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I INTRODUCTION

A. Purpose of the Environmental Impact Report

This document and the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) together comprise the Final EIR for the Branch Libraries Program.

The Draft EIR described the proposed Program, identified the environmental impacts associated with the Program, and identified mitigation measures that could reduce those impacts. The Draft EIR also evaluated several alternatives to the Program.

This document responds to comments received during the public review period on the Draft EIR and makes revisions to the Draft EIR, as necessary, in response to these comments. The revisions are limited to correcting errors, omissions, or misinterpretations.

This document, together with the Draft EIR, will be presented to the Zoning Adjustments Board and City Council to certify as a complete and adequate analysis of the environmental effects of the Program, under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), prior to either body taking action to approve the Program. The decision-making bodies must consider the conclusions of the EIR and make findings regarding that information as part of any approval.

B. Environmental Review Process

According to CEQA, lead agencies are required to consult with public agencies having jurisdiction over a proposed project, and to provide the general public and project applicant with an opportunity to comment on the environmental impact analysis that is prepared for a project. There are no public agencies with jurisdiction over the project other than the City of Berkeley.

The Draft EIR was made available for public review on December 14, 2011. Review copies were available at the Planning and Development Department,
the Central Library, South and West Branch libraries, and through the City of Berkeley website. The public was advised of the availability of the Draft EIR through posting on and off the site in the project vicinity, and through direct mailing to owners and occupants of property within 300 feet of the site, as required by law. A 45-day public review period was chosen by the City to ensure that the public had adequate time to comment particularly because the comment period coincided with the holiday period. CEQA requires only 30 days, since there are no State agencies with jurisdiction over the proposed projects.

Copies of all written comments received on the Draft EIR during the comment period are contained in this document. Each substantive comment on the Draft EIR has received a written response.

Public hearings on the Draft EIR were held by the Zoning Adjustments Board (ZAB), Planning Commission (PC), and Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC), during the comment period and transcripts of those meetings are included among the comments. The Final EIR will be made available for at least 10 days prior to final action by ZAB and the City Council.

C. Document Organization

This document is organized into the following chapters:

♦ Chapter 1: Introduction. This chapter discusses the use and organization of this Final EIR.

♦ Chapter 2: Draft EIR Summary. This chapter is a summary of the findings of the Draft EIR including corrections to the text of the Draft EIR. Underline text represents language that has been added to the EIR; text with strikethrough has been deleted from the EIR.

♦ Chapter 3: Revisions to the Draft EIR. Additional corrections to the text and graphics of the Draft EIR are contained in this chapter.
Underline text represents language that has been added to the EIR; text with strikethrough has been deleted from the EIR.

♦ **Chapter 4: List of Commenters.** Names of organizations and individuals who commented on the Draft EIR are included in this chapter.

♦ **Chapter 5: Comments and Responses.** This chapter contains master responses to commonly-made comments; a tabular listing of each comment and responses to them; reproductions of the letters received from organizations and individuals on the Draft EIR; and transcripts of the public hearings held with the ZAB, LPB, and PC.
This chapter presents a summary of the analysis contained in the Draft EIR as originally presented in Chapter 2 of that document, with corrections incorporated. The corrections are included in Chapter 3 in underline and strikethrough text.

The chapter summarizes the following: a) project under review, b) areas of controversy, 3) significant impacts and mitigation measures, 4) unavoidable significant impacts, and 5) alternatives to the projects.

A. Project Under Review

The Draft EIR provides an assessment of the potential environmental consequences of (1) a Zoning Ordinance Amendment (ZOA) to allow flexibility in the application of development standards at the City’s five existing public libraries, and (2) proposed demolition and replacement of two of those libraries, the South Branch Library and West Branch Library. These components are summarized briefly below and described further in Chapter 3 of the Draft EIR.

1. Zoning Ordinance Amendment
   a. Program Description
   The proposed program is an amendment to the City’s Zoning Ordinance (Berkeley Municipal Code Title 23) that would allow modification with a Use Permit of any zoning requirement applicable to a change, expansion, or reconstruction of an existing public library, where a Variance is currently required for most such modifications. The ZOA would not affect existing requirements for Use Permits, and would not apply to libraries built on new sites. The ZOA is as follows:

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

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

b. Program Objectives
There is one overarching program objective:

♦ To facilitate the approval of improvements authorized under Measure FF to “renovate, expand, and make seismic and access improvements at four neighborhood branch libraries, but not the Central Library”, without eliminating public review, by allowing modification of Zoning Ordinance requirements for the existing public libraries with Use Permits rather than Variances.

c. Program Locations and Surrounding Land Uses
The ZOA would apply to all four existing branches of the Berkeley Public Library: North, Claremont, South and West; and the Central Library. However, as the projects at North and Claremont have been found to be exempt from CEQA review, and there are no projects planned or foreseeable for the Central Library, the potential impacts of the ZOA relate only to planned improvements at the South and West Branches. Thus, the Draft EIR addresses only those impacts.
2. South and West Branch Library Projects
   a. General Project Objectives for South and West Branch Libraries
      The overall goal is to improve the functions, access, and enjoyment of the South Branch Library and Tool Lending Library, and the West Branch Library, for patrons and staff for years to come. General objectives are to:

      1. Increase library space in order to effectively house the library programs as described in the Facilities Master Plan (FMP), South Branch Library/Tool Lending Library Building Program, and West Branch Library Building Program, including adequate space for staff functions.

      2. Be within budget and consistent with Measure FF funding.

      3. Provide ADA-compliant access to both public and staff areas.

      4. Protect library users by bringing the libraries up to current building and seismic codes.

      5. Meet the need for upgraded technology, improved collection storage and more seating.

      6. Provide better lighting, ventilation, and thermal comfort, in an energy efficient and environmentally responsible facility.

      7. Provide a welcoming civic presence on a major street while respecting the neighborhood context.

      8. Operate effectively with current staffing levels by having sightlines that allow the library staff to monitor activities in different parts of the library by direct observation.

      9. Meet best practices for library design including providing convenient public access to all program areas and having appropriate adjacencies of programming areas.

   b. Specific Project Objective for South Branch Library

      10S. Provide a building with a visible ground-floor meeting space.
c. Specific Project Objective for West Branch Library
   10W. Provide reading spaces for adults that are not disturbed by traffic and internal noise sources.

3. South Branch Library
   a. Location and Setting
   The project site is located in the southern portion of the City of Berkeley, at 1901 Russell Street, at the northeastern corner of the intersection of Martin Luther King Jr. Way and Russell Street. One- and two-story single-family and multi-family residences line Russell Street around the project site. A three-story Thai Buddhist Temple is located on the northern side of Russell Street adjacent to and east of the project site. A vacant lot (approved as a parking lot for the Buddhist Temple) is located adjacent to and north of the project site. Residences and Grove Park are located across Martin Luther King Jr. Way on the block to the west of the project site.

   b. Existing Site Characteristics
   The 13,398 square-foot parcel is occupied by a one-story Main Library building and Tool Lending Library with a combined area of 5,400 square feet (4,550 for the Main Library and 850 square feet for the Tool Library). The structures are set back from Russell Street and Martin Luther King Jr. Way by grass lawns. There is an entrance to the Tool Lending Library and loading area from Martin Luther King Jr. Way, for vehicle access for tool transportation.

   The 2008 Branch Libraries Facilities Master Plan (FMP) documented the state of each of the branch libraries.\footnote{Noll & Tam, 2008. Berkeley Public Library. Branch Libraries Facilities Master Plan. July 2008. It is incorporated in this Draft EIR by reference and Volume 1 is in Appendix D2 of this Draft EIR. It is also available online at: http://www.berkeleypubliclibrary.org/about_the_library/branch_libraries_FMP.php.} The FMP described deterioration in the concrete blocks, windows, trim, roofing and other external elements of the South Branch Library. The interior of the building is generally in fair condition; however, the heating system is at the end of its anticipated life,
there is no ventilation system, no fire alarm system or sprinklers, and the electrical and lighting systems are outdated and need to be replaced.

c. Proposed South Branch Project
The new library would be an 8,656-square-foot, single-story building, which would serve the same functions and same number of patrons as the existing library. The overall structure would house 7,480 square feet of Main Library space and 1,176 square feet for the Tool Lending Library. There is no substantial expansion of the book collection, or existing services or programs. Most of the space being added to the building is devoted to providing a more efficient and less cluttered floor plan, adequate staff work areas, additional patron seating, compliance with accessibility requirements (e.g. wider aisle widths and hallways and larger bathrooms), and upgraded technology such as additional computers and self-check-out stations. Overall, the program will be improved, with the addition of dedicated teen space, a quiet study area, a larger meeting space, improved layout with better adjacencies and isolation of functions by noise level, a minimum ten-percent increase in book shelving, and adequate space to manage check-in and deliveries related to circulation.

As with the existing library, the main entrance to the new library would be located on Russell Street. There would also be a second entrance into the main library, as well as a separate entrance to the Tool Lending Library that would share access from Martin Luther King Jr. Way. Two short-term loading/unloading spaces are provided on-site, (as they are for the current library) one of which would fulfill ADA requirements for van accessibility.

4. West Branch Library
a. Location and Setting
The West Branch project site is located in the western area of the City of Berkeley, at 1125 University Avenue, near the intersection with San Pablo Avenue. Commercial, hotel and residential uses line University Avenue around the project site. Directly adjacent to the site on the east side is a hotel and on the west side is a store parking lot. An apartment complex, with an entrance on Hearst Avenue, is directly north of the project site behind the
A new apartment complex is located opposite of the project site on the southern side of University Avenue.

b. Existing Site Characteristics
The 12,000-square-foot parcel is occupied by the one-story, 6,230-square-foot West Berkeley Branch Library. The library building is set back from University Avenue by a trellised entry portico, ramp, and stairs, and by landscaping, which were all part of 1974 additions to the library. There is a driveway on the western side of the West Branch Library for loading.

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

c. Proposed West Branch Project
The proposed project involves demolition of the existing Berkeley West Branch Library and construction of a new library at the same location. The proposed new library would be a primarily one-story building with a small second story devoted to mechanical space. The building would have a total floor area of 9,400 gross square feet and a building footprint of 8,900 square feet. This building would perform the same functions and is expected to serve the same number of patrons as the existing library. With the exception of a larger meeting room to address existing overcrowding, there are no plans to expand existing services or programs, only to better accommodate the existing demand.
B. Areas of Controversy

Several comment letters were received during the scoping period for the South Branch Draft EIR and for the Branch Libraries Program Draft EIR, and are incorporated in Appendix C1 of the Draft EIR. Comments were also made verbally at the public scoping meetings for the EIR held on July 12, 2010 and October 20, 2010, at the City of Berkeley Planning and Development Department.

Comments on the South Branch Library project relevant to CEQA environmental review include the historical importance of the existing South Branch Library and the necessity for an EIR to analyze a renovation alternative, air quality and noise issues from construction, and increases in traffic on opening of the new library. These issues have been either adequately discussed in the IS or included in the EIR. Responses to these comments are included in Appendix C2 of the Draft EIR.

Several comments were received pertaining to the greenhouse gases (GHGs) that would be emitted as a consequence of the demolition and construction as compared to retaining existing structures with their embodied energy. It was suggested that these GHG emissions would be avoided if the library were simply restored. Although discussed briefly in the Initial Study, because of the extent of public interest and concern, the EIR includes a section that specifically analyzes GHGs with regards to the project.

For the ZOA, there were no comments regarding environmental impacts received in response to this document. Comments on the loss of books are outside the scope of this CEQA review.

The City of Berkeley decided to develop an EIR on the South and West Branch Library projects and the ZOA. A Scoping Meeting was held on October 20, 2010. Comments received were all in favor of the project and of expediting the environmental review process. The project team answered questions about the design selection process for the new libraries.
C. Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Under CEQA, a significant impact on the environment is defined as a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic and aesthetic significance.

Two potentially significant impacts to Cultural Resources were identified in Chapter 4, Environmental Evaluation, of the Draft EIR.

The impact and mitigation measures are summarized in Table 2-1 at the end of this chapter. They will form the basis of a Mitigation Monitoring Program presented in Appendix B of this Final EIR and implemented in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines.

D. Unavoidable Significant Impacts

Section 15126.2(b) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR identify any significant impacts that cannot be avoided, even with the implementation of feasible mitigation measures.

Impact CULTURAL-South-1: The proposed project would demolish the existing South Branch Library, which is considered a qualified historic resource for purposes of CEQA. The demolition would materially alter in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historic resource that convey its historical significance.

Impact CULTURAL-West-1: The proposed project would demolish the existing West Branch Library, which is a qualified historic resource. The demolition would materially alter in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historic resource that convey its historical significance.
All other project impacts are less than significant. The impacts from the ZOA are the same as those of the South Branch and West Branch Library projects.

E. Significant Impacts

Under CEQA, a significant impact on the environment is defined as a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project, including land, air quality, water resources, minerals, biological resources, cultural resources, noise, and aesthetics.

Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with long-term, regional growth and development, has the potential to generate environmental impacts in several areas. However, the growth-inducing effects of the proposed project are minimal because there is no anticipated growth in library programming as a result of the program.

Implementation of the proposed project would potentially generate significant environmental impacts in the area of Cultural Resources due to the demolition of historic resources. As shown in Table 2-1, these impacts would be considered significant and unavoidable.

F. Mitigation Measures

The Draft EIR suggests mitigation measures that could reduce the severity of two significant impacts to historic resources. However, with these mitigation measures, which are updated in Table 2-1, the two impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
G. Unavoidable Significant Impacts

Section 15126.2(b) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR describe any significant impacts that cannot be avoided, even with the implementation of feasible mitigation measures. As described in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, and shown in Table 2-1, there are two significant unavoidable impacts, both of which are in the area of Cultural Resources due to the demolition of historic resources. Even with mitigation, these impacts would remain Significant and Unavoidable.

H. Alternatives to the Projects

An EIR must evaluate a reasonable range of feasible alternatives to the project or the location of the project that would achieve most of the basic project objectives and would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant impacts of the project. Chapter 5 of the Draft EIR compares the impacts of the No Project, Existing Library Renovation, and Partial Preservation Alternatives for both the South and West Branch Library Projects, and the No Project, Demolition Only, and Rehabilitation and Renovation Only Alternatives for the ZOA.

For the ZOA, Section 5.1 concludes that The No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, but poses significant life safety risks to Library patrons and the public. Neither the No Demolition Alternative nor the Renovation and Rehabilitation Only Alternative avoids or substantially reduces impacts as compared to the Zoning Ordinance Amendment and neither would meet the basic project objective.

For the South Branch Library, Section 5.2 concludes that the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative as it is the only one that avoids the significant and unavoidable impact for historic resources. The Existing Library Renovation Alternative is the next most superior although it would still have significant impacts on the historical resources due to the highly visible and intrusive seismic work required. However, this impact
would still be slightly less severe than those of the proposed project because the South Branch Library would look similar to how it appeared when it first opened, rather than being completely demolished. This alternative however, would result in an effectively smaller library with reduced programming and would not accomplish most of the project objectives.

For the West Branch Library, Section 5.3 concludes that the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative as it is the only one that avoids the significant and unavoidable impact for historic resources. The proposed project would be the next most environmentally superior.

There would be no cumulative impacts from the South Branch or West Branch Library project or from the ZOA.

I. Summary Table

Table 2-1 presents a summary of impacts and mitigation measures identified in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR.

The table is arranged in four columns: 1) environmental impacts, 2) significance prior to mitigation, 3) mitigation measures, and 4) significance after mitigation. For a complete description of potential impacts, please refer to the specific discussions in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Significance With Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CULTURAL-South-1: The proposed project would demolish the existing South Branch Library, which is a qualified historic resource. The demolition would materially alter in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historic resource that convey its historical significance.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>CULTURAL-South-1a: The project sponsors shall undertake a salvage program to save and reuse the wood slat ceiling. Prior to demolition, the project sponsors shall conduct a full survey of all historic architectural elements and hire qualified salvage contractors and companies with experience in historic buildings to complete this salvage program. CULTURAL-South-1b: The project sponsors shall fund a permanent exhibition and interpretative program on the development of the South Berkeley Branch Library. The Berkeley South Branch Library is one of four branch libraries in the city, and the history of public library development in Berkeley shall be shared with the public through a permanent exhibition and interpretative program. Components of this mitigation program could include a kiosk containing historic photographs and plans, as well as a signage program and gallery located preferably at one of the Branch Libraries, or if not, at the Main Library. An accompanying report shall be made available at a local public institution such as the Berkeley Public Library and the California State Library. The project sponsor shall document the affected historical resource and its setting. Generally, this documentation shall be in accordance with Historic American Building Survey (HABS) Level II, which includes: ♦ Drawings: select existing drawings, where available; should be photographed with large-format negatives or photographically reproduced on Mylar. ♦ Photographs: photographs with large-format negatives of exterior and interior views, or historic views, where available. ♦ Written data: history and description in narrative or outline format. HABS material standards regarding reproducibility, durability, and size shall be met. Copies of the photographs and report shall be presented to repositories such as those listed above, which are invested in archiving the history of Berkeley, municipal libraries, etc.</td>
<td>SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Impact</td>
<td>Significance Before Mitigation</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>Significance With Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTURAL-West-1:</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>CULTURAL-West-1a: The project sponsors shall undertake a salvage program to save and promote reuse of the building's historically significant materials and features to the extent reasonably feasible, namely the Classical decorative elements called out in the Structure of Merit designation: the cornice, original wood framed windows, original arched entry with semi-circular window, engaged columns, ornamental medallion, and remaining incised lettering. Salvage allows for the removal of individual architectural elements for potential reuse. Salvaged elements could be reused at the project site or another project, or be given to an architectural salvage company. Salvage has the added benefit of landfill and waste diversion.</td>
<td>SU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                    |                               | CULTURAL-West-1b: The project sponsors shall fund a permanent exhibition and interpretative program on the development of the West Berkeley Branch Library. The Berkeley West Branch Library is one of four branch libraries in the city, and the history of public library development in Berkeley should be shared with the public through a permanent exhibition and interpretative program. Components of this mitigation program could include a kiosk containing historic photographs and plans, as well as a signage program and gallery located preferably at one of the Branch Libraries, or if not, at the Main Library. An accompanying report shall be made available at a local public institution such as the Berkeley Public Library and the California State Library. The project sponsor shall document the affected historical resource and its setting. Generally, this documentation shall be in accordance with HABS Level II, which includes:  
  - Drawings: select existing drawings, where available; should be photographed with large-format negatives or photographically reproduced on Mylar.  
  - Photographs: photographs with large-format negatives of exterior and interior views, or historic views, where available.  
  - Written data: history and description in narrative or outline format. |                           |

The proposed project would demolish the existing West Branch Library, which is a qualified historic resource. The demolition would materially alter in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historic resource that convey its historical significance.
## Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Significance With Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural-West-1 continued</td>
<td></td>
<td>HABS material standards regarding reproducibility, durability, and size shall be met. Copies of the photographs and report shall be presented to repositories such as those listed above, which are invested in archiving the history of Berkeley, municipal libraries, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GEOLOGY AND SOILS

*There are no significant geology and soils impacts, and, therefore, no mitigation measures.*

### GREENHOUSE GASES

*There are no significant greenhouse gas impacts, and, therefore, no mitigation measures.*
3 Revision to the Draft EIR

This chapter presents specific changes to the Draft EIR that are being made in response to comments made by the public, as well as staff-directed changes including typographical corrections and clarifications. In each case, the revised page and location on the page is presented, followed by the textual, tabular, or graphical revision. Underline text represents language that has been added to the EIR; text with strikethrough has been deleted from the EIR.

None of the revisions constitutes significant changes to the analysis contained in the Draft EIR. As such, the Draft EIR does not need to be recirculated.

Chapter 2 Report Summary

Page 2-5
The following sentence in the paragraph entitled Proposed South Branch Project is amended as follows:
Most of the space being added to the building is devoted to providing a more efficient and less cluttered floor plan, adequate staff work areas, additional patron seating, compliance with accessibility requirements (e.g. wider aisle widths and hallways and larger bathrooms), and upgraded technology such as additional computers and self-check-out stations.

The second paragraph on the same page is amended as follows:
As with the existing library, the main entrance to the new library would be located on Russell Street. There would also be a second entrance into the main library, as well as a separate entrance to the Tool Lending Library that would share access from on Martin Luther King Jr. Way. Two short-term loading/unloading spaces are provided on-site, as they are for the current library, one of which would fulfill ADA requirements for van accessibility, as for the current library.
The paragraph entitled Proposed West Branch Project is amended as follows:
The proposed project involves demolition of the existing Berkeley West Branch Library and construction of a new library at the same location. The proposed new library would be a primarily one-story building with a small second story devoted to mechanical space. The building would have a total floor area of 9,600 gross square feet and a building footprint of 8,900 square feet. This building would perform the same functions and is expected to serve the same number of patrons as the existing library. With the exception of a larger meeting room to address existing overcrowding, there are no plans to expand existing services or programs, only to better accommodate the existing demand.

The third paragraph under C. Impacts and Mitigation Measures are amended as follows:
The impact and mitigation measures are summarized in Table 2-1 at the end of this chapter. They will form the basis of a Mitigation Monitoring Program presented in Appendix K of this Draft EIR and implemented in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines.

The first sentence of the second paragraph under H. Alternatives to the Projects is amended as follows:
For the ZOA, Section 5.1 concluded that The No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, but poses significant life safety risks to Library patrons and the public.

The following changes are made to mitigation measures in Table 2-1:
CULTURAL-South-1a: The project sponsors shall undertake a salvage program to save and reuse the wood slat ceiling. Prior to demolition, the project sponsors shall conduct a full survey of all historic architectural
elements and hire qualified salvage contractors and companies with experience in historic buildings to complete this salvage program.

CULTURAL-South-1b: The project sponsors shall fund a permanent exhibition and interpretative program on the development of the South Berkeley Branch Library. The Berkeley South Branch Library is one of four branch libraries in the city, and the history of public library development in Berkeley shall be shared with the public through a permanent exhibition and interpretative program. Components of this mitigation program could include a kiosk containing historic photographs and plans, as well as a signage program and gallery located preferably at one of the Branch Libraries, or if not, at the Main Library. An accompanying report shall be made available at a local public institution such as the Berkeley Public Library and the California State Library. The project sponsor shall document the affected historical resource and its setting. Generally, this documentation shall be in accordance with Historic American Building Survey (HABS) Level II, which includes:

- **Drawings:** select existing drawings, where available, should be photographed with large-format negatives or photographically reproduced on Mylar.
- **Photographs:** photographs with large-format negatives of exterior and interior views, or historic views, where available.
- **Written data:** history and description in narrative or outline format.

HABS material standards regarding reproducibility, durability, and size shall be met. Copies of the photographs and report shall be presented to repositories such as those listed above, which are invested in archiving the history of Berkeley, municipal libraries, etc.

Significance with Mitigation. This mitigation would create a collection of preservation materials that would be available to the public and inform future research. However, according to Section 15126.4 (b) (2) of the Public Resources Code (CEQA), HABS-level documentation of a historical resource as mitigation for the effects of demolition of the resource will typically not
mitigate the effects to a less-than-significant impact. Because these mitigation measures do not prevent the loss to community character and collective history of the proposed demolitions, the impact associated with a substantial adverse change to a historical resource would remain significant and unavoidable.

CULTURAL-West-1a: The project sponsors shall undertake a salvage program to save and promote reuse of the building’s historically significant materials and features to the extent reasonably feasible, namely the Classical decorative elements called out in the Structure of Merit designation: the cornice, original wood framed windows, original arched entry with semi-circular window, engaged columns, ornamental medallion, and remaining incised lettering. Salvage allows for the removal of individual architectural elements for potential reuse. Salvaged elements could be reused at the project site or another project, or be given to an architectural salvage company. Salvage has the added benefit of landfill and waste diversion.

CULTURAL-West-1b: The project sponsors shall fund a permanent exhibition and interpretative program on the development of the West Berkeley Branch Library. The Berkeley West Branch Library is one of four branch libraries in the city, and the history of public library development in Berkeley should be shared with the public through a permanent exhibition and interpretative program. Components of this mitigation program could include a kiosk containing historic photographs and plans, as well as a signage program and gallery located preferably at one of the Branch Libraries, or if not, at the Main Library. An accompanying report shall be made available at a local public institution such as the Berkeley Public Library and the California State Library. The project sponsor shall document the affected historical resource and its setting. Generally, this documentation shall be in accordance with HABS Level II, which includes:

- **Drawings**: select existing drawings, where available; should be photographed with large-format negatives or photographically reproduced on Mylar.
Photographs: photographs with large-format negatives of exterior and interior views, or historic views, where available.

Written data: history and description in narrative or outline format.

HABS material standards regarding reproducibility, durability, and size shall be met. Copies of the photographs and report shall be presented to repositories such as those listed above, which are invested in archiving the history of Berkeley, municipal libraries, etc.

Significance with Mitigation. This mitigation would create a collection of preservation materials that would be available to the public and inform future research. However, according to Section 15126.4 (b) (2) of the Public Resources Code (CEQA), HABS-level documentation of a historical resource as mitigation for the effects of demolition of the resource will typically not mitigate the effects to a less-than-significant impact. Because these mitigation measures do not prevent the loss to community character and collective history of the proposed demolitions, the impact associated with a substantial adverse change to a historical resource would remain significant and unavoidable.

Chapter 3 Project Description

Page 3-7
An updated version of the South Branch Existing Library Site Plan is used in Figure 3-2 (see following page).

Page 3-8
The third paragraph of the discussion of South Branch Library existing characteristics, beginning on page 3-6, is hereby amended as follows:

For the South Branch Library, the FMP describes deterioration in the concrete blocks, windows, trim, and other external elements of...
Source: Field Paoli Architects
c. Community Meetings and BOLT Meetings

Concept designs for partial reuse and an all-new building were shared at two community meetings on September 17 and October 1, 2009. Of the schemes presented at the September 17 meeting, Scheme A involved preservation of the Main Adult and Children’s Reading Rooms (2,750 square feet) with a new two-story addition, for a total of 7,400 square feet. Scheme B preserved only the Main Adult Reading Room (1,450 square feet) with a new two-story addition for a total of 8,000 square feet. There were also two Schemes, C and D, for an all-new library design. Meeting attendees were surveyed after the meeting. They noted the space constraints posed by the project, their desire for a well-designed new structure that accommodates the full program on a single story using all 9,600 square feet, and the importance of the Tool Lending Library. The general consensus was that maximum use of space was more important than preserving the building.

At the second meeting, on October 1, 2009, Schemes B1 and B2, variations on the partial preservation Scheme B that preserved just the Main Adult Reading Room, were presented, as well as Scheme C for a new library. B1 was a one-story scheme but would not have accommodated the full library program, and B2 was a two-story scheme, with sufficient space. Meeting attendees were surveyed after the meeting and noted that space, functionality, access, and services (notably the Tool Lending Library) were of prime importance for the project. Scheme B2 went forward to the third community meeting held concurrently with the Board of Library Trustees (BOLT) meeting on October 14, 2009. Taking into account feedback from the public, project architect, and library staff, the BOLT voted unanimously in favor of the proposed project rather than the partial preservation alternative. As reported at the October 29, 2009 Landmarks Preservation Commission Subcommittee meeting, BOLT was in favor of making the community meeting room a “focal point” of the building closer to the front of Martin Luther King Jr. Way.
Page 3-13

The second paragraph of the discussion of community and BOLT meetings related to the South Branch Library is hereby amended as follows:

A two-story addition was also undesirable because it would also require more an additional staff member to oversee operations.

Page 3-14

The last paragraph of the discussion of community and BOLT meetings related to the South Branch Library is hereby amended as follows:

On January 7, 2010, Library staff and the project architect made an informational presentation to the LPC. On May 6, 2010, pursuant to BMC Section 23C.08.050.C, City staff referred the proposed demolition to the LPC to provide an opportunity to initiate the designation of the existing building as a City landmark, and/or to express objections to the demolition. After hearing a presentation of the current proposal, the LPC neither expressed objections nor decided to initiate the landmark designation process took no action. Their action allowed the project presented to them to proceed to a Use Permit process to permit its demolition.

Page 3-15

The third paragraph of the discussions of South Branch Library Project Characteristics is hereby amended as follows:

The following section describes the components of the project, including: new library proposed uses; details on the proposed design, including landscaping and drainage, lighting, and energy efficiency and green components; parking; access and circulation; zoning; reuse of materials; disposal of hazardous materials; foundation and grading; heavy construction equipment; utility line trenching; construction schedule and truck traffic; tree removal/protection; and site operations.

Page 3-17

Figure 3-4 is replaced with the figure on the following page:
The second paragraph of c. West Branch Library Project Description is hereby amended as follows:

The proposed new library would be a two-story building with a total floor area of 9,400 gross square feet and a building footprint of 8,900 square feet. The entire library program would be accommodated on the ground floor, and a 700-square-foot mechanical room would be located on the second floor. This two-story building would perform the same functions, and is expected to serve the same number of patrons, as the existing library. The building would also include a multi-purpose room that would be open to library visitors for general reading and computer use, and that could accommodate larger meetings than in the existing meeting room. However, the intent of the larger meeting area is mainly to address existing overcrowding rather than to accommodate larger meetings. With this exception, there are no plans to expand existing services or programs, only to better accommodate the existing activities.

The sentence about the project budget for West Branch Library Option A, located in the second paragraph, is hereby amended as follows:

The renovation and construction costs for Option A were estimated at $4.751,000 in the FMP Volume I (excluding contingency and escalation).21

Footnote 20 on page 3-38 is hereby amended as follows:

Volume I of the FMP was created after Volume II which had a slightly different total of $4,886,556 (excluding contingency and escalation).

Footnote 21 on page 38 is hereby amended as follows:

The project budget was initially based on this estimate but this was later revised to a bid-day estimate of $4.9 million including escalation, but not contingency.
The first paragraph is amended as follows:

e. Landmarks Preservation Committee and Subcommittee Meetings

A subcommittee of the LPC provided a report on the design progress to the main LPC on November 5, 2009. The LPC was informed that according to an existing Page & Turnbull report, the existing building lacked integrity. A committee member disagreed with that conclusion and stated that the building was a landmarked Structure of Merit.23

The design team then presented the three schemes for either a restored or all-new library from the Concept Design Report to a subcommittee of the LPC on November 19, 2009. The design team updated the subcommittee on the design progress on January 28, 2010. The LPC Chair, Gary Parsons, said he appreciated that the architects took seriously the retention of the old building and had explored how this could be done. He noted that the library program could not be accommodated if the library was left where it was and that there would be a “cascade of consequences” if it was moved. He questioned if moving the building would compromise its historic integrity. Another committee member noted that there seemed to be an inverse relationship between a high quality renovation and high quality library. The Chair did not think that the Library could bring forward a plan that the entire LPC committee could agree upon.

The design team made a subsequent presentation to the LPC on March 4, 2010, and this reported the BOLT conclusion that an all-new building was the preferred option and that designs for this option were being pursued. The Director of Library Services reported that the existing structure was in a poor state of repair and that consulting engineers had reevaluated the work necessary to renovate the historic structure, and that after reviewing costs and functionality, the Library intended to move forward with a plan for demolition and new construction.

23 It should be noted that integrity is not required for the Structure of Merit designation.
Chapter 4.1 Cultural Resources

Page 4.1-19
Mitigation Measure CULTURAL-South-1a on page 4.1-19, continuing onto page 4.1-20, of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

Mitigation Measure CULTURAL-South-1a: The project sponsors should undertake a salvage program to save and reuse the wood slat ceiling. Prior to demolition, the project sponsors shall conduct a full survey of all historic architectural elements and hire qualified salvage contractors and companies with experience in historic buildings to complete this salvage program.

Page 4.1-20
Mitigation Measure CULTURAL-South-1b on page 4.1-20 of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

Mitigation Measure CULTURAL-South-1b: The project sponsors shall fund a permanent exhibition and interpretative program on the development of the South Berkeley Branch Library. The Berkeley South Branch Library is one of four branch libraries in the city, and the history of public library development in Berkeley shall be shared with the public through a permanent exhibition and interpretative program. Components of this mitigation program could include a kiosk containing historic photographs and plans, as well as a signage program and gallery located preferably at one of the Branch Libraries, or if not, at the Main Library. An accompanying report shall be made available at a local public institution such as the Berkeley Public Library and the California State Library. The project sponsor shall document the affected historical resource and its setting. Generally, this documentation shall be in accordance with Historic American Building Survey (HABS) Level II, which includes:

- Drawings: select existing drawings, where available; should be photographed with large-format negatives or photographically reproduced on Mylar.
Photographs: photographs with large-format negatives of exterior and interior views, or historic views, where available.

Written data: history and description in narrative or outline format.

HABS material standards regarding reproducibility, durability, and size shall be met. Copies of the photographs and report shall be presented to repositories such as those listed above, which are invested in archiving the history of Berkeley, municipal libraries, etc.

Significance after Mitigation. This mitigation would create a collection of preservation materials that would be available to the public and inform future research. However, according to Section 15126.4 (b) (2) of the Public Resources Code (CEQA), HABS-level documentation of a historical resource as mitigation for the effects of demolition of the resource will typically not mitigate the effects to a less-than-significant impact. Because these mitigation measures do not prevent the loss to community character and collective history of the proposed demolitions, the impact associated with a substantial adverse change to a historical resource would remain significant and unavoidable.

Page 4.1-21
Mitigation Measure CULTURAL-West-1b on page 4.1-21 of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

Mitigation Measure CULTURAL-West-1b: The project sponsors shall fund a permanent exhibition and interpretative program on the development of the West Berkeley Branch Library. The Berkeley West Branch Library is one of four branch libraries in the city, and the history of public library development in Berkeley should be shared with the public through a permanent exhibition and interpretative program. Components of this mitigation program could include a kiosk containing historic photographs and plans, as well as a signage program and gallery located preferably at one of the Branch Libraries, or if not, at the Main Library. An accompanying report shall be made available at a local public institution such as the Berkeley
Public Library and the California State Library. The project sponsor shall document the affected historical resource and its setting. Generally, this documentation shall be in accordance with HABS Level II, which includes:

- **Drawings:** select existing drawings, where available; should be photographed with large-format negatives or photographically reproduced on Mylar.
- **Photographs:** photographs with large-format negatives of exterior and interior views, or historic views, where available.
- **Written data:** history and description in narrative or outline format.

HABS material standards regarding reproducibility, durability, and size shall be met. Copies of the photographs and report shall be presented to repositories such as those listed above, which are invested in archiving the history of Berkeley, municipal libraries, etc.

**Significance after Mitigation.** This mitigation would create a collection of preservation materials that would be available to the public and inform future research. However, according to Section 15126.4 (b) (2) of the Public Resources Code (CEQA), HABS-level documentation of a historical resource as mitigation for the effects of demolition of the resource will typically not mitigate the effects to a less-than-significant impact. Because these mitigation measures do not prevent the loss to community character and collective history of the proposed demolitions, the impact associated with a substantial adverse change to a historical resource would remain *significant and unavoidable.*

**Chapter 4.3 Greenhouse Gases**

**Page 4.3-13 to 4.3-14**

*The second paragraph of ii. Construction-Related GHGs, is hereby amended as follows:*

It is recognized that GHGs are also generated when new building materials are manufactured and transported to the construction site. These aspects of a
The proposed new South Branch library is approximately 60 percent larger than the existing building. It also provides more services, as in that in the new library the proposed community room and staff offices would be air-conditioned (which is not the case in the existing library) and there will also be a far more the number of computers used than with the present library.
Chapter 5.1 Alternatives to Zoning Ordinance Amendment

Page 5.1-1

The following text is hereby amended in the discussion of the City’s ability to make findings on the Variances.

In granting a Variance to a project, the City must make at least one of two each of the three findings specified by Section 23B.44.030 of the Berkeley Municipal Code, including that there are “exceptional or extraordinary circumstances applying to the land, building or use” and that a “Variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights of the subject property’s owner.” The first finding former would be difficult to make for the South and West Branches because these sites are, by Berkeley standards, relatively large, rectangular sites with no special constraints compared to other sites in their respective neighborhoods. Demolition of the South and West Branch buildings would create a “blank slate,” allowing relatively easy compliance with setback and lot coverage requirements. The second latter finding would also be difficult to conclude for these projects since the library is a publicly owned and operated facility, and therefore the economic use of the building is irrelevant. Compliance with the setback requirements would not preclude the continued use of the sites as public libraries.

Chapter 5.2 Alternatives to South Branch Library Project

Page 5.2-4

The following text is hereby added to the discussion of the South Branch Library Partial Preservation Alternative:

3. South Branch Library: Partial Preservation Alternative
The Partial Preservation Alternative would involve preservation and renovation of the Main Reading Room, demolition of the remaining 1961 structure, the Meeting Room and Tool Lending Library, and construction of a new two-story, publicly accessible addition. As over 50 percent of the
library would be demolished, this would be classified as a demolition under City of Berkeley ordinance, which reads as follows:

A building or enclosed structure shall be considered demolished for the purposes of this chapter when, within any continuous 12 month period, such building or enclosed structure is destroyed in whole or in part or is relocated from one lot to another. For purposes of this Section, destroyed in part means when 50% or more of the enclosing exterior walls and 50% or more of the roof are removed.

Page 5.2-5
The first paragraph on page 5.2-5 of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

The cost for this alternative was estimated in the 2009 Concept Design Report at $4,562,000, which was approximately 10 percent more than $4,146,000, which is the estimated cost of the proposed project at $4,146,000. The cost of this alternative would therefore be outside project budget of $4.3 million.

Page 5.2-11
Footnote 7 describing the seismic strengthening is hereby amended as follows:

An alternative and less visible way to provide this seismic strengthening is to deconstruct some of the concrete block walls and to rebuild the walls with insert some new block and new horizontal bracing into the roof, columns and walls to meet current codes. However, this would be much more disruptive to the historical integrity and would be considerably substantially more expensive. This method of seismic strengthening was therefore not proposed as part of this alternative.

Page 5.2-15
The discussion of the Existing Library Renovation Alternative is hereby amended as follows:
b. Existing Library Renovation Alternative
Under the Existing Library Renovation Alternative, operations would be reduced compared to the present situation. Instead of more computers, there would be the same number as presently the existing library, or fewer.

Page 5.2-16
The last sentence in the first full paragraph on page 5.2-16 is hereby amended as follows:
It should be noted, however, that the although Figure 5.2-3 is the design presented and priced in the Concept Design Report, slight changes were made subsequently and the current floor layout plan is illustrated on Figure 3-4 in the project description.

Pages 5.2-16 and 5.2-18
The discussion of the South Branch Library Alternatives’ consistency with Measure FF funding is hereby amended as follows:

2. Be within budget and consistent with Measure FF funding
Estimated costs for the project budget used to request money in Measure FF (and derived from figures in the FMP), is presented in Table 5.2-3, 5.3-3. By definition the No Project Alternative does not require expense, but it also solves none of the problems with the existing library. Also included in Table 5.2-3 are costs for Scheme B2 and Scheme C of the Concept Design Report, which are similar to the Partial Preservation Alternative and proposed project, respectively. The Concept Design Report estimated the cost of Scheme B2, which is similar to the Partial Preservation Alternatives analyzed here, at $4,562,000 and of the proposed project at $4,416,000. The project budget, as represented by the bid-day estimate and used to allocate request funding in Measure FF funds is $4,300,000. The Partial Preservation Alternative was therefore estimated to cost approximately 10 percent more than the proposed project, is over budget and does not meet this objective. Costs to renovate the complete existing library were not fully developed because program goals could not be met but it is likely they would be within budget.
The 10 percent figure is calculated from the difference between the Concept Design Report’s estimates for the Partial Preservation Alternative and the proposed project. It is possible that the estimate for the Partial Preservation Alternative would increase with further development of the design, as the proposed project did.

Table 5.2-3 is hereby amended as shown on the following page.

The discussion of the degree to which the South Branch Alternatives provide a welcoming street presence and respect neighborhood context is hereby amended as follows:

7. Provide a welcoming street presence on a major street while respecting the neighborhood context

The existing library is substantially lower in height than was built to be similar in scale to the surrounding residences. Passers-by might not be aware that there was a library if it were not for the sign. Library users, staff and administrators have expressed a desire for a more prominent building in keeping with its civic function, but one that is still respectful of the surrounding neighborhood. Therefore neither the No Project Alternative nor the Existing Library Renovation Alternative satisfies this objective. Elements of the Partial Preservation Alternative, with its two-story addition, provide a greater degree of “civic presence” (although some might say this has the effect of detracting from the architecture of the preserved older portion). In the concept design, the two-story addition slopes down towards the Main Reading Room which faces Russell Street. The second building addition also slopes away from Martin Luther King, the main thoroughfare, and inward to frame the Main Reading Room. The design of the Partial Preservation Alternative does not provide civic presence on a major street and fails in this objective. The proposed project has the meeting room at the main intersection of Martin Luther King and Russell Street, with street-side windows and a double-height central browsing area, with tall clerestory
TABLE 5.2-3  **COSTS FOR PROPOSED SOUTH BRANCH PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing Library Renovation Alternative</th>
<th>Partial Preservation Alternative</th>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Contractor</strong></td>
<td>$$4,300,000 &lt; 4,562,000$$</td>
<td>$$4,562,000$$</td>
<td>$$4,416,000$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contract Estimate</strong></td>
<td>$$4,146,000$$</td>
<td>$$4,146,000$$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

windows on all four sides. It therefore meets this objective of providing civic presence on a main thoroughfare.

Page 5.2-21

The discussion of the degree to which the South Branch Alternatives meet best practices for library design is hereby amended as follows:

Modern library design includes a variety of considerations for placing uses in juxtaposition (for example for adults monitoring children), or at some distance (to separate noisy uses). The existing library does not provide physical or acoustical separation. Teens and adults space are not sufficiently distinct and as a consequence, adults take the children’s seating due to lack of adequate spaces. In the existing library, computers are placed centrally and adjacent to the children’s area without consideration for the computer users’ needs for quiet. There is inadequate space for teens, with no dedicated seating and sound separation to allow them to study together, use computers, and read in a welcoming environment. For this reason, the existing library and No Project Alternative does not meet the objective of “best practice” in library design.
With the Partial Preservation Alternative, the children's area would be
directly adjacent to the service desk, which would be desirable, but also with
direct access to the entrance, which is a less safe configuration than with the
children's areas more in the interior, because of the potential for children
leaving the building undetected. Teens and computer users, which generally require greater assistance, are farther from the staff service desk making assisting them a greater challenge.

Chapter 5.3 Alternatives to West Branch Library Project

Page 5.3-2
The second paragraph on page 5.3-2 is hereby amended as follows:

Public restrooms would have to be enlarged to accommodate additional required water closets as required by the CBC. The staff restroom would require further enlargement to meet ADA accessibility code requirements. Both of these increases would take a significant amount of floor space from both the existing Multipurpose Room and the existing, and inadequate, staff work room.

Page 5.3-4
The fourth paragraph of the description of Partial Preservation Alternative 1, which begins on page 5.3-3, is hereby amended as follows:

All of the interior plaster would be removed; the entire interior surface of the structure would be lined with ½-inch structural plywood to create seismic shear walls; and the original interior finishes would then be restored. To accommodate the wider walls, all of the windows, including the historic components, would be rebuilt. The south windows and glass doors at the arched entry way that have already been replaced with modern windows would be replaced with more appropriate reproductions. The east and west windows would be salvaged and rebuilt. The doors would be restored and used as windows. Because the doors are positioned about two feet below floor level at the threshold, to complete this process and still retain the external historic character of the building would require digging a hole in the
The skylight (previously removed because of water leaks) would be reinstated. As this alternative is crafted to produce a library as similar to the original as possible, no photovoltaic panels would be installed on the rebuilt 1923 structure.

Page 5.3-13

_The discussion of geology and soil impacts of the No Project Alternative is hereby amended as follows:_

2. Geology and Soils
a. No Project Alternative

As evaluated in the Facilities Master Plan, several features of the existing library structure make it deficient with respect to its ability to withstand likely earthquakes. The rot and decay in the cripple studs compromises the vertical and lateral resistance of the building, and the original building is neither not seismically reinforced, and it is not nor tied into the 1974 addition. In the event of a major earthquake, the existing building could suffer extensive damage and potential instability. As the No Project Alternative is the existing situation, it represents the perpetuation of existing seismic safety risks. Although this is not technically a significant impact, however, as the possibility exists of reducing the risks from earthquakes to library visitors and staff, As such, the No Project Alternative is a worse alternative than the proposed project with respect to impacts from geology and soils.

Page 5.3-17

_Table 5.3-2 is hereby amended as shown on the following page._

Page 5.3-18

_The discussion of ADA compliance is hereby amended as follows:_

3. Provide ADA-compliant access to both public and staff areas

The reconfigured 1923 portion of the building can be made ADA compliant although the wider by widening the aisles, although this results in less programming space. New additions would be built to ADA standards. Only the No Project Alternative therefore fails this project objective.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>No Project Alternative</th>
<th>Renovation Alternative</th>
<th>Partial Preservation Alt. 1</th>
<th>Partial Preservation Alt. 2</th>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Increase library space in order to effectively house the library programs as described in the Facilities Master Plan and West Branch Library Building Program, including adequate space for staff functions.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Be within budget and consistent with Measure FF funding.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Provide ADA-compliant access to both public and staff areas.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Protect library users by bringing the libraries up to current building and seismic codes.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Meet the need for upgraded technology, improved collection storage, and more seating.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Provide improved lighting, ventilation, and thermal comfort, in an energy efficient and environmentally responsible facility.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Provide a welcoming civic presence on a major street while respecting the neighborhood context.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Operate effectively with current staffing levels by having sightlines that allow the library staff to monitor activities in different parts of the library by direct observation.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Meet best practices for library design including providing convenient public access to all program areas and having appropriate adjacencies of programming areas.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>(West Branch only) Provide reading spaces for adults that are not disturbed by traffic and internal noise sources.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Page 5.3-19

The discussion of civic presence and neighborhood context is hereby amended as follows:

7. Provide a welcoming civic presence on a major street while respecting the neighborhood context

Neighboring buildings are built up to the street front and several stories tall. In comparison, the existing building is set back and one story. In this context, the existing building is considered to lack civic presence. Even when renovated with the removal of the 1974 addition, it would still lack this. If moved to the street front and associated with a taller addition, it would be more prominent and meet this objective. However, neither of the Partial Preservation Alternatives would be as effective in its civic presence as the proposed project.

Chapter 6  CEQA Required Assessment

Page 6-2

Mitigation Measure CULTURAL-South-1a on page 6-2, continuing onto page 6-3, of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

Mitigation Measure CULTURAL-South-1a: The project sponsors should undertake a salvage program to save and reuse the wood slat ceiling. Prior to demolition, the project sponsors shall conduct a full survey of all historic architectural elements and hire qualified salvage contractors and companies with experience in historic buildings to complete this salvage program.

Page 6-3

Mitigation Measure CULTURAL-South-1b on page 6-3 of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

Mitigation Measure CULTURAL-South-1b: The project sponsors shall fund a permanent exhibition and interpretative program on the development of
the South Berkeley Branch Library. The Berkeley South Branch Library is one of four branch libraries in the city, and the history of public library development in Berkeley shall be shared with the public through a permanent exhibition and interpretative program. Components of this mitigation program could include a kiosk containing historic photographs and plans, as well as a signage program and gallery located preferably at one of the Branch Libraries, or if not, at the Main Library. An accompanying report shall be made available at a local public institution such as the Berkeley Public Library and the California State Library. The project sponsor shall document the affected historical resource and its setting. Generally, this documentation shall be in accordance with Historic American Building Survey (HABS) Level II, which includes:

- **Drawings:** select existing drawings, where available; should be photographed with large-format negatives or photographically reproduced on Mylar.

- **Photographs:** photographs with large-format negatives of exterior and interior views, or historic views, where available.

- **Written data:** history and description in narrative or outline format.

HABS material standards regarding reproducibility, durability, and size shall be met. Copies of the photographs and report shall be presented to repositories such as those listed above, which are invested in archiving the history of Berkeley, municipal libraries, etc.

**Significance after Mitigation.** This mitigation would create a collection of preservation materials that would be available to the public and inform future research. However, according to Section 15126.4 (b) (2) of the Public Resources Code (CEQA), HABS-level documentation of a historical resource as mitigation for the effects of demolition of the resource will typically not mitigate the effects to a less-than-significant impact. While in some instances these mitigation measures are judged to reduce the level of adverse effects to a less-than-significant level, they often do not alter the loss to community character and collective history. Therefore, the impact associated with a
substantial adverse change to a historical resource would remain significant and unavoidable.

Page 6-4
Mitigation Measure CULTURAL-West-1b on page 6-4 of the Draft EIR is hereby amended as follows:

Mitigation Measure CULTURAL-West-1b: The project sponsors shall fund a permanent exhibition and interpretative program on the development of the West Berkeley Branch Library. The Berkeley West Branch Library is one of four branch libraries in the city, and the history of public library development in Berkeley should be shared with the public through a permanent exhibition and interpretative program. Components of this mitigation program could include a kiosk containing historic photographs and plans, as well as a signage program and gallery located preferably at one of the Branch Libraries, or if not, at the Main Library. An accompanying report shall be made available at a local public institution such as the Berkeley Public Library and the California State Library. The project sponsor shall document the affected historical resource and its setting. Generally, this documentation shall be in accordance with Historic American Building Survey (HABS) Level II, which includes:

- **Drawings:** select existing drawings, where available; should be photographed with large-format negatives or photographically reproduced on Mylar.
- **Photographs:** photographs with large-format negatives of exterior and interior views, or historic views, where available.
- **Written data:** history and description in narrative or outline format.

HABS material standards regarding reproducibility, durability, and size shall be met. Copies of the photographs and report shall be presented to repositories such as those listed above, which are invested in archiving the history of Berkeley, municipal libraries, etc.
Significance after Mitigation. This mitigation would create a collection of preservation materials that would be available to the public and inform future research. However, according to Section 15126.4 (b) (2) of the Public Resources Code (CEQA), HABS-level documentation of a historical resource as mitigation for the effects of demolition of the resource will typically not mitigate the effects to a less-than-significant impact. While in some instances these mitigation measures are judged to reduce the level of adverse effects to a less-than-significant level, they often do not alter the loss to community character and collective history. Therefore, the impact associated with a substantial adverse change to a historical resource would remain significant and unavoidable.
Written and public hearing comments were received from the following agencies, organizations and members of the public. The comments are sorted, in the following order: organizations, private individuals, project team members, and public hearing comments. Comments within each category are arranged in chronological order received. The commenters are identified by an abbreviation that is used in the table of responses and in annotations to the letters and transcripts in Chapter 5.

A. Written Comments

Organizations
1. Library Users Association (LUA), Peter Warfield, Executive Director. Letter received January 31, 2011.
2. Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association (BAHA), Daniella Thompson, President. Letter received January 31, 2011.

Private Individuals

Project Team
1. Mark Schatz (MS). Letter received January 20, 2011.
Public Hearing Comments

This chapter includes each comment letter received during the public review period. The comments are annotated so that each point can be addressed separately. Responses to comments (along with verbatim excerpts of the comment letter text) are provided in Section B. Original comment letters with annotations are presented in Section C.

Several topics came up repeatedly in the comments. These are the subjects of four Master Responses, which address the comments with background and context. Some responses to individual letters and public hearing comments refer back to the larger response in the Master Response.

Master Response 1: Use of Measure FF Funds
Master Response 2: Extent of the Zoning Ordinance Amendment
Master Response 3: Other Alternatives
Master Response 4: Embodied Energy

A. Master Responses

Master Response 1: Use of Measure FF Funds
a. Use of Measure FF Funds for Demolition
   A number of comments question whether Measure FF bond monies may be used for demolition or reconstruction of branch libraries. This is not an environmental issue under CEQA; if funds are not available for those purposes the proposed South and West Branch projects would be infeasible, and CEQA issues would be moot. However, the City’s position is that Measure FF funds may be used for the South and West Branch Library projects, as proposed. A lawsuit to determine that issue is currently pending in Alameda County Superior Court. It should be noted that the outcome of that process does not affect the environmental information contained in the Draft EIR and Final EIR. Rather, it affects the financial feasibility of the proposed projects.
b. Consideration of Off-Site Alternatives
As reported in the Draft EIR, page 5-1, for each Branch Library project: “An off-site alternative was not considered because the proceeds of Measure FF bonds may not be used except at the four existing branch library sites, and there are no other funds available for the renovations.” The following footnote was included: “Memorandum from Zach Cowan, Acting City Attorney to Donna Corbeil, Library Director, dated October 2, 2009. Subject: Expenditure of Measure FF Funds for Construction of Replacement New Tool Lending Library at New Site.” Although it was not explicitly stated, that memo was included in Appendix G with other relevant documentation about Measure FF. Chapter 3 of the Final EIR contains a correction to insert the reference to the location of that memo, which was part of the Draft EIR and fully available to the public.

c. Budget Allocations
A number of comments question the budget allocations for the South and West Branch projects and whether additional funds are available beyond Measure FF bond proceeds. The following discussion provides information on the budget allocation process.

i. FMP Estimates
With respect to South Branch, the Facilities Master Plan (FMP) identified as options: (1) demolition of the northern part of the building and renovation of the southern part; and (2) complete demolition and construction of a new, larger building (FMP, pp. 37-38). Its recommendation was demolition and construction of a new Library and Tool Lending Library of 8,200 square feet (FMP, p. iii).

With respect to West Branch, the FMP identified as options: (1) demolishing all but the original 1923 building, moving it to the front of the site and building an addition behind it, and (2) a 2002 proposal which would involve a two-story addition (FMP, pp. 29-30; Exh. 2, Minutes, p. 3). The FMP recommended demolition of 4,130 of 6,230 square feet of existing buildings,
and new construction of 6,500 square feet for a total of 8,600 square feet (FMP, p. iii).

The FMP included an “all branch” cost estimate for the recommended options, with a total cost of just over $26 million (FMP, p. iii).

ii. Development of Specific Proposals
Shortly after Measure FF passed, the Board of Library Trustees (BOLT) began the process of determining how to meet the needs identified in the FMP, including establishing a budget and selecting architects.

In developing a more detailed budget, the Library began with the FMP estimate, as this was the best information available at the time. In February 2009, the BOLT adopted a budget of $26,015,875 for the four branch projects, as per Table 5-1. The figures are taken from the 2008 Facilities Master Plan, Volume I.¹

In order to refine this overall budget into a useful working budget, it was necessary to create a budget for the costs of overseeing the entire program that were not specific to any one branch, such as program management costs, program consultants, bond costs, program contingencies, and the like. These costs totaled about 10 percent of the budget and left about $23.5M to be allocated to the specific branch library projects. The next step was to allocate remaining funds to each branch. This was done by starting with the budgets contained in the FMP and then reducing them to account for the program costs that had been removed. This resulted in project costs for each branch that were distributed using percentages that were very similar to those in the FMP. Thus, the North Branch was allocated about 24 percent of the available funds, the West Branch was allocated about 30 percent, the South Branch was

¹ Pages 3 to 4 of the FMP Volume II note that the cost estimates were in flux at the time that Volume II was published. Volume I, which was published after Volume II, is considered the authoritative version as all four projects were under consideration at that time. Volume I is therefore used as the reference for Table 5-2.
### Table 5-1: Costs for Four Branch Library Projects Used for Budget, July 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hard Costs</th>
<th>Soft Costs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>$4,765,238</td>
<td>$1,456,919</td>
<td>$6,222,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>$5,401,615</td>
<td>$1,641,468</td>
<td>$7,043,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>$5,974,695</td>
<td>$1,807,662</td>
<td>$7,782,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claremont</td>
<td>$3,831,998</td>
<td>$1,136,280</td>
<td>$4,968,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$26,015,875</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


allocated about 27 percent, and the Claremont Branch was allocated about 19 percent.

After this gross distribution, the project funds for each branch were further broken down using accepted standard cost factors for each line item of each budget. For example, architectural/engineering (A/E) costs are typically 10 to 15 percent of the construction budget, permit costs are typically 3 percent of construction costs, and so on. Similar line items were used for each project and similar percentages were used for each line item within each project, adjusting only for known, unique circumstances within that project. These are identified as “soft costs” in the summary provided in Table 5-1.

Using this method a construction cost was developed for each branch and that construction cost was then used to negotiate the budgets contained in the A/E contracts. Because of the work that went into the FMP, when the A/E's were given their budgets, the Library had reason to believe that there was at least one potential solution for each branch that the budget could support. Each A/E was told to develop its own solution within the available budget. This resulted in the program budget (totaling $26 million) in Table 5-2.
TABLE 5-2  COSTS FOR FOUR BRANCH LIBRARY PROJECTS USED IN BRANCH LIBRARY PROGRAM, JULY 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hard Costs</th>
<th>Soft Costs</th>
<th>Contingency</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>$4,282,000</td>
<td>$1,175,470</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$5,657,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>$4,844,500</td>
<td>$1,285,020</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$6,329,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>$5,518,500</td>
<td>$1,420,955</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$7,139,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claremont</td>
<td>$3,268,500</td>
<td>$925,740</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$4,394,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>$2,479,315</td>
<td>$2,479,315</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$2,479,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>$26,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: BOLT; Berkeley Libraries Project Team; Kitchell, 2009.

