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PROJECT SUMMARY INFORMATION

1. **Project Title:** Berkeley South Branch Library Project

2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Berkeley, Planning and Development Department
   2120 Milvia Street
   Berkeley, CA 94704

3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Aaron Sage, AICP
   Senior Planner
   (510) 981-7425

4. **Project Location:**
   1901 Russell Street
   Berkeley, CA 94703

5. **Project Sponsor’s Name and Address:** Donna Corbeil, Director of Library Services
   Berkeley Public Library
   2090 Kittredge Street
   Berkeley, CA 94704

6. **General Plan Land Use Designation:** Medium Density Residential

7. **Zoning:** Restricted Multiple-Family Residential (R2-A) Zoning District

8. **Description of Project:**
The project would involve demolition of the Berkeley Public Library’s South Branch, a single-story 5,400-square-foot composite building consisting of the Main Library and Tool Lending Library, and the construction and operation of a new 8,656-square-foot library on the same site. The Use Permit Application for the demolition and new construction was filed on April 13, 2010, with a preliminary design subject to minor revisions. The application includes Variances for lot coverage, parking, driveway width, and setbacks, which would be approved as Use Permits rather than Variances if a pending zoning amendment is adopted by the City Council.

9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**
One- to three-story single-family and multi-family residential, religious, recreation.

10. **Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:** None
ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use
- Population & Housing
- Transportation/Traffic
- Agriculture & Forestry Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources
- Public Services
- Utilities & Service Systems
- Air Quality
- Geology & Soils
- Hydrology & Water Quality
- Noise
- Recreation
- Mandatory Findings of Significance

Determination:
On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

_____________________________
Signature       Date

_____________________________
Printed Name      For
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This chapter describes the proposed Berkeley South Branch Library Project (also referred to as “the proposed project”) analyzed in this Initial Study (IS). The description of the project includes the project location and setting, existing site characteristics, site history, project history, project characteristics, permits and approvals required to implement the project, and Standard Conditions of Approval.

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

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

The proposed project analyzed in this IS refers to all aspects of the proposed project, including demolition of the existing library, construction and operation of the new library, and all associated permits and approvals.

A. Project Location and Setting

1. Location and Access
The project location is shown in Figure 1. The project site is located in the southern portion of the City of Berkeley, at 1901 Russell Street, at the northeastern quadrant of the intersection of Martin Luther King Jr. Way and Russell Street. Martin Luther King Jr. Way is a thoroughfare that runs from Downtown Oakland through central Berkeley to north Berkeley. Russell Street is a neighborhood street. The Ashby Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) station is two blocks from the site, south on Martin Luther King Jr. Way. There is a bus stop on Martin Luther King Jr. Way adjacent to the site. The library is also within easy walking or cycling distance for most neighborhood residents. There is a traffic signal at the intersection.
2. Surrounding Uses

One-story, 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 (belonging to the Buddhist Temple) and a two-story residence are directly north of the project site. Residences and the Grove Park are located across Martin Luther King Jr. Way on the block to the west of the project site. Grove Park contains three basketball courts, three tennis courts, a softball diamond, and a children’s playground.

B. Existing Site Characteristics

A site plan for the existing library is shown in Figure 2. The 13,398 square-foot parcel is occupied by a one-story Main Library building and Tool Lending Library of combined area 5,400 square feet, as shown in Figure 3. The structures are set back from Russell Street and Martin Luther King Jr. Way by a grass lawn. Building setbacks from the existing sidewalks are shown in Table 1. There is a driveway on the Martin Luther King Jr. Way side next to the Tool Lending Library for vehicle access for tool transportation.

The 2008 City of Berkeley Branch Libraries Facilities Master Plan documented the state of each of the branch libraries. This described deterioration in the concrete blocks, windows, trim, and other external elements of the South Branch Library. The roofing was in poor condition with areas of ponding and fungus infestation. In the interior of the building, the wood ceiling in the original main reading room was in good condition, but all the other wall and floor finishes were in fair to poor condition. The heating system was at the end of its anticipated life and there was no ventilation system. There was no fire alarm system or sprinklers. The electrical and lighting systems were outdated and needed to be replaced.

C. Site History

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.

The existing building was designed by architect John Hans Ostwald, and opened in 1961. In 1974 a meeting room was added and, in 1991, the Tool Lending Library was added. A secondary shed was added to the Tool Lending Library more recently. The 1961 and 1974 portions of the building have been further analyzed for their eligibility for the California Register and could be eligible for the California Register due to the significance of the architect.
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D. Project History

In July 2008, the City of Berkeley Branch Libraries Facilities Master Plan proposed two options for the South Branch and Tool Lending Library. The first option involved replacing the library. Another option involved retaining the 1960s portion and incorporating it into a new structure.

In November 2008, Measure FF: Library Bond was passed by the voters of the City of Berkeley. It provided funds for the renovation, expansion, and seismic and access improvements of the four City of Berkeley neighborhood branch libraries at their existing locations. Beginning in 2009, Field Paoli Architects studied design options for the South Branch and Tool Lending Library. Designs were created that retained and reused portions of the existing building, particularly the main reading room. However, structural testing of the existing library’s concrete masonry unit (CMU) walls indicated that there is horizontal rebar only at the top of the walls, which does not comply with current building codes for the level of seismic hazard existing at the site. This could result in failure due to shearing during an earthquake. The study also found there was inadequate roof support. Both of these conditions would require strengthening to meet current codes, and this would alter the appearance of the building. Concept designs for partial reuse and an all-new building were shared at two community meetings in September and October 2009.

On October 14, 2009, the Board of Library Trustees (BOLT) recommended that the existing library be demolished and replaced. Subsequently, on January 27, 2010, Field Paoli presented two design schemes for an all-new library. Based on input from the library staff and administrative and community members, Field Paoli presented one final design to the BOLT on February 10, 2010.

As the original building is over 40 years old, meetings were also held with the City’s Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) to obtain comments on the demolition, pursuant to Section 23C.08.050.C of the City of Berkeley Zoning Ordinance. The LPC established a subcommittee, which met with the project design team several times. The design team argued that both the original building design and the new library program would be compromised by incorporating the original main reading room into a new expanded building, partly because it would then need to be two stories tall and this would require more staff to operate the same programs. On May 6, 2010, the LPC was given an opportunity to initiate the existing building as a City landmark, and to express objections to the demolition, and the LPC did neither.

