition, excavation work within 10 feet of the find shall cease immediately.
3. Geology and Soils

Soils Report

The City of Berkeley requires submittal of a Soil Properties Report to the Building Safety Division (for sites that are not located in seismic hazards areas where a full geotechnical report is required). This would cover issues of soil strength for the given type of construction and for expansive soils. (A Geotechnical Study Update, which is also the Soil Properties Report, was submitted to the City April 27, 2010.)

Geotechnical Report

In accordance with City of Berkeley grading and construction ordinances, a site-specific geotechnical report will be prepared that includes generally accepted and appropriate engineering techniques for determining the susceptibility of the project site to various geologic and seismic hazards, and the design criteria appropriate for the California Building Code (CBC).

4. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Asbestos and Lead Removal

The project applicant shall notify the construction contractor that asbestos and lead have been found in the West Branch Library and shall provide the contractor with a copy of the Asbestos and Lead Survey Report. The construction contractor shall adhere to all existing regulations requiring abatement of lead and asbestos hazards and worker health and safety procedures during construction activities.

Soil Contamination

Obvious soil contamination discovered during demolition, grading, or excavation shall be removed, segregated, and covered. The soil shall be profiled for off-site disposal and be removed from the site within 48 hours. The applicant shall contract with a competent professional to collect verification soil samples to ensure complete soil removal, and the City of Berkeley Toxics Management Division shall be notified of all soil contamination requiring removal.

5. Hydrology and Water Quality

Runoff Minimization and Control

Prior to issuance of a building permit, the project shall demonstrate compliance with the requirements of the City’s National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit as described in Berkeley Municipal Code (BMC) Section 17.20. Such projects are required to control construction-related drainage and erosion through the following conditions:

♦ The project plans shall identify site-specific Best Management Practices (BMPs) appropriate to activities conducted on-site to limit to the maximum extent practicable the discharge of pollutants into the City’s storm drainage system, regardless of season or weather conditions.

♦ The project plans shall include erosion control measures to prevent soil, dirt, and debris from entering the storm drain system, in accordance with BMC Chapter 17.20.
Trash enclosures and/or recycling areas shall be covered; no other area shall drain onto these areas. Drains in any wash or process area shall not discharge to the storm drain system; these drains should connect to the sanitary sewer.

Landscaping shall be designed with efficient irrigation to reduce runoff and promote surface infiltration and minimize the use of fertilizers and pesticides that contribute to stormwater pollution. Where feasible, landscaping should be designed and operated to treat runoff. When and where feasible, xeriscape and drought tolerant plants shall be incorporated into new development plans.

6. Noise
Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicant shall develop a site-specific noise reduction program prepared by a qualified acoustical consultant to reduce construction noise impacts to the maximum extent feasible, subject to review and approval of the Zoning Officer. The noise reduction program should include, but shall not be limited to, the following measures:

- Noise barrier at the site boundary adjacent to the abutting residential property, if the acoustical analysis proves such a barrier to be substantially effective in reducing noise impact at the adjacent residential property.

- Equipment and trucks used for project construction shall utilize the best available noise control techniques (e.g. improved mufflers, equipment redesign, use of intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures, and acoustically attenuating shields or shrouds, wherever feasible).

- Impact tools (e.g. jack hammers, pavement breakers, and rock drills) used for project construction shall be hydraulically or electrically powered wherever possible to avoid noise associated with compressed-air exhaust from pneumatically powered tools. However, where use of pneumatic tools is unavoidable, an exhaust muffler on the compressed-air exhaust shall be used; this muffler can lower noise levels from the exhaust by up to about 10 dBA. External jackets on the tools themselves shall be used where feasible, which could achieve a reduction of 5 dBA. Quieter procedures shall be used, such as drills rather than impact equipment, whenever feasible.

- Stationary noise sources shall be located as far from sensitive receptors as possible, and they shall be muffled and enclosed within temporary sheds, or insulation barriers or other measures shall be incorporated to the extent feasible. Signs shall be posted at the construction site that include permitted construction days and hours, a day and evening contact number for the job site, and a day and evening contact number for the on-site complaint and enforcement manager, and the City’s Noise Enforcement Officer, in the event of problems.

- An on-site complaint and enforcement manager shall be available to respond to and track complaints. The manager will be responsible for responding to any complaints regarding construction noise and for coordinating with the adjacent land uses. The manager will determine the cause of any complaints and coordinate with the construction team to implement effective measures (considered technically and economically feasible) warranted
to correct the problem. The telephone number of the coordinator shall be posted at the construction site and provided to neighbors in a notification letter. The manager shall notify the City’s Noise Enforcement Officer of all complaints within 24 hours. The manager will be trained to use a sound level meter and should be available during all construction hours to respond to complaints; and

♦ Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a pre-construction meeting shall be held with the Noise Enforcement Officer and the general contractor/on-site project manager to confirm that noise mitigation and practices are completed (including construction hours, neighborhood notification, posted signs, etc.).

7. Traffic and Transportation
A Traffic Management Plan (TMP) shall be prepared by the applicant and approved by Public Works Traffic Engineering (981-6400), and shall address the following issues:

♦ A construction schedule shall be specified and may be subject to approval.

♦ Applicant may request a Construction No Parking Permit (and associated signs and accompanying dashboard permits) for essential parking in a parking lane and along the property frontage of the work site during periods of active construction.

♦ Sidewalk shall be kept open at all times for pedestrian flow, unless a Street Use/Encroachment Permit is approved as provided below.

♦ Approved truck haul route to/from site shall be via Interstate 80 (I-80) and University Avenue. Trucks traveling from the north shall use I-80 to Gilman Street eastbound, San Pablo Avenue southbound, Cedar Street eastbound, and Sacramento Street southbound. Trucks traveling from the south shall use I-80 to Ashby Avenue eastbound and Sacramento Street northbound. Deviations from approved routes shall require separate approval.

♦ A Street Use/Encroachment Permit (requiring joint approval by Traffic Engineering and the Engineering Inspectors in the PSC), is required for any short-term or long-term:
  • alterations, closures, or blockages to pedestrian paths or sidewalks,
  • alterations, closures, or blockages to vehicle travel lanes (cars and bicycles), and
  • storage of building materials, dumpsters, debris anywhere in the public ROW.
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

I. AESTHETICS

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?*

The new library would have a maximum height of 32 feet, twice the maximum height of the existing library, which is 16 feet. The new structure would cover a larger portion of the lot: 75 percent of the lot as compared with 56 percent for the existing library. The project site is located in a built-out urban area along a major arterial, University Avenue.

The City of Berkeley has a Zoning Ordinance definition and General Plan policy that are intended to define and protect scenic views. Section 23F.04.010 of the Zoning Ordinance defines “view corridor” as “a significant view of the Berkeley Hills, San Francisco Bay, Mt. Tamalpais, or a significant landmark such as the Campanile, Golden Gate Bridge, and Alcatraz Island or any other significant vista that substantially enhances the value and enjoyment of real property.” Policy UD-31 of the City of Berkeley General Plan requires that significant views, including views to the Bay, hills, and significant landmarks should not be blocked by construction and requires that new buildings should “enhance a vista or punctuate or clarify the urban pattern.” No scenic views can be accessed from the site except eastward views of the Berkeley Hills from the site frontage along University Avenue, and the project would not alter these views. The Holiday Inn Express Hotel & Suites located adjacent to and east of the project site already blocks any views of the Hills from elsewhere on the project site. No scenic views can be accessed from the hotel or other properties looking across the project site.

Construction of the new library would not block views to the Berkeley Hills from along University Avenue. Therefore, there would be *no impact*.

b) *Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?*

Because the new library would replace the existing library building, no scenic resources would be substantially damaged. The site is not in proximity to Interstate 580, which is the closest State-designated Scenic Highway, and the City of Berkeley General Plan does not designate any scenic roadways. Therefore, there would be *no impact*. 
c) Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

The project would not result in an adverse visual change as compared to the existing building because the new library would not exceed the height of other tall buildings nearby, and would have an attractive, contemporary architectural design and style. The increased maximum height of the project as compared to the existing building would be consistent with the surrounding taller uses, such as the adjacent Holiday Inn Express Hotel & Suites and the Campanile Court apartments located across University Avenue from the project site. Additionally, the shadow study shown in Figure 9 demonstrates that the project would not cast significant shadows on the apartments to the rear (north) of the project site. The new library would also be better integrated with University Avenue by contributing to a pedestrian-oriented environment, including glazed storefront windows and a more open entry as well as adequate bicycle parking, benches, and a covered trellis providing shade. Additionally, the project would have a civic arts component that would engage the community. Aesthetic considerations that are relevant to the Historic Resources that may be represented by the existing library building are discussed in Section V. Therefore, the project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site or surroundings, and the impact would be less than significant.

d) Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

The project would have emergency lighting, illuminated exit signs, and motion sensors to control lighting inside the library, all of which are required by City Code. The existing library is not up to code and does not have these lighting elements. Entrances to the West Branch Library would be illuminated with pendant down-lights in overhead canopies. This shielding would avoid direct glare into neighboring residences. Additionally, double-glazed windows fronting University Avenue would reduce glare. Walkways around the building would be lit by wall-mounted, shielded down-lights. Landscaped areas may be lit with low-wattage fixtures. Some signs would be illuminated as the library would be open at night. Light would also conform to LEED requirements to prevent light pollution. Overall, the project would have more external lighting than on the site at present to improve visibility and safety. However, because lighting would be in conformance with Berkeley City Code and with LEED requirements, and would be shielded and directed away from adjacent uses, there would be a less-than-significant impact.