The “hard costs” in this budget consist of “bid-day estimates” (the estimated bid amounts) plus: (1) a construction contingency of 10 percent for change orders that may arise during the construction process, (2) an additional 1.5 percent for Civic Arts (work that will be done under a separate contract with artists), and (3) a small amount ($50,000 to $55,000) for miscellaneous purchase orders that may be needed to cover any small items that might have been missed in the construction contracts. All of these amounts are standard contingencies that are included in any project carried out by the City. Soft costs are those additional fees described above. The contingency of $200,000 for each project in Table 5–2 is a “project contingency” that is reserved for any unanticipated costs, whether hard or soft. Together, these constitute the "budget" for the project. For West Branch, the total site hard cost budget was $5,518,500 and the bid-day estimate was $4.9 million. For South Branch, the total site hard cost budget was $4,855,500 and the bid-day estimate was $4.5 million.

The BOLT believed that establishing a firm budget was critical because the ultimate design was going to be determined through a public process involving input from a wide variety of interests. The Library was aware that
as a result, the outcome of the design process would be unpredictable and
would not necessarily conform to the FMP’s options and recommendations.
Absent a budget, the result would very likely have been unaffordable because
the natural tendency in designing buildings is to want more rather than less.

Thus, the A/Es were expected to adhere to that budget in performing their
work and to confirm that budget with detailed construction cost estimates at
each significant step of the design process. Failure to design a project within
that budget would result in the project being redesigned to bring the project
back within the specified budget.

Throughout the design and construction process, the overall budget was
periodically reviewed and adjusted as estimated conditions become known.
Since there is only $26 million available, any increase in one project’s budget
would have to be accompanied by corresponding decreases in other projects
and/or general program costs. If that is not done, the budget will not be
balanced and the set of projects cannot go forward.

**Master Response 2: Extent of the ZOA**

This master response addresses three issues regarding the scope of the ZOA
and its potential impact on demolition or major alteration of the branch
libraries, as asserted in comment letters as follows:

1. Why the ZOA is not limited so as to exclude the Central Library.
2. How demolition of the branch libraries, or other major changes to these
   buildings (other than the current proposed projects) would implicate the
   ZOA are foreseeable and should be discussed in the EIR.
3. How foreseeable changes are not currently permitted, but would be
   allowed under the ZOA, with resulting impacts on the Central Library
   and the Claremont and North branch libraries that have not been
   addressed in the EIR.

It should be noted that the ZOA does not change the current permit
requirements of the Zoning Ordinance for demolition, reconstruction,
alteration, expansion, and other modifications of public libraries that are
consistent with current zoning requirements. Such projects are already allowed under various sections of the Zoning Ordinance with a Zoning Certificate, Administrative Use Permit, or Use Permit, provided that the required findings are made, and all applicable requirements of CEQA and the Landmarks Preservation Ordinance (LPO) are met. This includes but is not limited to Zoning Ordinance Section 23C.08.050, which permits demolition of non-residential buildings subject to a Use Permit, and Sections 23C.040.060 and .070, which permit modification and expansion of non-conforming buildings, among others. However, there are some aspects of library development that may not conform to zoning requirements and that cannot be approved except with a Variance, and this would be the case for all of the project alternatives that create new floor area, as well as for the projects themselves. The proposed ZOA would allow modifications of those zoning requirements with a Use Permit. This paragraph partially addresses the third issue noted above because many of the changes that commenters allege would be newly allowed by the ZOA are already allowed under the current Zoning Ordinance.

The first issue noted above is not an environmental issue under CEQA, but rather a policy issue. The Central Library was significantly renovated and expanded only a few years ago. As a result, no specific project is foreseeable and any “analysis” at this point would be completely speculative. Nonetheless, City staff anticipates that over a long period of time, perhaps 50 to 100 years, due to normal aging of buildings, changes in library technology and practices, user needs, and other factors, some kind of expansion or renovation project is likely to occur at all of the City’s public libraries, including the Central Library. Because public libraries are a unique use that cannot easily be accommodated within the normal zoning requirements, but which may not qualify for a Variance, it is an appropriate policy to allow flexibility to modify zoning requirements for such future projects.

Any future library improvement projects would be subject to CEQA analysis. Use Permits requested under the ZOA would require a public hearing by the Zoning Adjustments Board (ZAB), with opportunity for
appeal to the City Council. Furthermore, any such project involving a library that is designated a historic resource would require a public hearing by the Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC), also with opportunity for appeal to the City Council.

Regarding the second issue noted above, there is no requirement under CEQA to speculate about all conceivable future projects or the impacts of those projects. Due to lack of funding, there is no reasonable possibility of any expansion or renovation project involving the Central Library that would implicate the ZOA. For the same reasons, this is also true for the branch libraries, except for the branch library projects that have already been approved or are the subject of this EIR. In addition, the Berkeley Public Library has not expressed any interest or desire to undertake such projects. Although, as noted above, it is likely that some kind of expansion or renovation project will eventually occur, such projects and their possible impacts are not known or planned and any assessment would be speculative. There is no basis on which to identify or analyze their potential impacts, which will depend on the timing and nature of those projects (e.g., size, height, and design), as well as the environmental conditions at that time. Therefore, no meaningful analysis of potential impacts can be conducted for such projects, and no further CEQA review is required at this time. As noted above, any future library improvement projects would be subject to CEQA analysis (including consideration of cumulative impacts) and any Use Permit requested under the ZOA would require a public hearing by the ZAB, with opportunity for appeal to the City Council. Furthermore, any such project involving a designated historic resource would require a public hearing by the LPC, also with opportunity for appeal to the City Council.

Regarding the third issue, while the ZOA does provide more flexibility to modify zoning requirements, such as setbacks, parking, and height, it is speculative as to how that flexibility might be applied to unknown potential future projects. Any future applications for such modifications would be subject to CEQA review at that time, and would provide the level of information necessary to conduct a meaningful analysis of potential impacts.
Master Response 3: Other Alternatives

This master response addresses the comment letter by Todd Jersey Architects (TJA) and the plans put forward for alternative designs for both the South and West Branch Libraries that would preserve parts of the existing buildings. The master response describes:

- The similarities and differences between the TJA designs and partial preservation alternatives for South and West Branch libraries that were included in the Draft EIR, Chapters 5.2 and 5.3.
- Impacts to historic resources and greenhouse gas emissions from the TJA designs and how these are similar to, or different from, the South and West Branch partial preservation alternatives and the proposed South and West Branch projects, as described in the Draft EIR, Chapters 5.2 and 5.3.
- The degree to which the TJA designs are consistent with the project objectives, and a comparison to the consistency of the Draft EIR partial preservation alternatives.

The designs presented by TJA do not differ substantially from the partial preservation alternatives in the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR found that these partial preservation alternatives failed to prevent the loss of historic resources as defined by CEQA, and also failed to meet several of the project objectives.

a. TJA Design for West Branch

The TJA design for West Branch is essentially the same as West Branch Partial Preservation Alternative 1 (West PPA-1), described on pages 5.3-2 to 5 of the Draft EIR. West PPA-1 is the same as Scheme A of the Concept Design Report included in Appendix E2 of the Draft EIR. Both the TJA design and West PPA-1 include the following features:

- Rebuild and relocate the 1923 structure to a final location near the street.
- Abandon the historic arched entry and create a new entry to the west of the 1923 structure via a new addition toward the rear of the site.
- Attach a multi-story new addition to the rear of the rehabilitated 1923 structure.
- Rehabilitate the 1923 structure and avoid attaching new additions to the east or west sides. This dictates the requirement of an additional floor.
Both West PPA-1 and the TJA design place the Berkeley Reads program on a separate level from the library space.

i. Environmental Impacts
   a) Historic Resource Impacts

Both PPA-1 and the TJA design result in the preservation of the 1923 original library, at least in appearance. However, both would result in a loss of a historic resource as defined under CEQA. A full analysis of the historic resource impacts for the TJA design was carried out by Page & Turnbull for this Final EIR and is included in Appendix A. In summary, the TJA design would comply with Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation 1, 4, 6, 7, and 8, but would not comply with Standards 2, 3, 5, 9 and 10 as discussed below. The City of Berkeley Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) generally follows these standards to evaluate proposed rehabilitative work on historic properties.

**Rehabilitation Standard 2:** The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize the property will be avoided.

As proposed, the project will preserve and restore some of the primary façade of the original 1923 building and reconstruct portions that were demolished in 1974, thus maintaining its character-defining features. The existing character-defining features that would be preserved and restored include the Roman triumphal arched entry with semi-circular window and engaged columns; the surviving round ornamental medallion east of the arch; the window proportions of the three banks of windows to the east of the arched entry; the wood-frame windows on the west and east facades; the cornice on the west, south, and east facades; and the remaining incised lettering from the original “West Berkeley Branch Library,” namely “-ey Branch Library.”

However, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize the property will be altered because the original building will be moved to the southeast corner of the property, thus changing the building’s relationship to the street and
adjacent properties. The original entrance will be permanently sealed (the door is located 24” below the level of the interior floor, and does not satisfy American Disabilities Act (ADA) accessibility requirements), while a new entrance will be constructed in the setback addition. This will preclude the future function of the building from providing the public with the original circulatory experience of entering the reading room from the historic primary façade. As designed, the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative is not in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 2.

**Rehabilitation Standard 3:** Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historical properties, will not be undertaken.

Based on the brief description for the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative, a conclusion cannot be reached as to whether false history or conjectural features will be undertaken, or whether restoration of the primary façade will be conducted based on documented evidence. The proposed interior alterations and two-story addition will be designed with “commercial quality construction and materials” It is inconclusive at this stage of the design whether an architectural style, materials, and connections would be used to distinguish the addition from the historic portion of the Berkeley West Branch Library. As designed, the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative will not be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 3.

**Rehabilitation Standard 5:** Distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

Many of the original materials, features, and finishes have already been impacted or removed by the 1974 addition, affecting the building’s historic integrity. It appears that the remaining exterior materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship will be preserved as part of the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative.
Though not described fully in the project description, it is assumed that the seismic strengthening will be conducted similarly to the Alternatives presented in the DEIR, and the exterior finishes would be restored where beam elements are inserted into the walls. Historic wood-frame windows would be salvaged during the seismic strengthening process, while the walls are widened, and put back in place.

Furthermore, defining materials on the primary façade that were demolished in 1974 would be reconstructed with new materials, including the entry door within the Roman triumphal arched entry; the three banks of windows to the east of the arched entry (now just one window with snap mullion); the second round ornamental medallion west of the arch; the three banks of windows to the west of the arched entry; and the missing incised lettering from the original sign, namely “West Berkel.”

However, interior plaster or other original materials will also need to be removed in order to seismically strengthen the building, and foundation materials will be replaced as part of the relocation. The collective effect of the removal of original material adversely impacts the historic character and integrity of the building. As designed, the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative will not be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 5.

**Rehabilitation Standard 9:** New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and environment.

The proposed Partial Preservation Alternative demolishes over 50% of the building, thus classifying it as demolition under the Berkeley Municipal Code Section 23F.04.010. Although the portions to be demolished are secondary in importance to the library’s primary façade, alterations and construction of the new addition will still result in the loss of historic materials and features. Characteristic spatial relationships will be affected because the 1923 section of
the building will be moved from the center of the parcel with a deep setback too close to the property line in the southeast corner.

A new two-story addition will be constructed behind and to the west of the preserved section. The new work will be differentiated from the old via contemporary commercial-grade materials. Though the addition will be set back behind the original, the two-story section will immediately abut the original one-story building. The massing of the building as a whole will change in order to house all of the library’s programmatic needs. While many of the alterations will protect the character of the building, the partial demolition, relocation of the original portion of the library, and two-story addition will destroy historic features and spatial relationships. As designed, the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative will not be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 9.

Rehabilitation Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

The proposed Partial Preservation Alternative includes demolition of the 1974 addition, relocation of the original section forward and to the east on the property, and construction of a two-story addition behind the remaining original portion. If the addition were removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the building and its environment would be impaired because the majority of the building and its functions would be removed. As designed, the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative will not be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 10.

Standards Summary: The proposed Partial Preservation Alternative does not comply with Rehabilitation Standards 2, 5, 9 and 10 because it requires the removal of historic fabric and alters the property’s significant spatial relationships and features. Therefore, as currently designed, the project does
not appear to be in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.

b) Greenhouse Gases
Alternatives that preserved the core building could be crafted to be energy efficient and environmentally responsible, therefore meeting Objective #6. However, both West PPA-1 and the TJA design would be considerably inferior to the proposed project in their operating energy efficiency. The proposed project would be a zero net energy design, which means that it would use no net energy over the course of an average year, if it were operated according to specifications; it would rely entirely on solar energy for normal operations and would not use natural gas for regular heating and cooling. The proposed project design is able to achieve zero net energy because its extensive roof area can accommodate solar panels. All conceivable partial preservation alternatives, West PPA-1 and the TJA design included, would have limited roof areas and would not be able to achieve the same zero net energy, or zero carbon footprint. For a more extensive response to the issue of the energy efficiency and overall greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from the proposed project versus the partial preservation alternatives, the reader is referred to Master Response 4: Embodied Energy. As reported in the Draft EIR pages 4.3-14 to 15, West PPA-1 was deemed inferior to the proposed project with respect to GHG emissions, and the same would be true for the TJA design.

ii. Comparison to the Project Objectives
The large addition to the rear of the original building visually dominates the relocated original structure compared to the experience with the original building, but is necessary to provide sufficient programming space. As described on pages 5.3-2 to 5 of the draft EIR, West PPA-1 was formulated to ensure that the alternative provided sufficient space. The TJA design would also provide enough space.

According to the Draft EIR, page 5.3-17, West PPA-1 would fail the following project objectives:
2. Be within budget and consistent with Measure FF funding.

8. Operate effectively with current staffing levels by having sightlines that allow the library staff to monitor activities in different parts of the library by direct observation.

9. Meet best practices for library design including providing convenient public access to all program areas and having appropriate adjacencies of programming areas.

The project team disagrees with the commenter that the TJA alternative would be within the project budget. The commenter provided a cost summary for the TJA design. A professional cost estimator was hired by the Berkeley Public Library to calculate the cost for West PPA-1 of which the total was presented in the Draft EIR on page 5.3-16. The cost estimator was also asked to assess the cost of the TJA design and to compare this to the cost numbers suggested by the commenter. These TJA costs are presented in Table 5-3. In February 2011, the BPL Cost Estimator also carried out a benchmarking study to compare the costs of providing the new and renovated space for West PPA-1 to the costs of similar space in recent library projects in the Bay Area and other northern Californian cities. This is shown in Table 5-4.

As a result of these comparisons and an evaluation of the TJA design, the Cost Estimator provided revised costs for the TJA design as presented in Table 5-3. These are much higher than suggested by the commenter. In addition, the TJA design has 3,131 more square feet of space than West PPA-1. Thus it would cost around $939,000 more, even assuming a cheaper square footage of $300 per square foot as plumbing and toilets are not part of the additional space. West PPA-1 was estimated in the Draft EIR page 5.3-18 to cost $5,510,000 (if the $210,000 of solar panels is not included). The TJA design is estimated to cost $6,449,000.

West PPA-1 places the Berkeley Reads program on a separate floor where it can easily be reached without passing the library control point. Since the
### Table 5-3  **Cost Estimates for West Branch TJA Design**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Commenter Estimate</th>
<th>BPL Cost Estimator Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site work and vertical circulation</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$990,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore and move original</td>
<td>$630,000</td>
<td>$776,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New 1,000 sf Children’s Room</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$530,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder of library, meeting space, and literacy program</td>
<td>$3,300,000</td>
<td>$4,153,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,830,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,449,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The TJA alternative design totals 13,000 gsf, or 3,131 sf more than West PPA-1. Accounting for this additional space at approximately $300/gsf rather than the average cost of $550/gsf since the incremental cost of higher cost items such as plumbing and energy systems are taken to be in the base area of 9,869 gsf (West PPA-1), this extra building area will cost $939,000, which is added into the cost of the TJA in the last line item above, “Remainder of library, meeting space, and literacy program.”

Source: Harley Ellis Devereaux, 2011.

### Table 5-4  **Benchmarking Costs for Comparable Library Space**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparable Building</th>
<th>Floor Area (square feet)</th>
<th>Building-Only Cost per Square Feet, Leveled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Library/Student Academic Facility, San Bruno, CA</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>$557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Library/Education Center, Davis, CA</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>$448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Library/Student Services Facility, Sacramento, CA</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>$476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate for West PPA-1</td>
<td>9,869</td>
<td>$558</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Benchmarking is based on comparing recent library projects on a cost per square foot basis. To provide a meaningful like-for-like comparison, all sample projects from the professional estimator’s database have been leveled to match Q2/2010 timeline and a Berkeley location. In addition, the base cost model has had the following scope removed for the comparison: photovoltaic panels, escalation, mat slab/topping slab (in lieu of conventional foundations/slab-on-grade), sitework, hazmat/structure demo, FSC certified wood premium, normalized skin:floor ratio, historic restoration component, library shelving.

Note: These numbers are for comparison with similar recent projects only. The numbers do not represent the actual cost of each project since dissimilar project elements were removed to provide the like-for-like comparison. The actual total cost of each project is actually significantly higher.  Source: Harley Ellis Devereaux, 2011.
Berkeley Reads staff is present only at variable times during the day, the uncontrolled access and isolated location for the Berkeley Reads Room presents an unacceptable security risk. The TJA design has an additional drawback in library design when compared to West PPA-1 in that it also isolates the Multipurpose Room from the main part of the library by placing it on a separate level with the Berkeley Reads program.

The intent behind the Multipurpose Room is that it is more than a traditional community meeting room: the program requirements include use of this space as an ancillary adult quiet reading room and laptop space when it is not being used for other scheduled programs, such as children’s programs. Furniture and electronic connections planned for the space would support these library activities. The space requires oversight and control by library staff, which is not possible if the space is located on a different level and accessible without passing the library control point. It would therefore require an additional staff member to supervise activities in the Multipurpose Room, or present a security risk. In contrast, a traditional community meeting room would be unused and locked when not in use for meetings. For these reasons, the TJA design would fail Objectives 8 and 9.

b. TJA Design for South Branch
For the South Branch library, the TJA design is a variation on the South Branch Partial Preservation Alternative (South PPA) included in the Draft EIR, pages 5.2 to 6, which was Scheme B2 in the Concept Design Report and was presented at the second community meeting on October 1, 2009. Both would:

- Demolish the 1991 Tool Lending Library, the 1974 Meeting Room.
- Demolish the staff areas that were part of the original 1961 structure and fill the courtyard, which was part of the open space of the original design.
- Add a two-story addition that would require elevator and stairs.

The TJA design differs from South PPA in that the walls of the former Children’s Reading Room appear to be retained rather than demolished, but
the roof is replaced with a new hip roof similar to the existing Main Reading Room roof.

i. Environmental Impacts
   a) Historic Resource Impacts

Both South PPA and the TJA design result in the preservation of most of the 1961 original library, at least in appearance. However, both would result in a loss of a historic resource as defined under CEQA. A full analysis of the historic resource impacts for the TJA design was carried out by Page & Turnbull for this Final EIR and is included in Appendix A. In summary, the Draft EIR alternative, South PPA, and the TJA design would comply with Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation 1, 7, and 8, but would not comply with Standards 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9 and 10, as discussed below.

Rehabilitation Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize the property will be avoided.

As proposed, the TJA-proposed project will not sufficiently preserve the historic character of the property. Many of the character-defining materials and features will be retained, including the rectangular plan with Main Reading Room pavilion and its shallow sloped pyramidal roof, exaggerated overhangs, original concrete block walls, wood slat ceiling with central skylight in the Reading Room, and original decorative details including exposed cells of concrete blocks. It is inconclusive whether original windows would be preserved, or if new windows will be inserted into original openings.

However, character-defining features affected by this scheme include: the planar massing, since the building will be converted from a low, residential-feeling one-story building to two stories at the rear; the contrasting flat roof over the present Children’s Room (future Meeting Room) will be altered to a pyramidal roof to match that of the present Main Reading Room; and the wood slat ceiling and skylight in the present Meeting Room, which will be
demolished to make way for the new addition. The outdoor courtyard will also be demolished. Thus, distinctive materials, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize the property will be removed. As designed, the TJA-proposed Partial Preservation Alternative is not in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 2.

**Rehabilitation Standard 3:** Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historical properties, will not be undertaken.

The interior alterations and two-story addition proposed by TJA will be designed with “commercial quality construction and materials.” It is inconclusive at this stage of the design whether an architectural style, materials, and connections would specifically be used to remain distinguishable from the historic portion of the Berkeley South Branch Library. However, by repeating the form of the original pyramidal roof from the Main Reading Room above the Children’s Room (new Meeting Room), this alteration appears to create a false sense of historical development. As designed, the TJA-proposed Partial Preservation Alternative will not be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 3.

**Rehabilitation Standard 4:** Changes to a property that have acquired significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

The 1974 addition, which is compatible with the original building and designed by Hans Ostwald’s architecture firm, has gathered significance in its own right because it contributes to the overall design and character of the building. The 1974 addition will be demolished to make way for a new rear addition. As designed, the TJA-proposed Partial Preservation Alternative will not be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 4.

**Rehabilitation Standard 5:** Distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.
The central skylight and shiplapped wood ceiling surround in the present Meeting Room will be demolished in the TJA design alternative, though the ceiling will be retained in the present Main Reading Room. The original flat roof with a series of custom round lights will also be demolished in the present Children’s Room. It is inconclusive from the project description whether the original window materials will be preserved. The collective effect of the removal of original material adversely impacts the historic character and integrity of the building. As designed, the TJA-proposed Partial Preservation Alternative will not be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 5.

Rehabilitation Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

Deteriorated historic features include the roof, which suffers from rot. According to the TJA-proposed Partial Preservation Alternative, the roof will be repaired by using steel beams for overhangs and replacing sagging wood members in-kind. Seismic bracing and shotcrete will also have to be inserted into original parts of the building. These upgrades and replacement of materials will likely affect character-defining features and materials if they visibly cover the wood slat ceiling, high clerestory windows or decorative block walls in the Main Reading Room or replace sections of concrete block wall or eave overhangs. As designed, the TJA-proposed Partial Preservation Alternative will not be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 6.

Rehabilitation Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and environment.
Preservation of both the present Main Reading Room and Children’s Room walls and some roof will likely retain more than 50 percent of the building and not qualify as demolition under Berkeley Municipal Code 23F.04.010. Nevertheless, the TJA-proposed Partial Preservation Alternative includes demolition of the 1974 addition, which will alter the exterior of the building. Furthermore, the roof of the present Children’s Room will be converted to a pyramidal roof, which will affect the historic planar character of that wing.

A new two-story addition will be constructed behind the preserved sections. The new work will be differentiated from the old via modern commercial-grade materials. In an effort to pay deference to the original building, the addition will be set back behind the original and attached by one-story connectors. The massing of the building as a whole will change, but this is necessary in order to house all of the library’s programmatic needs. While many of the alterations will protect aspects of integrity, the partial demolition and new roof over the Children’s Room will destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships. As designed, the TJA-proposed Partial Preservation Alternative will not be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 9.

**Rehabilitation Standard 10:** New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

The TJA-proposed Partial Preservation Alternative includes demolition of the 1974 addition, which contributes to the building’s significance, and construction of a two-story addition behind the remaining original sections. If the addition were removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the building and its environment would be impaired because a large section of the building and its functions would be removed. As designed, the TJA-proposed Partial Preservation Alternative will not be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 10.
Standards Summary: The proposed Partial Preservation Alternative does not comply with Rehabilitation Standards 2, 4, 9 and 10 because it requires the removal of historic fabric in the original 1961 building and the 1974 addition. It also alters the property’s significant spatial relationships and features. Therefore, as currently designed, the South PPA and TJA alternative do not appear to be in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.

b) Greenhouse Gases
The Draft EIR found that the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on greenhouse gases and found that the South PPA would also have a similar impact. A partial preservation alternative, with its smaller surface area available for photovoltaic panels, would use more operational energy and emit more GHG emissions than an all-new design. However, without detailed calculations, it is not known at what point the loss of GHGs from energy embodied in the building would be overtaken by the energy savings and lower GHG emissions from improved operational energy use.

ii. Comparison to the Project Objectives
South PPA failed a number of project objectives and the TJA design would also fail these:

2. Be within budget and consistent with Measure FF funding.
7. Provide a welcoming civic presence on a major street while respecting the neighborhood context.
9. Meet best practices for library design including providing convenient public access to all program areas and having appropriate adjacencies of programming areas.

The cost to build South PPA was estimated in the Concept Design Report at $4,562,000.² Although the TJA design would preserve a larger portion of the original library (and in that respect is more similar to Concept Design Report

² It is possible that the estimate for the Partial Preservation Alternative would increase with further development of the design, as the proposed project did.
Scheme A, which was rejected in the Concept Design Phase for not providing adequate programming space, the total hard construction costs would almost certainly be greater than suggested by the commenter. The cost estimate provided by the commenter is incomplete; it is not apparent if it includes all foundation work, contractor costs, escalation to start of construction, or contingencies. Without more detailed information, it is not possible to make a direct comparison to the line items in the Concept Design cost plans for the Proposed Project and the Draft EIR South PPA.

As reported on pages 5.2-19 to 20 of the Draft EIR, the existing library is not considered to have civic presence on a major street, and the TJA design would therefore not either. Although a taller pitched roof is described for the new meeting room, the plan suggests blank walls with high windows only and low lobby ceilings.

In several ways, the TJA design is inferior to South PPA. The TJA design could also be said to fail Objective 1, with which South PPA was compliant:

1. Increase library space in order to effectively house the library programs as described in the Facilities Master Plan, South Branch Library/Tool Lending Library Building Program, including adequate space for staff functions.

The TJA design, as provided in this description, does not satisfy all of the space requirements as set forth in the Library Building Program, which include accessible staff and family restrooms and meeting room storage. Although it apparently provides more space than South PPA, it is ineffective in doing so. It adds second floor space; much of this houses larger utility rooms and a long term storage area that is not part of the library building program.

In several additional ways the design is less favorable than South PPA. It constricts outdoor space for loading behind vehicles, for site utilities and ladder storage, and for access around the building. It limits daylighting and views in many staff areas.
The TJA design also fails Objective 3, with which South PPA was compliant:

3. Provide ADA-compliant access without decreasing program area to both public and staff areas.

As drawn, the commenter’s proposal does not comply with California Building Code accessibility requirements. Two more accessible toilet rooms and accessible drinking fountains would also be required.

The TJA design would probably pass Objective 8 which South PPA failed:

8. Operate effectively with current staffing levels by having sightlines that allow the library staff to monitor activities in different parts of the library by direct observation.

The meeting room is relocated where its entrance and the entrances to the three library reading rooms are visible to the staff desk.

Master Response 4: Embodied Energy

a. Definitions and Understanding the Issue

Embodied energy is an issue of concern when deciding to either preserve all or part of an existing building or construct a new building with entirely new materials. It is important to keep the following in mind when examining the impacts of embodied energy:

1. The total embodied energy to be compared is known as “Cradle to Site,” which is the amount of energy consumed in the creation and use of building materials to construct the building at the project site. (The embodied energy does not account for the replacement of components after building occupancy since the effect of this replacement would be essentially the same for all of the alternatives.)

2. Energy already spent in the construction of an existing building is not included in the analysis of embodied energy because the energy consumed (and the carbon, or greenhouse gases (GHGs), released) has already occurred in the past.
3. The preservation or partial-preservation alternatives will account for and receive a credit for the embodied energy of new materials not used because of the re-use of all or part of the building components that exist at the project site.

4. While dollar cost is not factored into embodied energy calculations, extending the construction period will result in some additional embodied energy from additional construction energy being used at the site, including extended time for truck deliveries, and storage and transfer of materials to and from the site. It is difficult to quantify this effect.

5. The total energy consumption (and therefore the total GHG emissions) of the partial preservation alternatives and all-new designs is equal to the sum of the embodied energy and the energy used during the occupancy of the building.

If the effect mentioned in #4 above is small, then point #3 above means that a preservation or partial-preservation alternative will most likely have a lower embodied energy total than a completely new building. This has been noted in some of the Draft EIR comments. However, it is the total energy use impact of the alternatives and the total effect on the GHG emissions caused by the alternatives that is important to the analysis.

Two outcomes are possible in a specific project:

1. If the new building alternative does not have a lower energy use during occupancy than that of the preservation alternative, then the preservation alternative will clearly have a lower total energy impact (and smaller carbon footprint).

2. On the other hand, if the new building alternative has a much lower energy use after occupancy compared to the best case performance of the preservation alternative, then the total energy use impact of the new building will at some time during the occupancy period be less than that of the preservation alternative. In other words, although the preservation alternative starts out in Year 1 of occupancy with a lower total energy use impact because its embodied energy total is lower, at
some point the difference in embodied energy will be made up by the better energy use performance of the new building. If the new building is only a slightly better energy performer, this catch-up time could be many years. In the case of a zero net energy design such as the proposed design for West, the catch-up time is very short.

Every project is different and must be evaluated with regard to the amount of existing building components being re-used compared to new building materials required, as well as the energy performance during occupancy that can be expected for each of the alternatives.

b. Methodology
For specific projects, it is possible to calculate the embodied energy to a reasonable level of accuracy in order to make comparisons between design alternatives involving preservation versus new construction. While data on embodied energy of building materials has only recently been developed by various organizations, there is nevertheless a fair amount of consistency for specific commonly used materials. This consistency is sufficient to draw conclusions from the calculations that compare different alternatives for embodied energy totals and that in turn compare the amount of embodied energy to the amount of energy consumed in the daily operation of the building.

The conclusions below are based on embodied energy calculations principally using the database, Inventory of Carbon and Energy (ICE), developed by the Sustainable Energy Research Team at the University of Bath, UK. Embodied energy data was applied to the type of building assemblies typical in the branch library projects, as well as their structural elements, mechanical, electrical and plumbing systems materials, and interior finishes.

In the Partial Preservation Alternative evaluated in the Draft EIR for West Branch (West PPA-1), there are some components of the original building that would re-used, such as the floor framing and sheathing, some of the wall framing, exterior sheathing and stucco, and roof framing and sheathing.
However, there is also a substantial amount of new materials used in the reconstruction, including new plaster and shear wall plywood, new foundation materials, materials to replace about one-third of the south wall, replacement windows, a skylight, and a new front door. The embodied energy represented by the existing material that is re-used, and the embodied energy in the new material, are calculated, as shown in Figure 5-1.

For the calculation of the total energy use of the alternatives during occupancy, the proposed new building is shown performing at zero net energy for the year, as modeled using whole building energy analysis computer software during the recently completed Design Development phase. In the absence of such analysis for West PPA-1, and since this alternative cannot be designed to perform at zero net energy due to site and building form limitations (mainly the roof area available for solar panel display), the building is shown as performing at 35 percent better than California Title 24 requirements. The latter would be part of a LEED-Gold certification.

c. Results of the Calculations: Comparison of Partial Preservation Alternatives and the Proposed Project for West Branch Library

The embodied energy of both West PPA-1 and the proposed new building were calculated using the method and database described above. The results of this calculation are shown in Figures 5-1 and 5-2. The bar chart, Figure 5-1 also converts the embodied energy values (in kBtu, or kilo-British thermal units) to tons of carbon dioxide equivalent. As the graph in Figure 5-2 indicates, because of the very low amount of existing building components in comparison to the total building material required for the project, the difference between the two alternatives is small, approximately 5 percent.

---

3 However, only a LEED-Silver certification is required for the project by the City of Berkeley.

4 The ICE database provides a conversion from energy in kBtu to carbon dioxide in metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent. The metric tons were subsequently converted to imperial tons.
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- Proposed Design
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  - 3,943 kBtu
  - 1,397 CO2 tons

- Source: Harley Ellis Devereaux / Greenworks Studio, 2011

- 283 tons CO2
- 315 tons CO2
- 11 tons CO2
West PPA-1 has a lower embodied energy total, as expected, but the difference is small.

The energy use (and carbon released) during the occupancy of the building is zero for the proposed new building based on the analysis described above. The energy use during occupancy for West PPA-1 is based on a comparable structure in Berkeley with a LEED-Gold rating that was modeled for Title-24 compliance. Calculations showed that the energy use would be 200 kBtu/sf per year or about 2 MBtu per year for the building.

The total energy use impact, the sum of the embodied energy and the annual energy used during occupancy, is shown in Figure 5-2 for the all-new proposed project design and the Partial Preservation Alternative, West PPA-1. The graph shows that the total energy use of the new building drops below that of the partial preservation alternative within approximately two years of building occupancy. The difference between the two alternatives in total energy use (and the building carbon footprint) continues to increase dramatically year after year, reaching a total of 27,000 kBtu at the end of only 20 years.

d. Conclusions
The calculations show that the West Branch proposed project, which involves all-new construction, has a much lower energy and reduced GHG emissions impact compared to the Partial Preservation Alternative, West PPA-1. This calculation includes the effect of embodied energy. Approximately the same results would be expected from other partial preservation alternatives, such as the TJA design for West Branch.

The proposed South Branch project is designed to be a highly energy-efficient LEED-Gold building. To evaluate the comparative energy use of a South PPA, the annual energy use and the embodied energy would need to be calculated. As these figures are not readily available, the calculation has not been performed. It is unlikely that a partial preservation alternative for South
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Branch would be as energy-efficient over the lifetime of the building as an all-new design with a greater area of roof-mounted photovoltaic panels that would offset the loss of embodied energy in the existing building. However, without detailed designs and calculations this cannot be proven.

B. Responses to Comments

Table 5-5 lists each comment received in writing and at public hearings conducted during the 45-day comment period for the Draft EIR. The comments are presented in the order listed in Chapter 4 of this document, with the commenter's name abbreviated accordingly. Responses are provided to each substantive comment on the Draft EIR. Where the same comment has been made more than once, a response may direct the reader to another numbered comment and response, or to one of the master responses provided above. Where a response required revisions to the Draft EIR, those revisions are shown in Chapter 3 of this document.
### Response Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Source</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LUA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1. The information about the Draft EIR included some serious problems, including unavailability in paper format during the closure of the Planning Department for 11 days starting December 23, 2010 and extending through January 2, 2011. The Planning Department website did not carry information about the closure, the announcement of the Draft EIR did not include mention of the closure, and a request for open hours, so as to obtain a printed copy, which we made directly to the Planning Department staff, was ignored. (See attached email, below.) In addition, the notice about the Draft EIR gave an incorrect day of the week for your meeting January 19, 2011 -- saying it was on Thursday. Additionally, the DEIR only, without Appendices, was listed as being available only at the Central library and two branches (excluding North and Claremont); while Mr. Sage said the document was available at all four branches, there has not, to our knowledge, been any correction published so that the public might know where it is actually available – not where noted to be available. A $20 charge for a copy could reduce public interest and comment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The comment is correct that the Notice of Availability did not mention the Planning Department’s holiday closure. However, the EIR was available during the closure on the Planning Department’s website, and in paper format at all five public libraries. All public notice requirements of CEQA were met, including the requirement of CEQA Guidelines Section 15087(c)(5) that the location where the EIR is available for public review “shall be readily accessible to the public during the lead agency’s normal working hours.” The closure did not violate this requirement because the Planning Department normally closes during this time of the year as a cost savings measure, and therefore the closure did not occur during “normal working hours.”

It should be noted that the public review period was 45 days, where CEQA requires only 30 days, since there are no State agencies with jurisdiction over the proposed projects. Thus, even if the 11-day closure of the Planning Department were considered to be a reduction of the public review period, the minimum CEQA requirement would still be met.

The commenter’s request for the Planning Department’s open hours was not ignored. Rather, the staff person to whom the request was directed believed in good faith that the commenter no longer needed this information, since the email with the request also asked whether it was possible to have the EIR mailed. Having answered the latter question in the affirmative, and having mailed an electronic copy of the EIR to the commenter, the staff person did not realize that the commenter still required the information about opening hours.

The comment is correct that the Notice of Availability did not mention that the EIR was available at the North and Claremont branch libraries. No correction has been issued because the Planning Department did not become aware of this omission until shortly before the comment period ended, at which point there was little public benefit in issuing a correction. CEQA Guidelines Section 15087(c)(5) does not require that all locations where the EIR is available be included in the Notice of Availability.

The comment is correct that the Notice of Availability incorrectly gave the day of
TABLE 5-5 RESPONSE MATRIX (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the January 19 Planning Commission’s meeting on the Draft EIR, as Thursday, rather than Wednesday. This error did not significantly interfere with public comment because it was obvious that January 19 was not a Thursday, and because the Planning Commission normally meets on Wednesdays. In addition LPC and ZAB also held public meetings on the EIR. Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15087(i), public meetings on the EIR are encouraged, but not required. The comment regarding the cost of a copy of the EIR is noted. This cost is based on the Planning Department’s standard copying rate of 10 cents per page. Please see Master Response #2: Extent of Zoning Ordinance Amendment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUA 2</td>
<td>2. The document unfortunately says the scope does not include locations that are not being demolished, even though the zoning ordinance amendment clearly applies to all five current library locations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUA 3</td>
<td>And the document exhibits an unfortunate bias in favor of the library administration, including apparent endorsements of the supposedly open process by which the public was informed of plans, and the supposed public acceptance. Please read Steven Finacom’s long article in the December 14, 2010 Berkeley Daily Planet for another view on the library administration and Trustees’ apparent indifference to public concerns, as well as the five Commentaries that I have written for the Planet starting in May, 2010. The commenter is expressing an opinion and no response is required. The Draft EIR describes the public process in Chapter 3 Project Description, Section B5 South Branch Project History and C5 West Branch Project History.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUA 4</td>
<td>3. While you may consider cutting books (heavy cuts at Claremont Branch) to be out of the scope of your deliberations, please consider the two impacts of new libraries: (a) an almost invariable jump in visitors, at least at the beginning; (b) increased travel to other branches and library systems as the public realizes the impoverishment of library design and services that has occurred. Regarding the commenter’s first point, that visitor use of the library would increase, the Initial Study concluded that there would be no increase in usage from project operations as there would be no increase in library programs. Regarding the commenter’s second point, that usage of other branches would increase, this comment expresses the opinion of the commenter. Whether existing users of the South and West Branch Libraries would choose to frequent other library branches following the completion of the proposed project is unknown, and it would be speculative for this EIR to make such a prediction. For the purposes of this EIR, it is assumed that existing South and West Branch Library users would continue to frequent the libraries at levels similar to current conditions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| LUA 5 | Dear Mr. Sage
Your reply below to my last request, regarding the Draft EIR on the Library’s legislation and building plans, ignored my question about your holiday schedule and the fact that I said I wished to pick up the Draft |

See response to LUA 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Source</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LUA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>First, we agree with the overall assessment that the impact of demolishing South Branch and West Branch libraries would be significant, and that the mitigation efforts described would still leave impacts that &quot;remain significant and unavoidable.&quot; (page 2-9)</td>
<td>The comment is noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>But we think that this impact is an understatement. That is because the target libraries represent half of all Berkeley’s library branches, and because, at least in the case of Hans Ostwald, the South Branch architect, this is one of the few public buildings he designed and one of just a small handful of libraries that he designed. South Branch won an AIA/ALA award as well. Both South and West Branch libraries have been recognized by the city as having excellent architectural qualities that merit preservation.</td>
<td>The comment is noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>We are concerned that the Zoning Ordinance Amendment has not clearly been identified as having a significant impact – without time limit – and it has only been discussed in regard to currently planned demolitions, omitting the potential impacts on all current library locations. Additionally there is no explanation as to why the Central Library should be included in an ordinance that the report says is intended to “facilitate[e] Branch Library projects.” (page 1-4)</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #2: Extent of Zoning Ordinance Amendment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>In general, we are concerned that the problems with the planned projects have been understated and the supposed pro-project positions overstated. Attached are some additional comments on this document. [The comment is referencing the points included in Comments LUA-10 to -23 presented below and attached appendices included in the original.]</td>
<td>This comment provides the conclusion to the letter. Specific points are addressed in the comments that precede this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>There has been no comment about the environmental impact of a bookmobile traveling around Berkeley while the branches are being rebuilt or renovated. Renovations with expansions would presumably require less time to complete, and less time for a bookmobile to generate environmental impacts. At the time of publication of the Draft EIR, there were no well defined plans for a bookmobile service to assist library users who would otherwise use the South or West Branch Libraries. A bookmobile service is now anticipated for South and West Branches. This would consist of a van parked for 3-4 hours for 6 days a week, in a convenient location. Information on the location of the bookmobiles will be posted on the library website when it becomes available and has already been posted for Claremont and North branches. See</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5-5 Response Matrix (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Source</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LUA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>In addition, the library has not seriously considered providing the interim service that was provided when the Central Library was closed for renovation: a stationary store front (or other fixed location). Such a facility, or a trailer parked at or near the libraries having construction, would likely be far less environmentally harmful than a vehicle that must be driven out to branches and back multiple days a week. Why wasn’t this impact considered?</td>
<td>Provision of library services over a 20-year planning horizon was the subject of the Facilities Master Plan and the commenter is referred to that document. Provision of adequate library services is not an issue for this EIR. See also Response to Comment LUA-10 regarding the bookmobile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>This EIR is said to be 1,878 pages long – making review and public comment exceptionally arduous, especially for those with a primary interest in just one aspect, e.g. one branch. Why was this EIR structured this way?</td>
<td>The comment is correct regarding the total length of the EIR. However, only 214 pages of this is devoted to the actual EIR. The remainder is appendices, which are often quite lengthy. The total length is the result of the Planning Department’s desire to meet all requirements of CEQA and to fully inform the public. In order to facilitate public understanding of the EIR, Chapter 2 provides a 13-page summary which allows the public to understand the essential details of the proposed projects and their impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>The availability of the EIR was undermined by the closure of the Planning Department for 11 days shortly after it was issued, making paper copies completely unavailable for one quarter of the comment time.</td>
<td>See Response to LUA-1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>The DEIR repeatedly uses prejudicial terminology to reference the Zoning Amendment Ordinance (ZOA). It is not providing zoning “flexibility” but a fixed exemption from the need for Variances – a blank check in perpetuity. And why aren’t the potential environmental impacts of easing development on all five library locations discussed?</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #2: Extent of Zoning Ordinance Amendment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUA</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Why did the ZOA include Central Library, even though it was excluded from Measure FF?</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #2: Extent of Zoning Ordinance Amendment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUA</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>The many negative comments from the public about various aspects of Notes from public meetings held during the Conceptual Design phases about the</td>
<td>Notes from public meetings held during the Conceptual Design phases about the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Source</td>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the projects is ignored or occasionally hinted at as being in the</td>
<td>project choice, including LPC and BOLT meetings are included in Appendix H of the Draft EIR. A summary of the input received at those meetings was presented in Chapter 3 Project Description, pages 3-11 to 14 (South Branch) and pages 3-36 to 3-40 (West Branch). The commenter is quoting from Chapter 1 Summary and refers to the comments received at the October 12, 2010 scoping meeting held on the Branch Library program. At that meeting, all comments were in favor of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUA</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>We also read that some negative comments were “outside the scope of this CEQA review,” but we do not get an analysis of the favorable comments as to their scope. Why not?</td>
<td>This comment does not pertain to the EIR or its adequacy, or otherwise, as an informational document. The purpose of comments made during the scoping process is to ensure that the EIR includes all relevant environmental analysis. Issues of project design, merits, and funding do not pertain to the environmental impacts of the project, as was stated in the Draft EIR Introduction, pages 1-8 and 1-9. Although CEQA does not require a full response to comments at the scoping stage of the process, a fuller response to comments raising relevant issues was provided voluntarily in Appendix C2 of the Draft EIR. These responses stated that the issue had either been addressed in the Initial Study, or would be addressed in the EIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUA</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>While comments about loss of books are said to be outside the scope of this CEQA review, this DEIR repeatedly talks about the library's objectives regarding books. Isn't that inconsistent?</td>
<td>Provision of books is not in itself an impact under CEQA thresholds. However, CEQA Guidelines Section 15124 Project Description states a clearly written statement of objectives should be included. Objectives were presented in the Chapter 3 Project Description, pages 3-3 to 4 (South Branch) and pages 3-28 to 29 (West Branch). Consistency with stated project objectives was examined in the Draft EIR, pages 5.2-16 to 22 (South Branch), and pages 5.3-16 to 22 (West Branch). None of the library objectives refers explicitly and exclusively to books: Objective 1 refers to “library programs” (which includes provision of several media); Objective 5 is to “Meet the need for upgraded technology, improved collection storage and more seating.” There is therefore no inconsistency in the Draft EIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUA</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Further, we read that the South Branch project is to improve the library with, among other things, “a minimum ten-percent increase in book shelving...” Was someone working too close to a marijuana dispensary? The South Branch program, according to the architect, speaking at a BOLT meeting last summer, was to provide ONE LINEAR FOOT of additional shelving in a branch that would increase floor space by 64%. The actual was shown as 85 linear feet added, or less than 5%. Where did this ten percent figure come from? Later in the report there is no An increase in book shelving was not among the project objectives. This comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR, therefore no further response is required. However, Draft EIR page 3-14 referred to a maximum ten-percent increase in book shelving as part of the new library project description. According to the South Branch Project Architect, total linear feet of shelving is currently about 10 percent more than existing. The final count may vary as the design is finalized for construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 5-5 RESPONSE MATRIX (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Source</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LUA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Why is there no mention of the generally large increase in visits that all new libraries tend to experience?</td>
<td>As described in Appendix C2, Responses to Initial Studies and EIR Scoping Comments, of the Draft EIR, the Initial Study concluded that there would be no increase in traffic resulting from project operations as there would be no increase in library programs. Although the potential exists for increased patronage upon opening of the new library, this would be considered temporary. As all impacts were found to be less than significant, traffic was not discussed again in the Draft EIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>What about the drop in visits and increased visits to other libraries/jurisdictions once patrons realize how poorly the design may work?</td>
<td>As described in Chapter 2, Report Summary, of the Draft EIR, the proposed South and West Branch Library projects are not expected to substantially expand existing services and programs, and rather are intended to better accommodate existing demand. Whether existing users of the South and West Branch Libraries would choose to frequent other library branches following the completion of the proposed project is unknown, and it would be speculative for this EIR to make such a prediction. For the purposes of this EIR, it is assumed that existing South and West Branch Library users will continue to frequent the libraries at levels similar to current conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUA</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Poor design example: South Branch’s desk facing AWAY FROM THE ENTRANCE in Fig. 5.2-3. Another poor design example: The entrance to the South Branch is completely un-observed by any desk (Fig. 3-2). It’s mugger alley, and additionally has nothing of interest to a library patron shown. Another example: South Branch’s entrance is surrounded on either side by non-book activity: the mostly-empty and unused meeting room at the left, and staff areas on the right. Only at a distance is the children’s area visible at the far right. From MLK Jr Way, no books or reading activities are visible.</td>
<td>The comment refers to the South Branch Library design as presented in Figure 5.2-3 in the Draft EIR. That figure was taken from the Concept Design Report (CDR) so that it could be compared to Figures 5.2-1 and 5.2-2, that were taken from the same source. The design was changed slightly since the publication of the CDR in December 2009. The proposed project design as of December 2010 was presented in the Project Description as Figure 3-4. However, this did not have the furniture placement. A revised Figure 3-4, including the furniture, is shown in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR. In that figure the main desk is above the label “browsing,” where staff will have clear line of sight to the areas marked “adults,” “teens,” and “kids,” and the restroom and meeting room entrances. The concept design had a door that closed off the first section of the entry lobby. This has since been removed so the lobby opens directly into the library and the entry corridor is also visible from the Tool Library entry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUA</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>The Library has been extraordinarily bad at providing the public with information about key elements of its plan, including such things as book cuts at Claremont and public floor space cuts there. See Exhibits</td>
<td>The comment expresses the opinion of the commenter and does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR. The comment is noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5-5 Response Matrix (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Source</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LUA</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Daily Planet articles. [See original comments for these exhibits.]</td>
<td>This material was received after the comment deadline of 5 pm, January 31, 2011. No response is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAHA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association (BAHA) firmly supports renovating, improving, and upgrading Berkeley's branch libraries. However, we remain extremely concerned at and discouraged by the attitude of the City of Berkeley and the Berkeley Public Library leadership towards both historic preservation and the integrity of public funding processes. Measure FF provided for the renovation, expansion, and improvement of the four branch libraries. The Library now asserts it has the right to use this funding for the demolition and rebuilding of two of those branches. We disagree. This is a good government issue entirely separate from the merits of the currently proposed projects. It is not acceptable public policy to take funds approved by the voters for a very specific purpose and re-direct them to a purpose that was not mentioned—and was, in fact, essentially foreclosed—in the voter approval process.</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #1: Use of Measure FF Funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAHA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The Zoning Amendment also analyzed in the DEIR goes beyond facilitation of the current Branch Library programs to provide a blanket loophole, in perpetuity, for the Berkeley Public Library to alter, demolish, replace, renovate, or expand any of its five facilities, including the historic Central, North Berkeley, and Claremont Libraries. This permanent blanket exemption is not needed for the Central Library at all—a facility not included in the Branch Libraries Program—and is dangerous to the futures of the North Berkeley and Claremont branches, since it would make it easier for future library administrations to propose demolition of those historic resources and obtain City approval under the Zoning Ordinance.</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #2: Extent of Zoning Ordinance Amendment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAHA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>In addition, the current plans for the South and West Berkeley Branch Libraries as analyzed in the DEIR needlessly destroy established historic resources important to the Berkeley community. The DEIR acknowledges these are significant impacts to historic resources. This is entirely at odds with the Library's own publicity, as found on its 2008 Facilities Master Plan (FMP), which is the main document governing library planning for the next 20 years included several options for each library branch, with a commitment to ongoing discussions with the community following the passage of Measure FF. One option for the future of the South Branch Library that was reported in the FMP was an entirely new library with some historical...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Source</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Frequently Asked Questions About the Library Bond” page, on January 29, 2011:</td>
<td>Features being incorporated. The current plans, as reported in the Draft EIR, state what is now proposed for salvaging or retention from the existing buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://berkeleypubliclibrary.org/about_the_library/bond_faq.php">http://berkeleypubliclibrary.org/about_the_library/bond_faq.php</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The page states: “Will the historic elements of the Branch Libraries be preserved? Absolutely! Current plans for renovation include restoration and refurbishment of historic features at the branch libraries as part of any renovation, while improving their functionality into the 21st century.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAHA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Errors in the Document</td>
<td>The quoted text refers to the consensus reached by the Board after the design team’s presentation and audience comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Page 3-12 of the DEIR contains a factual error. It states that at the September 17, 2009, community meeting regarding the South Berkeley Library, “the general consensus was that maximum use of space was more important than preserving the building.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In fact, of the small public attendance at that meeting, at least three individuals spoke clearly and emphatically in favor of renovation of the existing historic library. The word “consensus” is not accurate in this context.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAHA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Undesirable Breadth of the Zoning Amendment (A)</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #2: Extent of Zoning Ordinance Amendment. As discussed in that response, Zoning Ordinance Section 23C.08.050 already permits demolition of non-residential buildings subject to a Use Permit and certain findings, and the ZOA does not affect this provision. It should also be noted that by providing greater flexibility to waive or modify zoning requirements for additions to existing libraries, the ZOA could in the future help avoid demolitions that might otherwise be necessary to accommodate needed expansion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The DEIR states on pages 1-4 and 1-5, that “in the interests of facilitating the branch Library projects for which an extensive public outreach process had been carried out, and a bond had already been approved by the voters, the City proposed adding the following language to the Zoning Ordinance to remove the need for Variances on these projects…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>…any conforming or lawful non-conforming public library existing as of May 1, 2010 may be (1) changed, (2) expanded, or (3) demolished and a new public library constructed on the same site, subject to issuance of a use permit…”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Please explain in the FEIR why the proposed zoning amendment includes language allowing demolition, when demolition was not included as an option in the Measure FF bond.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAHA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Please explain in the FEIR why the proposed zoning amendment includes language allowing demolition, when demolition was not included as an option in the Measure FF bond.</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #2: Extent of Zoning Ordinance Amendment and Master Response #1: Use of Measure FF Funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Please explain why the proposed Zoning Amendment includes language allowing change, expansion, or demolition/new construction at all.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment Source: public libraries in Berkeley, when the Measure FF bond and the City’s recent planning processes for spending Measure FF funds have been specific to the branch libraries and have explicitly not included the Central Library.

In essence: why is the Central Library a part of the Zoning Amendment at all?

We suggest removing the Central Library entirely from the proposed Zoning Amendment.

BAHA 7 (B) Additionally, the DEIR states on page i-5:

“As there are no proposed projects involving the Central Library (which was substantially renovated and expanded beginning in 2000)...this EIR is focused on the environmental implications of the ZOA as it pertains to the South and West Branches only...”

On page 2-2, the DEIR states that “...there are no projects planned for foreseeable for the Central Library...”

Neither statement is accurate. The Board of Library Trustees initiated in 2009 and adopted in 2010 a Central Library Planning Study that contemplated, among other things, reorganization of functions, spaces, and circulation within the Central Library, possibly including the original, historic landmark building.

Please examine plans for the reorganization of the Central Library facility as considered and/or proposed in the Central Library Planning Study (initiated by the Board of Library Trustees in July, 2009). Do these plans have any potential for additions, demolitions, expansions, or renovations at the Central Library? If so, please evaluate their environmental impact as part of the Final EIR.

Please include a summary of the Central Library Planning Study in the FEIR and specific descriptions of projects proposed and/or approved.

Please see Master Response #2: Extent of Zoning Ordinance Amendment. The study referred to by the Commenter is Central Library Space Planning, by Page & Moris, dated August 2009 and adopted in August 2011. The study is concerned with internal relocations and does not affect the exterior of the library.
Historically, Berkeley Public Library facilities have undergone numerous renovations, relocations, additions, and replacements as programs and public needs have changed. Major changes to BPL facilities occurred as follows:

- The Central Library facility was built in 1905, demolished in 1930, replaced by the current, now-historic, Main Library in 1931, expanded in the 1960s, and entirely renovated and expanded in 2002. That represents four major facilities changes over 97 years at Central.
- The South Berkeley Branch facility was built in 1927 at a different site, removed to its current site and a new building in 1961, added to in 1974 and 1979. That represents four major facilities changes over 84 years.
- The Claremont Branch facility was built in 1924 and extensively added to in 1975, representing two major facilities changes in 87 years.
- The West Berkeley Branch facility was built in 1923, extensively renovated and expanded in 1973, representing two major facilities changes in 88 years.
- Only the North Berkeley Branch Library has not undergone major expansion or renovation or replacement since its original construction in the 1936.

In sum, over a little more than a century, Berkeley has seen 12 major new construction of extensive addition/renovation projects to its public library facilities, with another two (North and Claremont) getting underway this year, and two more (South and West) proposed.

That represents 16 major new building, relocation, or renovation/addition projects since 1905 to Berkeley Public Library facilities. Given that history and the rapid pace of change in technology and public facilities usage, it is entirely foreseeable—indeed, it is certain—
that the Central Library and all the branch libraries—both renovated
and rebuilt—with undergo further projects in the future, quite possibly
within a few decades.

The DEIR cannot pretend that just because there are no major library
construction projects proposed beyond the current ones for the branches
that it is not foreseeable that the Zoning Amendment—proposed to be
in place permanently—will not have an effect on library facilities and
resources beyond the current renovations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Source</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| BAH A 9      |           | We ask that the FEIR specifically evaluate, under Cultural Resources
impacts, the potential of the Zoning Amendment to enable the
demolition or alteration of the North, Claremont, and historic Main
Library facilities in the future.

An alternative would be for the Zoning Amendment to apply only to
the four branch projects and to expire after their completion, rather
than remain in force. This would not only obviate the need for any
long-term mitigations, but would appropriately allow future Berkeley
residents and governing bodies to make their own decisions about the
desirability of major library alterations.

BAHA 10 | Mitigation Comments
A. Mitigation Measure CULTURAL-South 1A states in part: "The project
sponsors should undertake a salvage program to save and reuse the wood slat ceiling..."

This mitigation should be amended to replace "should" with "will" or
"shall." There is no effective meaning to a mitigation that suggests
something "should" be done, but does not require it.

BAHA 11 | B. There should be, at a minimum, an additional mitigation under
Cultural Resources for both West and South branches, requiring
measured drawing documentation of the historic structures (Ostwald's
original South Berkeley branch, Bartages' original West Berkeley
branch) to the standards of the Historic American Building Survey
(HABS) and photo-documentation of the entire present structures, to
the standards of the Historic American Building Survey (HABS).
The DEIR acknowledges that both original branch facilities are historically significant. The HABS documentation should be done by a professional architectural historian, and the resulting material deposited in one (and, preferably, two) public archives, possibly the Main Library History Room and the Environmental Design Archives at the College of Environmental Design, UC Berkeley.

Please note that HABS documentation would contribute useful permanent documentary materials for use in the mitigations proposed in Cultural South 1b, and Cultural West 1a and 1b, but those mitigations in and of themselves are not sufficient to properly document the buildings if they are demolished. HABS documentation is the appropriate mitigation in these circumstances, not simply the collection of some historic materials to be displayed in a “kiosk.”

### BAHA 12

C. Archaeological Mitigation. Page 3-19 of the DEIR states that a portion of the South Branch was built over a foundation from a building constructed in 1911 or earlier and believed to be part of a Berkeley church from that era. Page 3-24 states: “the new library would be built over a portion of the existing basement from a previous building on the site that underlies the existing library. The top 3 feet of the basement walls would be removed and the basement filled and compacted for new construction...”

These statements confirm that the South Branch site contains known pre-1911 archaeological features. The construction process should be governed by a mitigation that would provide for an archaeologist qualified in the understanding of early Bay Area buildings to evaluate the construction procedures, examine the site as the pre-1911 structure is unearthed, and recommend salvage and treatment for any archaeological artifacts found during that process.