The proposed project described in this Initial Study is the architect’s and the BOLT’s preferred design for a new building. The Use Permit Application 10-10000031 for demolition of the old library and construction of a new library was filed on April 13, 2010. As noted above, this application includes Variances for lot coverage, parking, driveway width, and setbacks, which would be approved as Use Permits rather than Variances if a pending zoning amendment is adopted by the City Council. Yellow “proposed development” signs were posted at the site’s street frontages to notify community members of the project.
E. Project Characteristics

The proposed project includes demolition of the existing library and construction and operation of a new single-story library on the same property. The following section describes the components of the project, including: the demolition and reuse of materials, foundation and grading, heavy construction equipment, utility line trenching, construction schedule and truck traffic, new library proposed uses, proposed design, zoning, access and circulation, parking, tree removal/protection, landscaping and drainage, lighting, energy-efficiency and green features, and site operations. The description is based on the Facilities Master Plan, Conceptual Design Report, Schematic Design Report, and other documents where specifically referenced.

1. Demolition and Reuse of Materials

The existing structure contains a minor amount of asbestos-containing materials and some lead-based paint. The construction contractor would be notified of the existence of these materials as they would require special handling during demolition. Uncontaminated materials from the old library would be reused where possible, including existing wood ceiling planks from the main reading room.

2. Foundation and Grading

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. The top 3 feet of the existing library foundation would also be removed. The new building would be supported on a 15-inch-deep, poured-in-place concrete mat slab on top of 6 inches of sand and gravel. The excavation is expected to be an average of 21 inches deep. As groundwater has been encountered at a minimum depth of just under 5 feet below surface, the excavation will probably not encounter groundwater and would not need dewatering. An estimated 500 cubic yards of soil would be removed from the site and made available to any nearby construction projects in need of fill.

3. Heavy Construction Equipment

The loudest noise-generating equipment associated with the construction phase would probably be concrete mixers, pumps, and earth-moving equipment. Pile drivers would not be employed for construction. Precise equipment choice is at the discretion of the general contractor and is not known at this time.

4. Utility Line Trenching

Some trenching in the public right-of-way would be necessary to provide new utility services to the building. As of May, 2010, a new 142-foot storm drain main is planned to extend easterly along Russell Street; a 33-foot sanitary sewer lateral would connect to the sewer main in Russell Street; and

---

the domestic water, fire and irrigation services would all connect to the existing water main in Martin Luther King Jr. Way. Trenching would also be required for the electrical and tele-data utilities. This design is still being developed.

5. Construction Schedule and Truck Traffic
The new South Branch Library and Tool Lending Library would be built in one phase. It is expected that construction would begin in February 2012 and continue for 12 months. In general there are likely to be around 10 construction-related passenger vehicles per day and these could be accommodated through regular curb-side street parking.

It is estimated that during the peak of construction, the number of construction delivery trucks would rarely exceed five per day and even then only on isolated days. It is possible that the sidewalk would need to be closed off, and some street parking spaces could be fenced off. It is unlikely that any street lanes would be closed unless there was a major delivery.

6. New Library Proposed Uses
The project proposes a new South Branch Library and Tool Lending Library with expanded space and improved facilities. The new library would include: a lobby, a multi-purpose room, restrooms, a children’s section with restroom, adult reading room, browsing area, teen section, study room; staff work areas (including restrooms, office, lounge, and book sorting area), and the tool lending area. Computers would be located in the main browsing area and in the reading rooms for children and teens.

7. Proposed Design
The proposed project design is a single-story building of contemporary architectural design. Figures 4, 5, 6, and 7 show the new library site plan, elevations, and architectural renderings. The curved front of the building along Martin Luther King Jr. Way encloses the meeting room and bathrooms. East of the entrance are the staff work areas and children’s reading room. To the north is the Tool Lending Library with an entrance set back from the street and two columns next to the door. The central portion of the building, which houses the browsing area, protrudes above the rest of the building to allow light to enter through windows on the side (a feature known as a clerestory). The roof of the browsing area slopes towards the front of the building.

As shown on Figures 5 and 6, the building has a variety of roof heights: The multipurpose room has a flat roof at a height of 18 feet and 6 inches, and the Tool Lending part and children’s room are also flat and slightly lower at 17 feet. The sloping roof of the browsing area reaches a maximum height of 30 feet and is the tallest part of the building. If solar panels are incorporated in the design, they would be located on a sloping surface over the main book collection and would reach a maximum height of 21 feet.

The new building would use mostly natural materials for exterior finishings, such as wood and porcelain tile, as well as some aluminum window frames with insulating glazing. Recessed areas on
Source: Field Paoli Architects
- SOUTH ELEVATION - RUSSELL STREET.

- WEST ELEVATION - MARTIN LUTHER KING JR WAY.

Source: Field Paoli Architects
FIGURE 7
NEW LIBRARY RENDERINGS

Source: Field Paoli Architects
both the north and east sides would create foreground views of landscaped areas from the main reading rooms. There would be some brighter colors on the exterior, in signs and graphic elements. Signage with the library’s name would be on an overhang over the entrance. The west elevation is recessed to make room for two designated loading/unloading spaces for the Tool Lending Library, including a van-accessible space. The Tool Lending Library would feature a second entrance with a covered walkway, windows, and signage. The north and east elevations would abut the neighboring lots with a 7-foot 2-inch rear setback and a 4-foot side setback, respectively.

8. Zoning
The proposed project is located in the Restricted Multiple-Family Residential (R-2A) Zoning District, which allows for a lot coverage of 50 percent on this site. With a building area of 8,656 square feet and lot area of 13,398 square feet, the proposed project would have a lot coverage of 65 percent. Existing and proposed setbacks and setbacks allowed by the zoning code are shown in Table 1. A Variance would be required to reduce the required setbacks on the north, west (Martin Luther King Jr. Way) and south (Russell Street) sides of the building. The zoning regulations for the site allow for a maximum average building height of 28 feet. The average height of the new library would be 24 feet high – which is within these regulations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1</th>
<th>MINIMUM SETBACKS FROM STREET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front/South (Russell Street)</td>
<td>19 feet 9 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Side (MLK)</td>
<td>7 feet 6 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Side (next to Buddhist Temple)</td>
<td>15 feet 0 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear/North (next to currently vacant lot)</td>
<td>4 feet 5 inches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project would require a Variance to allow a new building without providing the ten additional parking spaces that would otherwise be required by code. City code mandates one parking space for every 500 square feet of floor area that is publicly accessible. The current library has approximately 3,874 square foot of publicly available space which would require eight parking spaces, or six more than currently provided. The proposed library would have approximately 5,877 square foot of publicly accessible space, and would require 12 parking spaces to conform with the code, and that is 10 more than are proposed, and 4 more than required by the existing building.4

The width of driveways leading to the onsite loading/unloading spaces is approximately 25 feet. City code states that it cannot exceed 20 feet. A Variance also would be required to cover this feature.