Because there would be no significant impacts associated with aesthetics, no further evaluation will be required in the EIR.
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or of conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

a-e)

The site is occupied by an existing library. Therefore, there would be no impacts to agricultural resources, and no further evaluation will be required in the EIR.

III. AIR QUALITY

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

---

8 In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the State’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

9 Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.
III. AIR QUALITY
Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under applicable federal or State ambient air quality standards (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative Standards for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? |

a-c)

The San Francisco Bay Area occasionally violates State and federal standards for ozone and particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM₁₀) and less than 2.5 microns (PM₂.₅). Ozone forms when precursor chemicals, known as criteria pollutants, nitrous oxides (NOₓ), and reactive organic gases (ROGs), react with oxygen and sunlight. Diesel-powered construction equipment and passenger vehicles associated with the project would generate PM₁₀, PM₂.₅, and ozone precursor chemicals.

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) is responsible for developing regional plans for ozone reduction. On-site operation of construction equipment is subject to BAAQMD Rules and Regulations. Compliance with the BAAQMD Rules and Regulations would help meet the goals of regional air quality plans.

Construction of the project would produce dust, which could add to the amount of airborne particulates. However, the project would be subject to the City of Berkeley Standard Conditions of Approval (Project Description, Section G), which includes control measures to minimize dust. By definition, compliance with the Standard Conditions of Approval would reduce the relevant impact to a less-than-significant level.

Asbestos removal from the old library would be conducted in accordance with the procedures specified in Regulation 11, Rule 2 (Asbestos Demolition, Renovation and Manufacturing) of BAAQMD regulations, which would reduce the impact to less than significant.

There would be few on-road construction-related vehicles, with rarely more than five construction trucks per day and 10 construction-related personal vehicles per day. Because of the small number of on-road construction-related vehicles, the impact to air quality from these construction-related vehicles would be less than significant.

Operation of the new library would be an improvement over operation of the existing library with respect to emissions. The project must achieve at least a LEED Silver rating under City of Berkeley Resolution No. 62284-N.S., and the intention is to achieve a LEED Gold rating.
Under LEED, the project will follow improved indoor air quality and ventilation requirements. Filtered, natural ventilation would result in fewer emissions. Additionally, the number of library visitors and the number of library employees is not anticipated to increase as a result of the proposed project because operations of the new library would not differ substantially from the existing library. Therefore, no additional passenger vehicle trips are anticipated for the project.

Overall, there would be a *less-than-significant* impact on implementation of air quality plans, violation of air quality standards, or substantial contribution to air quality violations, or net increases in criteria pollutants due to the proposed project.

d) *Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?*

Sensitive receptors typically include residences, schools, parks, and hospitals. Sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project site that could be affected by the demolition and construction include the Campanile Court Apartments opposite of the project site along University Avenue and the Holiday Inn Express Hotel & Suites directly east of the site. Control measures built into the project as Standard Conditions of Approval, and adherence to BAAQMD Rules and Regulations to reduce construction dust and diesel particulate emissions would minimize the exposure by sensitive receptors to acceptable levels. Therefore, and also because of the short-term, temporary nature of construction, site preparation, and construction of the building shell, there would be a *less-than-significant* impact on sensitive receptors.

e) *Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?*

Because paints and other building materials could produce temporary odors during construction, and painting would occur over periods of a few days to a few weeks at most, the project would have a *less-than-significant* impact associated with objectionable odors.

Because all impacts on air quality would be less than significant, no further evaluation would be required in the EIR.

### IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan or other approved local, regional or State habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project would be located on a mostly paved site where there is an existing structure (the existing library). The project’s location in an urban, built-out environment along University Avenue does not support nests of any protected bird species. The project site includes a group of redwood trees located at the northeast corner of the site and two large, mature redwood trees located at the northwest corner of the site. The trees are not old growth trees, or from stump sprouts or seeds from old growth trees, and they were likely planted in the 1970s during the most recent additions to the library. According to the City Arborist, this location does not provide adequate space for the long-term growth of the redwood trees, and the trees could damage foundations of the new library and the neighboring hotel. Therefore, under the project, this group of trees would be removed.

According to the City Arborist, the double-trunked tree at the northwest corner would not likely survive the project due to the removal of roots during excavation. Therefore the Arborist has recommended that this tree be removed if the proposed design is to be implemented. The tree could be saved by raising the building’s floor to reduce the amount of excavation; however, this would require a longer wheelchair ramp, which would reduce the amount of usable space at the front and/or require that the building’s entry be moved to the side of the building.
On the sidewalk adjacent to the project site, the two existing trees belonging to the City of Berkeley would be removed and replaced with three new trees, such as London plane trees.

Construction of the project is not likely to cause any adverse effects to any sensitive or special-status plant or animal species directly or through modification of their habitat. Although some trees on the site would be removed, the project is not likely to substantially interfere with the migration of a native animal species or with a wildlife migratory corridor because the project site is located in an urban, built-out environment and has been developed since 1923. The site does not contain riparian habitat, wetlands or other sensitive natural community, and the site would not conflict with any approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plans.

Overall, there would be a less-than-significant impact associated with biological resources, and no further evaluation will be required in the EIR.

### V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as defined in Section 15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geologic feature?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?**

The existing library is identified by the City of Berkeley as a Structure of Merit, was the first branch library built in Berkeley, and is the only Carnegie-influenced library remaining in the city. Because it has been identified by the City as an historic resource, its demolition could be potentially significant, and further evaluation will be required in an EIR.

**b) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?**

The project would include site excavation, which could potentially disturb buried archaeological remains. However, requirements in the City of Berkeley’s Standard Conditions of Approval (Project Description, Section G) ensure that these impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.
c) Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Site excavation for the project could potentially uncover a unique paleontological resource or geologic feature. However, requirements in the City of Berkeley’s Standard Conditions of Approval (Project Description, Section G) ensure that these impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

d) Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

The site is in an urban area with an existing library on the property since 1923. Excavation would be restricted to the existing building footprint and driveway on the project site. If human remains were uncovered during site excavation for the project, the City of Berkeley’s Standard Conditions of Approval (Project Description, Section G) would require that the County Coroner and the City of Berkeley be immediately notified. The County Coroner would contact the California Native Heritage Commission if the Coroner were to determine that the remains are Native American. Additionally, excavation work within 10 feet of human remains would cease immediately. Impacts associated with disturbance of human remains would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Overall, because the existing library on the project site is designated by the City of Berkeley as a Structure of Merit, further evaluation of cultural resources will be required in the EIR.

---

### VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ iv) Landslides?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a-e)

Risks associated with geology and soils are a concern in Berkeley and throughout the San Francisco Bay Area. The proposed project is not located in an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault zone and no active or potentially active faults cross the site or are in proximity to the site. The closest major fault to the project site is the Hayward Fault, located approximately 2.5 miles east of the project site. The San Andreas Fault is located west of the project site across the San Francisco Bay approximately 20 miles away. According to studies by the United States Geological Survey (USGS), the Bay Area has a 63 percent probability that an earthquake of magnitude 6.7 or greater would occur within the next 30 years. Ground shaking from an earthquake on the Hayward Fault would be classified as “violent” according to maps published by the Association of Bay Area Governments.\(^\text{10}\) The California Building Code (CBC) includes requirements that factor in ground accelerations from likely earthquakes into building design. The CBC requires calculation of site-specific building parameters that take into account underlying sediment types and building location with respect to known earthquake faults. These factors are contained in the project’s Geotechnical Report, prepared in accordance with City of Berkeley requirements. Additionally, the Geotechnical Report addresses engineering techniques appropriate to mitigate earthquake-generated ground shaking and subsidiary issues such as landslides, liquefaction or lateral spreading. The project will use the information in the Geotechnical Report to incorporate design strategies that will help the project withstand potential earthquakes and related ground shaking, landslides, liquefaction or lateral spreading. Adherence to the recommendations in the Geotechnical Report would reduce impacts associated with geology and soils to a less-than-significant level.

In addition to the recommendations and mitigation measures described for earthquake-related issues, the Geotechnical Report describes soil type including soil erosion and any expansive soils. Because the site is flat and mostly paved, significant soil erosion is unlikely. However, compliance with federal and local permitting requirements, and the City of Berkeley National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES permit), included in the City of Berkeley’s Standard Conditions of Approval (Project Description, Section G) would mitigate soil erosion during grading and construction and reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.

\(^{10}\) ABAG maps of earthquake shaking scenarios are available online at http://www.abag.ca.gov/bayarea/eqmaps/mapsba.html.
The proposed project does not include use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems.

Although the project would have either a less-than-significant impact or no impact associated with geology and soils, the EIR will evaluate the potential for geology and soils impacts from alternatives to the project that would preserve and/or seismically enhance portions of the existing library.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:

| Would the project generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? |
| Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant | No Impact |
| a) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs? |
| | | | |

a) Would the project generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Construction vehicles, manufacture of construction materials, and heavy equipment used during demolition of the existing library and construction of the new library would produce GHG emissions. The BAAQMD adopted new thresholds and guidelines in June 2010 that included the following guidance for assessing the significance of construction-related GHG emissions.11

The District does not have an adopted Threshold of Significance for construction-related GHG emissions. However, the Lead Agency should quantify and disclose GHG emissions that would occur during construction, and make a determination on the significance of these construction generated GHG emission impacts in relation to meeting AB 32 GHG reduction goals. BAAQMD recommends using URBEMIS for proposed land use development projects and RoadMod for proposed projects that are linear in nature. Sources of construction-related GHGs only include exhaust, for which the same detailed guidance as described for criteria air pollutants and precursors should be followed.

