CHAPTER V
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that a Lead Agency establish a program to monitor and report on mitigation measures adopted as part of the environmental review process to avoid or reduce the severity and magnitude of potentially significant environmental impacts associated with project implementation. CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 (a) (1)) requires that a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) be adopted at the time that the agency determines to carry out a project for which an EIR has been prepared, to ensure that mitigation measures identified in the EIR are fully implemented.

The MMRP for the LBNL 2006 Long Range Development Plan (LDRP) is presented as a table that includes the full text of the mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR.14 The Lab may modify the means by which it will implement a mitigation measure, as long as the alternative means ensure compliance during project implementation. The MMRP describes implementation and monitoring procedural guidance, responsibilities, and timing for each mitigation measure identified in the EIR, including:

**Significant Impact:** Identifies the Impact Number and statement from the Final EIR.

**Mitigation Measure:** Provides full text of the mitigation measure as provided in the Final EIR.

**Monitoring Responsibility / Action:** Designates responsibility for implementation of the mitigation measures and when appropriate, summarizes the steps to be taken to implement the measures.

**Mitigation Timing:** Identifies the stage of the project during which the mitigation action will be taken.

**Monitoring Schedule and Reporting Procedure:** Specifies procedures for documenting and reporting mitigation implementation.

The responsibilities of mitigation implementation, monitoring and reporting extend to several LBNL departments and offices. The manager or department lead of the identified unit or department will be directly responsible for ensuring the responsible party complies with the

---

14 Note that table headings may be adjusted in project level MMRP’s to reflect the particular circumstances of the project.
mitigation. The Planning, Design and Construction Department is responsible for the overall administration of the program and for assisting relevant departments and project managers in their oversight and reporting responsibilities. The Department is also responsible for ensuring the relevant team understands their charge and completes the required procedures accurately and on schedule.
### MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility / Action Notes</th>
<th>Mitigation Timing</th>
<th>Monitoring Schedule / Reporting Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aesthetics and Visual Quality</strong></td>
<td>No mitigation is identified beyond the implementation of the LBNL Design Guidelines and the accompanying policy direction in the draft LRDP, and this impact is considered significant and unavoidable. However, Chapter V includes the Reduced Growth 1 Alternative, which would result in lesser changes in the visual environment by constructing less overall building square footage and buildings of reduced height and mass. This alternative would result in lesser aesthetic impacts than would the proposed project.</td>
<td>Facilities Planning Shall oversee compliance with design guidelines, LRDP policies, and LRDP EIR.</td>
<td>Project design and review process</td>
<td>Confirm and document during design approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VIS-2:</strong> The proposed project could alter views of the LBNL site, and could result in a substantial adverse effect to a scenic vista or substantially damage scenic resources. (Significant and Unavoidable)</td>
<td>No mitigation is identified beyond the implementation of the LBNL Design Guidelines and the accompanying policy direction in the draft LRDP, and this impact is considered significant and unavoidable. However, Chapter V includes the Reduced Growth 1 Alternative, which would result in lesser changes in the visual environment by constructing less overall building square footage and buildings of reduced height and mass. This alternative would result in lesser aesthetic impacts than would the proposed project.</td>
<td>Facilities Planning Shall oversee compliance with design guidelines, LRDP policies, and LRDP EIR.</td>
<td>Project design and review process</td>
<td>Confirm and document during design approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VIS-3:</strong> The proposed project would alter the existing visual character of the Lab site and could substantially degrade the existing visual character and quality of the site and its surroundings. (Significant and Unavoidable)</td>
<td>No mitigation is identified beyond the implementation of the LBNL Design Guidelines and the accompanying policy direction in the draft LRDP, and this impact is considered significant and unavoidable. However, Chapter V includes the Reduced Growth 1 Alternative, which would result in lesser changes in the visual environment by constructing less overall building square footage and buildings of reduced height and mass. This alternative would result in lesser aesthetic impacts than would the proposed project.</td>
<td>Facilities Planning Shall oversee compliance with design guidelines, LRDP policies, and LRDP EIR.</td>
<td>Project design and review process</td>
<td>Confirm and document during design approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VIS-4:</strong> Implementation of the LRDP would introduce new sources of light and glare into the LBNL site and increase the overall level of ambient light in the site vicinity.</td>
<td><strong>VIS-4a:</strong> All new buildings on the LBNL hill site constructed pursuant to the 2006 LRDP shall incorporate design standards that ensure lighting would be designed to confine illumination to its specific site, in order to minimize light spillage to adjacent LBNL buildings and open space areas. Consistent with safety considerations, LBNL project buildings shall shield and orient light sources so that they are not directly visible from outside their immediate surroundings.</td>
<td>Facilities Planning Shall oversee compliance with design guidelines, LRDP policies, and LRDP EIR.</td>
<td>Project design and review process</td>
<td>Confirm and document during design approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>VIS-4b:</strong> New exterior lighting fixtures shall be compatible with existing lighting fixtures and installations in the vicinity of the new building, and will have an individual photocell. In general, and consistent with safety considerations, exterior lighting at building entrances, along walkways and streets, and at parking lots shall maintain an illumination level of not more than 20 Lux (approximately 2 foot-candles).</td>
<td>Facilities Planning Shall oversee compliance with design guidelines, LRDP policies, and LRDP EIR.</td>
<td>Project design and review process</td>
<td>Confirm and document during design approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>VIS-4c:</strong> All new buildings on the LBNL hill site constructed pursuant to the 2006 LRDP shall incorporate design standards that preclude or limit the use of reflective exterior wall materials or reflective glass, or the use of white surfaces for roofs, roads, and parking lots, except in specific instances when required for energy conservation.</td>
<td>Facilities Planning Shall oversee compliance with design guidelines, LRDP policies, and LRDP EIR.</td>
<td>Project design and review process</td>
<td>Confirm and document during design approval.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Air Quality

**AQ-1:** Construction of new facilities proposed under the LBNL 2006 LRDP would generate short-term emissions of fugitive dust and criteria air pollutants that would affect local air quality in the vicinity of construction sites.

**AQ-1a:** The BAAQMD’s approach to dust abatement calls for “basic” control measures that should be implemented at all construction sites, “enhanced” control measures that should be implemented at construction sites greater than four acres in area, and “optional” control measures that should be implemented on a case-by-case basis at construction sites that are large in area or are located near sensitive receptors, or that, for any other reason, may warrant additional emissions reductions.

During construction of individual projects proposed under the LRDP, LBNL shall require construction contractors to implement the appropriate level of mitigation (as detailed below), based on the size of the construction area, to maintain project construction-related impacts at acceptable levels; this would reduce the potential impact to a less-than-significant level.

Elements of the “basic” dust control program for project components that disturb less than one acre shall include the following at a minimum:

- 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 two feet of freeboard (i.e., the minimum required space between the top of the load and the top of the trailer).
- Pave, apply water three times daily (or as sufficient to prevent dust from leaving the site), or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at construction sites.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility / Action Notes</th>
<th>Mitigation Timing</th>
<th>Monitoring Schedule / Reporting Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>AQ-1: Construction of new facilities proposed under the LBNL 2006 LRDP would generate short-term emissions of fugitive dust and criteria air pollutants that would affect local air quality in the vicinity of construction sites.</td>
<td>AQ-1a: The BAAQMD’s approach to dust abatement calls for “basic” control measures that should be implemented at all construction sites, “enhanced” control measures that should be implemented at construction sites greater than four acres in area, and “optional” control measures that should be implemented on a case-by-case basis at construction sites that are large in area or are located near sensitive receptors, or that, for any other reason, may warrant additional emissions reductions.</td>
<td>See individual components below.</td>
<td>PD&amp;C Shall include applicable air emission and dust control standards in contractor specifications and will monitor / inspect project sites.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility / Action Notes</th>
<th>Mitigation Timing</th>
<th>Monitoring Schedule / Reporting Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Quality (cont.)</strong></td>
<td><strong>AQ-1 (cont.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sweep daily or as appropriate (with water sweepers using reclaimed water if possible) all paved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.</td>
<td>PD&amp;C Shall include applicable air emission and dust control standards in contractor specifications and will monitor / inspect project sites.</td>
<td>-Contract specifications prior to project bidding process.</td>
<td>Record in contract specifications; project managers / inspectors shall periodically conduct physical monitoring at project sites during construction period for all subsequent projects and document results in project file.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sweep streets daily or as appropriate (with water sweepers using reclaimed water if possible) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-other measures during construction period for all applicable projects under 2006 LRDP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elements of the “enhanced” dust abatement program for project components that disturb four or more acres shall include all of the “basic” measures in addition to the following measures:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Hydroseed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for ten days or more).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Enclose, cover, water twice daily (or as sufficient to prevent dust from leaving the site), or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elements of the “optional” control measures are strongly encouraged at construction sites that are large in area or located near sensitive receptors, or that for any other reason may warrant additional emissions reductions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Install wheel washers for all exiting trucks, or wash off tires or tracks of all trucks and equipment leaving the site.</td>
<td>PD&amp;C Shall include applicable air emission and dust control standards in contractor specifications and will monitor / inspect project sites.</td>
<td>-Contract specifications prior to project bidding process.</td>
<td>Record in contract specifications; project managers / inspectors shall periodically conduct physical monitoring at project sites during construction period for all subsequent projects and document results in project file.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Install wind breaks, or plant trees/vegetative wind breaks at windward side(s) of construction areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-other measures during construction period for all applicable projects under 2006 LRDP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Suspend excavation and grading activity when winds (instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 miles per hour.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Limit the area subject to excavation, grading, and other construction activity at any one time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Air Quality (cont.)