4 The large amount of space given over to library seating and fixtures has not been subtracted from the publicly accessible space calculation.
A Variance or zoning amendment is therefore required to cover these issues. A zoning amendment is scheduled for City Council consideration in late June/early July. If the Council approves the amendment, this would likely occur before the Draft EIR is published.

9. Access and Circulation
The proposed project would have two main public entrances, one facing Russell Street on the south end of the vestibule, and another on the north end of the vestibule. In addition, there would be a public entrance to the Tool Lending Library on the western side. These entrances would be wheelchair-accessible. An existing AC-Transit bus stop serviced by the “12” line is located on Martin Luther King Jr. Way next to the project site. The existing bus pullout zone and shelter would remain in place.

10. Parking
The proposed project would continue to provide two short-term loading/unloading spots on the site to serve the Tool Lending Library, one of which would be van accessible. The two existing blue-striped curb spaces for handicapped parking, one on Martin Luther King Jr. Way and the other on Russell Street would also be maintained. In addition, two spaces on Martin Luther King Jr. Way would be green-striped for short-term parking. There would be six bicycle parking spaces (sufficient for 12 bicycles) on the south side of the building.

11. Tree Removal/Protection
The landscaping for the South Branch Library would remove the two tall eucalyptus trees between the sidewalk and existing library on the Martin Luther King Jr. Way side; the City arborist concurs that these non-native trees could be removed. In addition, a small (6-inch trunk diameter) willow along Russell Street would be removed. The large liquid amber tree on Russell Street and the other street trees on Martin Luther King, Jr. Way would be retained. In addition, the applicant is working to preserve the integrity of the root system for the coast live oak tree located just north of the site on the neighboring property and several measures for protection of this tree have been included into the Standard Conditions of Approval.

12. Landscaping and Drainage
Storm water infiltration zones are present on all sides of the building at low points in the topography, with water passing through at least 18 inches of sand and drain rock prior to draining into a perforated pipe that feeds into the storm drain system. These infiltration zones are typically planted with materials able to withstand the heavy amounts of water present during the rainy season. Additionally, the loading/unloading area for the Tools Library is paved with permeable paving stones over a gravel base to allow water infiltration and avoid direct runoff into the street.

There would be a new dry landscape garden to the east of the browsing area and a patio to the north of the adult reading room.
13. Lighting
The new building would require emergency lighting, illuminated exit signs and occupancy and
daylight sensors for lights inside the building. (All these are now required by code but are not present
in the existing building.) Entrances to the Tool Lending Library and Main Library would be
illuminated with compact fluorescent, surface-mounted fixtures in overhead canopies. Walkways
around the building would be illuminated by wall-mounted, compact fluorescent, shielded lights that
project downwards. Landscaped areas may be illuminated by low-wattage fixtures. Some signs would
be illuminated as the library would be open at night.

14. Energy-Efficiency and Green Components
In 2003, the City of Berkeley adopted Resolution No. 62,284-N.S., which requires that all City-
sponsored projects that enter design and construction after 2005 to meet a minimum Leadership in
Energy and Environmental Design (LEED)\(^5\) Silver rating. Building systems and finishes would ensure
that the proposed project achieves at least a LEED Silver rating, and the project design team is hoping
to achieve LEED Gold. Energy modeling for the new design indicates that the project would perform
26 percent better than the California Building Code Title 24 requirements, and 48 percent better than
the ASHRAE 90.1 standard that is used as a benchmark in LEED. Solar panels are expected to be a
project component.

15. Site Operations
The operating schedule is expected to be the same as for the existing library. The South Branch
Library’s hours are Monday and Tuesday from 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.; Wednesday and Thursday
from 12:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.; and Friday and Saturday from 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. The number of
full-time equivalent (FTE) employees at the new library would remain at 6.625 for the main part of
the library and 2.125 for the Tool Library, for a total of 8.75 FTE.

F. Required City Permits and Approvals

♦ Variances for approval of modifications to the lot coverage, parking, driveway width, and the
setback requirements in the R-2A Zoning District. In late June/early July, the City Council
would consider a zoning amendment that would make these modifications subject to a Use Permit
rather than a Variance.

♦ Use Permits to demolish the existing structure and build a new one. (Use Permit and Variance
application was submitted April 13, 2010.)

\(^5\) An internationally-recognized green building certification system established by the U.S. Green Building Council.
G. **Standard Conditions of Approval**

The City of Berkeley has a standard set of conditions of approval designed to minimize the environmental issues associated with construction projects. The following would be relevant to the South Branch Library Project.

1. **Air Quality**

   Compliance with BAAQMD Basic Control Measures for reducing construction emissions of PM10:

   - Water all active construction areas at least twice daily. Watering should be sufficient to prevent airborne dust from leaving the site. Increased watering frequency may be necessary whenever wind speeds exceed 15 miles per hour. Reclaimed water should be used whenever possible.

   - Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard (i.e. the minimum required space between the top of the load the top of the trailer).

   - Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.

   - Sweep streets (with water sweepers using reclaimed water if possible) at the end of each day if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent paved roads.

2. **Biological Resources**

   To prevent damage to the coast live oak tree on the adjacent property, the following measures would be included:

   - The project sponsor shall provide an arborist certified by the International Society of Arboriculture to supervise tasks requiring an “on-site Arborist” as indicated below. The City Forester, at his discretion, may also supervise these tasks.

   Tree protection fencing must be installed before any construction activity begins.

   - Tree protection fencing will be installed, removed, and repaired by the on-site Arborist only.

   - Heavy equipment may not be operated within the “dripline” of the tree, except within the footprint of the existing building.

   - Injury to the tree trunk must be documented and repaired immediately.

   - When tree roots are cut by necessity, roots 1 inch in diameter and greater must be saw cut and treated.

   - Fill soil must be kept from under the “dripline” of the tree, except within the footprint of the existing building.

   - No storage or dumping of tools and building materials may take place within the dripline of any tree, except within the footprint of the existing building.
♦ No material of any kind may be stored within the dripline of the tree, except within the footprint of the existing building.

♦ Original grade must be left undisturbed within the dripline of the tree, except within the footprint of the existing building.

♦ Nothing may be tied around the tree to act as an anchor, fulcrum, or any other function except demarcation of space with appropriate string.

♦ Any exposed roots must be covered with a mulch material.