The Lead Agency is encouraged to incorporate best management practices to reduce GHG emissions during construction, as applicable. Best management practices may include, but are not limited to: using alternative fueled (e.g., biodiesel, electric)

---

11 The BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines adopted in June, 2010, are available online at this link: http://www.baaqmd.gov/~/media/Files/Planning%20and%20Research/CEQA/BAAQMD%20CEQA%20Guidelines_June%202010.ashx. The quoted text can be found on page 8-7.
construction vehicles/equipment of at least 15 percent of the fleet; using local building materials of at least 10 percent; and recycling or reusing at least 50 percent of construction waste or demolition materials.

The sentence: “Sources of construction-related GHGs only include exhaust, for which the same detailed guidance as described for criteria air pollutants and precursors should be followed” has been generally interpreted to mean that only the GHGs coming from on-site construction vehicle use need quantification and not the GHGs emitted during the manufacture and transport of the construction materials. The BAAQMD guidelines include a table of screening levels to indicate at what project size numerical calculations of GHG emissions from construction or operation should be undertaken. For construction, only for a library greater than 277,000 square feet would quantification of emissions be required. For operations, only for a library greater than 15,000 square feet would quantification of emissions be required. Given the much smaller size of the project (8,900 square foot footprint, 9,600 gross square feet), GHGs from construction vehicle emissions have therefore not been modeled numerically. It is not known at this time if the construction vehicles include alternative fueled vehicles, the component of local building materials, or the percentage of material that can be recycled. However, Municipal Code Chapter 19.24 requires that the maximum amount of salvageable designated recyclable and reusable materials shall be recovered prior to demolition. A site-specific Waste Diversion Plan to be compiled by the contractor would describe the types and destinations of the materials. These efforts would help achieve the City of Berkeley goal of achieving Zero Waste by 2010 to 2020, as stated in Zero-Waste Resolution No. 62,849- N.S.

It is recognized that GHGs are also generated when new building materials are manufactured and transported to the construction site. Although this could be calculated, there is insufficient information available about the project at this time to make an accurate estimate. Moreover, this kind of analysis is not generally being undertaken for CEQA review, even for much larger projects that exceed the screening levels, and, as described above, it is not required by BAAQMD.

Operation of the new library would generate GHG emissions in the form of carbon dioxide from building energy use and transportation to and from the library. For the West Branch Library project, the building energy use would be considerably less than for the existing library, despite its larger size, given the changes in building codes, use of energy efficient building techniques and materials, and incorporation of solar panels in the project description. All City-sponsored projects are required to achieve a minimum LEED-Silver rating, which requires energy efficiency and other environmental impact reduction measures that will help reduce GHG emissions from the project. For example, the LEED checklist provides points for alternative travel mode accessibility, water use reduction, waste management and recycling, natural ventilation, and daylighting.

For the West Branch Library, the project sponsor intends to achieve a higher rating of LEED Gold (which requires a score of at least 60 out of 100 possible points, including certain minimum standards and a variety of strategies to reduce environmental impacts). The current
design is a “zero net energy” building design that, if operated correctly as per the computer model, would use no net energy over the course of an average year for heating, cooling and electricity.

Additionally, because the project does not substantially increase the number of library visitors or employees from the existing library, there would not be a substantial increase in operational GHG emissions from passenger vehicles as a result of the proposed project. While the larger multi-purpose room may accommodate larger meetings than the existing meeting room, such meetings are not anticipated to generate substantial new vehicle trips given that meetings are generally oriented to the surrounding West Berkeley area, rather than the entire City, allowing access by non-vehicular modes of travel. The lack of off-street parking would further encourage such travel modes. There would therefore be a less-than-significant impact from project operation.

b) Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs?

The City of Berkeley adopted a Climate Action Plan (CAP) on June 2, 2009. The CAP focuses on transportation, which encompasses 47 percent of Berkeley’s GHG emissions.

The new library would replace the existing library at its existing location. The existing site is adequately served by public transportation with several AC Transit bus lines servicing stops on University Avenue and San Pablo Avenue near the project site. The site is also located seven blocks from the North Berkeley BART station, and is surrounded by moderately dense residential neighborhoods with good pedestrian and bicycle networks, which will encourage patrons to walk or bike to the site rather than driving. The project does not provide additional vehicle parking, although it will provide bicycle parking, and in this way it discourages automobile use.

The CAP also contains a section on Building Energy Use. The project intends to achieve a LEED-Gold rating and will include photovoltaic panels on the roof, daylighting and natural ventilation. Therefore, it is expected that operation of the project will generate fewer GHGs than the existing library.

The CAP’s provision to encourage preservation and adaptive reuse of historic buildings is also relevant to this discussion. This section reads as follows:12

intensified to create additional housing or commercial space to help meet future demand.

The CAP encourages preservation and adaptive reuse but it does not require this above all other considerations, such as improved building energy use. The proposed project therefore would be in compliance with the major goals and policies of the CAP, and impacts would be less than significant.

Even though the impacts associated with GHG emissions are found to be less than significant in this Initial Study, as this is a controversial subject, with known public interest, the subject will be discussed again in the EIR.

VIII. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☒ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☒ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☒ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous material sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☒ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard for people living or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☒ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☒ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☒ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☒ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a-d)

A library has existed on the site since 1923, before which time the site was vacant according to Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps; therefore, there is no history of uses involving hazardous materials.

Materials from the demolition and construction would be transported to and from the site but this would not constitute routine transport. This short-term activity would involve very minor quantities of materials such as fuels, oils, solvents, and glues that would be used in construction. Accidents involving release of these materials are always possible, but such accidents are not considered likely.

The foundation will extend to the depth of undisturbed native soil or engineered fill. Groundwater is found at depths of 18 feet in this area of Berkeley. It is unlikely that excavation would encounter groundwater; therefore, dewatering would not be required due to groundwater disturbance. As described in Standard Conditions of Approval (Project Description, Section G), permit regulations may require treatment of groundwater generated by construction dewatering prior to discharge into the storm drain system or sewer system. There is no known subsurface contamination on the project site and therefore there is no reason to suspect groundwater contamination. Therefore, release of hazardous materials into the environment is not likely to occur as a result of the proposed project. Additionally, the project would comply with requirements related to hazardous materials and emissions under the City of Berkeley’s Standard Conditions of Approval (Section G of the Project Description). During demolition and site grading, atypical odors or staining would be noted and precautionary measures for soil testing and excavation would be carried out. Soil from the excavation would be transported to the appropriate landfill.

The proposed project would be located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school, including the Black Pine Circle School for grades K through 8. As noted above, given the short-term handling of very minor quantities of materials such as fuels, oils, solvents, and glues during construction, the impact would be small and therefore less than significant.

The proposed project is not on a list of hazardous materials sites, compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. The construction contractor would be provided with the asbestos and lead survey and required to comply with all applicable regulations concerning removal of this material. The project applicant would hire a hazardous materials consulting company to monitor the demolition activities of the contractor.

Given compliance with the Standard Conditions of Approval and the short-term use of minor quantities of hazardous materials, there would be a less-than-significant impact.
e) For a project within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard for people living or working in the project area?

The project is not located within 2 miles of a public or public use airport nor is it located within an airport land use plan; therefore, there would be no impact.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

The project is not located near a private airstrip; therefore, there would be no impact.

g) Would the project impair implementation or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

A Construction Management Plan, required by the City of Berkeley as a standard project feature, would ensure that construction vehicle maneuvering does not substantially interfere with traffic. During construction, the sidewalk would be temporarily blocked off, and some street parking spaces could be fenced off from street access. Additionally, trenching in the street might be necessary to install new utility lines, which could temporarily block street access during construction. Although the trenching could partially block University Avenue, which is an emergency access and evacuation routes designated in the Berkeley General Plan Transportation Element, the blockage would be temporary and would impede only a portion of University Avenue for a short time. Therefore, there would be a less-than-significant impact associated with implementation or physical interference with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan.

h) Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

The project is located in a built-out, urban area approximately 2.5 miles from the Berkeley Hills, the nearest area from which wildland fires could originate, and the project does not substantially increase the level of human occupancy at the site. Therefore, the project would have no impact from increased exposure to wildland fires.

Because all impacts from hazards and hazardous materials would either be less than significant or have no impact, no further evaluation will be required in the EIR.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g. the production rate of preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

j) Inundated by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

---

a) Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

The proposed project would result in excavation of approximately 1,400 cubic yards of soil over most of the project site. Because the project would disturb an area of less than one acre, the project would not require a project-specific National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. Instead, the project would be covered by and would apply for the city-wide permit, and as stated in the Project Description, the project would comply with its requirements. Thus, the project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, and the impact would be less than significant.

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table...
level (e.g. the production rate of preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

The project’s water is supplied by the East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) and would not use groundwater. Although the building footprint will increase, the project is designed to maximize on-site retention and filtration of stormwater, and minimize runoff. The project would not lower the local groundwater table or aquifer volume, and therefore, there would be a less-than-significant impact.

c-d)

The library site is approximately flat and the new library would not occupy a much greater area than the old. There would only be very minor changes to the drainage pattern. Following construction, the new building footprint would occupy 8,900 square feet compared to the current figure of 6,230 square feet. Additionally, the new library design would include flow-through planters to that would filter the stormwater runoff. Because the new impervious area is only slightly greater than the old impervious area by 2,670 square feet, there would be a less-than-significant impact associated with alteration of the existing drainage pattern resulting in erosion or flooding.

e-f)

New library operations would remain essentially the same as that of the existing library, so that there would be no additional sources of polluted runoff. Additionally, the project would be required to comply with the City of Berkeley’s Standard Conditions of Approval (Section G, Project Description), which addresses contamination resulting from any past uses found during demolition to prevent degradation of water quality and describes measures that reduce runoff. The project design would also include flow-through planters to filter the stormwater runoff from the project. Compliance with these Standard Conditions of Approval would ensure that impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

g-j)

The project site is not located in a 100-year flood hazard area and does not include housing. Therefore, there would be no impact associated with placing housing or other structures within the 100-year flood hazard area.