**AQ-1 (cont.)**

- Pave all roadways, driveways, sidewalks, etc. as soon as possible. In addition, building pads should be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.

- Designate a person or persons to monitor the dust control program and to order increased watering, as necessary, to prevent transport of dust off-site. Their duties shall include holidays and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The names and telephone numbers of such persons shall be provided to the BAAQMD prior to the start of construction.

**AQ-1b:** To mitigate equipment exhaust emissions, LBNL shall require its construction contractors to comply with the following measures:

- Construction equipment shall be properly tuned and maintained in accordance with manufacturers’ specifications.

- Best management construction practices shall be used to avoid unnecessary emissions (e.g., trucks and vehicles in loading and unloading queues would turn their engines off when not in use).

- Any stationary motor sources such as generators and compressors located within 100 feet of a sensitive receptor shall be equipped with a supplementary exhaust pollution control system as required by the BAAQMD and the California Air Resources Board.

- Incorporate use of low-NOx emitting, low-particulate emitting, or alternatively fueled construction equipment into the construction equipment fleet where feasible, especially when operating near sensitive receptors.

- For all construction projects of more than 10 days’ duration, LBNL shall designate and have on-site during construction a qualified air quality manager to oversee the implementation of construction air quality mitigation measures. Alternatively, LBNL may direct the construction contractor(s) to employ and have on site a construction air quality manager acceptable to LBNL.

**Monitoring Responsibility / Action Notes**

- PD&C: Shall include applicable air emission and dust control standards in contractor specifications and will monitor / inspect project sites.

**Monitoring Schedule / Reporting Procedure**

- Contract specifications prior to project bidding process.

- Other measures during construction period for all applicable projects under 2006 LRDP.

- Record in contract specifications; project managers / inspectors shall periodically conduct physical monitoring at project sites during construction period for all subsequent projects and document results in project file.
Air Quality (cont.)

AQ-1 (cont.)

- Idling time of diesel powered construction equipment shall be limited to three minutes.
- All diesel engines used by LBNL construction contractor(s) at the site, or for on-road hauling of construction material, shall be post-1996 models.
- On-site power shall be used to minimize reliance on portable generators.
- Offer incentives to encourage construction workers to carpool or employ other means of transportation. The incentives shall include, but are not necessarily limited to, preferential onsite parking and substantial assistance with transportation costs (gas cards, FasTrak toll passes, public transit passes, etc.); charging for parking as a disincentive shall also be explored.
- All construction diesel engines, which have a rating of 100 hp or more, shall meet, at a minimum, the Tier 2 California Emission Standards for Off-Road Compression-Ignition Engines as specified in California Code of Regulations, Title 13, section 2423(b)(1) unless certified by the on-site construction air quality manager that such engine is not available for a particular item of equipment. In the event a Tier 2 engine is not available for any off-road equipment larger than 100 hp, that equipment shall be outfitted with a Tier 1 engine. In the event a Tier 1 engine is not available for any off-road equipment larger than 100 hp, that equipment shall be outfitted with a catalyzed diesel particulate filter (soot filter), unless certified by engine manufacturers or the on-site construction air quality manager that the use of such devices is not practical for specific engine types. For purposes of this condition, the use of such devices is “not practical” if, among other reasons:

(1) There is no available soot filter that has been certified by either the California Air Resources Board or U.S. Environmental Protection Agency for the engine in question; or
Air Quality (cont.)

AQ-1 (cont.)

(2) The construction equipment is intended to be on-site for ten (10) days or less.

The use of a soot filter may be terminated immediately if one of the following conditions exists, provided that LBNL is informed within one (1) working day of the termination:

(1) The use of the soot filter is excessively reducing normal availability of the construction equipment due to increased downtime for maintenance, and/or reduced power output due to an excessive increase in backpressure.

(2) The soot filter is causing or is reasonably expected to cause significant engine damage.

(3) The soot filter is causing or is reasonably expected to cause a significant risk to workers or the public.

(4) Any other seriously detrimental cause which has the approval of LBNL prior to the termination being implemented.

Relief may be granted from this requirement if the construction air quality manager can demonstrate to LBNL that a good faith effort has been made to comply with this requirement and that compliance is not possible.

- Include the specifications in this measure in the construction bid documents and contracts.

AQ-4: Implementation of the proposed 2006 LRDP would expose people to toxic air contaminants.

AQ-4a: To avoid the single location where implementation of the 2006 LRDP would result in an increase in health risk in excess of the 10-in-one-million threshold, LBNL shall adjust, prior to the construction of parking structure PS-1 (or similarly configured building), the exhaust system of the existing generator near Building 90 to reduce or eliminate the restriction on upward exhaust flow caused by the existing rain cap. For example, modeling indicates that removal of the rain cap would reduce the risk caused by construction of parking structure PS-1 in proximity to the existing generator to a level below 10 in one million. The Lab could install a hinged rain cap, which would prevent moisture infiltration into the generator but still allow unobstructed exhaust flow and would avoid the significant impact identified in the health risk assessment.

PD&C
Shall plan, design, and implement projects such as PS-1, and is also in charge of implementing equipment modification in consultation with EH&S.

Prior to construction of parking structure PS-1 or similarly configured building.