The Archaeological Research Facility (ARF) at the University of California, Berkeley, has undertaken a number of similar excavations in.

Library staff researched this feature during the Initial Study phase using all known data sources and found no additional information. Page 3-9 of the Draft EIR related the following: “Prior to the construction of the library, the site was occupied with two structures associated with a church, under the names of St. Matthew’s Episcopal Church and Mt. Olive Baptist Church, according to Sanborn Fire Insurance maps from 1911 and 1950, respectively. A 1903 Sanborn map showed the site as vacant. The northern part of the existing library was built over a pre-existing basement that must have been from one of these church structures shown on the 1911 map.” As indicated on page 3-24 of Chapter 3 Project Description, excavations for the new library would be an average of 21 inches deep and are not expected to penetrate deeper than the 1961 library. The City concludes that the standard mitigation for archaeological resources was sufficient.
### TABLE 5-5 RESPONSE MATRIX (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Source</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Berkeley and should be contacted for advice on the proper wording of a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>mitigation and procedures to be followed.</td>
<td>Please note that requirements very similar to these are specified on page 4.1-8 of the DEIR summarizing City of Berkeley Standard Conditions of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
<td>Approval:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Archaeological Resources. The City's standard requirements require consultation with a qualified archaeologist if any cultural resources are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>found on site, and define cultural resources to include &quot;...foundations...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Since the DEIR and Library studies already document the existence of a pre-1911 foundation on the South Branch site, this standard should have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>been incorporated as a specific cultural resource mitigation in the DEIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A passing reference to adhering to Standard Conditions of Approval on page 4.1-17 is not sufficient. This should be a specific mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAHA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Project Alternatives</td>
<td>The suggested alternative is not feasible for the following reasons:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. Please include and evaluate an additional mitigation for the South</td>
<td>• Funds to purchase additional land are not available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Berkeley Branch, defined as a &quot;Partial renovation and site expansion&quot;</td>
<td>• The adjacent land of 1911 Russell Street is not for sale and is unlikely to be for sale as a Use Permit was recently granted for expansion of its use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>alternative. For the South Berkeley Library, an appropriate alternative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>consistent with both the stated goals of Measure FF and the renovation/expansion needs defined by the Library for the branch would be for the City to purchase a portion of the adjacent vacant property immediately to the north of the Library, removal of the 1960s addition to the branch, and construction of a hybrid scheme involving renovation of the original historic library at the corner of Russell and Martin Luther King, Jr. Way and a new addition extending over the present site and the additional land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>would be for the City to purchase a portion of the adjacent vacant</td>
<td>This would be an environmentally and programmatically superior alternative since it would not only preserve the historic sections of the building but give the branch additional space for an suitably sized addition/expansion beyond the existing, constrained, footprint of the Library site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>property immediately to the north of the Library, removal of the 1960s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>addition to the branch, and construction of a hybrid scheme involving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>renovation of the original historic library at the corner of Russell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and Martin Luther King, Jr. Way and a new addition extending over the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>present site and the additional land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 5-5 RESPONSE MATRIX (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Source</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The DEIR states on page 2-10 that &quot;an EIR must evaluate a reasonable range of feasible alternatives to the project or the location of the project that would achieve most of the basic project objectives and would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant impacts of the project.&quot; This alternative would indeed achieve that goal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHAHA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td><strong>B.</strong> Please include and evaluate an additional mitigation for the West Berkeley Branch, defined as a “Partial renovation and site expansion” alternative. For the West Berkeley Library, an appropriate alternative consistent with both the stated goals of Measure FF and the renovation/expansion needs defined by the Library for the branch would be for the City to purchase a portion of the adjacent parking lot immediately to the west of the Library, removal of the 1970s addition to the branch, and construction of a hybrid scheme involving renovation of the remaining original library structure and construction of an addition on the enlarged site. This would be an environmentally and programmatically superior alternative, since it would not only preserve the historic sections of the building, but give the branch additional space for an suitably sized addition/expansion beyond the existing, constrained, footprint of the Library site.</td>
<td>The suggested alternative is not feasible for the following reasons: • Funds to purchase additional land are not available. • There is no reason to suppose that adjacent lots are for sale. Renovation of the existing building would still result in a significant and unavoidable impact to historic resources, as described in the Draft EIR Chapter 5.3 Alternatives to West Branch Library Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHAHA</td>
<td>15</td>
<td><strong>C.</strong> The DEIR contains a substantial flaw in that it lacks adequate analysis of Measure FF and building demolition. Measure FF expressly provided funds to “renovate, expand, and make seismic and access improvements at four neighborhood branch libraries.” It did not provide funds to demolish the branches and/or entirely rebuild them on the same site, or on any other site. The Alternatives section of the DEIR, page 5-1, states that &quot;An off-site alternative was not considered because the proceeds of Measure FF bonds may not be used except at the four existing branch library sites, and there are no</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #1: Use of Measure FF Funds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 5-5 Response Matrix (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Source</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                |           | other funds available for the renovations…” | Authority for this statement is footnoted as "Memorandum from Zach Cowan, Acting City Attorney to Donna Corbeil, Library Director, dated October 2, 2009. Subject: Expenditure of Measure FF Funds for Construction of Replacement New Tool Lending Library at New Site."
<p>|                |           | Please provide a copy of this correspondence in the FEIR, rather than a short summary reference without quotations. |
|                |           | If, for legal reasons, the correspondence cannot be provided in the FEIR, please withdraw the entire statement from the FEIR. |
|                |           | The FEIR is a public document, analyzing material in the public domain. If the Library cannot or will not provide the public with a document that is used as the sole support for a major claim of the DEIR and Alternatives section, that claim should not be made. How is the public to evaluate its validity without a public airing and discussion of the supporting documentation? |
| BAH A          | 16        | The DEIR goes on to state, page 5-2, that “The Bond Measure itself, as well as the impartial analysis of the Bond Measure and the Bond Measure arguments, made no mention of moving an existing branch library to a different site and therefore evaluation of off-site locations is not appropriate.” | Please see Master Response #1: Use of Measure FF Funds. |
|                |           | The Bond Measure itself, the impartial analysis of the Bond measure provided to voters, and the official Bond Measure arguments also made no mention of demolishing an existing branch library. In fact, they referred only to “renovate, expand, and make seismic and access improvements”, and every piece of publicly available literature or correspondence during the election campaign from the Measure FF proponents reinforced the assumption that the money would be used only for those purposes. |
| BAH A          | 17        | Please explain in the FEIR how the document can conclude that relocation of a branch is not an option because it was not mentioned in the Bond Measure or campaign, but demolition of half of the branch | Please see Master Response #1: Use of Measure FF Funds. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Source</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAH A</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>If the FEIR contends that demolition is allowable under Measure FF, please provide supporting documentation in the public domain to fully establish this claim.</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #1: Use of Measure FF Funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAH A</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>This all seems to be a case of the City of Berkeley and the Berkeley Public Library picking and choosing selective interpretations of Measure FF to support preordained conclusions.</td>
<td>Comment noted. This comment is not raising an environmental issue that requires analysis under CEQA. However, please see Master Response #1: Use of Measure FF Funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TJA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>As you may know, I am a Berkeley resident and a leading practitioner of sustainable architecture, with offices on 8th and Gilman street in Berkeley. You may also know that from my public presentations that I grew up in Berkeley and have extremely fond memories of the South Branch Library as a child in the early 1970’s. I remember feeling safe welcomed in these warm and carefully designed and crafted spaces. The original South Branch, though suffering from years of neglect and poor “upgrades”, is a wonderful and rare example of the kind of human scaled architecture that came out of the notion of design for the public good which was taught and practiced in the late 1950-s and 1960s. The West branch, while not as unique as the South is also considered a historic structure of merit by the architectural community and is a lovely old building. Both of these buildings require our best thinking and planning to adopt them into any scheme for expanding or remodeling these branch libraries. Having studied the Draft EIR and the proposed designs and design process, it is my general opinion that there was a lack of commitment and/or emphasis to save these original buildings by both Field Paoli on the South Branch and Harvey Ellis Deveraux on the West Branch.</td>
<td>The comment refers to the historic merits of the South and West Branch Libraries. The Draft EIR describes the historic merits of the libraries on pages 4.1-10 through 4.1-14. As described on these pages, the South Branch Library is considered to be eligible for listing on the California Register and the West Branch Library has been designated a City of Berkeley Structure of Merit. Both buildings are considered to be historic resources under CEQA. The Draft EIR evaluates the impacts to the library buildings as historic resources in the Historic Resources Technical Report in Appendix I of the Draft EIR and in Section 4.1 Cultural Resources, and finds that these impacts would be significant and unavoidable. This comment refers to the opinion of the commenter on the merits of the project design and therefore no response is required under CEQA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TJA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Since it is relevant to this conversation I want to let you know that I am also the architect and major preservation force behind the restoration of the venerable Richmond Plunge, one of the nation’s premier restoration projects of the last few years. I designed the structural system to seismically upgrade this structure in a way that saved hundreds of</td>
<td>The commenter is correct that the EIR does not include an evaluation of aesthetics. As described on page 1-7 of the Draft EIR, aesthetics were evaluated in the Initial Studies for the project, which determined that the project would have either no impact or a less-than-significant impact for all standards of significance related to aesthetics. Therefore, this topic was not evaluated further in the Draft EIR.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The commenter’s proposed design considerations are noted. These comments do not pertain to the adequacy of the Draft EIR and therefore no response is required.

The commenter is expressing an opinion and not commenting on the adequacy of the Draft EIR, therefore no response is required under CEQA. However, with respect to space requirements, the Library’s goal is for the collections to be entirely available to the public and other library materials (such as folding chairs and other equipment) are shared among the libraries. Long term storage is not part of the branch library program.

A. The comment refers to problems with the South Branch Library that are identified in the Facilities Master Plan; these problems are listed on pages 1-3 to 1-4 of the Draft EIR.
The first part of the EIR discusses the Facilities Master Plan which was released in July 2008 which established the following problems at the South and West branches:

[A] South:
- Not seismically sound
- Lack of sufficient staff office, equipment and workspace
- Lack of sufficient programming, computer and common space
- Lack of sufficient space for collections and materials, including too library
- Inadequate seating and lighting
- Inadequate and outdated electrical, ventilation and plumbing systems
- Structural damage from decay and rot
- Occasional flooding in rainy season
- Not ADA compliant

[B] West:
- Not Seismically Sound
- Lack of sufficient staff office, equipment and workspace
- Lack of sufficient programming and meeting space including “Berkeley Reads” the adult literacy program
- Lack of sufficient space for collections and materials, including too library
- Inadequate lighting
- Inadequate and outdated electrical, ventilation and plumbing systems
- Structural damage from decay and rot
- Not ADA compliant

This list is the baseline for improvements and is generally acceptable to

B. The comment refers to problems with the West Branch Library that are identified in the Facilities Master Plan; these problems are listed on page 1-4 of the Draft EIR.

The comment is correct in that the Draft EIR found a significant impact from loss of historic resources under CEQA, that could not be entirely mitigated.
all parties. In addition the DEIR correctly determines that the original libraries are projects of historic merit and therefore cultural resources which would constitute significant detriment if lost.

**TJA 5** What is unacceptable to me as a Berkeley resident and green preservation architect (and to the CLU), are certain notions, assumptions and conclusions about the potential or lack thereof of the original libraries to be saved as a part of an expanded new modern library as required by the FMP.

The first troubling notion is that the architects hired by the City for these project have fulfilled the requirement that a “reasonable range of alternatives to avoid significant impacts” as required by law. I have looked at the alternatives that the architects of the West branch have put forward to keep the buildings as a part of an expanded scheme and I find them to be less than exhaustive and actually quite rudimentary in nature.

The architects of the South did a more extensive look at saving at least the main historic reading room, but they never seemed to come up with a scheme which had sufficient creativity to demonstrate a successful path towards saving and reintegrating the original building. Both studies in this regard seemed to me to be more committed to justifying demolition of the original buildings than preservation of the valued historic fabric. It seems to me likely that the designers and others involved were heavily weighted and prejudiced toward demolition.

As described on page 5-1 of the Draft EIR, CEQA requires that an EIR evaluate a reasonable range of feasible alternatives that would achieve most of the project objectives and avoid or substantially lessen the significant impacts of the project. (CEQA does not impose any such independent obligation on architects.) The Draft EIR considers alternatives to preserve both libraries, as well as one alternative to partially preserve the South Branch Library and two alternatives to partially preserve the West Branch Library. Several other alternatives were evaluated during the Concept Design phases of both projects and were described briefly in the Draft EIR Chapters 5.2 and 5.3 under Sections A.4 Alternatives Considered But Rejected. A fuller description of these can be found in the Concept Design Reports for the projects included in Draft EIR Appendix D.

As described in Chapter 5 of the Draft EIR, none of these alternatives was recommended because each of them fails to meet many of the project objectives. The opinion expressed by the commenter – that the project architects should have explored other alternatives to avoid demolition – is noted but is beyond the environmental analysis required for this EIR.

**TJA 6** Along these lines there are troubling conclusions reached in the EIR with regard to the feasibility of saving the original buildings. For instance, with regard to the designs that keep the original South Branch buildings, this comment is found on page 2-10:

“This alternative (saving the original library) however, would result in an effectively smaller library with reduced programming and would not accomplish most of the project objectives”

This is a statement that has led to the determination that it is not feasible to keep the original building and is, in my opinion a false assertion based upon insufficient discovery and creativity and was unfortunately a death
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Source</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| TJA            | 7         | On page 3-1 it is stated that in 2009 the Architects studied design options for the South Branch that retained and reused the original Adult and Child reading rooms but warns that structural testing was done and that the horizontal rebar was only at the top of the wall and that there was insufficient roof support (this is visibly obvious). Then the report warns us:  

“This could result in failure due to shearing in an earthquake”  

And then the report makes the assertion that fixing these problems would:  

“Alter the appearance of the building”  

This seems to me an attempt to try and make a case increasing the perceived cost of saving the building in dollars scaring us to believe that it can’t be fixed without looking badly. The truth as I see it is that the original building is easily seismically strengthened and in ways which do not significantly alter to the appearance of the building. |
| TJA            | 8         | The most troubling statement I found in the Draft EIR regarding the West Branch is this statement on page 3-39 with regard to the original W Barteges building:  

“Due to the extensive renovations required, it would essentially have to be rebuilt”  

To the extent that they falsely lead to the demolition of important cultural resources, I find these assertions to be inappropriately misleading. |
| TJA            | 9         | Now let's look at what we can do if, instead of assuming that these buildings are a detriment to a new modern library, we commit ourselves to their preservation and find ways to create a greater more culturally relevant library. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Source</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| TJA            | 7         | On page 3-1 it is stated that in 2009 the Architects studied design options for the South Branch that retained and reused the original Adult and Child reading rooms but warns that structural testing was done and that the horizontal rebar was only at the top of the wall and that there was insufficient roof support (this is visibly obvious). Then the report warns us:  

“This could result in failure due to shearing in an earthquake”  

And then the report makes the assertion that fixing these problems would:  

“Alter the appearance of the building”  

This seems to me an attempt to try and make a case increasing the perceived cost of saving the building in dollars scaring us to believe that it can’t be fixed without looking badly. The truth as I see it is that the original building is easily seismically strengthened and in ways which do not significantly alter to the appearance of the building. |
| TJA            | 8         | The most troubling statement I found in the Draft EIR regarding the West Branch is this statement on page 3-39 with regard to the original W Barteges building:  

“Due to the extensive renovations required, it would essentially have to be rebuilt”  

To the extent that they falsely lead to the demolition of important cultural resources, I find these assertions to be inappropriately misleading. |
<p>| TJA            | 9         | Now let's look at what we can do if, instead of assuming that these buildings are a detriment to a new modern library, we commit ourselves to their preservation and find ways to create a greater more culturally relevant library. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Source</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>valuable new whole than what we would have if we demolished these projects:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How we did it:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>West Branch:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The key ideas we employed to save and re-integrate the original structure:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Restore the original library as the Adult Reading Room. This is a perfect space for an adult reading room, especially when restored with its original skylight! This reading room is also much larger than the reading area scheme proposed by the design firm Harvey Ellis Deveraux.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Restore the original façade as a beautiful classical design that already has terrific civic presence! This saves a large sum of money over demolishing a building with this kind of civic presence and then having to recreate this existing civic presence in expensive modern design elements as proposed in the Harvey Ellis Deveraux design.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Move the building to a location 2 feet north of the current sidewalk and closer to the east property line to increase it's civic presence on University Avenue and make room for expanded program space to the west and behind the original building.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Create a new entry courtyard on the west side of the original building with stairs, bike parking and a ADA ramp that allows those with disabilities to start the building entrance process in the same location as non disabled persons thus confirming to Universal Design practices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Split the building program into two distinct parts and make the building two stories to house the distinct parts. Place the library program on the first level and the literacy, meeting spaces and mechanical and longer term storage on upper level. This allows us to have much less of a building footprint and to save the lovely redwood grove in the back of the library and make that a feature of the new library.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Put the Berkeley Reads program and the dedicated meeting room on the second level. Both can be accessed independent of the library but access to the upper level is seen by library personnel at the service desk to increase security.

It should be noted that keeping the meeting room on the ground level was desired so that library users could access this room when it is not being used so as to increase the area in the library for reading and study. Our design has a library that is larger than what is proposed even with the meeting room counted full time. This allows us to have a meeting room that is dedicated to meeting function and therefore much better at its dedicated function. It can also be used as a conference room for staff, etc without removing library patrons. Also this room can be used for all sorts of programs during the day that would be awkward to be housed in a space that is basically inside a library. Uses such as music and dance class, etc. It should also be noted that there is really no reason at all to keep the Adult Literacy Program on the ground level. It is an entirely distinct program and will have a better identity being separate from the library proper. Also by placing it on the second level we eliminate two separate entrances to the library and the long exterior corridor to the east which could be a security risk especially at night.

- Put the kid's room into a playful and comforting round room that is embedded into the redwood grove so kids can learn amongst the giants.

Advantages in our design:
- Our library is bigger! We have more breathing room for a larger library that has room to grow. Our adult reading room is almost twice the size of the Harvey Ellis Deveraux design.

- We save the redwood grove and can then place the kids room to be between and amongst the redwoods. This enables us to do something kids will love and that works with our biological and cultural heritage in a fun way.

- We show how cultural assets can be recombined into creative new compositions.
We avoid having two separate entrances and access the library proper, meeting rooms and the Berkeley Reads program from the same lobby. This increases the security and avoids a long unsupervised exterior walk that the HED plans have to allow for access the Berkeley Reads program when the library is closed.

We get more library square footage for the same money! It will be argued that our larger library will be too expensive. Nonsense! Our design spends money on the restoration of the original for our new adult reading room and our dramatic circular kids space and the rest of the building is class A rated commercial space which is being built by prevailing and union wages all over the bay area for less than $300 per square foot! Our scheme uses the existing building to create the civic presence of the project. We avoid the type of gymnastic architectural features that are employed in the new design to make it appealing by re-using an original structure of significant appeal and in a significant place. We then build another new building and connect the two with durable and elegant but not showy commercial quality construction systems and materials. Again, I just completed one of the most renowned historic restoration projects in the nation in the Richmond Plunge and did so at prevailing wages for $250 per square foot including a near Olympic sized interior swimming pool! I know that our design can be done for the same or less than the 4.6 million dollar figure being proposed for the new design and that we can get a bigger and more spacious library in the process!

TJA 10 South Branch:
Key ideas to save and reintegrate the original structure:
♦ Put additional entrance off MLK between existing children’s reading room and new building.
♦ Put meeting room in original kids room to put the meeting room at the corner and give it better presence and access by public. Also place bathrooms off MLK entrance so meeting rooms can be closed off to library but still have access to restrooms.
♦ Create additional interior ceiling height in new spaces.

Please see Master Response #3: Other Alternatives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Source</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>Create additional interior height in original children’s room (new meeting room) by creating a hip roof similar to adult reading room.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>Create limited second level for long term storage for tools, books etc. and a lounge with privacy from staff and view on the upper level and mechanical and IT space. A limited use elevator can be placed for under $100,000. Again, placing this now allows for breathing room for the staff and much needed storage space.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This storage space is needed but not provided in the proposed scheme by Field Paoli. Our proposal has ample area for storage which every library really desperately needs. The money by reemploying the existing structures in our scheme easily pays for the elevator, stairs and extra square footage for storage. This storage space can be built and conditioned very inexpensively. Why not take advantage of vertical air space to help us make a library that can grow!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advantages in our design:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>We have a larger library for the same money! By employing vertical space, we create larger spaces with more breathing room. Our adult reading room, which is the original historic reading room, has 150 square feet more than the adult reading room in the Field Paoli scheme.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>We have a bigger (100sf larger) and a larger private staff lounge on a partial second level which has bay and hill views and is away from the hustle and bustle of the main level staff work area to provide more separation between work and rest.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>We have a 400sf long term storage area on the upper level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>We have a sizable mechanical and electrical room on the upper level. This alone will reduce costs from our HVAC subcontractor!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>We have a larger IT room.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>We show how cultural assets can be recombined into creative new compositions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Source</td>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Construction cost is less! Forget the argument that our larger library and second level make our scheme more expensive. We use the same strategy to fix up the original and piggy back on its beauty to create a wonderful elegant new composition and do so for less money than what it would take to create the Field Paoli scheme.</td>
<td>♦ Let’s now revisit the FMP criterion specifically to see how we are doing against that criterion:</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #3: Other Alternatives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Construction cost is less! Forget the argument that our larger library and second level make our scheme more expensive. We use the same strategy to fix up the original and piggy back on its beauty to create a wonderful elegant new composition and do so for less money than what it would take to create the Field Paoli scheme.</td>
<td>♦ Let’s now revisit the FMP criterion specifically to see how we are doing against that criterion:</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #3: Other Alternatives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Construction cost is less! Forget the argument that our larger library and second level make our scheme more expensive. We use the same strategy to fix up the original and piggy back on its beauty to create a wonderful elegant new composition and do so for less money than what it would take to create the Field Paoli scheme.</td>
<td>♦ Let’s now revisit the FMP criterion specifically to see how we are doing against that criterion:</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #3: Other Alternatives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Construction cost is less! Forget the argument that our larger library and second level make our scheme more expensive. We use the same strategy to fix up the original and piggy back on its beauty to create a wonderful elegant new composition and do so for less money than what it would take to create the Field Paoli scheme.</td>
<td>♦ Let’s now revisit the FMP criterion specifically to see how we are doing against that criterion:</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #3: Other Alternatives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Construction cost is less! Forget the argument that our larger library and second level make our scheme more expensive. We use the same strategy to fix up the original and piggy back on its beauty to create a wonderful elegant new composition and do so for less money than what it would take to create the Field Paoli scheme.</td>
<td>♦ Let’s now revisit the FMP criterion specifically to see how we are doing against that criterion:</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #3: Other Alternatives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Source</td>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TJA 12</td>
<td>West:</td>
<td>Not Seismically Sound</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #3: Other Alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>♦ This building is a simple light wood framed building which is very easy and economical to seismically upgrade and move into another location. The original building is no bigger than a nice large home and its roof and floor diaphragms are in fine shape. Simple stuff; done all day every day in the Bay Area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>♦ This has been addressed in our design. Our square footages meet or exceed those of the proposed design. Again we go vertical to gain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5-5 Response Matrix (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Source</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>valuable long term storage and ample mechanical space. It should be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>also noted that the proposed design uses a two story volume to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“create Civic presence” Why not use the volume for space to serve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>library program instead of an expensive way to create more mass and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>presence. See attached plans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of sufficient programming and meeting space including “Berkeley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reads” the adult literacy program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Again, in our design we provide “breathing room” for the libraries to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>expand some and have more storage and staging area. The second</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>level is again key to allowing this breathing room. The Berkeley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reads program has its own identity and upper lobby area and the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>meeting room is larger than the proposed design and dedicated to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>meeting space. Our ground level library is larger than the proposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>space with our Adult area being substantially larger than proposed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We win the additional space game hands down.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of sufficient space for collections and materials, including too</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>library.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>♦ This has been accomplished and some. See above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inadequate lighting; inadequate and outdated electrical, ventilation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and plumbing systems; Structural damage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>♦ All can be easily, economically and sufficiently addressed as would</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>as is also done in the proposed design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TJA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Other discussion points:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Issue of “Civic Presence” and aesthetics:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In both of our designs we use the existing buildings as places of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“embodied civic presence” and elegance rather than tearing them down</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and using new expensive tall volumes and costly architectural methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and materials to create interest and presence. By working with the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>inherent beauty of the original buildings we save a TON of money by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>not having to re create and reestablish that beauty, scale and harmony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please see Master Response #3: Other Alternatives.
with entirely new architectural fabric.

TJA 14 Since aesthetics is not technically a part of the Draft EIR nor a part of the task of demonstrating the feasibility of saving the original buildings, I am not including the design sketches and perspectives we have developed to demonstrate the aesthetic beauty we have developed in our designs. These will be a part of any public presentation as the public discourse moves forward. I can say that our general approach is to attach the original buildings with low spaces and once away from the original buildings to pop up into higher volume single story spaces and our multi-story areas. This allows the original buildings to remain set off from anything new and continue to have independent artistic clarity and distinction. This is typically how we make additions to historic buildings and the where I have employed this simple and elegant strategy the project has been received awards for the careful blend of historic and new elements. This is said because we are not strangers to this issue or its challenges and we have succeeded in every instance of creating harmonious new composition that respects and enhances the existing while creating a powerful new whole.

Please see Master Response #3: Other Alternatives.

TJA 15 Green Design:
Todd Jersey Architecture is one of the leading green design firms in the nation having been doing innovative sustainable approaches to design for over 20 years. All green architects know that rule number one is to save and reincorporate existing architectural fabric wherever we can. In fact the LEED green building certification system awards points to projects that save existing buildings. The truth is we can’t afford to tear down buildings and the embodied energy they contain and call our projects green or sustainable. By saving the original buildings we should be able to reach a LEED Platinum level on both locations if desired. Our firm designed a LEED Platinum class A commercial space at a cost of less than $200 per square foot that is now well on its way to being completed. This translates into a prevailing wage cost of about $250 per square foot. We can do the same for our libraries!

Please see Master Response #4: Embodied Energy.

TJA 16 Construction Costs (all costs assume prevailing wages):
Please see Master Response #3: Other Alternatives.
**SITE WORK AND VERTICAL CIRCULATION:** $400,000

- Restore and move original 1,800sf original library to new foundation @ 350sf: $630,000
- New 1,000sf Children’s Room at $500/sf: $500,000
- Remainder of library, meeting space and literacy program, 11,000 at $300/sf (grade A commercial): $3,300,000
- Total: $4,830,000

**SITE WORK:** $300,000

- Restore original children’s room and adult reading rooms: $900,000
- New portion of library, 6,000sf at $400psf (higher psf than West due to use of CMU block) $2,400,000
- Upper level storage, break room with vertical circulation: $300,000
- Total construction cost: $3,900,000

Our designs make appropriate and economical use of vertical space to provide the required program space and some important and necessary additional space to grow. Use of this vertical space also takes some of the pressure to jam all programs on the same level and helps us work to save artfully restore and reemploy the original beloved structures and do so at or below the construction budgets for the proposed plan. Before you disregard my construction costs please know that I met my budget for the Richmond Plunge at $250 psf. I would be happy to have the budget numbers I have outlined above to work with!

**SUMMARY:**

- Our intent was to demonstrate the feasibility of keeping the original buildings as part of a new library that, at a minimum, matched the same economic and program requirements and constraints of the proposed building. We have done so and have made additional improvements that we feel are important even essential aspects of new libraries at the West and South branches.

We have done our work in a limited time frame. Both designs will need to be optimized for function and economy as we move forward but our purpose for now is complete and the feasibility and benefits of saving
### Table 5-5: Response Matrix (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Source</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TJA</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Square footage comparisons between schemes. South Branch [See original comment for a table.]</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #3: Other Alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TJA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Square footage comparisons between schemes. West Branch [See original comment for a table.]</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #3: Other Alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TJA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>TJA alternative design for South Branch Library. [See original]</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #3: Other Alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TJA</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>TJA alternative design for West Branch Library. [See original]</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #3: Other Alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Amendment: The justification for this amendment is that voters approved Measure FF which funds the improvement of the branch libraries. However, this measure did not address the demolition of these libraries, only the renovation. These renovations include expansion and seismic and access improvements, not demolition. Many times in the past, older historic buildings such as these have been preserved, only to be made accessible, seismically safe and expanded without demolishing the original building.</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #2: Extent of Zoning Ordinance Amendment. [MR 1 is also to the point.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Furthermore, the National Trust for Historic Preservation has determined that the greenest building is a renovated older building, even if a new design encompasses the latest environmental standards.</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #4: Embodied Energy. As a general statement, this is not correct. The assertion is misleading since it is true that for two buildings that have identical energy performance during occupancy, the greener building is the one that required less new material during construction. The National Trust for Historic Preservation does not make this general statement without qualification. For example, its website states that the greenest building is often the one that is already built [emphasis added]. <a href="http://www.preservationnation.org/issues/sustainability/">http://www.preservationnation.org/issues/sustainability/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>EIR law calls for consideration of alternative proposals when the environment may be effected by such things as demolishing structures with historical design elements.</td>
<td>The Draft EIR considers alternatives to preserve both libraries, as well as one alternative to partially preserve the South Branch Library and two alternatives to partially preserve the West Branch Library.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>South Branch: City staff claims that the proposed new building would serve the same functions and same number of patrons and only aims at providing a more efficient and less cluttered floor plan, work areas, seating and space for computers. Such improvements can be achieved by</td>
<td>The comment is correctly reporting the uses of the new library. Chapter 5.2 Alternatives to the South Branch Library Project described how schemes for enhancing and preserving the existing library are deficient in various respects. There are no facts presented to support the assertion that the Fairfield Public Library is an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Source</td>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Alternatives should be investigated to demolishing the South Branch Library. Some have suggested that the Library should be moved to the school building on Oregon St. near MLK which appears to be vacant and needing to be rehabilitated. This would be one way to preserve the old South Branch building with its lovely design while meeting the needs of the library.</td>
<td>The comment proposes an alternative location for the South Branch Library in order to preserve the existing library building in its current location. However, the comment does not explain how the existing library building would be used or how its renovation would be funded. The possibility of using alternative locations was discussed on Page 5-1 of the Draft EIR but ruled out because the City Attorney has determined that Measure FF bond money could not be used for a project in an alternative location. The City Attorney’s memo on the subject was included in the Draft EIR Appendix G. Even if Measure FF bond money could be spent at another site, there is currently no funding available to renovate the existing library building for another use, and relocation of the library would be inconsistent with the community’s desire to keep the library at its current location, as evidenced by the Save Our Library campaign of 2007. See response to Comment GG-2 for further information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>West Branch: As a long-time user of this branch, it seems to me to be a great waste of money to demolish a building which the city renovated relatively recently. Since expansion of functions and patronage is not expected, there is really no reason to demolish this fine old structure. Other ways of expanding the meeting room should be explored as that is not the sole purpose of a public library and in recent years that room has been devoted to the literacy program which it adequately accommodates.</td>
<td>The West Branch Library was last renovated in 1973-4. In 2007, it was only re-carpeted and painted. It is not therefore correct to say that it was renovated recently. The meeting room in the proposed West Branch project design is in fact a multi-purpose room that would be used as an adult reading room when not in use for meetings. The Literacy Program takes over all the space in the existing meeting room when it is being used for that purpose. At other times Literacy Program equipment that is left in the room takes away space from the meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>In sum, both branch libraries should be preserved as they both have design elements which would be irreplaceable and they embody existing energy that would be lost by their demolition and are therefore the greenest buildings at their sites.</td>
<td>The Draft EIR concluded that both buildings are qualified historic resources under CEQA and their loss would represent significant and unavoidable impacts. As regards the loss of the embodied energy if they were demolished, Please see Master Response #4: Embodied Energy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Measure FF did not involve demolition projects, only renovation.</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #1: Use of Measure FF Funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>In addition, many Berkeley citizens and library users appreciate the existing buildings and would like to see them preserved and enhanced rather than wastefully destroyed. The impact on the environment would be tons of building debris added to the landfills needlessly, the</td>
<td>The comment expresses concern regarding production of solid waste and destruction of cultural resources. This was discussed in the Initial Study in Section VIII Hazards and Hazardous Materials and XVII Utilities and Service Systems. It was determined that the construction waste would be disposed of in a landfill such as Altamont Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Source</td>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The wholly inadequate Page and Turnbull, Historic Resource Report on South Branch Library gives no accurate sense of the stature of John Hans Ostwald. The biography is grossly inadequate. To neglect the stature of his architectural roots in Europe, notably Switzerland, in the manner of this report, is totally unprofessional. There is no indication of the magnitude of Ostwald's stature and significance. After spending his youth in Berlin and Austria, Hans Ostwald worked in London for several years, returning to Vienna to focus on his architectural studies. He went on to Zurich to study under Karl Moser at the Eidgenossische Technische Hochschule (Federal Institute of Technology), at Zurich. Moser was not only one of the leading architectural instructors, but was also one of the leading architects of Switzerland and Central Europe, in the first half of the Twentieth Century. Ostwald worked as well for several years in Karl Moser's office in Zurich, before Ostwald's emigration to the United States. Moser's important art museum and his masterpiece, S. Antonius in Basel are commissions that should really be included in the historic report. Ostwald's work for Richard Neutra one of the undisputed leading modernists of the United States, West Coast, was not just &quot;briefly&quot;, but work by Ostwald on Neutra's most important Northern Californian Commission. The Sidney Kahn residence on Telegraph Hill is also one of Neutra's all time most important residences. Ostwald's work with Anshen + Allen was on their reputation making residence for Ralph K Davies, whose wife would later give Davies Symphony Hall to the Bay Area in San Francisco. Ostwald's many awards are not included and the early and important magazine articles at the dawn of Californian Modernism are spottily presented (see &quot;CALIFORNIA ARTS AND ARCHITECTURE&quot;, June 1947, p. 36-7 &quot;House for Dr. and Mrs. Lessor).</td>
<td>The information in the Historic Resource Technical Report was gathered primarily from the book &quot;John Hans Ostwald, Architect&quot; by Donald Reay and Peter Paret and it supports the argument that architect John Hans Ostwald was a &quot;master architect.&quot; The information provided by the commenter does not change the determination already made that the library is primarily significant for its connection to the architect.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
His own teaching career is not discussed as he taught at the University of California, Berkeley, School of Architecture 1971 as well as internationally.

The contributing role the South Branch Library had in Ostwald's formulation of his design for his winning design in the Architectural Competition for California Governor's Mansion is noted in the Donald Reay & Peter Paret biography, "John Hans Ostwald, Architect". The residential appropriate nature of the Branch neighborhood library is certainly confirmed by this win.

Ostwald's 1953 American Institute of Architecture, Award of Honor, for the Wienand House at 3577 Pacific at the Presidio Wall was a very important early Modern award that should not be overlooked. It indicates the timeliness of Ostwald's innovative design sensibility. He was always up with the cutting edge of design as is reflected in the highly significant South Berkeley Branch Library.

The new library proponents have falsely presented the South Berkeley Branch Library structure as being "cinder-block". The building is a post and beam reinforced concrete structure with seismic standards of connection of roof to columns. The library management has presented a completely false notion that can be viewed by the highly honest librarian Jane Scantlebury in her 7 Dec. 2010 Berkeley Daily Planet article which is honestly mistaken in portraying the building as a cinder-block structure.

The official structural report does nothing to dispel the confusion.

The Draft EIR, including the South Branch Historic Resource Technical Report in Appendix I1, is based on the Structural Report from Tipping Mar dated December 14, 2009, that states: “The roofs are typically wood framed and supported by concrete masonry unit (CMU) walls and/or concrete columns. This is an accurate statement. It goes on to explain that: “though designed in accordance with then-current building codes, the portion of the library constructed in 1961 is very deficient relative to current seismic design requirements.” Neither the Draft EIR nor the Tipping Mar report used the word “cinder-block.” Typical solutions for bringing the building up to current code are described in that report, and also in the Draft EIR under Existing Library Renovation Alternative, pages 5.2-2 to 4.

This Historic resources [sic] also avoids describing the structure as post and beam.

This is correct, the words post and beam were not used in the Draft EIR, including the South Branch Historic Resource Technical Report in Appendix I1, or the source document, the Structural Report from Tipping Mar.

What is the precise definition of being “on budget?”

This is not a CEQA issue and no response is required. However, please see Master Response #1: Use of Measure FF Funds.
### Table 5-5 Response Matrix (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Source</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JE</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Measure FF funds were allocated between the four branch library projects and other project expenses not related to a single library. a) How were allocation decisions made? b) What criteria were used to assign a cost to each branch library project and other expenses?</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #1: Use of Measure FF Funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>If one branch library project or another expense came in under budget, would it be possible to allocate unused funds to another branch library project?</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #1: Use of Measure FF Funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE</td>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Since the proposed projects for the South and West Branch Libraries were considered to be “on budget” by the DEIR, then the cost to demolish each library must be known, at least up to a reasonably accurate estimate. a) What is the best estimate of the total cost of each of these demolitions, including but not limited to, the labor, the disposal of materials, and the costs of trucks to dispose of materials? b) To within what percentage is each estimate accurate?</td>
<td>Project cost is not an environmental issue under CEQA, although economic viability is a criterion that can be used in discussion of the feasibility of project alternatives, as per CEQA Section 15126.6. The issue of cost was included in one of the project objectives. As relevant to the objective of remaining “on budget,” cost information contained in the Draft EIR was taken from the Schematic Design Reports and these do not provide accuracy percentages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE</td>
<td>A5</td>
<td>What does the DEIR mean by the term &quot;consistent with Measure FF funding?&quot;</td>
<td>This is not a CEQA issue and no response is required. However, please see Master Response #1: Use of Measure FF Funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE</td>
<td>A6</td>
<td>Are the proposed demolitions of the current South and West Branch Libraries consistent with Measure FF funding, which was to &quot;renovate, expand, and make seismic and access improvements at four neighborhood branch libraries?&quot;</td>
<td>This is not a CEQA issue and no response is required. However, please see Master Response #1: Use of Measure FF Funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE</td>
<td>A7</td>
<td>Is it true that if the demolition of the current South or West Branch Library is not considered consistent with Measure FF funding, then a plan involving demolition for the South or West Branch Library, respectively, does not satisfy program objective #2?</td>
<td>This is not a CEQA issue and no response is required. However, please see Master Response #1: Use of Measure FF Funds. The commenter asks a hypothetical question which appears to answer itself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE</td>
<td>A8</td>
<td>Does the City propose to use Measure FF funding for the above-mentioned demolitions?</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #1: Use of Measure FF Funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE</td>
<td>A9</td>
<td>The City Attorney has publicly stated that Measure FF funds cannot be used for demolition, and the Director of Library Services has said that funds for demolition will come from the General Fund. a) Is Measure FF the only source of funds for each of the branch library improvement projects, or are there other potential sources of funding?</td>
<td>The comment requests information outside the scope of the CEQA analysis. Please see Master Response #1: Use of Measure FF Funds. The City Attorney has advised that Measure FF funds should not be used for demolition absent a validation action. Since that advice was given, a (“reverse”) validation action has been filed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Source</td>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE</td>
<td>A10</td>
<td>b) Is the General Fund one such source of funding?</td>
<td>The comment requests information outside the scope of the CEQA analysis. No response is required under CEQA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE</td>
<td>A11</td>
<td>c) What programs or services might be cut to supply funds for demolitions?</td>
<td>The comment requests information outside the scope of the CEQA analysis. No response is required under CEQA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE</td>
<td>A12</td>
<td>a) If there are other potential sources of funding, then why weren’t they mentioned in the DEIR?</td>
<td>The comment requests information outside the scope of the CEQA analysis. However, the reader is referred to the Response to Comment ZAB-27.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE</td>
<td>A13</td>
<td>b) Isn’t it true that an accurate EIR requires full disclosure of all potential sources of funding for the projects in question?</td>
<td>The comment requests information outside the scope of the CEQA analysis. No response is required under CEQA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE</td>
<td>A14</td>
<td>a) Have there been any public meetings at which other sources of funding for the Branch Libraries Program was discussed?</td>
<td>The comment requests information outside the scope of the CEQA analysis. No response is required under CEQA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE</td>
<td>A15</td>
<td>b) If so, at which public meetings did such discussions take place?</td>
<td>The comment requests information outside the scope of the CEQA analysis. No response is required under CEQA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE</td>
<td>A16</td>
<td>c) What sources of funding were discussed, and who discussed them?</td>
<td>The comment requests information outside the scope of the CEQA analysis. No response is required under CEQA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Source</td>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>The DEIR provides no definition of a &quot;welcoming civic presence,&quot; so it's difficult to understand how some plans may satisfy this condition and others may not. a) What is the definition of a &quot;welcoming civic presence?&quot; b) Exactly what criteria must be satisfied for a project to have a &quot;welcoming civic presence?&quot; c) Are they published anywhere? d) Are any criteria of a welcoming civic presence subjective? e) If so, then who decides if the subjective criteria have been satisfied, and how would there be a fair and objective public process?</td>
<td>Library project satisfies its program objectives? Branch project satisfied all project objectives, in contrast to each of the alternatives. Table 5.3-2 on page 5.3-17 of the Draft EIR concluded that the proposed West Branch project satisfied all project objectives, in contrast to each of the alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Welcoming Civic Presence</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Both the South and West Branch Library Building Programs included in the Draft EIR Appendix D contain a Section IV. General Design Considerations. The first paragraph includes this stipulation: “The buildings should be welcoming and should provide comfortable gathering places for their communities. Both the exterior and interior of each building must be accessible and inviting.” The first criterion under B. Exterior and Site Issues reads: “Each building should stand out at its location as a significant community resource and be easily identifiable as the community library.” (The wording is slightly different between South and West because of the two parts to South Branch.) It continues: “The public entrance should be welcoming and accessible, designed to draw the public in.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>The DEIR provides no definition of a &quot;respecting the neighborhood context,&quot; so it's difficult to understand how some plans may satisfy this condition and others may not. a) What is the definition of &quot;respecting the neighborhood context?&quot; b) Exactly what criteria must be satisfied for a project to respect the</td>
<td>Please see Response to Comment JE-B1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Source</td>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE B3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Is it possible for subjective criteria to be used in such a way to exclude plans that might otherwise satisfy the program objectives?</td>
<td>Please see Response to Comment JE-B1. In addition, the commenter is asking a hypothetical question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE B4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Projects that satisfy many program objectives might be able to be modified to satisfy others,</td>
<td>As explained in the response to number 93, “civic presence” and “respecting neighboring context” are considered together. In the Draft EIR, Chapters 5.2 and 5.3, alternatives have been considered with respect to their characteristics for providing a welcoming presence on the major street, their overall massing in relation to adjacent residential buildings, and, in partial preservation alternatives, the relationship of the new additions to parts of the original building. In addition, the commenter is asking a hypothetical question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>South Branch: Why did the Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) consider only one Partial Preservation Alternative of the several considered during the Concept Design Phase, as stated on p. 5.2-4?</td>
<td>The number and range of alternatives considered by the LPC is outside the scope of this EIR. As described in the Draft EIR, several preservation alternatives were considered in the Facilities Master Plan and during the Conceptual Design phases. The September 29, 2009, LPC Subcommittee meeting minutes (in Appendix H1 of the Draft EIR) note that it was agreed that Field Paoli Architects would bring forward only their best scheme for each option (keeping Main Reading Room or all new construction) and that these would then be evaluated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>South Branch: Was a single-story Partial Preservation Plan considered as an alternative in this DEIR, since such a plan might have a greater chance to satisfy all of the program objectives?</td>
<td>A single-story addition to a preserved Main Adult and Children’s Reading Rooms was discussed on page 5.2-6 and 5.2-10, under Alternatives Considered but Rejected. This alternative was rejected because, by preserving the entire 1961 structure, the new two-story addition could not have a large enough footprint to house all the required library program, and the tool loading area was compromised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE C3</td>
<td></td>
<td>South Branch: According to Table 5.2-3, the Measure FF budget for the South Branch project is $4,300,000 [sic] but the Proposed Project would cost $4,146,000.</td>
<td>Both the text on page 5.2-16 and Table 5.2-3 on page 5.2-18 of the Draft EIR contain a typographical error in the cost of the proposed project (which is Scheme C from the Conceptual Design Report, December, 2009). The correct figure is $4,146,000,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5-5 Response Matrix (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Source</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| $4,416,000.   |           | a) Isn't Table 5.2-2 inaccurate in stating that the Proposed Project satisfies program objective #2 (to be within budget and consistent with Measure FF funding) when it clearly doesn't?  
   b) Isn't it true that the Proposed Project is really over budget and does not satisfy condition #2?  
   c) Why wasn't this discussed in the comparison of alternatives? | rather than $4,416,000. This error has been corrected as shown in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR. At $4,146,000, the proposed project would be within the Measure FF project budget of $4,300,000 |
| JE C4         | South Branch:  
   On p. 5.2-18, the Partial Preservation Alternative is estimated to cost $4,562,000.  
   Why does the DEIR say that the Partial Preservation Project is 10% more expensive than the Proposed Project, costing $4,416,000, rather than 0.3% more expensive, which is the accurate figure? | Please see Response to Comment JE-C3 regarding the typographical error in the proposed project budget. At $4,146,000, the proposed project would be within the Measure FF project budget of $4,300,000. And the estimated concept cost of the Partial Preservation Alternative, at $4,562,000, would be 10 percent higher than the Proposed Project. |
| JE D1         | West Branch:  
   The 2002-2004 Proposition 14 Plan to renovate and expand the West Branch Library is discussed on p. 3-37. This plan would have saved the 1923 portion of the library, while demolishing the 1974 addition, expanding the library, and moving the 1923 portion closer to University Avenue. According to the DEIR, "an Initial Study was completed for this project in October 2003 and found that, with mitigation measures, there would not be a significant effect on the environment, including on historic resources." (Emphasis mine.) The DEIR states on p. 5.3-3, that Partial Preservation Alternative 1 is "similar to the alternative that ... was analyzed in an Initial Study in 2003," and on p. 5.3-5, that "Partial Preservation Alternative 2 is similar to Partial Preservation Alternative 1. Then how is it possible for the DEIR to reach the conclusion on p. 5.3-12 that both Partial Preservation Alternatives 1 and 2 would result in a significant and unavoidable impact on cultural resources, when the Initial Study for a similar plan concluded that there would be no such impact? The DEIR should be revised to include an accurate assessment of the impacts of Partial Preservation Plans 1 and 2. | The Project Description in the 2003 Initial Study was relatively short and lacking in details as the project was at a conceptual stage. Key project components were listed for possible inclusion. Although the words "restore" and "strengthen" were used, exactly how this work would be performed was not described. Consequently the conclusions reached in that study are not relevant to this EIR analysis.  
   This Draft EIR is considerably more detailed and draws on more extensive analysis. The Draft EIR concludes that there would be significant impacts to historic resources from both of the West Branch Partial Preservation Alternatives. The Draft EIR therefore comes to a different conclusion than the 2003 Initial Study. |
| JE D2         | West Branch:  
   On p. 5.3-10, the DEIR states that the Facilities Master Plan (FMP) proposed rebuilding the West Branch Library in a way that was similar to the Proposition 14 plan. This plan was in turn similar to Partial | The Draft EIR page 5.3-10 is referring to the FMP preferred scheme, which was Option A shown on page 29 of FMP Volume II. The FMP did not indicate why that scheme was recommended in preference to Option B (also shown on page 29 of Volume II of the FMP). |
### Table 5-5 Response Matrix (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Source</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>JE D3 West Branch:</strong></td>
<td>Preservation Plan 1 (and also to Partial Preservation Plan 2, which is not mentioned in this context). The plan that the FMP proposed is referred to as the &quot;preferred scheme.&quot; What is the complete list of qualities that this scheme had that made it &quot;preferred?&quot;</td>
<td>A. Please see Master Response #1: Use of Measure FF Funds. B. The FMP, upon which the branch building budgets were based does not provide detailed designs for buildings, so specific building features, such as parts of the electrical system, were not determined at that time. This type of detail is developed as part of the design process that occurs after the budget is determined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JE D4 West Branch:</strong></td>
<td>Why aren’t there separate cost estimates for both partial preservation alternatives?</td>
<td>As discussed on page 5.3-5 of the DEIR, West Branch Partial Preservation Alternative 2 (PPA-2) is similar to PPA-1 except that the 1923 structure would be lowered to sidewalk grade and shifted toward the west to provide an accessible front entrance into the original structure, rather than providing the entrance into the new addition as in PPA-2. Due to the similarities between the two designs, a separate cost estimate was not deemed necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JE D5 West Branch:</strong></td>
<td>Why are there two columns labeled “Partial Preservation Alt 1” in Table 5.3-2 and none labeled “Partial Preservation Alt 2?”</td>
<td>The column headings in Table 5.3-2 on page 5.3-17 of the Draft EIR have been revised accordingly, as shown in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JE D6 West Branch:</strong></td>
<td>The proposed West Branch project is described as two stories on p. 3-27, but presented as only one story on p. 5.3-4. a) Why is this? b) Does the proposed project have a second floor? c) If so, why is there no diagram for it? d) If there is a second floor, then why isn’t it shown or discussed in the comparison of alternatives in Section 5.3?</td>
<td>The West Branch proposed project would have a small enclosed mechanical room on the second story. This would not be a functional part of the library, and cannot be accessed from inside the building, but is considered a second story by the City zoning standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JE D7 West Branch:</strong></td>
<td>There is considerable expense in adding a second floor.</td>
<td>It is true there would be considerable expense in adding a second floor. See response to JE-D6 that clarifies the nature of the West Branch 2nd floor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Source</td>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| a) Does it seem reasonable to build a second floor only to provide a 700-square foot mechanical area, as stated on p. 3-27?  
 b) The West Branch is on a transit corridor on University Avenue and near a transit node at University and San Pablo, where population is expected to increase in accordance with the City's Climate Action Plan. Would having a larger second floor allow for the library better accommodate the future needs of a growing neighborhood without having to spend as much later?  
 c) Is it possible that anticipating and accommodating the needs of a growing neighborhood might outweigh the benefits of having a visible meeting space on the first floor?  
 d) Is it possible that there are mitigations for having the meeting room on the second floor, such as notices posted in the library and outside the doors?  
 e) Is it possible that it may better serve the community to build a more complete second floor during this branch improvement process? There may never be funds to do this again, and it will certainly be more expensive to expand the second floor later. | A very inexpensive stair is used. No elevator is necessary. The space is already enclosed by building walls and roof, therefore available at a little extra cost.  
 b) and c) These are hypothetical questions. The FMP identified population trends, and the City of Berkeley is not growing quickly. There are many criteria for library space needs, and the library planning process has also considered the recent expansion of the Central Branch Library.  
 d) The Multi-Purpose Room is not primarily a “meeting room” but an ancillary library space that can be used as a quiet reading room and/or a laptop room when not being used for group activities. This space should be adjacent to the main reading room, and not on a separate floor and unavailable for supervision by the library staff.  
 e) Making the building larger at this time would cause the project budget to be exceeded, which is not possible. Installation of structural elements and provision for a future elevator would also incur additional cost that is not within the budget. |
| JE E1 | On p. 3-2, the DEIR states that the overarching program objective is “to facilitate the approval of improvements authorized by Measure FF to ‘renovate, expand, and make seismic and access improvements at the four neighborhood branch libraries, but not the Central Library’ without eliminating public review, by allowing modification of Zoning Ordinance requirements for the existing public libraries with Use Permits rather than Variances.”  
 a) Then why is the Central Library included as part of the ZOA, which applies to "all conforming or legal non-conforming public library existing as of May 1, 2010?"  
 b) Does this contradict the overarching objective?  
 c) Are there other objectives for the ZOA?  
 d) If so, what are they?  
 e) If there are other objectives, what are all of the potential environmental impacts that may result from these objectives?  
 f) Would the ZOA facilitate the demolition or a major alteration of the Central Library? At the January 19, 2011 Planning Commission | Please see Master Response #2: Extent of Zoning Ordinance Amendment. |
### Table 5-5: Response Matrix (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Source</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| JE E2          |           | Meeting, Planner Aaron Sage acknowledged that this was possible.  
g) Then why weren’t these potential environmental impacts on this historic resource studied in the DEIR?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Please see Master Response #2: Extent of Zoning Ordinance Amendment.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| JE E3          |           | The ZOA does not sunset after the completion of the improvements authorized by Measure FF.  
a) Why not?  
b) Would the ZOA facilitate any demolitions or major alterations of the branch libraries after the branch library projects were completed?  
c) If so, then why aren’t these potential environmental impacts analyzed as part of this DEIR? The EIR should be corrected to include such an analysis.                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Please see Master Response #2: Extent of Zoning Ordinance Amendment.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| JE E4          |           | On p. 3-1, the DEIR states “besides facilitating the approval of improvements discussed in the Branch Libraries Facilities Master Plan (FMP) and authorized under Measure FF, the ZOA would also allow modification of zoning requirements applicable to future, as yet unknown, improvements that may be necessary.” (Emphasis mine.)   
a) In what ways might zoning requirements change?  
b) Why is there no discussion or analysis of the potential environmental impacts of such a far-reaching and unknown changes to the Zoning Ordinance?  
Please see Master Response #2: Extent of Zoning Ordinance Amendment.                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Please see Master Response #2: Extent of Zoning Ordinance Amendment. In addition, whether these powers are necessary is a policy issue beyond the scope of CEQA.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| JE E5          |           | The ZOA states, “the Board may modify any requirement of this Title applicable to such a change, expansion or new library as part of the Use Permit.”  
a) What does this mean?  
b) Is the "Board" the Zoning Adjustments Board?  
c) What specific powers are being given to the Board?  
d) Are these powers necessary?  
e) If so, why?  
Please see Master Response #2: Extent of Zoning Ordinance Amendment.                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Please see Master Response #2: Extent of Zoning Ordinance Amendment.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
<p>| JE E5          |           | On p. 2-2, the DEIR states that &quot;the potential impacts of the ZOA relate only to planned improvements at the South and West Branches. Thus, this Draft EIR addresses only those impacts. &quot;How is it possible to come to such a conclusion when the ZOA has potential impacts as discussed in items 1-4, above? The EIR must be corrected to fully explore and analyze all of the potential impacts discussed above.                                                                 | Please see Master Response #2: Extent of Zoning Ordinance Amendment.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JE</td>
<td>E6</td>
<td>The alternatives to the ZOA presented in the DEIR were not feasible alternatives. Why was there no consideration of a ZOA that would apply only to the Measure FF projects and sunset upon their completion? This is a reasonable alternative whose environmental impacts could be understood by the public and analyzed.</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #2: Extent of Zoning Ordinance Amendment. The suggested alternative would not avoid any of the impacts identified in the EIR, and therefore was not included in the alternatives analysis for the ZOA. However, on March 2, 2011, the Planning Commission considered revisions to the ZOA that would have excluded the Central Library and any branch library projects submitted after 2014 from the ZOA. The Commission decided not to include these revisions in its recommendation to the City Council on the ZOA. The City Council will also consider these revisions when it considers the ZOA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>This letter is regarding the planned demolition of the West and South Berkeley libraries. Balloon Measure FF, passed by the voters, was never meant to be used for demolition of any of the library branches. The ballot stated that bond proceeds would be used for renovation, construction, seismic and disabled improvements. The language also stated that plans for renovation include restoration and refurbishment of historic features at the branch libraries as part of any renovation.</td>
<td>Measure FF is quoted on page 1-4 of the Draft EIR and documents pertaining to Measure FF are included in Appendix G of the Draft EIR. Although this is not a CEQA issue, the reader is referred to Master Response #1: Use of Measure FF funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The West Berkeley branch was originally built in 1923. It is considered an example of the Carnegie style of libraries along with the Oakland Golden Gate branch Library at 5626 San Pablo and the Oakland Temescal branch at 5205 Telegraph.</td>
<td>The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR; therefore, no response is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>In 2003 the Berkeley Library wrote and sponsored an application to the Landmarks Commission that the West Berkeley branch be designated a Structure of Merit. At that time they wanted to restore its historic facade. Recently, a member of the Landmarks Commission during that time period has recounted that the Library proposed restoring the West Berkeley branch, including restoration of its historic facade. Plans were presented to the Landmarks Commission in 2003 that need to be brought back and disclosed for public review. The Structure of Merit designation was approved by the City of Berkeley Landmarks Commission in 2003. There are reasons the Library advocated at that time that the West Berkeley branch be designated a Structure of Merit. These reasons are on record and need to be brought to the public for review.</td>
<td>The significant features for the Structure of Merit listing were reported on page 3-36 of the Draft EIR. For additional detail on past projects, the reader is referred to the Landmarks Preservation Committee minutes that are available, on request, from the City. Those detailed discussions are not relevant to the proposed project and alternatives as discussed in the Draft EIR. The comment is noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Source</td>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The West Berkeley Branch Library is a significant building, an historic resource on a significant intersection at University and San Pablo Avenues. University Avenue is the gateway to the University. University and San Pablo Avenues are the intersection of 4 corners of one of the earliest roads connecting Alameda and Contra Costa Counties going back at least 80 years.</td>
<td>The Draft EIR page 4.1-16 to 17 concluded that the existing West Branch library appeared significant because of its design and association with historic events. It concluded that the building had not maintained its historic integrity due to the 1973 additions and alterations. However, it is a historic resource under CEQA because it had been designated a City of Berkeley Structure of Merit. The comment is noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Another key issue that needs to be looked at is that of embodied energy. In general, talk about energy use and new buildings usually is regarding operating energy. Analysis needs to take into account the energy that is bound up in existing buildings. Embodied energy is the total expenditure of energy involved in the creation of the building and its materials. When we throw away an historic building we simultaneously throw away the embodied energy incorporated into that building. Razing historic buildings results in a triple hit on scarce resources. 1) We are throwing away thousands of dollars of embodied energy involved in the creation of the building. 2) We are replacing with materials vastly more consumptive of energy. 3) Recurring embodied energy savings increase dramatically as a building life stretches over 50 years.</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #4: Embodied Energy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mike Jackson, Chief Architect, Illinois Historic Preservation Agency, believes that only a fool or a fraud would claim to be an environmentalist and yet throw away historic buildings.</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #4: Embodied Energy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JD</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Our local Architect Todd Jersey has created plans for the West and South branches showing how they can be preserved and made earthquake safe. He has carefully incorporated all of library staff concerns, as well as nearby residents concerns garnered from several public meetings. His plans and budget save money as well. We have an opportunity to renew the West and South Berkeley branches and bring them to their original glory with updates to the 21st century.</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #3: Other Alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JD</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>A plan for demolition of the buildings requires a CEQA review and a full EIR.</td>
<td>Demolition of the South and West Branch Libraries is described in the project description and evaluated in this EIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Zoning Amendment Ordinance (Z.O.A.) for the Berkeley Public Library must not be approved. City agencies and departments should not be exempt from the laws and procedures with which the residents</td>
<td>The commenter is making policy arguments and no response is required under CEQA. However, please see Master Response #2: Extent of Zoning Ordinance Amendment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Source</td>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Berkeley touts itself as a &quot;Green&quot; city. Isn’t this more rhetoric, when</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #4: Embodied Energy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the Berkeley Public Library is planning to demolish and rebuild, rather</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>than renovate, the West and South Berkeley Branch Libraries?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCB</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Furthermore, the West Branch is a &quot;Structure of Merit&quot; and the South</td>
<td>The comment expresses a fact. No response is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Branch received an American Institute of Architects (A.I.A.) award of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>merit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>If the Concerned Library Users’ lawsuit is successful in preventing the</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #2: Extent of Zoning Ordinance Amendment. As</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>demolition of one or both branches, passage of the Z.O.A. will facilitate</td>
<td>discussed in that response, Zoning Ordinance Section 23C.08.050 already</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>any future demolition and bypass the variance request procedure</td>
<td>permits demolition of non-residential buildings subject to a Use Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>required of the residents and business owners in Berkeley.</td>
<td>and certain findings, and the ZOA does not affect this provision. It</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>should also be noted that by providing greater flexibility to waive or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>modify zoning requirements for additions to existing libraries, the ZOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>could in the future help avoid demolitions that might otherwise be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>necessary to accommodate needed expansion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The enclosed appendices are part and parcel of my comment letter to be</td>
<td>The appendices are included with the Comment letter in this Final EIR,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>included in the FEIR:</td>
<td>but as they pertain to the Zoning Ordinance Amendment process and are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>not comments on the Draft EIR, no response is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCB</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Appendix A: Stephanie Manning: Letter to City Council. Re: Second</td>
<td>This letter states that it addresses the repeal of Ordinance No. 7, 148-N.S. It does not include comments on the Draft EIR and no response is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>reading of repeal of Ordinance No. 7, 148-N.S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCB</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Appendix B: Susan D. Cerny: Letter to City Council Re: Second reading</td>
<td>This letter states that it addresses the repeal of Ordinance No. 7, 148-N.S. It does not include comments on the Draft EIR and no response is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of repeal of Ordinance No. 7, 148-N.S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCB</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Appendix C: Steven Finacom &quot;Measure FF and Branch Library Demolitions,&quot;</td>
<td>This is an article entitled Measure FF and Branch Library Demolitions. It does not directly refer to material in the Draft EIR and no response is required under CEQA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Berkeley Daily Planet. 12/14/10. Re: Second reading of repeal of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ordinance No. 7, 148-N.S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I gathered signatures all over Berkeley for two petition drives</td>
<td>The comment is noted. The comment makes vague reference to loss of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>regarding our Landmark Preservation Ordinance. During the several</td>
<td>historical resources in South and West Berkeley without commenting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>weeks total that I actively sought signatures – talking to community</td>
<td>directly on the substance or adequacy of the EIR. As discussed in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>members on the street every day – it became clear to me that the</td>
<td>response to Comment GG-5, the proposed demolitions would not have any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>residents of South and West Berkeley were particularly concerned about</td>
<td>cumulative impacts on historical resources. Several alternatives to both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the loss of their historic resources. Dozens of African American</td>
<td>projects were discussed in the Draft EIR. However, as noted in the Draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>residents of South and</td>
<td>EIR, none of the alternatives met all the project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5-75
West Berkeley told me that they felt that their neighborhoods were targets for demolitions. By contrast, I never once heard a similar statement in North Berkeley or the Elmwood.