Additionally, the project site is not located behind a levee failure area or in the path of water flow from a dam. The project site is located 0.5-mile from San Francisco Bay at approximately sea level, but is not located in an area that could be inundated by a tsunami, according to the Berkeley General Plan Disaster Preparedness and Safety Element. Therefore, there would be no impacts associated with exposing people or structures to flooding, including flooding as a result of failure of a levee or dam, or with inundation by tsunami.

Because all impacts from hydrology and water quality would either be less than significant or have no impact, no further evaluation will be required in the EIR.
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Would the project physically divide an established community?

Physically dividing an established community typically refers to a project that includes a major roadway or development that would physically block and/or separate an existing neighborhood or community from itself or surrounding areas. Because there is an existing library on the project site and the new library would be built on the same site, there would be no impact.

b) Would the project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

The project would be consistent with the Berkeley General Plan. Policy LU-27 in the Land Use Element calls for “pedestrian-friendly, visually attractive areas of pedestrian scale.” The project would have an entrance fronting University Avenue, display windows, bicycle parking facilities and street trees. The project would also incorporate an existing ornamental stone from the existing library and provide a civic arts component that would further engage the community.

The front portion of the project site (up to 80 feet from University Avenue) is located in the General Commercial (C-1) Zoning District, and the remainder is located in the Multiple Family Residential (R-3) Zoning District. The project would include the following modifications or waivers from the C-1 and R-3 zoning requirements:

- The project would not include any commercial space, where the C-1 regulations specify that 30 percent of the land area and 75 percent of the frontage on University Avenue must be used for commercial uses.
- The project has a rear setback of 5 feet, 6 inches where the R-3 District requires a rear setback of 15 feet.
The project does not provide off-street parking spaces, where Zoning regulations require 13 spaces (1 space per 500 square feet of publicly accessible floor area).

The project would request these modifications as part of its Use Permit and Design Review, and the Zoning Adjustments Board would have discretionary authority to grant the modifications upon finding that they would not be detrimental to the City’s general welfare, to surrounding properties, or to persons working or residing in the project vicinity. In and of themselves, the request for discretionary modifications would have no land use impacts, nor are they inconsistent with the City’s regulations, since the Zoning Ordinance provides that they may be granted. Potential impacts of the modified features have been analyzed throughout this document as part of the proposed project.

As noted in the Greenhouse Gas Emissions section above, the project could potentially conflict with the City of Berkeley’s CAP provision to encourage preservation and adaptive reuse of historic buildings. However, the proposed project would address the existing library’s seismic safety and building access issues and would be designed under the zero net energy concept, consistent with the major goals and policies of the CAP.

Additionally, the project would be consistent with the University Avenue Strategic Plan (UASP), adopted November 1996. The UASP outlines strategies for public safety, land use, urban design, economic development, housing, transportation, and community services to improve the quality of life along University Avenue. Under the UASP, the project is located in the San Pablo Avenue Node, which has been designated a locally-serving destination targeted for higher-intensity mixed-use buildings. The project would be consistent with the UASP design guidelines for Avenue Nodes, which call for the building to front University Avenue, ground floor space to be occupied by retail or services, the building to be a minimum of two stories tall, and a decorative and pedestrian-oriented building façade.

Because the project would not conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations, there would be no impact.

c) Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

There are no applicable habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans for the project site; therefore, there would be no impact.

Because there would be no impacts associated with land use, no further evaluation will be required in the EIR.
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES
Would the project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State? ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

a-b) The site is not associated with known mineral resources or locally important mineral resource recovery sites. Therefore, there would be no impact.

Because there would be no impact to mineral resources, no further evaluation will be required in the EIR.

XII. NOISE
Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

a-b) The City of Berkeley Noise Ordinance regulates the hours allowed for construction and demolition work and has guidelines for maximum allowable construction-related noise levels.
for residential and commercial/industrial areas. Specifically, the Noise Ordinance restricts construction to between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on weekdays, and 9:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on weekends or holidays, unless a variance is secured from the Noise Control Officer.

Also, where technically and economically feasible, the Noise Ordinance requires that construction activities be conducted in such a manner that the maximum noise levels at affected properties will not exceed the maximum allowable noise levels designated in the Ordinance. The project abuts the R-3 residential area, so that applicable standards for this project would include maximum noise levels of 80 dBA on weekdays and 65 dBA on weekends and legal holidays for short-term, mobile equipment such as jackhammers, drills, and saws, and maximum noise levels of 65 dBA on weekdays and 55 dBA on weekends and legal holidays for stationary, repetitively-scheduled equipment. The project would comply with these maximum noise levels and the regulated hours called for in the Noise Ordinance; therefore, impacts associated with consistency with the Noise Ordinance would be less than significant.

Construction noise levels depend on the type of equipment operating. The main noise producers associated with the demolition phase of the proposed project would be excavators removing material and trucks hauling material away from the site. The existing library is a relatively small structure of about 6,230 square feet, and the total period for demolition and construction would be approximately 12 months. The demolition phase would be approximately one month long with the loudest noise restricted to approximately three weeks. Pile drivers would not be employed for construction. The loudest noise-generating equipment associated with the construction phase would most likely be concrete mixers, pumps, and earth-moving equipment, which would be utilized for a short time span of about two months during construction. The City of Berkeley’s Standard Conditions of Approval (Project Description, Section G) would reduce the noise impacts of construction at neighboring residences. Compliance with the Standard Conditions of Approval and the short-term, temporary nature of the construction noise, including groundborne vibration and noise levels, would reduce noise impacts to a less-than-significant level.

c-d)

The new library would have the same uses and is projected to have the same number of patrons as the existing library. Noise levels, which are minimal, would not change from project operation, and there would be no permanent or temporary operational impacts associated with ambient noise levels. Therefore, there would be no impact.

e-f)

The project is not located within 2 miles of a public or public use airport nor is it located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, there would be no impact.

Because all impacts from noise would either be less than significant or have no impact, no further evaluation will be required in the EIR.
XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

a-c) The project does not propose or include housing and involves no substantial increase in the expected occupancy of the library. Therefore, there would be no impact associated with population and housing.

Because there would be no impacts associated with population and housing, no further evaluation will be required in the EIR.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Without Mitigation Incorporated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other public facilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other
performance objectives for any of the public services: fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, other public facilities?

The proposed project includes no substantial increase in the expected occupancy of the library so the project would not affect the ability of fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, and other public services to meet their performance objectives. Although the new library would have a multi-purpose room larger than the meeting room in the existing library, the increase in size of the meeting space would not substantially increase the overall expected occupancy of the library. Because of the larger multi-purpose room in the new library as compared to the existing library, attendance at meetings in this larger room could slightly increase, but because this increase would be temporary, it would have no impact on schools and parks and have a less-than-significant impact associated with fire and police protection. Overall, no further evaluation will be required in the EIR.

**XV. RECREATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities, such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

The proposed project would not include housing or recreational facilities, and no substantial increase is expected in the occupancy of the library; no additional persons are expected as a result of the project that would affect the use of parks or recreational facilities. Although the new library would have a multi-purpose room larger than the meeting room in the existing library, the increase in size of the meeting space would not substantially increase the overall expected occupancy of the library. Therefore, there would be no impacts associated with recreation, and no further evaluation will be required in the EIR.
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?  

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?  

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?  

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?  

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?  

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?  

a-b)  
The demolition of the old library and construction of the new library is expected to take a total of 12 months. Construction-related traffic is estimated at a maximum of five trucks per day and 10 personal vehicles per day at the height of construction. Trenching in the street to install new utility lines may be necessary. A Construction Traffic Management Plan outlining the process for allowing traffic to flow during construction activities would be required under the City of Berkeley’s Standard Conditions of Approval. Additionally, construction trucks would be required to travel along University Avenue, which is the closest truck route designated by the City of Berkeley and connects to Interstate 80 (I-80). University Avenue is known to be congested, although level of service (LOS) data is not currently available. As stated in the Conditions of Approval (see Project Description, Section G) trucks traveling from the north shall use I-80 to Gilman Street eastbound, San Pablo Avenue southbound, Cedar Street eastbound, and Sacramento Street southbound. Trucks traveling from the south shall use I-80 to Ashby Avenue eastbound and Sacramento Street northbound. These requirements would prevent construction traffic from impacting more sensitive residential areas. In addition, construction traffic would not adversely impact overall congestion levels in
the area because the library would be closed during construction, thereby reducing the overall traffic generated by the site.

Additionally, operation of the new library would not differ substantially from the existing library in that no additional employees are expected. Programs would remain essentially the same, although there could be larger meetings in the multi-purpose room. However, these meetings would rarely be held during commute hours, and therefore, there would be no significant impact from operation of the proposed project on the applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system or the applicable congestion management program.