Approval process for PS-1 or similarly configured building shall include implementation plan for this measure. Considered complete upon documentation of modification of rain cap on generator near Building 90.
**MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility / Action Notes</th>
<th>Mitigation Timing</th>
<th>Monitoring Schedule / Reporting Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Quality (cont.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AQ-6:</strong> Even though cumulative emissions of toxic air contaminants would decrease, implementation of the LBNL 2006 LRDP, in combination with other potential contributing projects, would contribute to cumulative emissions of toxic air contaminants that result in an excess cancer risk that exceeds, and would continue to exceed, 10 in one million. (Significant and Unavoidable)</td>
<td>Because most of the cancer risk from TACs is due to diesel particulate, measures to reduce the risk (beyond regulations already in place that will substantially reduce diesel particulate emissions in the next 20 years) would include those measures that could reduce vehicular travel to and from Berkeley Lab. Implementation of Mitigation Measure TRANS-1c, development and implementation of a new Transportation Demand Management Program (see Transportation/Traffic), would result in a concomitant increase in vehicular emissions, including those of TACs. However, even with implementation of this measure, Berkeley Lab, as a major employer and thus a substantial source of vehicular traffic, would likely continue to contribute to Bay Area-wide emissions of TACs for the foreseeable future.</td>
<td>See below for TRANS-1c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biological Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIO-2:</strong> Development under the 2006 LRDP could result in adverse impacts to drainages and/or wetlands subject to Corps and CDFG jurisdiction, including permanent or temporary fill, and accidental discharges of fill materials or other deleterious substances during construction.</td>
<td><strong>BIO-2a:</strong> Future development under the 2006 LRDP shall avoid, to the extent feasible, the fill of potentially jurisdictional waters. Therefore, during the design phase of any future development project that may affect potentially jurisdictional waters, a preliminary evaluation of the project site shall be made by a qualified biologist to determine if the site is proximate to potentially jurisdictional waters and, if deemed necessary by the biologist, a wetlands delineation shall be prepared and submitted to the Corps for verification. Most development projected under the 2006 LRDP would have no potential for impacts on jurisdictional waters. However, development in specific locations including Buildings S-1 and S-9, as well as Parking Structures and Lots PS-1 and PL-9 and Roads R-2 and R-5, could require fill of or create the potential for accidental discharges to jurisdictional waters. It should be noted that the preferable form of mitigation recommended by the Corps is avoidance of jurisdictional waters. To the extent practicable, new development under the 2006 LRDP shall be located so as to avoid the fill of jurisdictional waters.</td>
<td>Facilities Planning&lt;br&gt;Shall engage a qualified wetlands biologist or other qualified professional to conduct an initial survey and prepare a report on the findings thereof.</td>
<td>Project design and review process&lt;br&gt;Document in project file at project approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Biological Resources (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility / Action Notes</th>
<th>Mitigation Timing</th>
<th>Monitoring Schedule / Reporting Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIO-2 (cont.)</td>
<td>BIO-2b: Any unavoidable loss of jurisdictional waters shall be compensated for through the development and implementation of a project-specific Wetlands Mitigation Plan.</td>
<td>Facilities Planning Where applicable, to provide project-specific Wetlands Mitigation Plan in coordination with LBNL EH&amp;S and relevant regulatory and overseeing agencies.</td>
<td>During project design and review process and environmental review and approval process.</td>
<td>-Successful completion as required to secure necessary agency permits -Mitigation Plan measures will be inspected, where applicable, during and after implementation of subsequent projects. Results will be documented in project file.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the event that potential impacts to streams resulting from a 2006 LRDP development project are identified, compensation for loss of jurisdictional waters would be based on the Corps-verified wetlands delineation identified in Mitigation Measure BIO-2.a. During the permit application process for specific development project(s) with identified impacts on jurisdictional drainages or wetlands, LBNL would consult with the Corps, CDFG, and Regional Water Quality Control Board regarding the most appropriate assessment and mitigation methods to adequately address losses to wetland function that could occur as a result of the development project(s). A project-specific wetland mitigation plan would be developed prior to project implementation and submitted to permitting agencies for their approval. The plan may include one or more of the following mitigation options: restoration, rehabilitation, or enhancement of drainages and wetlands in on-site areas that remain unaffected by grading and project development or off-site at one or more suitable locations within the project region; creation of on-site or off-site drainages or wetlands at a minimum of a 1:1 functional equivalency or acreage ratio (as verified by the Corps); purchase of credits in an authorized mitigation bank acceptable to the Corps and CDFG; contributions in support of restoration and enhancement programs located within the project region (such as those operated by local non-profit organizations including the Friends of Strawberry Creek, ...
### Significant Impact

#### Biological Resources (cont.)

**BIO-2 (cont.)**

the Urban Creeks Council, or the Waterways Restoration Institute); or other options approved by the appropriate regulatory agency at the time of the specific project approval.

All mitigation work proposed in existing wetlands or drainages on- or off-site shall be authorized by applicable permits.

**BIO-2c:** To the extent feasible, construction projects that might affect jurisdictional drainages and/or wetlands could be scheduled for dry-weather months. Avoiding ground-disturbing activities during the rainy season would further decrease the potential risk of construction-related discharges to jurisdictional waters.

**BIO-3:** Construction activities proposed under the 2006 LRDP could adversely affect special-status nesting birds (including raptors) such that they abandon their nests or such that their reproductive efforts fail.

**BIO-3:** Direct disturbance, including tree and shrub removal or nest destruction by any other means, or indirect disturbance (e.g., noise, increased human activity in area) of active nests of raptors and other special-status bird species (as listed in EIR Table IV.C-1) within or in the vicinity of the proposed footprint of a future development project shall be avoided in accordance with the following procedures for Pre-Construction Special-Status Avian Surveys and Subsequent Actions. No more than two weeks in advance of any tree or shrub removal or demolition or construction activity involving particularly noisy or intrusive activities (such as concrete breaking) that will commence during the breeding season (February 1 through July 31), a qualified wildlife biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys of all potential special-status bird nesting habitat in the vicinity of the planned activity and, depending on the survey findings, the following actions shall be taken to avoid potential adverse effects on nesting special-status nesting birds:

1. Pre-construction surveys are not required for demolition or construction activities scheduled to occur during the non-breeding season (August 1 through January 31).
2. If pre-construction surveys indicate that no nests of special-status birds are present or that nests are inactive or potential habitat is unoccupied, no further mitigation is required.

**PD&C**

Shall schedule construction projects accordingly, when feasible.

**Facilities Planning**

Where construction is scheduled during breeding season (February 1 through July 31), shall engage a qualified wildlife biologist to conduct pre-construction survey(s) and identify appropriate treatment in accordance with the procedures delineated here for Pre-Construction Special-Status Avian Surveys and Subsequent Actions. The wildlife biologist shall prepare a report upon the completion of surveys (if no nests of special-status birds are present or nests are inactive or potential habitat is unoccupied) or upon completion of construction activity that could disturb special-status birds that are present. The biologist shall have the authority to initiate protective action in accordance with the procedures described herein.

**Monitoring Responsibility / Action Notes**

Project design and review process, and during construction for all projects under 2006 LRDP.

**Monitoring Schedule / Reporting Procedure**

Considered complete upon documentation of construction scheduling.

Considered complete upon receipt by LBNL of biologist’s final report.
V. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility / Action Notes</th>
<th>Mitigation Timing</th>
<th>Monitoring Schedule / Reporting Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources (cont.)</td>
<td>BIO-3 (cont.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. If active nests of special-status birds are found during the surveys, a no-disturbance buffer zone will be created around active nests during the breeding season or until a qualified biologist determines that all young have fledged. The size of the buffer zones and types of construction activities restricted within them will be determined through consultation with the CDFG, taking into account factors such as the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a. Noise and human disturbance levels at the project site and the nesting site at the time of the survey and the noise and disturbance expected during the construction activity;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Distance and amount of vegetation or other screening between the project site and the nest; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c. Sensitivity of individual nesting species and behaviors of the nesting birds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Noisy demolition or construction activities as described above (or activities producing similar substantial increases in noise and activity levels in the vicinity) commencing during the non-breeding season and continuing into the breeding season do not require surveys (as it is assumed that any breeding birds taking up nests would be acclimated to project-related activities already under way). However, if trees and shrubs are to be removed during the breeding season, the trees and shrubs will be surveyed for nests prior to their removal, according to the survey and protective action guidelines 3a through 3c, above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Nests initiated during demolition or construction activities would be presumed to be unaffected by the activity, and a buffer zone around such nests would not be necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Destruction of active nests of special-status birds and overt interference with nesting activities of special-status birds shall be prohibited.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. The noise control procedures for maximum noise, equipment, and operations identified in Section IV.I, Noise, of this EIR shall be implemented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Biological Resources (cont.)

**BIO-4:** Removal of trees and other proposed construction activities during the breeding season could result in direct mortality of special-status bats. In addition, construction noise and human disturbance could cause maternity roost abandonment and subsequent death of young.

**BIO-4:** Project implementation under the 2006 LRDP shall avoid disturbance to the maternity roosts of special-status bats during the breeding season in accordance with the following procedures for Pre-Construction Special-Status Bat Surveys and Subsequent Actions. No more than two weeks in advance of any demolition or construction activity involving concrete breaking or similarly noisy or intrusive activities, that would commence during the breeding season (March 1 through August 31), a qualified bat biologist, acceptable to the CDFG, shall conduct pre-demolition surveys of all potential special-status bat breeding habitat in the vicinity of the planned activity. Depending on the survey findings, the following actions shall be taken to avoid potential adverse effects on breeding special-status bats:

1. If active roosts are identified during pre-construction surveys, a no-disturbance buffer will be created by the qualified bat biologist, in consultation with the CDFG, around active roosts during the breeding season. The size of the buffer will take into account factors such as the following:
   a. Noise and human disturbance levels at the project site and the roost site at the time of the survey and the noise and disturbance expected during the construction activity;
   b. Distance and amount of vegetation or other screening between the project site and the roost; and
   c. Sensitivity of individual nesting species and the behaviors of the bats.

2. If pre-construction surveys indicate that no roosts of special-status bats are present, or that roosts are inactive or potential habitat is unoccupied, no further mitigation is required.

3. Pre-construction surveys are not required for demolition or construction activities scheduled to occur during the non-breeding season (September 1 through February 28).

**Facilities Planning**

Where construction is scheduled during breeding season (February 1 through July 31), shall engage a qualified wildlife biologist to conduct pre-construction survey(s) and identify appropriate treatment in accordance with the procedures delineated here for Pre-Construction Special-Status Bat Surveys and Subsequent Actions. The wildlife biologist shall prepare a report upon the completion of surveys (if no nets of special-status birds are present or nests are inactive or potential habitat is unoccupied) or upon completion of construction activity that could disturb special-status birds that are present. The biologist shall have the authority to initiate protective action in accordance with the procedures described herein.

