LETTER C240

Gordon Wozniak
<gordon.wozniak@sbcglobal.net>

To: "Lawrence, Jennifer" <2020LRDP@cp.berkeley.edu>
cc: "Hegarty, Irene" <hegarty@berkeley.edu>
Subject: 2020 LRDP DEIR

06/17/2004 05:11 PM
Please respond to
gordon.wozniak

Dear Jennifer,

I have several comments regardiing the University of California at Berkeley's 2020 LRDP Draft DEIR.

Overall, I found the document both comprehensive and informative. The DEIR will serve a valuable reference tome for planning.

HAZARDOUS WASTE
First, I commend the University for the remarkable reduction in its hazardous waste generation. Over the last twelve years, the total amount of hazardous wastes produced by UCB has decreased by over 50%. This major reduction was not an easy task and is a major achievement that UCB should be proud of. I hope that in the next decade, UCB will continue its aggressive waste reduction policies and achieve even further reductions to offset the growth in its population.

BUILDING SPACE
Currently, UCB has about 13M ft2 of building space and is proposing to add an additional ~2M ft2 of additional space. Although it is beyond the scope of this letter to comment on the justification for the additional space proposed, I believe that it is important that UCB demonstrate that it is currently utilizing its existing space efficiently, before consturcting large amounts of new space. Although constructing new space is very costly, reassigning underutilized space to new programs can be very difficult politically,
However, many organizations have achieved substantial reductions in their space needs by imposing a space charge to all users (an effective rent). For example, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) charges a space charge for all laboratory and office space and as a result has achieved improved space utilization. In addition, there was a recent article in the New York Times describing how corporations have substantially decreased the size of offices that are assigned to employees to decrease their cost in renting space.

C240-1

BEST PRACTICE - Thus, I would propose that UCB adopt as a best practice the policy of imposing a space charge for all assigned space similar to the one in practice at LBNL. In this manner, UCB would ensure that it is utilizing its existing space efficiently before constructing costly new space to accomodate new programs.

HOUSING
In the 2020 LRDP, the UCB is proposing to increase its headcount of students by 1,650 from the current 31,800 to 33,450 and the number of current employees by 2,870 from 12,940 to 15,810, increases of 5.2% and 22.2%, respectively. To house this proposed increase in the number of students and staff, one would expect that a similar increase in housing was needed.
STUDENT HOUSING
However, UCB is proposing to increase the number of student beds (under construction, design & proposed) by 4,870 beds. This total represents

C240-2

over 3,000 beds more that are required to house the anticipated 1,650 increase in student headcount. C240-2

STAFF/FACULTY HOUSING

In contrast, UCB is proposing to increase the number of faculty units by 230 and provide no housing for other staff, although the number of employees is increasing by 2,870.

This disproportionate response were almost twice as much student housing is being planned than is needed to accommodate the increase in the student population and less than 10% of the housing needed to accomodate the increase in staffing seems to be poor policy. Such a housing policy will have a major impact on worsing traffic in Berkeley. For example, since only 10% of the students drive, increasing the number of students that live in Berkeley will not substantially decrease the number of commuters. However, since 50% of the staff drive to work, planning to have 90% of the new hires live outside of Berkeley (50% of whom commute by car) will only increase the city's traffic problems. Furthermore, providing substantially more student housing than is required to meet the anticipated increase in student headcount will have a major negative impact on the private rental market in Berkeley which is currently accomodating this population with a high vacancy rate. C240-3 C240-4

Thus, I would recommend that UCB provide or subsidize the purchase of housing for the proposed new staff in a similar proportion as is being provided for the increase in the student population. C240-5

BEST PRACTICE- Plan to provide only 1,650 new beds of student housing to accomodate the estimated increase in student headcount. To minimize the transportation impacts of the substantial increase (2,870) in faculty/staff, provide, or subsidize the purchase of, sufficient housing in Berkeley to house the estimated increase in faculty/staff headcount. C240-6

Sincerely,

Gordon Wozniak
Berkeley City Council, District 8

11.2C.240 RESPONSE TO COMMENT LETTER C240

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C240-1

There have been proposals at UC Berkeley to move toward a market-based system of space allocation. However, one problem with such systems is the disparity in resources among departments. Many UC Berkeley faculty perceive this disparity to be growing, as individual departments become more entrepreneurial to compensate for the continued decline in state support. Space allocation based on ability to pay could, over time, lead to significant inequities in facilities, which in turn could further worsen funding prospects for the leaner disciplines.