3. Cultural Resources

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

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

Human Remains
In the event that human skeletal remains are encountered during demolition or construction activities for the proposed project, the project applicant shall immediately notify the County Coroner and the City of Berkeley. If the County Coroner determines that the remains are Native American, the Coroner shall contact the California Native Heritage Commission, pursuant to subdivision (c) of Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code. In addition, excavation work within 10 feet of the find shall cease immediately.
4. Geology and Soils
Soils Report
The City of Berkeley requires submittal of a Soil Properties Report to the Building Safety Division (for sites that are not located in seismic hazards areas where a full Geotechnical report is required). This covers issues of soil strength for the given type of construction and for expansive soils. (A Draft Geotechnical Investigation was submitted to the City May 4, 2010.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Dewatering**

If dewatering is required as part of project excavation, the applicant shall obtain a permit from the Berkeley Department of Public Works and RWQCB for discharge of groundwater generated by construction dewatering into the storm drain system and from the East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) for discharge into the sewer system. Permit regulations may require treatment of groundwater generated by construction dewatering activities prior to discharge into the storm drain system or sewer system.

**7. Noise**

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

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

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

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

- Stationary noise sources shall be located as far from sensitive receptors as possible, and they shall be muffled and enclosed within temporary sheds, or insulation barriers or other measures shall be incorporated to the extent feasible. Signs shall be posted at the construction site that include permitted construction days and hours, a day and evening contact number for the job site, and a day and evening contact number for the on-site complaint and enforcement manager, and the City’s Noise Enforcement Officer, in the event of problems.
An on-site complaint and enforcement manager shall be available to respond to and track complaints. The manager will be responsible for responding to any complaints regarding construction noise and for coordinating with the adjacent land uses. The manager will determine the cause of any complaints and coordinate with the construction team to implement effective measures (considered technically and economically feasible) warranted to correct the problem. The telephone number of the coordinator shall be posted at the construction site and provided to neighbors in a notification letter. The manager shall notify the City's Noise Enforcement Officer of all complaints within 24 hours. The manager will be trained to use a sound level meter and should be available during all construction hours to respond to complaints.

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

8. Traffic and Transportation
Prior to building permit issuance, a construction management plan shall be submitted for approval by the Office of Transportation, Public Works Department, and Planning Department. This plan shall indicate locations of pedestrian walkways and bike lanes adjacent to the site, directional signage, material and equipment storage, trailers, and worker parking, and shall include a schedule of site operations that may block traffic, and provisions for traffic control. The plan shall also indicate the designated routes for construction-related traffic. The City Zoning Officer and/or Traffic Engineer may limit off-site parking of construction-related vehicles to protect the health, safety, or convenience of the surrounding neighborhood. All contractors shall be required to comply with the provisions of the Construction Management Plan.
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

I. AESTHETICS

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential</th>
<th>Significantly</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>With Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The City of Berkeley General Plan Policy UD-31 states that “construction should avoid blocking significant views, especially ones toward the Bay, hills, and significant landmarks such as the Campanile, Golden Gate Bridge, and Alcatraz Island. Whenever possible, new buildings should enhance a vista or punctuate or clarify the urban pattern.” Section 23F.04.010 of the Zoning Ordinance defines “view corridor” as “a significant view of the Berkeley Hills, San Francisco Bay, Mt. Tamalpais, or a significant landmark such as the Campanile, Golden Gate Bridge, and Alcatraz Island or any other significant vista that substantially enhances the value and enjoyment of real property.”

Elevations of the new library are shown in Figures 5 and 6. The new library would mostly have a flat roof of elevation 17 feet or 18 feet 6 inches. This compares to the present height of 17 feet and 6 inches. The new structure would cover proportionately more of the lot and be located 4 feet from the property line with the adjacent Thai Buddhist Temple at 1911 Russell Street, compared to the current 15 feet. However, there is already an existing wall with landscaping approximately 10 feet tall along the boundary that obscures views from the lower two floors of Thai Buddhist Temple.

Although the central portion of the new library would protrude to a maximum height of 30 feet – which is considerably taller than present – this central zone is relatively narrow and it is unlikely that it would greatly interfere with views from the upper floors of the Temple. Views of the library and surroundings from a greater distance would not be significantly changed, as the new building, although slightly larger, is similar in scale to the present configuration.

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

The new library is a replacement of an existing building and no scenic resources would be destroyed. The site is not near to Interstate 580, which is the closest State-designated Scenic Highway, and the City of Berkeley General Plan does not designate any scenic roadways. There would therefore be no impact.
c) Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

The project would result in a slight visual change compared to the existing conditions due to the slightly larger size of the new building and the more modern design. The new building would use finishes such as wood, tile, and some aluminum window frames. With its mostly natural colors, it would blend in with the surroundings. It would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site or surroundings and there would be a less-than-significant impact.

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

The new building would require emergency lighting, illuminated exit signs, and motion sensors to control lighting inside the library. These are now required by code but are not present in the existing building. Entrances to the Tool Lending Library and Main Library would be illuminated with pendant down-facing lights in overhead canopies. This shielding would avoid direct glare into neighboring residences. Walkways around the building would be lit by wall-mounted, shielded downlights. Landscaped areas may be lit with low-wattage fixtures. Some signs would be illuminated as the library would be open at night. The degree of external lighting would be marginally greater than present to improve visibility and safety but would have a less-than-significant impact on the surroundings.

The new library design includes some windows along Russell Street, but not substantially more than at present. There are shading elements such as deep overhangs on all of these windows to eliminate any of the light from projecting up from the site. In general, window construction and material are designed to minimize glare.

As all impacts to aesthetics are less than significant, the subject will not be evaluated again in the EIR.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

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

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

a-e) The site is already occupied by an existing library and there would be no impacts to agricultural resources. The subject will not be evaluated again in the EIR.

III. AIR QUALITY

Would the project:*

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? □ □ X □
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? □ □ X □
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under applicable federal or State ambient air quality standards (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative Standards for ozone precursors)? □ □ X □
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? □ □ X □
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? □ □ X □

* Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.
The San Francisco Bay Area occasionally violates State and federal standards for ozone, particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM10) and less than 2.5 microns (PM2.5). Ozone forms due to reactions of precursor chemicals, known as Criteria Pollutants, nitrous oxides (NOx), reactive organic gases (ROGs), with oxygen and sunlight. Fine particulate matter, PM10 and PM2.5, and ozone precursors would be generated by diesel-powered construction equipment and by passenger vehicles associated with the project.

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) is responsible for developing regional plans for ozone reduction. On-site operation of construction equipment is subject to BAAQMD Rules and Regulations and compliance with these ensures that the goals of regional air quality plans are not obstructed and that operation of construction equipment does not have a significant effect upon ozone formation or production of other pollutants.

Construction activity also produces dust which can add to the amount of airborne particulates. However, the project would be subject to the standard City of Berkeley controls for dust minimization outlined in the Standard Conditions of Approval (Project Description, Section G). By definition, these limit dust-related impacts to less than significant.