**Monitoring Schedule / Reporting Procedure**

Prior to construction for all applicable projects under 2006 LRDP.

Considered complete upon receipt by LBNL of biologist’s final report.
### MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility / Action Notes</th>
<th>Mitigation Timing</th>
<th>Monitoring Schedule / Reporting Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIO-4</strong>: (cont.)</td>
<td>4. Noisy demolition or construction activities as described above (or activities producing similar substantial increases in noise and activity levels in the vicinity) commencing during the non-breeding season and continuing into the breeding season do not require surveys (as it is assumed that any bats taking up roosts would be acclimated to project-related activities already under way). However, if trees are to be removed during the breeding season, the trees would be surveyed for roosts prior to their removal, according to the survey and protective action guidelines 1a through 1c, above.</td>
<td>Facilities Planning</td>
<td>When (and if) Alameda whipsnakes were found during construction projects under 2006 LRDP.</td>
<td>Considered complete upon receipt by LBNL of biologist's final report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Bat roosts initiated during demolition or construction activities are presumed to be unaffected by the activity, and a buffer is not necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Destruction of roosts of special-status bats and overt interference with roosting activities of special-status bats shall be prohibited.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. The noise control procedures for maximum noise, equipment, and operations identified in Section IV.I, Noise, of this EIR shall be implemented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIO-5</strong>: Implementation of the 2006 LRDP could result in take or harassment of Alameda whipsnakes.</td>
<td><strong>BIO-5a</strong>: With the approval of the USFWS on a case-by-case basis, relocate any snake encountered during construction that is at risk of harassment; cease construction activity until the snake is moved to suitable refugium. Alternatively, submit a general protocol for relocation to the USFWS for approval prior to project implementation.</td>
<td>Facilities Planning</td>
<td>Prior to the start of construction of applicable projects under the 2006 LRDP.</td>
<td>Considered complete upon receipt by LBNL of biologist's final report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>BIO-5b</strong>: Conduct focused pre-construction surveys for the Alameda whipsnake at all project sites within or directly adjacent to areas mapped as having high potential for whipsnake occurrence. Project sites within high potential areas shall be fenced to exclude snakes prior to project implementation. This would not include ongoing and non-site specific activities such as fuel management.</td>
<td>Facilities Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Where applicable, shall engage a biologist qualified to survey for whipsnakes. The biologist shall prepare a report regarding any relocation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Biological Resources (cont.)

**BIO-5 (cont.)**

Methods for pre-construction surveys, burrow excavation, and site fencing shall be developed prior to implementation of any project located within or adjacent to areas mapped as having high potential for whipsnake occurrence. Such methods would be developed in consultation or with approval of USFWS for any development taking place in USFWS officially designated Alameda whipsnake critical habitat. Pre-construction surveys of such project sites shall be carried out by a permitted biologist familiar with whipsnake identification and ecology (Swaim, 2002). These are not intended to be protocol-level surveys but designed to clear an area so that individual whipsnakes are not present within a given area prior to initiation of construction. At sites where the project footprint would not be contained entirely within an existing developed area footprint and natural vegetated areas would be disturbed any existing animal burrows shall be carefully hand-excavated to ensure that there are no whipsnakes within the project footprint. Any whipsnakes found during these surveys shall be relocated according to the Alameda Whipsnake Relocation Plan. Snakes of any other species found during these surveys shall also be relocated out of the project area. Once the site is cleared it shall then be fenced in such a way as to exclude snakes for the duration of the project. Fencing shall be maintained intact throughout the duration of the project.

**BIO-5c:** (1) A full-time designated monitor shall be employed at project sites that are within or directly adjacent to areas designated as having high potential for whipsnake occurrence, or (2) Daily site surveys for Alameda whipsnake shall be carried out by a designated monitor at construction sites within or adjacent to areas designated as having moderate potential for whipsnake occurrence.

Each morning, prior to initiating excavation, construction, or vehicle operation at sites identified as having moderate potential for whipsnake occurrence, the project area of applicable construction sites shall be surveyed by a designated monitor trained in Alameda whipsnake identification to ensure that no Alameda whipsnakes are present. This survey is not intended to be a protocol-level survey. All laydown and deposition areas, as well as...
### Significant Impact

**BIO-5 (cont.)**

Well as other areas that might conceal or shelter snakes or other animals, shall be inspected each morning by the designated monitor to ensure that Alameda whipsnakes are not present. At sites in high potential areas the monitor shall remain on-site during construction hours. At sites in moderate potential areas the monitor shall remain on-call during construction hours in the event that a snake is found on-site. The designated monitor shall have the authority to halt construction activities in the event that a whipsnake is found within the construction footprint until such time as threatening activities can be eliminated in the vicinity of the snake and it can be removed from the site by a biologist permitted to handle Alameda whipsnakes. The USFWS shall be notified within 24 hours of any such event.

**BIO-5d:** Alameda whipsnake awareness and relevant environmental sensitivity training for each worker shall be conducted by the designated monitor prior to commencement of on-site activities.

All on-site workers at applicable construction sites shall attend an Alameda whipsnake information session conducted by the designated monitor prior to beginning work. This session shall cover identification of the species and procedures to be followed if an individual is found on-site, as well as basic site rules meant to protect biological resources, such as speed limits and daily trash pickup.

**BIO-5e:** Hours of operation and speed limits shall be instituted and posted.

All construction activities that take place on the ground (as opposed to within buildings) at applicable construction sites shall be performed during daylight hours, or with suitable lighting so that snakes can be seen. Vehicle speed on the construction site shall not exceed 5 miles per hour.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility / Action Notes</th>
<th>Mitigation Timing</th>
<th>Monitoring Schedule / Reporting Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIO-5 (cont.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Facilities Planning</td>
<td>Prior to the start of construction of applicable projects under 2006 LRDP.</td>
<td>Considered complete upon receipt by LBNL of trainer’s documentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PD&amp;C</td>
<td>Prior to and during construction activities of applicable projects.</td>
<td>Considered complete upon completion of each project and documentation by LBNL Project Manager of construction crew compliance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Biological Resources (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility / Action Notes</th>
<th>Mitigation Timing</th>
<th>Monitoring Schedule / Reporting Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIO-5 (cont.)</strong></td>
<td><strong>BIO-5f:</strong> Site vegetation management shall take place prior to tree removal, grading, excavation, or other construction activities. Construction materials, soil, construction debris, or other material shall be deposited only on areas where vegetation has been mowed. Areas where development is proposed under the 2006 LRDP are subject to annual vegetation management involving the close-cropping of all grasses and ground covers; this management activity would be performed prior to initiating project-specific construction. Areas would be re-mowed if grass or other vegetation on the project site becomes high enough to conceal whipsnakes during the construction period. In areas not subject to annual vegetation management, dense vegetation would be removed prior to the onset of grading or the use of any heavy machinery, using goats, manual brush cutters, or a combination thereof.</td>
<td>PD&amp;C Shall oversee project site vegetation management and laydown activities.</td>
<td>Prior to and during construction activities of applicable projects.</td>
<td>Considered complete upon documentation by Project Manager.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIO-6:</strong> Project activities allowed under the LRDP, including facilities and road construction in areas designated for use as Research and Academic, Central Commons, and Support Services zones, as well as vegetation management activities in designated Perimeter Open Space, could result in the take of special-status plant species. Construction activities, as well as vegetation management activities, have the potential to disturb or result in mortality of these species or eliminate their habitat. (Significant; Less than Significant with Mitigation)</td>
<td><strong>BIO-6a:</strong> Floristic surveys for special-status plants shall be conducted at specific project sites where suitable habitat is present. Floristic surveys shall also be conducted in designated Perimeter Open Space. All occurrences of special-status plant populations, if any, shall be mapped. Although no special-status plants have been observed at LBNL during past biological resource surveys, the distribution and size of plant populations often vary from year to year, depending on climatic conditions. Therefore, a baseline survey of all non-developed areas, including the designated Perimeter Open Space areas, where there is potential for future development or vegetation management activities, should be conducted in accordance with USFWS and CDFG guidelines by a qualified botanist during the period of identification for all special-status plants. During this initial survey, any special-status plant populations found, as well as areas with high potential for supporting special-status plants (i.e., less disturbed areas, rock outcrops and other areas of thin soils, areas supporting a relatively high proportion of native plant species) would be identified and mapped. Thereafter, surveys of Perimeter Open survey. The biologist shall prepare a report documenting the survey findings.</td>
<td>Facilities Planning -Where applicable, shall engage a qualified plant biologist to conduct an initial floristic survey. -Shall engage a qualified plant biologist to conduct site-specific surveys of development sites prior to the start of construction and of vegetation management areas where the potential for special-status plants is documented in the initial survey. -Shall engage a qualified plant biologist to conduct directed studies every five years.</td>
<td>-Baseline survey at beginning of 2006 LRDP period. -Site specific surveys during project design and environmental review process. -Periodic surveys every five years in April / June beginning five years after initial baseline survey.</td>
<td>Considered complete upon receipt by LBNL of survey(s).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility / Action Notes</th>
<th>Mitigation Timing</th>
<th>Monitoring Schedule / Reporting Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources (cont.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO-6 (cont.)</td>
<td>Space areas where ongoing vegetation management (i.e., active vegetation removal to minimize potential wildland fire damage to facilities and personnel) activities would be undertaken, and that are mapped as supporting or having potential to support special-status plant species, would be conducted in April and June every five years.</td>
<td>Facilities Planning</td>
<td>When applicable, based on surveys detailed in BIO-6a.</td>
<td>When applicable, considered complete upon receipt by LBNL of final transplantation and monitoring report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In those proposed LRDP development sites where suitable habitat is present for special-status species identified as having a moderate to high potential for occurrence (see Table IV.C-1, p. IV.C-10), protocol-level rare plant surveys would be conducted prior to construction. Surveys should be conducted during the periods of identification for all species under consideration at each applicable development site, the timing and scope to be directed by a qualified botanist. During the initial survey, any special-status plant populations found, as well as all areas with high potential for supporting special-status plants (i.e. less disturbed areas, rock outcrops and other areas of thin soils, areas supporting a relatively high proportion of native plant species), would be identified and mapped.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO-6b: Seeds or cuttings shall be collected from sensitive plant species found within developable areas and open space and at risk of being any adversely affected, or sensitive plants found in these areas shall be transplanted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If special-status plants are found during floristic surveys and are at risk of being adversely affected, a qualified botanist working in conjunction with an expert in native plant horticulture, CNPS, and CDFG, would collect seeds, bulbs, and cuttings for propagation and planting in specific project revegetation efforts as well as restoration of native habitat within designated Open Space. Perennial species could be transplanted, if found in undeveloped locations that have a high likelihood for future development. Due to its unreliability, translocation alone should not be relied upon as a sole means of mitigation; however, healthy individuals of any special-status plant species should be transplanted to areas of suitable habitat that are protected in perpetuity. The relocation sites may be located either on or off the LBNL hill site. If the areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Biological Resources (cont.)