While a market-based system is something UC Berkeley may wish to consider in the future, the UC Berkeley Strategic Academic Plan offers an alternative that should be explored first.[2] In the final section, "The Path to Implementation", Action A.12 proposes a more rigorous approach to asset stewardship for precisely the reasons the writer suggests. While A.12 has not yet been implemented in full (although several other actions have), it has the advantage of being an expansion of existing practices without the potential disadvantages of inequity. Note the first action item under A.12, "Guidelines and Required Findings for Location Priority" has been incorporated into the 2020 LRDP as section 3.1.16.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS C240-2 AND C240-3

The growth in the number of students is one, but not the only, reason for the proposed increase in student housing. University student housing near campus also provides students with the community of peers and mentors, and the access to academic resources, they require to excel. The targets for student housing in the 2020 LRDP reflect the goals established in the Strategic Academic Plan.

Because the state provides no funds for housing, the entire cost of housing construction, maintenance, and operation must be supported by rents. This in turn requires a conservative approach to inventory expansion, to ensure the inventory does not outpace demand, since each vacancy places a greater debt burden on the balance of residents and drives up the rents required to service it.

While UC Berkeley has extensive experience with student housing, it has almost no experience with faculty or staff housing, and therefore must be cautious in the amount of resources it commits to this new market and product type. The rental faculty housing envisioned in the 2020 LRDP represents a first pilot venture into this market. If it succeeds – in terms of both financial feasibility and its benefits to the academic enterprise – further initiatives could be pursued.

These initial 100 units of housing are prioritized for faculty, rather than staff as the writer suggests, because faculty housing is an established goal of the Strategic Academic Plan. However, the economics are likely to be similar, and the experience with the initial 100 units would inform future initiatives in staff as well as faculty housing.

(Note the number of faculty units has been reduced from 200 to 100 as a result of deleting the units envisioned for the Hill Campus: see Thematic Response 8.)

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C240-4

See previous response. While Berkeley has recently experienced a significant amount of new, private rental housing construction in the campus vicinity, and rents have declined in part due to this increase in supply, history would suggest this is a temporary condition. Berkeley is a desirable place to live, and the University provides a stable and growing source of prospective tenants, both workers and students. In fact, to the extent new University housing is able to house a greater percentage of UC Berkeley students, more private housing would be available to accommodate the growing staff demand cited by the writer in the previous comment.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS C240-5 AND 240-6

As explained above, UC Berkeley is not yet prepared to initiate a program of staff housing at the scale envisioned by the writer, although to the extent the modest program of faculty housing in the 2020 LRDP succeeds, more ambitious future initiatives would be explored. Such a program, however, would require amendment of the 2020 LRDP if undertaken directly by the University.

LETTER C241

June 6, 2004

Jennifer Lawrence
University of California, Berkeley
Facilities Services
1936 University Avenue Suite #300
Berkeley, CA 94720-1380

RE: Comments on UC Berkeley's 2020 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) Draft Environmental Impact Report

Dear Ms. Lawrence:

As a resident of the Berkeley Hills I am writing you today to express my opposition to the 100-unit high-density housing development proposed in the UC 2020 LRDP. The contiguous area to this development is zoned for very low-density housing, and for good reason. This is a single-family residential district. Because we live in one of the most high-risk fire zones in the United States, it is essential that we maintain adequate egress from our neighborhood, as well as access for emergency vehicles. Already, we have seen an intolerable increase in parking problems, and traffic congestion near the Grizzly Peak Boulevard, Centennial Drive area due to growth from the UC Space Sciences lab. The addition of 100 high-density housing units, along with the automobile traffic they will create is simply not acceptable.

It is also critical that we stop further destruction of the upper Strawberry Creek Watershed. Construction of impermeable surfaces, such as buildings and parking lots, will increase run-off and will detrimentally impact the City of Berkeley's aging infrastructure. Sections of the proposed development site sits on an aquifer (underground lake) that, in times of emergency, such as a break on the EBMUD water line at the Caldecott Tunnel, could provide potable water for the entire city of Berkeley. Additionally, this site sits next to the Lawrence Hall of Science Fault Zone, between the Hayward/Wildcat Canyon fault lines – hardly a logical place for housing. Finally, further destruction of one of the few remaining open spaces in Berkeley is intolerable.

The City of Berkeley is experiencing an historical residential housing vacancy rate. There is also a great deal of construction of condominiums and townhouses in progress, all of which are within walking distance to campus. It makes much more sense to utilize available housing within the stated objectives of the LRDP ("within one mile from campus") than to begin an environmentally unsound and costly project that will only have negative impacts on the city infrastructure and potentially put people's lives at risk during a fire or other emergency.

In view of the above, please explain how you are planning to mitigate all the health and safety hazards created for the neighborhood including inadequate egress in the case of fire and/or earthquake, increased traffic, noise, pollution, lack of infrastructure, and lack of parking, which will ensue due to the increase in population from the proposed high-density housing project.

