

West Campus Pool. The West Campus Pool is more or less in the middle of the West Campus site, several hundred feet south of University Avenue. It lies adjacent to Curtis Street, which is primarily residential. The pool entrance is at the corner of Addison and Browning Streets, both of which are also residential. There is little activity on the West Campus site, because the school that formerly operated there is closed. There is a Child Development Center immediately south of the pool, and the Old Gym building is also in use as a gymnasium. The playing fields and a tot lot adjacent to the north side of the pool are closed to the public. Most of the remaining school buildings are vacant.

B. TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION SETTING

The King Pool site has access from Hopkins Street, a collector street with total average daily traffic volume (2007) of 5,132 vehicles. The Willard Pool facility fronts on Telegraph Avenue, which is classified as a major street with an average total daily traffic volume of approximately 24,000 vehicles. West Campus Pool has access from Curtis Street or Browning Street, both of which are local streets with light traffic. The pool is about a block from University Avenue, a major street with an average total daily traffic volume of over 34,000 vehicles.

The Willard and King Pool sites are located on bus routes, with bus stops located within 250 feet or less of the pool entrances. The West Campus pool is located less than a block from University Avenue, which is served by three bus routes. All three of the pool sites have bicycle-parking racks. Both Hopkins Street and Telegraph Avenue have bike lanes; the Willard Pool site is two blocks from a Bicycle Boulevard and the West Campus pool is four blocks from a Bicycle Boulevard on Channing and Ninth Streets, three blocks from bike lanes on Delaware Street, and less than three blocks from the West Street bike path leading to the Ohlone Greenway. All of the sites have good pedestrian access and are located in, or immediately adjacent to, residential neighborhoods. Accordingly many patrons walk or bike to the pools, as do many of the employees. There are no on-site vehicular parking facilities at any of the three swimming pools, however on-street parking is available near all of the sites.

C. OTHER

Additional relevant environmental setting information these for other topics addressed in the Initial Study is incorporated into the respective responses to the questions in the checklist, as set forth in the next chapter.

III. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise	<input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing	<input type="checkbox"/> Public Services
<input type="checkbox"/> Resources / Recreation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation / Traffic	<input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems
<input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance		

DETERMINATION: (TO BE COMPLETED BY THE LEAD AGENCY)
ON THE BASIS OF THIS INITIAL EVALUATION:

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

<p>_____/s/ William Rogers_____ Signature</p>	<p>_____ Date</p>
<p>_____William Rogers_____ Printed name</p>	<p>_____City of Berkeley_____ For</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

A. AESTHETICS	IMPACT			
	YES			NO
WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>King Campus. The King Pool site is located in an attractive, well-landscaped city park setting, with tall trees, grassy open spaces, and playgrounds. The pool facility is set back against a thickly vegetated slope on one side and beside a vegetated swale that provides a visual buffer between it and the back yards of the adjacent homes on Carlotta Street. The tall fencing and plantings along the adjacent tennis courts greatly filter the views of the pool facility from Hopkins Street, to the extent that a casual observer may fail to recognize it. Nevertheless, the overall view of the park from Hopkins Street is sufficiently attractive that some might consider it a scenic vista.</p> <p>While the King Pool facility would be essentially reconstructed, its visual profile would hardly be changed. The pool boundaries would remain the same, and the height, mass and bulk of the entrance structure would not change. The proposed Design Variant for King Pool would add a water slide on the pool deck, and it would rise higher than entrance structure, and higher than the fence separating the pool and the tennis courts. The waterslide would be visible from Hopkins Street, but it would look like a slide, which is appropriate and can be expected in a city park. It is concluded that neither the Preferred Plan, nor the Design Variant, would have a substantial adverse effect on the existing vistas of and across the site.</p> <p>Willard Campus. The existing Willard Pool site looks somewhat like a commercial facility when seen from Telegraph Avenue, and has an institutional-looking setting when seen from Derby Street. It is in an open, lightly landscaped and not particularly attractive urban location and cannot be characterized as providing a scenic vista. The project would not substantially change views of the site, although the top of the proposed waterslide might be visible from some nearby locations. However, this visual addition would not be significant and would not degrade a scenic vista.</p> <p>West Campus. As with the Willard Pool site, the West Campus Pool site has a very urban character, but is much more degraded, since many of the buildings on the Campus are unoccupied, or lightly used, and are poorly maintained. The vacant lots and empty buildings in the vicinity of the site are not scenic, and implementation of the proposed improvements at the West Campus site would have no adverse impact on a scenic vista.</p>				

A. AESTHETICS	IMPACT			
	YES			NO
WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
The project would not affect any scenic highways.				
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>As noted above, the project would change the visual quality of the three affected sites, even though all three sites currently have public swimming pool facilities. While the site dimensions and entrance structures at the King Pool and the Willard Pool would remain essentially unchanged, the West Campus pool would be entirely reconstructed. The key visual changes at the respective sites are noted below:</p> <p>King Campus. If the Design Variant with a waterslide is chosen for the King Pool site, the waterslide would also be the tallest feature of the pool, and would be visible, beyond the tennis courts, from Hopkins Street. Due to the angle of view and intervening vegetation, it is not expected that the waterslide would be visible from Carlotta Street, nor from the Carlotta Street homes adjacent to the pool. Nor would it be visible from the King Middle School buildings that share the campus. Because the King Pool is set back so far from Hopkins Street, and visually shielded by the tennis courts and the tree and shrub cover in the park, the waterslide would not be so prominent as to support a conclusion that it would substantially degrade the visual character of the site and its surroundings, resulting in a significant adverse visual impact.</p> <p>Willard Campus. The 27-foot tall waterslide at Willard would be visible from Derby Street and Willard Park to the east. The existing street trees would filter its visibility from Telegraph Avenue. While it would be a unique and unusual visual element in this urban context, it would have very little bulk and mass compared to the other multi-story buildings on the campus, and it cannot be concluded that the addition of this element would substantially degrade the visual character of the site and its surroundings. As an unmistakable swimming pool feature, the waterslide may add visual identity to the Willard Pool, which it currently lacks.</p> <p>West Campus. The indoor pools in the Preferred Plan at the West Campus site would involve construction of a new building approximately 200 feet long (east to west) and 90 feet wide. The roof peak for most of the building would be 25 feet above grade, while the superstructure over the indoor waterslide would rise up to 35 feet high. The new building would be set back over 200 feet from</p>				

A. AESTHETICS	IMPACT			
	YES			NO
WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>University Avenue, with direct views of it across the existing (unused) playing fields. It would be a prominent new structure on Curtis Street, taller and bulkier than the adjacent Child Development Center (which is in pre-manufactured buildings), and somewhat taller and larger than the existing Old Gym immediately to the south. With the Design Variant, the building structure along Curtis Street would be longer (90 feet vs. 65 feet, approximately) but not more than 25 feet tall, because the waterslide would be located outdoors. With the Design Variant, the overall structure would be taller and deeper than the Child Development Center, but not as large as the existing Old Gym.</p> <p>The West Campus site is highly degraded in its current state, as it looks (and is) partially abandoned and underutilized. The addition of the new pool structure would provide ample visual evidence of the City's multi-million dollar investment in a new public facility on the site, reducing the blighted appearance of the Campus. Accordingly, the project would not result in a substantial degradation of the existing visual quality and no significant impact is projected.</p>				
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Night lighting is currently provided at all three swimming pools. In the course of the proposed reconstruction work, the existing poles and fixtures would be replaced and/or relocated, as appropriate. To ensure that the replacement fixtures do not create objectionable new sources of light or glare that are visible from off-site locations, the following mitigation is proposed:</p> <p>Mitigation Measure AESTH - 1. The pool lighting systems shall be designed by a qualified lighting engineer. Aimed, sharp cutoff fixtures shall be specified to minimize light spill and glare.</p>				

B. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES	IMPACT	
	YES	NO

B. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES	IMPACT			
	YES			NO
<p>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 Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.</p> <p>WOULD THE PROJECT:</p>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
The proposed project sites are in urban locations and are not considered Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.				
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act Contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
The project sites are not zoned for agricultural use, nor are they under Williamson Act Contracts.				
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
The project would not result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use.				