**BIO-6 (cont.)**

For transplanting are located off-site, they should be within a 20-mile radius of the project site. Plants should be relocated to areas with ecological conditions (slope, aspect, microclimate, soil moisture, etc.) as similar to those in which they were found as possible. Existing plants could also be held in containers for specific post-project revegetation efforts on-site.

## Cultural Resources

**CUL-1:** Implementation of the 2006 LRDP could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of historical resources, as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, including historical resources that have not yet been identified.

**CUL-1:** Mitigation for the demolition or substantial physical alteration of Buildings 71 and 88, and other historical buildings and structures at LBNL found to be significant historical resources at the completion of the ongoing surveys and research, shall include the development of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) among the Department of Energy, the State Historic Preservation Officer, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. Full implementation of the MOA’s stipulations shall also be required as part of this mitigation measure.

**CUL-3:** Implementation of the proposed 2006 LRDP could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.

**CUL-3:** If an archaeological artifact is discovered on-site during construction under the proposed LRDP, all activities within a 50-foot radius shall be halted and a qualified archaeologist shall be summoned within 24 hours to inspect the site. If the find is determined to be significant and to merit formal recording or data collection, adequate time and funding shall be devoted to salvage the material. Any archaeologically important data recovered during monitoring shall be cleaned, catalogued, and analyzed, with the results presented in a report of finding that meets professional standards.

**CUL-4:** Implementation of the proposed 2006 LRDP could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

**CUL-4:** In the event that human skeletal remains are uncovered during construction or ground-breaking activities resulting from implementation of the 2006 LRDP at the LBNL site, CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e)(1) shall be followed:

- In the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, the following steps should be taken:

## Monitoring Responsibility / Action Notes

Facilities Planning

In the event that historical resource(s) are proposed for demolition, shall engage a qualified historical consultant and shall initiate consultation with the SHPO.

When applicable, prior to the start of any demolition or other physical alteration of the resource.

When applicable, considered complete upon completion of MOA.

When applicable, upon receipt by LBNL of archaeologist’s final report.

When applicable, considered complete upon contact with coroner and, where applicable, with Native American Heritage Commission and/or most likely descendent.
### Cultural Resources (cont.)

**CUL-4 (cont.)**

1. There shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until:

   - **(A)** The coroner of the county in which the remains are discovered must be contacted to determine that no investigation of the cause of death is required, and
   - **(B)** If the coroner determines the remains to be Native American:
     1. The coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours.
     2. The Native American Heritage Commission shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the most likely descended from the deceased Native American.
     3. The most likely descendent may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, or

2. Where the following conditions occur, the landowner or his authorized representative shall rebury the Native American human remains and associated grave goods with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance.

   - **(A)** The Native American Heritage Commission is unable to identify a most likely descendent or the most likely descendent failed to make a recommendation within 24 hours after being notified by the commission;
   - **(B)** The descendant identified fails to make a recommendation; or
   - **(C)** The landowner or his authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the descendant, and the mediation by the Native American Heritage Commission fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner.
### Geology and Soils

**GEO-1:** Future construction projects within the Alquist-Priolo Zone could expose people or structures to surface fault rupture.

**GEO-1:** Seismic emergency response and evacuation plans for LBNL shall incorporate potential inaccessibility of the Blackberry Canyon entrance and identify alternative ingress and egress routes for emergency vehicles and facility employees in the event of roadway failure from surface fault rupture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility / Action Notes</th>
<th>Mitigation Timing</th>
<th>Monitoring Schedule / Reporting Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEO-1: Future construction projects within the Alquist-Priolo Zone could expose people or structures to surface fault rupture.</td>
<td>GEO-1: Seismic emergency response and evacuation plans for LBNL shall incorporate potential inaccessibility of the Blackberry Canyon entrance and identify alternative ingress and egress routes for emergency vehicles and facility employees in the event of roadway failure from surface fault rupture.</td>
<td>EH&amp;S Shall prepare plans.</td>
<td>Prior to project approval of new 2006 LRDP projects.</td>
<td>Documented in Project file and in Berkeley Lab emergency plans. Information will be shared with City of Berkeley / City of Berkeley Fire Department.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GEO-2:** Implementation of the LRDP would expose people and structures to seismic hazards such as groundshaking and earthquake-induced landsliding.

**GEO-2:** A site-specific, design-level geotechnical investigation shall occur during the design phase of each LBNL building project, and prior to approval of new building construction within the LBNL hill site. This investigation shall be conducted by a licensed geotechnical engineer and include a seismic evaluation of potential maximum ground motion at the site. Geotechnical investigations for sites within either a Seismic Hazard Zone for landslides or an area of historic landslide activity at LBNL, as depicted on EIR Figures IV.E-2 and IV.E-3, or newly recognized areas of slope instability at the inception of project planning, shall incorporate a landslide analysis in accordance with CGS Publication 117. Geotechnical recommendations shall subsequently be incorporated into building design.

Earthquakes and groundshaking in the Bay Area are unavoidable and may occur at some time during the period covered by the LRDP. Although some structural damage is typically not avoidable, building codes and local construction requirements have been established to protect against building collapse and to minimize injury during a seismic event. Considering that the future individual buildings would be constructed in conformance with the California Building Code, LBNL requirements, federal regulations and guidelines, and Mitigation Measure GEO-2, the risks of injury and structural damage from groundshaking and earthquake-induced landsliding would be reduced and the impacts, therefore, would be considered less than significant.

Furthermore, as described in the Project Description, some of the buildings constructed pursuant to the LRDP would be occupied by staff relocated from other, older LBNL facilities, some of which...
### Geology and Soils (cont.)

**GEO-2 (cont.)**

were constructed in accordance with less stringent building code requirements than those that would apply to future construction. As of 2003, 14 percent of LBNL buildings were over 60 years old. Many of these buildings were constructed as temporary structures that were never replaced. The LRDP specifically proposes the demolition of some 30 outdated buildings that together include approximately 250,000 square feet. In this regard, implementation of the LRDP would result in a beneficial seismic safety impact.