Compliance with the Standard Conditions of Approval and the very small and temporary addition of truck traffic during construction of the project would result in an overall less-than-significant impact.

c) Would the project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

The project is not in the vicinity of an airport and would have a lower height than nearby buildings such as the adjacent Holiday Inn Express Hotel & Suites, and the five-story Campanile Court building across the street. Therefore, there would be no change to air traffic patterns resulting from the proposed project and no impact due to this issue.

d-e)

The proposed project would not affect the layout of the existing road network, or the Berkeley-designated emergency access routes, and would not produce driving hazards due to a design feature. The project is located along University Avenue near San Pablo Avenue, both of which are emergency access routes designated by the City of Berkeley. During construction, trucks would be required to occupy street parking spaces in front of the library during unloading and loading. Additionally, the project would replace an existing library on the same site and therefore would not introduce incompatible uses.

Overall, there would be no impact associated with driving hazards due to a design feature, or incompatible uses, and a less-than-significant impact associated with inadequate emergency access.

f) Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

Public transit access to the library would not change with the proposed project. Pedestrian access would also be unaltered. Adequate bike parking of at least the same amount or more than what currently exists on the site would be located outside the library. The new library would include six bicycle racks in the entry plaza and bicycle parking for staff. Therefore, there would be no impact associated with public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.
Because impacts from transportation and traffic would either be less than significant or have no impact, no further evaluation will be required in the EIR.

**XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS**

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?

g) Comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

a-b) Although the proposed project would be larger than the existing library, the uses and occupancy would be the same as that of the existing library. Additionally, the project is anticipating a LEED-Gold certification and is pursuing a “zero net energy” plan, which could reduce water consumption and wastewater generation. Therefore, there would be a less-than-significant impact.

c) Would the project require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

The project would demolish the existing library and construct a new library with a building footprint that is 2,670 square feet larger than that of the existing library. This increase in the building footprint would not necessarily lead to an increase in the volume of water entering stormwater drainage facilities. Flow-through planters in the project design would filter the stormwater before discharging it to the street. Therefore, no new treatment facilities would be required, and there would be a less-than-significant impact.
d) Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

See response to a-b) above. Because water consumption for the project would remain the same or potentially be reduced as compared to the existing library (due to more efficient plumbing fixtures), there would be a less-than-significant impact associated with sufficient water supplies.

e) Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?

See response to a-b) above. Because water consumption would be the same or less than the existing library (due to more efficient plumbing fixtures), wastewater generation for the project would also remain the same or potentially be reduced as compared to the existing library, there would be a less-than-significant impact associated with wastewater treatment capacity.

f-g)

Solid waste generation from ongoing library operations would remain the same as for the existing library since there would be no substantial increase in the expected occupancy of the library. Construction and demolition waste would be subject to a standard condition of approval requiring approval of a construction and demolition recycling plan, which would minimize the amount of waste reaching the landfill. The project would continue to be served by the appropriate landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs and the project would comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations. Therefore, there would be a less-than-significant impact.

Because all impacts to utilities and service systems would either be less than significant or have no impact, no further evaluation will be required in the EIR.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

The proposed project would replace the existing library with a new library on the same site in an urban, built-out area. It would have no significant impacts on biological resources. However, the existing building to be demolished was built in 1923 and is the only Carnegie-influenced library remaining in the City of Berkeley. This existing library could be considered by some as an important example of California history and therefore, the impact could be potentially significant. Because this impact could be potentially significant, it will be further discussed and evaluated in the EIR.

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

The project would be consistent with the amount of development anticipated in the EIR for the City’s General Plan, which analyzed the cumulative impacts of such development. The proposed project would replace the existing library with a new library on the same site. Therefore, impacts would be restricted to the effects of construction and of placing a larger building at this location. There are currently no other projects requiring discretionary review proposed for adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity. Relative to other development in the area, the project would be a relatively small building located on a constrained site. Therefore, there would be a less-than-significant impact.

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Potential effects during the construction phase of the project, such as noise and dust, would be kept to a less-than-significant level due to the Conditions of Approval described in Section G of the Project Description. Additionally, the project is anticipated to be certified LEED-Gold
and would follow a “zero net energy” plan. Environmental effects would be *less than significant*. 
APPENDIX B

NOTICES OF PREPARATION
Notice of Preparation

June 17, 2010

To: Reviewing Agencies

Re: Berkeley South Branch Library
SCH# 2010062051

Attached for your review and comment is the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Berkeley South Branch Library draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

Responsible agencies must transmit their comments on the scope and content of the NOP, focusing on specific information related to their own statutory responsibility, within 30 days of receipt of the NOP from the Lead Agency. This is a courtesy notice provided by the State Clearinghouse with a reminder for you to comment in a timely manner. We encourage other agencies to also respond to this notice and express their concerns early in the environmental review process.

Please direct your comments to:

Aaron Sage
City of Berkeley Planning & Development Dept.
2120 Milvia Street
Berkeley, CA 94704

with a copy to the State Clearinghouse in the Office of Planning and Research. Please refer to the SCH number noted above in all correspondence concerning this project.

If you have any questions about the environmental document review process, please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan
Acting Director

Attachments
cc: Lead Agency
SCH# 2010062051  
Project Title Berkeley South Branch Library  
Lead Agency Berkeley, City of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>NOP Notice of Preparation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>The proposed project involves demolition of an existing public library and construction of a new library at the same location. The existing library has restrooms and interior aisles that are not compliant with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements; there are seismic safety issues; the structure is decaying; the mechanical and electrical systems are outdated; and the building is inefficient in energy use. The old library is inadequate for today's computer uses and other technological needs. The new library would be an 8,656-square foot, single-story building which would serve the same functions and same number of patrons as the existing library. The overall structure would house 7,480 sf of Main Library space and 1,176 sf for the Tool Lending Library. The building height would be 30 feet to a central clerestory, and 18'-16&quot; or 17 ft. elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lead Agency Contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Aaron Sage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>City of Berkeley Planning &amp; Development Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>(510) 981-7425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>2120 Milvia Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip</td>
<td>94704</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Alameda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Streets</td>
<td>Russell Street/Martin Luther King Jr. Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lat / Long</td>
<td>053-1679-016-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proximity to:

- **Highways**: Hwy 13, 123
- **Airports**: Union Pacific, BART
- **Railways**: King, Longfellow, Leconte
- **Schools**: King, Longfellow, Leconte
- **Land Use**: Z: R-2A (Restricted Multiple-Family Residential); GP: Medium Density Residential

### Project Issues

- Resources Agency; Office of Historic Preservation; Department of Parks and Recreation; Department of Water Resources; Department of Fish and Game, Region 3; Native American Heritage Commission; Caltrans, District 4; Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 2; California Highway Patrol

### Date Received

- 06/17/2010

### Start of Review

- 06/17/2010

### End of Review

- 07/16/2010

Note: Blanks in data fields result from insufficient information provided by lead agency.
| Resources Agency |
| Resources Agency | Nadell Gayou |
| Dept. of Boating & Waterways | Mike Sotelo |
| California Coastal Commission | Elizabeth A. Fuchs |
| Colorado River Board | Gerald R. Zimmerman |
| Dept. of Conservation | Rebecca Salazar |
| California Energy Commission | Eric Knight |
| Cal Fire | Allen Robertson |
| Central Valley Flood Protection Board | James Herota |

| Office of Historic Preservation | Wayne Donaldson |
| Dept of Parks & Recreation Environmental Stewardship | Section |
| California Department of Resources, Recycling & Recovery | Sue O'Leary |
| S.F. Bay Conservation & Dev't. Comm. | Steve McDade |
| Dept. of Water Resources Resources Agency | Nadell Gayou |

| Other Departments |
| Food & Agriculture | Steve Shaffer |
| Dept. of Food and Agriculture |
| Depart. of General Services Public School Construction |
| Dept. of General Services | Anna Garbeff |
| Environmental Services Section |
| Dept. of Public Health | Bridgette Binning |
| Dept. of Health/Drinking Water |

| Independent Commissions, Boards |
| Delta Protection Commission | Linda Flick |
| Cal EMA (Emergency Management Agency) | Dennis Castrillo |
| Governor's Office of Planning & Research | State Clearinghouse |
| Native American Heritage Comm. | Debbie Treadway |
| Public Utilities Commission | Leo Wong |
| Santa Monica Bay Restoration | Guanyu Wang |
| State Lands Commission | Marina Brand |
| Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) | Cherry Jacques |

| Caltrans, District 8 | Dan Kopulsky |
| Caltrans, District 9 | Gayle Rosander |
| Caltrans, District 10 | Tom Dumas |
| Caltrans, District 11 | Jacob Armstrong |
| Caltrans, District 12 | Chris Herne |

| Cal EPA |
| Air Resources Board |
| Airport Projects | Jim Lemer |
| Transportation Projects | Douglas Ito |
| Industrial Projects | Mike Tolletup |

| State Water Resources Control Board Regional Programs Unit Division of Financial Assistance |
| State Water Resources Control Board Student Intern, 401 Water Quality Certification Unit Division of Water Quality |
| State Water Resources Control Board Steven Herrera Division of Water Rights |
| Dept. of Toxic Substances Control CEQA Tracking Center |
| Department of Pesticide Regulation CEQA Coordinator |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) |
| RWQCB 1 | Cathleen Hudson |
| North Coast Region (1) |
| RWQCB 2 | Environmental Document Coordinator |
| San Francisco Bay Region (2) |
| RWQCB 3 | Central Coast Region (3) |
| RWQCB 4 | Teresa Rodgers |
| Los Angeles Region (4) |
| RWQCB 5S | Central Valley Region (5) |
| Central Valley Region (5) |
| RWQCB 5F | Fresno Branch Office |
| RWQCB 5R | Central Valley Region (5) |
| Redding Branch Office |
| RWQCB 6 | Lahontan Region (6) |
| RWQCB 6V | Lahontan Region (6) |
| Victorville Branch Office |
| RWQCB 7 | Colorado River Basin Region (7) |
| RWQCB 8 | Santa Ana Region (8) |
| RWQCB 9 | San Diego Region (9) |

