

2 REPORT SUMMARY

This summary presents a brief description of the proposed project, areas of controversy known to the lead agency, potentially significant impacts of the proposed project, mitigation measures, and impacts that would remain significant, and alternatives that were evaluated for their ability to reduce the proposed project's significant impacts. A summary of project impacts as they may contribute to the overall cumulative impacts is also discussed.

A. Brief Project Description

The Seismic Life Safety, Modernization, and Replacement of General Purpose Buildings, Phase 2 Project (the proposed project) would provide seismically safe facilities for scientific research at the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL). It would involve demolishing 43,000 gross square feet (gsf) of space contained in several older, seismically poor, very poor, and failing buildings and constructing a similar amount of space in a single new facility elsewhere on the site that would be built to higher seismic safety standards. Specifically, the proposed project involves demolition of Building 25/25B, Building 55, and Building 71 trailers C, D, F, J, K, and P. Building 25/25B is located at the center of the main hill campus, in the Old Town area. Buildings 55 and 71 are in the northwest of the main hill campus. The new 43,000 gsf General Purpose Laboratory (GPL) would be built on the site where Building 25/25B now stands. Building 85/85A would be seismically strengthened. The project includes a number of mitigation measures from the LBNL 2006 LRDP EIR that have been incorporated into and made part of the proposed project.¹

Since the publication of the Draft EIR, planning decisions made by UC LBNL management regarding future space needs have necessitated the revi-

¹ All adopted 2006 LRDP mitigation measures remain in effect. A number of those mitigation measures are identified in this EIR as measures that apply to and are a part of the proposed project. The fact that a mitigation measure is not specifically set forth in this EIR, however, does not mean that that measure may not apply in some way.

sion of plans for the relocation of UC LBNL personnel associated with the proposed project. Under these revised plans, the future occupants of the proposed GPL would be drawn primarily from locations on the LBNL main hill site, with only approximately 30 UC Berkeley researchers transferring from the adjacent UC campus. Some of the UC researchers who would be relocated already work on or travel regularly to the LBNL main hill site. Additionally, no parking passes would be issued to UC researchers, who would either walk, bicycle, or use the shuttle service to get to and from the LBNL main hill site. As a result, there would be only a negligible increase in ADP of the LBNL main hill site and no increase in the number of vehicle commute trips.²

B. Supplementation of the LBNL 2006 LRDP EIR

In addition to serving as a project-level EIR for the Seismic Phase 2 Project, this document supplements the prior EIR prepared in 2006 for LBNL's Long Range Development Plan (LRDP), with respect to new information regarding operational traffic impacts affecting the program-level analysis of the LRDP as a whole.

C. Areas of Controversy

Oral and written comments on the proposed project were received during the public scoping process and at a scoping meeting held on January 14, 2009 at the North Berkeley Senior Center. Several members of the public objected to the location of the LBNL facility in a zone of high seismic hazard and landslides, especially given that hazardous chemicals are housed there. They also criticized what they described as the LBNL legacy of having contaminated surrounding soil and groundwater during past operations.

² The addition of 30 or so UC Berkeley researchers represents an increase of less than 1 percent over the 2006 average daily population (ADP) of 3,650 personnel of the LBNL main hill site.

Additional concerns focused on the location of the Building 85 complex, which houses the LBNL hazardous waste handling facility, on an area described as an ancient landslide and subject to wildland fires. The building has been the subject of past controversy with an appeal to the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) against the re-issuing of its hazardous waste facility handling permit. (The appeal was rejected and DTSC reissued the permit.)

Members of the public also commented on the construction of the proposed GPL in Strawberry Canyon, adjacent to the UC Botanical Gardens. Several neighbors expressed concern that the project would be detrimental to the beauty, tranquility, and unspoiled character of that resource. UC Botanical Gardens' staff voiced objections to the potential visual impact of the proposed three-story GPL building and also suggested it might increase noise and lead to parking conflicts. It should be noted that since the NOP scoping process, the project was revised and the GPL is now proposed at a location that is not near the UC Botanical Garden.