It is therefore disheartening that the Trustees' plan is to demolish the South and West Branch libraries, while simply renovating, expanding and making seismic and access improvements – exactly what the voters approved in 2008 in Measure FF – to the North Branch and Claremont libraries.

The comment is informational in nature. It is correct that the community was surveyed about their library needs and that subsequent to that SOL performed their own survey and collected signatures. The SOL petition submitted at that August 2007 BOLT meeting read as follows: “We the undersigned people of South Berkeley and the surrounding areas, are opposed to moving our South Branch Library from MLK Jr. Way and Russell to the Ed Roberts campus at the Ashby Bart. We are in support of maintaining our library in our neighborhood with a fair share of services for our community in addition to the tool lending library.” Some versions of the survey had a different header: “We the undersigned want our South Berkeley Branch neighborhood library to remain in its present Russell St. location and to maintain a fair share of services for our neighborhood from this location.” At the September 19, 2007 BOLT meeting, staff was authorized to hire Noll & Tam and conduct the FMP. The BOLT decided to not pursue the idea of relocating to Ed Roberts Campus. Volume I of the FMP, Assessing the Needs, on pages 9 through 16, includes population charts and the results of patron surveys. These surveys show that most members of the community desire to keep the branch in its current location, rather than relocate the branch.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Source</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>interviewed by HTA. They collected signatures seeking to save the South Branch Library.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ultimately SOL gathered over 600 signatures asking to keep the South Branch Library (and historic building) on Russell Street. This is an indication that the real community wants the South Branch to be renovated rather than demolished.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Library Board of Trustees knew about this grassroots effort to save the South Branch Library yet apparently entirely ignored it. Just two years later, a &quot;public process&quot; was conducted where politically well-connected persons were heard, and people who disagreed with the new top-down plan to demolish the South Branch Library were ignored (as was reported to me by an attendee of the &quot;public process&quot;).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| GG 3 | West Berkeley Branch Library | West Berkeley, one of the least wealthy parts of town, has suffered more than its fair share of recent demolitions. |          |
|      |                            | The Boy Scout building, formerly at 2040 Fourth Street and in use as a Mexican restaurant, was designated a City of Berkeley Structure of Merit in 2005. It was demolished for a housing development in 2008. |          |
|      |                            | The Brennan's Building, specifically mentioned in the West Berkeley Plan as a cultural resource and known to everyone as a visual landmark of West Berkeley until its demise, was demolished for the same housing project. |          |
|      |                            | The Drayage Building, formerly at the southwest corner of Addison Street and 3rd Street (the railroad tracks), was identified in the West Berkeley Field Survey as a potential City of Berkeley Structure of Merit Landmark property. Yet in 2005 its low-income population was evicted when a developer showed an interest in the property for a housing development. A different developer purchased the site and demolished the building. It lies vacant today. |          |

The comment describes buildings in West Berkeley that have been demolished recently. The comment is noted. The "Boy Scout building" at 2040 Fourth Street was designated as a Structure of Merit by the Landmarks Preservation Commission, but this designation was overturned by the City Council. Thus its demolition did not represent demolition of a Structure of Merit. The other buildings cited were never designated as Landmarks or Structures of Merit, and were not deemed to be historical resources under CEQA.

The comment concludes by asking the question why demolition of the West Branch Library is being considered. The reader is referred to the discussion of alternatives to the proposed West Branch Project in Draft EIR chapter 5.3. Several alternatives to demolition were discussed but as they failed to prevent the significant and unavoidable impact of loss of a historic resource, and failed to meet the project objectives, they are not recommended.
A pre-World War II Japanese American florist shop at the corner of San Pablo Avenue and Delaware Street, a lovely Art-Deco structure, was destroyed in 2007 despite a growing movement at the time to preserve California’s Japan-towns.

The Historic Resource Technical Report for the West Berkeley Branch prepared by Page & Turnbull concluded that the branch is eligible for listing in the California Register for, among other reasons, its Classical Revival-style design influenced by the Carnegie design and because it was the first branch library constructed in Berkeley. Furthermore, it was designated a City of Berkeley Structure of Merit in 2003. The FMP recommended restoring "the original 1923 branch facade and the lovely interior historic details" (see Exhibit F). Why is demolition even being considered?

Appendix C was a record of the statements made at the Branch Libraries Program EIR Scoping Meeting on October 20, 2010. The project architects answered the questions on public involvement in the choice of the preferred schemes. The Draft EIR reported independently on the public process and series of public meetings in Chapter 3, Project Description, in Section B.5.b (South Branch) and Section C.5.b. (West Branch – see also augmented reports in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR). The Project Description discussions of the public process were drawn from meeting minutes that were also included in Appendix H.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Source</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GG 4</td>
<td>How were the decisions to demolish the branches made?</td>
<td>In Appendix C to the DEIR there was a partial explanation of the so-called &quot;public process&quot; in choosing the &quot;Preferred Schemes&quot; for the two branch libraries: &quot;1. Public Participation in the Choice of Preferred Schemes for South and West Branch Libraries Comment: At the community meetings on South Branch and West Branch projects, was the option of demolition [and new construction] discussed? Reply from South Branch Project Architect: Yes, the demolition option was discussed, and most comments received were in favor of the demolition [and new construction] option. Comment: At the community meetings, was there a community consensus on preserving aspects of the building? Reply from West Branch Project Architect: Several studies were</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 5-5 Response Matrix (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Source</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>presented at the meetings about possible reuse of the older building. The consensus at the community meetings was not towards rebuilding the older building but towards producing a really good library.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG 5 Cumulative Impacts</td>
<td>1. According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15355, analysis of cumulative impacts is limited to &quot;closely related past, present and reasonable foreseeable probable future projects.&quot; There are no demolitions in South or West Berkeley that would meet this definition. The demolitions cited in comment GG-3 are not closely related to the proposed demolitions because they were approved in 2007 or earlier, and, except for the building at San Pablo and Delaware, which is located about 900 feet from the West Branch, are located at least one-half mile from the West Branch. Furthermore, none of these demolitions was determined to have significant impacts under CEQA, and there is no evidence that they would be cumulatively significant in combination with the proposed demolitions. Regarding present and future projects, there are no reasonably foreseeable projects, including projects in the City's application pipeline, or preliminary projects pending application of which the City is aware.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG 6</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>What is the cumulative impact to low-income Berkeley residents of so many demolitions occurring in low-income areas?</td>
<td>2. As discussed in the previous response, there are no significant cumulative impacts on historical resources due to the proposed demolitions. Historical resource impacts are based on adverse physical changes to the affected resources, not on the socioeconomic status of persons in the vicinity of the resources, and socioeconomic changes are not considered under CEQA unless they cause changes in the physical environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG 6</td>
<td>3. Please analyze the environmentally superior Todd Jersey Architecture plans for the South Branch Library that would preserve and enhance the historic adult and children's reading rooms.</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #3: Other Alternatives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG 6</td>
<td>4. Please analyze the environmentally superior Todd Jersey Architecture plans for the West Berkeley Branch Library that would preserve the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please see Response to Comment GG-4. The extensive public process already undertaken was reported in the Draft EIR with reference to original meeting minutes.

No additional information is presented in the comment as part of the request of an extension. The Draft EIR has not been shown to be deficient in the provision of information or its analysis of the issues pertaining to the projects and there is no reason to extend the comment period, schedule additional hearings, or recirculate a Revised Draft EIR.

The comment is noted. Pursuant to CEQA, the Final EIR will be certified prior to action on the projects. Pursuant to BMC Chapter 23B.32, the ZAB will hold public hearings on the proposed projects. The Final EIR may be considered at the same hearing as long as it is certified prior to approval of the projects.

CEQA Article 9 specifies the issues that are to be considered in an EIR and there is no requirement to consider provision, abandonment, or relocation of books. The comment does not include substantial evidence justifying the conclusion that a large number of books will be abandoned, destroyed, or removed. According to the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Source</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>economic and social impact of a proposed project.</td>
<td>The likely abandonment, destruction, and removal and relocation of large numbers of books from the branch libraries is a significant social impact that should be discussed in the EIR. The essence of a public library is its book collection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How many books will be removed from each of the Branch Libraries? How many books will be sold or given away? How many books will be sent to deep storage?</td>
<td>The loss of these unique books would be a significant social and historically loss to the Berkeley community. Older books, especially, contain information and ideas not found anywhere else. About 10 years ago, in a controversial move, the City of San Francisco abandoned, gave away or destroyed thousands of irreplaceable books in the course of relocating its Main Public Library. Will this be repeated in Berkeley?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF 5</td>
<td>The EIR should discuss Project alternatives in which no books are destroyed, sold or given away.</td>
<td>The choice of media to be kept in the library is outside the scope of the Draft EIR as it is not an environmental issue. Objectives merely state that the libraries shall effectively house the library programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF 6</td>
<td>Social impact of loss of branch libraries for an extended period</td>
<td>The EIR should also consider the negative social impact of the loss of each of the Branch Public Libraries for an extended period of time. Realistically, where are Berkeley residents expected to go for their library needs while the Branch Libraries are being rebuilt or renovated?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can the Berkeley Main Library really handle a large additional volume of people everyday? The EIR should recognize that while parking is generally available near the Branch Libraries, there is no free parking anywhere near the Berkeley Main Library.</td>
<td>Can the Berkeley Main Library really handle a large additional volume of people everyday? The EIR should recognize that while parking is generally available near the Branch Libraries, there is no free parking anywhere near the Berkeley Main Library.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF 7</td>
<td>Please inform me of the availability of the Final EIR or Revised Draft EIR, and of any subsequent public hearings on the EIR or the Branch Libraries Project.</td>
<td>The Final EIR will be made available to the public through a link on the City website. A Notice of Availability will be mailed to those who have requested one.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5-5 Response Matrix (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Source</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>In granting a Variance to a project, the City must make at least one of two findings specified by Section 23B.44.030 of the Berkeley Municipal Code, including finding that there are &quot;exceptional or extraordinary circumstances (sic-&quot;or conditions&quot; omitted) applying to the land, building or use&quot; and finding that a &quot;Variance (sic-&quot;the granting of the application&quot; is omitted) is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights of the subject property's owner.&quot; Of the two required findings, the former would be difficult to conclude for the South and West Branches because these sites are, by Berkeley standards, relatively large, rectangular sites with no special constraints compared to other sites in their respective neighborhoods. Demolition of the South and West Branch buildings would create a “blank slate,” allowing relatively easy compliance with setback and lot coverage requirements. The latter finding would also be difficult to conclude for these projects since the library is a publicly owned and operated facility, and therefore the economic use of the building is irrelevant. Compliance with the setback requirements would not preclude the continued use of the sites as public libraries.</td>
<td>The comment is quoting the text in Section 5.1-1 of the Draft EIR. No response is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>There are many inadequacies in this part of the DEIR 1) - The inability to count.</td>
<td>The comment is correct in that three findings are required to grant a Variance, one of which is the normal “non-detriment” finding required in any event for all discretionary permits. The text on page 5-1 has been amended in Chapter 3 of the Draft EIR has been corrected in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR. This does not affect the validity of the statement in the EIR as to the reason for the ZOA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2) - The excluding of “relatively large rectangular sites from being eligible for receiving a variance” no matter what their use.</td>
<td>The comment is noted. This comment does not pertain to any environmental issue under CEQA, but rather to the policy issue of whether the ZOA is appropriate and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 5-5 Response Matrix (continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Source</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To quote the DEIR:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Of the two required findings, the former would be difficult to conclude for the South and West Branches because these sites are, by Berkeley standards, relatively large, rectangular sites with no special constraints compared to other sites in their respective neighborhoods. To quote the variance language of the Zoning Ordinance.</td>
<td>The commenter's opinion is noted. The comment is correct that the use of a property as a public library could be a basis for granting the first Variance finding, independent of the size or shape of the parcel, if it were determined that library use were unique or exceptional. There is no official City policy or City Attorney opinion that &quot;use of the property&quot; is not to be considered in making this finding, or that there can be no Variances on sites which are relatively large and rectangular. Rather, each Variance must be considered on its own unique facts, and the utility of generalized rules is questionable. Nonetheless, the larger, more regularly shaped and less developed a parcel of land is, the harder it is to make this finding. However, even if the first finding could be made on the basis of the library use, the second finding could not be made. Please also see Response to GP-5 below.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23B.44.010 Variances
The Board may grant Variances to vary or modify the strict application of any of the regulations or provisions of this Ordinance with reference to the use of property, the height of buildings, the yard setbacks of buildings, the percentage of lot coverage, the lot area requirements, or the parking space requirements of this Ordinance....(Bold added)

23B.44.030.1.
There are exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applying to the land, building or use referred to in the application, which circumstances or conditions do not apply generally to land, buildings and/or uses in the same District; (bold added)

Comment: It is again inexplicable, to say the least, that the "use of the property" is ignored and only the site's shape and size --"relatively large, rectangular" is invoked. The "use of the property" is a public library of which there is one in the whole West Berkeley area and one in the whole South Berkeley area.

Is this DEIR invoking official City policy and/or the City Attorney's opinion that "use of the property" is not to be considered in variance findings despite the wording of the ordinance?

Further, is this DEIR invoking official City policy and/or the City Attorney's opinion that there can be no variances on sites in the neighborhoods around these libraries which are relatively large and rectangular? Of course, if this is policy it would refer to all such sites in...
### Table 5-5 Response Matrix (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Source</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3) - Demolition and “easy compliance”? To quote: Demolition of the South and West Branch buildings would create a &quot;blank slate,&quot; allowing relatively easy compliance with setback and lot coverage requirements. Comment: This sentence is very confused – There is no relationship between demolition and “easy compliance.” The buildings could by demolished now with a use permit but if the variances remain – which they would without the ZOA, there would be supposedly – I say supposedly because I have doubts about this contention about variances – no “relatively easy compliance.” So it is not demolition which makes for “easy compliance.” – It is (supposedly) only after the ZOA is enacted and it would then only take a use permit that it would be “easy compliance.” Take it out. The commenter’s opinion is noted. The intent of the sentence is merely that it is generally easier to comply with applicable development standards when a site is vacant than when there is an existing building being preserved. The existing building forms a constraint on new development that would be removed by demolition, thereby opening up more options for complying with applicable standards. The text on page 5-1 of the Draft EIR has been amended in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4) - The difficulty or perhaps impossibility of granting a variance to any &quot;publicly owned and operated facility.&quot; The second finding is 2. The granting of the application is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights of the subject property’s owner; To quote the DEIR: The latter finding would also be difficult to conclude for these projects since the library is a publicly owned and operated facility, and therefore the economic use of the building is irrelevant. Comment: It is nice to see the word “use” – which was left out in the first variance finding – actually used albeit, in a garbled manner. It seems to say that the library has an “economic use” but since the City owns it, it is irrelevant because the City cannot have any substantial property rights with regard to say, a new West Berkeley Library. There is a bond issue for 26 million dollars of which many millions are to be devoted to the West Berkeley site but such economic figures, no matter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The commenter’s opinion is noted. This comment does not pertain to any environmental issue under CEQA, but rather to the policy issue of whether the ZOA is appropriate and necessary. There is no written opinion on this finding. One major purpose of Variances, which is reflected by this finding, is to avoid arbitrary and inequitable applications of land use regulations that result in takings. There can be no taking of City property by virtue of City regulations. Thus application of this finding to a City development project is problematic. The commenter implies that hardship is a permissible alternative basis for a Variance. However the required findings do not refer to generalized hardship but to loss of a “substantial property right.” The text on page 5-1 of the Draft EIR has been amended in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 5-5  RESPONSE MATRIX (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Source</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>II. The wording and meaning of the Zoning Ordinance Amendment.</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #2: Extent of Zoning Ordinance Amendment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Notwithstanding any other provision of this Title, any conforming or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lawful nonconforming public library existing as of May 1, 2010 may be (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>changed, (2) expanded, or (3) demolished and a new public library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>constructed on the same site, subject to issuance of a Use Permit, unless</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>such change, expansion or new library is otherwise allowed by this Title.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Board may modify any requirement of this Title applicable to such</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>change, expansion or new library as part of the Use Permit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The wording of the amendment is overly broad, unclear, and needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>modification and there is really no direct analysis of its impact.'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>I) – The declaration that the ZOA does not really “by itself would not</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #2: Extent of Zoning Ordinance Amendment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>result in an environmental impacts”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Although the ZOA is a policy or administrative process, that by itself</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>would not result in environmental impacts, it facilitates four branch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>library projects each of which is reasonable [sic] foreseeable.” (5.1.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment: Given the preparer’s difficulty with language and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>interpretation as shown above with regard to variance language, the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>disclaimer is both wrong and inadequate. The ZOA is an amendment to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the ZO which covers 5 libraries. Any changes that could be made with a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>use permit and could have an impact on the environment, require the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ZOA language – whether a policy or an administrative process or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>whatever - be examined for such impact. This is not done.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3 – The last sentence of the ZOA gives the Zoning Adjustment Board the</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #2: Extent of Zoning Ordinance Amendment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>overly broad authority to change by use permit any requirement in the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>entire ZO which may be applicable to “such change, expansion, or new</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>library.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To quote:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Board may modify any requirement of this Title applicable to such change, expansion or new library as part of the Use Permit.

There is simply nowhere in the DEIR any recognition of the possibly dozens or perhaps hundreds of requirements that can be modified. I am not describing what might or might not happen, but the clear issue is what authority this provision actually gives the Zoning Adjustment Board. And nowhere is this discussed.

We know that the change from variance to use permit explicitly changes the authority of the Zoning Adjustment Board with regard to

the use of property, the height of buildings, the yard setbacks of buildings, the percentage of lot coverage, the lot area requirements, or the parking space requirements of this Ordinance;

Take for example the height of the building which houses a library. The setbacks, percentage of lot coverage etc. may have very little environmental impact but clearly with the wording of the ZOA the Zoning Adjustment Board has the authority by issuing a use permit to build any number of stories on any of the 5 library sites at any time in the future—three stories, four stories, or even more. Again, the issue is not what is the probability of something happening but does the looseness of the language legally give the Zoning Adjustment Board authority to do so with a use permit. This ZOA language also applies to the library building site downtown and gives the Zoning Adjustment Board the authority with a use permit to build any number of stories on that site, 5, 6 or even more. The impact of such authority given to the Zoning Adjustment Board by the language of the ZOA is never addressed by the DEIR and thus the DEIR is not adequate.

Suggested language change—Since the clear reason for the ZOA language is setbacks, lot coverage, lot area requirements and parking and not stories, rewrite the ZOA to refer specifically to these items.
### Table 5-5  RESPONSE MATRIX (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Source</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3) What is the meaning of the phrase in the ZOA which reads after “subject to the issuance of a Use Permit” – unless such change, expansion or new library is otherwise allowed by this Title”?</td>
<td>The Planning Commission has recommended that the City Council adopt a revised ZOA with language to address this comment. The revised language makes it clear that changes already allowed with a Zoning Certificate or Administrative Use Permit would still be allowed under the ZOA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Something sounded wrong to me about Sara Shumer’s comment on the cost estimates for the two library options at last week's ZAB meeting.</td>
<td>The comment is noted. Typographical errors regarding the cost of the proposed project on pages 5.2-16 and 5.2-18 of the Draft EIR have been revised, as shown in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1. Page 2-5, first paragraph – 8th line – would be better if it said (e.g. wider <em>aisle widths</em> and hallways …)</td>
<td>Page 2-5 of the Draft EIR has been revised accordingly, as shown in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Source</td>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2. Page 2-5, 2nd paragraph – we actually have a second entrance into the main library as well as a separate entrance into the tool lending library on Martin Luther King Way. Also, we should note here, since this is the first mention of the on-site loading/unloading spaces, that one of them meets the ADA requirement for van accessible parking.</td>
<td>Page 2-5 of the Draft EIR has been revised to clarify that a second entry to the main library and the entrance to the Tool Lending Library share access from Martin Luther King Jr. Way. Two short-term loading/unloading spaces are provided on-site, as they are at the current library, and one would be ADA van-accessible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS-2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3. Page 3-12, 1st paragraph – 11th line – makes reference to the new structure &quot;using all 9,600 square feet&quot;. 9,600 sf is actually the proposed area for west branch, not south. I think this would be better worded to say, &quot;... a well-designed new structure to meet the full program on a single story.&quot;</td>
<td>Page 3-12 of the Draft EIR has been revised, as shown in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS-2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4. Page 3-13, 1st paragraph, line 2 – delete the word &quot;more&quot; between require and an.</td>
<td>Page 3-13 of the Draft EIR has been revised accordingly, as shown in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS-2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5. Page 4.3-13 – bottom paragraph, 2nd to the last line – south is pursuing a LEED gold rating. However, I don’t think we should say that we would receive the credit for recycled materials and locally produced materials because we’re not sure of getting them. maybe we say that “within that scoring system, they are pursuing a credit for ...”</td>
<td>Pages 4.3-13 to 4.3-14 of the Draft EIR have been revised accordingly, as shown in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS-2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6. Page 5.2-18 – the chart is incorrect. The concept design report estimate for the proposed project is $4,146,000. The numbers are transposed. There are more recent estimates for this design, but since we didn’t do later estimates for the other alternatives, I think it’s best to use these for comparative purposes.</td>
<td>Page 5.2-18 of the Draft EIR has been revised accordingly, as shown in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS-2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7. Page 5.2-20 – first paragraph, first line. This is not correct. The existing library is substantially lower than the surrounding residences, and since the houses predate the library, I’m guessing it’s always been that way. From MLK Way, this is particularly noticeable, and if anything, detracts from the library having any sense of civic presence within the context of this neighborhood, or along the busy main street.</td>
<td>Page 5.2-20 of the Draft EIR has been revised accordingly, as shown in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS-2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8. Page 5.2-21 – a few minor typos – first full paragraph, line 6 – should be space, not spaces.</td>
<td>Page 5.2-21 of the Draft EIR has been revised accordingly, as shown in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS-2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9. Same page, first paragraph, 2nd to the last line – should be do, not does</td>
<td>Page 5.2-21 of the Draft EIR has been revised accordingly, as shown in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS-2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10. Same page, 2nd paragraph, 5th line – should be computer users, who – not which.</td>
<td>Page 5.2-21 of the Draft EIR has been revised accordingly, as shown in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 5-5 Response Matrix (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Source</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MS-2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>I have to say that this was a very tedious document to read, mainly because there were so many elements that were repeated twice or even more often. Sometimes there were full paragraphs or even pages that were repeated verbatim, but I guess that’s just the nature of an EIR. I certainly appreciate the thoroughness of the study, and wish us all well in getting it approved in final form very soon.</td>
<td>The comment is noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3-8 “elements of.” Hanging sentence</td>
<td>Page 3-8 of the Draft EIR has been revised accordingly, as shown in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3-12 footnote 9 references LPC but it is the BOLT minute meetings which should be referenced here</td>
<td>Page 3-12 of the Draft EIR has been revised, as shown in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3-13 “would also require more an additional” – grammatical / typo</td>
<td>Page 3-13 of the Draft EIR has been revised accordingly, as shown in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3-14 LPC took no action. Can you say the result of no action, it almost implies that they could revisit later but it was a referral and as they took no action it moves to the next step in the process, but is not open to returning to LPC again, right?</td>
<td>The Draft EIR is correct in that it states that the LPC took no action. No correct to the Draft EIR is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3-15 “schedule and truck traffic,” typo</td>
<td>Page 3-15 of the Draft EIR has been revised accordingly, as shown in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3-58 Section on noise mitigation seems excessive, particularly bullet #2 and #3; we really need a Noise enforcement officer? Is this the norm for City projects?</td>
<td>The requirements listed on page 3-58 and 3-59 of the Draft EIR are standard conditions of approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.1-21 mitigation – should we agree to capture before demolition with professional photographer engaged to take picture?</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure CULTURAL-West-1b on page 4.1-21 of the Draft EIR has been revised accordingly, as shown in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.3-13 south is intending to receive a gold LEED rating I think</td>
<td>Page 4.3-13 of the Draft EIR has been revised accordingly, as shown in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.3-15 second paragraph – spacing of 2nd line and punctuation needs fixing. Also can we say Gold LEED rating here, are the energy-calc. updated since the time this was written?</td>
<td>The proposed South Branch project has been designed in accordance with the requirements for LEED Gold Certification. This includes the provision of rooftop photovoltaic solar panels for onsite energy generation to help offset the energy used by the building including the computers and other equipment contained within. The energy calculations have been regularly updated to reflect the progress in the design documentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Source</td>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.2-4 Footnote 3, on page 5.3-4 the same code is fully cited and italicized, can we do the same here for consistency?</td>
<td>Page 5.2-4 of the Draft EIR has been revised accordingly, as shown in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.2-15 b. “the same number as presenting the existing library” typo</td>
<td>Page 5.2-15 of the Draft EIR has been revised accordingly, as shown in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.2-16 C. “however it should be noted, however, that the although..“ typo</td>
<td>Page 5.2-16 of the Draft EIR has been revised accordingly, as shown in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.2-18 chart and text below – need to correct to $4,146 M</td>
<td>Page 5.2-18 of the Draft EIR has been revised accordingly, as shown in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.2-20 “the second addition also slopes away…” second story addition might read more clearly</td>
<td>Page 5.2-20 of the Draft EIR has been revised accordingly, as shown in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.3-2 second paragraph, last line, staff room changed to staff work room</td>
<td>Page 5.3-2 of the Draft EIR has been revised accordingly, as shown in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.3-4 first paragraph – “the doors would be restored” I thought doors would be replaced with windows since these are not the originals?</td>
<td>Page 5.3-4 of the Draft EIR has been revised accordingly, as shown in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.3-13 “first paragraph: “As the No Project alternative... (change to too?)” and “is worse” to “is a worse”</td>
<td>Page 5.3-13 of the Draft EIR has been revised, as shown in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.3-18 #3, “although the wider aisles” not sure what trying to say here</td>
<td>Page 5.3-18 of the Draft EIR has been revised, as shown in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.3-19 #7 “If moved to the street it and associated with a taller addition...” typo</td>
<td>Page 5.3-19 of the Draft EIR has been revised accordingly, as shown in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>p. 3-27. Gross floor area is 9,400 sf, not 9,600 sf. Also, the Multipurpose Room is not only intended for “larger meetings”, but is a true multipurpose room that will be open for general reading and computer use. This is an important point since the adjacency and staff control of this room is important for non-meeting periods. Otherwise, it could be kept locked up and on a different floor, as in Scheme A. The intent is to accommodate the community’s oft-repeated request for more reading space.</td>
<td>Page 3-27 of the Draft EIR has been revised accordingly, as shown in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>p. 3-58. It is a little odd to have so much noise control in that very noisy location. Can’t this be toned down and be limited to tool use section? There must be so much noise coming from trucks unloading at the 99 cents Store to the west of those residences as well as the University Avenue noise. (If anything, our building will be a great noise barrier for them once the structure is up.)</td>
<td>The comment refers to the Standard Conditions of Approval. As stipulated in these Standard Conditions, if acoustical analysis proves such a barrier would not be effective, it would not be required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 5-5 RESPONSE MATRIX (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Source</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>p. 4.3-14. “Overall, the increase in emissions due to all projects combined, would not be large”. This is not an accurate statement. I would restate it as “Overall, there would be a decrease in emissions due to all projects combined even though two of the branches grow in size because the buildings would be brought up to current Title-24 energy standards, significantly reducing their overall energy use and therefore their GHG emissions. In fact, since South is expected to perform at 35% below Title-24 standards and West is expected to perform at zero-net-energy use and zero carbon emissions, the reduction in GHG emissions for all four branches combined will be substantial.” The document goes on to make summary statements about South’s energy use likely to be higher than the existing building, partly due to the increase in computer use. Avery can comment on the basis for this assumption, but I doubt that these generalizations are true. We have annual energy bills for all the branches and we know the projected energy use of West including plug loads like computers (namely zero) and we know the projected energy use of South. If we compare the existing with the proposed, we can state definitively that South will in fact use less and by how much. Also, it is troublesome to see language for West that says it will use “considerably less” than the existing building – why mince words? – they should just say flat out that it is projected to consume zero non-renewable energy over the course of a year and will have a zero carbon footprint.</td>
<td>Page 4.3-14 of the Draft EIR has been revised, as shown in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>p. 5.3-4. “The doors would be restored and used as windows”. I think that we should also note that the door location, to remain historically correct from the outside, would require a hole in the floor with a guardrail around it, since it is about 2' below the floor level at the threshold. (There was an internal short flight of stairs in 1923.) The alternative is to change the exterior (historic tampering that would probably not be accepted) and raise the historic arched door/window up to floor level so that its sill aligns with the other window sills on that wall. (The Jersey schemes keep ignoring this seemingly unimportant detail. It is actually important and I think that the EIR should note it.)</td>
<td>Page 5.3-4 of the Draft EIR has been revised accordingly, as shown in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 5-5 RESPONSE MATRIX (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Source</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LPC 1 Gary Parsons: The Zoning Amendment that is part of the EIR scope addresses five (5) specific sites where there are existing library buildings. Both the Planning Commission and City Council reports identify different issues with the sites that require special treatment. Three (3) of the sites are in residential districts. The precedent for such amendments is not adequately provided nor can the analysis be combined.</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #2: Extent of Zoning Ordinance Amendment regarding the “precedent” or policy rationale for the ZOA. Regarding combination of analysis, the EIR includes the ZOA with the South and West Branch Library projects because CEQA requires that an EIR consider “the whole of the action” before the agency. However, the EIR provides separate analyses of the ZOA and the South and West Branch Library projects in order to facilitate public understanding and consideration of these separate components of the overall “action”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>LPC 2 Anne Wagley: The EIR schedule is such that the last two weeks in December should be a moratorium period and the schedule extended to allow for the limited public access to the EIR documentation during the holidays. When the general public has no access to a required public document for which there is a hearing or action has to be taken within a certain period, then the time to respond should be extended by the amount of time that the public was not able to access that document.</td>
<td>The reader is referred to Response to Comment LUA-1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>LPC 3 Anne Wagley: Requests that newly surfaced “preservation alternatives” either be incorporated into the EIR for consideration as alternative plans, or that they at least be reviewed by the body that certifies the EIR.</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #3: Other Alternatives. The TJA designs have been reviewed as part of this Final EIR that will be presented to the Zoning Advisory Board (for certification as regards the two branch library projects) and City Council (for certification as regards the Zoning Ordinance Amendment).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>LPC 4 Steve Winkel: The concept represented in the EIR that the “no project” alternative is feasible is misleading.</td>
<td>The comment serves as an introduction to the comments that follow; no response is necessary apart from the responses below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>LPC 5 Steve Winkel: All approved buildings are code compliant when built; standards change.</td>
<td>The comment is noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPC</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>LPC 6 Steve Winkel: It is understandable to aggregate [2] EIRs, but it also is very difficult, as different buildings raise different issues (structure, character, integrity, context). The comparisons between the West and South Branch facilities are a comparison of “apples and oranges”. For clarity, there should be two (2) EIR documents. The following three (3) sub-items also should be addressed in each —1) the bond measure; 2) the context and programs for the two buildings; and 3) the site analysis and use of Measure FF funds for each.</td>
<td>The decision was made to prepare a single EIR after preparation of separate Initial Studies. Context, programs, and site analysis for the two buildings was included in the Draft EIR Chapter 3 Project Description. However the EIR does not undertake to compare the two West and South Branch projects, and this was not its function. In general, the policy of CEQA is that environmental review should consider the “whole of the action”, which in this case consists of the ZOA and the two projects analyzed in this EIR. For issues pertaining to the Bond Measure and Use of Measure FF Funds, please see Master Response #1: Use of Measure FF Funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPC</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LPC 7 Steve Winkel: Notes that on page 5.2-5, the cost is discussed as part of the reason that the partial preservation alternative (Option B2 of Concept Design Report for the South Branch Library) was discarded. Would like to note that the objective of an EIR is to provide facts</td>
<td>CEQA Guidelines require that an EIR select a range of alternatives to be given detailed consideration, based on ability to meet project objectives, feasibility (where feasibility includes economic viability), or ability to avoid significant impacts. In order to fully inform the reviewing public as to the feasibility of alternatives, the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 5-5  RESPONSE MATRIX (CONTINUED)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Source</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPC</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Antoinette Pietras: Public expectations for the bond measure that funded the project should be considered, especially if demolition was not identified as a possibility. The financial aspect of the allocations per branch may be missing in terms of how the total allocation will be directed to each branch.</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #1: Use of Measure FF Funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPC</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Gary Parsons, Anne Wagley: Carrie Olson’s father, who was the architect in charge of the working drawings for South Branch, should be contacted and interviewed for any missing information on the design and construction details. Given the sensitivity of the situation (out of concern for both his emotional and delicate physical health), attempted contact should be made through his daughter, Carrie Olson.</td>
<td>Although outside scope of CEQA review, this comment will be taken into consideration by the City and request conveyed to the family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Chris Linvill: The analysis should discourage variances, which are possible with findings for unusual circumstances. Alterations that legalize non-conforming conditions are not adequate for findings that allow a variance.</td>
<td>The Draft EIR analyzes the proposed branch library projects as part of the wider Branch Library Program, including the ZOA. With inclusion of the ZOA, Variances would not be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPC</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Austene Hall: Questions the inclusion of the Zoning Ordinance Amendment within the EIR for the buildings. First, with the pending lawsuit feels they [the Zoning Ordinance Amendment EIR and the Library Buildings EIR] should be separate EIR reports. Furthermore, feels it is inappropriate to change zoning laws for individual projects. It sets a precedent.</td>
<td>See Response to Comment LPC6 above. The EIR does not comment on the merits of the program, but merely analyzes the environmental impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAB</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Please see the meeting minutes presented in the following section, for the full text of these comments. The table below selects the speaker’s name and his/her main points.</td>
<td>The comment is an introduction to the points that followed; these are addressed in subsequent responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Linda Schacht: I’ve read the entire EIR, and I just want to point out...</td>
<td>The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5-5: Response Matrix (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Source</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZAB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R. Allen: I'm sorry, but I must have misunderstood your [Linda Schacht's] comments earlier.</td>
<td>See Response to Comment ZAB-1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAB</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D. Matthews: Could some one answer this, is there solar on the south library?</td>
<td>Solar panels were always an option for the South Branch Library and the project architects have now decided that there is sufficient budget to include them as part of the project. As they were not a definite component of the design in the early stages, they were not included on some of the figures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Elizabeth Watson: I am in support of anything that you can do to support getting these new libraries built. .... And I also enthusiastically agree with Linda's comments that we do run the risk of perhaps not building them at all if we continue with delays.</td>
<td>The commenter is making a statement of her position and no response is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(Elizabeth Watson continued) I also have a request, I'm a citizen of Berkeley, .... Would you please ask all of us to identify where we live. Because there seems to be substantial opposition to these libraries that come from people who do not live in Berkeley. .... D. Matthews: In actuality, that should be part of the record and that's an oversight. Thank you for calling it to my attention. ....</td>
<td>The comment does not pertain to the CEQA analysis. Responses are provided to all relevant comments under CEQA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAB</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Peter Warfield: ....the campaign to try and disrespect and disallow folks who have something to say, especially journalists to reveal about what is going on, is most unfortunate.</td>
<td>The comment is noted. No response is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAB</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(Peter Warfield continued) The first thing to be said about the libraries</td>
<td>The comment is noted. No response is required. For a discussion of funding, Please...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in question is that Berkeley has an extraordinarily excellent group of branch libraries. The North Branch is a landmark. The West Branch is an official Structure of Merit. And the South Branch is a really quite wonderful building when you remove at least in your mind the overcrowded conditions that exist there. For reasons that are quite reasonable the library wants to put a lot of materials in there, computers and so on. But as a result, it's not really something that can be appreciated as well as it should and could be. If you see the original photograph that was published of the interior and exterior, particularly the interior, in the Hunt’s Oswald book, one of which was published in the BAHA blog which opposes very much the demolition – Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association – you see a beautiful building, wonderful, spacious, with light. The interior has become a cramped attic, that just doesn’t show off for example when you put bookcases smack up against the floor to ceiling windows you can’t see the charm of the windows, look out or looking in. The choice here is not to do nothing versus tear two of the branches down. But rather to renovate versus build new. And the mandate of Measure FF did not contemplate demolitions.

ZAB 8 (Peter Warfield continued) I want to say that overall the point that I was going to make earlier in public comment was simply that the Draft EIR and paper version was not available during the entire 11 days of Christmas time that the planning department was closed. And there was no indication in the information about the materials that the planning department would be closed, and not available for questions or paper copies. There were copies available of things online. Unfortunately this is a very political document.

ZAB 9 (Peter Warfield continued) The purpose of the zoning ordinance amendment is stated as being to facilitate the Measure FF, Measure FF talks about four branches. It does not include the central library. But the zoning amendment did. There is talk about impact minimal, therefore the scope only includes two branches. And doesn’t include the larger issues of the other branches as well. Everybody knows that new branches invariably bring huge crowds that, is not contemplated. And ultimately, think that the emphasis that this program represents will

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Source</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZAB 8 (Peter Warfield continued)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Use of Measure FF Funds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAB 9 (Peter Warfield continued)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Extent of Zoning Ordinance Amendment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Source</td>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAB</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Bradley Wiedmaier: ....some of the people speaking for this do not live</td>
<td>The CEQA process facilitates public involvement. It does not limit the opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in the neighborhoods of the two branches if you want to get particular.</td>
<td>to comment to those who will be most affected by the project. Comments from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>....Berkeley is a world class city because of the university. It has a</td>
<td>people who live outside Berkeley are relevant to this process. Responses are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>heritage that needs to be protected.</td>
<td>provided to comments irrespective of the residence of the commenter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAB</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(Bradley Wiedmaier continued) One of the things that needs to be</td>
<td>The commenter is referred to the South Branch Historic Resource Report by Page &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>protected is the south branch library. Although it’s not a landmark it</td>
<td>Turnbull in Appendix I1 of the Draft EIR for a full analysis of what constitutes a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>deserves to be under CEQA, having just arrived at 50 years of age, it</td>
<td>historic resource under CEQA. This concluded that the South Branch Library was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>should be so designated. It’s unfortunate that has not happened.</td>
<td>eligible for listing under Criterion 3, Architecture and for its design and association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with John Hans Oswald. It is not currently a City of Berkeley Landmark and the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>criteria used for designating local landmarks are not the same as those used to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>determine what is a historic resource under CEQA. The commenter is offering a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>personal opinion as to whether or not it should be also a landmark.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAB</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(Bradley Wiedmaier continued) It’s too bad that the 45 days required by</td>
<td>Please see response to LUA-13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEQA were impeded by the holidays and the holiday next week to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>interrupt the time for people to speak.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAB</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(Bradley Wiedmaier continued) I have distributed two messages from</td>
<td>The comment serves as an introduction to the comments that follow; it requires no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Steve that were published to the people of Berkeley through the “Daily</td>
<td>response apart from the responses provided below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planet.” [I] urge you to read those. I think that they’re very fair.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to illustrate, I think, how the process has been pretty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>grossly presented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAB</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(Bradley Wiedmaier continued) The idea that this building is not</td>
<td>According to Tipping Mar, the structural engineer for the South Branch, the major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>connected to its roof is false. There’s no proof of that. I’ve heard</td>
<td>structural deficiency of the existing building is in its lateral (earthquake-resisting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>people make this statement which is ridiculous. Also talking about the</td>
<td>strength, not the vertical support provided by the columns. The lateral system of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>concrete block. The concrete block is not structural, primarily. The</td>
<td>the reading room is formed by the CMU infill panels which occur between the concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>concrete block is infill. It is a post and beam structure.</td>
<td>columns. The load path for seismic forces runs from the roof through the concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>columns and into the CMU walls. Neither the concrete columns nor the CMU walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>have steel reinforcing detalle to provide adequate seismic safety required by current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>building codes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAB</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(Bradley Wiedmaier continued) Over and over again the people that</td>
<td>The comment is noted. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>have tried to eliminate the possibility of renovation of the buildings,</td>
<td>EIR; therefore, no response is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>driven, if you read Steven’s piece, how they planned all along to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>demolish these buildings. They have couldn’t get the ones in the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 5-5: Response Matrix (continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Source</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZAB</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(Bradley Wiedmaier continued) But the issue on the presentation that this building is going to collapse is preposterous. The standards are there, the engineer’s report, and the DEIR does not categorically say they did not find connections. They didn’t thoroughly look.</td>
<td>The structural report from the FMP, included in the Draft EIR, Appendix D4a, also states that “the small amount of lateral ties provided in the cantilevered columns supporting the roof framing makes them...susceptible to brittle shear failure.” The column roof connections are inadequate by today’s building codes and would need to be strengthened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAB</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(Bradley Wiedmaier continued) Also, I would like to say, why is the main branch library included in this elimination of variance? Why are all the branches included in perpetuity, not just on the projects at hand?</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #2: Extent of Zoning Ordinance Amendment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAB</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(Bradley Wiedmaier continued) I think that there are real issues of lot coverage and setbacks that impact people, north branch talking to the neighbors, they aren’t out here, because they think that this is being run through, there’s nothing they can say, the process has been decided on and it’s a waste of time. That’s what I got from people. They will have cars from their overscaled new neighbor meeting room clogging up their neighborhoods. They weren’t happy about that. They weren’t happy about the building being right on the corner of the property line on Josephine.</td>
<td>The North Branch Library project was not a subject of the Draft EIR because it was determined to be exempt from CEQA, as stated on page 1-5 of the Draft EIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAB</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(Bradley Wiedmaier continued) Let me finish this sentence, please. The Tam report which had no problems with renovation has been 86’ed. You don’t hear about that. It didn’t have the information that the library wanted to put out. I would urge you to check it out.</td>
<td>The commenter is referring to the 2008 Noll &amp; Tam Facilities Master Plan (FMP) that has been referenced throughout the Draft EIR. The commenter is correct in that the FMP preferred scheme for the West Branch Library in the FMP was one of renovation, rather than demolition and new construction. However, the FMP was a preliminary document and did not analyze the feasibility of the proposals. On further research during the Conceptual Design Phase, when detailed consideration was given to what it would take to rehabilitate the West Branch to current seismic safety codes and for disabled access, it became clearer that this was not a feasible option. For an account of the renovation required, see Chapter 5.3.A.2 Existing Library Renovation Alternative. Note also that there would still be a significant and unavoidable impact from loss of historic resources under this alternative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAB</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Judith Epstein: I urge you to participate in the DEIR process as commissioners and private citizens....On behalf of concerned library users we intend to present an alternative in the DEIR process. We have</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #3: Other Alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Source</td>
<td>Comment Source</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAB 21</td>
<td>Judith Epstein continued</td>
<td>They [the alternatives] would be less expensive. That’s an important thing to note. Because with the demolition processes, Measure FF cannot pay for demolition as the City Attorney has said. It means the money comes from the general fund. And we’re a cash strapped city as all cities are today. That means that money that might be used for other programs will be needed to be taken away for demolition. You really want to consider that.</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #3: Other Alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAB 22</td>
<td>Judith Epstein continued</td>
<td>I hope you will ask a lot of questions, also about the zoning amendment. Bradley brought up an interesting point. Why was the zoning amendment so widely construed? Why not more narrowly construed? Why should it not just apply to the projects at hand. Why is it applying to the main library as well, where there’s been no construction and in perpetuity. We don’t know what the future may bring, we may regret this.</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #2: Extent of Zoning Ordinance Amendment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAB 23</td>
<td>Liz Hodely</td>
<td>...The citizens of Berkeley voted to support a bond measure, and to finance the renovations of the branches. And there’s been a lot of fundraising going on to add additional support to the</td>
<td>The comment is noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Source</td>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>library. And there's been a very public process of people being really engaged in thinking about the use of the library, and how the design, renovations and the design can address the changes that need to happen, enhance the functionality of the library and the branches. And I think it's important to remember that this process has gone on over a number of months, with lots of people participating in the process... It's true that we're existing in a very cash strapped [?], and one of the impacts of drawing this whole process out is that it's costing the city more, it's making these projects become more expensive, and I think actually doing all of these renovations to these instead of the demolition of the two branches would actually be more expensive, and problematic. I encourage you to really help move this process forward, and approve the EIR.</td>
<td>[Response at the January 14, 2011, ZAB Meeting by Donna Corbeil] No. A. There's additional fundraising that is being done by Berkeley Public Library Foundation. So the bond money can only go to supporting actual construction, but furniture and fixtures have to be supported outside of the bond money. That's why there is fundraising going on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAB 24</td>
<td>A. M. Alvarez Cohen: I have a question. ....There is bond funding for some of this work. Is the bond funding covering all of the work proposed?</td>
<td>B. M. Alvarez Cohen: Is there any assumption that the work for the proposed project would come from the general fund of the city?</td>
<td>B. I don't know that. I don't have the answer to that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAB 25</td>
<td>Gale Garcia: ....I support the alternative of preserving the historic portions of the south and west branch libraries. Using the designs of a preservation oriented architect such as Todd Jersey. Todd Jersey found a way to restore the Richmond plunge for a fraction of the cost estimated by those who wished to demolish it.</td>
<td>The comment is noted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAB 26</td>
<td>(Gale Garcia continued) And I'd like to reiterate in case you didn't hear me, I live in south Berkeley and grew up in Berkeley near the west branch. And by the way, CEQA is a public process.</td>
<td>The comment is noted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAB 27</td>
<td>A. M. Alvarez-Cohen: I think at this point I'd like to know what the library's official position is on how you expect this to be funded.</td>
<td>[Response at the January 14, 2011, ZAB Meeting by Donna Corbeil] A. The $26 million currently is budgeted to cover all the expenses associated with the four projects as put forward. As a previous speaker says, it will not cover furniture, fixtures and equipment which is not allowable under the use of bond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. M. Alvarez Cohen: What happens if you don't raise the money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Source</td>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAB 28</td>
<td>M. Alvarez Cohen: What some one said in the public hearing is wrong, then, that you are expecting to rely on the general fund.</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would just say that the the demolition portion of the projects is part of the construction budget. It is budgeted. Use of money from the General Fund is outside the scope of this EIR. For additional information, please see Master Response #1: Use of Measure FF Funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAB 29</td>
<td>S. Shumer: Out of curiosity, there is the statement that the Measure FF does not cover moving tools to another location, the tool library. I’m not clear why, if demolition is permitted, even though it’s not included – one of the preservation options is thrown out the door because you can’t move the tools and you can’t accommodate the tools.</td>
<td></td>
<td>I can clarify that. The Library Board of Trustees actually explored that idea, because it was brought forward in our community process, that the Library could move the tool library to another location. And one of the Library Board’s agenda items we fully examined that. But several issues, I would say, just briefly. One is that we could move the tool library, we could not use bond funds for the alternative site that we found for the tool library. So if we move the tool library to another location, built a building or something, we could do that but we can’t use the bond monies. And there is no other source of funding available to do that. The second thing is we cannot use the bond funds for that because it has been determined that the expectation [of voters], and then the City Attorney’s analysis of the bond fund at the time it was put forward on the ballot, it said that the projects would take place at the current locations. For additional information, please see Master Response #1: Use of Measure FF Funds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 5-5  RESPONSE MATRIX (CONTINUED)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Source</th>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZAB</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>R. Allen: Can you tell me, I think Mark touched on it, but what is your desired schedule for starting construction on all these buildings?</td>
<td>[Response at the January 14, 2010, ZAB Meeting by Donna Corbeil] The North and the Claremont projects are expected to start construction in late March or April. These two projects are on hold pending the completion of the EIR. Because of course we would need a Use Permit. And we need to go through the full planning process.... Aaron Sage: Basically our schedule has the EIR being completed in April. And then also at the same time you [will be] considering the Use Permits. So depending on what the outcome of that decision is and whether that is appealed to Council, it’s likely that this would not be finished before June or July.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAB</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>S. Shumer: The one question is that there don’t seem to be any alternatives that don’t include at least 50% demolition. And I was wondering about that problem.</td>
<td>For the South Branch Library project, it is correct that even the Partial Preservation Alternative involves demolishing over 50 percent of the existing structure. Alternatives involving less demolition, such as the alternative that maintained both the Adult’s and Children’s Reading Rooms, with new additions, were determined infeasible in the Conceptual Design Stage because even a two-story addition would not provide enough space overall for the library programs. A discussion of this was included on pages 5.2-6 and 5.2-10 of the Draft EIR under Section C. Alternatives Considered by Rejected. As discussed in Master Response #3: Other Alternatives, the suggested alternative for South Branch Library by Todd Jersey Architects would also involve substantial demolition and could also meet the City of Berkeley criteria of 50 percent demolition, although it is not known for sure at this time. For the West Branch Library project, as described on pages 5.3-2 to 5.3-5 of the Draft EIR, it is also correct to say that over 50 percent of the existing structure would be demolished (according to the City’s definition), because the seismic strengthening would be so invasive, that most of the preserved structure would have to be essentially rebuilt. As discussed in Master Response #3: Other Alternatives, the suggested alternative by Todd Jersey Architects for West Branch Library would also involve 50 percent demolition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAB</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>(S. Shumer continued) At some point, let me raise another very minor issue, or specific, and that is that the alternative which is the partial preservation alternative says that, on page 5.5, that it can’t be done because the cost is prohibitive. And that the cost of the proposed project is $41.4. The alternative is $45.6. And that that is a prohibitive difference. But then on the table on 5.23 and below it says that it is a bid</td>
<td>Please see Response to Comment ZAB-33.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Source</td>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAB 33</td>
<td></td>
<td>(S. Shumer continued) It seems to me the alternatives that preserve part of the building are not really developed. And they’re rejected on things like it would be too expensive, then it turns out when you look at other figures, they’re not too expensive. That begins to undermine my faith, if you will, in the rejection of the partial preservation. And also on a chart, although I don’t know that that is binding in any way, the chart claims that the preservation, because it’s not a total preservation, has the same status as the total demolition.</td>
<td>Typographical errors in the document regarding the cost of the proposed project have been revised, as shown in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6.d does not require the impact discussions for alternatives to be evaluated in the same detail as for the proposed project. The alternatives evaluation in the EIR is intended to provide a comparative analysis of the proposed project against the alternatives, rather than an exhaustive impact evaluation of the alternatives. Table 5.2-1 states that the South Branch Library Partial Preservation Alternative would, like the proposed project, result in a significant and unavoidable impact, and the table also acknowledges that impacts would be somewhat less under the alternative, although still significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAB 34</td>
<td></td>
<td>R. Allen: ...Since the issue of money and costs have come up, I would emphasize that all of these issues were on the table. And we’ve been very lucky in Berkeley that we’ve had a depression, because if this had been a normal economy, we would have run out of money a long time ago to get these buildings built. And if this is delayed any further by any of this irrational “no we don’t want it,” it could cost us the ability to build one of these. While as an architect I can say I don’t see an upsign of the economy turning around, there is a little breath of air, and it wouldn’t surprise me at all within 6 to 12 months to see things change, and the bidding climate change entirely from a point where right now the city can get terrific prices and most likely meet their budget. And a year from now I think that’s not going to be possible. I would like for the record to say that this process has been more than thorough. We would do detriment to this city and the library system if we allowed anything further to delay it.</td>
<td>The comment is noted. No response is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Source</td>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAB</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>D. Mathews: I’d also like to go on record in regard to the libraries, that I agree with Bob, as a real estate broker I totally understand the cost per square foot of development. And we are at a time when it’s a bargain to build things if you have the financing to do it.</td>
<td>The comment is noted. No response is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAB</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>G. Williams: I understand that our role tonight is simply to hear comments from the public on the adequacy of the EIR and comments from the Board. And I have no comments on the inadequacy of it. I think that it is a thoroughly-done EIR. And I therefore have no comment.</td>
<td>The comment is noted. No response is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAB</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>E. Kopelson: Echoing some of the same comments that were just mentioned, definitely support this moving quickly forward. Regarding the adequacy, I think it’s [a] more than adequate EIR and it’s very thorough. That said, if you could put the same amount of information regarding the Landmark Preservation Committee and subcommittee feedback, the same amount of information regarding the West Berkeley Branch as you did on the South Berkeley branch that would be helpful.</td>
<td>The comment is noted. The text of page 3-40 of the Draft EIR is amended to add additional information on the West Branch LPC and LPC Subcommittee minutes in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Speaker 1: A Berkeley Public Library Board member and planner, stated that the EIR adequately addresses the integrity of the West Branch EIR. She urged the Commission to move the project forward to the City Council.</td>
<td>The comment is noted. No response is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Speaker 2: Stated support for the library project and the proposed zoning amendments.</td>
<td>The comment is noted. No response is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Speaker 3: Jane Scantlebury, a retired librarian, stated she has volunteered at the South Branch Library and that it is difficult to get around the library and the City should build the best, most modern libraries that it can without delay.</td>
<td>The comment is noted. No response is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Speaker 4: Linda Schacht stated support for the library improvements, particularly due to social justice concerns regarding the poor condition of the South and West branch libraries in comparison with the other branches.</td>
<td>The comment is noted. No response is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Speaker 5: David Snyder, Executive Director of the Berkeley Library Foundation, stated the proposed improvements are necessary to improve services and fulfill the voter’s goals with Measure FF. Stated there has be ample public input and involvement. He stated that the South and West</td>
<td>The comment is noted. No response is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Source</td>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Speaker 6: Merilee Mitchell stated opposition to the demolition of library buildings because Measure FF did not mention demolition and because re-use of existing buildings is a greener option.</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #4: Embodied Energy. Design studies show that the proposed new building is in fact the greener option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Speaker 7: Judith Epstein, a member of Concerned Library Users, stated the DEIR inadequately addresses the proposed zoning amendments because it says the impacts of the amendments are the same as those for demolishing the South and West Berkeley Library branches, but the amendments apply to all branches (including Central Library) in perpetuity. She stated that the EIR should address other potential impacts at the libraries.</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #2: Extent of Zoning Ordinance Amendment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Judith Epstein (continued) stated the South and West branch libraries have been neglected while the other branches have been better maintained, which is a social justice issue.</td>
<td>The comment expresses the opinion of the commenter and does not address the adequacy of the Draft EIR. The comment is noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Judith Epstein (continued) also stated that the partial preservation alternative for South was not adequately studied. Her group has hired preservation architect Todd Jersey to study other alternatives, including one which saves the entire original building, but not the 1970s addition.</td>
<td>Partial preservation alternatives were studied extensively during the Conceptual Design Phase, as reported in the Draft EIR, pages 3-11 to 3-13. As regards the Todd Jersey alternative for South Branch, please see Master Response #3: Other Alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Speaker 8: Todd Jersey, architect, stated there are feasible partial preservation alternatives that could meet the project objectives and offered to provide descriptions of those alternatives. He stated that significant historic pieces can be integrated into a new whole.</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #3: Other Alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Commissioner Poschman indicated that page 5.1-1 refers to two findings for variance, but there are actually three required findings.</td>
<td>Please see response to Comment IND-GP-2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Commissioner Poschman also stated the EIR should explain why a variance for the use of the building is not a feasible alternative, given that public libraries are a unique use (only 5 in the City).</td>
<td>Please see response to Comment IND-GP-3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Commissioner Poschman stated the EIR does not adequately make the case that a public building cannot get a variance. He stated that the EIR's analysis of the &quot;economic use&quot; Variance finding is such that no public building could ever get a Variance and that there is no opinion from the City Attorney to support this analysis, therefore the EIR is inadequate.</td>
<td>Please see response to Comment IND-GP-5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Source</td>
<td>Comment #</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Commission Poschman also stated the amendments could potentially allow a 3, 4, or 5 story building on a library site, but the EIR does not analyze the potential impacts of this outcome and only analyzes the outcome of the proposed buildings.</td>
<td>Please see response to Comment IND-GP-8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Commission Poschman wanted to know how the Judith Epstein/Todd Jersey alternatives compared to the Partial Preservation alternatives for West Branch in the EIR, and how not including these alternatives would affect the quality of the EIR.</td>
<td>Please see Master Response #3: Other Alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Commissioners asked if the publicly-proposed partial preservation alternatives meet the project objectives.</td>
<td>Table 5.2-2 on page 5.2-17 showed that the South Branch Partial Preservation Alternative failed to satisfy Project Objectives 2, 7, 8, 9, and 10. Table 5.3-2 on page 5.3-17 showed that both West Branch Partial Preservation Alternatives failed to satisfy Project Objectives 2, 8, and 9, and that Partial Preservation Alternative 1 also failed to satisfy Project Objective 10.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nicola Swinburne

From: Sage, Aaron E. [ASage@ci.berkeley.ca.us]
Sent: Monday, January 31, 2011 2:50 PM
To: Nicola Swinburne; Corbeil, Donna
Subject: FW: For Plan Commn. Members - Draft Library EIR Comments for today's meetingFYI -- Fw: Ignored Questions, Unannounced 11-Day Planning Dept. Closure 12-23-10 to 1-3-10... RE: Thanks, and some questions: RE: Link to Draft EIR for Branch Libraries

FYI.