Last Updated on 03/24/10
## Reviewing Agencies Checklist

Lead Agencies may recommend State Clearinghouse distribution by marking agencies below with an "X". If you have already sent your document to the agency please denote that with an "S".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Name</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Resources Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boating &amp; Waterways, Department of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Highway Patrol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans District #4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans Division of Aeronautics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Valley Flood Protection Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coachella Valley Mtns. Conservancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado River Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation, Department of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections, Department of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta Protection Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, Department of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish &amp; Game Region #</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Agriculture, Department of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry and Fire Protection, Department of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Services, Department of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services, Department of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing &amp; Community Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Waste Management Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American Heritage Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Emergency Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Historic Preservation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Public School Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation, Department of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesticide Regulation, Department of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Utilities Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional WQCB # 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.F. Bay Conservation &amp; Development Comm.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel &amp; Lower L.A. Rivers &amp; Mtns. Conservancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin River Conservancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica Mtns. Conservancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Lands Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWRCB: Clean Water Grants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWRCB: Water Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWRCB: Water Rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahoe Regional Planning Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxic Substances Control, Department of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Resources, Department of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: NWIC - Sonoma State Univ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local Public Review Period (to be filled in by lead agency)

Starting Date: ___________________________  Ending Date: ___________________________

Lead Agency (Complete if applicable):

Consulting Firm: Design Community & Environment  
Address: 1625 Shattuck Avenue, Suite 300  
City/State/Zip: Berkeley, CA 94709  
Contact: Nicola Swinburne  
Phone: 510-848-3815

Applicant: Donna Corbeil, Director of Library Services  
Address: 2090 Kittredge Street  
City/State/Zip: Berkeley, CA 94704  
Phone: 510-981-6915

Signature of Lead Agency Representative: ___________________________  Date: 6/16/2010

NOTICE OF PREPARATION (NOP) OF AN
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND
NOTICE OF A SCOPING MEETING FOR THE
BERKELEY SOUTH BRANCH LIBRARY PROJECT

The City of Berkeley is preparing an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for the Berkeley South Branch Library, which is further described below. An Initial Study has been prepared that briefly describes the City's initial conclusions about the potential environmental effects of the project, mitigation measures and standard conditions of approval that could apply to the project, and remaining topics to be analyzed in the EIR.

A copy of the Initial Study is available at the City of Berkeley Planning and Development Department, Land Use Planning Division, 2120 Milvia Street, Berkeley, California, or online at: http://www.ci.berkeley.ca.us/ContentDisplay.aspx?id=362. Based on the Initial Study, the City expects the EIR to further address only the potential physical and environmental effects of the project on cultural/historic resources, and geology and soils.

The City of Berkeley staff invites you to comment on the conclusions of the Initial Study and resulting proposed scope of the EIR. Please send your written comments within 30 days from the date you receive this notice, but no later than Monday, July 19, 2010, to: Aaron Sage, AICP, Planning and Development Department, Land Use Planning Division, 2120 Milvia Street, Berkeley, CA 94704, or via e-mail: asage@cityofberkeley.info. You may also contact Mr. Sage by telephone at (510) 981-7425.

You may also provide comments at the EIR Scoping Meeting, which will be held on Monday, July 12, 2010 at 4:00 p.m. at the Permit Service Center, 2120 Milvia Street, 2nd Floor, Berkeley. No decision on the project application is being made at this time; additional notice of public hearings will be provided prior to action on the project.

The City of Berkeley is the Lead Agency for the project (i.e., the public agency with the responsibility for either approving the project or carrying it out). No State agencies with shared responsibility for approving or carrying out the project have yet been identified, and there are therefore no Responsible Agencies under CEQA. This notice is being sent to the State Clearinghouse and other interested parties. When the Draft EIR is published, it will be sent to the State Clearinghouse and to others who respond to this Notice of Preparation (NOP) or who otherwise indicate that they would like to receive a copy.

---

**EIR PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING**
The City of Berkeley will conduct a public scoping session on Monday, July 12, 2010 at 4 p.m. The meeting will be held at the Permit Service Center, 2120 Milvia Street, 2nd floor, Berkeley, CA 94704.
PROJECT TITLE: Berkeley South Branch Library - Use Permit application #10-10000031

PROJECT LOCATION: The project site is located at 1901 Russell Street in South Berkeley (see Figure 1). The cross-street is Martin Luther King, Jr. Way. The project site is surrounded by one-story, two-story, single-family and multi-family residences; a three-story Thai Buddhist Temple; a vacant lot (belonging to the Buddhist Temple); and Grove Park.

Assessor’s Parcel Number (APN): 053 167901601

EXISTING CONDITIONS: The 13,398-square-foot project site is occupied by a 5,400-square-foot composite building consisting of the Main Library and Tool Lending Library. The existing South Berkeley Branch Library was designed by architect John Hans Ostwald, and opened in 1961. In 1974 a meeting room was added and, in 1991, the Tool Lending Library was added. The 1961 and 1974 portions of the building have been further analyzed for their eligibility for the California Register and could be eligible for the California Register due to the significance of the architect.

PROJECT SPONSOR: Donna Corbeil, Director of Library Services, Berkeley Public Library

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The proposed project involves demolition of the existing Berkeley South Branch and Tool Lending Library at 1901 Russell Street in the City of Berkeley and construction of a new library at the same location. The existing library has restrooms and interior aisles that are not compliant with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements; there are seismic safety issues; the structure is decaying; the mechanical and electrical systems are outdated; and the building is inefficient in energy use compared to today’s standards. The old library is inadequate for today’s computer uses and other technological needs.

The new library would be an 8,656-square-foot, single-story building which would serve the same functions and same number of patrons as the existing library. The overall structure would house 7,480 square feet of Main Library space and 1,176 square feet for the Tool Lending Library. There is no planned expansion of the book collection, or existing services or programs. As with the existing library, the main entrance to the new library would be located on Russell Street with a second entrance to the Tool Lending Library on Martin Luther King Jr. Way. The maximum height of the new library would be 30 feet for the central portion, or clerestory. The maximum heights of the rest of the building are 18 feet and 6 inches, and 17 feet. This compares to 17 feet and 6 inches for the existing structure at the top of the main reading room. As for the current library, only two short-term loading/unloading spaces are provided on-site.

REQUESTED APPROVALS: Discretionary actions/approvals by the City that may be necessary for this project include: Use Permits for demolition and construction; Variances for lot coverage, parking, driveway width, and setbacks, which would be approved as Use Permits rather than Variances if a pending zoning amendment is adopted by the City Council.

PROBABLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS: City staff has completed an Initial Study for the proposed project and has made an initial determination that the significant effects of the proposed project would be limited to cultural/historical resources.

CEQA PROCESS: All issue topics were examined in the Initial Study and potential impacts were all found to be less-than-significant, except in the issue area of cultural/historic resources. Due to potential environmental effects, this issue will be discussed in greater detail in an EIR. Although impacts from geology and soils were found to be less than significant, this issue will be
discussed again in the EIR due to the seismic safety issues involved in preserving historically significant portions of the existing building. All issues except cultural resources and geology and soils were scoped out by the Initial Study and will not be discussed again in the Draft EIR.

The Draft EIR will examine a reasonable range of alternatives to the project, including the CEQA-mandated No Project Alternative and other potential alternatives that may be capable of reducing or avoiding potential environmental effects. As there may be impacts from geology and soils from one or more of these alternatives, this issue will be discussed again in the EIR.

The Draft EIR will be distributed for public comment, and responses to comments will be prepared prior to final consideration of the project and EIR. Notices of public hearings and availability of the Final EIR will be provided.

Date of Distribution: June 16, 2010

[Signature]
Aaron Sage, AICP, Senior Planner

Attached: Figure 1 – Location Map
NOTICE OF PREPARATION (NOP) OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE BERKELEY SOUTH BRANCH LIBRARY PROJECT

-- Public Comment Period Extended --

The City of Berkeley is preparing an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for the Berkeley South Branch Library, which is further described below. An Initial Study has been prepared that briefly describes the City’s initial conclusions about the potential environmental effects of the project, mitigation measures and standard conditions of approval that could apply to the project, and remaining topics to be analyzed in the EIR.

A copy of the Initial Study is available at the City of Berkeley Planning and Development Department, Land Use Planning Division, 2120 Milvia Street, Berkeley, California, or online at: http://www.ci.berkeley.ca.us/ContentDisplay.aspx?id=362. Based on the Initial Study, the City expects the EIR to further address only the potential physical and environmental effects of the project on cultural/historic resources, and geology and soils.

The City of Berkeley staff invites you to comment on the conclusions of the Initial Study and resulting proposed scope of the EIR. Please send your written comments within 30 days from the date you receive this notice, but no later than Monday, August 16, 2010, to: Aaron Sage, AICP, Planning and Development Department, Land Use Planning Division, 2120 Milvia Street, Berkeley, CA 94704, or via e-mail: asage@cityofberkeley.info. You may also contact Mr. Sage by telephone at (510) 981-7425.