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

On-road construction-related vehicles would not be numerous (rarely more than 5 construction trucks and 10 personal vehicles even at the peak of construction). Due to their small number, they would not have a significant effect upon air quality.

Operation of the new library would not differ significantly from operation of the existing library with respect to emissions. Improved heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems are expected to result in fewer emissions. As the patronage of the library and the number of library employees is not anticipated to increase as a result of the proposed project, there would be no additional passenger vehicle trips.

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

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

Sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project site that could be affected by demolition and construction activities include young and elderly persons, and other recreational users of Grove Park, which is opposite the library on Martin Luther King Jr. Way. Recreational use of the park is greatest at weekends and in the early evening (in summer time) outside normal construction hours. Use of the park by young children and the elderly is a daytime use during construction hours. However, the
short-term, nine-month period for the demolition, site preparation, and construction of the building shell, when air pollutant emissions would be greatest, would not have a major effect upon sensitive receptors given the overall westerly winds and relatively short exposure periods for park visitors.

Mitigations included as part of the project as Standard Conditions of Approval, and adherence to BAAQMD Rules and Regulations to reduce construction dust and diesel particulate emissions, would minimize the exposure by sensitive receptors to acceptable levels.

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

Although paints and other building materials might produce temporary odors during construction, their use would be limited to periods of a few days, or weeks at most, and it is not expected that these would cause significant odor problems. All of the specified paints, stains, sealants, etc. have low volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and are non-toxic. Paints intended for use on the building interior would be selected to be VOC-free, if practical.

As all impacts on air quality are less than significant, the subject will not be evaluated again in the EIR.

### IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan or other approved local, regional or State habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a–f)

Construction of a new library would require removal of a small amount of turf so that the new library would be positioned closer to the existing sidewalk. The two large mature eucalyptus trees between the sidewalk and the existing library would be removed as would the small willow to the west of the entrance on Russell Street. Given their location in a well-travelled corridor, they are unlikely to support nests of any protected bird species.

There is a coast live tree on the adjacent property to the north on Martin Luther King Jr. Way that has roots reaching under the fence onto the library property. The oak has circumference of 57 inches as measured at 4 feet above the ground and is protected by the City of Berkeley Tree Ordinance. As Standard Conditions of Approval, several measures are included to prevent root damage to the tree that could otherwise occur from excavation, and heavy equipment. With these incorporated, the coast live oak tree would be protected during the new library reconstruction.

Minor modifications to the existing, non-native vegetation are not likely to cause any adverse effects to any sensitive or special-status plant or animal species directly or through modification of their habitat. It is unlikely that in such an urban location the proposed project would substantially interfere with the migration of a native animal species or a wildlife corridor. No riparian habitat, other sensitive natural community type, or wetlands would be removed.

Removal these trees and small amount of turf in this highly urban location would not conflict with any local ordinances, policies, or other plans protecting biological resources. No wetlands are affected by the proposed project.

As all impacts to biological resources are either less than significant, or there is no impact, the subject will not be evaluated again in the EIR.
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

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

The existing library is not identified by the City of Berkeley as a designated landmark nor is it identified in the California Historical Resources Information System's Northwest Information Center (Northwest Information Center). However, as part of the 2008 Facilities Master Plan, Frederick Knapp Architects completed a report on the features of the library pertaining to its historic significance. Frederick Knapp concluded that the original 1961 structure including the reading room was eligible for inclusion on the California Register of Historic Resources because of its association with the original architect, John Hans Ostwald, and for its design characteristics. The 1974 meeting room addition could be eligible for listing because its design is highly compatible with the original building. The 1991 Tool Library buildings could not be considered eligible. Given this opinion about the 1961 and 1974 portions of the structure, there could be a potentially significant impact if the current library building were demolished. The issue of its value as a historic resource will therefore be discussed in greater detail in an EIR.

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

The project involves a small amount of excavation of some areas currently covered by asphalt or turf and it is possible there are buried archaeological remains. Standard Conditions of Approval (Project Description, Section G) would be used to ensure that this impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level.

c) Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

As above, in the unlikely event of the discovery of a unique paleontological resource, Standard Conditions of Approval (Project Description, Section G) would be used to that this impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level.
d) Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Geotechnical investigations performed in 1960 prior to construction of the existing library revealed an old basement in the center of the site that was left in place and filled. The basement must have belonged to one of the church buildings that occupied the north and east of the site at least from 1911 to 1950 and were recorded in the Sanborn Fire Insurance maps for the area. There are no buildings on the site in the 1903 Sanborn map. As human burials within City limits were banned in 1910, it is very unlikely that the old basement is associated with Christian burials. If human remains were uncovered during excavations for the new library, Standard Conditions of Approval (Project Description, Section G) would ensure that the County Coroner and the City of Berkeley are notified immediately. If the County Coroner determines that the remains are Native American, the Coroner would contact the California Native Heritage Commission. In addition, excavation work within 10 feet of the find would cease immediately. With this measure in place there would be a less-than-significant impact from the discovery of human remains.

Cultural Resources will be discussed in greater detail in the EIR.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a-e)

The proposed project is not located in an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault zone and no active or potentially active faults cross the site or are present in the near vicinity. However, the site is located 1 mile west of the Hayward Fault, 14 miles northwest of the Calaveras Fault, and 19 miles northeast of the San Andreas Fault. Recent studies by the United States Geological Survey (USGS) have shown that there is a 62 percent chance of an earthquake of magnitude 6.7 or greater, and an 80 percent chance of an earthquake magnitude 6.0 to 6.6, occurring in the Bay Area within the next 30 years. Ground shaking from an earthquake on the Hayward Fault would be classified as “violent” according to maps published by the Association of Bay Area Governments. Ground accelerations from likely earthquakes are factored into building design that is required to conform to the California Building Code (CBC). The CBC requires calculation of site-specific parameters for the building that depend on the type of underlying sediments and precise location of the building with respect to known earthquake faults. These factors are contained in the site-specific Geotechnical Report for the proposed project, prepared in accordance with City of Berkeley grading and construction ordinances.

Using this information, the building can be designed to withstand likely earthquakes. However, although seismic safety is not thought to be an issue for the preferred, all-new design of the library (the proposed project), the EIR will examine several alternatives that will include at least one preserving parts of the existing structure. As seismic stability for these alternatives could be an issue, geology and soils will be discussed further in the EIR.

Earthquake-generated ground shaking can result in several subsidiary issues such as landslides, liquefaction, or lateral spreading. However, the site is flat and landslides and lateral spreading are not of concern. The site is not located in a known liquefaction hazard area and according to the Geotechnical Report is underlain by clay, which is not susceptible to liquefaction. Engineering techniques appropriate for construction in this area are described in the Geotechnical Report. Adherence to these recommendations assures a less-than-significant impact from these issues.