From: Harrison, Jordan
Sent: Monday, January 31, 2011 11:33 AM
To: Sage, Aaron E.
Subject: FW: For Plan Commn. Members - Draft Library EIR Comments for today's meetingFYI -- Fw: Ignored Questions, Unannounced 11-Day Planning Dept. Closure 12-23-10 to 1-3-10... RE: Thanks, and some questions: RE: Link to Draft EIR for Branch Libraries

Comment letter on the EIR.

From: Library Users Association [mailto:libraryusers2004@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 19, 2011 5:36 PM
To: Harrison, Jordan
Subject: For Plan Commn. Members - Draft Library EIR Comments for today's meetingFYI -- Fw: Ignored Questions, Unannounced 11-Day Planning Dept. Closure 12-23-10 to 1-3-10... RE: Thanks, and some questions: RE: Link to Draft EIR for Branch Libraries

Dear Secretary Jordan Harrison:

Please distribute to Planning Commission members as soon as possible, preferably prior to tonight's meeting.

Thank you.

Peter Warfield
Library Users Association

Dear Planning Commission Members:

We hope that you review the Draft EIR with an awareness of some major concerns:

1. The information about the Draft EIR included some serious problems, including unavailability in paper format during the closure of the Planning Department for 11 days starting December 23, 2010 and extending through January 2, 2011. The Planning Department website did not carry information about the closure, the announcement of the Draft EIR did not include mention of the closure, and a request for open hours, so as to obtain a printed copy, which we made directly to the Planning Department staff, was ignored. (See attached email, below.)

In addition, the notice about the Draft EIR gave an incorrect day of the week for your meeting January
19, 2011 -- saying it was on Thursday. Additionally, the DEIR only, without Appendices, was listed as being available only at the Central library and two branches (excluding North and Claremont); while Mr. Sage said the document was available at all four branches, there has not, to our knowledge, been any correction published so that the public might know where it is actually available -- not were noted to be available.

A $20 charge for a copy could reduce public interest and comment.

2. The document unfortunately says the scope does -- not -- include locations that are not being demolished, even though the zoning ordinance amendment clearly applies to all five current library locations.

And the document exhibits an unfortunate bias in favor of the library administration, including apparent endorsements of the supposedly open process by which the public was informed of plans, and the supposed public acceptance. Please read Steven Finacom's long article in the December 14, 2010 Berkeley Daily Planet for another view on the library administration and Trustees' apparent indifference to public concerns, as well as the five Commentaries that I have written for the Planet starting in May, 2010.

3. While you may consider cutting books (heavy cuts at Claremont Branch) to be out of the scope of your deliberations, please consider the two impacts of new libraries: (a) an almost invariable jump in visitors, at least at the beginning; (b) increased travel to other branches and library systems as the public realizes the impoverishment of library design and services that has occurred.

Thank you for your attention to this.

Sincerely yours,

Peter Warfield
Executive Director
Library Users Association
415/753 - 2180

--- On Wed, 1/5/11, Library Users Association <libraryusers2004@yahoo.com> wrote:

From: Library Users Association <libraryusers2004@yahoo.com>
Subject: LPC Members: FYI -- Fw: Ignored Questions, Unannounced 11-Day Planning Dept. Closure 12-23-10 to 1-3-10... RE: Thanks, and some questions: RE: Link to Draft EIR for Branch Libraries
To: JClaiborne@CityofBerkeley.info
Date: Wednesday, January 5, 2011, 8:37 PM

Secretary:
Jay Claiborne (Acting LPC Secretary)
Planning & Development
(510) 981-7429
E-mail: JClaiborne@CityofBerkeley.info
Dear Secretary:

Please forward this letter to each member of the Landmarks Preservation Commission as soon as possible, and preferably prior to the next meeting, which I understand is January 6, 2011 and is to discuss the Library Draft EIR.

Thank you

Peter Warfield
Executive Director
Library Users Association

Dear Landmarks Preservation Commission Members:

When your scheduled discussion of the Draft EIR for the Berkeley Public Library occurs -- and we were informed that the discussion is scheduled for January 6, 2011 -- we ask you to keep in mind that the document was not available to the public in printed form for the entire period, December 23, 2011 through January 2, 2011.

Our request to obtain a copy and to learn when we could pick it up appears to have been ignored by the Planning Department staffer working on this. His response to our request made no mention of the office closure, with the result that we had no access over the holidays to the paper copy we requested in December. The email exchange is attached below.

Thank you for your attention to this.

Sincerely yours,

Peter Warfield
Executive Director
Library Users Association
415/753-2180

--- On Wed, 1/5/11, Library Users Association <libraryusers2004@yahoo.com> wrote:

From: Library Users Association <libraryusers2004@yahoo.com>
Subject: Ignored Questions, Unannounced 11-Day Planning Dept. Closure 12-23-10 to 1-3-10... RE: Thanks, and some questions: RE: Link to Draft EIR for Branch Libraries
To: "Aaron E.Sage" <ASage@ci.berkeley.ca.us>
Date: Wednesday, January 5, 2011, 8:27 PM

Dear Mr. Sage:

Your reply below to my last request, regarding the Draft EIR on the Library's legislation and building plans, ignored my question about your holiday schedule and the fact that I said I wished to pick up the Draft EIR regarding the library plans promptly or have it mailed.

This was particularly dismaying because I did not come to your office on the same day as you sent your reply --

1/31/2011
and learned the next day, by a recorded telephone message when I telephoned the Planning Department, that the entire Planning Department would be closed from that day -- Thursday, December 23, 2010, through January 2, 2011, reopening January 3, 2011.

In other words, I could neither pick up the document to study it, as I requested of you, nor could I ask any questions about it, for 11 days -- and there are meetings scheduled immediately afterwards, for example January 6, 2010 is the Landmarks Preservation meeting at which other information indicates this DEIR is to be discussed.

I think it unconscionable that the Draft EIR should be scheduled for these meetings, and have a comment closing date of January 31, when the requested printed report is inaccessible and the department closed for 11 of those 48 or so days -- especially when there has been no notice of this fact in your emails, the departmental announcement, or the departmental website.

Regarding locations of DEIRs and Appendices, my specific question might be stated more pointedly: WHY IS NEITHER The DEIR nor Appendices to be available at North Branch and Claremont Branch libraries? Certainly the zoning amendment portion affects the legality of their renovation approvals -- so why are DEIRS only (and not appendices) to be provided only to three library locations (with the Planning Department to have all the documents)?

I would urge the Planning Department to postpone the due date for DEIR comments because of the closure and short notice to the various city agencies that are to consider the document this month.

Peter Warfield
Executive Director
Library Users Association
415/7 5 3 - 2 1 8 0

--- On Wed, 12/22/10, Sage, Aaron E. <ASage@ci.berkeley.ca.us> wrote:

From: Sage, Aaron E. <ASage@ci.berkeley.ca.us>
Subject: RE: Thanks, and some questions: RE: Link to Draft EIR for Branch Libraries
To: libraryusers2004@yahoo.com
Date: Wednesday, December 22, 2010, 9:58 AM

Mr. Warfield, I will mail you a CD rom free of charge. As to where the documents are available, this is our standard practice, going back several years at least.

Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Aaron Sage

From: Library Users Association [mailto:libraryusers2004@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, December 21, 2010 8:51 PM
To: Sage, Aaron E.
Subject: Thanks, and some questions: RE: Link to Draft EIR for Branch Libraries
Dear Aaron Sage:

Thank you for this; I expect to come shortly but if I cannot, could you mail (and what would be the cost for mailing) the DEIR and appendices on CD rom? Also, **what is your work schedule for the holiday period, meaning when might I drop by and find you in the office?**

Also -- how was it determined where the locations for the DEIR documents would be and what portions of the full DEIR with Appendices? If mandated by regulation or law, a citation, preferably with text, would be helpful.

Thank you--

Peter Warfield  
Executive Director  
Library Users Association  
415/753-2180

--- On Thu, 12/16/10, Sage, Aaron E. <ASage@ci.berkeley.ca.us> wrote:

From: Sage, Aaron E. <ASage@ci.berkeley.ca.us>  
Subject: Re: Link to Draft EIR for Branch Libraries  
To: libraryusers2004@yahoo.com  
Date: Thursday, December 16, 2010, 12:06 PM

Hi Peter,

A hard copy of the EIR, not including the appendices, is $20.00. It is available now. For the appendices, you would need to take a CD rom (available from us for free) to a printer (e.g., FedEx Office) to have it printed. Please let me know if any questions.

Aaron

______________________________________________________________

From: Library Users Association [mailto:libraryusers2004@yahoo.com]  
Sent: Wednesday, December 15, 2010 1:19 PM  
To: Sage, Aaron E.  
Subject: Re: Link to Draft EIR for Branch Libraries
Dear Aaron Sage:

Thank you for this notice. How much would a hard copy cost and how soon could I obtain one?

Peter Warfield  
Executive Director  
Library Users Association  
415/7 5 3 - 2 1 8 0

--- On Wed, 12/15/10, Sage, Aaron E. <ASage@ci.berkeley.ca.us> wrote:

From: Sage, Aaron E. <ASage@ci.berkeley.ca.us>  
Subject: Link to Draft EIR for Branch Libraries  
To:  
Date: Wednesday, December 15, 2010, 11:22 AM

Dear community member,  
The Draft EIR for the South and West Branch Libraries and Zoning Amendment has now been posted on the Planning Department’s website at the following link. (This is a more direct link than the one provided in my previous e-mail.) Please let me know if you have any questions.  
http://www.ci.berkeley.ca.us/ContentDisplay.aspx?id=62528  

Aaron Sage, AICP  
Senior Planner  
City of Berkeley  
ph 510-981-7425  
fax 510-981-7420  
Please note that I am out of the office on Fridays. Thank you.

From: Sage, Aaron E.  
Sent: Tuesday, December 14, 2010 6:04 PM  
Subject: Draft EIR now available for South and West Branch Library Projects and Zoning Amendment  
Dear community member,  
The City of Berkeley has completed a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for a proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment (ZOA) to allow flexibility in the application of development standards at the City’s existing public libraries, and for proposed development projects at the South Branch Library and at the West Branch Library. The Draft EIR will be available online at the following link beginning tomorrow, December 15:  
http://www.ci.berkeley.ca.us/ContentDisplay.aspx?id=362#DEIR  
Hard copies and CDs are available for purchase. Please see attached notice for further information regarding this document and opportunities for public review and comment, and let me know if you have any questions.  
<< File: 2010-12-14_NOA_Corrected_Library EIR.pdf >>  

Aaron Sage, AICP  
Senior Planner  
City of Berkeley  
ph 510-981-7425  
fax 510-981-7420  
Please note that I am out of the office on Fridays. Thank you.
Planning Department  
c/o Aaron Sage  
Berkeley, California  
By email: asage @ cityofberkeley.info  

Subject: Library Draft EIR Comments - Berkeley Public Library -  
“Significant Impacts” Is an Understatement for the Impact 
Of Two Demolitions, and Proposed Zoning Ordinance 
Amendment  

Ladies and Gentlemen:  

We are commenting on the “Berkeley Branch Libraries Program  
Draft Environmental Impact Report,” SCH # 2010062051, Prepared for  
the City of Berkeley by Design, Community & Environment (DC&B),  
with “technical subconsultants” Page and Turnbull, issued December 14,  
2010.  

First, we agree with the overall assessment that the impact of  
demolishing South Branch and West Branch libraries would be  
significant, and that the mitigation efforts described would still leave  
impacts that “remain significant and unavoidable.” (page 2-9)  

But we think that this impact is an understatement. That is because the  
target libraries represent half of all Berkeley’s library branches, and  
because, at least in the case of Hans Ostwald, the South Branch architect,  
s has one of the few public buildings he designed and one of just a small  
handful of libraries that he designed. South Branch won an AIA/ALA  
award as well. Both South and West Branch libraries have been  
recognized by the city as having excellent architectural qualities that  
merit preservation.  

We are concerned that the Zoning Ordinance Amendment has not clearly  
been identified as having a significant impact -- without time limit -- and  
it has only been discussed in regard to currently planned demolitions,
omitting the potential impacts on all current library locations. Additionally there is no explanation as to why the Central Library should be included in an ordinance that the report says is intended to “facilitate[e] Branch Library projects.” (page 1-4)

In general, we are concerned that the problems with the planned projects have been understated and the supposed pro-project positions overstated.

Attached are some additional comments on this document.

Thank you for your attention to this.

Sincerely yours,

Peter Warfield
Executive Director
Library Users Association
Some Comments on the December 14, 2010 Draft EIR for Berkeley
Public Library

There has been no comment about the environmental impact of a
bookmobile traveling around Berkeley while the branches are being re-
built or renovated. Renovations with expansions would presumably
require less time to complete, and less time for a bookmobile to generate
environmental impacts.

In addition, the library has not seriously considered providing the interim
service that was provided when the Central Library was closed for
renovation: a stationary store front (or other fixed location). Such a
facility, or a trailer parked at or near the libraries having construction,
would likely be far less environmentally harmful than a vehicle that must
be driven out to branches and back multiple days a week.

Why wasn’t this impact considered?

This EIR is said to be 1,878 pages long -- making review and public
comment exceptionally arduous, especially for those with a primary
interest in just one aspect, e.g. one branch. Why was this EIR structured
this way?

The availability of the EIR was undermined by the closure of the
Planning Department for 11 days shortly after it was issued, making
paper copies completely unavailable for one quarter of the comment
time.

The DEIR repeatedly uses prejudicial terminology to reference the
Zoning Amendment Ordinance (ZOA). It is not providing
zoning “flexibility” but a fixed exemption from the need for Variances --
a blank check in perpetuity. And why aren’t the potential environmental
impacts of easing development on all five library locations discussed?
Why did the ZOA include Central Library, even though it was excluded from Measure FF?

The many negative comments from the public about various aspects of the projects is ignored or occasionally hinted at as being in the Appendix. Meanwhile, we read how the October 20, 2010 meeting received coments “all in favor of the project.” (p. 1-9)

We also read that some negative comments were “outside the scope of this CEQA review,” but we do not get an analysis of the favorable comments as to their scope. Why not?

While comments about loss of books are said to be outside the scope of this CEQA review, this DEIR repeatedly talks about the library’s objectives regarding books. Isn’t that inconsistent?

Further, we read that the South Branch project is to improve the library with, among other things, “a minimum ten-percent increase in book shelving…” Was someone working too close to a marijuana dispensary? The South Branch program, according to the architect, speaking at a BOLT meeting last summer, was to provide ONE LINEAR FOOT of additional shelving in a branch that would increase floor space by 64%. The actual was shown as 85 linear feet added, or less than 5%. Where did this ten percent figure come from? Later in the report there is no mention of shelving increases as a goal (p. 3-4).

Why is there no mention of the generally large increase in visits that all new libraries tend to experience? What about the drop in visits and increased visits to other libraries/jurisdictions once patrons realize how poorly the design may work? Poor design example: South Branch’s desk facing AWAY FROM THE ENTRANCE in Fig. 5.2-3. Another poor design example: The entrance to the South Branch is completely un-observed by any desk (Fig. 3-2). It’s mugger alley, and additionally has nothing of interest to a library patron shown. Another example:
South Branch’s entrance is surrounded on either side by non-book activity: the mostly-empty and unused meeting room at the left, and staff areas on the right. Only at a distance is the children’s area visible at the far right. From MLK Jr Way, no books or reading activities are visible.

The Library has been extraordinarily bad at providing the public with information about key elements of its plan, including such things as book cuts at Claremont and public floor space cuts there. See Exhibits’ A and B.
Since the passage of Measure FF in November 2008, the Library has embarked on its building program to improve accessibility, code compliance and seismic safety in all the neighborhood branches.

Field Paoli (www.fieldpaoli.com) is the design team selected to work on the South Branch / Tool Lending Library project. The Board of Library Trustees has decided to replace the existing building of 5,400 sq. ft. with a new, larger 8,656 sq. ft. library that complies with all current codes including being seismically safe and fully ADA-accessible, to serve the South Berkeley community into the future. Information on the condition of the existing branch is available in the Branch Facilities Master Planning and was updated in the design process by the architects. Input from the community during the design process, which included four neighborhood community meetings and four design presentations to the Board of Library Trustee, was a critical piece in the decision-making process.

The new South Branch / Tool Lending Library will be a warm and welcoming building with improved lighting, ventilation, and thermal comfort. It will create a civic presence for pedestrians and passersby, will be easier to use with a more spacious and organized layout and will be part of the revitalization of the South Berkeley neighborhood. With input from the community and staff, the design team has brought the Tool Lending Library and South Branch Library together into one space with distinct zones throughout the building for adults, teens, and children’s services and a true separation of noisy and quiet areas. Features of the design include a flexibly planned program space which will be available throughout the day for multiple purposes and a small group study room. The library will have more seating, including lounge chairs, more public access computers, improved collection access and additional space for laptop users.

The much loved, unique Tool Lending Library will have a larger space with adequate storage for their large collection of tools, designated staff space for maintenance and repair of the collection, adequate counter and display space, and the two short term parking spaces for pick-up and drop off will remain.

In keeping with Berkeley’s commitment to a green future, the new library design will reduce energy and water consumption. The design team will be working to attain LEED Gold Certification, adding photovoltaics to offset dependence on the energy grid and taking advantage of natural lighting and ventilation opportunities. One such feature is a central, day-lit browsing area with popular materials, media, holds, and self-check stations. The new library will serve the community well into the future.

The planning process is ongoing. The City of Berkeley Planning & Development Department is managing the CEQA process and an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is underway. Prior to construction beginning the final plans will be reviewed by the Zoning Adjustment Board, the Board of Library Trustees, and other agencies as required.

For more project information, go to http://berkeleypubliclibrary.org/branchimprovements or call 510-981-6195.

The Library continues to seek input from the Berkeley community! Please share your comments, questions, and ideas about the branch improvement projects on a Branch Improvement Program Comment Form. We value your input!
Reader Commentaries

**Opposing Zoning Ordinance Changes Regarding Demolishing Libraries**

*By Peter Warfield  
Tuesday May 25, 2010*

This is a letter Library Users Association sent to the Planning Commission expressing concern about the Berkeley Public Library's product and process for carrying out branch library renovations under Measure FF and the consequent concerns about granting the Library special exemptions from the customary scrutiny that its current and future building projects would undergo:

Honorable Members:

As supporters of good libraries and good library service, we respectfully oppose granting the above-referenced zoning changes as a kind of partial zoning blank check for current and as yet unspecified future “improvement projects,” as your public notice refers to them, by the Berkeley Public Library, and we ask you not to approve the amendments at your May 26, 2010 meeting or at any other meeting.
Our primary reasons are twofold:

1. **There is at least serious question as to whether the Library is doing the right thing with its planned renovations**, and instead degrading and dumbing down libraries through a book de-emphasis program that appears to be well along in the planning stages. Despite a small increase in floor space, Claremont Branch is to receive a 23% decrease in linear feet of shelving. West Branch is to receive 50% more floor space, but only a 3% increase in shelving.

2. **The Library has misrepresented its plans and misled the public with respect to the facts about its plans.** As a consequence, the Library needs far greater scrutiny for its actions, rather than another opportunity to evade accountability.

Some may argue that surely the Library has in the past fully reported, and would in future fully describe, its plans in public – but my personal experience at last week’s meeting of the Board of Library Trustees (BOLT) says otherwise.

**WEST BRANCH**

The architect’s presentation on West Branch plans at the May 12, 2010 BOLT meeting showed a new building – and a small portion of one chart showed a **50% increase in floor space but only a 3% increase in linear feet of shelving** for books and materials. These percentages, which represent a de-emphasis on books, were nowhere shown or mentioned in the agenda packet for the meeting, which included a memo to the Trustees from Director of Library Services Donna Corbeil, plus three attachments: a 4-22-10 Community Meeting announcement, meeting notes from the meeting, and eight pages of the architect’s “Design Schemes” and “Schematic Designs.” Neither the meeting announcement nor the notes, which included summaries what the architects said, made any mention of specific shelving statistics. (The notes said there were “7 non-library attendees, over ½ were first time attendees.”)

In the meeting room was a glossy, color booklet apparently prepared by the library, titled “Shaping the Future of Your Neighborhood Library; the Berkeley Public Library Branch Libraries Facilities Master Plan” (SFYNL), which purported to present a “summary of the Facilities Master Plan and the promise it brings for our branch libraries.” Neither the planned demolition of the West branch nor the book de-emphasis were even hinted at in the Library’s booklet. Instead the booklet boasted that the branch “In May of 2003, was designated by the City
The May 12, 2010 BOLT meeting continued with a different architect’s presentation on Claremont Branch renovations. No statistics were presented about such basic aspects of the renovation as floor space increases/decreases, shelving, etc. Only after two members of the public complained about a floor space reduction for children, and book reductions generally, did the library director acknowledge that some details could be found in the agenda packet. A page on “Existing Vs. Proposed Conditions” revealed adult book shelving is to be cut by 27%, and overall shelving reduced 23%. The Library’s booklet, SFYNL, says nothing about Claremont’s shelving reductions – instead, it says, “The branch boasts a large collection...” and it promises “a more efficient interior layout.”

We note that the library’s plan to cut 913 linear feet of shelving from Claremont’s current listed total of 4,027 was buried in a quarter-inch thick agenda packet, and is equal to eliminating more than 60 bookcases, each one three feet wide and five shelves high.

The Berkeley Public Library Foundation’s full-size color fundraising brochure, copies of which were also on the table at the meeting, is also misleading. The title is, “Four Branches, One Goal; the Neighborhood Libraries Campaign.” It makes no mention of the planned book reductions at Claremont Branch and the book de-emphasis in West Branch, although it does reference “replacement of the current [West Branch] building with a brand new building.” For Claremont Branch, the brochure specifically praises written materials as follows: “Claremont’s collection – strong in travel, art, bestsellers, literary fiction, magazines, and newspapers – will be more accessible with the help of this [fund-raising] Campaign.” And on the opposite page, the brochure highlights in large type, “Last year, neighborhood library users checked out 875,000 items – books, DVDs, other media, and more.” (Emphasis in the original.) But nothing is said about Claremont’s many planned reductions in specific categories of shelving: 42 linear feet cut from Children’s Books, and 30 feet cut from Children’s A/V; Teen Books + A/V are to be cut by 105 linear feet. Adult Books are to be cut by 607 linear feet (from 2264, a 27% reduction). Adult Magazines are to be cut by 80 feet, Adult A/V cut by 172 feet (of an existing 252 – a 68% reduction). Lighter reading gets increased shelf space: Children’s Magazines, and Teen Magazines are increasing by 12 and 36 linear feet, respectively. The only other increase in shelving is +75 feet for holds, up from zero – these are materials obtained from other branches or library systems when not available at the branch.
The May 12, 2010 BOLT agenda packet included notes of a March 31, 2010 community meeting on Claremont Branch’s Design Development. The notes show “16 non-library audience members” attended. Of 15 comments, both that were related to shelving and books commented negatively on the book and shelving reductions. The two pages of notes do not say what, if anything, the public was shown or told about the reductions.

**SUMMARY**

While we have not yet reviewed renovation plans for the other two branches, we are very concerned that the product of at least these two library renovations appears to be a dumbing down of the service, while the Library’s practices both un-inform and mis-inform the public. We therefore ask you not to allow less accountability than is currently required. We urge rejection of the proposed zoning amendments to Title 23 of the Berkeley Municipal Code for “Development Flexibility for Existing Public Libraries.”

Library Users Association thanks you for your efforts on this matter.

*Peter Warfield is Executive Director of the Library Users Association.*

Email: libraryusers2004@yahoo.com

******************************************************************************

**TWO.**

Berkeley's Branch Library Plans:
Two Demolitions Instead of Renovation, Book Cuts and
Permanent Changes to Zoning Variance Requirements

By Peter Warfield (Partisan Position)
Monday June 21, 2010

The promise of Library Measure FF (2008) to “renovate and expand” Berkeley Public Library’s four branch libraries, has instead turned into plans to demolish and replace two of the branches, cut shelving for books and materials, eliminate all reference desks in favor of roving reference librarians – and on June 29 the City Council is expected to vote on zoning legislation that would permanently exempt all existing library buildings from having to obtain variances for any future changes, or demolitions combined with new library construction on the same site.

West Branch, despite being a city “structure of merit,” and South Branch, are both to be demolished and replaced with new buildings. A library-sponsored review of these facilities found that both have qualities that could make them worthy of landmarking, but 1970s renovations at West Branch and neglect over time at South Branch have damaged or hidden many of their landmark-worthy features.

Claremont Branch is to get a small addition of 340 square feet while losing 913 linear feet of shelving for books and materials, out of the existing 4,027 – a 23% cut in space for books. Other branches are to receive floor space expansions of 50% or more, while book space is to increase by only 4%.

The traditional adult and children’s reference desks – separate from each other and apart from busy and noisy circulation desks – are to be eliminated. The “Building Program,” authored by Page + Moris, dated January 2010, says that for South and West branches, “One service desk will serve the whole library.” The other branch building programs say the same thing in almost identical words. The reference librarians will be roving about, we are told in the “Building Program” and the same thing was said at one of the Board of Library Trustees (BOLT) meetings I attended in May and June. The “Building Program” says, “Librarians will be encouraged circulate through the public areas when they are on ‘desk duty’ for proactive interaction with library users, rather than to remain at the [single] Service Desk at all times.”

And another change in Berkeley’s branch libraries will be “Recognition Opportunities.” That means, in exchange for donations to the Berkeley Public Library Foundation, donor names and honorees are to be posted in locations such as library rooms, on or at the “North Branch
Chandelier,” on equipment such as self-check stations, in Children/Teen/Adult Areas, on book shelves. Additionally publicity from the Foundation says, “A donor wall will be prominently located in each branch,” and those giving more than $2,500 will receive “temporary recognition” in the Central Library.

Three current designs exceed lot coverage or setback requirements, some by substantial amounts. North Branch’s blockbuster two-story addition would add 77% to existing floor space – with only a 4% increase in shelving space for books. The addition would cause lot coverage to jump from 32% to 43% in a district zoned for a maximum of 40%. The park-like area to the west of the library, along Josephine Street, would have a two-story addition jutting out from the existing building, about 55 feet wide, and coming to as close as four feet from the property line, just 16 feet from the curb. The exact width and setback distance were unavailable as of June 10 because plans on file with the Planning Department did not show them, an error acknowledged by a Planning Department employee.

South Branch plans provide for lot coverage to balloon from 38% to 61%, where the allowable is 50%. In addition, two of South Branch’s proposed setbacks conflict with what is permitted. The West setback is to range from three feet to 37 feet, where six feet is required. And the North setback is to range from 6 feet 6 inches to 16 feet, where 15 feet is the minimum required.

Claremont Branch lot coverage increases from 60% to 63%, with a permitted coverage of 50%. A variance for the existing lot coverage was granted circa 1974, according to the Planning Department.

The Planning Department on May 26 voted 7-2 to recommend City Council approval of proposed zoning legislation, paving the way for City Council action expected June 29. At a “preview” of North Branch and Claremont branch plans presented to the Zoning Adjustments Board (ZAB) meeting June 10, one of the commissioners ask whether such legislation for exemption from having to obtain variances has been provided for other agencies. The Planning Department representative said No.

Bradley Wiedmaier, an architectural historian, said the proposed permanent zoning exemption represents “an assault on planning.” “North Branch’s new addition places an urban high-density addition, that is more suitable for a commercial district, into a residential, low-density neighborhood,” he said.

John English, a Berkeley citizen and preservationist, said “The most outrageous thing is that the Board (of Library Trustees) plans demolitions. Measure FF does not authorize demolition – it authorized renovations.”
Poor Maintenance Affects Library Branches

Berkeley has not been kind to all of its branch libraries. A report that includes the condition and history of Berkeley’s libraries was prepared for the library by Noll and Tam Architects in July, 2008. North Branch is a city landmark in “good to excellent” condition, and Claremont Branch “appears eligible to [be listed] to the California Register under Criterion 3 (design) with an overall condition of “good to excellent.”

The Noll and Tam report said of South Branch: “It appears the property is eligible to [be listed on] the California Register for its association with architect John Hans Ostwald and potentially for its design characteristics.” But the report says the condition of the building is “fair to bad.” The report recommended “stabilization and repair” of “exterior portions of the original building [which] are among its most deteriorated features, though they appear very easy to restore. Additionally, they recommend “reversal of incompatible alterations.” And, they wrote, “Restoration of the original lighting would measurably increase the historical integrity of the building in a way likely to be readily understood by many visitors. The same is true of the skylights.” A 1975 book about the architect, John Hans Ostwald, would make assessment of the significance of the building easier, according to the report.

At West Branch, the report says 1970s changes have spoiled its “historical integrity.” “Most of the original exterior elevations are no longer visible, the ceiling in the reading room has been lowered, (adult reading room), and the original entry steps have been floored over. The 1970s additions are so divergent from the original in character, and alter and cover it so much on both interior and exterior, that they impair the historical integrity of the property.”

The report also includes pictures of West Branch’s coved ceiling and “wood crown molding” currently not visible because they are above the “suspended acoustic ceiling system in adult reading room’s northwest corner.”

********************************************************************************

Peter Warfield is Executive Director of Library Users Association.

A previous article about library renovation plans was published in the Berkeley Daily Planet May 25, 2010, “Opposing Zoning Ordinance Changes Regarding Demolishing Libraries”.

********************************************************************************

THREE.
Berkeley City Council to Take Final Vote on Library Exemption from Zoning Variances

By Peter Warfield, Executive Director, Library Users' Association
Monday July 05, 2010

Berkeley's City Council is scheduled to vote tonight, July 6, 2010, on a second, and presumably final, passage of legislation that would exempt the Berkeley Public Library (BPL) from having to obtain zoning Variances for any future renovations to, or demolitions with replacement of, existing buildings, including the downtown Central library.

At a contentious City Council meeting June 29, during which members of the public and then Council members raised questions about the legality and propriety of Measure FF (2008) being used to demolish two branch libraries, the Council nonetheless voted 10-0, with one abstention (Arreguin) to approve the legislation on first reading.

There were several problematic aspects to what happened, particularly regarding the accuracy of information provided to the City Council by the Planning Department and Board of Library Trustees (BOLT).

A Planning Department memo to the Mayor and City Council, dated June 29, 2010, asserted that the City Attorney gave advice about the legality of the library's planned demolition of South Branch and West Branch prior to planned replacement with new buildings. But when we caught up with the author of the memo, we were told that the advice had been given orally -- not in writing. We found this surprising, to say the least.
We are accustomed to seeing City Attorney opinions on significant matters made in writing. These are typically carefully worded products of research and experience, often containing citations to legal cases. The opinions usually state the question asked, and may extrapolate to questions not asked but still relevant to the matter at hand.

Additionally, we found an apparent serious error in the Planning Department memo's statement about the wording of Measure FF. The memo says, "Measure FF expressly referred to 'construction,' and therefore its funds "may be used for construction of new libraries." But we double-checked the wording and there is no mention of "construction" in the measure itself. The word "construction" is only used in the "City Attorney's Impartial Analysis of Measure FF."

The Planning Department memo additionally says Measure FF "does not prohibit demolition," and that "the City Attorney has also advised that Measure FF funds should not be used for demolition...." In somewhat tortured logic, the memo says, "current plans are to use other funds for demolition."

Susan Kupfer, Chair of the Board of Library Trustees (BOLT), sent a letter to the City Council dated June 18, 2010, in which she makes some interesting statements. One of them is this: "While the existing buildings are grandfathered in place, and the planned renovations and/or new construction are not an expansion of library collections or services, the lots on which they are located are small and there is the need to provide upgraded and compliant facilities which might require variances of the current code."

But in fact, it is not the case that the new library facility designs "might" require variances -- all three designs for all three branches whose designs are at the Planning Department DO require variances under current code. We noted this in a previous Daily Planet Article in the June 22, 2010 issue, "Berkeley's Branch Library Plans: Two Demolitions Instead of Renovation, Book Cuts and Permanent Changes to Zoning Variance Requirements."

North Branch's planned blockbuster two-story addition, which would extend close to Josephine Street, would add 77% to existing square footage, and would exceed the currently allowable 40% lot coverage. The plans would increase lot coverage to 43%, from the current 32%. 
South Branch, currently planned as a demolition and complete rebuild, would violate current zoning codes regarding both lot coverage and setbacks. Allowable lot coverage now is 50%, while the existing building covers 38%. The planned building's lot coverage would be 61%. The planned building would also violate existing setback requirements on two of its sides.

And Claremont Branch plans would also increase lot coverage beyond what was approved in the early 1970s as a variance allowing 60% coverage where 50% was and still is the maximum allowed. The newly planned expansion would make the building cover 63% of the lot.

Here is the exact wording of the Planning Department's June 29, 2010 paragraph regarding Measure FF and the library's demolition plans:

"Regarding the concerns raised by community members as to whether the proposed projects are consistent with Measure FF, the City Attorney has confirmed that Measure FF does not require expansion or retention of book shelving, and does not prohibit demolition. However, the City Attorney has also advised that Measure FF funds should not be used for demolition absent a validation action. Thus, at present there are no plans to use Measure FF funds for demolition. Rather, current plans are to use other funds for demolition. Because Measure FF expressly referred to 'construction,' Measure FF funds may be used for construction of new libraries."

This is wording of "City of Berkeley Bond Measure FF": "Shall the City of Berkeley issue general obligation bonds not exceeding $26,000,000 to renovate, expand, and make seismic and access improvements at four neighborhood branch libraries, but not the Central Library, with annual reporting by the Library Board to the City Council?"

And here is the second paragraph of the "City Attorney's Impartial Analysis of Measure FF":

"This bond measure would authorize the issuance of $26 million of general obligation bonds. The bond measure specifies that bond proceeds would be limited to renovation, construction, seismic, and disabled access improvements, and expansion of program areas at the City's four neighborhood branch libraries, but not the Central Library downtown. Current plans for renovation include restoration and refurbishment of historic features at the branch libraries as part of any renovation."
Peter Warfield is Executive Director of Library Users Association.


******************************************************************************

FOUR.

BAHA Opposition to Demolitions:


Also at:  http://tinyurl.com/BPLPlans-4

Page One

**BAHA Opposes Library Demolitions; Council Approves Zoning Waiver for Library**

*By Peter Warfield (Partisan Position)*

*Monday July 26, 2010*

Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association (BAHA) has taken a formal position opposing demolition of Berkeley Public Library’s (BPL’s) South Branch Library, in a letter sent to the Planning Department earlier this month.

Meantime, the City Council on July 6 approved the library’s permanent exemption from having to obtain variances for existing buildings that are to be renovated or demolished and replaced,
and the Zoning Adjustments Board (ZAB) July 22 voted to approve use permits for Claremont and North Branch libraries, subject to the City Council’s exemption taking effect August 9. The use permits would allow the library to move forward with its renovation plans for the two libraries.

The library’s plans for Claremont Branch included a cut of 913 linear feet of shelving for books and materials, which is 23% of the library’s figure for existing shelving of 4,098 linear feet. However, in a modest victory for critics of the cuts, the library’s director, Donna Corbeil, said at the July 14 meeting of the Board of Library Trustees that the shelving cuts would be reduced. An attachment to the agenda showed a net shelving reduction of 574 linear feet, still a substantial number. The cuts would affect shelving for everything except Teen Magazines, Children “Programming,” and Holds (material from other library branches or library systems), which are to be increased by 34, 90, and 96 feet, respectively. The collection and media categories would be cut for all categories of users: adults, teens, and children.

In addition to formal opposition on South Branch, expressed in comment on an upcoming Environmental Impact Report, BAHA’s president, Daniella Thompson, writes in the online BAHA News dated July 21, 2010, “We are dismayed to learn that the Library Board of Trustees is planning to demolish two branch libraries: West Berkeley and South Berkeley.” She adds, “The Library Bond Measure FF, which passed in the November 2008 election, promised an altogether different outcome.”

Thompson goes on to say that “The West Berkeley Branch Library (William K. Bartges, 1923) was designated a Structure of Merit in 2003, and any application for a demolition permit should require CEQA review and a public hearing before the Landmarks Preservation Commission.”

South Branch, Thompson writes, “designed by John Hans Ostwald in 1960, is one of Berkeley’s Mid-Century Modern gems.”

Measure FF said the following: “Shall the City of Berkeley issue general obligation bonds not exceeding $26,000,000 to renovate, expand, and make seismic and access improvements at four neighborhood branch libraries, but not the Central Library, with annual reporting by the Library Board to the City Council?”

Measure FF made no mention of demolition.

According to a Planning Department memo to the City Council, the City Attorney has since advised that Measure FF funds may not be used for demolition, but could be used to rebuild libraries if funding for demolitions came from another source. As noted in a previous Commentary, the Planning Department said that this advice had been given orally, not in writing.

Numerous members of the public have spoken at public meetings and written letters opposing the library’s plans, particularly the demolitions.
At the City Council’s July 6, 2010 meeting, Council Member Susan Wengraf asked Director of Library Services Donna Corbeil “why the recommendation has been made that the two branches be demolished rather than be restored.” Ms. Wengraf said, “it would be useful for [the public] to know.”

Ms. Corbeil replied as follows, according to the city’s unofficial text file provided by Certified Realtime Reporter [Note: “sic” means we are quoting what was written, even though it may not appear to be quite right]:

“I am Donna Corbeil, director of the library. I think to speak to them together doesn’t do either one of those projects together [sic]. But the South Berkeley branch, we had extensive discussions there about the library and the architect looked at many options of trying to make that a functional library, to have as much square footage as we possibly could, and as you know there are two libraries also there. And brought forward several different options to the community, including keeping a portion of the current building. We also met I think at least three times with a subcommittee of the landmarks preservation commission to discussion [sic] the projects and options under consideration and held community meetings. It became clear in order to maximize that space to have as much library as we could and to function as efficiently as possible that a one-story option was preferred and that we could make best use of that site for the tool library and the library both with an entirely new building versus trying to keep one small section of the original building. So a lot of thought went into that, and it took many, many months to get to that place where the library board discussed that opening, I think at more than one meeting before they made that recommendation.” Ms. Corbeil continued: “The West branch project is a little bit – is not quite to that stage yet. We have held community meetings discussing the options. Again, the community – at the community meetings we talked about repainting the oldest portion of the building. As you know, it was added on to later on, and unfortunately, a large portion of the original building was destroyed in that addition at that time. And that branch is unique in that it houses the Berkeley Reads program which is our adult literacy program. And so trying to again maximize our space for both the Berkeley Reads program and Berkeley desire [sic] is to have one library so it runs more efficiently. Not to go on about it. But I think the board felt that was the best option for that community, given the space, a well functioning library, and to accommodate the needs of the literacy program. So that project is still under discussion as well.”

“S. Wengraf: Thank you very much.”

Peter Warfield is Executive Director of Library Users Association. Email: Libraryusers2004@yahoo.com.

Previous articles about Library plans by the same author have appeared in the Berkeley Daily Planet’s issues of May 22, June 25, and July 6, 2010.
Berkeleyside published an article two days later, dated July 28, by Frances Dinkelspiel, “South branch library demolition opposed.”

It quoted library director Donna Corbeil as saying the following about the South Branch Library:

“It’s a concrete block building,” she said. “It was a cute design for its time, but it was really built on the cheap. “

The full article is provided below. The url is:

**FIVE.**


Also at: http://tinyurl.com/BPLPlans-5

**Page One**

Library Continues March to RFID, Branch Demolitions Despite Opposition and Lawsuit
Berkeley Public Library’s Board of Library Trustees (BOLT) approved the purchase of a new RFID (Radio Frequency Identification) check-out/check-in system from a new vendor, Bibliotheca, to replace the existing system from Checkpoint, despite near-unanimous opposition from members of the public at the meeting, whose concerns included privacy threats, high cost, and potential health risks to the public and staff from radio frequency radiation.

BOLT took the action on a unanimous 4-0 vote at a Special Meeting October 18, 2010 (Winston Burton, Abigail Franklin, Susan Kupfer, and Darryl Moore, with Carolyn Henry-Golphin absent). The Trustees approved signing a three-year contract not to exceed $447,006, through October 28, 2013.

The Monday, October 18th Special Meeting had been called after cancellation of the regularly scheduled meeting of Wednesday, October 13. With agendas mailed late Thursday, October 14th, according to the library, a number of the members of the public on the mailing list only received notice the same day as the specially-scheduled Monday meeting. It appeared to be a very hastily called meeting with minimal advance notice, on a matter the library has been considering for well over a year.

A contract for an RFID system was signed with the vendor, Bibliotheca, on October 29, 2010.

Despite the short notice and unusual time and day of the meeting, nine members of the public spoke during Public Comment. Every member of the public who spoke to the matter of RFID opposed the system, suggesting the library obtain a barcode system instead. One member of the public did not address the issue of RFID but rather praised the library for taking steps toward fulfilling its obligations under the Nuclear Free Berkeley Act (NFBA).

The City Council on January 27, 2009, had granted the library a two-year waiver under the Act so as to allow the 3M company to maintain the library’s existing proprietary RFID check-out/check-in system for just two years, with the expectation that the library would find a compliant vendor to maintain or replace the system within that time. The library wanted to give the 3M Company a contract to take over over maintenance of the library’s Checkpoint RFID system in 2008, when 3M became Checkpoint’s exclusive provider of maintenance. However, 3M would not sign Berkeley’s standard form that it would not do work for nuclear weapons during the life of the contract.

Questions remain as to the scheduling of the new RFID system’s installation, and when the 3M maintenance contract for the existing system is to be terminated. The Library’s plans indicate implementation is to be phased, beginning with Central, and the West and South branches. Implementation at North and Claremont branches is to occur in fiscal year 2011-2012. The latter installations would exceed the City Council’s two-year waiver of the Nuclear Free Berkeley Act by four to 16 months, and raise the question of when use of the existing system and its maintenance by 3M are to be ended.
Lawsuit Against Demolitions Filed

Recently, a group called Concerned Library Users (CLU) filed a lawsuit opposing the Library’s plans to demolish West Branch and South Branch library buildings. The demolitions are part of the Library’s plan to replace these buildings with brand-new ones, rather than renovate and expand the branches, as provided by Measure FF, which passed in 2008.

Library publicity and studies have praised both the West Branch and South Branch library buildings for their architectural qualities. West Branch was designated by the city as a “Structure of Merit” and Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association (BAHA) is among those supporting renovation and expansion, instead of demolition.

The CLU lawsuit argues that Measure FF provided funding for renovations and expansions -- not demolitions -- and that the Library’s current demolition plans are not a legitimate use of the funds provided by the measure.

An appeal of the Zoning Adjustment Board’s approval for the North and Claremont branch libraries’ building expansions has also been filed and is scheduled to be heard by the Berkeley City Council on December 7, 2010. The Library’s plans would expand both branches beyond the lot coverage percentages allowed prior to the recent City Council action to permanently waive the need for variances when existing library buildings are expanded or demolished and rebuilt.

The CLU lawsuit also challenges the legality of the City Council’s legislation because, it says, potential environmental impacts were not adequately considered as required under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The planned renovations to the Claremont Branch, despite a small increase in floor space, would provide less floor space for the public, according to a Planning Department memo, and would also diminish public service by drastically cutting back on existing space for books, according to library plans. The library plans for North Branch include a very substantial 77% increase in floor space, but a much smaller percentage increase in shelving for books and materials. In both instances this represents an unfortunate book de-emphasis.

**********************************/////

Peter Warfield is Executive Director of Library Users Association and can be reached at libraryusers2004@yahoo.com. Four articles about the Berkeley Public Library’s branch renovation and demolition plans have previously appeared in the Berkeley Daily Planet in May, June, and July, 2010.
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-----Original Message-----
From: Daniella Thompson [mailto:editor@berkeleyheritage.com]
Sent: Monday, January 31, 2011 2:47 PM
To: Sage, Aaron E.
Cc: baha@berkeleyheritage.com
Subject: BAHAs comments on Branch Libraries DEIR

Aaron,

Attached please find BAHAs comments on the Branch Libraries DEIR.

--
Daniella Thompson

President
Berkeley Architectural Heritage Assn.
http://berkeleyheritage.com
January 31, 2011

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

Re: Comments on Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Berkeley Branch Libraries Program

Dear Mr. Sage:

The Berkeley Architectural Heritage Association (BAHA) firmly supports renovating, improving, and upgrading Berkeley’s branch libraries. However, we remain extremely concerned at and discouraged by the attitude of the City of Berkeley and the Berkeley Public Library leadership towards both historic preservation and the integrity of public funding processes.

Measure FF provided for the renovation, expansion, and improvement of the four branch libraries. The Library now asserts it has the right to use this funding for the demolition and rebuilding of two of those branches. We disagree. This is a good-government issue entirely separate from the merits of the currently proposed projects. It is not acceptable public policy to take funds approved by the voters for a very specific purpose and re-direct them to a purpose that was not mentioned—and was, in fact, essentially foreclosed—in the voter approval process.

The Zoning Amendment also analyzed in the DEIR goes beyond facilitation of the current Branch Library programs to provide a blanket loophole, in perpetuity, for the Berkeley Public Library to alter, demolish, replace, renovate, or expand any of its five facilities, including the historic Central, North Berkeley, and Claremont Libraries.

This permanent blanket exemption is not needed for the Central Library at all—a facility not included in the Branch Libraries Program—and is dangerous to the futures of the North Berkeley and Claremont branches, since it would make it easier for future library administrations to propose demolition of those historic resources and obtain City approval under the Zoning Ordinance.

In addition, the current plans for the South and West Berkeley Branch Libraries as analyzed in the DEIR needlessly destroy established historic resources important to the Berkeley community. The DEIR acknowledges these are significant impacts to
historic resources. This is entirely at odds with the Library’s own publicity, as found on its “Frequently Asked Questions About the Library Bond” page, on January 29, 2011: http://berkeleypubliclibrary.org/about_the_library/bond_faq.php

The page states: “Will the historic elements of the Branch Libraries be preserved? Absolutely! Current plans for renovation include restoration and refurbishment of historic features at the branch libraries as part of any renovation, while improving their functionality into the 21st century.”

Aside from these general comments, below are our specific concerns about the DEIR.

Errors in the Document

Page 3-12 of the DEIR contains a factual error. It states that at the September 17, 2009, community meeting regarding the South Berkeley Library, “the general consensus was that maximum use of space was more important than preserving the building.” In fact, of the small public attendance at that meeting, at least three individuals spoke clearly and emphatically in favor of renovation of the existing historic library. The word “consensus” is not accurate in this context.

Undesirable Breadth of the Zoning Amendment

(A) The DEIR states on pages 1-4 and 1-5, that “in the interests of facilitating the branch Library projects for which an extensive public outreach process had been carried out, and a bond had already been approved by the voters, the City proposed adding the following language to the Zoning Ordinance to remove the need for Variances on these projects...

...any conforming or lawful non-conforming public library existing as of May 1, 2010 may be (1) changed, (2) expanded, or (3) demolished and a new public library constructed on the same site, subject to issuance of a use permit…”

Please explain in the FEIR why the proposed zoning amendment includes language allowing demolition, when demolition was not included as an option in the Measure FF bond.

Please explain why the proposed Zoning Amendment includes language allowing change, expansion, or demolition/new construction at all public libraries in Berkeley, when the Measure FF bond and the City’s recent planning processes for spending Measure FF funds have been specific to the branch libraries and have explicitly not included the Central Library.

In essence: why is the Central Library a part of the Zoning Amendment at all? We suggest removing the Central Library entirely from the proposed Zoning Amendment.

(B) Additionally, the DEIR states on page i-5:

“As there are no proposed projects involving the Central Library (which was substantially renovated and expanded beginning in 2000)...this EIR is focused on the environmental implications of the ZOA as it pertains to the South and West Branches only…”

On page 2-2, the DEIR states that “…there are no projects planned for foreseeable for the Central Library…”

BAHA DEIR Comments—Branch Library Projects, January 31, 2011, page 2 of 7
Neither statement is accurate. The Board of Library Trustees initiated in 2009 and adopted in 2010 a Central Library Planning Study that contemplated, among other things, reorganization of functions, spaces, and circulation within the Central Library, possibly including the original, historic landmark building.

Please examine plans for the reorganization of the Central Library facility as considered and/or proposed in the Central Library Planning Study (initiated by the Board of Library Trustees in July, 2009). Do these plans have any potential for additions, demolitions, expansions, or renovations at the Central Library? If so, please evaluate their environmental impact as part of the Final EIR.

Please include a summary of the Central Library Planning Study in the FEIR and specific descriptions of projects proposed and/or approved within it that might alter the physical character of the Central Library, particularly the historic spaces. (C) Historically, Berkeley Public Library facilities have undergone numerous renovations, relocations, additions, and replacements as programs and public needs have changed. Major changes to BPL facilities occurred as follows:

- The Central Library facility was built in 1905, demolished in 1930, replaced by the current, now-historic, Main Library in 1931, expanded in the 1960s, and entirely renovated and expanded in 2002. That represents four major facilities changes over 97 years at Central.

- The South Berkeley Branch facility was built in 1927 at a different site, removed to its current site and a new building in 1961, added to in 1974 and 1979. That represents four major facilities changes over 84 years.

- The Claremont Branch facility was built in 1924 and extensively added to in 1975, representing two major facilities changes in 87 years.

- The West Berkeley Branch facility was built in 1923, extensively renovated and expanded in 1973, representing two major facilities changes in 88 years.

- Only the North Berkeley Branch Library has not undergone major expansion or renovation or replacement since its original construction in the 1936.

In sum, over a little more than a century, Berkeley has seen 12 major new construction of extensive addition/renovation projects to its public library facilities, with another two (North and Claremont) getting underway this year, and two more (South and West) proposed.

That represents 16 major new building, relocation, or renovation/addition projects since 1905 to Berkeley Public Library facilities. Given that history and the rapid pace of change in technology and public facilities usage, it is entirely foreseeable—indeed, it is certain—that the Central Library and all the branch libraries—both renovated and rebuilt—with undergo further projects in the future, quite possibly within a few decades.

The DEIR cannot pretend that just because there are no major library construction projects proposed beyond the current ones for the branches that it is not foreseeable
that the Zoning Amendment—proposed to be in place permanently—will not have an effect on library facilities and resources beyond the current renovations.

We ask that the FEIR specifically evaluate, under Cultural Resources impacts, the potential of the Zoning Amendment to enable the demolition or alteration of the North, Claremont, and historic Main Library facilities in the future.

An alternative would be for the Zoning Amendment to apply only to the four branch projects and to expire after their completion, rather than remain in force. This would not only obviate the need for any long-term mitigations, but would appropriately allow future Berkeley residents and governing bodies to make their own decisions about the desirability of major library alterations.

Mitigation Comments

A. Mitigation Measure CULTURAL-South 1A states in part: “The project sponsors should undertake a salvage program to save an reuse the wood slat ceiling…”

This mitigation should be amended to replace “should” with “will” or “shall.” There is no effective meaning to a mitigation that suggests something “should” be done, but does not require it.

B. There should be, at a minimum, an additional mitigation under Cultural Resources for both West and South branches, requiring measured drawing documentation of the historic structures (Ostwald’s original South Berkeley branch, Bartages’ original West Berkeley branch) to the standards of the Historic American Building Survey (HABS) and photo-documentation of the entire present structures, to the standards of the Historic American Building Survey (HABS).

The DEIR acknowledges that both original branch facilities are historically significant.

The HABS documentation should be done by a professional architectural historian, and the resulting material deposited in one (and, preferably, two) public archives, possibly the Main Library History Room and the Environmental Design Archives at the College of Environmental Design, UC Berkeley.

Please note that HABS documentation would contribute useful permanent documentary materials for use in the mitigations proposed in Cultural South 1b, and Cultural West 1a and 1b, but those mitigations in and of themselves are not sufficient to properly document the buildings if they are demolished. HABS documentation is the appropriate mitigation in these circumstances, not simply the collection of some historic materials to be displayed in a “kiosk.”

C. Archaeological Mitigation. Page 3-19 of the DEIR states that a portion of the South Branch was built over a foundation from a building constructed in 1911 or earlier and believed to be part of a Berkeley church from that era. Page 3-24 states: “the new library would be built over a portion of the existing basement from a previous building on the site that underlies the existing library. The top 3 feet of the basement walls would be removed and the basement filled and compacted for new construction...”
These statements confirm that the South Branch site contains known pre-1911 archaeological features. The construction process should be governed by a mitigation that would provide for an archaeologist qualified in the understanding of early Bay Area buildings to evaluate the construction procedures, examine the site as the pre-1911 structure is unearthed, and recommend salvage and treatment for any archaeological artifacts found during that process.

The Archaeological Research Facility (ARF) at the University of California, Berkeley, has undertaken a number of similar excavations in Berkeley and should be contacted for advice on the proper wording of a mitigation and procedures to be followed.

Please note that requirements very similar to these are specified on page 4.1-8 of the DEIR summarizing City of Berkeley Standard Conditions of Approval: Archaeological Resources. The City’s standard requirements require consultation with a qualified archaeologist if any cultural resources are found on site, and define cultural resources to include “…foundations…”

Since the DEIR and Library studies already document the existence of a pre-1911 foundation on the South Branch site, this standard should have been incorporated as a specific cultural resource mitigation in the DEIR.

A passing reference to adhering to Standard Conditions of Approval on page 4.1-17 is not sufficient. This should be a specific mitigation.