The City of Berkeley is the Lead Agency for the project (i.e., the public agency with the responsibility for either approving the project or carrying it out). No State agencies with shared responsibility for approving or carrying out the project have yet been identified, and there are therefore no Responsible Agencies under CEQA. This notice is being sent to the State Clearinghouse and other interested parties. When the Draft EIR is published, it will be sent to the State Clearinghouse and to others who respond to this Notice of Preparation (NOP) or who otherwise indicate that they would like to receive a copy.

PROJECT TITLE: Berkeley South Branch Library - Use Permit application #10-1000031

PROJECT LOCATION: The project site is located at 1901 Russell Street in South Berkeley (see Figure 1). The cross-street is Martin Luther King, Jr. Way. The project site is surrounded by one-story, two-story, single-family and multi-family residences; a three-story Thai Buddhist Temple; a vacant lot (belonging to the Buddhist Temple); and Grove Park.

Assessor's Parcel Number (APN): 053 167901601

EXISTING CONDITIONS: The 13,398-square-foot project site is occupied by a 5,400-square-foot composite building consisting of the Main Library and Tool Lending Library. The existing
South Berkeley Branch Library was designed by architect John Hans Ostwald, and opened in 1961. In 1974 a meeting room was added and, in 1991, the Tool Lending Library was added. The 1961 and 1974 portions of the building have been further analyzed for their eligibility for the California Register and could be eligible for the California Register due to the significance of the architect.

PROJECT SPONSOR: Donna Corbeil, Director of Library Services, Berkeley Public Library

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The proposed project involves demolition of the existing Berkeley South Branch and Tool Lending Library at 1901 Russell Street in the City of Berkeley and construction of a new library at the same location. The existing library has restrooms and interior aisles that are not compliant with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements; there are seismic safety issues; the structure is decaying; the mechanical and electrical systems are outdated; and the building is inefficient in energy use compared to today's standards. The old library is inadequate for today's computer uses and other technological needs.

The new library would be an 8,656-square-foot, single-story building which would serve the same functions and same number of patrons as the existing library. The overall structure would house 7,480 square feet of Main Library space and 1,176 square feet for the Tool Lending Library. There is no planned expansion of the book collection, or existing services or programs. As with the existing library, the main entrance to the new library would be located on Russell Street with a second entrance to the Tool Lending Library on Martin Luther King Jr. Way. The maximum height of the new library would be 30 feet for the central portion, or clerestory. The maximum heights of the rest of the building are 18 feet and 6 inches, and 17 feet. This compares to 17 feet and 6 inches for the existing structure at the top of the main reading room. As for the current library, only two short-term loading/unloading spaces are provided on-site.

REQUESTED APPROVALS: Discretionary actions/approvals by the City that may be necessary for this project include: Use Permits for demolition and construction; Variances for lot coverage, parking, driveway width, and setbacks, which would be approved as Use Permits rather than Variances if a pending zoning amendment is adopted by the City Council.

PROBABLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS: City staff has completed an Initial Study for the proposed project and has made an initial determination that the significant effects of the proposed project would be limited to cultural/historical resources.

CEQA PROCESS: All issue topics were examined in the Initial Study and potential impacts were all found to be less-than-significant, except in the issue area of cultural/historic resources. Due to potential environmental effects, this issue will be discussed in greater detail in an EIR. Although impacts from geology and soils were found to be less than significant, this issue will be discussed again in the EIR due to the seismic safety issues involved in preserving historically significant portions of the existing building. All issues except cultural resources and geology and soils were scoped out by the Initial Study and will not be discussed again in the Draft EIR.

The Draft EIR will examine a reasonable range of alternatives to the project, including the CEQA-mandated No Project Alternative and other potential alternatives that may be capable of reducing or avoiding potential environmental effects. As there may be impacts from geology and soils from one or more of these alternatives, this issue will be discussed again in the EIR.
The Draft EIR will be distributed for public comment, and responses to comments will be prepared prior to final consideration of the project and EIR. Notices of public hearings and availability of the Final EIR will be provided.

Date of Distribution: July 15, 2010

Aaron Sage, AICP, Senior Planner

Attached: Figure 1 – Location Map
NOTICE OF PREPARATION (NOP) AND SCOPING SESSION
FOR AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) FOR:

- ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT TO ALLOW FLEXIBILITY IN THE
  APPLICATION OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR EXISTING PUBLIC
  LIBRARIES;
- SOUTH BRANCH LIBRARY PROJECT; AND
- WEST BRANCH LIBRARY PROJECT

SEPTEMBER 28, 2010

The City of Berkeley is preparing an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), pursuant to the California
Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), for a Zoning Ordinance Amendment to allow flexibility in the
application of development standards at each of the existing Branch Libraries and the Central Library,
and for proposed development projects at the South Branch Library and at the West Branch Library.
The anticipated scope of the EIR is further described below.

Three Initial Studies have been prepared for this project:

- Zoning Amendment for Public Libraries, May 26, 2010
- South Branch Library Initial Study, June 10, 2010
- West Branch Library Initial Study, September 7, 2010

These Initial Studies briefly describe the City’s initial conclusions about the potential environmental
effects of the projects and ordinance, mitigation measures and standard conditions of approval that
could apply to the projects, and remaining topics to be analyzed in the EIR.

Two other library projects that are affected by the Zoning Ordinance Amendment (the North and
Claremont Branch Libraries) have been found to be categorically exempt under CEQA. There is no
proposed or foreseeable project at the Central Library. The Initial Studies are available at the City of
Berkeley Planning and Development Department, Land Use Planning Division, 2120 Milvia Street,
Berkeley, California or online at: http://www.ci.berkeley.ca.us/ContentDisplay.aspx?id=362#IS.

All issue topics required under CEQA were examined in the Initial Studies and potential impacts were
all found to be less than significant, except in the area of cultural resources. Due to potential
significant effects, this issue will be discussed in greater detail in the EIR. Although impacts from
geology and soils and greenhouse gas emissions were found to be less than significant, these issues
will be discussed in the EIR because of seismic safety issues involved in preserving historically
significant portions of the existing buildings (in project alternatives), and because greenhouse gas
emissions is a controversial subject and of known public interest. All other issues were found to be
less than significant and will not be discussed again in the EIR. Cumulative impacts, growth
inducement, short-term versus long-term, and effects on human beings will be considered, and
alternatives to the projects will be evaluated.
The City of Berkeley invites you to comment on the conclusions of the Initial Studies and the resulting proposed scope of the EIR. **Please send your written comments within 30 days from the date you receive this notice, but no later than Monday, November 1, 2010, to: Aaron Sage, AICP, Land Use Planning Division, 2120 Milvia Street, Berkeley, CA 94704, or via email: asage@cityofberkeley.info.** You may also contact Aaron by telephone at (510) 981-7425.

You may also provide comments at the **EIR Scoping Session, which will be held on Wednesday, October 20, 2010 at 7.00 p.m. at the Land Use Planning Division, 2118 Milvia Street, 2nd Floor, Berkeley, CA 94704.**

The City of Berkeley is the Lead Agency for the projects (i.e., the public agency with the greatest responsibility for either approving the project or carrying it out). This notice is being sent to the State Clearinghouse, any responsible agencies, and other interested parties. When the Draft EIR is published, it will be sent to the State Clearinghouse and to others who respond to this Notice of Preparation (NOP) or who otherwise indicate that they would like to receive a copy. A Final EIR with responses to comments on the Draft EIR will be prepared prior to final consideration of the proposed projects. Notices of public hearings on the projects, and the availability of the Final EIR, will also be provided to NOP respondents and those requesting such notice.

**PROJECT TITLE:** Zoning Ordinance Amendment and South and West Branch Libraries

**PROJECT LOCATIONS:**

**Zoning Ordinance Amendment.** Applies to the four existing Branch Libraries and the Central Library.

**South Branch.** The project site is located at 1901 Russell Street in South Berkeley. The cross street is Martin Luther King Jr. Way. The project site is surrounded by one-story, two-story, single-family and multi-family residences; a three-story Thai Buddhist Temple; a vacant lot (belonging to the Buddhist Temple); and Grove Park. Assessor’s Parcel Number (APN): 053-1679-016-01.

**West Branch.** The project site is located at 1125 University Avenue in West Berkeley. The nearest cross street is San Pablo Avenue. The project site is surrounded by retail, a hotel, multi-family residential, and new mixed-use developments. Assessor’s Parcel Number (APN): 057-2085-011-00.

**North Branch.** The site is located at 1170 The Alameda, in a relatively low-density residential neighborhood in North Berkeley, at the northwest corner of The Alameda and Hopkins Street. Other than a gas station located at the southeast corner of The Alameda and Hopkins Street, the site is surrounded by single-family residences dating mainly from the 1920s and 1930s. Assessor’s Parcel Number (APN): 061-2605-035-00.

**Claremont Branch.** The site is located at 2940 Benvenue Avenue, at the southwest corner of Ashby and Benvenue Avenues in the Elmwood neighborhood, a predominantly residential neighborhood with a small-scale commercial district along Ashby and College Avenues with structures dating mainly from 1906 to 1930. The site is adjoined on the west and south by a dental office and single-family residences. Assessor’s Parcel Number (APN): 052-1573-016-00.

**Central Library.** The site is located at 2090 Kittredge Street, in the heart of downtown Berkeley, at the intersection of Kittredge Street and Shattuck Avenue, near the Downtown Berkeley BART station and numerous bus lines, diverse shopping and services, the University of California campus, and high density residential development. Assessor’s Parcel Number (APN): 057-2028-017-01.
EXISTING CONDITIONS:

Zoning Ordinance Amendment. Currently, the Zoning Ordinance does not provide any flexibility in the application of development standards for public libraries, except for exceeding the height limit in R Districts and waiving the parking requirement for additions to existing buildings in C Districts.