**GEO-3**: Implementation of the LRDP would result in construction on soils that could be subject to erosion and instability.

**GEO-3a**: Construction under the LRDP shall be required to use construction best management practices and standards to control and reduce erosion. These measures could include, but are not limited to, restricting grading to the dry season, protecting all finished graded slopes from erosion using such techniques as erosion control matting and hydroseeding or other suitable measures.

**GEO-3b**: Revegetation of areas disturbed by construction activities, including slope stabilization sites, using native shrubs, trees, and grasses, shall be included as part of all new projects.

**PD&C**

Shall prepare and implement construction BMPs and erosion control plans.

During project design phase, and prior to the start of excavation or other construction activities for all applicable projects.

**Monitoring Schedule / Reporting Procedure**

Considered complete upon documentation of compliance with erosion-control best management practices.

**Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

**HAZ-3**: Operation of LBNL pursuant to the 2006 LRDP, including proposed increases in laboratory and facility space, would increase the use of hazardous materials in research, facility construction, and facility maintenance activities, consequently resulting in increased generation, storage, transportation, and disposal of hazardous wastes, including transport associated with off-site disposal of hazardous and radioactive wastes, from research and facility maintenance activities.

**HAZ-3a**: LBNL shall continue to prepare an annual self-assessment summary report and a Site Environmental Report that summarize environment, health, and safety program performance and identify any areas where LBNL is not in compliance with environmental laws and regulations governing hazardous materials, and worker safety, emergency response, and environmental protection.

An EH&S assessment of LBNL activities is performed annually, and these results are reported annually in the LBNL Self-Assessment Report.

In addition, LBNL prepares an annual Site Environmental Report that describes the environmental activities noted above. Implementation of this measure would ensure that the information in the LBNL Self-Assessment and Site Environmental Reports continues to be collected, reviewed, and provided.

**EH&S**

Annually

Documented in annual reports throughout the lifetime of the 2006 LRDP.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility / Action Notes</th>
<th>Mitigation Timing</th>
<th>Monitoring Schedule / Reporting Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hazards and Hazardous Materials (cont.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GEO-2 (cont.)</strong></td>
<td><strong>HAZ-3b:</strong> Prior to shipping hazardous materials to a hazardous waste treatment, storage, or disposal facility, LBNL shall confirm that the facility is licensed to receive the type of waste LBNL is proposing to ship.</td>
<td>EH&amp;S</td>
<td>Prior to shipping hazardous materials.</td>
<td>Verification of DOE Order 435.1 throughout the lifetime of the 2006 LRDP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LBNL is required by DOE Order 435.1 to verify that the receiving facility has all appropriate licenses and that the waste meets all waste acceptance criteria of the receiving facility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>HAZ-3c:</strong> LBNL shall require hazardous waste haulers to provide evidence that they are appropriately licensed to transport the type of wastes being shipped from LBNL.</td>
<td>EH&amp;S</td>
<td>Prior to shipping hazardous waste.</td>
<td>Throughout the lifetime of the 2006 LRDP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shipping procedures at LBNL require all transporters of hazardous, radioactive, and mixed waste to provide evidence that they are appropriately licensed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>HAZ-3d:</strong> LBNL shall continue its waste minimization programs and strive to identify new and innovative methods to minimize hazardous waste generated by LBNL activities.</td>
<td>EH&amp;S</td>
<td>Annually, or as appropriate.</td>
<td>Throughout the lifetime of the 2006 LRDP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Each LBNL Division is required to identify and implement new waste minimization activities each year. The waste minimization program at LBNL reduced hazardous waste by 72% during the period 1993-2004.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>HAZ-3e:</strong> In addition to implementing the numerous employee communication and training requirements included in regulatory programs, LBNL shall undertake the following additional measures as ongoing reminders to workers of health and safety requirements:</td>
<td>EH&amp;S</td>
<td>As appropriate.</td>
<td>Throughout the lifetime of the 2006 LRDP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Continue to post phone numbers of LBNL EH&amp;S subject matter experts on the EH&amp;S website.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Continue to post Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans in all LBNL buildings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Continue to post sinks, in areas where hazardous materials are handled, with signs reminding users that hazardous materials and wastes cannot be poured down the drain.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Continue to post dumpsters and central trash collection areas where hazardous materials are handled with signs reminding users that hazardous wastes cannot be disposed of as trash.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Hazards and Hazardous Materials (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility / Action Notes</th>
<th>Mitigation Timing</th>
<th>Monitoring Schedule / Reporting Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAZ-3 (cont.)</td>
<td>HAZ-3f: LBNL shall update its emergency preparedness and response program on an annual basis and shall provide copies of this program to local emergency response agencies and to members of the public upon request.</td>
<td>EH&amp;S</td>
<td>Annually.</td>
<td>Throughout the lifetime of the 2006 LRDP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZ-4: Implementation of the LRDP would involve the handling of hazardous materials and wastes within one-quarter mile of an existing school.</td>
<td>See Mitigation Measures HAZ-3a through HAZ-3f, above.</td>
<td>See above for HAZ-3a and 3f.</td>
<td>As appropriate.</td>
<td>See above for HAZ-3a and 3f.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Noise

**NOISE-1: Development under the proposed LRDP would result in temporary noise impacts related to construction and demolition activities.**

- **NOISE-1a:** To reduce daytime noise impacts due to construction/demolition, LBNL shall require construction/demolition contractors to implement noise reduction measures appropriate for the project being undertaken. Measures that might be implemented could include, but not be limited to, the following:
  - Construction/demolition activities would be limited to a schedule that minimizes disruption to uses surrounding the project site as much as possible. Such activities would be limited to the hours designated in the Berkeley and/or Oakland noise ordinance(s), as applicable to the location of the project. This would eliminate or substantially reduce noise impacts during the more noise-sensitive nighttime hours and on days when construction noise might be more disturbing.
  - To the maximum extent feasible, 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). conduct period physical monitoring for violations. documentation of compliance in project file for each subsequent project.
### MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility / Action Notes</th>
<th>Mitigation Timing</th>
<th>Monitoring Schedule / Reporting Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noise (cont.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **NOISE-1 (cont.)**| • Stationary noise sources shall be located as far from adjacent receptors as possible.  
• At locations where noise may affect neighboring residential uses, LBNL will develop a comprehensive construction noise control specification to implement construction/demolition noise controls, such as noise attenuation barriers, siting of construction laydown and vehicle staging areas, and community outreach, as appropriate to specific projects. The specification will include such information as general provisions, definitions, submittal requirements, construction limitations, requirements for noise and vibration monitoring and control plans, noise control materials and methods. This document will be modified as appropriate for a particular construction project and included within the construction specification.  
**NOISE-1b:** For each subsequent project pursuant to the LRDP that would involve construction and/or demolition activities, LBNL shall engage a qualified noise consultant to determine whether, based on the location of the site and the activities proposed, construction/demolition noise levels could approach the property-line receiving noise standards of the cities of Berkeley or Oakland (as applicable). If the consultant determines that the standards would not be exceeded, no further mitigation is required. If the standards would be reached or exceeded absent further mitigation, one or more of the following additional measures would be required, as determined necessary by the noise consultant:  
• Stationary noise sources shall be muffled and enclosed within temporary sheds, incorporate insulation barriers, or other measures to the extent 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
| PD&C              | Shall engage a qualified noise consultant, consistent with this mitigation measure. Where applicable, LBNL shall implement the consultant’s recommended noise reduction measures and, if recommended, conduct noise monitoring. The consultant shall prepare a report stating, as applicable, that no measures are required, that measures have been implemented and will reduce noise sufficiently, or that measures have been implemented and the results monitored during demolition and/or construction.  
|                   | Prior to the start of demolition or construction activities on all subsequent development projects. | Considered complete upon receipt by LBNL of consultant’s report and implementation, if applicable, of recommended noise control measures. |
## Noise (cont.)

### NOISE-1 (cont.)

Tools themselves shall be used where feasible, and this could achieve a reduction of 5 dBA. Quieter procedures shall be used, such as drills rather than impact equipment, whenever feasible.

- Noise from idling trucks shall be kept to a minimum. No trucks shall be permitted to idle for more than 10 minutes if waiting within 100 feet of a residential area.