C. AIR QUALITY	IMPACT	
	YES	NO

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
See b), below.				
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>The proposed project is located in the Bay Area Air Basin, which is a state and federal non-attainment area for ozone and a state non-attainment area for fine particulate matter (PM₁₀). The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) has promulgated guidelines to assist local agencies in assessing potential air quality impacts in their CEQA reviews. The District's threshold of significance for mobile source emissions (cars and trucks) generated by a proposed project is 80 pounds per day of oxides of nitrogen, which are ozone precursors. Generally, a project that could generate 2,000 vehicle trips per day would approach this threshold and should be evaluated in detail using approved air pollution computer models.</p> <p>Implementation of the proposed project would entail improvements and repairs at three existing public swimming pools. While the patronage may increase somewhat due to attractiveness of the new facilities, increased traffic generation would not approach the threshold level of 2,000 vehicle trips per day. Accordingly, the potential air pollution impacts from the operation of the project would not exceed the BAAQMD threshold of significance and would be less than significant.</p> <p>The project does not call for the installation of any new stationary sources of air pollution, such as pump stations, generators, boilers, etc. and no BAAQMD permits to operate would be required.</p> <p>The construction activities would generate windborne dust and associated, unhealthful, small particulate matter (PM₁₀) from the site clearing, site excavation, fill transport and fill placement work that would occur in varying degrees at each site, each of which is located in, or adjacent to, densely populated neighborhoods of Berkeley. The BAAQMD Guidelines include specific practices that have been shown to reduce the air quality impacts of construction work. The Guideline requirements are incorporated into the following mitigation measure:</p> <p>Mitigation Measure AIR-1. To reduce temporary emissions of PM₁₀ during construction, the contractor shall implement the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water all active construction areas at least twice a day. • Cover all trucks hauling dry soil, sand, or other loose materials, or require at least two feet of freeboard. • Pave, apply water three times a day, or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas. 				

C. AIR QUALITY	IMPACT			
	YES			NO
WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sweep daily, preferably with water sweepers, all paved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at the construction site. Sweep any public streets where soil is visibly deposited once a day, preferably with water sweepers. Limit the area subject to excavation, grading or other construction activity at any one time. Suspend excavation and grading activity when winds (instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 mph. Limit traffic speeds on unpaved areas to 15 mph. Include a training module in the worker safety program to explain dust-exposure risks and hygiene procedures to minimize ingestion of soil particles by on-site workers. <p>Implementation of these requirements would reduce the potential air quality impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p>				
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The potential for the project to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant, and in particular PM ₁₀ would be addressed by Mitigation Measure AIR-1, above.				
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

C. AIR QUALITY	IMPACT			
	YES			NO
WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>No substantial concentrations of criteria pollutants or toxic air contaminants are projected as a result of the project. While the respective pool sites are located in residential neighborhoods that would be considered sensitive receptors, the swimming pools do not presently, and would not, as a result of the project, generate substantial concentrations of criteria pollutants or toxic air contaminants. The chemicals used to sanitize the pool waters (sodium hypochlorite (bleach) and carbon dioxide) are liquids and are delivered and stored in sealed containers. They do not volatilize as criteria pollutants or toxic air contaminants.</p>				
e) Alter wind, moisture or temperature so as to substantially affect public areas or change the climate, either in the community or the region?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>The project involves the upgrading of three existing swimming pools located in a dense urban setting. The magnitude of the project and its respective components is too small to have a significant effect on local or regional wind, moisture or temperature patterns or climate.</p>				
f) Create objectionable odors or dust affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>The project would not involve any activities that would generate objectionable odors. During construction dust would be generated. This is addressed in item C (b), above.</p>				

D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	IMPACT			
	YES			NO
WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p></p>				

D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	IMPACT																														
	YES			NO																											
WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact																											
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																											
<p>Recent studies have indicated that eight special status plant species have previously existed in, or have the potential to occur, in the Berkeley area, while eighteen special status animal species are known to occur or have the potential to occur in the area.</p> <p>None of the eight special status plants that are known to occur or have the potential to occur in the vicinity are found on the respective swimming pool/school campus sites because these sites do offer suitable habitat, specifically, salt marshes or vernal pools.</p> <p>All of the special status animals that are known to occur or have the potential to occur in the area are birds. These species, their status and possible presence is summarized below:</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Species</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Status</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Potential for Occurrence</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>California Brown Pelican</td> <td>Endangered-Federal & State</td> <td>Observed, forages in nearshore waters</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Double-crested Cormorant</td> <td>Special Concern -State</td> <td>Observed, forages in nearshore waters</td> </tr> <tr> <td>California Least Tern</td> <td>Endangered-Federal & State</td> <td>Observed, forages in nearshore waters</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Northern Harrier</td> <td>Special Concern - State</td> <td>Observed, forages and nests in waterfront area</td> </tr> <tr> <td>White-tailed Kite</td> <td>Fully Protected - State</td> <td>Observed, forages and nests in in west Berkeley/waterfront</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Peregrine Falcon</td> <td>Endangered; Fully Protected - State</td> <td>Forages nearby</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Osprey</td> <td>Special Concern - State</td> <td>Observed; forages in subtidal areas</td> </tr> <tr> <td>California Black Rail</td> <td>Threatened;</td> <td>No suitable habitat on sites</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					Species	Status	Potential for Occurrence	California Brown Pelican	Endangered-Federal & State	Observed, forages in nearshore waters	Double-crested Cormorant	Special Concern -State	Observed, forages in nearshore waters	California Least Tern	Endangered-Federal & State	Observed, forages in nearshore waters	Northern Harrier	Special Concern - State	Observed, forages and nests in waterfront area	White-tailed Kite	Fully Protected - State	Observed, forages and nests in in west Berkeley/waterfront	Peregrine Falcon	Endangered; Fully Protected - State	Forages nearby	Osprey	Special Concern - State	Observed; forages in subtidal areas	California Black Rail	Threatened;	No suitable habitat on sites
Species	Status	Potential for Occurrence																													
California Brown Pelican	Endangered-Federal & State	Observed, forages in nearshore waters																													
Double-crested Cormorant	Special Concern -State	Observed, forages in nearshore waters																													
California Least Tern	Endangered-Federal & State	Observed, forages in nearshore waters																													
Northern Harrier	Special Concern - State	Observed, forages and nests in waterfront area																													
White-tailed Kite	Fully Protected - State	Observed, forages and nests in in west Berkeley/waterfront																													
Peregrine Falcon	Endangered; Fully Protected - State	Forages nearby																													
Osprey	Special Concern - State	Observed; forages in subtidal areas																													
California Black Rail	Threatened;	No suitable habitat on sites																													

D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	IMPACT			
	YES			NO
WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>California Clapper Rail</p> <p>Burrowing Owl</p> <p>Short-eared Owl</p> <p>Loggerhead Shrike</p> <p>California Horned Lark</p> <p>Alameda Song Sparrow</p>	<p>Fully Protected - State</p> <p>Endangered-Federal & State;</p> <p>Fully Protected - State</p> <p>Special Concern - State</p>	<p>No suitable habitat on sites</p> <p>Observed on waterfront</p> <p>Suitable habitat (open areas with few trees) occurs in region</p> <p>Possible; habitat is grasslands or pastures</p> <p>Possible in nearby grasslands</p> <p>Possible</p>		
<p>The habitats found on the three sites could be characterized as developed, populated urban lands. None of the sites are adjacent to open water areas or tidally influenced wetlands. The upland areas adjacent to the Willard and West Campus pool sites contain few trees and provide limited opportunities for roosting and nesting, but the Martin Luther King Campus contains a number of tall trees and thick vegetation buffers that can provide nesting opportunities for raptors and foraging/nesting habitat for smaller birds.</p> <p>However, the construction work involved in the project would occur on existing pool sites that are bounded by fences and covered by concrete deck surfaces and structures. Only a few landscaping plants and shrubs would be affected; no trees would be removed at any of the sites. Since the work would essentially consist of the renovation and/or replacement of existing swimming pools and associated buildings, there is little or no potential for harm to any of the special status species that occur, or may occur, in the area, and no significant impacts on special status species are projected.</p>				
<p>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?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>There is no riparian habitat on any of the three sites, and none are within a natural community conservation area.</p>				

D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	IMPACT			
	YES			NO
WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No wetlands are present on any of the three sites, and implementation of the project would not require a Section 404 permit from the US Army Corps of Engineers.				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
The project would not affect migratory fish, nor would it affect resident or migratory wildlife corridors.				
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Construction of the proposed pool enclosure at West Campus and replacement of the pool deck at the King Pool site may be close enough to the Strawberry Creek culvert and a drainage swale, respectively, to fall within the purview of the Berkeley Creeks Ordinance. (See II, I, 3, above.) Mitigation to ensure that the project does not conflict with the policies established in this ordinance is proposed below. The project would not conflict with local tree preservation policies as no trees would be removed in conjunction with construction of the project.</p> <p>Mitigation BIO-1: The Department shall submit the detailed site and structure plans for the West Campus and King Pool projects to the City Engineer for review and issuance of the appropriate permits, subject to the applicable findings, as required in the Creeks Ordinance.</p>				

D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	IMPACT			
	YES			NO
WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
None of the sites are within an area covered by a Natural Community Conservation Plan. Nor are they within the area of a Habitat Conservation Plan or other similar local, regional or State plan.				