South Branch. The 13,398-square-foot project site is occupied by a 5,400-square-foot composite building consisting of the Main Library and Tool Lending Library. The existing South Berkeley Branch Library was designed by architect John Hans Ostwald, and opened in 1961. In 1974 a meeting room was added and, in 1991, the Tool Lending Library was added. The 1961 and 1974 portions of the building have been further analyzed for their eligibility for the California Register and could be eligible for the California Register due to the significance of the architect and for the building design. The existing library has restrooms and interior aisles that are not compliant with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements; there are seismic safety issues; the structure is decaying; the mechanical and electrical systems are outdated; and the building is inefficient in energy use compared to today’s standards. The old library is inadequate for today’s computer uses and other technological needs.

West Branch. The 12,000-square-foot project site is occupied by the Berkeley West Branch Library, a one-story, 6,230-square-foot building. The oldest portions of the building were designed by architect William K. Bartges, and opened in 1923. In 1974, there was a series of additions designed by Ratcliff-Slama-Cadwalader Architects, including a teen room in front of the 1923 library; a new circulation desk, staff area, children’s room, and community room to the rear; and a new east entrance. The 1974 additions also included a screened courtyard with a trellised ramp and landscaping and stairs leading to the new entrance. The building is designated as a City Structure of Merit.

The existing library has restrooms, ramps, and interior aisles that are not compliant with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and California Building Code accessibility requirements; there are seismic safety issues with the original building which was not reinforced or tied into the 1974 additions; and the original building structure and substructure is rotting and decaying. The mechanical, lighting and electrical systems are outdated and the building is inefficient in energy use compared to today’s standards. The existing library is inadequate for today’s computer uses and other telecommunication needs. In addition, the existing library does not have a fire sprinkler system. Finally, the existing library lacks sufficient programming and meeting space to support the literacy tutoring and youth programming needs of library users.

North Branch. The site is a triangular-shaped parcel with an area of 16,980 square feet. The site is developed with the North Branch of the Berkeley Public Library, a predominantly one-story building with a small basement in the rear and a floor area of 5,706 square feet. The building was designed by noted Berkeley architect James Plachek, and was completed in 1936. The building was designated as a City landmark in 2001.

Claremont Branch. The site is comprised of two separate parcels with a total area of 11,652 square feet. These parcels would be merged into a single parcel as part of the project. Together the parcels form a “reverse L” with the longer portion along Benvenue Avenue, and the shorter portion extending 75 feet to the west. The site is developed with the Claremont branch of the Berkeley Public Library, a predominantly one-story building with a small second story in the northern portion and a floor area of 7,768 square feet. The northern portion of the building was designed by noted Berkeley architect James Plachek, and was built in 1923. This portion is not a City landmark, but it is considered a potential historical resource due to its association with Plachek. The southern portion of the building was built in 1973 in a contemporary style, and has no substantial historical significance.
Central Library. The site has an area of 39,274 square. The original library was designed by James Plachek and opened in January 1931, replacing a Carnegie library designed by John Galen Howard on the same site. The building is a designed City Landmark and is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. In 2002 an extensive seismic retrofit, expansion and renovation of the original building was completed.

PROJECT SPONSORS:

Zoning Ordinance Amendment. City of Berkeley
Branch Library Projects. Donna Corbeil, Directory of Library Services, Berkeley Public Library

PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS:

Zoning Ordinance Amendment. The proposed amendment to the City’s Zoning Ordinance (Berkeley Municipal Code Title 23) would allow modification with a Use Permit of any zoning requirement applicable to a change, expansion, or reconstruction of an existing public library, where a Variance is currently required for most such modifications. The proposed amendment would not affect existing requirements for a Use Permit for any new library or for any change or expansion of an existing nonconforming library. The Amendment will be analyzed in the EIR only as it pertains to the two branch library projects which require EIRs (South and West Branches), and not two additional branch library projects which have been determined to be categorically exempt under CEQA (North and Claremont Branches), or for the Central Library for which no construction project is proposed or foreseeable at this time.

The amendment to the Berkeley Municipal Code is to add a new Section 23C.04.076, as follows:

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Title, any conforming or lawful non-conforming public library existing as of May 1, 2010 may be (1) changed, (2) expanded, or (3) demolished and a new public library constructed on the same site, subject to issuance of a Use Permit, unless such change, expansion or new library is otherwise allowed by this Title. The Board may modify any requirement of this Title applicable to such change, expansion or new library as part of the Use Permit.

The main purpose of the amendment is to facilitate the approval of improvements authorized under Measure FF, a bond measure approved by Berkeley voters in November 2008 to “renovate, expand, and make seismic and access improvements at four neighborhood branch libraries”. The amendment would also allow modification of zoning requirements applicable to future, as yet unknown, improvements, which are at present speculative. The amendment would not allow modification of zoning standards for any newly constructed building on a site other than the five currently existing library sites.

South Branch. The proposed project involves demolition of the existing Berkeley South Branch and Tool Lending Library at 1901 Russell Street in the City of Berkeley and construction of a new library at the same location. The new library would be an 8,656-square-foot, single-story building which would serve the same functions and same number of patrons as the existing library. The overall structure would house 7,480 square feet of Main Library space and 1,176 square feet for the Tool Lending Library. There is no planned expansion of the book collection, or existing services or programs. As with the existing library, the main entrance to the new library would be located on Russell Street with a second entrance to the Tool Lending Library on Martin Luther King Jr. Way. The maximum height of the new library would be 30 feet for the central portion, or clerestory. The maximum heights of the
rest of the building are 18 feet and 6 inches, and 17 feet. This compares to 17 feet and 6 inches for the existing structure at the top of the main reading room. As for the current library, only two short-term loading/unloading spaces are provided on-site. The project sponsor hopes to achieve a LEED Gold rating for the new building.

**West Branch.** The proposed project involves demolition of the existing Berkeley West Branch Library at 1125 University Avenue in the City of Berkeley and construction of a new library at the same location. The new library would be a two-story building with a total floor area of 9,600 gross square feet and a building footprint of 8,900 square feet. The entire library program would be accommodated on the ground floor, and a 700-square-foot mechanical room would be located on the second floor. This two-story building would perform the same functions and is expected to serve approximately the same number of patrons as the existing library. However, the building would also include a multi-purpose room that could accommodate larger meetings than in the existing meeting room. The building would have a “zero net energy” design to reduce energy usage and greenhouse gas emissions.

**NOTE TO READER:** The City has already conducted environmental review for the following two projects (North and Claremont Branch Libraries), and has determined that these projects are categorically exempt from CEQA under CEQA Guidelines Section 15301(e). The following information is provided for informational purposes only, and these projects will not be included in this EIR.

**North Branch.** The project would expand the existing North Branch Library from 5,706 to 9,555 square feet. The addition would be located on the west (rear) side of the building, facing Josephine Street. The addition would have two stories and would be set back 4 feet from the property line along Josephine Street (16 feet from the street itself). Restrooms, staff work areas, and a teen reading room would be located on the upper story of the addition, and additional restrooms, a multi-purpose meeting room and utility rooms would be located on the lower story, partially below grade. In order to relate properly to the existing building, the addition would have a flat roof and would not exceed the height of the existing eaves. The existing building would be restored, and no substantial change of use would occur, except that meetings currently being held in the children’s reading room would now be held in the new multi-purpose room.

The project also includes the following improvements: ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) compliant restrooms, corridors, and ramp; new drought tolerant landscaping with bio-retention area for stormwater runoff; restoration of exterior of existing structure; energy efficiency improvements; and seismic upgrades.

Based on the additional floor area, six additional parking spaces would be required. The site does not have adequate space for these spaces without removing existing green space, and the project includes a request to waive this requirement. The project also includes a request for lot coverage of 43 percent where 40 percent is the maximum normally allowed.

**Claremont Branch.** The project would expand the existing Claremont Branch Library from 7,768 to 8,110 square feet. Of the 342 square feet, 206 square feet would be added below existing roof overhangs on the west and south walls of the 1973 addition, and in the former entry of the 1923 building, which was closed after the 1973 addition. The remaining 136 square feet would be added on the west side of the building where the two wings come together. Although the project increases the building’s total floor area, it also converts some of the existing public area to staff area, thereby decreasing the total public area in the building by about 230 square feet. Therefore, because the parking requirement for libraries is based on the amount of publicly accessible area, no additional parking is required for the project.
The project also includes the following improvements: ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) compliant restrooms, corridors, and front ramp; new drought tolerant landscaping with bio-retention area for stormwater runoff; restoration of exterior of 1923 structure; energy efficiency improvements, including a “cool roof”; building would qualify for at least a LEED Silver rating; new architectural treatment for entry (on Benvenue side of 1973 addition), including new dormer, additional glazing, and new glass and steel canopy; reorganization of interior for more efficient layout; additional adult and children seating, and computer areas; seismic upgrades, including new shear panels, masonry ties, chimney bracing, and roof diaphragm strengthening; removal of stair on west wall of 1973 addition; and relocation of stair on south wall about 20 feet closer to Benvenue.

The project also includes requests to allow expansion of the lot coverage from 60 to 63 percent, where the maximum normally allowed is 45 percent, and to allow a new bay window at the southwest portion of the building to encroach into a required rear yard.

Central Library. No construction work is planned or foreseen at the Central Library. A 1996 bond measure authorized $35 million for a major renovation and expansion project, which was completed in 2002. There is no need for further construction at the Central Library, nor is there any known funding source for further construction should the need arise.

Aaron Sage, AICP, Senior Planner