Project Alternatives

A. Please include and evaluate an additional mitigation for the South Berkeley Branch, defined as a “Partial renovation and site expansion” alternative. For the South Berkeley Library, an appropriate alternative consistent with both the stated goals of Measure FF and the renovation/expansion needs defined by the Library for the branch would be for the City to purchase a portion of the adjacent vacant property immediately to the north of the Library, removal of the 1960s addition to the branch, and construction of a hybrid scheme involving renovation of the original historic library at the corner of Russell and Martin Luther King, Jr. Way and a new addition extending over the present site and the additional land.

This would be an environmentally and programmatically superior alternative since it would not only preserve the historic sections of the building but give the branch additional space for an suitably sized addition/expansion beyond the existing, constrained, footprint of the Library site.

The DEIR states on page 2-10 that “an EIR must evaluate a reasonable range of feasible alternatives to the project or the location of the project that would achieve most of the basic project objectives and would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant impacts of the project.”

This alternative would indeed achieve that goal.

B. Please include and evaluate an additional mitigation for the West Berkeley Branch, defined as a “Partial renovation and site expansion” alternative.
For the West Berkeley Library, an appropriate alternative consistent with both the stated goals of Measure FF and the renovation/expansion needs defined by the Library for the branch would be for the City to purchase a portion of the adjacent parking lot immediately to the west of the Library, removal of the 1970s addition to the branch, and construction of a hybrid scheme involving renovation of the remaining original library structure and construction of an addition on the enlarged site.

This would be an environmentally and programmatically superior alternative, since it would not only preserve the historic sections of the building, but give the branch additional space for an suitably sized addition/expansion beyond the existing, constrained, footprint of the Library site.

C. The DEIR contains a substantial flaw in that it lacks adequate analysis of Measure FF and building demolition.

Measure FF expressly provided funds to “renovate, expand, and make seismic and access improvements at four neighborhood branch libraries”. It did not provide funds to demolish the branches and/or entirely rebuild them on the same site, or on any other site.

The Alternatives section of the DEIR, page 5-1, states that “An off-site alternative was not considered because the proceeds of Measure FF bonds may not be used except at the four existing branch library sites, and there are no other funds available for the renovations…”

Authority for this statement is footnoted as “Memorandum from Zach Cowan, Acting City Attorney to Donna Corbeil, Library Director, dated October 2, 2009. Subject: Expenditure of Measure FF Funds for Construction of Replacement New Tool Lending Library at New Site.”

Please provide a copy of this correspondence in the FEIR, rather than a short summary reference without quotations.

If, for legal reasons, the correspondence cannot be provided in the FEIR, please withdraw the entire statement from the FEIR.

The FEIR is a public document, analyzing material in the public domain. If the Library cannot or will not provide the public with a document that is used as the sole support for a major claim of the DEIR and Alternatives section, that claim should not be made. How is the public to evaluate its validity without a public airing and discussion of the supporting documentation?

The DEIR goes on to state, page 5-2, that “The Bond Measure itself, as well as the impartial analysis of the Bond Measure and the Bond Measure arguments, made no mention of moving an existing branch library to a different site and therefore evaluation of off-site locations is not appropriate.”

The Bond Measure itself, the impartial analysis of the Bond measure provided to voters, and the official Bond Measure arguments also made no mention of demolishing an existing branch library. In fact, they referred only to “renovate, expand, and make seismic and access improvements”, and every piece of publicly
available literature or correspondence during the election campaign from the Measure FF proponents reinforced the assumption that the money would be used only for those purposes.

Please explain in the FEIR how the document can conclude that relocation of a branch is not an option because it was not mentioned in the Bond Measure or campaign, but demolition of half of the branch libraries is allowed, even though no mention was made of demolition.

If the FEIR contends that demolition is allowable under Measure FF, please provide supporting documentation in the public domain to fully establish this claim.

This all seems to be a case of the City of Berkeley and the Berkeley Public Library picking and choosing selective interpretations of Measure FF to support pre-ordained conclusions.

Sincerely,

Daniella Thompson
President
FYI.

Hi Aaron, Please accept this comment to the draft EIR for the North and West Branch Libraries. Thanks so much.

Todd Jersey

TO TODD JERSEY ARCHITECTURE
1321 EIGHTH STREET, SUITE 2
BERKELEY, CA 94710

Todd Jersey, AIA
Principal

DIRECT: 510.528.5477 x301
OFFICE: 510.528.5477
todd@toddjerseyarchitecture.com

http://www.toddjerseyarchitecture.com
January 30, 2011

To: Aaron Sage  
City of Berkeley Planning Dept.  
2120 Milvia Street  
Berkeley, CA 94704

From: Todd Jersey, Architect

RE: Draft Outline Rebuttal to Draft EIR of Berkeley Branch Libraries (West and South)

Dear Aaron,

As you may know, I am a Berkeley resident and a leading practitioner of sustainable architecture, with offices on 8th and Gilman street in Berkeley. You may also know that from my public presentations that I grew up in Berkeley and have extremely fond memories of the South Branch Library as a child in the early 1970’s. I remember feeling safe welcomed in these warm and carefully designed and crafted spaces.

The original South Branch, though suffering from years of neglect and poor “upgrades”, is a wonderful and rare example of the kind of human scaled architecture that came out of the notion of design for the public good which was taught and practiced in the late 1950-s and 1960s. The West branch, while not as unique as the South is also considered a historic structure of merit by the architectural community and is a lovely old building.

Both of these buildings require our best thinking and planning to adopt them into any scheme for expanding or remodeling these branch libraries. Having studied the Draft EIR and the proposed designs and design process, it is my general opinion that there was a lack of commitment and/or emphasis to save these original buildings by both Field Paoli on the South Branch and Harvey Ellis Deveraux on the West Branch.

Since it is relevant to this conversation I want to let you know that I am also the architect and major preservation force behind the restoration of the venerable Richmond Plunge, one of the nation’s premier restoration projects of the last few years. I designed the structural system to seismicly upgrade this structure in a way that saved hundreds of thousands of dollars over what was originally propose by another architect/structural engineering team. I have the skill, experience and passion for saving and restoring old beloved buildings.

It is from my work with the Plunge that I was contacted by the Concerned Library Users (CLU) to look at the Draft EIR which was submitted by Design, Community & Environment for public review on December 14, 2010. The CLU has specifically tasked me with looking at the assumptions made by the City and its consultants that have led to the plans to demolish rather than restore and add to the original West and South branches of the library and to provide my opinion as to the validity of those assumptions. They also asked me to see if I could create designs for the West and South Branch libraries which met all the requirements of the Facilities Master Plan while saving the original buildings. I have happily taken on these tasks which I think we have successfully accomplished.

This report is the result of this work and I submit it to you and in the public record as a road map toward saving the original South and West branch library buildings. It comes with floor plans and square footage lists to back up our claims.

I do want to say at this point that, outside of the issue of saving the original buildings the new proposals designed by the separate firms are pleasant and mostly well considered and done by design firms I have great respect for. However it is my opinion that, though brand new, both proposals are still cramped for space on the small existing lots and do not provide sufficient long term storage or room to expand and grow, which is essential for public libraries. We sought to address this issue with the addition of long term storage space and in the case of the West, larger program spaces, and to do so at the same overall construction costs.

The Draft EIR:

Let us now move to an examination of the EIR itself and its reports on what is needed for the new libraries as well as the assumptions, statements and conclusions about the original structures.
The first part of the EIR discusses the Facilities Master Plan which was released in July 2008 which established the following problems at the South and West branches:

**South:**
- Not Seismically Sound
- Lack of sufficient staff office, equipment and workspace
- Lack of sufficient programming, computer and common space
- Lack of sufficient space for collections and materials, including too library
- Inadequate seating and lighting
- Inadequate and outdated electrical, ventilation and plumbing systems
- Structural damage from decay and rot
- Occasional flooding in rainy season
- Not ADA compliant

**West:**
- Not Seismically Sound
- Lack of sufficient staff office, equipment and workspace
- Lack of sufficient programming and meeting space including “Berkeley Reads” the adult literacy program
- Lack of sufficient space for collections and materials, including too library
- Inadequate lighting
- Inadequate and outdated electrical, ventilation and plumbing systems
- Structural damage from decay and rot
- Not ADA compliant

This list is the baseline for improvements and is generally acceptable to all parties. In addition the DEIR correctly determines that the original libraries are projects of historic merit and therefore cultural resources which would constitute significant detriment if lost.

What is unacceptable to me as a Berkeley resident and green preservation architect (and to the CLU), are certain notions, assumptions and conclusions about the potential or lack thereof of the original libraries to be saved as a part of an expanded new modern library as required by the FMP.

The first troubling notion is that the architects hired by the City for this project have fulfilled the requirement that a “reasonable range of alternatives to avoid significant impacts” as required by law. I have looked at the alternatives that the architects of the West branch have put forward to keep the buildings as a part of an expanded scheme and I find them to be less than exhaustive and actually quite rudimentary in nature. The architects of the South did a more extensive look at saving at least the main historic reading room, but they never seemed to come up with a scheme which had sufficient creativity to demonstrate a successful path towards saving and reintegrating the original building. Both studies in this regard seemed to me to be more committed to justifying demolition of the original buildings than preservation of the valued historic fabric. It seems to me likely that the designers and others involved were heavily weighted and prejudiced toward demolition.

Along these lines there are troubling conclusions reached in the EIR with regard to the feasibility of saving the original buildings. For instance, with regard to the designs that keep the original South Branch buildings, this comment is found on page 2-10:

“This alternative (saving the original library) however, would result in an effectively smaller library with reduced programming and would not accomplish most of the project objectives”

This is a statement that has led to the determination that it is not feasible to keep the original building and is, in my opinion a false assertion based upon insufficient discovery and creativity and was unfortunately a death sentence for the historic building. In a relatively short time, my office has come up with a design that meets every single project objective, saves the South Branch.
On page 3-1 it is stated that in 2009 the Architects studied design options for the South Branch that retained and reused the original Adult and Child reading rooms but warns that structural testing was done and that the horizontal rebar was only at the top of the wall and that there was insufficient roof support (this is visibly obvious). Then the report warns us:

“This could result in failure due to shearing in an earthquake”

And then the report makes the assertion that fixing these problems would:

“Alter the appearance of the building”

This seems to me an attempt to try and make a case increasing the perceived cost of saving the building in dollars scaring us to believe that it can’t be fixed without looking badly. The truth as I see it is that the original building is easily seismically strengthened and in ways which do not significantly alter the appearance of the building.

The most troubling statement I found in the Draft EIR regarding the West Branch is this statement on page 3-39 with regard to the original W Barteges building:

“Due to the extensive renovations required, it would essentially have to be rebuilt”

To the extent that they falsely lead to the demolition of important cultural resources, I find these assertions to be inappropriately misleading.

Now lets look at what we can do if, instead of assuming that these buildings are a detriment to a new modern library, we commit ourselves to their preservation and find ways to create a greater more culturally valuable new whole than what we would have if we demolished these projects:

How we did it:

West Branch:

The key ideas we employed to save and re-integrate the original structure:

- Restore the original library as the Adult Reading Room. This is a perfect space for an adult reading room, especially when restored with its original skylight! This reading room is also much larger than the reading area scheme proposed by the design firm Harvey Ellis Deveraux.
- Restore the original façade as a beautiful classical design that already has terrific civic presence! This saves a large sum of money over demolishing a building with this kind of civic presence and then having to recreate this existing civic presence in expensive modern design elements as proposed in the Harvey Ellis Deveraux design.
- Move the building to a location 2 feet north of the current sidewalk and closer to the east property line to increase it’s civic presence on University Avenue and make room for expanded program space to the west and behind the original building.
- Create a new entry courtyard on the west side of the original building with stairs, bike parking and a ADA ramp that allows those with disabilities to start the building entrance process in the same location as non disabled persons thus confirming to Universal Design practices.
- Split the building program into two distinct parts and make the building two stories to house the distinct parts. Place the library program on the first level and the literacy, meeting spaces and mechanical and longer term storage on upper level. This allows us to have much less of a building footprint and to save the lovely redwood grove in the back of the library and make that a feature of the new library.
- Put the Berkeley Reads program and the dedicated meeting room on the second level. Both can be accessed independent of the library but access to the upper level is seen by library personnel at the service desk to increase security.

It should be noted that keeping the meeting room on the ground level was desired so that library users could access this room when it is not being used so as to increase the area in the library for reading and study. Our design has a library that is larger than what is proposed even with the meeting room counted full time. This allows us to have a meeting room that is dedicated to meeting function and therefore much better at its dedicated function. It can also be used as a conference room for staff, etc without removing library patrons. Also this room can be used for all sorts of
programs during the day that would be awkward to be housed in a space that is basically inside a library. Uses such as music and dance class, etc. It should also be noted that there is really no reason at all to keep the Adult Literacy Program on the ground level. It is an entirely distinct program and will have a better identity being separate from the library proper. Also by placing it on the second level we eliminate two separate entrances to the library and the long exterior corridor to the east which could be a security risk especially at night.

- Put the kid’s room into a playful and comforting round room that is embedded into the redwood grove so kids can learn amongst the giants.

Advantages in our design:
- Our library is bigger! We have more breathing room for a larger library that has room to grow. Our adult reading room is almost twice the size of the Harvey Ellis Deveraux design.
- We save the redwood grove and can then place the kids room to be between and amongst the redwoods. This enables us to do something kids will love and that works with our biological and cultural heritage in a fun way.
- We show how cultural assets can be recombined into creative new compositions
- We avoid having two separate entrances and access the library proper, meeting rooms and the Berkeley Reads program from the same lobby. This increases the security and avoids a long unsupervised exterior walk that the HED plans have to allow for access the Berkeley Reads program when the library is closed.
- We get more library square footage for the same money! It will be argued that our larger library will be too expensive. Nonsense! Our design spends money on the restoration of the original for our new adult reading room and our dramatic circular kids space and the rest of the building is class A rated commercial space which is being built by prevailing and union wages all over the bay area for less than $300 per square foot! Our scheme uses the existing building to create the civic presence of the project. We avoid the type of gymnastic architectural features that are employed in the new design to make it appealing by re-using an original structure of significant appeal and in a significant place. We then build another new building and connect the two with durable and elegant but not showy commercial quality construction systems and materials. Again, I just completed one of the most renowned historic restoration projects in the nation in the Richmond Plunge and did so at prevailing wages for $250 per square foot including a near Olympic sized interior swimming pool! I know that our design can be done for the same or less than the 4.6 million dollar figure being proposed for the new design and that we can get a bigger and more spacious library in the process!

South Branch:

Key ideas to save and reintegrate the original structure:
- Put additional entrance off MLK between existing children’s reading room and new building.
- Put meeting room in original kids room to put the meeting room at the corner and give it better presence and access by public. Also place bathrooms off MLK entrance so meeting rooms can be closed off to library but still have access to restrooms
- Create additional interior ceiling height in new spaces
- Create additional interior height in original children’s room (new meeting room) by creating a hip roof similar to adult reading room.
- Create limited second level for long term storage for tools, books etc. and a lounge with privacy from staff and view on the upper level and mechanical and IT space. A limited use elevator can be placed for under $100,000. Again, placing this now allows for breathing room for the staff and much needed storage space. This storage space is needed but not provided in the proposed scheme by Field Paoli. Our proposal has ample area for storage which every library really desperately needs. The money by reemploying the existing structures in our scheme easily pays for the elevator, stairs and extra square footage for storage. This storage space can be built and conditioned very inexpensively. Why not take advantage of vertical air space to help us make a library that can grow!

Advantages in our design:
- We have a larger library for the same money! By employing vertical space, we create larger spaces with more breathing room. Our adult reading room, which is the original historic reading room, has 150 square feet more than the adult reading room in the Field Paoli scheme.
• We have a bigger (100sf larger) and a larger private staff lounge on a partial second level which has bay and hill views and is away from the hustle and bustle of the main level staff work area to provide more separation between work and rest.
• We have a 400sf long term storage area on the upper level.
• We have a sizable mechanical and electrical room on the upper level. This alone will reduce costs from our HVAC subcontractor!
• We have a larger IT room
• We show how cultural assets can be recombined into creative new compositions
• Construction cost is less! Forget the argument that our larger library and second level make our scheme more expensive. We use the same strategy to fix up the original and piggy back on its beauty to create a wonderful elegant new composition and do so for less money than what it would take to create the Field Paoli scheme.

Let’s now revisit the FMP criterion specifically to see how we are doing against that criterion:

South:
Not Seismically Sound
• The original building has a wood frame roof structure and the overall building is low and has a low seismic load. We can take care of a seismic upgrade to this building in a variety of economical methods that DO NOT CHANGE THE LOOK OF THE BUILDING, similar to what I employed at the Richmond Plunge which was a much greater challenge. This is a lengthy discussion for a later submittal.

Lack of sufficient staff office, equipment and workspace
• This has been addressed in our design. Our square footages meet or exceed those of the proposed design. See attached plans and square footage comparisons.

Lack of sufficient programming, computer and common space
• This has been addressed in our design. Our square footages meet or exceed those of the proposed design. See attached plans. We are using the original children’s room as the multi purpose room as its square footage and location is similar to what is proposed by the Field Paoli design and allows us to keep the original room.

Lack of sufficient space for collections and materials, including too library
• This has been addressed in our design. Our square footages meet or exceed those of the proposed design. We have added a second level storage space over the tool library to create more space for books and materials that might want to be stored rather than on open shelves. This gives the library much more breathing room so stuff that really should be in longer term storage is not boxed lying around the staff work area as will surely occur without extra storage. See attached plans

Inadequate seating and lighting
• Our seating exceeds the proposed. Natural light will be from skylight in keeping with the original design. Artificial lighting is TBD

Inadequate and outdated electrical, ventilation and plumbing systems
• Both schemes upgrade the HVAC strategies and systems and employ radiant floor heating and natural ventilation.

Structural damage from decay and rot
• Walls are CMU and in great shape. Roof easily repaired and made to last using steel beams for overhangs and replacing sagging wood members.

Occasional flooding in rainy season
• Not clear what the source of this is but most likely has several remedies as would be employed in either scheme.

West:
Not Seismically Sound.
This building is a simple light wood framed building which is very easy and economical to seismically upgrade and move into another location. The original building is no bigger than a nice large home and its roof and floor diaphragms are in fine shape. Simple stuff; done all day every day in the Bay Area.

Lack of sufficient staff office, equipment and workspace
- This has been addressed in our design. Our square footages meet or exceed those of the proposed design. Again we go vertical to gain valuable long term storage and ample mechanical space. It should be also noted that the proposed design uses a two story volume to “create Civic presence” Why not use the volume for space to serve library program instead of an expensive way to create more mass and presence. See attached plans

Lack of sufficient programming and meeting space including “Berkeley Reads” the adult literacy program
- Again, in our design we provide “breathing room” for the libraries to expand some and have more storage and staging area. The second level is again key to allowing this breathing room. The Berkeley Reads program has its own identity and upper lobby area and the meeting room is larger than the proposed design and dedicated to meeting space. Our ground level library is larger than the proposed space with our Adult area being substantially larger than proposed. We win the additional space game hands down.

Lack of sufficient space for collections and materials, including too library
- This has been accomplished and some. See above.

Inadequate lighting; Inadequate and outdated electrical, ventilation and plumbing systems; Structural damage.
- All can be easily, economically and sufficiently addressed as would as is also done in the proposed design

**Other discussion points:**

### Issue of “Civic Presence” and aesthetics:

In both of our designs we use the existing buildings as places of “embodied civic presence” and elegance rather than tearing them down and using new expensive tall volumes and costly architectural methods and materials to create interest and presence. **By working with the inherent beauty of the original buildings we save a TON of money by not having to re create and reestablish that beauty, scale and harmony with entirely new architectural fabric.**

Since aesthetics is not technically a part of the Draft EIR nor a part of the task of demonstrating the feasibility of saving the original buildings, I am not including the design sketches and perspectives we have developed to demonstrate the aesthetic beauty we have developed in our designs. These will be a part of any public presentation as the public discourse moves forward. I can say that our general approach is to attach the original buildings with low spaces and once away from the original buildings to pop up into higher volume single story spaces and our multi story areas. This allows the original buildings to remain set off from anything new and continue to have independent artistic clarity and distinction. This is typically how we make additions to historic buildings and the where I have employed this simple and elegant strategy the project has been received awards for the careful blend of historic and new elements. This is said because we are not strangers to this issue or its challenges and we have succeeded in every instance of creating harmonious new composition that respects and enhances the existing while creating a powerful new whole.

### Green Design:

Todd Jersey Architecture is one of the leading green design firms in the nation having been doing innovative sustainable approaches to design for over 20 years. All green architects know that rule number one is to save and reincorporate existing architectural fabric wherever we can. In fact the LEED green building certification system awards points to projects that save existing buildings. The truth is we can’t afford to tear down buildings and the embodied energy they contain and call our projects green or sustainable. By saving the original buildings we should be able to reach a LEED Platinum level on both locations if desired. Our firm designed a **LEED Platinum class A commercial space at a cost of less than $200 per square foot** that is now well on its way to being completed. This translates into a prevailing wage cost of about $250 per square foot. We can do the same for our libraries!

### Construction Costs (all costs assume prevailing wages):

**West:**

| Site work and vertical circulation: | $40,000 |

**TJA-12**

**TJA-13**

**TJA-14**

**TJA-15**

**TJA-16**
Restore and move original 1,800sf original library to new foundation @ 350sf: $630,000
New 1,000sf Children’s Room at $500/sf $500,000
Remainder of library, meeting space and literacy program, 11,000 at $300/sf (grade A commercial): $3,300,000
Total: $4,830,000

South:
Site work: $300,000
Restore original children’s room and adult reading rooms: $900,000
New portion of library, 6,000sf at $400psf (higher psf than West due to use of CMU block) $2,400,000
Upper level storage, break room with vertical circulation $300,000
Total construction cost: $3,900,000

Our designs make appropriate and economical use of vertical space to provide the required program space AND some important and necessary additional space to grow. Use of this vertical space also takes some of the pressure to jam all programs on the same level and helps us work to save artfully restore and reemploy the original beloved structures and do so at or below the construction budgets for the proposed plan. Before you disregard my construction costs please know that I met my budget for the Richmond Plunge at $250 psf. I would be happy to have the budget numbers I have outlined above to work with!

Summary:

Our intent was to demonstrate the feasibility of keeping the original buildings as part of a new library that, at a minimum, matched the same economic and program requirements and constraints of the proposed building. We have done so and have made additional improvements that we feel are important even essential aspects of new libraries at the West and South branches.

We have done our work in a limited time frame. Both designs will need to be optimized for function and economy as we move forward but our purpose for now is complete and the feasibility and benefits of saving these buildings now well established for public consideration.

We look forward to having these designs be part of the public discourse as we as a City contemplate our alternatives and pave a logical way forward.

Thank you for you careful attention to this important matter.

Todd Jersey, AIA
January 31, 2011

Square footage comparisons between schemes. Note the Todd Jersey Architecture schemes have utilized vertical space to economically increase the building and program size of our schemes and done so at same or less cost as we avoid expensive architectural elements and tall volumes which the proposed schemes need to do to create civic presence. We create renewed civic presence in the restoration and reemployment of the original buildings into a beautiful and vastly more economical whole.

South Branch:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Area</th>
<th>Field Paoli Design (all new)</th>
<th>Todd Jersey Architecture Design (preserves original)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lobby</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browsing Area</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Room</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adult Reading Room</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,150</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,300</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids Room</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teens Room</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Workroom</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returns/sorting</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers Office</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Lounge</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Room</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Storage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Room</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Room</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool Lending Area</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total library</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

West Branch:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Area</th>
<th>Harvey Ellis Design (all new)</th>
<th>Todd Jersey Architecture Design (preserves original)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lobby</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browsing Area</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adult Reading Room</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,800</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids Area</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teens Room</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Workroom</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers Office</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Lounge</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returns/Sorting</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Room</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Level Lobby</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>400 on third level above meeting space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Storage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400 on third level above meeting space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Room</td>
<td>500 assumed on upper level</td>
<td>500 on third level above meeting space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Room</td>
<td>100 assumed on upper level</td>
<td>100 on third level above meeting space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Room</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total library</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,600</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Nicola Swinburne

From: Sage, Aaron E. [ASage@ci.berkeley.ca.us]
Sent: Monday, January 03, 2011 8:23 AM
To: Nicola Swinburne; Corbeil, Donna; Steven Dewan
Subject: FW: Comment on DEIR on West & South Branch Libraries & Zoning Amendment

FYI.

-----Original Message-----
From: Stephanie Manning [mailto:sbayshellmounds@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sat 1/1/2011 1:14 PM
To: Sage, Aaron E.
Subject: Comment on DEIR on West & South Branch Libraries & Zoning Amendment

To: Aaron Sage, Planning Department
From: Stephanie Manning, public comment

These are my public comments regarding the Draft EIR on the West & South Branch Library changes being proposed and the amendment to the City's Zoning Ordinance.

Zoning Ordinance Amendment: The justification for this amendment is that voters approved Measure FF which funds the improvement of the branch libraries. However, this measure did not address the demolition of these libraries, only the renovation. These renovations include expansion and seismic and access improvements, not demolition. Many times in the past, older historic buildings such as these have been preserved, only to be made accessible, seismically safe and expanded without demolishing the original building. Furthermore, the National Trust for Historic Preservation has determined that the greenest building is a renovated older building, even if a new design encompasses the latest environmental standards. EIR law calls for consideration of alternative proposals when the environment may be effected by such things as demolishing structures with historical design elements.

South Branch: City staff claims that the proposed new building would serve the same functions and same number of patrons and only aims at providing a more efficient and less cluttered floor plan, work areas, seating and space for computers. Such improvements can be achieved by preserving and enhancing what is already there. The Fairfield Public Library, although not historic in nature, accomplished this by using the original building and re-arranging the interior. Alternatives should be investigated to demolishing the South Branch Library. Some have suggested that the Library should be moved to the school building on Oregon St. near MLK which appears to be vacant and needing to be rehabilitated. This would be one way to preserve the old South Branch building with its lovely design while meeting the needs of the library.

West Branch: As a long-time user of this branch, it seems to me to be a great waste of money to demolish a building which the city renovated relatively recently. Since expansion of functions and patronage is not expected, there is really no reason to demolish this fine old structure. Other ways of expanding the meeting room should be explored as that is not the sole purpose of a public library and in recent years that room has been devoted to the literacy program which it adequately accommodates.

In sum, both branch libraries should be preserved as they both have design elements which would be irreplaceable and they embody existing energy that would be lost by their demolition and are therefore the greenest buildings at their sites. Measure FF did not involve demolition projects, only renovation. In addition, many Berkeley citizens and library users appreciate the existing buildings and would like to see them preserved and enhanced rather than wastefully destroyed. The impact on the environment would be tons of building debris added to the landfills needlessly, the destruction of a cultural amenity and the loss of historic buildings.

Stephanie Manning
2339 Oregon St., #C
Berkeley, CA 94705
(c)(510)295-8498

2/10/2011
Nicola Swinburne

From: Sage, Aaron E. [ASage@cl.berkeley.ca.us]
Sent: Monday, January 31, 2011 4:54 PM
To: Nicola Swinburne; Cora Palmer
Subject: FW: DEIR South Berkeley Branch Library & Zoning Law Change

FYI.

From: Bradley Wiedmaier [mailto:bradley_wiedmaier@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, January 31, 2011 4:53 PM
To: Sage, Aaron E.
Subject: DEIR South Berkeley Branch Library & Zoning Law Change

The wholly inadequate Page and Turnbull, Historic Resource Report on South Branch Library gives no accurate sense of the stature of John Hans Ostwald. The biography is grossly inadequate. To neglect the stature of his architectural roots in Europe, notably Switzerland, in the manner of this report, is totally unprofessional. There is no indication of the magnitude of Ostwald's stature and significance.

After spending his youth in Berlin and Austria, Hans Ostwald worked in London for several years, returning to Vienna to focus on his architectural studies. He went on to Zurich to study under Karl Moser at the Eidgenossische Technische Hochschule (Federal Institute of Technology), at Zurich. Moser was not only one of the leading architectural instructors, but was also one of the leading architects of Switzerland and Central Europe, in the first half of the Twentieth Century. Ostwald worked as well for several years in Karl Moser's office in Zurich, before Ostwald's emigration to the United States. Moser's important art museum and his masterpiece, S. Antonius in Basel are commissions that should really be included in the historic report.

Ostwald's work for Richard Neutra one of the undisputed leading modernists of the United States, West Coast, was not just "briefly", but work by Ostwald on Neutra's most important Northern
Californian Commission. The Sidney Kahn residence on Telegraph Hill is also one of Neutra's all time most important residences.

Ostwald's work with Anshen + Allen was on their reputation making residence for Ralph K Davies, whose wife would later give Davies Symphony Hall to the Bay Area in San Francisco.

Ostwald's many awards are not included and the early and important magazine articles at the dawn of Californian Modernism are spottily presented (see "CALIFORNIA ARTS AND ARCHITECTURE", June 1947, p. 36-7 "House for Dr. and Mrs. Lessor").

His own teaching career is not discussed as he taught at the University of California, Berkeley, School of Architecture 1971 as well as internationally.

The contributing role the South Branch Library had in Ostwald's formulation of his design for his winning design in the Architectural Competition for California Governor's Mansion is noted in the Donald Reay & Peter Paret biography, "John Hans Ostwald, Architect". The residential appropriate nature of the Branch neighborhood library is certainly confirmed by this win.

Ostwald's 1953 American Institute of Architecture, Award of Honor, for the Wienand House at 3577 Pacific at the Presidio Wall was a very important early Modern award that should not be overlooked. It indicates the timeliness of Ostwald's innovative design sensibility. He was always up with the cutting edge of design as is reflected in the highly significant South Berkeley Branch Library.

Bradley Wiedmaier,
Architectural Historian
Nicola Swinburne

From: Sage, Aaron E. [ASage@ci.berkeley.ca.us]
Sent: Tuesday, February 01, 2011 2:12 PM
To: Nicola Swinburne
Cc: Corbeil, Donna
Subject: FW: Structural disinformation

Here’s one more that came in after 5. (Steve said we need to accept it and respond.)

From: Bradley Wiedmaier [mailto:bradley_wiedmaier@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, January 31, 2011 5:00 PM
To: Sage, Aaron E.
Subject: Structural disinformation

The new library proponents have falsely presented the South Berkeley Branch Library structure as being "cinder-block". The building is a post and beam reinforced concrete structure with seismic standards of connection of roof to columns. The library managment has presented a completely false notion that can be viewed by the highly honest librarian Jane Scantlebury in her 7 Dec. 2010 Berkeley Daily Planet article which is honestly mistaken in portraying the building as a cinder-block structure.

The official structural report does nothing to dispell the confusion.

This Historic resources also avoids describing the structure as post and Beam.

Bradley Wiedmaier
January 30, 2011

Aaron Sage  
Senior Planner  
City of Berkeley  
Planning and Development Department  
2120 Milvia St.  
Berkeley, CA 94704

Re: Draft EIR Comments Regarding Berkeley Branch Library Program

Dear Mr. Sage,
This letter is regarding the planned demolition of the West and South Berkeley libraries.

Ballot Measure FF, passed by the voters, was never meant to be used for demolition of any of the library branches. The ballot stated that bond proceeds would be used for renovation, construction, seismic and disabled improvements. The language also stated that plans for renovation include restoration and refurbishment of historic features at the branch libraries as part of any renovation.

The West Berkeley branch was originally built in 1923. It is considered an example of the Carnegie style of libraries along with the Oakland Golden Gate branch Library at 5606 San Pablo and the Oakland Temescal branch at 5205 Telegraph.

In 2003 the Berkeley Library wrote and sponsored an application to the Landmarks Commission that the West Berkeley branch be designated a Structure of Merit. At that time they wanted to restore its historic facade. Recently, a member of the Landmarks Commission during that time period has recounted that the Library proposed restoring the West Berkeley branch, including restoration of its historic facade. Plans were presented to the Landmarks Commission in 2003 that need to be brought back and disclosed for public review. The Structure of Merit designation was approved by the City of Berkeley Landmarks Commission in 2003. There are reasons the Library advocated at that time that the West Berkeley branch be designated a Structure of Merit. These reasons are on record and need to be brought to the public for review.

The West Berkeley Branch Library is a significant building, an historic resource on a significant intersection at University and San Pablo Avenues. University Avenue is the gateway to the University. University and San Pablo Avenues are the intersection of 4 corners of one of the earliest roads connecting Alameda and Contra Costa Counties going back at least 80 years.
Another key issue that needs to be looked at is that of embodied energy. In general, talk about energy use and new buildings usually is regarding operating energy. Analysis needs to take into account the energy that is bound up in existing buildings. Embodied energy is the total expenditure of energy involved in the creation of the building and its materials. When we throw away an historic building we simultaneously throw away the embodied energy incorporated into that building. Razing historic buildings results in a triple hit on scarce resources.

1) We are throwing away thousands of dollars of embodied energy involved in the creation of the building.
2) We are replacing with materials vastly more consumptive of energy.
3) Recurring embodied energy savings increase dramatically as a building life stretches over 50 years.

Mike Jackson, Chief Architect, Illinois Historic Preservation Agency, believes that only a fool or a fraud would claim to be an environmentalist and yet throw away historic buildings. Our local Architect Todd Jersey has created plans for the West and South branches showing how they can be preserved and made earthquake safe. He has carefully incorporated all of library staff concerns, as well as nearby residents concerns garnered from several public meetings. His plans and budget save money as well. We have an opportunity to renew the West and South Berkeley branches and bring them to their original glory with updates to the 21st century. A plan for demolition of the buildings requires a CEQA review and a full EIR.

Sincerely,

Julie Dickinson
Branch Libraries Program DEIR Comments and Questions
Submitted by Judith Epstein on January 31, 2011

Please answer the following questions and revise the Draft EIR as appropriate to produce a complete and accurate EIR, written in good faith.

A. The feasibility of plans for the South and West Branch Library improvement programs is, in part, related to economics. The second project objective of each of the South and West Branch Library projects is to “be on budget and consistent with Measure FF funding.” The EIR must accurately describe and analyze funding for each proposed project and alternative.

1. What is the precise definition of being “on budget?”
2. Measure FF funds were allocated between the four branch library projects and other project expenses not related to a single library.
   a) How were allocation decisions made?
   b) What criteria were used to assign a cost to each branch library project and other expenses?
3. If one branch library project or another expense came in under budget, would it be possible to allocate unused funds to another branch library project?
4. Since the proposed projects for the South and West Branch Libraries were considered to be “on budget” by the DEIR, then the cost to demolish each library must be known, at least up to a reasonably accurate estimate.
   a) What is the best estimate of the total cost of each of these demolitions, including but not limited to, the labor, the disposal of materials, and the costs of trucks to dispose of materials?
   b) To within what percentage is each estimate accurate?
5. What does the DEIR mean by the term “consistent with Measure FF funding?”
6. Are the proposed demolitions of the current South and West Branch Libraries consistent with Measure FF funding, which was to “renovate, expand, and make seismic and access improvements at four neighborhood branch libraries?”
7. Is it true that if the demolition of the current South or West Branch Library is not considered consistent with Measure FF funding, then a plan involving demolition for the South or West Branch Library, respectively, does not satisfy program objective #2?
8. Does the City propose to use Measure FF funding for the above-mentioned demolitions?
9. The City Attorney has publicly stated that Measure FF funds cannot be used for demolition, and the Director of Library Services has said that funds for demolition will come from the General Fund.
   a) Is Measure FF the only source of funds for each of the branch library improvement projects, or are there other potential sources of funding?
   b) Is the General Fund one such source of funding?
   c) What programs or services might be cut to supply funds for demolitions?
10. Has the public been notified of possible program cuts or asked if it supports using General Fund monies for demolitions?
11. The DEIR does not mention other sources of funding for the Branch Libraries projects.
a) If there are other potential sources of funding, then why weren’t they mentioned in the DEIR?
b) Isn’t it true that an accurate EIR requires full disclosure of all potential sources of funding for the projects in question?

12. The DEIR does not mention if other sources of funds for the Branch Library Program (outside of Measure FF) were discussed at public meetings.
   a) Have there been any public meetings at which other sources of funding for the Branch Libraries Program was discussed?
   b) If so, at which public meetings did such discussions take place?
   c) What sources of funding were discussed, and who discussed them?

13. Has the public been informed in any way about the possible use of funding outside of Measure FF for any parts of the branch library projects?

14. The DEIR does not mention if City officials or staff have discussed funding possibilities outside of public forums.
   a) Has there been discussion among City officials or staff outside of public forums about using funding other than Measure FF funding for any parts of the library projects, such as demolitions?
   b) If so, what are these sources of funding and which City officials or staff proposed them?
   c) Under what circumstances were these other sources of funding considered?

15. If the demolition of the current South or West Branch Library cannot be funded by Measure FF bond funds, then how could the South or West Branch project, respectively, satisfy its program objectives?

16. Isn’t it true that neither Proposed Plan for the South or West Branch Library project satisfies its program objectives?

B. The seventh project objective of each of the South and West Branch Library projects is to “provide a welcoming civic presence on a major street while respecting neighborhood context.”

1. The DEIR provides no definition of a “welcoming civic presence,” so it’s difficult to understand how some plans may satisfy this condition and others may not.
   a) What is the definition of a “welcoming civic presence?”
   b) Exactly what criteria must be satisfied for a project to have a “welcoming civic presence?”
   c) Are they published anywhere?
   d) Are any criteria of a welcoming civic presence subjective?
   e) If so, then who decides if the subjective criteria have been satisfied, and how would there be a fair and objective public process?

2. The DEIR provides no definition of a “respecting the neighborhood context,” so it’s difficult to understand how some plans may satisfy this condition and others may not.
   a) What is the definition of “respecting the neighborhood context?”
   b) Exactly what criteria must be satisfied for a project to respect the neighborhood context?
   c) Are they published anywhere?
   d) Are any criteria of a respecting the neighborhood context subjective?
e) If so, then who decides if the subjective criteria have been satisfied, and how
would there be a fair and objective public process?
3. Is it possible for subjective criteria to be used in such a way to exclude plans that
might otherwise satisfy the program objectives?
4. Projects that satisfy many program objectives might be able to be modified to satisfy others.
a) Is it possible for a project that is said not to have a welcoming civic presence to be
modified in such a way that it would have a welcoming civic presence?
b) If so, how may this be achieved?
c) If not, why not?
d) Is it possible for a project that is said not to respect the neighborhood context to be
modified in such a way that it would respect the neighborhood context?
e) If so, how may this be achieved?
f) If not, why not?

C. The South Branch Project
1. Why did the Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) consider only one
Partial Preservation Alternative of the several considered during the Concept
Design Phase, as stated on p. 5.2-4?
2. Was a single-story Partial Preservation Plan considered as an alternative in this
DEIR, since such a plan might have a greater chance to satisfy all of the program
objectives?
3. According to Table 5.2-3, the Measure FF budget for the South Branch project is
$4,300,000, but the Proposed Project would cost $4,416,000.
a) Isn’t Table 5.2-2 inaccurate in stating that the Proposed Project satisfies
program objective #2 (to be within budget and consistent with Measure FF
funding) when it clearly doesn’t?
b) Isn’t it true that the Proposed Project is really over budget and does not satisfy
condition #2?
c) Why wasn’t this discussed in the comparison of alternatives?
4. On p. 5.2-18, the Partial Preservation Alternative is estimated to cost $4,562,000.
Why does the DEIR say that the Partial Preservation Project is 10% more
expensive than the Proposed Project, costing $4,416,000, rather than 03.3% more
expensive, which is the accurate figure?

D. The West Branch Project
1. The 2002-2004 Proposition 14 Plan to renovate and expand the West Branch
Library is discussed on p. 3-37. This plan would have saved the 1923 portion of
the library, while demolishing the 1974 addition, expanding the library, and
moving the 1923 portion closer to University Avenue. According to the DEIR,
“an Initial Study was completed for this project in October 2003 and found that,
with mitigation measures, there would not be a significant effect on the
environment, including on historic resources.” (Emphasis mine.) The DEIR states
on p. 5.3-3, that Partial Preservation Alternative 1 is “similar to the alternative
that … was analyzed in an Initial Study in 2003,” and on p.5.3-5, that “Partial
Preservation Alternative 2 is similar to Partial Preservation Alternative 1.” Then
how is it possible for the DEIR to reach the conclusion on p. 5.3-12 that both
Partial Preservation Alternatives 1 and 2 would result in a significant and
unavoidable impact on cultural resources, when the Initial Study for a similar plan
concluded that there would be no such impact? The DEIR should be revised to
include an accurate assessment of the impacts of Partial Preservation Plans 1 and
2.

2. On p. 5.3-10, the DEIR states that the Facilities Master Plan (FMP) proposed
rebuilding the West Branch Library in a way that was similar to the Proposition
14 plan. This plan was in turn similar to Partial Preservation Plan 1 (and also to
Partial Preservation Plan 2, which is not mentioned in this context). The plan that
the FMP proposed is referred to as the “preferred scheme.” What is the complete
list of qualities that this scheme had that made it “preferred?”

3. On p. 5.3-10, the DEIR states that cost of the preferred scheme was estimated to
be $4,751,000. The footnote states that this estimate was “without contingency
and escalation.”
   a) How was the $4.9 million estimate Measure FF funding request in the footnote
calculated, based on the cost of the preferred scheme?
   b) Since photovoltaic panels were expected to be part of the project, why wasn’t
an estimate for the $210,000 cost figured into the cost for the Partial Preservation
Alternatives before the Measure FF funds were requested?

4. Why aren’t there separate cost estimates for both partial preservation alternatives?

5. Why are there two columns labeled “Partial Preservation Alt 1” in Table 5.3-2
and none labeled “Partial Preservation Alt 2?”

6. The proposed West Branch project is described as two stories on p. 3–27, but
presented as only one story on p. 5.3-4.
   a) Why is this?
   b) Does the proposed project have a second floor?
   c) If so, why is there no diagram for it?
   d) If there is a second floor, then why isn’t it shown or discussed in the
comparison of alternatives in Section 5.3?

7. There is considerable expense in adding a second floor.
   a) Does it seem reasonable to build a second floor only to provide a 700-square-
foot mechanical area, as stated on p. 3-27?
   b) The West Branch is on a transit corridor on University Avenue and near a
transit node at University and San Pablo, where population is expected to increase
in accordance with the City’s Climate Action Plan. Would having a larger second
floor allow for the library better accommodate the future needs of a growing
neighborhood without having to spend as much later?
   c) Is it possible that anticipating and accommodating the needs of a growing
neighborhood might outweigh the benefits of having a visible meeting space on
the first floor?
   d) Is it possible that there are mitigations for having the meeting room on the
second floor, such as notices posted in the library and outside the doors?
   e) Is it possible that it may better serve the community to build a more complete
second floor during this branch improvement process? There may never be funds
to do this again, and it will certainly be more expensive to expand the second floor later.

E. The Zoning Ordinance Amendment is considered in this DEIR, but no real work has done to assess potential environmental impacts of such a far-reaching amendment. Maybe the ZOA goes too far.

1. On p. 3-2, the DEIR states that the overarching program objective is “to facilitate the approval of improvements authorized by Measure FF to ‘renovate, expand, and make seismic and access improvements at the four neighborhood branch libraries, but not the Central Library’ without eliminating public review, by allowing modification of Zoning Ordinance requirements for the existing public libraries with Use Permits rather than Variances.”
   a) Then why is the Central Library included as part of the ZOA, which applies to “all conforming or legal non-conforming public library existing as of May 1, 2010?”
   b) Does this contradict the overarching objective?
   c) Are there other objectives for the ZOA?
   d) If so, what are they?
   e) If there are other objectives, what are all of the potential environmental impacts that may result from these objectives?
   f) Would the ZOA facilitate the demolition or a major alteration of the Central Library? At the January 19, 2011 Planning Commission Meeting, Planner Aaron Sage acknowledged that this was possible.
   g) Then why weren’t these potential environmental impacts on this historic resource studied in the DEIR?

2. The ZOA does not sunset after the completion of the improvements authorized by Measure FF.
   a) Why not?
   b) Would the ZOA facilitate any demolitions or major alterations of the branch libraries after the branch library projects were completed?
   c) If so, then why aren’t these potential environmental impacts analyzed as part of this DEIR? The EIR should be corrected to include such an analysis.

3. On p. 3-1, the DEIR states “besides facilitating the approval of improvements discussed in the Branch Libraries Facilities Master Plan (FMP) and authorized under Measure FF, the ZOA would also allow modification of zoning requirements applicable to future, as yet unknown, improvements that may be necessary.”  (Emphasis mine.)
   a) In what ways might zoning requirements change?
   b) Why is there no discussion or analysis of the potential environmental impacts of such a far-reaching and unknown changes to the Zoning Ordinance?

4. The ZOA states, “the Board may modify any requirement of this Title applicable to such a change, expansion or new library as part of the Use Permit.”
   a) What does this mean?
   b) Is the “Board” the Zoning Adjustments Board?
   c) What specific powers are being given to the Board?
   d) Are these powers necessary?
   e) If so, why?
5. On p. 2-2, the DEIR states that "the potential impacts of the ZOA relate only to planned improvements at the South and West Branches. Thus, this Draft EIR addresses only those impacts." How is it possible to come to such a conclusion when the ZOA has potential impacts as discussed in items 1-4, above? The EIR must be corrected to fully explore and analyze all of the potential impacts discussed above.

6. The alternatives to the ZOA presented in the DEIR were not feasible alternatives. Why was there no consideration of a ZOA that would apply only to the Measure FF projects and sunset upon their completion? This is a reasonable alternative whose environmental impacts could be understood by the public and analyzed.
required of the residents and business owners in Berkeley.

The enclosed appendices are part and parcel of my comment letter to be included in the FEIR:

Appendix A: Stephanie Manning: Letter to City Council
Appendix B: Susan D. Cerny: Letter to City Council
Appendix C: Steven Finacom "Measure FF and Branch Library Demolitions" Berkeley Daily Planet, 12/14/10.

Sincerely, Gene Bernardi

Page 2 of 9 pages.
Dear Mayor and City Council Members:

This letter is in regards to the second reading of the repeal of Ordinance No. 7,148-N.S., which appears on the January 18th Council agenda.

As a long time Berkeley resident and public library user, I urge you to repeal Ordinance No. 7,148-N.S. which substitutes Use Permits rather than Variances for alterations or demolitions to Berkeley Public Library branches. Berkeley's libraries are a public trust and deserve citizen input on alterations and especially on demolitions.

In addition, the illegal use of Measure FF funds towards the demolition of the South and West Branches should be prohibited. Measure FF was enacted by citizen vote to rehabilitate and enhance these structures not to demolish and rebuild them.

Both the South and West Branch libraries have historic design elements which should be preserved as added cultural amenities to library users and Berkeley residents. In addition, the National Trust for Historic Preservation has determined that the greenest building is a rehabilitated older building which is already standing, even if new buildings were designed up to the latest “green” standards. The embodied energy of the existing buildings, in addition to the historic design and cultural attachment, would be lost if they are demolished.

To circumvent a public process by eliminating the public hearing requirements regarding alterations to public libraries, by lifting, “at the last minute” those requirements is truly undemocratic. Please repeal Ordinance No. 7,148-N.S.

Sincerely,
Susan D. Cerny
860 Keeler Avenue
Berkeley 94708
Measure FF and Branch Library Demolitions

By Steven Finacom
Monday December 13, 2010

A community group, “Concerned Library Users”, recently sued the City of Berkeley to, in part, stop the illegal use of bond funds for the demolition of two branch libraries.

Although the lawsuit has been excoriated and ridiculed by some public officials and community members it is, in my view, a justifiable and important effort to restrain the City from improperly changing the voter-approved use of bond money.

Let me state first that I am not a member of “Concerned Library Users”, nor am I a party to the lawsuit. My concerns about the bond arose separately, and well before the suit was filed. But they are directly relevant to some of the issues in the lawsuit.

There is one—just one—central point here.

Is it legal for a City to solicit bond funds from the voters with a specific set of written promises, then later change the use of the money to do something the ballot measure specifically did NOT fund?

In 2008 Berkeley voters approved Measure FF, which provided 26 million dollars to renovate and expand Berkeley’s four branch public libraries. The exact wording of the ballot language is worth remembering.

“Shall the City of Berkeley issue general obligation bonds not exceeding $26,000,000 to renovate, expand, and make seismic and access improvements at four neighborhood branch libraries, but not the Central Library, with annual reporting by the Library Board to the City Council?” Vote Yes or No.

Subsequent to voter approval of the bonds, the Library continued a planning and design process and hired a design team for each branch.

By early 2010 the direction of the detailed planning was clear. The Board of Library Trustees intended to renovate and build a rear addition on the North Branch, renovate the Claremont Branch without significant expansion, and demolish and completely rebuild the West and South branches.

The bond allows two of those proposed activities—renovation and expansion. One of them—demolition—is not allowed.

By proceeding down a path that will result in the demolition of the two branches, the City of Berkeley and Board of Library Trustees are directly violating the will of the voters.

Is this important? Indeed it is. If the City can establish that the explicit conditions of voter-approved bonds can be altered or ignored after the fact, then no funding earmarked for a specific purpose is safe.

There would be no point in detailed bond language or conditions at all. Instead, each ballot statement might as well read, “Do you, Berkeley voters, approve giving X million dollars above and beyond your regular taxes to the City of Berkeley to spend as it wishes? Yes or No.”
Does this matter to you? It should. What if, for instance, the School District put up a bond measure promising to renovate your neighborhood school, and you worked hard to get it passed. Then, after the election, the School Board said, “Hey, sorry, we thought all along that money would be better spent closing your school and renovating another. Sorry.”

Or what if the City Council asked voters to approve a special tax devoted solely to increase police services then, after it passed, decided that the money should go to sewer repairs instead? All for good reason, of course.

Wouldn’t you object on principle? Shouldn’t you?

So why didn’t anyone object to the proposed demolition of the South and West branches earlier than the middle of this year, when the plans were far advanced?

People did object earlier. I was one of them. No objections had any effect.

Consider the minutes of the October, 2009, Board of Library Trustees meeting. The Board met to discuss the South Branch project and take public testimony.

I attended that meeting and spoke specifically to the issue of the intent of Measure FF. Here’s how the minutes recorded my comments. They don’t exactly repeat my words, but the summary is reasonably accurate.

“Demolition vs. renovation: he has reviewed all of the public documents on the library bond through the annual report. He believes library represented to the community that would renovate and expand the branch, in his analysis given the wording of the bond measure and election analysis the library is foreclosed from a teardown of any branch, legal risk of violation, can not be easily dismissed.”

Remember, this is in October 2009, well over a year ago and before the Board of Library Trustees had stated its choice of a demolition / rebuild scheme for the South and West Branches.

What did the Board say in response to my comments?

Here’s a comment from Darryl Moore, as reported in the minutes. “In response to questions raised he suggested staff consult with the City Attorney’s Office if needed.”

That’s dry language, but it makes the point. I recall Councilmember Moore said something along the lines of “We’ve been put on notice” and asked the staff to get legal advice on whether the bond language would allow the demolitions.

Then there’s this highly revealing comment. Remember, this is not my wording; it’s from the official minutes of the Board.

“Trustee Kyper agreed with the positive comments regarding Scheme 2. To address a concern expressed during comments about the library’s ability to build new, she does not believe it is not allowed. The process leading up to the bond measure included a community process, public discussion by the board and a vote by BOLT, a new library scheme was discussed as an option throughout the process.”
Again, dry official minutes language. I remember that Trustee Kupfer seemed genuinely mystified that anyone would think the bond funds couldn’t be used for demolition. After all, they had... demolition on the table all along, she argued. Everyone knew it was being considered.

Did they? Did we? Did the Trustees really intend, from before the 2008 election, that any planning for the South and West Branch Libraries put demolition seriously on the table?

If so, they had a strange way of communicating that intention to the voters.

There was indeed a consultant report before the election that considered demolition. But in the critical months leading up to the bond election itself, public library documents and campaign literature fell strangely and selectively silent on the possibility of the demolition.

For example, here’s part of the text of the ballot argument in favor of Measure FF signed by, among others, Councilmember Moore, then Vice-Chair of the Board of Library Trustees.

"The branches are old and out of date and must be improved in order to support the over 800,000 visits during the year...This measure will bring the buildings up to current code standards, meet seismic requirements, make all of the branches fully accessible to Berkeley’s diverse population."

No word about “demolition” there, or elsewhere in the ballot arguments. In fact, the rebuttal to the ballot argument against Measure FF emphasized, “Help save and restore our neighborhood branch libraries by voting YES on Measure FF!” (emphasis added).

And it wasn’t only the official ballot arguments. Here’s what “Save Our Branch Libraries: Yes on Measure FF” said on its Facebook page. “Measure FF is a $26 million bond to renovate, expand, and make seismic and access improvements at four of Berkeley’s neighborhood branch libraries...”

And here’s a fact sheet issued on Library stationery for the election.

"The revenue from the bond will bring the buildings up to current code standards...What are the plans for each of the Branch Libraries?...North Branch, receive a small addition...West Branch have it’s 1974 addition replaced to address structural issues; restore original 1923 branch façade...South Branch...expanded to incorporate the Tool Library program into the branch with substantial increase in space...net space increase of 3,160 sq. feet...Claremont Branch receive a small lobby expansion...refurbish/restored historic features..."

And here’s part of a Daily Planet opinion piece by three prominent Library supporters, less than two months before the election. "It is critical that we renovate all our branches to ensure they are safe, modern, buildings that will serve our community..."

Consider all that language. “Bring the buildings up to current code standards... must be improved... save and restore our neighborhood branch libraries... be expanded... receive an addition... restore original... refurbish...restore...renovate all our branches...”

If arguments like those constituted a clear request to the voters to allow demolition of half the branch libraries, the Library must be using a different dictionary than the rest of us.

Councilmember Max Anderson recently told the San Francisco Chronicle, “The people voted for these libraries to be fixed up — they didn’t vote to put restrictions on what can and can’t be done with them.”
Councilmember Anderson is well intentioned, but completely wrong. The people DID indeed vote for restrictions, restrictions crafted by the promoters of Measure FF.

If Measure FF had simply been a mandate to “fix up” and/or completely rebuild the branches without precondition, then it would not have included the “renovate, expand and make seismic and access improvements” wording.

It would have simply said something like this: “Do you approve of appropriating 26 million dollars from special property taxes that the Board of Library Trustees may then use for making the four branch libraries better, in whatever way the Board deems best?”

Or perhaps it would have said, “renovate, expand, demolish/rebuild, and make seismic and access improvements…”

There’s a good reason, I suspect, that language like that did NOT go on the ballot. I believe that those who prepared the wording of Measure FF were afraid that if the measure seemed to open the door to demolition, enough voters would say “No” to sink the bonds.

In particular, voters in politically influential north and southeast Berkeley might have been afraid the Library would demolish either the North or the Claremont Branches. It wouldn’t be the first time in Berkeley that a public institution asked for bond funds to upgrade facilities, then demolished and rebuilt them instead.

If the ballot measure wording had been in specific—or had specifically mentioned demolition—it is quite likely the measure would have been defeated and there would be no money to do anything with any of the branch libraries at this time.

I know I would have voted against it for that reason, and I know many others who probably would have, too. And it would have made a critical difference.

Measure FF passed with 68.01 percent of the votes. It needed a two-thirds majority, 66.6 percent.

That two-thirds majority would have required 37,223 votes out of those cast. The Measure received 37,973. Thus, it has a margin of victory of about 750 votes.

Would 750 “Yes” voters—out of more than 55,000 casting votes on the Measure—have decided against Measure FF if the ballot language and campaign had given them reason to be concerned about demolition of any or all of the branch libraries instead of renovation?

I think any reasonable person familiar with Berkeley would agree that’s quite possible, especially if the Board of Library Trustees had made honestly made demolition a part of their case and campaign for the branch funding.

So foreclosing the possibility of demolition was, in my view, a direct reason the Measure achieved the two-thirds threshold.

In essence, the trustees chose to opt for a “safe” bond measure that would not include demolition. Now that they have the money they shouldn’t go back and change its use.

They had free will in this. They chose the wording of the bond measure. They advocated for “renovate, expand, and make seismic and access improvements…” They entered into a compact with Berkeley voters and taxpayers on terms they established.
That seems to me to be an essential point of the lawsuit. And perhaps there’s a little tacit agreement, even on the City side.

In June, City Attorney Zach Cowan apparently advised the City Council that Measure FF money could not be used to demolish the South and West Branches.

There’s simply no reason he would have advised that if he didn’t believe a legal challenge to the Measure on the demolition issue would have a chance in court.

That advice may not, however, have extended the same prohibition to use of the Measure FF funds to construct entirely new buildings. So the City and the Board of Library Trustees and their legal staff might be working on a back-up strategy.

Find funds elsewhere, outside the bonds—probably on the order of hundreds of thousands—to tear down the two branches. That would cause the City some financial pain, but would not be impossible.

Then claim that, with the old buildings gone, entirely new buildings can be constructed with the Measure FF funds to satisfy the bond intent of providing safe, accessible, expanded branch libraries.

If that indeed is the City’s strategy it is important that it be vigorously opposed. Making the branch buildings go away with some other funds then rebuilding them with Measure FF funds would be, in my view, as clear a violation of voter intent as doing it all with the bond money.

It would be a bit of legal sophistry, not clear justice. And it would open the door just as fully to official amnesia about voter intentions in the future on any other ballot measure. That would be very bad for Berkeley.

(I fully understand many readers are now wondering what I would propose for the libraries instead of what the City is currently trying to do?

If all my arguments went to their logical conclusion, the City would have no bond funds available to pursue the preferred plan of demolishing the South and West branches. Surely I don’t believe they should just sit there in poor condition?