The geotechnical report describes soil type including its propensity for erosion and any expansive qualities, which were found to be low to moderate. As the site is flat, significant soil erosion is unlikely. However, compliance with federal and local permitting requirements, and the City of Berkeley National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit, included in the Standard Conditions of Approval (Project Description, Section G) would minimize soil erosion during grading and construction to a level of less than significant.

The proposed project does not include use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems. Because of potential seismic safety impacts related to project alternatives, geology and soils will be evaluated further in the EIR.

---

7 ABAG maps of earthquake shaking scenarios are available online at http://www.abag.ca.gov/bayarea/eqmaps/mapsba.html.
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:

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

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

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

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

Gases generated by the project that interfere with the balance of the sun’s radiation on the earth (the so-called greenhouse gases, or GHGs) are dominated by carbon dioxide. The proposed project would generate carbon dioxide from gasoline/diesel and electricity use during project demolition/construction and operation.

Demolition/construction would use heavy equipment that produces GHGs. New construction materials used in the project also produces GHGs from their manufacture. However, draft significance criteria issued by the BAAQMD in October 2009 do not include recommended values for construction-related GHG emissions by which the significance could be judged.

Operation of the new library would use energy and produce GHGs, although its design ensures that it uses energy highly efficiently. The efficiency of building energy use is rated by the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) system. The City of Berkeley requires that all current City-sponsored projects achieve a minimum of LEED Silver standard that describes the efficiency of their building energy use. The new building is designed to be meet at least this LEED Silver standard and possibly to achieve Gold.

The new building is approximately 60 percent larger than the existing building and provides cooling for the community room and staff offices, when necessary, when the existing building does not. It has a much more efficient lighting system than the existing building and so consumes less energy for that function. However, the far greater number of computers in the new library requires a greater energy use than the existing library. Overall, therefore, the energy use for the new library would be greater than the existing library. Roof-mounted photovoltaic panels are included in the plans for the new

---

9 Information about the proposed BAAQMD CEQA thresholds can be found online at: http://www.baaqmd.gov/Divisions/Planning-and-Research/CEQA-GUIDELINES.aspx
10 An internationally-recognized green building certification system established by the U.S. Green Building Council.
library and would generate around 38 percent of the building’s energy use\textsuperscript{11} and reduce grid-supplied electricity and gas usage.

As the new library is not anticipated to have more patrons or more library employees than the existing library, there would not be an increase in operational GHG from passenger vehicles as a result of the proposed project.

Draft BAAQMD criteria for operational GHG emissions are being used to define projects that have particularly large GHG emissions, and as this project is relatively small, these are not relevant. Overall, the project would therefore have a less-than-significant impact on GHG emissions.

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

The City of Berkeley adopted a Climate Action Plan (CAP) on June 2, 2009. The CAP focused on Berkeley’s main area of GHG production, 47 percent of which is from transportation. The new library would be built at the same location as the old library. Alternative locations for the new library are not being considered because the bond money that would finance the proposed project restricts construction to the existing site. However, the existing site is very well served by public transportation, being located only two blocks from the Ashby BART station, on a relatively well-travelled street (Martin Luther King Jr. Way) with a bus stop outside, and within short walking and biking distance for most of the neighborhood that it serves. It does not provide additional vehicle parking, although it would provide bicycle parking, and in this way does not encourage automobile use.

The CAP also contains a section on Building Energy Use. The building is being designed to LEED Silver standards, as required by the City, and there current plans include photovoltaic panels on the roof. As a consequence there are expected to be substantial energy savings over operation of the existing library, which has a building envelope that is not very energy efficient due its several different portions that were constructed at different times. In this way, the South Branch Library, as a City institution, would be demonstrating the desired leadership in building energy efficiency and using renewable sources of energy. The building would reuse materials from the old library where possible. Natural lighting would aid reading without unnecessary use of artificial lighting.

The only element of the CAP with which the proposed project could be said to be in conflict is in the provision to encourage preservation and adaptive reuse of historic buildings. However, as discussed in the Project Description, the existing library is inadequate with respect to seismic safety, access issues, and modern library uses. The proposed project represents the best solution to these issues and it would result in a new structure. Even excepting this, the proposed project is overwhelmingly in compliance with the main goals and policies of the CAP.

\textsuperscript{11} Email from Avery Taylor Moore, Field Paoli Architects to DC&E, May 3, 2010.
As all impacts from greenhouse gases are less than significant, the subject will not be evaluated again in the EIR.

VIII. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

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

The proposed project is not on a list of hazardous materials sites. The site has been used as a library since 1961 and a church prior to that. The existing structure contains fluorescent light fixtures and older electrical equipment that would be removed prior to demolition. A survey in January 2008 discovered three locations with asbestos-containing material. These are: in the office area floor; spray on ceiling finish; and the roof flashing. This material would be removed by a licensed asbestos contractor. Lead-based paint was found in some interior and exterior finishes. The construction

---

12 Reported in the Schematic Design Report.
contractor would be provided with the asbestos and lead survey and required to comply with all applicable regulations concerning removal of this material.

The tool-lending section of the library has contained small amounts of oil and gasoline necessary for equipment functioning and maintenance. However, no leaks have been reported and no staining was noted in building surveys. During demolition and site grading, any unusual odors, or staining, would be noted and precautionary measures for soil testing and excavation would be carried out as described in the Standard Conditions of Approval (Project Description, Section G). Soil from the excavation would be disposed of in a suitable landfill.

Holes would be drilled for piers for the new foundations. These would extend to the depth of undisturbed native soil or engineered fill which in places would be at least 3 feet below ground surface, although the average depth of excavation is less than 2 feet (12 inches). As groundwater has been found at depths of 4 to 5 feet at the site, it is unlikely that the excavation would encounter groundwater. If it did, groundwater would be expected to flow slowly into the excavation as the underlying substrate is a stiff clay. In the unlikely occurrence that the excavation reaches groundwater, it would be dewatered. As described in Standard Conditions of Approval (Project Description, Section G), permit regulations may require treatment of groundwater generated by construction dewatering prior to discharge into the storm drain system or sewer system. Contamination is therefore not likely to be released to the environment as a result of the proposed project.

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

Although the project is within one quarter mile of park that is frequented by young children, as there would be only minimal hazardous materials usage during construction of the proposed project, there would be a less-than-significant impact from its use at this location.

\[ e) \text { For a project within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard for people living or working in the project area.} \]

The project is not located near a public or public use airport and there would be no impacts.

\[ f) \text { For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?} \]

The project is not located near a private airstrip and there would be no impacts.