E. CULTURAL RESOURCES	IMPACT			
	YES			NO
WOULD THE PROJECT	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>None of the three existing swimming pool complexes that would be affected by the project are on the City of Berkeley's list of Historical Landmarks, and none of them are classified as Structures of Merit, nor are they within the boundaries of an Historical District. Nor are any of them listed on the State or National Registers of Historic Places, or possess characteristics that would qualify them as an historic resource under CEQA.</p> <p>The existing Berkeley High School Old Gym and Pool building is listed as a Berkeley Historical Landmark. Its planned demolition is not a part of this project and the impacts on this cultural resource were addressed independently in the <i>Berkeley High School South of Bancroft Master Plan Environmental Impact Report</i>.</p>				
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in §15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
All three of the project sites are currently developed with swimming pools, concrete pool decks,				

E. CULTURAL RESOURCES	IMPACT			
	YES			NO
WOULD THE PROJECT	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>changing rooms and other structures and have been extensively disturbed in the past for the construction of these facilities. Although there is only a slight possibility that archaeological resources may be unearthed in the course of additional excavations on these sites associated with the proposed project, the City of Berkeley's routine mitigation protocols for construction projects within the City would be applicable, as follows:</p> <p>Mitigation CULT-1: If an archaeological resource is exposed during demolition or construction activities for the proposed project, the construction contractor shall be required to notify the City of Berkeley immediately and all excavation work within ten 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 the cultural resource exposed during construction. 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 DPR 523 (historic properties) forms.</p>				
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
None of the sites have any unique geological features, and the near-surface geology does not support known paleontological resources.				
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>None of the sites are expected to hold archaeological resources, including human skeletal remains. Nevertheless, routine mitigation protocols for construction projects within the City would be applicable, as follows:</p> <p>Mitigation CULT-2: In the event that human skeletal remains are encountered during demolition or construction activities for the proposed project, the construction contractor shall be required to 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, all excavation work within ten feet of the find shall cease immediately.</p>				

F. GEOLOGY AND SOILS	IMPACT			
	YES			NO
WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Several active earthquake faults are located nearby, including the Hayward Fault, less than one-half mile east of the Willard Campus site and the San Andreas Fault, about six miles to the west of the City of Berkeley. None of the three pool sites, however, are within an earthquake special studies zone, and the risk of fault rupture across the surface of these sites during a major earthquake would be limited.				
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>The project sites are in locations that are projected to be subject to high shaking amplification and violent groundshaking (Modified Mercalli Scale) during a major earthquake on the Hayward or San Andreas Fault. During such an event, general panic would be expected among people on the site, underground pipes would be broken, conspicuous cracks would appear in the ground, water would be splashed out of the pools, and some frame structures would be destroyed. There would be less risk of harm to people at the outdoor pools, as there would be fewer people in enclosed areas. Closure of the existing Warm Water Pool at Berkeley High School will reduce the level of seismic hazard for pool patrons, as that building is not designed to resist seismic shaking. The soil conditions beneath the West Campus site are subject to higher ground shaking amplification than the soils beneath the King and Willard Pool sites, and the West Campus is proposed to be enclosed, putting patrons at higher risk of harm than at the other sites should a major earthquake occur when the pools are open and occupied.</p> <p>Because of the risks of significant seismic ground shaking in Berkeley and at the respective pools sites, the design of all major structures associated with the project should be reviewed by a structural engineer, as called for in the following mitigation measure:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Mitigation GEO-1: The design plans for the renovation of the existing buildings at the King</p>				

F. GEOLOGY AND SOILS	IMPACT			
	YES			NO
WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>and Willard Campuses and for the new pool enclosure at the West Campus shall be reviewed by a qualified structural engineer, in consultation with an engineering geologist, who shall provide recommendations for reducing life safety hazards for pool users during a major earthquake. The review shall extend to the foundation and support systems for proposed water slides, new lighting systems, and other above ground structures. The engineering recommendations shall be incorporated into the final design plans.</p> <p>Mitigation GEO-2: All water treatment chemical storage tanks, and related pumping and piping systems shall be secured to resist seismic movement and any incompatible chemicals (e.g. acids and sodium hypochlorite) shall be stored in physically segregated locations so that they could not mix if spilled.</p>				
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>All three campuses are in locations that have been mapped as having a low liquefaction susceptibility (less than 1% of the land surface would liquefy) during a major earthquake (7.1 Richter magnitude). It is noted that the liquefaction risk would be a function of the seismic ground shaking risk, and Mitigation Measure GEO-1, above would also address this hazard.</p>				
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>All of the sites have very little topographic variation, and no landslide hazards are present.</p>				
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>The three project sites currently house swimming pool facilities, and the repair/ renovation or replacement work would involve minimal disturbance of exposed topsoil. The building areas on the King and Willard Campuses are currently covered with pools, concrete decks and buildings, while on the West Campus site, small areas of exposed soil area are present along one or more edges of the projected building area, under both the Preferred Plan and Design Variant. No substantial soil erosion would be likely to occur, and Mitigation Measure Hydro – 1, below, would further reduce the risk of impact.</p>				

F. GEOLOGY AND SOILS	IMPACT			
	YES			NO
WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
None of the project sites are on unstable geologic units or on locations that appear unstable or are showing signs of subsidence, lateral spreading, or collapse. All three swimming pool sites were graded and leveled to support swimming pools and associated decks and structures over 40 years ago, and appear stable and secure today. No adverse impacts due to unstable geologic conditions are expected.				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>The alluvial soils found generally throughout the lower elevations of Berkeley have a high clay content and are classified as expansive, with a high potential for shrinking and swelling as moisture content changes. The existing swimming pool complexes on all three sites appear to have resisted major damage from expansive soil conditions, although most of the concrete deck slabs at all the pools have some cracks, and many run the length of the slab. To ensure that the repair, renovation and/or reconstruction work at all three pool sites can better resist the shrinking and swelling properties of the underlying soils, the following mitigation is recommended:</p> <p>Mitigation GEO-3: The design plans for all three pool complexes shall be reviewed by a registered engineering geologist, whose recommendations for the installation of base materials and/or soil treatments designed to minimize the potential damage from expansive soils shall be incorporated into the designs and implemented by the construction contractor.</p>				
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No septic systems are proposed.				

G. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	IMPACT			
	YES			NO
WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>The project would continue to involve the routine use of water treatment chemicals as well as machinery lubricants, cleaning solvents and other common hazardous materials for operation of the swimming pools and maintenance of the locker rooms and other on-site facilities. Water treatment chemicals stored on each site include up to 500 gallons of sodium hypochlorite (bleach) and 250 gallons of liquid CO₂. Workers have been trained in the storage and use of these materials and transport and delivery protocols are in effect. No public hazards or environmental damage from accidental releases of the water treatment chemicals have been reported.</p> <p>It is expected that the existing water treatment processes will be continued if the Master Plan is approved with the possible addition of small quantities of cyanuric acid to lower the alkalinity and optimize (reduce) the level of CO₂ required. Based on a review of the existing facilities and operations by a swimming pool specialty consultant¹, the following mitigation measures are recommended in order to minimize the potential risks to the public from the use of hazardous water treatment chemicals at the respective facilities:</p> <p>Mitigation Measure HAZ-1: The chemical storage and treatment facilities at each site shall be redesigned and reconstructed to meet current applicable standards found in the California Building Code and the Uniform Fire Code. This shall specifically include seismic safety strapping of the chemical storage tanks, separate storage of potentially reactive acids and bases, proper ventilation of the chemical and mechanical rooms.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure HAZ-2: Revised safety policies and procedures for the handling, storage and application of the water treatment chemicals shall be prepared for each pool site and the pool management and authorized on-site staff shall be trained in the application of the revised policies and procedures prior to the re-opening of each pool.</p>				

¹ Arch Pac Aquatics, *Pool Study for the Willard, West and King Swim Centers*, Berkeley, CA, Feb. 15, 2008, 59 pps.

G. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	IMPACT			
	YES			NO
WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
See previous response. No significant public hazards from upsets or accidents due to the routine delivery of water treatment chemicals to the three pool sites are projected. The primary chemicals used (sodium hypochlorite and liquid carbon dioxide) are common industrial chemicals for which safe handling and delivery procedures are well established. They are currently used at all three sites (and have been for over 40 years). The storage and containment facilities would be upgraded to comply with current and more stringent building codes and would be more seismically secure. (See Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-2).				
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within ¼ mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The King and Willard Pools are located on public school campuses and are less than ¼ mile from active school buildings. The West Campus Pool is located on a former school campus and is less than 100 feet from a childcare center. As noted above, the pool sanitization chemicals that are, and would continue to be, used on the sites are common industrial chemicals for which safe handling and delivery procedures are well established. The proposed project would upgrade the storage and containment facilities and improve their seismic safety, thus reducing the risks of the accidental release of any of the industrial chemicals used on the sites.				
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
None of the pool sites are located on parcels that are included on the "Cortese lists", compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.				

G. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	IMPACT			
	YES			NO
WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan referral area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
None of the pool sites are within the referral areas for the Alameda ALUC or the Contra Costa ALUC. Nor are they within two miles of a public airport.				
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
The sites are not with in the vicinity of a private airstrip.				
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
The project would not affect any emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans.				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
None of the pool sites are within a wildland/urban interface area.				

H. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY	IMPACT	
	YES	NO

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Construction of the project would not be expected to result in any violations of water quality standards. The existing pool facilities are connected to the City of Berkeley's sanitary sewer and storm drain system, and will remain connected to these systems whether or not the respective pool rehabilitation projects are implemented. Completion of the three projects would not substantially increase the quantity, nor change the quality of wastewater discharged from the respective sites, and the project would not lead to any violations of applicable water quality or waste discharge requirements.</p>				
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 pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>The project would not utilize groundwater, nor would it interfere with groundwater recharge. The reconstructed pools may incorporate one or more dewatering wells around their perimeters that would be activated when the pools are emptied for maintenance so as to reduce exterior pressures from groundwater and protect the integrity of the pool shells. The occasional use of these wells would not adversely affect groundwater supplies.</p>				
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>The drainage pattern on the respective sites would not be substantially altered.</p> <p>During construction, the excavation work could potentially result in soil erosion and siltation. Mitigation to ensure that these potential impacts do not become significant is proposed, as follows:</p> <p>Mitigation HYDRO-1: A Notice of Intent covering the overall project (three sites totaling 1.58 acres) shall be filed and a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall be prepared, as required by the State Water Resources Control Board for projects involving more than one acre of land disturbance. The SWPPP shall incorporate appropriate Best Management Practices (BMPs) to control soil and surface water runoff during demolition, excavation,</p>				

H. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY	IMPACT			
	YES			NO
WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
filling, and trenching. To the extent feasible, ground-disturbing activities shall be conducted during the dry season (April 15 to October 31). Stockpiled soil shall be covered and protected with temporary erosion control measures. The SWPPP shall include temporary erosion control measures in the event that rainy weather occurs during construction.				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
The project would not affect the course of a stream or river, nor would it increase the risk of flooding on or off the site. All three project sites are currently developed with swimming pool complexes; implementation of the proposed project would result in negligible changes in impermeable area and little, if any, net increase in the rate and amount of surface runoff.				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
The project sites are currently developed with swimming pool decks and buildings that drain to the City's stormwater drainage systems. This would not change as a result of the project; there would be essentially no increase in the amount of stormwater runoff from the sites and no new sources of stormwater pollution would be created.				
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Implementation of the project would not result in an increase in the discharge of pollutants from the respective sites to the waters of San Francisco Bay.				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

H. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY	IMPACT			
	YES			NO
WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
The proposed project would not include the construction of housing.				
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
None of the project sites are within a 100-year flood zone, and no structures proposed as part of the project 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
The project would not put people or property at risk due to rainfall induced flooding, and none of the three sites are at risk from dam or levee failure flooding.				
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
The lowest of the sites, the West Campus site, is approximately 62 feet above sea level. Tsunami prediction models suggest that height of a 100-year Tsunami reaching Berkeley Marina would be about seven feet above sea level. This would not be high enough to pose a significant risk to the West Campus site, and the potential impact from Tsunami inundation is considered to be less-than-significant.				

I. LAND USE AND PLANNING	IMPACT			
	YES			NO
WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

I. LAND USE AND PLANNING	IMPACT			
	YES			NO
WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
The proposed project would not divide an established community.				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>The proposed project would be sponsored by the City of Berkeley, which is also responsible for land use planning within its boundaries. The relationship of the proposed project with applicable policies found in the <i>Berkeley General Plan</i> is described in Chapter II, Section H, above. The analysis notes that the three existing pools conform to the General Plan's land use designations for their sites, and would continue to do so if the proposed <i>Citywide Pools Master Plan</i> is implemented. Furthermore, implementation of the Master Plan would implement policies found in the Open Space Element relating to maintenance, repair and enhancement of the City's recreational facilities and working with other agencies to improve, preserve, maintain and renovate existing recreational facilities. Specific actions identified relative to these policies include repairing the swim centers, working with the School District to repair or replace the warm water pool and to consider voter approved special bonds to fund implementation of these actions.</p> <p>Regional and State agencies with regulatory authority over specific environmental concerns include, among others, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, the Regional Water Quality Control Board, State Water Resources Control Board, the Department of Fish and Game, the Department of Toxic Substances Control, and the Bay Conservation and Development Commission. With one exception, the proposed project would not raise issues or have features that would bring it under the jurisdiction of any of these agencies. The exception is that the project would be large enough (in aggregate) to require a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, pursuant to State Water Resources Control Board Regulations. This is addressed above, in Section III, H, c, and would be mitigated to a less than significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1.</p>				
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

I. LAND USE AND PLANNING	IMPACT			
	YES			NO
WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
There are no adopted Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Community Conservation Plans affecting the project area.				

J. MINERAL RESOURCES	IMPACT			
	YES			NO
WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No mineral resources would be affected by this project.				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No mineral resources would be affected by this project.				