No, I don’t. I would be happy to write another opinion piece explaining—again, going back to 2009—what approach I think the Library could have followed and why they can still follow it and achieve the goal of good, updated, branch libraries.

But the arguments for or against other alternatives should not detract from the primary argument I’ve made in this commentary—that regardless of benefits or harm to the Library’s projects, it is bad public policy, and probably illegal, to change the use of bond monies from what voters explicitly approved.)

###

Appendix C, page 9 of 9 pages.
Re: Comments and Questions about Draft EIR for Berkeley Branch Libraries Program

Dear Mr. Sage:

I gathered signatures all over Berkeley for two petition drives regarding our Landmark Preservation Ordinance. During the several weeks total that I actively sought signatures – talking to community members on the street every day – it became clear to me that the residents of South and West Berkeley were particularly concerned about the loss of their historic resources. Dozens of African American residents of South and West Berkeley told me that they felt that their neighborhoods were targets for demolitions. By contrast, I never once heard a similar statement in North Berkeley or the Elmwood.

It is therefore disheartening that the Trustees' plan is to demolish the South and West Branch libraries, while simply renovating, expanding and making seismic and access improvements – exactly what the voters approved in 2008 in Measure FF – to the North Branch and Claremont libraries.

South Berkeley Branch Library

The Berkeley Public Library Branch Libraries Facilities Master Plan (FMP) included a report by Frederick Knapp Architects concluding that the original 1961 structure was eligible for inclusion on the California Register of Historic Resources because of its association with the original architect, John Hans Ostwald (pg 3-9 of the DEIR).

For some recent history about the South Berkeley Branch Library: in 2007 there was a top-down plan to move it into the Ed Roberts complex on Adeline Street. Immediate neighbors of the library formed a group called Save Our Library (SOL) to preserve the library – the existing building in its existing location. SOL advocated for the preservation and improvement of the South Branch Library, which is what Measure FF claimed would be done to all of the branch libraries (see Exhibits A, B, C, D and E).

The Library Board of Trustees hired a firm, Hatchuel Tabernik & Associates (HTA), to survey the community's library needs. It determined that there would be a favorable response to the move. How it came to this decision is unknown.

SOL members felt that the survey did not reflect the community and therefore did their own survey. They stood outside the South Branch Library for many days and asked people how they felt about the potential move. They found that only a few people even knew about the proposed move and they found only one person who actually had been
interviewed by HTA. They collected signatures seeking to save the South Branch Library.

Ultimately SOL gathered over 600 signatures asking to keep the South Branch library (and historic building) on Russell Street. This is an indication that the real community wants the South Branch to be renovated rather than demolished.

The Library Board of Trustees knew about this grassroots effort to save the South Branch Library yet apparently entirely ignored it. Just two years later, a “public process” was conducted where politically well-connected persons were heard, and people who disagreed with the new top-down plan to demolish the South Branch Library were ignored (as was reported to me by an attendee of the “public process”).

**West Berkeley Branch Library**

West Berkeley, one of the least wealthy parts of town, has suffered more than its fair share of recent demolitions.

The Boy Scout building, formerly at 2040 Fourth Street and in use as a Mexican restaurant, was designated a City of Berkeley Structure of Merit in 2005. It was demolished for a housing development in 2008.

The Brennan’s Building, specifically mentioned in the West Berkeley Plan as a cultural resource and known to everyone as a visual landmark of West Berkeley until its demise, was demolished for the same housing project.

The Drayage Building, formerly at the southwest corner of Addison Street and 3rd Street (the railroad tracks), was identified in the West Berkeley Field Survey as a potential City of Berkeley Structure of Merit Landmark property. Yet in 2005 its low-income population was evicted when a developer showed an interest in the property for a housing development. A different developer purchased the site and demolished the building. It lies vacant today.

A pre-World War II Japanese American florist shop at the corner of San Pablo Avenue and Delaware Street, a lovely Art-Deco structure, was destroyed in 2007 despite a growing movement at the time to preserve California’s Japan-towns.

The *Historic Resource Technical Report* for the West Berkeley Branch prepared by Page & Turnbull concluded that the branch is eligible for listing in the California Register for, among other reasons, its Classical Revival-style design influenced by the Carnegie design and because it was the first branch library constructed in Berkeley. Furthermore, it was designated a City of Berkeley Structure of Merit in 2003. The FMP recommended restoring “the original 1923 branch façade and the lovely interior historic details” (see Exhibit F). Why is demolition even being considered?

*How were the decisions to demolish the branches made?*
In Appendix C to the DEIR there was a partial explanation of the so-called “public process” in choosing the “Preferred Schemes” for the two branch libraries:

“1. Public Participation in the Choice of Preferred Schemes for South and West Branch Libraries

Comment: At the community meetings on South Branch and West Branch projects, was the option of demolition [and new construction] discussed?

Reply from South Branch Project Architect: Yes, the demolition option was discussed, and most comments received were in favor of the demolition [and new construction] option.

Comment: At the community meetings, was there a community consensus on preserving aspects of the building?

Reply from West Branch Project Architect: Several studies were presented at the meetings about possible reuse of the older building. The consensus at the community meetings was not towards rebuilding the older building but towards producing a really good library.”

It appears that the architects who stood to profit from the projects were the people who got to summarize the comments from the public. Why was this allowed to happen? This seems to be a flagrant conflict of interest, especially in light of the evidence that dissenting opinions were not given the same importance as those supporting the top-down plan (see Exhibits A-E and G).

Cumulative Impacts

The cumulative impact of targeting South and West Berkeley for demolitions, despite ample evidence that the people who live in those neighborhoods wish to preserve their historic buildings rather than have them replaced with brand new buildings, has not been adequately studied.

Questions and requests:

1. What is the cumulative impact of so many demolitions of historic buildings in West Berkeley?

2. What is the cumulative impact to low-income Berkeley residents of so many demolitions occurring in low-income areas?

3. Please analyze the environmentally superior Todd Jersey Architecture plans for the South Branch Library that would preserve and enhance the historic adult and children’s reading rooms.
4. Please analyze the environmentally superior Todd Jersey Architecture plans for the West Berkeley Branch Library that would preserve the historic 1923 portion of the building and restore some of the architectural elements.

5. The "public process" should begin anew with impartial individuals quantifying responses from the public after a detailed and thorough survey has been taken of South and West Berkeley residents' sentiments with respect to the proposed demolitions of historic resources.

Sincerely,

Gale Garcia
Why we want the South Branch Library to stay where it is

The Berkeley South Branch library is on the Library Trustees’ fast track to being moved to the Ed Roberts campus. Much money has already been spent on this project. Architects Noll and Tam have developed three space options at the Ed Roberts campus.

We are a group of South Berkeley residents who are opposed to the proposed move. We have called ourselves Save Our Library, (SOL). We believe that the proposal is being driven by political motives that have little to do with better serving South Berkeley residents.

At the June 9th community forum, held at St. Paul African Methodist Episcopal Church (A.M.E.), some community members felt strongly that the move to the Ed Roberts campus was being “sold” to the community and their survey did not reflect the number of neighbors and community members who do not want our South Branch library moved or services reduced. We are concerned with maintaining this venue as it is central to our diverse community connection which has been developed over years.

After the forum it was clear that we needed to raise our community’s awareness of these issues. We decided to take the concerns we voiced at the forum to our community members and get their opinions and concerns to get a consensus. The consensus was concern for the safety of our children, keeping the library in our neighborhood and making the changes at South Branch, e.g., remodel, rearrange, and reuse, rather than putting our money somewhere else, were the dominant issues. We are advocating for the preservation and improvement of our South Branch library.

Many children use the South Branch Library. We are concerned that the move will put our children at risk in two ways. There will be two large very busy streets for the children to cross. Currently, the intersections of Adeline Street and Ashby Avenue do not have caution signs alerting motorists that our community has disabled persons, children, elders, or dogs, as pedestrians. Even if caution signs are installed, people drive and multi-task these days and there is no way to guarantee the safety of pedestrians. Several people have been killed or badly injured in this area as it is. There are many concerns with the concept of a “transit library” built on top of a light rail system.

A Berkeley firm, Hatchel Tabernik & Associates (HTA), was hired by the Library Trustees to survey the South Berkeley community’s library needs. They came up with statistics that pointed to a very favorable response to the move by the community; we decided to look into it further.

We stood outside the South Branch library for many days and asked people if they knew about the move and how they felt about it. In the course of a petition drive to contest the proposed move, we collected hundreds of signatures, but encountered only a handful, (fewer than 10%) who even knew about the proposed move, and only one person who had been actually interviewed by HTA.

What we want is for the South Branch library to stay on Russell Street. Please come to the next Board of Library Trustees (BOLT) meeting. Meetings are usually at the South Branch library on Russell at M.L.King, Jr. Way at 7pm. Public Comment begins the meeting, (you will have to sign a speaker card so please arrive a few minutes early). Your presence insures the democratic process.

If you cannot make the meetings,
please write to: BOLT at 2090 Kittredge Street, Berkeley, CA 94704
Or Berkeley Daily Planet at: opinion@berkeleydailyplanet.com

Save Our Library (SOL) 510 849-1296 savesobranch@yahoo.com
Berkeley Library Deserves to Be Saved

by Jane Wellford

The South Branch Library is on the Library Trustees' fast track to being moved to the Ed Roberts campus on the uphill side of the Albany/Berkeley border. Much money has already been spent on this project. A Berkeley firm, Hattenfeld, Taburn & Associates, was hired by the Library Trustees to survey the South Berkeley community's library needs. They came up with statistics that pointed to a very favorable response to the move by the community, which decided to look into it further. We believe that the proposal is being driven by political motives that have little to do with better serving South Berkeley residents.

Save Our Library is a group of South Berkeley residents and library users who came together at a Community Forum on June 8, called by the Board of Library Trustees and held at St. Paul African Methodist Episcopal Church. We decided to go to the community and ask them, as we asked the city, the South Branch Library for many days and asked people if they knew about the move and how they felt about it. In the course of a petition drive to contest the proposed move, we collected hundreds of signatures, with only a handful (less than 10 percent) from people who even knew about the proposed move, and only one person who had actually interviewed by the company hired to do the survey.

We felt strongly that the move to the Ed Roberts campus was being "sold" to the community. We also felt that the survey of South Berkeley needs, ordered by the Board of Library Trustees, did not reflect the neighbors and community members.

We are advocating for the present.
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duates and improvement of South Branch Library at Russell Street and Martin Luther King Jr. Way. It is to be an expanded Children's and Teen Learning Library. We are not opposed to the building of a library at the Ed Roberts Campus.

However, there are many concerns with the concept of a "transit library" built on top of a train rail system where the existing South Branch Library is a small, safe and friendly space where many children go after school and on Saturdays.

The new director of the Library has called for a community meeting to be held this Wednesday, July 31, at 7 p.m. at the Lawrence Middle School 3000 3rd Street in the multipurpose room. Architects from Noli & Tan have developed three space options at the Ed Roberts Campus that they will present to the meeting. If you have ideas about the South Berkeley Library, please come and discuss your ideas with the South Berkeley Library.

Jane Wellford is a member of Save Our Library. For more information call 911-555-0000.
Meeting Draws South Branch Library Supporters

By JUDITH SCHERR

A community meeting which officials said they called Tuesday evening to discuss general library needs was part Berkeley Library lovefest, part rally to save the South Berkeley Branch Library.

While notices of the community meeting at the Over 60s Health Clinic on Sacramento Street and Alcatraz Avenue, posted around town and on the city website, called for people to come to the meeting to “tell us what you want from your Berkeley Public Library,” other notices posted by a group organizing to Save the South Berkeley Branch Library asked for supporters to turn out to the meeting.

There has been a plan afoot, which the Library Board of Trustees has been discussing for more than a year, to move the small South Berkeley library at Martin Luther King Jr., Way and Russell Street a few blocks southeast to the planned Ed Roberts Campus, slated to house mostly non-profit organizations serving disabled people.

The project, to be located where the Ashby BART Station east parking lot is now, has yet to raise the funds it needs to break ground.

The first community meeting to introduce the possible library move was held last month at St. Paul's AME Church, while there is support for the proposal, opposition has also begun to congeal.

The trustees have commissioned architectural drawings of the project and, while speaking favorably of it, they are quick to say they have made no decision about the move.

The architect will speak about the project at a public meeting at 7 p.m. August 1 at the Central Library third-floor meeting room. At the same time there will be interviews for new trustees and selection of the trustee by the board.

When the 30 or so people attending the Tuesday evening meeting were asked what they liked about the library, people did not hesitate to speak up: “It’s rare that I’m looking for a book I can’t find in the library,” said one person.

“I go to the West Branch and I like it because they’ll send me a book from another branch,” said another.

People said they like the reference staff, the fact that they can get newspapers online or go to the Central Library to look at paper copies, the children’s programs, the way homeless people visiting the library are treated with respect and much more.

The discussion turned to the possible move of the South Berkeley Branch.

“I’d like to know why you want to relocate it,” said one person, “It’s right next to a park and in a residential setting.”

While South Branch supervisor Jeri Ewart underscored how small the library is, one person responded with the response, “You don’t need a map to move around in it,” she said.

A woman identifying herself as a teacher at the adult school said her students told her they feel more comfortable in the small setting. “They feel intimidated in the Central Library,” she said.

Yolanda Huang, a Parks and Recreation Commission member, said the South Branch Library is on a trajectory for kids walking down from Willard Middle School, up from Longfellow School and is next to a recreation center. “It’s part of their world,” she said, suggesting that the recreation center ought to be better integrated with the library.

“The South Branch is a little place for kids in the afternoons,” Huang said.

Elaine Green, a candidate for the Board of Trustees, said the proposed site of South of Ashby and east of Addison poses safety

Continued on Page Twenty-One
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concerns for children crossing the wide streets.

A member of the group is forming to keep the South Branch where it is; Green said they have collected signatures of 300 people who oppose the move.

Winston Burton suggested spending funds to improve South Branch rather than moving it, using the meeting room for homework help, showing films and hosting art and music programs. “It can become so much more than a place to read books,” he said.

One person suggested moving the adult books to a new site at the Ed Roberts Campus and leaving the children’s and youth component where it is, and another said the tool library should move, leaving space for expansion of the rest of the library.

Library Trustee Terry Powell pointed out some of the negatives of the present South Branch site. “We know that the South Branch is very crowded,” she said, noting that the space limits the number of books there.

“First, limited accessibility [for disabled people],” and a limited number of computers, she said, underscoring, however, “We haven’t made a decision, no commitment.”

But Huang was not convinced that South Branch versus Ed Roberts was the correct discussion to be having. “The needs of the South Branch need to be unhinged from Ed Roberts” and considered in their own right, she said.
August 2, 2007

Councilman Max Anderson  
2180 Milvia Street, 5th Floor  
Berkeley, CA 94704

Re: Keeping our South Branch Library on Russell Street.

Dear Councilman Anderson

On behalf of the committee, Save Our Library (SOL), (South Berkeley residents) and supporters, your constituents, we strongly urge you to advocate for our position to keep the library at its present location. We have enclosed petitions containing five hundred and seventy-five (575) signatures of your constituents who are collectively teachers, students, property owners, business owners, and elders all of whom want to keep our beloved South Branch at its current location. Over the past fifty years our South Branch has been an integral part of our daily neighborhood activity and community connection. [Our South Branch has an atmosphere of peace and a special quality that feels sacred to those of us who love it.] It has maintained an educational and cultural partnership with our children’s schools and our children in a safe environment. Its’ presence is a welcoming venue for our culturally diverse community. It is our library. Its’ opening in 1961 marked the end of a segregated Berkeley and the beginning of our social justice era. It is the center piece of our neighborhood. Our concerns about the proposed new site are real. In addition to the objectionable prospect of ripping the soul out of our community; crossing the Adeline St. and Ashby Ave. corridors raises some serious safety issues. One could argue that the Ed Roberts Campus (ERC) location is only two blocks away and is still in our neighborhood. No. The ERC is a light rail site in South Berkeley; with the risk of crossing the highway and a transit location, as well as the danger of drivers who multi-task (this cannot be mitigated)! We know that our branch needs some improvements and we believe that those improvements can be satisfactorily met at the current location. In addition, as mentioned at last weeks meeting the findings of a sociologist held that children do not change their established routes of travel. The ERC is not on their route. We hope you will partner with us and other members in our community to strengthen our connection through other activities at the
library. One of our members designed a plan for development and introduced it to the city, which was well received for addressing the needs of our community; it has the Youth Uprising Model (youth advocacy) as a component. The library could partner with the recreation center, (across the street), and implement this model. Another study revealed that small venues enhanced the individual’s connection to their environment (related to our tribal needs). Conversely, when there are fewer small venues e.g. branch libraries, corner stores, or barber shops, people become disconnected with their neighborhood.

There is another issue that is evidenced in our city as a consequence of this new development trend, it is gentrification. Wherever these light rail developments occur the impact is gentrification to residents and existing businesses. We are your constituents not those who might be commuting from elsewhere. Gentrification is development void of democracy, this is an avoidable aberration for Berkeley. We hope that you will consider all of the factors thoroughly before proceeding deliberately; being ever watchful for the “x” factor that cannot be mitigated and has the potential to cause irrevocable damage.

We believe in order to assess the needs of our library; you must engage the community in the process. The library trustees’ and Mr. Bern have agreed to work with us on this issue; we are willing to partner with them or anyone who is able to help.

What is at stake is the safety of our children, the loss of our community connection, the decline of our children’s participating in library services, the loss of a treasure to the entire community, our South Branch, and a significant part of our social history. We will zealously continue our commitment to keep our branch library.

Thank you

Enclosures
Co: Board of Library Trustees

Email: savesobranch@yahoo.com
Date: April 1, 2008

To: The Honorable Mayor and Council members

From: Elaine Green, Chair
       Save Our Library (SOL), savesobranch@yahoo.com

Re: Petition to keep the South Branch Library (and historic building) on Russell Street

Public Comment

Dear Honorable Mayor Bates and Council Members

Our committee, Save Our Library (SOL) and the signers of the attached petition urge to consider our concerns when reviewing the reports and needs of our community. The South Branch Library has historical value, a public venue where our diverse community has a sense of “community property,” and is the center piece of our neighborhood. It is a safe place for our children.

We have attended many meetings held by the Board of Library Trustees requesting that our library be remodeled and in compliance with the ADA. Our request seems to be the ballot measure package 2.

We urge again to consider the public will in your decision process.

At your service

God
Shaping the Future of Your Neighborhood Library

West Branch

West Branch, constructed in 1923, is the oldest of the four branch libraries. In May of 2003, was designated by the City Landmarks Commission as a "Structure of Merit." The branch serves an active and diverse community and houses the library's successful "Berkeley Reads" adult literacy program, providing over 8,000 hours of literacy education each year. In addition, West Branch offers storytimes and programs for young children, a meeting room for community use, programs for teens and a popular selection of multilingual materials.
With over 93,000 visits a year, West Branch is a hub of activity. However, branch activities and services are hampered by its small size. The community meeting room is in constant use for literacy tutoring and youth programming, and demand outweighs available space for program events, seating and tables for reading, and computers. The recommended renovations will add much-needed space — including a study room for the literacy program, address structural issues, and restore the original 1923 branch façade and the lovely interior historic details.

**Issues of concern**
- Lack of sufficient programming and meeting space
- Inadequate and outdated electrical, ventilation and plumbing systems
- Inadequate lighting
- Structural damage from decay, pests, and rot
- Not seismically sound
- Not ADA compliant

**Recommendations**
- Increase existing 6,230 sq ft building by 38%, approximately 2,300 sq ft of additional space
- Make existing building seismically safe
- Upgrade and/or replace the mechanical, electrical, and telecommunication systems
- Replace existing lighting
- Add a fire sprinkler system for the entire building
- Bring existing building up to full ADA compliance
Reader Opinion

Measure FF and Branch Library Demolitions

By Steven Finacom
Mon Dec 13 17:56:00 -0800 2010

A community group, Concerned Library Users, recently sued the City of Berkeley to, in part, stop the illegal use of bond funds for the demolition of two branch libraries.

Although the lawsuit has been excoriated and ridiculed by some public officials and community members it is, in my view, a justifiable and important effort to restrain the City from improperly changing the voter-approved use of bond money.

Let me state first that I am not a member of Concerned Library Users, nor am I a party to the lawsuit. My concerns about the bond arose separately, and well before the suit was filed. But they are directly relevant to some of the issues in the lawsuit.

There is one just one-central point here.

Is it legal for a City to solicit bond funds from the voters with a specific set of written promises, then later change the use of the money to do something the ballot measure specifically did NOT fund?

In 2008 Berkeley voters approved Measure FF, which provided 26 million dollars to renovate and expand Berkeley’s four branch public libraries. The exact wording of the ballot language is worth remembering.

“Shall the City of Berkeley issue general obligation bonds not exceeding $26,000,000 to renovate, expand, and make seismic and access improvements at four neighborhood branch libraries, but not the Central Library, with annual reporting by the Library Board to the City Council?” Vote Yes or No.

Subsequent to voter approval of the bonds, the Library continued a planning and design process and hired a design team for each branch.
By early 2010 the direction of the detailed planning was clear. The Board of Library Trustees intended to renovate and build a new addition on the North Branch, renovate the Claremont Branch without significant expansion, and demolish and complete rebuild the West and South branches.

The bond allows two of those proposed activities—renovation and expansion. One of them—demolition—is not allowed.

By proceeding down a path that will result in the demolition of the two branches, the City of Berkeley and Board of Library Trustees are directly violating the will of the voters.

Is this important? Indeed it is. If the City can establish that the explicit conditions of voter-approved bonds can be altered or ignored once a decision is made, then no funding earmarked for a specific purpose is safe.

There would be no point in detailed bond language or conditions at all. Instead, each ballot statement might as well read, “Do you, Berkeley voters, approve giving X million dollars above and beyond your regular taxes to the City of Berkeley to spend as it wishes? Yes or No.”

Does this matter to you? It should. What if, for instance, the School District put up a bond measure promising to renovate your neighborhood school, and you worked hard to get it passed. Then, after the election, the School Board said, “Hey, sorry, we thought all along that money would be better spent closing your school and renovating another. Sorry.”

Or what if the City Council asked voters to approve a special tax devoted solely to increase police services then, after it passed, decided that the money should go to sewer repairs instead? All for good reason, of course.

Wouldn’t your object on principle? Shouldn’t you?

So why didn’t anyone object to the proposed demolition of the South and West Branches earlier than the middle of this year, when the plans were far advanced?

People did object earlier. I was one of them. No objections had any effect.

Consider the minutes of the October, 2009, Board of Library Trustees meeting. The Board met to discuss the South Branch project and take public testimony.

I attended that meeting and spoke specifically to the issue of the intent of Measure FF. Here’s how the minutes recorded my comments. They don’t exactly repeat my words, but the summary is reasonably accurate.

"Demolition vs. renovation: he has reviewed all of the public documents on the library bond through the annual report. He believes library represented to the community that would renovate and expand the branches, in his analysis given the wording of the bond measure and election analysis the library is foreclosed from a tear down of any branch, legal risk of violation, can not be easily dismissed."

Remember, this is in October 2009, well over a year ago and before the Board of Library Trustees had stated its choice of a demolition/rebuild scheme for the South and West Branches.

What did the Board say in response to my comments?

Here’s a comment from Darryl Moore, as reported in the minutes. "In response to questions raised he suggested staff consult with the City Attorney’s Office if needed."

That’s dry language, but it makes the point. I recall Councilmember Moore said something along the lines of “We’ve been put on notice” and asked the staff to get legal advice on whether the bond language would allow the demolitions.

Then there’s this highly revealing comment. Remember, this is not my wording; it’s from the official minutes of the Board.

"Trustee Kupfer agreed with the positive comments regarding Scheme 2. To address a concern expressed during comments about the library’s ability to build new, she does not believe it is not allowed. The process leading up to the bond measure included a community process, public discussion by the board and a vote by BOLT, a new library scheme was discussed as an option throughout the process."

Again, dry official minutes language. I remember that Trustee Kupfer seemed genuinely mystified that anyone would think the bond funds couldn’t be used for demolition. After all, they had demolition on the table all along, she argued. Everyone knew it was being considered.

Did they? Did we? Did the Trustees really intend, from before the 2008 election, that any planning for the South and West Branch Libraries put demolition seriously on the table?

If so, they had a strange way of communicating that intention to the voters.

There was indeed a consultant report before the election that considered demolition. But in the critical months leading up to the bond election itself, public library documents and campaign literature fell strangely and selectively silent on the possibility of the demolition.

For example, here’s part of the text of the ballot argument in favor of Measure FF signed by, among others, Councilmember Moore, then Vice-Chair of the Board of Library Trustees.

"The branches are old and out of date and must be improved in order to support the over 80,000 visits during the year... This measure will bring the buildings up to current code standards, meet seismic requirements, make all of the branches fully accessible to Berkeley’s diverse population."

No word about “demolition” there, or elsewhere in the ballot arguments. In fact, the rebuttal to the ballot argument against Measure FF emphasized, "Help save and restore our neighborhood branch libraries by voting YHS on Measure FF" (emphasis added).

And it wasn’t only the official ballot arguments. Here’s what "Save Our Branch Libraries: Yes on Measure FF" said on its Facebook page. "Measure FF is a $26 million bond to renovate, expand, and make seismic and access improvements at four of Berkeley’s neighborhood branch libraries..."

And here’s a fact sheet issued by Library Stationary for the election.

"The revenue from the bond will bring the buildings up to current code standards... What are the plans for each of the Branch Libraries?... North Branch, receive a small addition... West Branch have it’s 1974 addition replaced to address structural issues; restore original 1923 branch facade... South Branch... expanded to incorporate the Tool Library program into the branch with substantial increase in space... net space increase of 3,150 sq. feet... Claremont Branch receive a small lobby expansion... refurbish/restored historic features..."

And here’s part of a Daily Planet opinion piece by three prominent Library supporters, less than two months before the election. “It is critical that we renovate all our branches to ensure they are safe, modern, buildings that will serve our community..."

Consider all that language. “Bring the buildings up to current code standards... must be improved... save and restore our neighborhood branch libraries... be expanded... receive an addition... restore original... refurbish... restore... renovate all our branches..."

If arguments like those constituted a clear request to the voters to allow demolition of half the branch libraries, the Library must be using a different dictionary than the rest of us.
Councilmember Max Anderson recently told the San Francisco Chronicle, “The people voted for these libraries to be fixed up - they didn’t vote to put restrictions on what can and can’t be done with them.” Councilmember Anderson is well intentioned, but completely wrong. The people DID indeed vote for restrictions, restrictions crafted by the promoters of Measure FF.

“If Measure FF had simply been a mandate to “fix up” and/or completely rebuild the branches without precondition, then it would not have included the “renovate, expand and make seismic and access improvements” wording.

It would have simply said something like this: “Do you approve of appropriating 26 million dollars from special property taxes that the Board of Library Trustees may then use for making the four branch libraries better, in whatever way the Board deems best?”

Or perhaps it would have said, “renovate, expand, demolish/ rebuild, and make seismic and access improvements…”

There’s a good reason, I suspect, that language like that did NOT go on the ballot. I believe that those who prepared the wording of Measure FF were afraid that if the measure seemed to open the door to demolition, enough voters would say “No” to sink the bonds.

In particular, voters in politically influential north and southeast Berkeley might have been afraid the Library would demolish either the North or the Claremont Branches. It wouldn’t be the first time in Berkeley that a public institution asked for bond funds to upgrade facilities, then demolished and rebuilt them instead.

If the ballot measure wording had been in specific-or had specifically mentioned demolition-it is quite likely the measure would have been defeated and there would be no money to do anything with any of the branch libraries at this time.

I know I would have voted against it for that reason, and I know many others who probably would have, too. And it would have made a critical difference.

Measure FF passed with 68.01 percent of the votes. It needed a two-thirds majority, 66.6 percent.

That two-thirds majority would have required 37,223 votes out of those cast. The Measure received 37,973. Thus, it has a margin of victory of about 750 votes.

Would 750 “Yes” voters-out of more than 55,000 casting votes on the Measure-have decided against Measure FF if the ballot language and campaign had given them reason to be concerned about demolition of any or all of the branch libraries instead of renovation?

I think any reasonable person familiar with Berkeley would agree that’s quite possible, especially if the Board of Library Trustees had made honestly made demolition a part of their case and campaign for the branch funding.

So foreclosing the possibility of demolition was, in my view, a direct reason the Measure achieved the two-thirds threshold.

In essence, the trustees chose to opt for a “safe” bond measure that would not include demolition. Now that they have the money they shouldn’t go back and change its use.

They had free will in this. They chose the wording of the bond measure. They advocated for “renovate, expand, make seismic and access improvements…” They entered into a compact with Berkeley voters and taxpayers on terms they established.

That seems to me to be an essential point of the lawsuit. And perhaps there’s a little tacit agreement, even on the City side.

In June, City Attorney Zach Cowan apparently advised the City Council that Measure FF money could not be used to demolish the South and West Branches.

There’s simply no reason he would have advised that if he didn’t believe a legal challenge to the Measure on the demolition issue would have a chance in court.

That advice may not, however, have extended the same prohibition to use of the Measure FF funds to construct entirely new buildings. So the City and the Board of Library Trustees and their legal staff might be working on a back-up strategy.

Find funds elsewhere, outside the bonds—probably on the order of hundreds of thousands—to tear down the two branches. That would cause the City some financial pain, but would not be impossible.

Then claim that, with the old buildings gone, entirely new buildings can be constructed with the Measure FF funds to satisfy the bond intent of providing safe, accessible, expanded branch libraries.

If that indeed is the City’s strategy it is important that it be vigorously opposed. Making the branch buildings go away with some other funds then rebuilding them with Measure FF funds would be, in my view, as clear a violation of voter intent as doing it all with the bond money.

It would be a bit of legal sophistry, not clear justice. And it would open the door just as fully to official amnesia about voter intentions in the future on any other ballot measure. That would be very bad for Berkeley.

(I fully understand many readers are now wondering what I would propose for the libraries instead of what the City is currently trying to do?)

If all my arguments went to their logical conclusion, the City would have no bond funds available to pursue the preferred plan of demolishing the South and West branches. Surely I don’t believe they should just sit there in poor condition?

No, I don’t. I would be happy to write another opinion piece explaining again, going back to 2009—what approach I think the Library could have followed and why they can still follow it and achieve the goal of good, updated, branch libraries.

But the arguments for or against other alternatives should not detract from the primary argument I’ve made in this commentary—that regardless of benefits or harm to the Library’s projects, it is bad public policy, and probably illegal, to change the use of bond monies from what voters explicitly approved.)
Nicola Swinburne

From: Sage, Aaron E. [ASage@ci.berkeley.ca.us]
Sent: Monday, January 31, 2011 3:42 PM
To: Nicola Swinburne; Corbeil, Donna
Subject: FW: comments on Branch Libraries Program Draft EIR
Attachments: Branch Libraries Demolition & Renovation Project, Jan 2011.doc

FYI.

-----Original Message-----
From: Clifford J Fred [mailto:cafred1@juno.com]
Sent: Monday, January 31, 2011 3:31 PM
To: Sage, Aaron E.
Subject: comments on Branch Libraries Program Draft EIR

1-31-11

to Aaron Sage,

Please include my attached comments on the Berkeey Branch Libraries Program Draft EIR in the official CEQA record for response.

Please reply by phone or e-mail to confirm that you have received my comments.

thank you
Clifford Fred
525-1486

Get Free Email with Video Mail & Video Chat!
http://www.juno.com/freemail?refclid=JUTAGOUT1FM0210
January 30, 2011
Clifford Fred
1334 Peralta Avenue
Berkeley, California 94702

Aaron Sage
City of Berkeley Planning Department

**RE: COMMENTS ON CITY OF BERKELEY BRANCH PUBLIC LIBRARIES DEMOLITION & RENOVATION PROJECT DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (DEIR)**

I urge the City of Berkeley to extend the comment period for the Branch Public Libraries Demolition & Renovation Project Draft EIR by at least an additional 30 days, and to schedule an additional public hearing on the Draft EIR at the end of the comment period. The Branch Libraries service a broad section of the community, and notification of the availability of the DEIR has been inadequate.

The proposed demolitions of the South and West Branches have not been well publicized. The historic features of these libraries deserve to be preserved, just as those of the Claremont and North Branches.

Based on the public’s comments on the Draft EIR, I urge the City to re-circulate a revised Branch Libraries Demolition & Renovation Project and a revised Draft EIR.

The Revised Draft EIR - which responds to and incorporates the public's comments on the First Draft, should be re-circulated for public review and comment, with at least one public hearing on the Revised Draft EIR. This would give the public the opportunity to review and comment on the Lead Agency’s responses to the significant environmental points raised in the review and consultation process.

The Branch Libraries Demolition & Renovation Project should be considered separately from the EIR. Once a Final EIR is approved, the City should hold public hearings on the project itself.

**THE LIKELY ABANDONMENT, DESTRUCTION, OR REMOVAL AND RELOCATION OF BOOKS FROM THE BRANCH LIBRARIES.**

Where appropriate, a Draft EIR should contain discussion of the economic and social impact of a proposed project.

The likely abandonment, destruction, and removal and relocation of large numbers of books from the branch libraries is a significant social impact that should be discussed in the EIR. The essence of a public library is its book collection.

How many books will be removed from each of the Branch Libraries? Specifically, which of these books will be discarded or destroyed? Specifically, which of these books will be sold or given away? Specifically, which of these books will be sent to deep storage?

See page 2.
Clifford Fred comments on Branch Libraries Project Draft EIR continued from page 1.

The loss of these unique books would be a significant social and historically loss to the Berkeley community. Older books, especially, contain information and ideas not found anywhere else.

About 10 years ago, in a controversial move, the City of San Francisco abandoned, gave away or destroyed thousands of irreplaceable books in the course of relocating its Main Public Library. Will this be repeated in Berkeley?

The EIR should discuss Project alternatives in which no books are destroyed, sold or given away.

SOCIAL IMPACT OF LOSS OF BRANCH LIBRARIES FOR AN EXTENDED PERIOD

The EIR should also consider the negative social impact of the loss of each of the Branch Public Libraries for an extended period of time. Realistically, where are Berkeley residents expected to go for their library needs while the Branch Libraries are being rebuilt or renovated?

Can the Berkeley Main Library really handle a large additional volume of people everyday? The EIR should recognize that while parking is generally available near the Branch Libraries, there is no free parking anywhere near the Berkeley Main Library.

Please inform me of the availability of the Final EIR or Revised Draft EIR, and of any subsequent public hearings on the EIR or the Branch Libraries Project.

Thank you,

Clifford Fred
Nicola Swinburne

From: Sage, Aaron E. [ASage@ci.berkeley.ca.us]
Sent: Monday, January 31, 2011 9:15 AM
To: Nicola Swinburne; Corbeil, Donna
Subject: FW: Corrected copy-- my name added!
Attachments: Comments on Library DEIR variances and ZOA.doc

FYI. (Replaces previous version.)

From: G. Poschman [mailto:poschman1@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, January 28, 2011 9:56 AM
To: Sage, Aaron E.
Subject: Corrected copy-- my name added!

I hope this does it.

1/31/2011
Thursday, January 27, 2011

To: Aaron Sage, Senior Planner  
Land Use Planning Division

From: Gene Poschman

Re: Comments on the Inadequacy of the “Berkeley Branch Libraries Program—Draft Environmental Impact Report Sch #2010062051”

I. Section 5.1 Alternatives to Zoning Ordinance Amendment of the DEIR reads as follows:

In granting a Variance to a project, the City must make at least one of two findings specified by Section 23B.44.030 of the Berkeley Municipal Code, including finding that there are "exceptional or extraordinary circumstances [sic-"or conditions” omitted] applying to the land, building or use" and finding that a "Variance [sic- “the granting of the application is omitted ] is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights of the subject property's owner." Of the two required findings, the former would be difficult to conclude for the South and West Branches because these sites are, by Berkeley standards, relatively large, rectangular sites with no special constraints compared to other sites in their respective neighborhoods. Demolition of the South and West Branch buildings would create a "blank slate," allowing relatively easy compliance with setback and lot coverage requirements. The latter finding would also be difficult to conclude for these projects since the library is a publicly owned and operated facility, and therefore the economic use of the building is irrelevant. Compliance with the setback requirements would not preclude the continued use of the sites as public libraries.

There are many inadequacies in this part of the DEIR

1)—The inability to count.

To quote:

“In granting a Variance to a project, the City must make at least one of two findings specified by Section 23B.44.030 of the Berkeley Municipal Code, ….”

(bold added)

Comment: But section 23B.44.030 has not two but three findings and states in Section A that all of the findings must be made.

   23B.44.030 Findings for Issuance and Denial
A. After the Board has conducted a public hearing, it shall act on the application. The Board may approve a Variance application, either as submitted or modified, only if it makes all of the following findings: (Bold added) [goes on to show 3 findings]

How any competent DEIR preparation could count 2 rather than 3 findings and then somehow get 1 out of 2 is inexplicable to say the least.

2)--- The excluding of “relatively large rectangular sites from being eligible for receiving a variance” no matter what their use.

To quote the DEIR:

Of the two required findings, the former would be difficult to conclude for the South and West Branches because these sites are, by Berkeley standards, relatively large, rectangular sites with no special constraints compared to other sites in their respective neighborhoods.

To quote the variance language of the Zoning Ordinance.

23B.44.010 Variances
The Board may grant Variances to vary or modify the strict application of any of the regulations or provisions of this Ordinance with reference to the use of property, the height of buildings, the yard setbacks of buildings, the percentage of lot coverage, the lot area requirements, or the parking space requirements of this Ordinance....(Bold added)

23B.44.030.1.

There are exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applying to the land, building or use referred to in the application, which circumstances or conditions do not apply generally to land, buildings and/or uses in the same District; (bold added)

Comment: It is again inexplicable, to say the least, that the “use of the property” is ignored and only the site’s shape and size --“relatively large, rectangular” is invoked. The “use of the property” is a public library of which there is one in the whole West Berkeley area and one in the whole South Berkeley area.

Is this DEIR invoking official City policy and/or the City Attorney’s opinion that “use of the property ” is not to be considered in variance findings despite the wording of the ordinance?

Further, is this DEIR invoking official City policy and/or the City Attorney’s opinion that there can be no variances on sites in the neighborhoods around these libraries which are
relatively large and rectangular? Of course, if this is policy it would refer to all such sites in Berkeley of which there must be many thousands.
3)—Demolition and “easy compliance”?

To quote:

Demolition of the South and West Branch buildings would create a "blank slate," allowing relatively easy compliance with setback and lot coverage requirements.

Comment: This sentence is very confused—There is no relationship between demolition and “easy compliance.” The buildings could by demolished now with a use permit but if the variances remain—which they would without the ZOA, there would be supposedly—I say supposedly because I have doubts about this contention about variances-- no “relatively easy compliance.” So it is not demolition which makes for “easy compliance.” –It is (supposedly) only after the ZOA is enacted and it would then only take a use permit that it would be “easy compliance.”

Take it out.

4)—The difficulty or perhaps impossibility of granting a variance to any “publicly owned and operated facility.”

The second finding is

2. The granting of the application is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights of the subject property’s owner;

To quote the DEIR:

The latter finding would also be difficult to conclude for these projects since the library is a publicly owned and operated facility, and therefore the economic use of the building is irrelevant.

Comment: It is nice to see the word “use” –which was left out in the first variance finding—actually used albeit, in a garbled manner. It seems to say that the library has an “economic use” but since the City owns it, it is irrelevant because the City cannot have any substantial property rights with regard to say, a new West Berkeley Library. There is a bond issue for 26 million dollars of which many millions are to be devoted to the West Berkeley site but such economic figures, no matter how many millions, are not a substantial property right!

Please have the DEIR refer to a written opinion by the City Attorney on this finding and the way the DEIR has described it so that the EIR will have some chance of being adequate.
II. The wording and meaning of the Zoning Ordinance Amendment.

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

The wording of the amendment is overly broad, unclear, and needs modification and there is really no direct analysis of its impact.

1)—The declaration that the ZOA does not really “by itself would not result in an environmental impacts”

Although the ZOA is a policy or administrative process, that by itself would not result in environmental impacts, it facilitates four branch library projects each of which is reasonable [sic] foreseeable.” (5.1.2)

Comment: Given the preparer’s difficulty with language and interpretation as shown above with regard to variance language, the disclaimer is both wrong and inadequate. The ZOA is an amendment to the ZO which covers 5 libraries. Any changes that could be made with a use permit and could have an impact on the environment, require the ZOA language --whether a policy or an administrative process or whatever-- be examined for such impact. This is not done.

3----The last sentence of the ZOA gives the Zoning Adjustment Board the overly broad authority to change by use permit any requirement in the entire ZO which may be applicable to “such change, expansion, or new library.”

To quote:

The Board may modify any requirement of this Title applicable to such change, expansion or new library as part of the Use Permit.

There is simply nowhere in the DEIR any recognition of the possibly dozens or perhaps hundreds of requirements that can be modified. I am not describing what might or might not happen, but the clear issue is what authority this provision actually gives the Zoning Adjustment Board. And nowhere is this discussed.
We know that the change from variance to use permit explicitly changes the authority of the Zoning Adjustment Board with regard to

the use of property, the height of buildings, the yard setbacks of buildings, the percentage of lot coverage, the lot area requirements, or the parking space requirements of this Ordinance;

Take for example the height of the building which houses a library. The setbacks, percentage of lot coverage etc. may have very little environmental impact but clearly with the wording of the ZOA the Zoning Adjustment Board has the authority by issuing a use permit to build any number of stories on any of the 5 library sites at any time in the future—three stories, four stories, or even more. Again, the issue is not what is the probability of something happening but does the looseness of the language legally give the Zoning Adjustment Board authority to do so with a use permit. This ZOA language also applies to the library building site downtown and gives the Zoning Adjustment Board the authority with a use permit to build any number of stories on that site, 5, 6 or even more. The impact of such authority given to the Zoning Adjustment Board by the language of the ZOA is never addressed by the DEIR and thus the DEIR is not adequate.

Suggested language change—Since the clear reason for the ZOA language is setbacks, lot coverage, lot area requirements and parking and not stories, rewrite the ZOA to refer specifically to these items.

_The Board may modify any requirement of this Title concerning setbacks, lot coverage, lot area requirements and parking applicable to such change, expansion or new library as part of the Use Permit._

3)—**What is the meaning of the phrase in the ZOA which reads after “subject to the issuance of a Use Permit” —unless such change, expansion or new library is otherwise allowed by this Title”?**

At first glance it appears to perhaps mean that if something is now a ZC that it would not be upped to a Use Permit but the phrase is “otherwise allowed by this title.” It makes it appear that if it now is allowed by this title by a use permit that after this ZOA is enacted it would no longer need a use permit. There is no explanation anywhere that I know of why this language is in here and what it means. If it has something to do with ZC’s or AUP’s make it explicit with regard to these two things. If it is broader—spell it out. There is no way to know its impact if it difficult or impossible to know what it means.
Nicola Swinburne

From: Sage, Aaron E. [ASage@ci.berkeley.ca.us]
Sent: Thursday, January 20, 2011 11:45 AM
To: Nicola Swinburne
Subject: FW: big mistake in eir!

FYI. Looks like we'll need to correct this in the FEIR.

From: Corbeil, Donna
Sent: Thursday, January 20, 2011 9:00 AM
To: Sage, Aaron E.
Subject: FW: big mistake in eir!

Aaron,
Thought you should know about this. Also, I have some comments on the draft, mostly typo sort of thing, do you want these now?
Donna

Donna Corbeil
Director of Library Services
Berkeley Public Library
2090 Kittredge Street
Berkeley, CA 94704
510-981-6195
FAX 510-981-6111
DCorbeil@CityofBerkeley.info

From: Mark Schatz [mailto:ms@fieldpaoli.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 19, 2011 5:50 PM
To: Corbeil, Donna
Cc: Avery Taylor Moore; Hye-Yeon Jamie Park
Subject: big mistake in eir!

Donna,
Something sounded wrong to me about sara shumer’s comment on the cost estimates for the two library options at last week’s zab meeting.
Turns out Nicola got the number transposed for option c’s concept estimate.

The correct figure is $4.146 million, but she has $4.416 million instead.

The dd estimate was $4,331K including the solar panels, and the cost of demo, which wasn’t in the concept estimate as I recall.
Anyways, sara’s point was that the costs were so close, we couldn’t use that as an argument, but they were only that close because of the transcribed numbers!!

Let us know how to proceed so we can get this corrected.

1/31/2011
mark

Mark Schatz, FAIA, LEED AP
Principal
FIELD PAOLI
150 CALIFORNIA, 7TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94111
(415) 788-6606 (F) (415) 788-6605

Confidentiality Statement: This email and any attachment is confidential. It is intended solely for the use by the intended recipient(s), and any unauthorized disclosure, reproduction, distribution, use, or retention of its contents is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please call us at (415) 788-6606, and then delete this message immediately.
From: Mark Schatz [mailto:ms@fieldpaoli.com]
Sent: Friday, January 28, 2011 4:19 PM
To: Sage, Aaron E.; Corbeil, Donna
Cc: Avery Taylor Moore; Edward Dean
Subject: comments on DEIR

Hi Aaron and Donna,
I have just reread the EIR, and I do have a few important (and a few minor) comments.

1. Page 2-5, first paragraph – 8th line – would be better if it said (e.g. wider aisle widths and hallways …)
2. Page 2-5, 2nd paragraph – we actually have a second entrance into the main library as well as a separate entrance into the tool lending library on Martin Luther King way. Also, we should note here, since this is the first mention of the on-site loading/unloading spaces, that one of them meets the ADA requirement for van accessible parking.
3. Page 3-12, 1st paragraph – 11th line – makes reference to the new structure “using all 9,600 square feet”. 9,600 sf is actually the proposed area for west branch, not south. I think this would be better worded to say, “… a well-designed new structure to meet the full program on a single story.”
4. Page 3-13, 1st paragraph, line 2 – delete the word “more” between require and an.
5. Page 4.3-13 – bottom paragraph, 2nd to the last line – south is pursuing a green gold rating. However, I don’t think we should say that we would receive the credit for recycled materials and locally produced materials because we’re not sure of getting them. maybe we say that “within that scoring system, they are pursuing a credit for …”
6. Page 5.2-18 – the chart is incorrect. The concept design report estimate for the proposed project is $4,146,000. The numbers are transposed. There are more recent estimates for this design, but since we didn’t do later estimates for the other alternatives, I think it’s best to use these for comparative purposes.
7. Page 5.2-20 – first paragraph, first line. This is not correct. the existing library is substantially lower than the surrounding residences, and since the houses predate the library, I’m guessing it’s always been that way. from mlk way, this is particularly noticeable, and if anything, detracts from the library having any sense of civic presence within the context of this neighborhood, or along the busy main street.
8. Page 5.2-21 – a few minor typos – first full paragraph, line 6 – should be space, not spaces.
9. Same page, first paragraph, 2nd to the last line – should be do, not does
10. Same page, 2nd paragraph, 5th line – should be computer users, who – not which.

I have to say that this was a very tedious document to read, mainly because there were so many elements that were repeated twice or even more often. Sometimes there were full paragraphs or even pages that were repeated verbatim, but I guess that’s just the nature of an EIR.

I certainly appreciate the thoroughness of the study, and wish us all well in getting it approved in final form very...
soon.

Thanks, and have a good weekend.

Mark

Mark Schatz, FAIA, LEED AP
Principal

FIELD PAOLI

150 CALIFORNIA, 7TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94111
[T] 415.788.6600 [F] 415.788.6650

Confidentiality Statement: This email and any attachment is confidential. It is intended solely for the use by the intended recipient(s), and any unauthorized disclosure, reproduction, distribution, use, or retention of its contents is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please call us at (415) 788-6606, and then delete this message immediately.
Nicola Swinburne

From: Sage, Aaron E. [ASage@ci.berkeley.ca.us]
Sent: Monday, January 31, 2011 9:22 AM
To: Nicola Swinburne
Subject: FW: DEIR feedback
Attachments: DEIR comments 1.31.11.doc

FYI.

From: Corbeil, Donna
Sent: Friday, January 28, 2011 2:52 PM
To: Sage, Aaron E.
Cc: Mark Schatz; 'Dean, Edward'
Subject: DEIR feedback

Dear Aaron,
Just a few comments on the document I the attached, it is a lot and well done. I am also sending to Ed and Mark as FYI. I have asked them to send comments as well.
Thank you,
Donna

Donna Corbeil
Director of Library Services
Berkeley Public Library
2090 Kittredge Street
Berkeley, CA 94704
510-981-6195
FAX 510-981-6111
DCorbeil@CityofBerkeley.info
DEIR comments:

3-8 “elements of.” Hanging sentence
3-12 footnote 9 references LPC but it is the BOLT minute meetings which should be referenced here
3-13 “would also require more an additional” – grammatical / typo
3-14 LPC took no action. Can you say the result of no action, it almost implies that they could revisit later but it was a referral and as they took no action it moves to the next step in the process, but is not open to retuning to LPC again, right?
3-15 “schedule and truck traffic;” typo
3-58 Section on noise mitigation seems excessive, particularly bullet #2 an d#3; we really need a Noise enforcement officer? Is this the norm for City projects?
4.1-21 mitigation – should we agree to capture before demolition with professional photographer engaged to take picture?
4.3-13 south is intending to receive a gold LEED rating I think
4.3-15 second paragraph – spacing of 2nd line and punctuation needs fixing. Also can we say Gold LEED rating here, are the energy-calc. updated since the time this was written?
5.2-4 Footnote 3, on page 5.3-4 the same code is fully cited and italicized, can we do the same here for consistency?
5.2-15 b. “the same number as presenting the existing library” typo
5.2-16 C. “however it should be noted, however, that the although..” typo
5.2-18 chart and text below – need to correct to $4,146 M
5.2-20 “the second addition also slopes away…” second story addition might read more clearly
5.3-2 second paragraph, last line, staff room changed to staff work room
5.3-4 first paragraph – “the doors would be restored” I thought doors would be replaced with windows since these are not the originals?
5.3-13 “first paragraph: “As the No Project alternative… (change to - too?)” and “is worse” to “is a worse”
5.3-18 #3. “although the wider aisles” not sure what trying to say here
5.3-19 #7 “If moved to the street it and associated with a taller addition..” typo
FYI.

From: Dean, Edward [mailto:etdean@hdev.com]
Sent: Friday, January 28, 2011 4:44 PM
To: Corbel, Donna; Sage, Aaron E.
Cc: Avery Taylor Moore
Subject: RE: DEIR feedback

Notes:

p. 3-27. Gross floor area is 9,400 sf, not 9,600 sf. Also, the Multipurpose Room is not only intended for “larger meetings”, but is a true multipurpose room that will be open for general reading and computer use. This is an important point since the adjacency and staff control of this room is important for non-meeting periods. Otherwise, it could be kept locked up and on a different floor, as in Scheme A. The intent is to accommodate the community’s oft-repeated request for more reading space.

p. 3-58. It is a little odd to have so much noise control in that very noisy location. Can’t this be toned down and be limited to tool use section? There must be so much noise coming from trucks unloading at the 99 cents Store to the west of those residences as well as the University Avenue noise. (If anything, our building will be a great noise barrier for them once the structure is up.)

p. 4.3-14. “Overall, the increase in emissions due to all projects combined, would not be large”. This is not an accurate statement. I would restate it as “Overall, there would be a decrease in emissions due to all projects combined even though two of the branches grow in size because the buildings would be brought up to current Title-24 energy standards, significantly reducing their overall energy use and therefore their GHG emissions. In fact, since South is expected to perform at 35% below Title-24 standards and West is expected to perform at zero-net-energy use and zero carbon emissions, the reduction in GHG emissions for all four branches combined will be substantial.” The document goes on to make summary statements about South’s energy use likely to be higher than the existing building, partly due to the increase in computer use. Avery can comment on the basis for this assumption, but I doubt that these generalizations are true. We have annual energy bills for all the branches and we know the projected energy use of West including plug loads like computers (namely zero) and we know the projected energy use of South. If we compare the existing with the proposed, we can state definitively that South will in fact use less and by how much. Also, it is troublesome to see language for West that says it will use “considerably less” than the existing building—why mince words?—they should just say flat out that it is projected to consume zero non-renewable energy over the course of a year and will have a zero carbon footprint.

p. 5.3-4. “The doors would be restored and used as windows”. I think that we should also note that the door location, to remain historically correct from the outside, would require a hole in the floor with a guardrail around it, since it is about 2’ below the floor level at the threshold. (There was an internal short flight of stairs in 1923.) The alternative is to change the exterior (historic tampering that would probably not be accepted) and raise the historic arched door/window up to floor level so that its sill aligns with the other window sills on that
wall. (The Jersey schemes keep ignoring this seemingly unimportant detail. It is actually important and I think that the EIR should note it.)

etdean@greenworkstudio.com; edean@hedev.com

G R E E N W O R K S S T U D I O

Harley Ellis Devereaux
California Offices: Los Angeles | Berkeley | San Diego | Riverside
2430 5th Street Studio M | Berkeley, CA 94710

From: Corbeil, Donna [mailto:DCorbeil@ci.berkeley.ca.us]
Sent: Friday, January 28, 2011 2:52 PM
To: Sage, Aaron E.
Cc: Mark Schatz; Dean, Edward
Subject: DEIR feedback

Dear Aaron,
Just a few comments on the document I the attached, it is a lot and well done. I am also sending to Ed and Mark as FYI. I have asked them to send comments as well.
Thank you,
Donna

Donna Corbeil
Director of Library Services
Berkeley Public Library
2090 Kittredge Street
Berkeley, CA 94704
510-981-6195
FAX 510-981-6111
DCorbeil@CityofBerkeley.info

1/31/2011
Comments Submitted from Landmark Preservation Commissioners:

The following comments were made at the Landmarks Preservation Commission meeting of January 6, 2011 regarding the Draft EIR for the West and South Branch Berkeley Libraries and are being submitted from the recorded minutes at the request of the commissioners by the Secretary.

1. Gary Parsons:
   - The Zoning Amendment that is part of the EIR scope addresses five (5) specific sites where there are existing library buildings. Both the Planning Commission and City Council reports identify different issues with the sites that require special treatment. Three (3) of the sites are in residential districts. The precedent for such amendments is not adequately provided nor can the analysis be combined.

2. Anne Wagley:
   - The EIR schedule is such that the last two weeks in December should be a moratorium period and the schedule extended to allow for the limited public access to the EIR documentation during the holidays. When the general public has no access to a required public document for which there is a hearing or action has to be taken within a certain period, then the time to respond should be extended by the amount of time that the public was not able to access that document.
   - Requests that newly surfaced "preservation alternatives" either be incorporated into the EIR for consideration as alternative plans, or that they at least be reviewed by the body that certifies the EIR.

3. Steve Winkel:
   - The concept represented in the EIR that the “no project” alternative is feasible is misleading.
   - All approved buildings are code compliant when built; standards change.
   - It is understandable to aggregate EIRs, but it also is very difficult, as different buildings raise different issues (structure, character, integrity, context). The comparisons between the West and South Branch facilities are a comparison of “apples and oranges”. For clarity, there should be two (2) EIR documents. The following three (3) sub-items also should be addressed in each — 1) the bond measure; 2) the context and programs for the two buildings; and 3) the site analysis and use of Measure F funds for each.
   - Notes that on page 5.2-5, the cost is discussed as part of the reason that the partial preservation alternative (Option B2 of Convept Design Report for the
South Branch Library) was discarded. Would like to note than the objection of an EIR is to provide facts regarding environmental impacts, not fiscal impacts, and therefore feels that this discussion of costs is inappropriate. The attention of the decision makers should be on Table 5.2-1 (on page 5.2-11), which discusses significant-avoidable and less-than-significant impacts of the various alternatives. For example, should this table and the environmental findings provided in this document cause the decision makers to determine that a preservation or partial preservation alternative would be the best choice, then it may preclude a decision for $2.6 million more to be allocated to this job vis-a-vis the other projects.

4. Antoinette Pietras:
   - Public expectations for the bond measure that funded the project should be considered, especially if demolition was not identified as a possibility. The financial aspect of the allocations per branch may be missing in terms of how the total allocation will be directed to each branch.

5. Gary Parsons, Anne Wagley:
   - Carrie Olson’s father, who was the architect in charge of the working drawings for South Branch should be contacted and interviewed for any missing information on the design and construction details. Given the sensitivity of the situation (out of concern for both his emotional and delicate physical health), attempted contact should be made through his daughter, Carrie Olson.

6. Chris Linvill:
   - The analysis should discourage variances, which are possible with findings for unusual circumstances. Alterations that legalize non-conforming conditions are not adequate for findings that allow a variance.