---

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

The project would not block any major roadways. A construction traffic management plan is required as a standard project feature for projects of this size and larger. This would ensure that construction vehicle maneuvering does not substantially interfere with traffic. Stationary construction vehicles would be preferentially located along Russell Street, rather than Martin Luther King Jr. Way, to avoid blocking a potential emergency vehicle access route.

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

The project is located in an urban area approximately 2 miles from the East Bay Hills from which wildland fires could originate. There would therefore be a less-than-significant impact from wildland fires on the proposed project.

As all impacts from hazards and hazardous materials are either less than significant or there is no impact, the subject will not be evaluated again in the EIR.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

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

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

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

Would the project:

- e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?
  - Potentially Significant Impact: ☐  Significantly Less than Significant Impact: ☐  Less Than Significant Impact: ☒  No Impact: ☐

- f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?
  - Potentially Significant Impact: ☐  Significantly Less than Significant Impact: ☒  Less Than Significant Impact: ☐  No Impact: ☐

- g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?
  - Potentially Significant Impact: ☐  Significantly Less than Significant Impact: ☒  Less Than Significant Impact: ☐  No Impact: ☐

- h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?
  - Potentially Significant Impact: ☐  Significantly Less than Significant Impact: ☒  Less Than Significant Impact: ☐  No Impact: ☐

- i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?
  - Potentially Significant Impact: ☒  Significantly Less than Significant Impact: ☐  Less Than Significant Impact: ☐  No Impact: ☐

- j) Inundated by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?
  - Potentially Significant Impact: ☐  Significantly Less than Significant Impact: ☒  Less Than Significant Impact: ☐  No Impact: ☐

- a-j) The proposed project would result in excavation of 500 cubic yards of soil over an area slightly greater than the footprint of the current library. As the project would occupy less than 1 acre, it would not require a project-specific NPDES permit but would be covered by the City-wide permit. Standard Conditions of Approval (Section G, Project Description) describes the measures that are incorporated into the project to ensure that the impact to water quality from runoff is less than significant.

If any contamination resulting from past uses in the Tool Lending Library were found during demolition, this would be addressed by Standard Conditions of Approval to reduce contamination to a less-than-significant level.

New library operations, including Tool Lending Library operations, would not differ from present and there would be no additional sources of pollution. The library site is approximately flat and the new library would not occupy a much greater area than the existing building. There would only be very minor changes to the drainage pattern. Following construction, the new building footprint would occupy 8,656 square feet compared to the current 5,400 square feet. This addition of 3,260 square feet of impervious area would only add slightly to the amount of runoff reaching the storm drain.

Storm water infiltration zones are present on all sides of the building at low points in the topography, with water passing through at least 18 inches of sand and drain rock prior to draining into a perforated pipe that feeds into the storm drain system. These infiltration zones are typically planted with materials able to withstand the heavy amounts of water present during the rainy season. Additionally,
the loading/unloading area for the tools library is paved with permeable paving stones over a gravel base to allow water infiltration and avoid direct runoff into the street.

Drainage plans have ensured that adequate drainage is provided and that flooding is not an issue. The creation of this amount of impervious surface would not have a substantial impact to groundwater recharge rates in the area. The project’s water is supplied by the EBMUD and would not use groundwater. There would be no impact to lowering of the local groundwater table or to aquifer volume.

The project is not located in a 100-year flood hazard area and it is not located behind a levee or in the path of water flow from a dam. The project site is located 1.6 miles from San Francisco Bay and at an elevation of 115.5 feet above sea level, and it is not close to any other large bodies of water.

As all impacts from hydrology and water quality are either less than significant, or there is no impact, the subject will not be evaluated again in the EIR.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Would the project physically divide an established community?

A library is already located at the project site and the existing uses would continue. There would therefore be no impact on the surrounding community development pattern.

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

The proposed project is located in the Restricted Multiple-family Residential (R-2A) Zoning District, which allows for a lot coverage of 50 percent on this site. With a building area of 8,656 square feet and lot area of 13,398 square feet, the proposed project would have a lot coverage of 65 percent. A Variance is therefore required. Existing and proposed setbacks and setbacks allowed by the zoning
code are shown in Table 1. A Variance would be required to reduce the required setbacks on the north, west (Martin Luther King Jr. Way) and south (Russell Street) sides of the building.

The project would also require a Variance to allow a new building without providing the ten additional parking spaces that would otherwise be required by code. City code mandates one parking space for every 500 square feet of floor area that is publicly accessible. The current library has approximately 3,874 square foot of publicly available space which would require eight parking spaces, or six more than currently provided. The proposed library would have approximately 5,877 square foot of publicly accessible space, and would require 12 parking spaces to conform with the code, and that is 10 more than are proposed, and 4 more than required by the existing building.\(^{14}\)

The width of driveways leading to the onsite loading/unloading spaces is approximately 25 feet. City code states that it cannot exceed 20 feet. A Variance also would be required to cover this feature.

As noted above, in late June/early July, the City Council will consider a zoning amendment that would make the proposed lot coverage, setback, driveway width, and parking modifications subject to a Use Permit rather than a Variance. Before approving the requested permits, the Zoning Adjustments Board would evaluate each permit for conformance with the policies of the General Plan and the required Zoning Ordinance findings, and would adopt findings to show that no detrimental impacts would result from approval of the requested permits.

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

There are no applicable habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans.

As there are no impacts from land use, the subject will not be evaluated again in the EIR.

### XI. MINERAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{14}\) The large amount of space given over to library seating and fixtures has not been subtracted from the publicly accessible space calculation.
The site is not associated with any mineral resources and there would be no impact to mineral resources. As there are no impacts to mineral resources, the subject will not be evaluated again in the EIR.

XII. NOISE
Would the project result in:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The City of Berkeley Noise Ordinance regulates the allowable hours for construction and demolition work and has guidelines for maximum allowable construction-related noise levels in areas zoned R-1 through R-2A. Specifically, the Noise Ordinance restricts construction to between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on weekdays, and 9:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on weekends or holidays, unless a Variance is secured from the Environmental Health Division.

Where technically and economically feasible, the Noise Ordinance requires that construction activities be conducted in such a manner that the maximum noise levels at affected properties will not exceed the maximum allowable noise levels set forth in the ordinance. The applicable standards for this project are 75 dBA on weekdays and 60 dBA on weekends and legal holidays at residential properties within the R-2A District surrounding the project site. At properties within the nearby R-4 District (immediately south of the site), the applicable standards are 80 dBA on weekdays and 65 dBA on weekends and holidays.
Construction noise levels would depend on precisely which equipment was operating. The main noise producers associated with the demolition phase of the proposed project would be excavators removing material and trucks hauling it away. The existing library is a relatively small building (5,400 square feet) and the total period for demolition and construction is planned to be 12 months. The demolition phase is unlikely to take longer than one month with the loudest noise being restricted to approximately three weeks. Pile drivers would not be employed for construction. The loudest noise-generating equipment associated with the construction phase would probably be concrete mixers, pumps, and earth-moving equipment and the activities that use this equipment are estimated to take around two months. Several Standard Conditions of Approval listed in Section G of the Project Description would reduce the impacts of the construction at neighboring residences. With these in place, and due to the relatively brief periods of the loudest construction noise, the construction-related impacts would be reduced to less-than-significant levels.