K. NOISE	IMPACTS	
	YES	NO

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Construction of the project would entail the use heavy equipment air compressors and impact tools including jackhammers for demolition, and large trucks for hauling debris and delivering concrete and other materials to the respective sites. This equipment typically generates noise levels of 90 dBA at 50 feet, with peaks that can be higher for some operations. Residential buildings, which are considered noise sensitive land uses, are found in the vicinity of all the pools. There are approximately five residences within 300 feet of the Willard site, 20 residences within 300 feet of the King site and ten residences within 300 feet of the West Campus site, all of which could experience short-term impacts from project related construction noise.</p> <p>All three of the project sites currently have operating swimming pools and this will continue, whether or not the proposed project is implemented. Any changes in operating noise would be a function of changes in pool operations, and are assessed below in K, c, relating to permanent noise impacts.</p> <p>The following mitigation is proposed to reduce the potential noise impacts during construction:</p> <p>Mitigation NOISE-1: Construction activity shall be limited to the hours between 7:00 AM and 5:00 PM, Monday through Friday, and between 9:00 AM and 5:00 PM on Saturday. No construction related activity shall occur on Sunday.</p> <p>Mitigation NOISE-2: The Parks, Recreation and Waterfront Department shall require that the construction contractor submit a Construction Noise Reduction Plan for review and approval by the Department’s Director prior to commencement of construction. The Noise Reduction Plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equipment and trucks used for project construction shall utilize the best available noise control techniques (e.g. improved mufflers, intake silencers, engine enclosures, acoustically attenuating shields or shrouds, wherever feasible). • Stationary noise sources, such as air compressors, shall be located as far from sensitive sources as possible, and shall be muffled and enclosed within temporary sheds, or insulation barriers. • Signs shall be posted at the respective construction sites that include the permitted construction days and hours, a day and evening phone contact number for the job site, 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. • The on-site complaint and enforcement manager shall be available to respond to and track complaints. The manager will be responsible for responding to complaints regarding 				

K. NOISE	IMPACTS			
	YES			NO
WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>construction noise and for coordinating with the adjacent land uses. The manager shall notify the City's Noise Enforcement Officer of all complaints within 24-hours, and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior to start of construction, a pre-construction meeting shall be held with the Noise Enforcement Officer and the general contractor/on-site project manager at each respective site to confirm that noise mitigation practices are understood and that the required notification signs are in place. <p>Implementation of these mitigation measures would substantially reduce, but may not eliminate, the short-term construction noise impacts.</p>				
b) Result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No vibration or groundborne noise impacts would occur in conjunction with the project.				
c) Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>All three of the project sites are presently developed as swimming pool complexes, and would remain so if the financing is approved and the Master Plan is implemented. Changes in operations and programming of activities at the respective pools could result in short term, episodic changes in noise generated from the respective sites due to some of the following factors:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The addition of the water slides and increased area of shallow waters at King Pool (Design Variant only), Willard Pool (Preferred Plan), and West Campus Pool (Design Variant only) would likely increase patronage during family swimming and open swimming times, and generate more noise from children shouting. 2) The occasional swim competitions (estimated at 6 to 10 per year) at the King Pool would generate periodic crowd noise when the competitions are occurring. 3) Converting the West Campus pool to an indoor pool (Preferred Plan) may reduce off-site noise compared to both existing conditions and the Design Variant, and would reduce the potential for increased noise due to the addition of the waterslide at the facility. 				

K. NOISE	IMPACTS			
	YES			NO
WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>4) The possible reduction in pool hours would increase the periods of inactivity at respective sites. The pools do not generate noise when they are closed.</p> <p>Based on these factors, implementation of the Master Plan would be expected to increase periods of noisy activity at Willard, King (with the Design Variant) and West Campus (with the Design Variant) Pools due to children playing on the waterslides and more frequent swim meets. At the same time, the pool closure hours (when off-site noise cannot occur) may increase at all facilities, depending on the operational budget available.</p> <p>In any event, it is not expected that the off-site ambient noise levels, which are determined on the basis of 24-hour average noise levels, would be increased substantially due to short term, episodic increases in noise generated at the pools from more children playing more loudly or from cheering at more frequent swim meets. The potential for a substantial, permanent increase in ambient noise levels due to the operational changes would be very low, and no significant impact is projected.</p>				
d) Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Construction Noise: See K, a), above.</p> <p>Operational Noise: See K, c), above.</p>				
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan referral area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
The project is not within an ALUC referral area.				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

K. NOISE	IMPACTS			
	YES			NO
WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
The site is not in the vicinity of a private airstrip.				

L. POPULATION AND HOUSING	IMPACT			
	YES			NO
WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
The project is intended to address the continuing needs for recreational, conditioning and therapeutic swimming programs for residents of City of Berkeley and adjoining communities It would not either directly or indirectly, induce population or employment growth in the area.				
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No housing would be lost and no one would be displaced as a result of this project.				

M. PUBLIC SERVICES	IMPACT	
	YES	NO

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for 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:				
i) Fire Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Fire protection would be provided by the City of Berkeley, and the Berkeley Fire Department would be the first responder for fire or medical calls from any of the three sites. The fire hazards associated with the project would be very low, while the demand for emergency first aid or medical transport services could increase marginally, assuming that pool use increases. However, no significant impacts on the Berkeley Fire Department's ability to serve are projected.</p>				
ii) Police Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>The Berkeley Police would be the primary responders to calls for service from the respective sites. Considering that operating swimming pools are already present at all three sites, which are served by the Berkeley Police, the project would not generate a need for additional police personnel, equipment or buildings, and no significant impacts on the Police Department are projected.</p>				
iii) School facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>All three swimming pools sites are located on existing school campuses owned by the Berkeley Unified School District. The new/renovated facilities would be built within the boundaries of the existing pool sites, with the exception of a small expansion on the pool site at West Campus. This enlargement of the West Campus pool site would be done with the approval of the School District and would not impact school facilities, because there is no active school at the West Campus. The new warm water pool at the West Campus site would replace the existing warm water pool on the Berkeley High School campus. By constructing a new warm water pool, the City would accommodate existing and future users of the warm water pool, while relieving the School District of the financial costs associated with heating and maintaining the existing warm water pool. By replacing the facility the City would also be supporting the School District's plans for renovations of Berkeley High School. In summary, no adverse impacts on school facilities are projected.</p>				

M. PUBLIC SERVICES	IMPACT			
	YES			NO
WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
iv) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>The pools on the King and Willard campuses are adjacent to existing park facilities. Implementation of the Master Plan would not directly affect either of these parks, as all the proposed improvements would occur within the existing pool site boundaries. Indirectly, operations at the King Pool could increase the level of use at the nearby tot lot and open space areas, if more families with children are drawn to the park for swimming lessons, open swimming and family swimming. The increase is likely to be greater with the Design Variant, because it includes a water slide. While this indirect effect on the King neighborhood park could increase the need for routine maintenance work, it would not result in a significant adverse impact on the integrity of the park. Changes at the Willard Pool might result in some increase of use at Willard Park, but less than at King.</p> <p>The overall impacts on the city's recreation facilities would be beneficial, as the project would result in repairs and major upgrades at all three city swimming pools. These benefits could be partially offset if it is necessary to implement Operational Scenario 2 or 3, both of which call for reductions in the pool operating hours, compared to current conditions.</p>				
v) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>The Berkeley Fire Department would continue to provide emergency medical and paramedic services. It is not likely that there would be a significant increase in calls for service, as the pools would be open approximately as much as they are now or less. No adverse impact on these services is projected.</p>				

N. RECREATION	IMPACT			
	YES			NO
WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

N. RECREATION	IMPACT			
	YES			NO
WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>The project would renovate or replace all of Berkeley's public swimming pools, which are over 40 years old. One of the goals of the <i>Citywide Pools Master Plan</i> is to address the physical deterioration of the existing pool facilities that has occurred with 40+ years of active use and to replace the much older (85 year old) warm water pool that will be demolished in conjunction with the next phase of Berkeley High School's rebuilding,</p> <p>One of the pool sites (King Pool) is incorporated into an existing neighborhood park, which, in turn, is located on the Martin Luther King Middle School campus. Improvements to King Pool could lead to increased patronage of the adjacent neighborhood park facilities, such as the tot lot and open space areas, if more families with children are drawn to the park for swimming lessons, open swimming and family swimming. The increase is likely to be greater with the Design Variant, because it includes a water slide. While this indirect effect on the King neighborhood park could increase the need for routine maintenance work, it would not result in a significant adverse impact on the integrity of the park, and its existing facilities.</p>				
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>This project entails the renovation and/or reconstruction of existing recreational facilities. The potential environmental impacts associated with this work are discussed in this Initial Study, and mitigation measures are proposed to address potentially significant impacts.</p>				

O. TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION	IMPACT	
	YES	NO

WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>The King Pool site has access from Hopkins Street, a collector street with total average daily traffic volume (2007) of 5,132 vehicles. The Willard Pool facility fronts on Telegraph Avenue, which is classified as a major street with an average total daily traffic volume of approximately 24,000 vehicles. The West Campus pool has access from Curtis Street or Browning Street, both of which are local streets with light traffic. The pool is about a block from University Avenue, a major street with an average total daily traffic volume of over 34,000 vehicles. None of the streets or nearby intersections that are used to access any of the pool sites are at or over their capacity during peak hours or at off-peak times.</p> <p>Since the project involves renovation and/or replacement of existing swimming pool facilities that are in operation and have been for many years, much of the vehicular traffic that is generated by pool users is existing traffic and is included in the traffic volumes noted below.</p> <p>Traffic generated by the operation of the pools varies among the facilities and from hour to hour due to the differing characteristics of the pool programs. King Pool is open 50 weeks per year and has several programs that contribute some vehicle trips to peak hour traffic. These include morning lap swimming, ending at 8:30 am (M-F, year-round), afternoon lap swimming (year-round) and, in the summer, family swimming beginning at 5:30 pm (M-F), the 4:45 pm class of youth swim lessons (M-F), and private swim lessons at 5:30, 6:00 and 6:30 (Tues. & Thurs.). In addition, the Barracuda Swim team practices at King in the fall, winter and spring months, with about 50 swimmers, an estimated half of whom walk, 10% drive and 40% get dropped off. It is estimated that the Barracudas generate about 55 PM peak hour trips.¹ Overall, these programs at King Pool generate about 10 AM peak hour trips year-round, 65 PM peak hour trips in the fall, winter and spring, and also 65 PM peak hour trips in the summer.</p> <p>Willard Pool is currently only open in the summer and the only peak hour traffic its programs generate is from the weekday, 5:30 – 7:30 PM lap swim and public swim sessions. It is estimated that these programs generate less than 10 vehicular trips in the PM peak hour (summer months only).</p> <p>The existing West Campus pool is only open in the summer. It has morning lap swimming, stroke technique classes, and Masters swimming in the summer and Barracuda Swim team practices in the summer, ending at 6 PM, in the PM peak period. The morning activities draw an average of about 20 patrons, of which about five bike. Assuming the rest drive, the AM peak hour traffic generation is about 15 trips. The Barracudas draw about 75 swimmers in the summer months. The staff estimates that five</p>				

¹ Each drive and park generates one peak hour trip when they leave, and each drop-off generates two PM peak hour trips when they are picked up.

O. TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION	IMPACT			
	YES			NO
WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

drive, 30% bike, scooter, skateboard or walk, and the rest get dropped off and picked up. Accordingly, the West Campus pool generates about 100 PM peak hour trips in the summer months. In May and September it generates no peak hour trips, as it only operates between 1:30 and 4:30 PM.

The Warm Water Pool (at Berkeley High School) is open four days a week (M,W, F & Sat.). The 4:30 – 7:30 PM Senior and Disabled Swim program draws an average of 40 participants, and it is estimated that 90% of them drive, generating 20-30 vehicular trips in the 5:00 to 6:30 PM peak period (three days per week). As noted above, these are existing trips that are on the road system; however, this traffic would be relocated along with the pool, away from the Civic Center in downtown Berkeley to the West Campus site.

Changes in traffic that could result from the project will depend on three factors, summarized below:

1. The addition of the warm water pool at the West Campus Site. Relocation of the Warm Water Pool from Berkeley High School to West Campus would transfer an estimated 20 to 30 PM peak hour trips from the Berkeley Civic Center area to the West Campus site three days per week. Considering that the peak hour traffic volume on University Avenue is estimated to approach 4,000 vehicles per hour, this increase (0.75%) would not be substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and would not result in a significant impact.

2. Potential increases in patronage. It is expected that the improvements proposed for the respective pools will make them more attractive and would draw increased patronage from the Berkeley community. This, in turn, could result in increased traffic accessing the sites.

At the King Campus, the programs that occur in peak traffic periods include morning and afternoon lap swimming year-round. In the summer there is family swimming, private swim lessons and some youth swim lessons, and during the rest of the year the Barracudas practice ends in the PM peak period. With the Preferred Plan for King Pool there would be an increase in capacity for lap swimming (four lanes), and patronage is likely to increase although the amount of increase is difficult to predict. Based on conversations with pool staff, it is estimated that lap swimming would increase by 20%. It is not expected that the new facilities would substantially affect the size of the Barracudas. Based on these assumptions, the AM and PM peak hour traffic generated by King Pool under the Preferred Plan would both increase by four trips. Assuming that the peak hour volumes on Hopkins Street approach 600 vehicles, this would be a 0.6% increase in both the AM and PM peak hours. An increase of this magnitude would not result in a significant traffic impact.

With the Design Variant for the King Pool there would be a substantial increase in capacity for swim lessons and for family swimming, which could increase the patronage by these users by up to 50%. Since family swimming and swim lessons are often scheduled in the afternoon, it is estimated that the

O. TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION	IMPACT			
	YES			NO
WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Design Variant would generate a net increase of 10 PM peak hour trips. (The projected AM peak hour traffic increase for the Design Variant would be the same as the Preferred Plan -- four additional trips.) Based on these assumptions, the Design Variant would result in a 0.6% increase in traffic on Hopkins Street in the AM Peak hour and 1.6% in the PM peak hour. Neither increase would be expected to result in a significant traffic impact.</p> <p>At the Willard Campus, it is likely that pool would experience increases in the public, family swim, and youth swim lesson programs, due to the installation of the new shallow pool and waterslide. None of these programs coincide with peak traffic periods, and any traffic they add would not be substantial in relation to the existing traffic load or capacity of the street system. There might be an increase in patronage at the afternoon lap swim session, which starts during the PM peak period for traffic. Even if patronage were to grow by 20%, this would add only two to four vehicles to the street network, and would not result in a significant traffic impact.</p> <p>At the West Campus site, the warm water pool would generate an estimated 20 to 30 PM peak hour trips. The reconstructed existing pool could generate additional PM peak hour trips in the non-summer months, as it might be opened for lap swimming, masters swimming or family swimming when the warm water pool is open. This could generate an additional ten PM peak hour trips, for a total increase of 30 to 40 PM peak hour trips in the non-summer months (and 20 to 30 in the summer months). If all these trips used University Avenue, the PM peak hour volume would increase by about 0.8% to 1.0%, which would not be substantial in relation to the existing traffic load or capacity, and would not result in a significant impact.</p> <p>The Design Variant for the West Campus Pool would not differ greatly from the West Campus Preferred Plan in terms of programs and patronage, and the traffic generation is expected to be generally the same.</p> <p>3. Changes in operating hours. As noted in the project description, the <i>Master Plan</i> recognizes that implementation of the Preferred Plan will increase the Department's annual operating costs and that additional operating funds will have to be found or operating hours will have to be cut.</p> <p>Three possible operating scenarios are presented. Scenario 1 would maintain the existing operating schedule for King and Willard pools and the Warm Water Pool and set the operating schedule for the new West Campus Play/Instructional Lap pool at 50 weeks per year. Scenario 2 would reduce operations at Willard Pool from 20 to 10 weeks per year, and would reduce operations at the West Campus warm water pool from 50 weeks per year to 10 weeks per year. Scenario 3 is intended to reduce the operating budget to approach current levels, and calls for reducing operations at the King Pool by 25 hours per week (from 75 to 50), reducing operations at Willard by 10 weeks per year (from 20</p>				

O. TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION	IMPACT			
	YES			NO
WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>to 10 weeks), reducing operations at the West Campus warm water pool from 50 weeks to 10 weeks per year and reducing operations at the new West Campus Play/Instructional/Lap Pool by six hours per week from 18 to 12 hours, 50 weeks per year. Scenario 2 could eliminate all peak hour traffic generated at Willard on 50 days a year and on 200 days a year at West Campus. Scenario 3, could reduce peak hour traffic generation further, at all sites, depending upon the hours cut.</p> <p>To summarize the changes in traffic that would be expected to occur at each pool site under the various operating scenarios, the following observations can be made:</p> <p>a. At the King Campus, projected increases in patronage would add about four AM peak hour trips and between four and ten PM peak hours trips to Hopkins Street and connecting intersections. This would occur under Operating Scenarios 1 and 2, and could be reduced on some days depending upon how the operational hours are cut under Scenario 3. In any event, the increases are small relative to the existing traffic load and no significant impacts are projected.</p> <p>b. At the Willard Campus, no significant traffic impact is projected because the project would add only about two to four vehicles to the street network in the PM peak hour, during 20 weeks per year, under Operating Scenario 1 and 10 weeks per year, under Scenarios 2 and 3.</p> <p>c. At the West Campus site, the warm water pool would add 20 – 30 PM peak hour trips to the street network on 3 days a week (year around) and the lap/instructional/play pool would add about 10 PM peak hour trips in the non-summer months, under Scenario 1 only. This would not be substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and would not result in a significant impact.</p> <p>d. In the Civic Center area, the closure of the Warm Water Pool (in 2011), would remove 20 – 30 PM peak hour trips from the street network, on 3 days a week. This is small relative to the existing traffic loads, and would have a minimal (beneficial) effect.</p> <p>In conclusion, the overall traffic impacts of the proposed project would be less than significant.</p>				
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency (CMA) for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Interstate 80 is the only road or highway designated by the Alameda County Congestion Management Authority in the immediate project vicinity. It was operating at LOS F in 1991 when the CMA was formed, and is “grandfathered” from the requirement of a CMA-prepared Deficiency Plan, so the</p>				

O. TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION	IMPACT			
	YES			NO
WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>applicable Level of Service Standard is F. The West Campus pool site is located within a few minutes driving time from I-80, via University Avenue, but it is not projected that the proposed project would add significantly to the existing congestion on I-80 for the following reasons:</p> <p>a) There is an existing pool in operation at the site, so any increase in traffic would have to result from a marginal increase in patronage, which may occur, but would be small.</p> <p>b) Very few (if any) pool users would be expected to access the West Campus site via the freeway, as most would be Berkeley residents and would come to the site on local, City streets.</p> <p>c) The potential number of new pool users using the freeway to access the West Campus pool would be insignificant in comparison to the existing pm peak hour volumes on I-80, which exceed 15,000 vehicles an hour.</p> <p>Accordingly, no significant impacts on the CMA designated highway system are projected.</p>				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
The project would not affect air traffic.				
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No hazardous design features or incompatible uses that could result in traffic hazards have been identified.				
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
All of the pool sites are easily accessible by emergency vehicles from arterial or collector streets. Access to the King and Willard pools will be unchanged, while emergency access to the West Campus Pool may improve somewhat, because the relocated entrance will be closer to Curtis Street, which can be more easily accessed from University Avenue than can the existing entrance, which requires driving one block on Bonar Street and then a block on Addison Street.				

O. TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION	IMPACT			
	YES			NO
WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>All of the pool sites are located on school campuses with limited on-site parking. The two campuses with active schools (King and Willard) do not offer parking for pool employees or patrons, while at the West Campus site, which does not have an active school, use of the School District's parking lot is condoned (while not officially permitted) by the School District.¹ Accordingly, all patrons and employees at the King and Willard pools and some at the West Campus pool use on-street parking. The on-street parking facilities in close walking distance to each pool are described below:</p> <p>King Campus: On Hopkins Street, between Carlotta Street and Beverly Place there are approximately 78 spaces, of which two are handicapped (blue) and two are drop-off (white) spaces. In addition, there are about 23 spaces on Carlotta Street, (between Hopkins and the top of the hill) including one 10-minute (green) space. Colusa Street has 13 parking spaces between Hopkins Street and the Codornices Creek Bridge. Other park and recreation facilities beside the swimming pool generate parking demand on these streets, particularly activities at the playing field and tennis courts. Based on the observations by the pool staff, the Middle School generates limited parking demand on Hopkins, as closer parking is available on the school site and streets to the south.</p> <p>A parking survey taken on a summer weekday at mid-day when one swimming lesson session was ending and another was about to begin, showed that the parking spaces were 62% occupied, with the highest occupancy rate near the pool entrance and tennis courts. Another survey taken at 5:30 PM showed the same occupancy rate, with concentrated occupancies near the entrances to the pool/tennis courts and the track. At 62% occupancy rate, there are 45 spaces remaining within a reasonable walking distance of the pool.</p> <p>Willard Campus. No off street parking is available to patrons or employees of the Willard Pool. Most on-street parking is restricted such that parking is difficult for employees, and less difficult for patrons (who normally park for one to two hours). On Telegraph Avenue, between Stuart and Derby Streets there are 36 spaces, of these ten are unmetered (but five of there are passenger loading on school days), 11 are metered one-hour, seven are metered two-hour, one is handicapped, four are white, two are yellow and one is green.</p> <p>On Derby Street between Regent and Telegraph, there are 28 spaces, of which 17 are unrestricted, 10 are two-hour, metered and one is yellow. Neighborhood Parking Permit Area B begins at Derby and Regent, with a two-hour restriction on all vehicles that do not have a neighborhood permit. On Stuart</p>				

¹ The parking lot has a sign at the entrance indicating that a permit is required, but many pool patrons and employees know that this is not currently enforced. The lot has 148 available spaces.

O. TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION	IMPACT			
	YES			NO
WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Street between Regent and Telegraph, there are 40 spaces, of which 38 are in Permit Area B (2-hr. without a permit) and two are two-hour metered. There is cul-de-sac on Regent on the southeast side of the Willard Campus with 14 parking spaces, all in Permit Area B.</p> <p>Parking occupancy surveys of these areas were taken on a weekday at 1:30 PM (when the pool had no patrons) and at 11:00 AM, when the Senior Exercise class was in progress. Occupancy rates were 50% in the first survey and 48% in the second. In both surveys, between 90% and 100% of the 27 unrestricted parking spaces were occupied, corroborating comments by the pool staff that it is very difficult for them to find parking at Willard that does not require them to move their cars every two hours. There is an ample supply of street parking for pool patrons who stay less than two hours.</p> <p>West Campus. As noted, the West Campus does not house an active school and the School District does not prohibit parking in the campus' parking lot on Browning Street. It provides 148 spaces (excluding those used for District storage) and is lightly used. The inventory of on-street parking in the vicinity of the West Campus Pool includes approximately 59 unrestricted spaces on Curtis Street between University Ave. and the south edge of West Campus. On Addison Street between Browning and Bonar Streets there are 17 spaces, including one handicapped space. On Browning Street between Addison and the southern edge of West Campus there are 27 spaces. Finally, University Avenue, between Curtis and Bonar has about 15 spaces designated for one-hour parking plus one yellow space and 10 metered spaces on the north side.</p> <p>A parking survey conducted on a weekday, mid-day period when there were no activities at the pool, showed that 59 of the 130 available (45%) on-street spaces were occupied. A second survey conducted on a weekday at 6:00 PM (when the Barracudas practice was ending) showed a parking occupancy rate of 32%. These surveys reveal that there is no shortage of parking at the West Campus site.</p> <p>Implementation of the <i>Master Plan</i> would not significantly increase parking demand at any of the three sites, as all of them have existing pools in operation. Furthermore, there is a good supply of on-street parking spaces are normally available within reasonable walking distance of each pool. Implementation of the <i>Master Plan</i>, however, would raise several special considerations with respect to parking:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Shortage of Handicapped Parking. Many of the regular patrons of the warm water pool are elderly and disabled persons, most of whom drive to swim and many of whom have disabled placards and/or mobility difficulties. Inconvenient parking for this group of patrons would be a potential impact and mitigation is proposed. 2. Staff Parking at Willard. The Willard Campus has ample short-term parking but very limited long-term parking is available. Mitigation to address this issue is proposed. 				

O. TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION	IMPACT			
	YES			NO
WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>4. Swim Meets and Special Events. The <i>Master Plan</i> calls for a new competition style pool at the King Pool site. It is expected that the pool would host swim meets more frequently, potentially as many as six to ten meets per year. Each meet would draw over 200 swimmers and some spectators, resulting in extraordinary parking demands, and occasional parking shortages in the vicinity of the site. Mitigation would be appropriate to the extent feasible.</p> <p>To address these special considerations, the following mitigation measures are proposed:</p> <p>Mitigation TRAF-1: During the design of the West Campus pools, the project architect, the Parks Recreation and Waterfront Department (PRW) and Public Works Department shall identify locations for five to ten handicapped parking spaces in proximity to the pool entrance. Possible locations could include the area where the current entrance plaza/locker room building is now located and/or curbside spaces on Curtis Street and Browning Street near the pools.</p> <p>Mitigation TRAF-2: To reduce the demand on the limited number of unrestricted parking spaces in the vicinity of the Willard Pool, the PRW Department shall coordinate with the School District to develop a parking agreement for the Willard Pool that would allow pool staff to use three to five of Willard School's on-site parking spaces in the period when the school is not in session but the pool is open.</p> <p>Mitigation TRAF-3: The PRW Department shall work with the School District to investigate the feasibility of developing a special event parking plan for events at the King Pool. Potentially some of the swim meet competitor's vehicles could be accommodated on the King School Campus, and the event sponsor could be held responsible for providing maps, directional signs, or space assignments in advance of meets. This would reduce the demand for event-day parking on neighborhood streets.</p> <p>With these mitigation measures, the project's potential parking impacts would be less than significant.</p>				
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>The Willard and King sites are located on bus routes, with bus stops located within 250 feet or less of the pool entrances. The West Campus pool is located less than a block from University, which is served by three bus routes. All three of the project sites have bicycle-parking racks and have good bicycle access. Hopkins Street and Telegraph Avenue have bicycle lanes, Derby Street is a bike route and the West Campus site is close to Bike Boulevards along 9th Street and Channing Way. All of the sites have</p>				

O. TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION	IMPACT			
	YES			NO
WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>excellent pedestrian access and are located in, or immediately adjacent to, residential neighborhoods. Accordingly many patrons walk or bike to the pools, as do many of the employees.</p> <p>The existing pools are generally consistent with City policies encouraging good walking, biking or transit access to recreational opportunities. The project is intended to improve the quality of the City's swimming facilities, and to that end, it would provide higher quality recreational facilities, which would be centrally located and have good access by multiple modes of alternative transportation.</p>				

P. WATER AND WASTEWATER	IMPACT			
	YES			NO
WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>The project would involve the re-construction and upgrading of the existing public restroom and shower facilities at all three pool sites. All of the existing facilities are connected to Berkeley's sewer system and will maintain those connections. Sewage from Berkeley is transported to the East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) Treatment Plant near the Bay Bridge. This treatment plant is operated to comply with Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) requirements. It has a capacity of 168 million gallons a day (mgs) and the current average flow is 80 mgd. The project would add little, if any, additional sewage to the system, and would not have the potential to result in an exceedence of the wastewater treatment requirements applicable to the plant.</p>				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>This project would not generate new water or wastewater treatment demand that would, in turn,</p>				

P. WATER AND WASTEWATER	IMPACT			
	YES			NO
WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
require the construction of new or expanded treatment facilities.				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Storm water accumulation, collection and transport would be essentially unchanged as a result of the project. All three sites are currently covered by swimming pools, concrete decks and buildings, and will continue to be if the project is implemented. On-site drainage systems would be modified or replaced (especially at the West Campus site, where pool(s) would be covered), but the stormwater would continue to be delivered to the City's storm drains in essentially the same amount and manner as it is today. No expansion of stormwater facilities, with the potential to independently cause additional environmental effects, would be triggered by the proposed project.				
d) Require new or expanded entitlements in order to have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Potable water for the three pool sites is provided by the EBMUD, which would continue to serve the sites. There could be a small increase in water demand if patronage increases, however EBMUD has sufficient entitlements to meet the projected needs of all existing urban areas served by the District. No impact is projected.				
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

P. WATER AND WASTEWATER	IMPACT			
	YES			NO
WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Wastewater from the existing pools is currently, and would continue to be, transported to the EBMUD wastewater treatment plant near the Bay Bridge approaches. There could be a small increase in water demand if patronage increases, but the treatment plant is operating below capacity and would be able to accommodate any increases in demand generated by the project.				
f) Not be able to be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Trash collected at the three pool sites is transported to the Berkeley Transfer Station on Gilman Street. The project would not result in a significant incremental addition to the City's existing waste stream, and would have little or no effect on the capacity of the landfills used by the City.				
g) Be in non-compliance with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Trash and recycling containers are currently, and would continue to be, provided on-site as part of the project, and the material collected from these containers would be disposed of or recycled in accordance with state and local regulations.				

Q. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	IMPACT			
	YES			NO
WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Q. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	IMPACT			
	YES			NO
WOULD THE PROJECT:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
As noted above, the project would not result in any potentially significant impacts on biological or cultural resources.				
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
The project involves the rehabilitation and/or reconstruction of existing public swimming pools operated by the City of Berkeley. The project's individual environmental impacts are not significant, can be mitigated, and do not compound any potential environmental impacts of past, current or probable future projects on the respective project sites, adjacent sites or in the City as whole. The project would not result in, or contribute to, any potential cumulative environmental impacts.				
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The potentially significant environmental impacts identified in this Initial Study can be reduced to a less-than-significant level with feasible mitigation that can be incorporated into the project's design.				

R. REFERENCES

1. Alameda County Congestion Management Agency, *Countywide Transportation Plan, 2001-2026*, August 2, 2001, 128 pps, plus appendices.
2. Arch Pac, Aquatics, Pool Study for the Willard, West and King Swim Centers, Berkeley CA, February 15, 2008, 59 pps. plus attachments.
3. Association of Bay Area Governments, (ABAG) *Bay Area Shaking Maps*, 2004, www.abag.ca.gov
4. Bay Area Air Quality Management District, *Air Quality and Urban Development*, 1985.
5. Bass, Nick, Willard Pool staff, personal communication, July 24, 2009.
6. Berkeley Unified School District, *Berkeley High School South of Bancroft Master Plan Environmental Impact Report*, (Turnstone Consulting) September 26, 2006.
7. Cadzen, Audrey, Aquatics Facilities Supervisor, (Willard and Warm Water Pools), personal communication, July 23, 2009.
8. City of Berkeley, *Berkeley Bikeways Map*, www.ci.berkeley.ca.us
9. City of Berkeley, *Berkeley Citywide Pools Master Plan*, Final Draft, April 2, 2009, 44 pps.
10. City of Berkeley, *Berkeley General Plan: A Guide for Decision-making*, April 2002, 191 pps. plus appendices
11. City of Berkeley, *Berkeley Pools Inventory (for Citywide Pools Master Plan)*, Sports Management Group, 7 pps.
12. City of Berkeley, *Initial Study for the Berkeley Marina Master Plan*, October 21, 2002, 51 pps.
13. City of Berkeley, *Initial Study for the Gilman Streets Playing Fields*, June 10, 2005, 109 pps, plus appendices.
14. City of Berkeley, *An Overview of the City of Berkeley Aquatics Program*, Power Point Slides, n. d., 32 pps.
15. City of Berkeley, *Municipal Code, Chapter 23 (Zoning Ordinance); 23D.28; 23D.32; 23C.08.050*
16. City of Berkeley, *Pool Activity Schedules*, June 15 – August 20, 2009 for Willard Pool, King Pool, West Campus Pool and January 26 – April 30, 2009, Berkeley High Warm Water Pool.
17. City of Berkeley, *Pool Program Detailed Participation Numbers*, September 2007 –August 2008, 2 pps.
18. City of Berkeley, *Traffic Engineering, Average Total Daily Traffic Volume Map*, www.ci.berkeley.ca.us
19. Fonseca, Rosemary, Berkeley Aquatics Coordinator, personal communications, July 11, 2009
20. Glass Architects, *City of Berkeley Warm Water Therapy Pool, Preliminary Feasibility Study and Report*, April 18, 2005, 42 pps.
21. Goodman, Dylan, staff, West Campus Pool, personal communication, July 17, 2009
22. Hrusha, Kate, staff, West Campus Pool, personal communication, July 17, 2009

23. Jones, Lew, Facilities Director, Berkeley Unified School District, e-mail communication, July 10, 2009.
24. Lucero, Blythe, Aquatics Facilities Supervisor (King and West Campus), personal communications, various dates.
25. OpenAire, Waterparks and Pool Enclosures, product information sheets, www.openaire.com
26. Petta, David, ELS Architecture and Urban Design, personal communications, various dates.
27. *Material Data Safety Sheets* for Industrial Sodium Hypochlorite (T-Chem Products), Liquid Carbon Dioxide (Liquid Carbonic, and Cyanuric Acid (Sigma-Aldrich).
28. Stott, Tina, Planning Consultant, personal communications, various dates.