D. Significant Impacts

As part of the analysis in this EIR the impacts of the proposed project were considered with respect to the following 13 issues under CEQA:

1. Aesthetics
2. Air Quality
3. Biological Resources
4. Cultural Resources
5. Geology and Soils
6. Greenhouse Gas Emissions
7. Hazards and Hazardous Materials
8. Hydrology and Water Quality
9. Land Use and Planning
10. Noise
11. Public Services

12. Transportation and Traffic
13. Utilities and Service Systems

Potentially significant impacts under CEQA are included in the following summary table (Table 2-1).

E. Alternatives

Four alternatives to the proposed project were analyzed with respect to their ability to meet project objectives and/or to reduce or avoid identified significant impacts of the proposed project.

1. *Building 74 SE Parking Lot Site Alternative.* Under this on-site alternative, the Buildings 25/25B, 55, and 71 trailers would still be demolished and Building 85/85A seismically strengthened. A new GPL would still be built, but instead of at the Building 25/25B demolition site, it would be built at LBNL on a site southeast of Building 74. The site is currently a parking lot with a small shed, Building 74F. Building 74F would be demolished and a two- to three-story 43,000 gsf GPL would be built at this location, terraced into the hillside. The building footprint would be approximately 15,000 sf. Together with the drive aisle, the total footprint would be 29,505 sf. This would represent development of 8,905 sf of an already developed area and 20,600 sf of an adjacent undeveloped hillside. The site is located in close proximity to the UC Botanical Garden and is within the Oakland city limit.
2. *Richmond Field Station Alternative.* Under this alternative, the Buildings 25/25B, 55, and 71 trailers would still be demolished and Building 85/85A seismically strengthened. A new GPL would still be built, but instead of at a location at LBNL, it would be located at the UC Richmond Field Station (RFS), a 162-acre teaching and research facility with over 500,000 sf of existing research space located approximately 6 miles (by freeway) northwest of the LBNL site. Under this alternative, the GPL would be built on a 3.2-acre area of the RFS currently used for storage of California Partners

LAWRENCE BERKELEY NATIONAL LABORATORY
 SEISMIC LIFE SAFETY PHASE 2 PROJECT EIR
 SUMMARY

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND PROJECT-SPECIFIC MITIGATION MEASURES

Significant Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
AESTHETICS			
	<i>There are no significant impacts or adverse effects under CEQA to aesthetics.</i>		
AIR QUALITY			
	<i>There are no significant impacts or adverse effects under CEQA to air quality.</i>		
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES			
	<i>There are no significant impacts or adverse effects under CEQA to biological resources.</i>		
CULTURAL RESOURCES			
	<i>There are no significant impacts or adverse effects under CEQA to cultural resources.</i>		
GEOLOGY AND SOILS			
	<i>There are no significant impacts or adverse effects under CEQA to geology and soils.</i>		
GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS			
	<i>There are no significant impacts or adverse effects under CEQA to greenhouse gas emissions.</i>		
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS			
	<i>There are no significant impacts or adverse effects under CEQA to hazards and hazardous materials.</i>		
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY			
	<i>There are no significant impacts or adverse effects under CEQA to hydrology and water quality.</i>		

LTS = Less Than Significant S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact

**LAWRENCE BERKELEY NATIONAL LABORATORY
SEISMIC PHASE 2 PROJECT EIR
SUMMARY**

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES (CONTINUED)

Significant Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
LAND USE AND PLANNING			
<i>There are no significant impacts or adverse effects under CEQA to land use and planning.</i>			
NOISE			
<i>There are no significant impacts or adverse effects under CEQA to noise.</i>			
PUBLIC SERVICES			
<i>There are no significant impacts or adverse effects under CEQA to public services.</i>			
TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC			
<i>There are no significant impacts or adverse effects under CEQA to transportation and traffic.</i>			
UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS			
<i>There are no significant impacts or adverse effects under CEQA to utilities and service systems.</i>			

LTS = Less Than Significant S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact

for Advanced Transit and Highways research vehicles. Design and operation of the facility would be equivalent to the GPL under the proposed project in all respects. This alternative would involve the relocation of 130 UC LBNL personnel to the RFS site, which is not well served by public transit. It would therefore be necessary to construct parking spaces for additional researchers, visitors, and guests at the RFS.