The new library would have the same uses and is projected to have the same number of patrons as the existing library. Noise levels, which are minimal, would not therefore change from project operation and there would be no permanent operational impacts.

e-f)
The project is not located within 2 miles of a public airport or private airstrip.

As all impacts from noise are either less than significant, or there is no impact, the subject will not be evaluated again in the EIR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a-c)
The proposed project is not associated with housing and involves no increase in the expected occupancy of the library. There would therefore be no impact to population and housing. As there are no impacts to population and housing, the subject will not be evaluated again in the EIR.
XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- Fire protection?
- Police protection?
- Schools?
- Parks?
- Other public facilities?

The proposed project involves no increase in the expected occupancy of the library. There would therefore be no impact to public services and the subject will not be evaluated again in the EIR.

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

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?
The proposed project does not create new housing and does not increase the occupancy of the existing library. There would therefore be no impact to recreation facilities, and the subject will not be evaluated again in the EIR.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC
Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Without Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

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

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

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

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

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

a-f)  
The demolition of the existing library and construction of the new library is expected to take a total of 12 months. Construction truck traffic is estimated at a maximum of five trucks and 10 personal vehicles per day at the height of construction (except on the very busiest days when there could be more). A Construction Traffic Management plan outlining the process for allowing the traffic to flow during the construction activities would be required as a Standard Condition of Approval for the project. It is possible that the sidewalk would need to be closed off, and some street parking spaces could be fenced off. It is unlikely that any street lanes would be closed unless there was a major
delivery. The subject will be discussed with City of Berkeley transportation department to ensure that this does not adversely affect traffic.

Construction trucks would presumably travel along Martin Luther King Jr. Way, one block south to Ashby Avenue, which is the closest City of Berkeley designated truck route and connects to Interstate 80. The Martin Luther King Jr. Way/Ashby Avenue intersection is known to be congested, although level of service (LOS) data is not currently available. However, the project would add to this only by a very small amount for a short time period.

The construction-related passenger vehicles would be accommodated through regular curb-side street parking. As the library would be closed during construction, and no parking would be taken by library patrons at that time, the smaller construction vehicles are not likely to overwhelm the neighborhood parking supply. Neither construction delivery, nor passenger vehicles are considered to result in any significant impacts to the traffic circulation.

Operation of the new library would not differ from present in that no additional library patrons or employees are anticipated. There would therefore be no impact from operation of the proposed project.

The project is not in the vicinity of an airport, is proposed as a one-story building, and would be only a few feet taller than the existing building. There would be no change to air traffic patterns resulting from the proposed project.

The proposed project would not affect the layout of the existing road network, or emergency access, and would not produce driving hazards due to a design feature.

The project is located at a street corner. The main emergency access route is along Martin Luther King Jr. Way. Although most of the larger delivery trucks would load and then depart, if they needed to stay for an extended period, they would be required to use Russell Street. There would be no impact.

Mass transit access to the library would not change with the proposed project. Pedestrian access would also be unaltered. Adequate provision would be made for bike parking outside the library similar to, or in excess of, what is there currently.

As all impacts from transportation and traffic are either less than significant, or there is no impact, the subject will not be evaluated again in the EIR.
XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

- Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less Than Significant Impact ☒ With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ Less Than Significant Impact ☐ No Impact)
- Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less Than Significant Impact ☒ With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ Less Than Significant Impact ☐ No Impact)
- Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less Than Significant Impact ☒ With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ Less Than Significant Impact ☐ No Impact)
- Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? (☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less Than Significant Impact ☒ With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ Less Than Significant Impact ☐ No Impact)
- Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments? (☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less Than Significant Impact ☒ With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ Less Than Significant Impact ☐ No Impact)
- Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs? (☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less Than Significant Impact ☒ With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ Less Than Significant Impact ☐ No Impact)
- Comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less Than Significant Impact ☒ With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ Less Than Significant Impact ☐ No Impact)

a-g)

Although there is a small increase in building footprint (3,256 square feet) created by the project, there is no net increase in stormwater runoff, because the project provides multiple infiltration zones around the site.

Although the proposed new library would be approximately 65 percent larger than the existing facility, the uses and occupancy are anticipated to be the same. As such, the water consumption, wastewater generation, and solid waste generation would remain essentially the same as present. All existing utility services would be removed or abandoned in place. New utility services would tie into existing mains in the perimeter streets with the exception of the storm drain system. A storm drain main extension east along Russell Street is necessary to convey site storm drainage. As described in Section VIII, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, construction debris would be disposed of at a landfill such as Altamont Pass for which there is adequate capacity.

As all impacts to utilities and service systems are either less than significant, or there is no impact, the subject will not be evaluated again in the EIR.
XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

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

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

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

The proposed project is a replacement building with the same existing uses and it would have minimal impacts on biological resources. However, the existing building, due for demolition, is almost 50 years old and could be considered by some as an important example of California history. As this impact is potentially significant, it will be discussed and evaluated further in an EIR.

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

As the proposed project is a replacement building with the same existing uses, impacts are essentially restricted to the effects of construction and of placing a larger building at this location.

Construction is planned at the adjacent Thai Buddhist Temple on 1911 Russell Street. Under Use Permit #07-10000040/#08-70000019, adopted September 22, 2009, the Zoning Adjustments Board approved: 1) expansion of on-site food sales from three times per year on special occasions only to every Sunday; 2) demolition of two structures; 3) construction of four structures; 4) creation of an eight-space parking lot; 5) merging of three parcels into one; and 6) erection of a 6-foot-high
landscaped wall as part of the existing Wat Mongkolratanaram, or Thai Temple. No building permits have yet been issued for the construction. The three-story building to the east of the existing library is not affected by the construction work, and the currently vacant parcel to the north of the library would be used for parking, shade structures and Sunday food-serving (when the library is closed).

Both of the proposed developments are small, and even in combination with growth as outlined in Berkeley’s General Plan, the project’s effects would not be cumulatively considerable.

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

Environmental effects from the project that cause adverse effects on human health, such as diesel particulates emanating from construction vehicles, or paint odors from exterior painting are less than significant because this is a relatively small construction project, and the construction period would last a year or less.