7. Austene Hall
   - Questions the inclusion of the Zoning Ordinance Amendment within the EIR for the buildings. First, with the pending lawsuit feels they [the Zoning Ordinance Amendment EIR and the Library Buildings EIR] should be separate EIR reports. Furthermore, feels it is inappropriate to change zoning laws for individual projects. It sets a precedent.
It's **Linda SCHACHT**, I live on Benvenue, have lived in Berkeley my whole life. I thank you for listening to us about this plan for the two libraries in Berkeley. I've read the entire EIR, and I just want to point out a few things to you. It says in the community process section about the south branch, that the landmarks preservation commission had taken no action to initiate the establishment of the existing building as a landmark nor to express opposition to the demolition. In the same section about west, it says the design team showed the new building design to the LPC and everyone at the new building. The EIR finally says that the only alternative that will fully protect the historic nature of south and west is to have no project at all. In other words, to leave the branches as they are. That would of course deny Berkeleyians the libraries that they have come to expect based on their vote overwhelming support for measure FF, the bond measure that provided $26 million to do the four branches. There have been, as the architect mentioned, dozens of meetings about these two branches attended by hundreds of people in Berkeley who all came to the conclusion that these buildings needed to come down and that they wanted full library services in those two neighborhoods.
that would be equivalent to those in the other neighborhoods at
the north and Claremont branches, which will be undergoing
renovations starting in March. If this doesn't go forward, my
sense is that, because of clay delays and increased cost of
construction, those two branches could end up not being
reconstructed at all. And that would be an unacceptable result
of this entire lawsuit and planning process. I'd appreciate that
the EIR has been completed, that was part of the settlement with
the people who have -- the plaintiffs in the lawsuit. This has
gone forward. I urge you to support it and I want you to know
that over the past several months the people of Berkeley have
raised and donated almost $1.4 million to go ahead with these
branch projects. And there is overwhelming support in the
community for them. I hope that you can confirm the EIR's
findings and support it. Thanks very much.

D. Matthews: Yes, we have a question.

R. Allen: I'm sorry, but I must have misunderstood your
comments earlier. I thought you were saying that the EIR
conclusion was that there should be nothing built.

No, it says that the -- no project alternative is the superior
environmental alternative in the sense that if you don't do
anything then you don't disturb the environment at all. But it
poses of course significant life safety risks to library patrons
and the public. These buildings are not accessible. The roof of
the south branch is not attached to the rest of the buildings.
The staff who work there and the people who go there to use the libraries are N. Endangered every time they enter the door. The city could condemn the south branch if it wanted to.

D. Matthews: We're with you.

R. Allen: I thought we had more of an issue --

No, no. Got to do it. Thank you.

D. Matthews: Could some one answer this, is there solar on the south library? There is, okay. Elizabeth Watson.

S. Shumer: Do we have copies of this?

I'm Elizabeth Watson, live on campus drive. I am in support of anything that you can do to support getting these new libraries built. To be honest, the variances of what planning and zoning and landmarks and all that does is a bit Greek to me. I'm really more concerned about the libraries. I do understand that the ordinance change, amendment that we asked for, would facilitate the planning process. The results of which is that these gorgeous libraries would get built and the citizens of Berkeley would be served. And I also am enthusiastically agree with Linda's comments that we do run the risk of perhaps not building them at all if we continue with delays. I also have a request, I'm a citizen of Berkeley, I've only lived here for five years, but I like living here. Would you please ask all of us to identify where we live. Because there seems to be substantial opposition to these libraries that come from people who do not
live in Berkeley. As you are zoning land use, the physical space that is the City of Berkeley, I would appreciate that anyone who has comments either for or against mention whether or not they live here. And pay taxes here.

D. Matthews: In actuality, that should be part of the record and that's an oversight. Thank you for calling it to my attention.

Thanks for your help with getting us new libraries.

D. Matthews: Peter warfield.

Good afternoon, Peter warfield, libraries users association. The two libraries in question --

D. Matthews: I'm going to start right now, let's state your address, too.

I live in San Francisco, I want to say that it is not permissible to require people to identify themselves or give their names, leapt alone their addresses, as a precondition for making public comment under the brown act. Unfortunately, there seems to have ban heavy campaign to make it -- have been a heavy campaign to make it seem people who don't live in Berkeley or don't live close enough to a branch that they are not allowed to speak about the matter.

D. Matthews: No one is making that assumption. I suggest you use your time wisely.

Thank you. So the campaign to try and disrespect and disallow
folks who have something to say, especially journalists to reveal about what is going on, is most unfortunate. The first thing to be said about the libraries in question is that Berkeley has an extraordinarily excellent group of branch libraries. The north branch is a landmark. The west branch is an official structure of merit. And the south branch is a really quite wonderful building when you remove at least in your mind the overcrowded conditions that exist there. For reasons that are quite reasonable the library wants to put a lot of materials in there, computers and so on. But as a result, it's not really something that can be appreciated as well as it should and could be. If you see the original photograph that was published of the interior and exterior, particularly the interior, in the HUNTS-OSWALD book, one of which was published in the BAHON blog which opposes very much the demolition. Berkeley architectural heritage association, you see a beautiful building, wonderful, spacious, with light. The interior has become a cramped attic, that just doesn't show off for example when you put bookcases smack up against the floor to ceiling windows you can't see the charm of the windows, look out or looking in. The choice here is not to do nothing versus tear two of the branches down. But rather to renovate versus build new. And the mandate of measure FF did not contemplate demolitions. I want to say that overall the point that I was going to make earlier in public comment was simply that the draft EIR and paper version was not available
during the entire 11 days of Christmas time that the planning department was closed. And there was no indication in the information about the materials that the planning department would be closed, and not available for questions or paper copies. There were copies available of things online. Unfortunately this is a very political document. I think. The purpose of the zoning ordinance amendment is stated as being to facilitate the measure FF, measure FF talks about four branches. It does not include the central library. But the zoning amendment did. There is talk about impact minimal, therefore the scope only includes two branches. And doesn't include the larger issues of the other branches as well. Everybody knows that new branching variably bring huge crowds that, is not contemplated. And ultimately, think that the emphasis that this program represents will actually drive people to go to other libraries branches or to other library systems ultimately. Thank you.

D. Matthews: Thank you. Bradley Wiedmaier. Sorry. Tricky German names. Chairman Matthews and board members, thank you for hearing me, I will voluntarily give my address, I live in downtown San Francisco in union square. I'm over here all the time, to the libraries on campus and in the city. And I consider myself a Berkeleyan of a certain sense. I also note that some of the people speaking for this do not live in the neighborhoods of the two branches if you want to get particular.
Really, we're not ZENOphobic or parochial. Berkeley is a world class city because of the university. It has a heritage that needs to be protected. One of the things that needs to be protected is the south branch library. Although it's not a landmark it deserves to be under CEQA, having just arrived at 50 years of age, it should be so designated. It's unfortunate that has not happened. It's too bad that the 45 days required by CEQA were IMPENDED by the holidays and the holiday next week to interrupt the time for people to speak. I have distributed two messages from Steve, that were published to the people of Berkeley through the "daily planet." You urge to you read those. I think that they're very fair. I would like to illustrate, I think, how the process has been pretty grossly presented. The idea that this building is not connected to its roof is false. There's no proof of that. I've heard people make this statement which is ridiculous. Also talking about the concrete block. The concrete block is not structural. Primarily. The concrete block is infill. It is a post and beam structure. Over and over again the people that have tried to eliminate the possibility of renovation of the buildings, and driven, if you read Steven's piece, how they planned all along to demolish these buildings. They have couldn't get the ones in the neighborhoods to come down, people live historic buildings. The ones that were on the flat lands, it's a little more up for grabs. Who knows who is going to get what kind of goodies through these jobs. But the
issue on the presentation that this building is going to collapse is preposterous. The standards are there, the engineer's report, and the DEIR does not categorically say they did not find connections. They didn't thoroughly look. Also, I would like to say, why is the main branch library included in this elimination of variance? Why are all the branches included in perpetuity, not just on the projects at hand? I think that there are real issues of lot coverage and setbacks that impact people, north branch talking to the neighbors, they aren't out here, because they think that this is being ran through, there's nothing they can say, the process has been decided on and it's a waste of time. That's what I got from people. They will have cars from their overscaled new neighbor meeting room clogging up their neighborhoods. They weren't happy about that. They weren't happy about the building being right on the corner of the property line on Josephine.

D. Matthews: I have to ask you to finalize, please.

Let me finish this sentence, please. The Tamm report which had no problems with renovation HAS been 86'ed. You don't hear about that. It didn't have the information that the library wanted to put out. I would urge you to check it out.

D. Matthews: Thank you for your comments. Judith Epstein.

I'm Judith Epstein. I urge to you participate in the DEIR process as commissioners and private citizens. The DEIR process
is open to everyone until January 31. You can make comments and you can also ask questions. If there's something you don't understand, ask questions about it. It's part of the CEQA process they have to answer your questions. CEQA allows for considerations of alternatives. And on behalf of concerned library users we intend to present an alternative in the DEIR process. We have hired preservation architect Todd jersey. If his name is familiar, he did the Richmond plunge. The Richmond plunge is a pool that everyone thought would be too expensive to save, they thought it would be cheaper to start anew. He proved them wrong. The community now has a beautiful public resource. We propose to do something similar, in proposal for the south and west branches. For the west branch we propose to save only the 1923 section and then rehabilitate that and demolish the 1970s section and with that space expand upon the rest of the lot. This allows you to have room for all of the library's himself. It makes it ADA accessible. And it will be up to code seismically. For the south branch, we propose to save the 1960s portion of the reading room, and then DEMOLISH the 1970s portion, expand on to the full lot. We don't need two stories to do this, as the other partial preservation alternative that was mentioned. Apparently they needed to stories to do it. There's enough room to use the entire lot, have the ADA spaces, have the tool library, and accommodate all of the library's programs. In both cases, these alternatives would be seismically safe and ADA
accessible. They would be less expensive. That's an important thing to note. Because with the demolition processes, measure FF cannot pay for demolition as the City Attorney said. It means the money comes from the general fund. And we're a cash-strapped city as all cities are today. That means that money that might be used for other programs will be needed to be taken away for demolition. You really want to consider that. I hope you will ask a lot of questions, also about the zoning amendment. Bradley brought up an interesting point. Why was the zoning amendment so widely construed? Why not more narrowly construed? Why should it not just apply to the projects at hand. Why is it applying to the main library as well, where there's been no construction and in PERPETUITY. We don't know what the future may bring, we may regret this. I hope you will participate actively in this process. If you don't get all of your questions answered tonight or if you haven't had time to study the report, you have until January 31 at 5:00 P.M.

D. Matthews: Thank you for your comments. Good timing. Liz hodely.

I'm Liz, I live at 1705 BUENA avenue. I live in Berkeley. And I have been a resident for over 30 years. I've been user of the library and supporter, financial supporters of the library. I wanted to reiterate the importance of the public process in support of the library that has where taken place. The citizens
of Berkeley voted to support a bond measure, and to finance the
renovations of the branches. And there's been a lot of
fundraising going on to add additional support to the library.
And there's been a very public process of people being really
engaged in thinking about the use of the library, and how the
design, renovations and the design can address the changes that
need to happen, enhance the functionality of the library and the
branches. And I think it's important to remember that this
process has gone on over a number of months, with lots of people
participating in the process. So the idea of kind of bringing in
these new ideas of that had no public process, I think, is not
very SIMPATICO of what the city has constructed as a good public
process. It's true that we're existing in a very cash-strapped
N, and one of the impacts of drawing this whole process out is
that it's costing the city more, it's making these projects
become more expensive, and I think actually doing all of these
renovations to these -- instead of the demolition of the two
branches would actually be more expensive, and problematic. I
encourage you to really help move this process forward, and
approve the EIR.

D. Matthews: I have a question for you.

M. Alvarez-Cohen: I have a QUESTION. If you aren't the
definitive person to answer, this I'll --

Okay.

M. Alvarez-Cohen: There is bond funding for some of this work.
Is the bond funding covering all of the work proposed?

No. There's additional fundraising that is being done bite Berkeley public library foundation. So the bond money can only go to supporting actual construction, but furniture and fixtures have to be supported outside of the bond money. That's why there is fundraising going on.

M. Alvarez-Cohen: Is there any assumption that the work for the proposed project would come from the general fund of the city? I don't know that. I don't have the answer to that.

M. Alvarez-Cohen: All right.

D. Matthews: Gail Garcia.

I'm Gail Garcia, I am a south Berkeley resident, as I have been for about 33 years. I also grew up in Berkeley about six blocks away from the west Berkeley branch. I support the alternative of preserving the historic pourings of the south and Berkeley -- Bring the Mike towards your mouth.

I support the alternative of preserving the historic portions of the south and west branch libraries. Using the designs of a preservation oriented architect such as Todd jersey. Todd jersey found a way to restore the Richmond plunge for a fraction of the cost estimated by those who wished to demolish it. And I'd like to reiterate in case you didn't hear me, I live in south Berkeley and grew up in Berkeley near the west branch. And by the way, CEQA is a public process.
D. Matthews: Thank you for your comments. Anyone else who wishes to speak on this item? That didn't have an opportunity to. Okay, we're going to move forward. Any additional comments from you, Aaron?

A. Sage: I thought I would make con clarification about the way that the item was described tonight. It says something along the lines of receiving comments on the adequacy of the EIR. I want to be clear that this is not when you would formally make a decision as a body that the document is or isn't adequate. It's more as individual ZAB members or if you like to adopt a set of comments that the ZAB would make, which would be taken in as part of the normal CEQA process. I wanted to make that clear.

D. Matthews: Thank you. I'm going to close the public comment and bring it back to the board. Michael?

M. Alvarez-Cohen: I did want to see if I could get my question answered before we closed the public hearing.

D. Matthews: Can I open it again.

M. Alvarez-Cohen: I think at some point I'd like to know what the library's official position is on how you expect this to be funded.

D. Matthews: We're opening up the public hearing again. See if some one can answer that for us.

Good evening commissioners, I'm Donna Corbeil, the director of the public library.

Your address?
I LIVE IN Oakland, I'm sorry to say. But I work in Berkeley every day.

D. Matthews: No one has to apologize, it's fine. Not like it's a loaded question for everyone.

I am an employee of the city. The $26 million currently is budgeted to cover all the EXPENSES associated with the four projects as put forward. As a previous speaker says, it will not cover furniture, fixtures and equipment which is not allowable under the use of bond funds.

M. Alvarez-Cohen: Then you are trying to raise the money privately?

Yes, the foundation, the library foundation is undertaking a campaign to raise $3 million. They raised, want to say $5 million -- $4 million for the central library project out of private funds, not city funds or public funds. They have undertaken that campaign, doing well with that.

D. Matthews: Are they going to to put up one of those barometers that we see?

We can ask them if they'd like to do that.

M. Alvarez-Cohen: What happens if you don't raise the money privately?

Well I'm very optimistic, our foundation has a good record of raising funds. And they have the time period for all the branches to be done to do that in. If not, I guess our worst case scenario we put things back that we currently have in the
branches or use library tax fund. We are allowed to use the library tax funds for furniture and other equipment.

M. Alvarez-Cohen: What some one said in the public hearing is wrong, then, that you are expecting to rely on the general fund. You know, I would just say that the library has in the budget the demolition portion of the project is part of the construction budget. It is budgeted.

D. Matthews: Sara?

S. Shumer: So do I understand that even though FF does not have demolition in the list of things that you can do, you are using FF funds for demolition?

You know, there is currently, a few people alluded to. There is litigation. I think it would be improper to comment on anything that is associated with the litigation.

S. Shumer: That issue is under litigation.

Yes, it is.

S. Shumer: Out of curiosity, there is the statement that the measure FF does not cover moving the tools to another location, the tool library. I'm not clear why, if demolition is permitted, even though it's not included -- one of the preservation options is thrown out the door because you can't move the tools and you can't accommodate the tools.

I can clarify that, as the library board of trustees actually explored that idea, ball games it was brought forward in our community process, the library could move the tool library to
another location. And one of the library board agenda items we fully examined that. Several issues, I would say briefly, one is that we could move the tool library, we could not use bond funds for the alternative site that we found for the tool library. If we move it to another location we built a building or something, we could do that but we can't use the bond monies. There is no other source of funding available to do that. The second thing is the reason we cannot use the bond funds for that is correct it has been determined that the expectation, and then the City Attorney's analysis of the bond fund at the time it was put forward on the ballot, City Attorney's analysis, it says that the projects would take place at the current locations. So the idea was no one wanted us to consider alternative locations for the library but that we would -- the libraries would stay in their current lot locations that they're knot at. And there's a lot of operational issues with us, the library operating another location, and another service at another alternate location. Those are some of the thing the library board did consider. We did explore alternative funding but given the economic times and some other factors, there is no other funding available. We proceeded -- also just one other part, the community in our meetings really did want the tool library to stay where it is. It's been there for a long time. It came from a CDBG grant, that's why it's there, and people wanted to it stay.

D. Matthews: Hold on a minute. Bob?
R. Allen: Can you tell me, I think Mark touched on it, but what is your desired schedule for starting construction on all these buildings?

The north and the Claremont PROJECTS are expected to start construction in late March or April. These two projects are on hold pending the completion of the EIR. Because of course we would need a use permit. And we need to go through the full planning process. But also Aaron might be able to speak more about the whole approval process which we would have to go through. Our schedule is depending on that.

R. Allen: Appreciate it.

D. Matthews: I am pretty sure we understand the process of the thank you. Any other questions? Aaron, you want to offer any clarification? You're good? About the approval process.

A. Sage: If you want further information on that I'd be happy to provide it. Basically our schedule has the EIR being completed in April. And then also at the same time you considering the use permits. Depending on whether that decision, what the outcome of that decision is and whether that is appealed to council. It's likely that this would not be finished before June or July.

D. Matthews: Thank you. Any additional questions? I'm going to close the public hearing, again.

S. Shumer: Of staff.

D. Matthews: Edward? Sara, then Edward.
S. Shumer: We don't have to have an open hearing for that, do we?

D. Matthews: You have a question for staff?

S. Shumer: I have a few questions but we can close the public hearing.

D. Matthews: It's already closed.

S. Shumer: Okay, sorry. The one question is that there don't seem to be any alternatives that don't include at least 50% demolition. And it's kind of, I was wondering about that problem. At some point, let me raise another very minor issue, or specific, and that is that the alternative which is the partial preservation alternative says that, on page 5.5, that it can't be done because the cost is prohibitive. And that the cost is of the -- I'm sorry, of the proposed project is $41.4. The alternative is $45.6. And that that is a prohibitive difference. But then on the table on 5.23, it says that -- and below it says that it is a bid day. My first question, are the two estimates for the same day? Then on table 5.23, it turns out that the proposal, I think, is actually 4.416 which makes it very close to the alternative, to the partial preservation alternative. And therefore it doesn't seem to me that -- it's no longer 4 million difference. I'm not sure I understand where all of the figures come from and if they're all comparable.

I got lost on the second part of -- I was following you on 5.2-5, so if you wouldn't mind just --
S. Shumer: Table 5.23 --

Table 5.23.

S. Shumer: On page 5.312 -- I'm sorry, it's not, that's a different problem.

A. Sage: 5.2-18 is where table 5.23 is.

S. Shumer: Right.

A. Sage: Are you saying there's a discrepancy between the table and the paragraph?

S. Shumer: Yeah. Sorry, table 5.23. I'm sorry, I should have put the page down also. 5.2-1. What it says -- 5.2-18. What it says is that the proposed project is 4.1 -- 4.416 and the partial preservation is 4.562 which makes the preservation one lower. Whereas preservation one is rejected because on page 5.25 -- tell you what, my general question is, which is that it seems to me the alternatives that preserve part of the building are not really flushed out, not really developed. And they're rejected on things like it would be too expensive then it turns out when you look at other figures they're not too expensive. That begins to undermine my faith, if you will, in the rejection of the partial preservation. And also on a chart, although I don't know that that is binding in any way, the chart claims that the preservation, because it's not a total preservation, has the same status as the total demolition.

D. Matthews: I actually think that this is the kind of discussion that will come up when we're in the process of
looking at this to take action.

S. Shumer: I thought you said the discussion today, were things that we thought the EIR ought to approach.

D. Matthews: Okay, I'm with you.

S. Shumer: I thought this was preliminary that this was things they might look at.

A. Sage: Thank you, noted.

D. Matthews: All right, noted. Bob?

R. Allen: Well, it's either respond to that or run out of the room screaming in agony. All of these items have been on the public table for, I don't know, two years. I've lost track of how many public meetings I have gone to. I would say that this is the most irrational approval process I've ever witnessed. Except my wife would be angry with me, she spent four years of her life fighting to get a simple single fire station built in the Berkeley hills. It's a commentary on the Berkeley process. And I think this one is just OBSCENE. I admire the patience and graciousness of the APPLICANTS and the people working with them that you had to go through this. Since the issue of money and costs have come up, I would emphasize that all of these issues were on the table. And we've been very lucky in Berkeley that we have had a depression, because if this had been a normal economy we would have run out of money a long time ago to get these buildings built. And if this is delayed any further by any of this irrational "no we don't want it" it could cost us the
ability to build one of these. As an architect I can say I don't see an upsign of the economy turning around, there is a little breath of air, and it wouldn't surprise me at all within 6 to 12 months to see things change, and the bidding climate change entirely from a point where right now the city can get terrific prices and most likely meet their budget A year from now I think that won't be possible. I would like for the record to say that this process has been more than thorough. We would do detriment to this city and the library system if we allowed anything further to delay it.

D. Matthews: I'd also like to go on the record in regard to the libraries, that I agree with Bob, as a real estate broker I totally understand the cost per square footage for development. And we are at a time when it's a bargain to build things if you have the financing to do it. Utilize that to the benefit. In addition to that, as a mom of a child who really enjoyed reading and spending time in the libraries here in Berkeley, which was more than 20 years ago, I was fully aware that they were in need of redevelopment even then. And to have it before us, for example, that our libraries are in good order and can accommodate and really service the needs of our children, and purport positive education is not where I sit in regard to this. I think that our responsibility first of all is to our children. And if we are not providing excellent environments for them to continue their educational efforts, it's costly to the city, to
the community, to our state. So I'm supporting this to move forward as quickly as possible. George?

**G. Williams:** So, I understand our role tonight is simply to hear comments from the public on the adequacy of the EIR and comments from the board. And I have no comments on the inadequacy of it. I think it is a thoroughly-done EIR. And therefore have no comment.

**D. Matthews:** Edward?

**E. Kopelson:** Echoing some of the same comments that were just mentioned, definitely support this moving quickly forward. Regarding the adequacy, I think it's more than adequate EIR and it's very thorough. That said, if you could put the same amount of information regarding the landmark preservation committee and subcommittee feedback, the same amount of information regarding the west Berkeley branch as you did on the south Berkeley branch that would be helpful.

**D. Matthews:** Any other comments? If not that's it. We have more items on our agenda, what do I have. Where's my agenda? I think they're leaving. Hold on, hold on just a second.
DRAFT MINUTES OF REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
January 19, 2011

1 Time: The meeting was called to order by Chair Stoloff at 7:10 p.m.
2 Location: North Berkeley Senior Center.

3 ROLL CALL

4 Commissioners Present: Patricia Dacey Victoria Eisen, Larry Gurley, Jim
Novosel, Harry Pollack, Gene Poschman, Jim Samuels, David Stoloff.

5 Commissioners Absent: Teresa Clarke (excused).

6 Staff Present: Amoroso, Harrison, Marks, Sage.

8 ORDER OF AGENDA - No change.

9 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD – No speakers.

10 PLANNING STAFF REPORT – None.

11 CHAIR and COMMITTEE REPORTS – None.

12 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion/Second/Carried (HP/JS) to approve the draft minutes of the regular and
special meetings of December 8, 2010 with changes. Ayes: Dacey, Eisen,
Gurley, Novosel, Pollack, Poschman, Samuels, Stoloff. Noes: None. Abstain:
None. Absent: Clarke.

17 CONSENT CALENDAR - None.

18 AGENDA ITEMS

19 Item 9: SB 375 Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) Process

Planning Director Dan Marks provided an overview of the SCS process and
answered Commissioner questions about Berkeley’s role.

22 Item 10: Library Amendments: Public Comment on the DEIR

Senior Planner Aaron Sage provided an overview of the proposed zoning
amendments to allow library modifications and demolitions, and a summary of
the DEIR findings, and asked that the Commission take public comments on the
DEIR and provide Commissioner comments.

27 Public Comment
Speaker 1: A Berkeley Public Library Board member and planner, stated that the EIR adequately addresses the integrity of the West Branch EIR. She urged the Commission to move the project forward to the City Council.

Speaker 2: Stated support for the library project and the proposed zoning amendments.

Speaker 3: Jane Sadlery (sp?), a retired librarian, stated she has volunteered at the South Branch Library and that it is difficult to get around the library and the City should build the best, most modern libraries that it can without delay.

Speaker 4: Linda Schact stated support for the library improvements, particularly due to social justice concerns regarding the poor condition of the South and West branch libraries in comparison with the other branches.

Speaker 5: David Snyder, Executive Director of the Berkeley Library Foundation, stated the proposed improvements are necessary to improve services and fulfill the voter’s goals with Measure FF. Stated there has be ample public input and involvement. He stated that the South and West branch libraries must stay on schedule in order to stay within budget.

Speaker 6: Merilee Mitchell stated opposition to the demolition of library buildings because Measure FF did not mention demolition and because re-use of existing buildings is a greener option.

Speaker 7: Judith Epstein, a member of Concerned Library Users, stated the DEIR inadequately addresses the proposed zoning amendments because it says the impacts of the amendments are the same as those for demolishing the South and West Berkeley Library branches, but the amendments apply to all branches (including Central Library) in perpetuity. She stated that the EIR should address other potential impacts at the libraries. She stated the South and West branch libraries have been neglected while the other branches have been better maintained, which is a social justice issue. She also stated that the partial preservation alternative for South was not adequately studied. Her group has hired preservation architect Todd Jersey to study other alternatives, including one which saves the entire original building, but not the 1970s addition.

Speaker 8: Todd Jersey, architect, stated there are feasible partial preservation alternatives that could meet the project objectives and offered to provide descriptions of those alternatives. He stated that significant historic pieces can be integrated into a new whole.

Commissioner Discussion and Comment

Commissioner Poschman indicated that page 5.1-1 refers to two findings for variance, but there are actually three required findings. He stated the EIR should explain why a variance for the use of the building is not a feasible alternative,
given that public libraries are a unique use (only 5 in the City). he stated the EIR does not adequately make the case that a public building cannot get a variance. He stated that the EIR's analysis of the “economic use” Variance finding is such that no public building could ever get a Variance and that there is no opinion from the City Attorney to support this analysis, therefore the EIR is inadequate. Commission Poschman also stated the amendments could potentially allow a 3, 4, or 5 story building on a library site, but the EIR does not analyze the potential impacts of this outcome and only analyzes the outcome of the proposed buildings. He wanted to know how the Judith Epstein/Todd Jersey alternatives compared to the Partial Preservation alternatives for West Branch in the EIR, and how not including these alternatives would affect the quality of the EIR.

Commissioners asked if the publicly-proposed partial preservation alternatives meet the project objectives.

Motion/Second/Carried (JN/HP) to set a public hearing on the propose zoning ordinance amendments and permit staff to select the date. Ayes: Dacey, Eisen, Gurley, Novosel, Pollack, Poschman, Samuels, Stoloff. Noes: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Clarke.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:35 pm

Commissioners in attendance: 8
Members of the public in attendance: 15
Public Speakers: 9
Length of the meeting: 1 hour 25 minutes
INTRODUCTION
This Historic Resource Technical Report Addendum was prepared at the request of Design Community & Environment (DC&E), for the Berkeley South Branch Library at 1901 Russell Street in Berkeley, California. The addendum is a response to comments on the “Berkeley Branch Libraries Program Draft EIR,” and specifically addresses one letter of comments by Todd Jersey Architecture, dated 30 January 2011.

The Berkeley South Branch Library is a modern neighborhood branch library constructed in 1961. The building was designed by Bay Area architect John Hans Ostwald. In 1974, a meeting room addition, also designed by Ostwald’s firm, was constructed. The tool lending library, not designed by Ostwald or Ostwald’s firm, was constructed in 1991.

The proposed project is part of the Branch Library Improvement Program that began in 2009 as a result of the passage of Bond Measure FF in November 2008. The proposed project would involve demolition of the existing Berkeley South Branch Library, and the construction and operation of a new 8,656-square-foot library on the same site. The proposed project was previously analyzed in the “Berkeley Branch Libraries Program Draft EIR,” and was determined to cause a significant adverse impact to a historic resource under CEQA.

This report provides an evaluation of a proposed “Partial Preservation” Project Alternative by Todd Jersey Architecture under the provisions of CEQA. The Project Alternative seeks to reduce or avoid the significant adverse impacts to the qualified historic resource. Additional information about the history and significance of the building can be found in the “Berkeley South Branch Library Historic Resource Technical Report,” prepared by Page & Turnbull in October 2010.

EVALUATION OF PROJECT SPECIFIC IMPACTS
This section will analyze the project-specific impacts of the Partial Preservation Alternative on the environment, as required by CEQA.

STATUS OF EXISTING BUILDING AS AN HISTORIC RESOURCE
A building may qualify as a historic resource if it falls within at least one of four categories listed in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a). The four categories are:

- A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code SS5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4850 et seq.).

- A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements of section 5024.1 (g) of the Public Resources Code, shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.

- Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be an historical resource, provided the lead agency’s determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be “historically significant” if the
The resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code SS5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4852).

- The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, not included in a local register of historical resources (pursuant to section 5020.1(k) of the Pub. Resources Code), or identified in an historical resources survey (meeting the criteria in section 5024.1(g) of the Pub. Resources Code) does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be an historical resource as defined in Pub. Resources Code sections 5020.1(j) or 5024.1.

In general, a resource that meets any of the four criteria listed in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a) is considered to be a historical resource unless “the preponderance of evidence demonstrates” that the resource is not historically or culturally significant.1

Therefore, the Berkeley South Branch Library, which appears eligible to the California Register, under the first of the categories listed above, is a qualified historic resource under CEQA.

**Determination of Significant Adverse Change Under CEQA**

According to CEQA, a “project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historic resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment.”2 Substantial adverse change is defined as: “physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historic resource would be materially impaired.”3 The significance of an historical resource is materially impaired when a project “demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance” and that justify or account for its inclusion in, or eligibility for inclusion in, the California Register.4 Thus, a project may cause a substantial change in a historic resource but still not have a significant adverse effect on the environment as defined by CEQA as long as the impact of the change on the historic resource is determined to be less-than-significant, negligible, neutral or even beneficial.

**PARTIAL PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVE**

**Description**

According to the letter addressed to Aaron Sage of the City of Berkeley Planning Dept. titled “Re: Draft Outline Rebuttal to Draft EIR of Berkeley Branch Libraries (West and South)” by Todd Jersey (30 January 2011), the Partial Preservation Alternative would involve preservation of the Main Reading Room and Children’s Reading Room at the Berkeley South Branch Library while demolishing the remainder of the 1974 addition. A new, two-story addition will be constructed in its place.

Further, the Alternative includes the following:

- Insert an additional entrance off Martin Luther King, Jr. Way between existing Children’s Reading Room and the new north addition.
- Place the Meeting Room in the original Children’s Reading Room at the southwest corner of the building to provide better presence and access by the public. Also, place bathrooms near the Martin Luther King, Jr. Way entrance so the Meeting Room can be closed off to the library but still have access to the restrooms.

---

1 Pub. Res. Code SS5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4850 et seq.
2 CEQA Guidelines subsection 15064.5(b).
3 CEQA Guidelines subsection 15064.5(b)(1).
4 CEQA Guidelines subsection 15064.5(b)(2).
- Create additional interior ceiling height in the new spaces
- Create additional interior height in the original Children’s Room (new Meeting Room) by creating a hip roof similar to the Adult Reading Room.
- Create a partial second floor for long term storage for tools, books, etc.; a lounge with privacy for staff; mechanical; and IT space. A limited use elevator to be installed to access the second floor.

At this stage of the design, several aspects of this proposed Partial Preservation Alternative are inconclusive, including the specific method of seismic strengthening, and style and materials of the addition. It is assumed that the seismic strengthening will be conducted through a method similar to that proposed in the Alternatives section of the DEIR. However, sufficient information in the project description exists to analyze Todd Jersey Architecture’s Alternative according to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.

**Secretary of the Interior’s Standards Analysis**

The *Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings (Secretary’s Standards)* provide guidance for working with historic properties. The *Secretary’s Standards* are used by Federal agencies and local government bodies across the country (including the Berkeley Landmarks Preservation Commission) to evaluate proposed rehabilitative work on historic properties. The *Secretary’s Standards* are a useful analytic tool for understanding and describing the potential impacts of substantial changes to historic resources. Compliance with the *Secretary’s Standards* does not determine whether a project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historic resource. Rather, projects that comply with the *Secretary’s Standards* benefit from a regulatory presumption under CEQA that they would have a less-than-significant adverse impact on an historic resource. Projects that do not comply with the *Secretary’s Standards* may or may not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historic resource.

The *Secretary’s Standards* offers four sets of standards to guide the treatment of historic properties: Preservation, Rehabilitation, Restoration, and Reconstruction. The four distinct treatments are defined as follows:

**Preservation:** The *Standards for Preservation* “require retention of the greatest amount of historic fabric, along with the building’s historic form, features, and detailing as they have evolved over time.”

**Rehabilitation:** The *Standards for Rehabilitation* “acknowledge the need to alter or add to a historic building to meet continuing new uses while retaining the building’s historic character.”

**Restoration:** The *Standards for Restoration* “allow for the depiction of a building at a particular time in its history by preserving materials from the period of significance and removing materials from other periods.”

**Reconstruction:** The *Standards for Reconstruction* “establish a limited framework for re-creating a vanished or non-surviving building with new materials, primarily for interpretive purposes.”

---

Typically, one set of standards is chosen for a project based on the project scope. In this case, the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative scope includes altering the Berkeley South Branch Library to meet the evolving use of the building while retaining its character-defining features. Therefore, the Standards for Rehabilitation should be applied.

Standards for Rehabilitation
The following analysis applies each of the Standards for Rehabilitation to the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative for the Berkeley South Branch Library. This analysis is based upon design documents dated 31 January 2011, prepared by Todd Jersey Architects, and included as an attachment to this report.

Rehabilitation Standard 1: A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces and spatial relationships.

The proposed Partial Preservation Alternative retains the Berkeley South Branch Library’s historic use as a public branch library.

As designed, the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative is in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 1.

Rehabilitation Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize the property will be avoided.

As proposed, the project will not sufficiently preserve the historic character of the property. Many of the character-defining materials and features will be retained, including the rectangular plan with Main Reading Room pavilion and its shallow sloped pyramidal roof, exaggerated overhangs, original concrete block walls, wood slat ceiling with central skylight in the Reading Room, and original decorative details including exposed cells of concrete blocks. It is inconclusive whether original windows would be preserved, or if new windows will be inserted into original openings.

However, character-defining features affected by this scheme include: the planar massing, since the building will be converted from a low, residential-feeling one-story building to two stories at the rear; the contrasting flat roof over the present Children’s Room (future Meeting Room) will be altered to a pyramidal roof to match that of the present Main Reading Room; and the wood slat ceiling and skylight in the present Meeting Room, which will be demolished to make way for the new addition. The outdoor courtyard will also be demolished. Thus, distinctive materials, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize the property will be removed.

As designed, the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative is not in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 2.

Rehabilitation Standard 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historical properties, will not be undertaken.

The proposed interior alterations and two-story addition will be designed with “commercial quality construction and materials,” though it is inconclusive at this stage of the design whether an
architectural style, materials, and connections would specifically be used that would remain distinguishable from the historic portion of the Berkeley South Branch Library. However, by repeating the form of the original pyramidal roof from the Main Reading Room above the Children’s Room (new Meeting Room), this alteration appears to create a false sense of historical development.

As designed, the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative will not be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 3.

Rehabilitation Standard 4: Changes to a property that have acquired significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

The 1974 addition, which is compatible with the original building and designed by Hans Ostwald’s architecture firm, has gathered significance in its own right because it contributes to the overall design and character of the building. The 1974 addition will be demolished to make way for a new rear addition.

As designed, the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative will not be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 4.

Rehabilitation Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

The central skylight and shiplap wood ceiling surround in the present Meeting Room will be demolished, though the ceiling will be retained in the present Main Reading Room. The original flat roof with a series of custom round light fixtures will also be demolished in the present Children’s Room. It is inconclusive from the project description whether the original window materials will be preserved. The collective effect of the removal of original material adversely impacts the historic character and integrity of the building.

As designed, the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative will not be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 5.

Rehabilitation Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

Deteriorated historic features include the roof, which suffers from rot. According to the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative, the roof will be repaired by using steel beams for overhangs and replacing sagging wood members in-kind. Seismic bracing and shotcrete will also have to be inserted into original parts of the building. These upgrades and replacement of materials will likely affect character-defining features and materials if they visibly cover the wood slat ceiling, high clerestory windows or decorative block walls in the Main Reading Room or replace sections of concrete block wall or eave overhangs.

As designed, the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative will not be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 6.
Rehabilitation Standard 7: Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

The proposed Partial Preservation Alternative, as currently designed, does not include any chemical or physical treatments to the Berkeley South Branch Library.

As designed, the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative will be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 7.

Rehabilitation Standard 8: Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measure will be undertaken.

The proposed Partial Preservation Alternative does not include any major excavation, and no archaeological resources are expected to be encountered. If any archaeological material should be encountered during this project, construction will be halted and proper mitigation undertaken.

If the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative follows the guidelines outlined above, it will be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 8.

Rehabilitation Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and environment.

Preservation of both the present Main Reading Room and Children’s Room walls and some roof will likely retain more than 50% of the building and not qualify as demolition under Berkeley Municipal Code 23F.04.010. Nevertheless, the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative includes demolition of the 1974 addition, which will alter the exterior of the building. Furthermore, the roof of the present Children’s Room will be converted to a pyramidal roof, which will affect the historic planar character of that wing.

A new two-story addition will be constructed behind the preserved sections. The new work will be differentiated from the old via modern commercial-grade materials. In an effort to pay deference to the original building, the addition will be set back behind the original and attached by one-story connectors. The massing of the building as a whole will change, but this is necessary in order to house all of the library’s programmatic needs. While many of the alterations will protect aspects of integrity, the partial demolition and new roof over the Children’s Room will destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships.

As designed, the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative will not be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 9.

Rehabilitation Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

The proposed Partial Preservation Alternative includes demolition of the 1974 addition, which contributes to the building’s significance, and construction of a two-story addition behind the remaining original sections. If the addition were removed in the future, the essential form and
integrity of the building and its environment would be impaired because a large section of the building and its functions would be removed.

As designed, the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative will not be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 10.

Standards Summary
The proposed Partial Preservation Alternative does not comply with Rehabilitation Standards 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9 and 10 because it requires the removal of historic fabric in the original 1961 building and the 1974 addition. It also alters the property’s significant spatial relationships and features. Therefore, as currently designed, the project does not appear to be in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.

Analysis of Project Specific Impacts Under CEQA
Provided below is an analysis of the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative’s potential impacts to historic architectural resources in terms of CEQA criteria (determination of significant adverse impact).

Impact 1.0 – The proposed Partial Preservation Alternative would partially demolish the Berkeley South Branch Library building, which is a qualified historic resource, and materially alter several character-defining features. (Significant)

As the above analysis demonstrates, the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative as currently designed does not appear to be in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, and would affect the eligibility of the Berkeley South Branch Library for listing in the California Register. The proposed Partial Preservation Alternative would partially demolish the Berkeley South Branch Library building, which is a qualified historic resource for the purposes of CEQA. Some character-defining features would also be removed or altered as part of the project. The partial demolition and alterations would be considered a significant adverse impact, since it would materially alter in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of the Berkeley South Branch Library that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the State and local registers. Therefore, there would be a significant impact caused by a substantial adverse change to a historic resource.

Mitigation measures such as those proposed in the Historic Resource Technical Report (HABS documentation, salvage program, and interpretive program) would help convey the significance of the Berkeley South Branch Library, and would reduce the impact of the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative. However, the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative demolishes character-defining features of an historic resource and the mitigation measures are insufficient to avoid a substantial adverse change in the resource. Even with mitigation, the library would no longer be eligible for listing in the California Register, and the impact to historic resources could not be reduced to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.
West Branch Library
INTRODUCTION
This Historic Resource Technical Report Addendum was prepared at the request of Design Community & Environment (DC&E), for the Berkeley West Branch Library at 1125 University Avenue in Berkeley, California. The addendum is a response to comments on the “Berkeley Branch Libraries Program Draft EIR,” and specifically addresses one letter of comments by Todd Jersey Architecture, dated 30 January 2011.

The Berkeley West Branch Library is a neighborhood branch library constructed in 1923. The building was designed by Bay Area architect William K. Bartges. In 1974, a substantial addition designed by architect Ratcliff-Slama-Cadwalader was constructed. The 1923 portion of the building was designated a City of Berkeley Structure of Merit on May 5, 2003.

The proposed project is part of the Branch Library Improvement Program that began in 2009 as a result of the passage of Bond Measure FF in November 2008. The proposed project would involve demolition of the existing Berkeley West Branch Library, and the construction and operation of a new two-story building with a total floor area of 9,600 gross square feet and a building footprint of 8,900 square feet on the same site. The proposed project was previously analyzed in the “Berkeley Branch Libraries Program Draft EIR” and was determined to cause a significant adverse impact to a historic resource under CEQA.

This report provides an evaluation of a proposed “Partial Preservation” Project Alternative by Todd Jersey Architecture under the provisions of CEQA. The Project Alternative seeks to reduce or avoid the significant adverse impacts to the qualified historic resource. Additional information about the history and significance of the building can be found in the “Berkeley West Branch Library Historic Resource Technical Report,” prepared by Page & Turnbull in December 2010.

EVALUATION OF PROJECT SPECIFIC IMPACTS
This section will analyze the project-specific impacts of the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative on the environment, as required by CEQA.

STATUS OF EXISTING BUILDING AS AN HISTORIC RESOURCE
A building may qualify as a historic resource if it falls within at least one of four categories listed in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a). The four categories are:

- A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code SS5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4850 et seq.).

- A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements of section 5024.1 (g) of the Public Resources Code, shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.

- Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be an historical resource, provided the lead agency’s determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally,
a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be “historically significant” if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code SS5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4852).

- The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, not included in a local register of historical resources (pursuant to section 5020.1(k) of the Pub. Resources Code), or identified in an historical resources survey (meeting the criteria in section 5024.1(g) of the Pub. Resources Code) does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be an historical resource as defined in Pub. Resources Code sections 5020.1(j) or 5024.1.

In general, a resource that meets any of the four criteria listed in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a) is considered to be a historical resource unless “the preponderance of evidence demonstrates” that the resource is not historically or culturally significant.”

Therefore, the Berkeley West Branch Library, which has been designated a City of Berkeley Structure of Merit, under the second of the categories listed above, is a qualified historic resource under CEQA.

Determination of Significant Adverse Change Under CEQA
According to CEQA, a “project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historic resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment.” Substantial adverse change is defined as: “physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historic resource would be materially impaired.” The significance of an historical resource is materially impaired when a project “demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance” and that justify or account for its inclusion in, or eligibility for inclusion in a local register of historical resources pursuant to local ordinance or resolution. Thus, a project may cause a substantial change in a historic resource but still not have a significant adverse effect on the environment as defined by CEQA as long as the impact of the change on the historic resource is determined to be less-than-significant, negligible, neutral or even beneficial.

PARTIAL PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVE
Description
According to the letter addressed to Aaron Sage of the City of Berkeley Planning Dept. titled “Re: Draft Outline Rebuttal to Draft EIR of Berkeley Branch Libraries (West and South)” by Todd Jersey (30 January 2011), the Partial Preservation Alternative would involve moving and restoring the original portion of the library, and constructing a new two-story addition at the rear.

Further, the Alternative includes the following:

- Restore the original library as the Adult Reading Room and restore the original skylight.
- Restore the original façade.
- Move the original 1923 building to a location 2 feet north of the current sidewalk and closer to the east property line to increase its civic presence on University Avenue and make room for expanded program space to the west and behind the original building.

---

1 Pub. Res. Code SS5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4850 et seq.
2 CEQA Guidelines subsection 15064.5(b).
3 CEQA Guidelines subsection 15064.5(b)(1).
4 CEQA Guidelines subsection 15064.5(b)(2).
- Seismically upgrade the original 1923 building.
- Create a new entry courtyard on the west side of the original building with stairs, bike parking, and an ADA ramp (this will be the only exterior entrance)
- Build a two-story addition. Place the library program on the ground floor and the literacy spaces (such as the Berkeley Reads Program), meeting spaces, mechanical room and long term storage on the second floor.
- The ground floor of the addition will include a new round-shaped Children’s Room
- The addition will be constructed with commercial quality construction materials and systems

The general principles in this proposed Partial Preservation Alternative are in keeping with Partial Preservation Alternative 1 in the DEIR; the differences are primarily found in the locations of programmatic uses of the interior spaces.

At this stage of the design, several aspects of this proposed Partial Preservation Alternative are inconclusive, including specific method of seismic strengthening, and style and materials of the addition. It is assumed that the seismic strengthening will be conducted through a method similar to that proposed in the Alternatives section of the DEIR. However, sufficient information in the project description exists to analyze Todd Jersey Architecture’s Proposed Project Alternative according to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards Analysis

The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings (Secretary's Standards) provide guidance for working with historic properties. The Secretary's Standards are used by Federal agencies and local government bodies across the country (including the Berkeley Landmarks Preservation Commission) to evaluate proposed rehabilitative work on historic properties. The Secretary’s Standards are a useful analytic tool for understanding and describing the potential impacts of substantial changes to historic resources. Compliance with the Secretary’s Standards does not determine whether a project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historic resource. Rather, projects that comply with the Secretary’s Standards benefit from a regulatory presumption under CEQA that they would have a less-than-significant adverse impact on an historic resource. Projects that do not comply with the Secretary’s Standards may or may not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historic resource.

The Secretary's Standards offers four sets of standards to guide the treatment of historic properties: Preservation, Rehabilitation, Restoration, and Reconstruction. The four distinct treatments are defined as follows:

**Preservation:** The Standards for Preservation “require retention of the greatest amount of historic fabric, along with the building’s historic form, features, and detailing as they have evolved over time.”

**Rehabilitation:** The Standards for Rehabilitation “acknowledge the need to alter or add to a historic building to meet continuing new uses while retaining the building’s historic character.”

**Restoration:** The Standards for Restoration “allow for the depiction of a building at a particular time in its history by preserving materials from the period of significance and removing materials from other periods.”
**Reconstruction:** The *Standards for Reconstruction* “establish a limited framework for re-creating a vanished or non-surviving building with new materials, primarily for interpretive purposes.”

Typically, one set of standards is chosen for a project based on the project scope. In this case, the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative scope includes altering the Berkeley West Branch Library to meet the evolving use of the building while retaining its character-defining features. Therefore, the *Standards for Rehabilitation* should be applied.

**Standards for Rehabilitation**

The following analysis applies each of the *Standards for Rehabilitation* to the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative for the Berkeley West Branch Library. This analysis is based upon design documents dated 31 January 2011, prepared by Todd Jersey Architects, and included as an attachment to this report.

**Rehabilitation Standard 1:** A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces and spatial relationships.

The proposed Partial Preservation Alternative retains the Berkeley West Branch Library’s historic use as a public branch library.

As designed, the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative is in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 1.

**Rehabilitation Standard 2:** The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize the property will be avoided.

As proposed, the project will preserve and restore some of the primary façade of the original 1923 building and reconstruct portions that were demolished in 1974, thus maintaining its character-defining features. The existing character-defining features that would be preserved and restored include the Roman triumphal arched entry with semi-circular window and engaged columns; the surviving round ornamental medallion east of the arch; the window proportions of the three banks of windows to the east of the arched entry; the wood framed windows on the west and east facades; the cornice on the west, south, and east facades; and the remaining incised lettering from the original “West Berkeley Branch Library,” namely “-ey Branch Library.”

However, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize the property will be altered because the original building will be moved to the southeast corner of the property, thus changing the building’s relationship to the street and adjacent properties. The original entrance will be permanently sealed (the door is located 24” below the level of the interior floor, and does not satisfy accessibility requirements), while a new entrance will be constructed in the set-back addition. This will preclude the future function of the building from providing the public with the original circulatory experience of entering the reading room from the historic primary façade.

As designed, the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative is *not* in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 2.

---

Rehabilitation Standard 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historical properties, will not be undertaken.

Based on the brief description for the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative, a conclusion cannot be reached as to whether false history or conjectural features will be undertaken, or whether restoration of the primary façade will be conducted based on documented evidence. The proposed interior alterations and two-story addition will be designed with “commercial quality construction and materials,” though it is inconclusive at this stage of the design whether an architectural style, materials, and connections would be used that would distinguish the addition from the historic portion of the Berkeley West Branch Library.

As designed, the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative will not be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 3.

Rehabilitation Standard 4: Changes to a property that have acquired significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

The 1974 addition has not gained significance in its own right, and in fact detracts from the original portion of the building. Demolishing this addition will not affect the building’s significance, which is rooted only in the original section.

As designed, the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative will be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 4.

Rehabilitation Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

Many of the original materials, features, and finishes have already been impacted or removed by the 1974 addition, affecting the building’s historic integrity. It appears that the remaining exterior materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship will be preserved as part of the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative.

Though not described fully in the project description, it is assumed that the seismic strengthening will be conducted similarly to the Alternatives presented in the DEIR, and the exterior finishes would be salvaged during the seismic strengthening process, while the walls are widened, and put back in place.

Furthermore, defining materials on the primary façade that were demolished in 1974 would be reconstructed with new materials, including the entry door within the Roman triumphal arched entry; the three banks of windows to the east of the arched entry (now just one window with snap mullion); the second round ornamental medallion west of the arch; the three banks of windows to the west of the arched entry; and the missing incised lettering from the original sign, namely “West Berkel-.”

However, interior plaster or other original materials will also need to be removed in order to seismically strengthen the building, and foundation materials will be replaced as part of the relocation. The collective effect of the removal of original material adversely impacts the historic character and integrity of the building.
As designed, the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative will not be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 5.

**Rehabilitation Standard 6:** Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

Deteriorated historic features, including the decayed substructure, wood sashes of remaining original windows, doors, and exterior finishes will be repaired. Missing features, including parts of the cornice, incised lettering, medallions, and windows, will be replaced with the use of documentary and physical evidence.

As designed, the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative will be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 6.

**Rehabilitation Standard 7:** Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.

The proposed Partial Preservation Alternative, as currently designed, does not include any chemical or physical treatments to the Berkeley West Branch Library.

As designed, the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative will be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 7.

**Rehabilitation Standard 8:** Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measure will be undertaken.

The proposed Partial Preservation Alternative does not include any major excavation, and no archaeological resources are expected to be encountered. If any archaeological material should be encountered during this project, construction will be halted and proper mitigation undertaken.

If the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative follows the guidelines outlined above, it will be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 8.

**Rehabilitation Standard 9:** New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and environment.

The proposed Partial Preservation Alternative demolishes over 50% of the building, thus classifying it as demolition under the Berkeley Municipal Code Section 23F.04.010. Although the portions to be demolished are secondary in importance to the library’s primary façade, alterations and construction of the new addition will still result in the loss of historic materials and features. Characteristic spatial relationships will be affected because the 1923 section of the building will be moved from the center of the parcel with a deep setback to very near the property line in the southeast corner.
A new two-story addition will be constructed behind and to the west of the preserved section. The new work will be differentiated from the old via contemporary commercial-grade materials. Though the addition will be set back behind the original, the two-story section will immediately abut the original one-story building. The massing of the building as a whole will change, though this is necessary in order to house all of the library’s programmatic needs. While many of the alterations will protect the character of the building, the partial demolition, relocation of the original portion of the library, and two-story addition will destroy historic features and spatial relationships.

As designed, the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative will not be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 9.

**Rehabilitation Standard 10:** New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

The proposed Partial Preservation Alternative includes demolition of the 1974 addition, relocation of the original section forward and to the east on the property, and construction of a two-story addition behind the remaining original portion. If the addition were removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the building and its environment would be impaired because the majority of the building and its functions would be removed.

As designed, the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative will not be in compliance with Rehabilitation Standard 10.

**Standards Summary**

The proposed Partial Preservation Alternative does not comply with Rehabilitation Standards 2, 5, 9 and 10 because it requires the removal of historic fabric and alters the property’s significant spatial relationships and features. Therefore, as currently designed, the project does not appear to be in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.

**Analysis of Project Specific Impacts Under CEQA**

Provided below is an analysis of the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative’s potential impacts to historic architectural resources in terms of CEQA criteria (determination of significant adverse impact).

**Impact 1.0 – The proposed Partial Preservation Alternative would partially demolish the Berkeley West Branch Library building, which is a qualified historic resource, and materially alter several character-defining features. (Significant)**

As the above analysis demonstrates, the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative as currently designed does not appear to be in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, and would very likely affect the ability of the Berkeley West Branch Library to be listed as a City of Berkeley Structure of Merit. The proposed Partial Preservation Alternative would partially demolish the Berkeley West Branch Library building, which is a qualified historic resource for the purposes of CEQA. Some historic materials and spatial relationships would also be altered as part of the project. The partial demolition and alterations would be considered a significant adverse impact, since it would materially alter in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of the Berkeley West Branch Library that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the State and local registers. Therefore, there would be a significant impact caused by a substantial adverse change to a historic resource.
Mitigation measures such as those proposed in the Historic Resource Technical Report would help convey the significance of the Berkeley West Branch Library, and would reduce the impact of the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative. However, the proposed Partial Preservation Alternative demolishes character-defining features of an historic resource and the mitigation measures are insufficient to avoid a substantial adverse change in the resource. Even with mitigation, the library would no longer be eligible as a City of Berkeley Structure of Merit, and the impact to historic resources could not be reduced to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.
APPENDIX B

MITIGATION MONITORING REPORT
Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15097, mitigation measures adopted by the Lead Agency must be monitored to ensure that they are successfully implemented. The following table comprises the mitigation measures recommended in the Final EIR for Berkeley Branch Libraries Program, the agency or department responsible for carrying them out, and the recommended method and timing for verification that they have been carried out as intended. This program, or one similar, must be adopted if the Program and Projects are approved.
## Mitigation Monitoring Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Responsible Department/Agency</th>
<th>Method of Verification</th>
<th>Timing of Verification</th>
<th>Compliance Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CULTURAL RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTURAL-South-1a:</td>
<td>Berkeley Public Library</td>
<td>Site Inspection by City of Berkeley Planning Department</td>
<td>During Demolition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project sponsors shall undertake a salvage program to save and reuse the wood slat ceiling. Prior to demolition, the project sponsors shall conduct a full survey of all historic architectural elements and hire qualified salvage contractors and companies with experience in historic buildings to complete this salvage program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Berkeley Public Library</td>
<td>Submittal to the City of Berkeley Planning Department</td>
<td>HABS: Prior to demolition.</td>
<td>Exhibit: Upon occupancy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTURAL-South-1b:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project sponsors shall fund a permanent exhibition and interpretative program on the development of the South Berkeley Branch Library. The Berkeley South Branch Library is one of four branch libraries in the city, and the history of public library development in Berkeley shall be shared with the public through a permanent exhibition and interpretative program. Components of this mitigation program could include a kiosk containing historic photographs and plans, as well as a signage program and gallery located preferably at one of the Branch Libraries, or if not, at the Main Library. An accompanying report shall be made available at a local public institution such as the Berkeley Public Library and the California State Library. The project sponsor shall document the affected historical resource and its setting. Generally, this documentation shall be in accordance with Historic American Building Survey (HABS) Level II, which includes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Drawings: select existing drawings, where available; should be photographed with large-format negatives or photographically reproduced on Mylar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Photographs: photographs with large-format negatives of exterior and interior views, or historic views, where available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Written data: history and description in narrative or outline format.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HABS material standards regarding reproducibility, durability, and size shall be met. Copies of the photographs and report shall be presented to repositories such as those listed above, which are invested in archiving the history of Berkeley, municipal libraries, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>Responsible Department/Agency</td>
<td>Method of Verification</td>
<td>Timing of Verification</td>
<td>Compliance Verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CULTURAL-West-1a</strong>: The project sponsors shall undertake a salvage program to save and promote reuse of the building’s historically significant materials and features to the extent reasonably feasible, namely the Classical decorative elements called out in the Structure of Merit designation: the cornice, original wood framed windows, original arched entry with semi-circular window, engaged columns, ornamental medallion, and remaining incised lettering. Salvage allows for the removal of individual architectural elements for potential reuse. Salvaged elements could be reused at the project site or another project, or be given to an architectural salvage company. Salvage has the added benefit of landfill and waste diversion.</td>
<td>Berkeley Public Library</td>
<td>Site Inspection by City of Berkeley Planning Department</td>
<td>During Demolition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CULTURAL-West-1b</strong>: The project sponsors shall fund a permanent exhibition and interpretative program on the development of the West Berkeley Branch Library. The Berkeley West Branch Library is one of four branch libraries in the city, and the history of public library development in Berkeley should be shared with the public through a permanent exhibition and interpretative program. Components of this mitigation program could include a kiosk containing historic photographs and plans, as well as a signage program and gallery located preferably at one of the Branch Libraries, or if not, at the Main Library. An accompanying report shall be made available at a local public institution such as the Berkeley Public Library and the California State Library. The project sponsor shall document the affected historical resource and its setting. Generally, this documentation shall be in accordance with HABS Level II, which includes:</td>
<td>Berkeley Public Library</td>
<td>Submittal to the City of Berkeley Planning Department</td>
<td>HABS: Prior to demolition.</td>
<td>Exhibit: Upon occupancy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Drawings: select existing drawings, where available; should be photographed with large-format negatives or photographically reproduced on Mylar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Photographs: photographs with large-format negatives of exterior and interior views, or historic views, where available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Written data: history and description in narrative or outline format.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HABS material standards regarding reproducibility, durability, and size shall be met. Copies of the photographs and report shall be presented to repositories such as those listed above, which are invested in archiving the history of Berkeley, municipal libraries, etc.