- If determined necessary by the noise consultant, a set of site-specific noise attenuation measures shall be developed before construction begins; possible measures might include erection of temporary noise barriers around the construction site, use of noise control blankets on structures being erected to reduce noise emission from the site, evaluation of the feasibility of noise control at the receivers by temporarily improving the noise reduction capability of adjacent buildings, and monitoring the effectiveness of noise attenuation measures by taking noise measurements.

- If determined necessary by the noise consultant, at least two weeks prior to the start of excavation, LBNL or its contractor shall provide written notification to all neighbors within 500 feet of the construction site. The notification shall indicate the estimated duration and completion date of the construction, construction hours, and necessary contact information for potential complaints about construction noise (i.e., name, telephone number, and address of party responsible for construction). The notice shall indicate that noise complaints resulting from construction can be directed to the contact person identified in the notice. The name and phone number of the contact person also shall be posted outside the LBNL boundaries.

### NOISE-4:

Continued operation of the LBNL hill site facility would result in a long-term increase in ambient noise levels.

**Mechanical equipment shall be selected and building designs prepared for all future development projects pursuant to the 2006 LRDP so that noise levels from future building and other facility operations would not exceed the Noise Ordinance limits of the cities of Berkeley or Oakland for commercial areas or residential zones as measured on any commercial or residential property in the area surrounding the future LRDP project. Controls that would typically be PD&C

Shall direct architects, mechanical engineers, and other design professionals to ensure that new buildings and facilities employ maximum feasible noise controls for mechanical equipment. During the design of all subsequent projects. Considered complete upon documentation of implementation of maximum feasible noise controls in building mechanical equipment.
### Noise (cont.)

**NOISE-4 (cont.)**

Incorporated to attain adequate noise reduction would include selection of quiet equipment, sound attenuators on fans, sound attenuator packages for cooling towers and emergency generators, acoustical screen walls, and equipment enclosures.

**NOISE-5:** Development under the proposed LRDP would result in temporary contributions to cumulative noise impacts related to construction and demolition activities. (Significant and Unavoidable)

Implementation of Mitigation Measures NOISE-1a and NOISE-1b would reduce the cumulative impact of construction noise to the maximum extent feasible. However, for purposes of a conservative analysis, the cumulative effect of construction noise is considered significant and unavoidable.

**Facilities Planning**

In conjunction with the City of Berkeley and UC Berkeley, shall prepare additional studies through TDM Plan process and continue to monitor intersection level of service. Upon a determination that the signal warrant is met, the three entities would work to implement installation of a traffic signal and/or undertake alternative mitigation strategies.

**Monitoring Schedule / Reporting Procedure**

Throughout the lifetime of the 2006 LRDP, at least until such time as the signal warrant is met. Considered complete upon signal installation or upon installation of alternative mitigation strategies.

### Transportation/Traffic

**TRANS-1a:** LBNL shall work with UC Berkeley and the City of Berkeley to design and install a signal at the Gayley Road/Stadium Rim Way intersection, when a signal warrant analysis shows that the signal is needed. The intersection would meet one-hour signal warrants for peak-hour volume and peak-hour delay under 2025 conditions with implementation of the LBNL 2006 LRDP. LBNL shall contribute funding on a fair-share basis, to be determined in consultation with UC Berkeley and the City of Berkeley, for a periodic (annual or biennial) signal warrant check to allow the City to determine when a signal is warranted, and for installation of the signal. Should the City determine that alternative mitigation strategies may reduce or avoid the significant impact, the Lab shall work with the City and UC Berkeley to identify and implement such alternative feasible measure(s). See also Mitigation Measure TRANS-1c, development and implementation of a new Transportation Demand Management Program.

With the implementation of this mitigation measure, the intersection of Gayley Road/Stadium Rim Way would operate at an acceptable level of service (LOS B or better under traffic signal control) during both the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

This mitigation measure is proposed to be adopted as part of the LRDP and will be monitored through the LRDP mitigation monitoring and reporting program. It will thus continue to be a
### Significant Impact

Transportation/Traffic (cont.)

#### TRANS-1 (cont.)

Binding mitigation commitment of LBNL. Under CEQA case law, however, when the lead agency contributes fair-share funding to a mitigation measure that will be carried out by another entity, there must be some evidence of a reasonable plan in place in order for the lead agency to conclude that the adopted mitigation will reduce the impact to a less than significant level (*City of Marina v. Board of Trustees of the California State University* (2006) 39 Cal.4th 341). LBNL has discussed this with the City, and based on that consultation, LBNL understands there have been some discussions of improvements at Gayley Road/Stadium Rim Way. Also, the University has retained a consultant to perform studies related to these improvements, but there is not yet a plan in place for the improvements. As such, it cannot be determined at this time that this impact will be mitigated to a less than significant level. Accordingly, this impact would still be considered significant and unavoidable, but LBNL would contribute to fair-share funding which, if a reasonable plan is implemented, would mitigate these impacts to a less than significant level.

#### TRANS-1b:

LBNL shall work with the City of Berkeley to design and install a signal at the Durant Avenue/Piedmont Avenue intersection, when a signal warrant analysis shows that the signal is needed. LBNL shall contribute funding, on a fair-share basis, to be determined in consultation with UC Berkeley and the City of Berkeley, for a periodic (annual or biennial) signal warrant check to allow the City to determine when a signal is warranted, and for installation of the signal. Should the City determine that alternative mitigation strategies may reduce or avoid the significant impact, the Lab shall work with the City and UC Berkeley to identify and implement such alternative feasible measure(s). See also Mitigation Measure TRANS-1c, development and implementation of a new Transportation Demand Management Program.

With the implementation of this mitigation measure, the Durant Avenue/Piedmont Avenue intersection would operate at an acceptable level of service (LOS B or better under traffic signal control) during both the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

This mitigation measure is proposed to be adopted as part of the LRDP and will be monitored through the LRDP mitigation monitoring and reporting program. It will thus continue to be a

---

**Facilities Planning**

In conjunction with the City of Berkeley and UC Berkeley, shall monitor intersection level of service. Upon a determination that the signal warrant is met, the three entities would work to implement installation of a traffic signal and/or undertake alternative mitigation strategies.

- Additional studies will begin following finalization of TDM Plan.
- Additional mitigation will be implemented, as warranted, under the TDM Plan process.

Throughout the lifetime of the 2006 LRDP, at least until such time as the signal warrant is met. Considered complete upon signal installation or upon installation of alternative mitigation strategies.
### Transportation/Traffic (cont.)

**TRANS-1** (cont.)

binding mitigation commitment of LBNL. Under CEQA case law, however, when the lead agency contributes fair-share funding to a mitigation measure that will be carried out by another entity, there must be some evidence of a reasonable plan in place in order for the lead agency to conclude that the adopted mitigation will reduce the impact to a less than significant level (City of Marina v. Board of Trustees of the California State University (2006) 39 Cal.4th 341). LBNL has discussed this with the City, and based on that consultation, LBNL understands there have been some discussions of improvements at Gayley Road/Stadium Rim Way. Also, the University has retained a consultant to perform studies related to these improvements, but there is not yet a plan in place for the improvements. As such, it cannot be determined at this time that this impact will be mitigated to a less than significant level. Accordingly, this impact would still be considered significant and unavoidable, but LBNL would contribute to fair-share funding which, if a reasonable plan is implemented, would mitigate these impacts to a less than significant level.

**TRANS-1c:** LBNL shall fund and conduct a study to evaluate whether there may be feasible mitigation (with design standards acceptable to the City) at the intersection of Hearst Avenue at Gayley Road/La Loma Avenue. This intersection is currently signalized, and physical geometric limitations constrain improvements within its current right-of-way. All four corners of this intersection are occupied by existing UC Berkeley facilities, including Foothill Student Housing, Cory Hall, and outdoor tennis courts, as well as the Founders’ Rock. The LOS analyses herein used conservative assumptions so as to not underestimate potential project impacts. For example, even though the approach widths at this intersection allow drivers to maneuver past other vehicles as they near the intersection, the absence of pavement striping to delineate separate lanes dictated that the analysis conservatively assume all vehicle movements on each approach are made on a single lane. Similarly, without the certainty that standard lane widths (and adequate storage lengths) could be provided, possible improvement measures were not relied on to judge that significant impacts would be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. Judging the success of possible mitigation measures with a conservative standard is reasonable, but in consultation with City of Berkeley staff, the Lab will conduct a

---

**Facilities Planning**

Shall prepare an annual report on the implementation of its Transportation Demand Management Program.

**Monitoring Schedule / Reporting Procedure**

Annual reporting throughout the lifetime of the 2006 LRDP.