3. *Leased Space Off-Site Alternative.* Under this alternative, Buildings 25/25B, 55, and 71 trailers would still be demolished and Building 85/85A seismically strengthened. However, the functions and programs that would otherwise be provided in the GPL would be relocated to the Berkeley West Biocenter (LBNL Building 977) at 717 Potter Street in Berkeley, situated approximately 5 miles from the LBNL site. LBNL currently leases 60,000 gsf at this site.³ Additional space would be leased in order to accommodate relocated personnel and operations. Overall, there would be an increase in the population of approximately 30 people at the Potter Street site.
4. *Reduced Project Alternative.* Under the Reduced Project Alternative, the demolition and construction components of the Seismic Phase 2 Project would not occur. However seismic strengthening of Building 85/85A would still take place. LBNL employees and guests would remain in Buildings 55 and 71 trailers that have been designated as seismically “poor” or described as “failing.” As per UC policies on seismic safety, personnel have already been moved from Building 25/25B that was designated as “very poor” and the building would remain vacant. Under this alternative, limited capital investment would be needed to continue activities at LBNL. UC LBNL would continue to pay energy and maintenance costs for the older facilities, including costs for necessary upgrades. Overall, there would still be around 100 LBNL personnel in the off-site Potter Street facility.

³ Stanton, Richard. Project Manager, Facilities Division, LBNL. Personal communication with DC&E. December 21, 2009.

5. *No Project Alternative.* Under the No Project Alternative, the demolition, construction components, and the seismic strengthening of the Seismic Phase 2 Project would not occur. UC LBNL employees and guests would remain in Buildings 55 and 71 trailers that have been designated as seismically “poor” or “failing.” Personnel have already moved from Building 25/25B that was designated as “very poor” and the building would remain vacant. Building 85/85A would remain in its current condition under this alternative, limited capital investment would be needed to continue activities at LBNL. UC LBNL would continue to pay energy and maintenance costs for the older facilities, including costs for necessary upgrades. UC LBNL personnel would also remain in the off-site Potter Street facility.

As described in Chapter 5, Alternatives to the Proposed Project, the alternatives analysis finds the Reduced Project Alternative to be the environmentally superior alternative. However, the Reduced Project Alternative does not meet many of the project objectives.

F. Cumulative Impacts

1. Projects Considered in the Draft EIR

The following ongoing and reasonably foreseeable planned projects on the LBNL site, UC Berkeley campus, and in the surrounding Berkeley/Oakland area were considered and analyzed for their near-term cumulative impacts in conjunction with the proposed project.

Projects on the LBNL Site

1. Seismic Phase 1
2. Building 74 Modernization
3. The User Support Building (USB)
4. Building 51 and the Bevatron Demolition
5. Berkeley Lab Laser Accelerator (BELLA) Laser Acquisition, Installation and Use for Research and Development
6. Old Town Demolition

7. Solar Energy Research Center (SERC)
8. The Computational Research and Theory Building (CRT)
9. Net-Zero Energy Buildings Project (N-ZEB)

Projects on University of California Campus

10. South Campus Integrated Projects (SCIP)
11. Northeast Quadrant Science and Safety Projects (NEQSSP)
12. Helios
13. UC Berkeley Law School Infill
14. UC Berkeley Naval Architecture Restoration and Blum Center
15. Warren Hall Replacement

The Draft EIR determined that one significant and unavoidable cumulative impact would result from the proposed project in combination with these projects and other foreseeable growth at LBNL, UC Berkeley, and the Cities of Oakland and Berkeley through 2025. This impact was identified as SP2 Cumulative Impact TRANS-1. However, with the project modifications, this impact has been reduced to *no impact*.

2. Additional Projects

The following projects were not known at the time the Draft EIR was prepared; however, they have been considered for the purpose of the Final EIR. The inclusion of these projects in the cumulative analysis does not result in any new significant or substantially more severe impacts.

Projects on the LBNL Site

Seismic Phase 3 (SP3)

Projects on University of California Campus

Vegetation Management Projects

Undetermined Locations

Next Generation Light Source (NGLS)

LAWRENCE BERKELEY NATIONAL LABORATORY
SEISMIC PHASE 2 PROJECT FINAL EIR
REPORT SUMMARY