Reports shall be made available to the City of Berkeley and Public via Lab’s website. The report may be prepared in conjunction with ongoing LBNL reporting activities.
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility / Action Notes</th>
<th>Mitigation Timing</th>
<th>Monitoring Schedule / Reporting Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation/Traffic (cont.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANS-1 (cont.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| further study to reevaluate whether there may be feasible mitigation (with design standards acceptable to the City) at this intersection. That additional study will be conducted by the Lab as part of the TDM program set forth below as Mitigation Measure TRANS-1d. If such mitigation is determined by Berkeley Lab to be feasible, then Berkeley Lab shall contribute funding on a fair-share basis, to be determined in consultation with UC Berkeley and the City of Berkeley, for the installation of the improvements. This mitigation measure will be monitored through the LRDP mitigation monitoring and reporting program. It will thus continue to be a binding mitigation commitment of LBNL. Under CEQA case law, however, when the lead agency contributes fair-share funding to a mitigation measure that will be carried out by another entity, there must be some evidence of a reasonable plan in place in order for the lead agency to conclude that the adopted mitigation will reduce the impact to a less than significant level (City of Marina v. Board of Trustees of the California State University (2006) 39 Cal.4th 341). LBNL will reevaluate its conclusion that there is not feasible mitigation for this intersection, and will retain and fund a consultant to perform that reevaluation. However, given that LBNL has evaluated all of the potential mitigation that has been suggested and concluded that mitigation is not feasible, and given the absence of a City plan for such improvements, it cannot be determined at this time that this impact will be mitigated to a less than significant level. Accordingly, this impact would still be considered significant and unavoidable, but LBNL shall fund the study pursuant to the TDM program, and would contribute to fair-share funding which, if feasible mitigation is identified and a plan to proceed with that mitigation is implemented, would mitigate this impact to a less than significant level. **TRANS-1d:** LBNL shall develop and implement a new Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program to replace its existing TDM program. This enhanced TDM Program has been drafted in consultation with the City of Berkeley, and is proposed to be adopted by the Lab following The Regents’ consideration of the 2006 LRDP. The new draft proposed TDM Program is attached to this EIR as Appendix G. The proposed TDM Program includes several implementation phases tied to the addition of parking to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility / Action Notes</th>
<th>Mitigation Timing</th>
<th>Monitoring Schedule / Reporting Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation/Traffic (cont.)</td>
<td>LBNL. The final provisions of the TDM Program may be revised as it is finally adopted but will include a TDM coordinator and transportation committee, an annual inventory of parking spaces and a gate count, a study of more aggressive TDM measures, investigation of a possible parking fee, investigation of sharing services with UC Berkeley and an alternative fuels program. The TDM program shall also include funding of a study to reevaluate the feasibility of mitigation at the Hearst and Gayley/LaLoma intersection. The new draft proposed TDM Program also includes a requirement that LBNL conduct an additional traffic study to reevaluate traffic impacts on the earliest to occur of 10 years following the certification of this EIR or the time at which the Lab formally proposes a project that will bring total development of parking spaces pursuant to the 2006 LRDP to or above 375 additional parking spaces.</td>
<td>Facilities Planning Shall prepare an annual report on the implementation of its Transportation Demand Management Program.</td>
<td>Annual reporting throughout the lifetime of the 2006 LRDP.</td>
<td>Reports shall be made available to the City of Berkeley and Public via Lab’s website. The report may be prepared in conjunction with ongoing LBNL reporting activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANS-3: Implementation of the 2006 LRDP would result in an increase in ridership on LBNL shuttle buses, including additional demand for bicycle service on the inbound shuttles, potentially causing overcrowding on the shuttle buses or an inability by bicyclists to use the shuttle buses with their bicycles. (Significant; Less than Significant with Mitigation)</td>
<td>TRANS-3: LBNL shall develop and maintain a transportation plan designed to ensure that the current balance of transportation modes is maintained. This plan shall include 1) maintaining the same (or lesser) ratio of parking permits and parking spaces to average daily population (ADP), and 2) ensuring that levels of shuttle bus service and provision of bike racks on shuttle buses are sufficient to accommodate projected demand.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Transportation/Traffic (cont.)

**TRANS-8:** Development pursuant to the 2006 LRDP, when combined with development under the UC Berkeley LRDP as well as surrounding development in Berkeley and nearby communities that could affect the study intersections, would contribute to a degradation of level of service at local intersections. (Significant and Unavoidable)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility / Action Notes</th>
<th>Mitigation Timing</th>
<th>Monitoring Schedule / Reporting Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANS-8:</strong> LBNL shall implement Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a (work with UC Berkeley and the City of Berkeley to design and install a signal at the Gayley Road/Stadium Rim Way intersection; LBNL would contribute funding on a fair-share basis, to be determined in consultation with UC Berkeley and the City of Berkeley, to install the signal) and Mitigation Measure TRANS-1b (work with the City of Berkeley to design and install a signal at the Durant Avenue/Piedmont Avenue intersection, when a signal warrant analysis shows that the signal is needed; LBNL would contribute funding on a fair-share basis, to be determined in consultation with UC Berkeley and the City of Berkeley, to install the signal and for monitoring to determine when a signal is warranted).</td>
<td>See above under TRANS-1a.</td>
<td>See above under TRANS-1a.</td>
<td>See above under TRANS-1a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the implementation of these mitigation measures, the intersections of Gayley Road/Stadium Rim Way and Durant Avenue/Piedmont Avenue would operate at LOS B or better during both the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

As explained earlier, the intersection of Hearst Avenue at Gayley Road/La Loma Avenue is currently signalized, and physical geometric limitations constrain improvements within its current right-of-way. Without the certainty that standard lane widths (and adequate storage lengths) could be provided, possible improvement measures were not relied on to judge that significant impacts would be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. Judging the success of possible mitigation measures with a conservative standard is reasonable, but in consultation with City of Berkeley staff, the Lab shall fund and conduct a study to evaluate whether there may be feasible mitigation (with design standards acceptable to the City) at this intersection. That additional study will be conducted by the Lab as part of the TDM program set forth below as Mitigation Measure TRANS-1d. If such mitigation is determined by Berkeley Lab to be feasible, then Berkeley Lab shall contribute funding on a fair share basis, to be determined in consultation with UC Berkeley and the City of Berkeley, for the installation of the improvements.
### Utilities, Service Systems, and Energy

**UTILS-2:** Implementation of the proposed 2006 LRDP would generate additional wastewater, requiring system improvements to ensure that additional wastewater flows from the Lab are directed into unconstrained sub-basins.

**UTILS-2:** LBNL shall implement programs to ensure that additional wastewater flows from the Lab are directed into unconstrained sub-basins, as necessary and appropriate. LBNL shall continue to direct the Lab’s existing western effluent flows into sub-basin 17-013. In addition, new flows at the Lab shall be directed into either sub-basin 17-013, sub-basin 17-304, unconstrained portions of sub-basin 17-503, or another sub-basin that has adequate capacity. Final design and implementation of these improvements shall be negotiated between the appropriate parties and shall undergo appropriate environmental review and approval. LBNL shall closely coordinate the planning, approval, and implementation of this mitigation with the City of Berkeley and the UC Berkeley, as appropriate.

**PD&C**
Shall develop appropriate engineering solutions for new east canyon projects, in consultation with the City of Berkeley and UC Berkeley, as applicable.

**Mitigation Timing**
- Engineering solutions planning prior to approval of east canyon projects that would affect constrained subbasin.
- Construction / implementation of engineering solutions complete in time to avoid significant impact to constrained subbasin.

**Monitoring Schedule / Reporting Procedure**
After mitigation is triggered by East Canyon projects, LBNL shall prepare a report on the progress made in accommodating additional wastewater flows of new east canyon projects and shall submit this report to the City of Berkeley and make it publicly available on the Lab’s website. The report may be prepared in conjunction with ongoing LBNL reporting activities.

**UTILS-4:** On-site construction due to development proposed under the 2006 LDRP would generate construction waste and debris.

**UTILS-4:** LBNL shall develop a plan for maximizing diversion of construction and demolition materials associated with the construction of the proposed project from landfill disposal.

**PD&C**
In coordination with EH&S, shall develop plans to minimize the amount of construction and demolition debris sent to landfills annually, if applicable, and throughout the lifetime of the 2006 LRDP.

**Mitigation Timing**
Annually, if applicable, and throughout the lifetime of the 2006 LRDP.

**Monitoring Schedule / Reporting Procedure**
LBNL shall report on its progress in implementing this measure as part of ongoing LBNL reporting activities.