Yours truly,

Robert A Lewis
Signature

1298 Grizzly Peak Blvd
Address

LETTER C242

June 6, 2004

RECEIVED
JUN 17 2004
PHYSICAL & ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING

Jennifer Lawrence
University of California, Berkeley
Facilities Services
1936 University Avenue Suite #300
Berkeley, CA 94720-1380

RE: Comments on UC Berkeley's 2020 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) Draft Environmental Impact Report

Dear Ms. Lawrence:

As a resident of the Berkeley Hills I am writing you today to express my opposition to the 100-unit high-density housing development proposed in the UC 2020 LRDP. The contiguous area to this development is zoned for very low-density housing, and for good reason. This is a single-family residential district. Because we live in one of the most high-risk fire zones in the United States, it is essential that we maintain adequate egress from our neighborhood, as well as access for emergency vehicles. Already, we have seen an intolerable increase in parking problems, and traffic congestion near the Grizzly Peak Boulevard, Centennial Drive area due to growth from the UC Space Sciences lab. The addition of 100 high-density housing units, along with the automobile traffic they will create is simply not acceptable.

It is also critical that we stop further destruction of the upper Strawberry Creek Watershed. Construction of impermeable surfaces, such as buildings and parking lots, will increase run-off and will detrimentally impact the City of Berkeley's aging infrastructure. Sections of the proposed development site sits on an aquifer (underground lake) that, in times of emergency, such as a break on the EBMUD water line at the Caldecott Tunnel, could provide potable water for the entire city of Berkeley. Additionally, this site sits next to the Lawrence Hall of Science Fault Zone, between the Hayward/Wildcat Canyon fault lines – hardly a logical place for housing. Finally, further destruction of one of the few remaining open spaces in Berkeley is intolerable.

The City of Berkeley is experiencing an historical residential housing vacancy rate. There is also a great deal of construction of condominiums and townhouses in progress, all of which are within walking distance to campus. It makes much more sense to utilize available housing within the stated objectives of the LRDP ("within one mile from campus") than to begin an environmentally unsound and costly project that will only have negative impacts on the city infrastructure and potentially put people's lives at risk during a fire or other emergency.

In view of the above, please explain how you are planning to mitigate all the health and safety hazards created for the neighborhood including inadequate egress in the case of fire and/or earthquake, increased traffic, noise, pollution, lack of infrastructure, and lack of parking, which will ensue due to the increase in population from the proposed high-density housing project.

Yours truly,

[signature] 1323 Hopkins St. Berkeley CA 94702
Signature Address

LETTER C243

June 6, 2004

RECEIVED
JUN 17 2004
PHYSICAL & ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING

Jennifer Lawrence
University of California, Berkeley
Facilities Services
1936 University Avenue Suite #300
Berkeley, CA 94720-1380

RE: Comments on UC Berkeley's 2020 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) Draft Environmental Impact Report

Dear Ms. Lawrence:

As a resident of the Berkeley Hills I am writing you today to express my opposition to the 100-unit high-density housing development proposed in the UC 2020 LRDP. The contiguous area to this development is zoned for very low-density housing, and for good reason. This is a single-family residential district. Because we live in one of the most high-risk fire zones in the United States, it is essential that we maintain adequate egress from our neighborhood, as well as access for emergency vehicles. Already, we have seen an intolerable increase in parking problems, and traffic congestion near the Grizzly Peak Boulevard, Centennial Drive area due to growth from the UC Space Sciences lab. The addition of 100 high-density housing units, along with the automobile traffic they will create is simply not acceptable.

It is also critical that we stop further destruction of the upper Strawberry Creek Watershed. Construction of impermeable surfaces, such as buildings and parking lots, will increase run-off and will detrimentally impact the City of Berkeley's aging infrastructure. Sections of the proposed development site sits on an aquifer (underground lake) that, in times of emergency, such as a break on the EBMUD water line at the Caldecott Tunnel, could provide potable water for the entire city of Berkeley. Additionally, this site sits next to the Lawrence Hall of Science Fault Zone, between the Hayward/Wildcat Canyon fault lines – hardly a logical place for housing. Finally, further destruction of one of the few remaining open spaces in Berkeley is intolerable.

The City of Berkeley is experiencing an historical residential housing vacancy rate. There is also a great deal of construction of condominiums and townhouses in progress, all of which are within walking distance to campus. It makes much more sense to utilize available housing within the stated objectives of the LRDP ("within one mile from campus") than to begin an environmentally unsound and costly project that will only have negative impacts on the city infrastructure and potentially put people's lives at risk during a fire or other emergency.

In view of the above, please explain how you are planning to mitigate all the health and safety hazards created for the neighborhood including inadequate egress in the case of fire and/or earthquake, increased traffic, noise, pollution, lack of infrastructure, and lack of parking, which will ensue due to the increase in population from the proposed high-density housing project.

Yours truly,

Bernadette Talbot 1411 Grizzly Peak, Berkeley CA 94706
Signature Address

LETTER C244

June 6, 2004

RECEIVED
JUN 17 2004
PHYSICAL & ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING

Jennifer Lawrence
University of California, Berkeley
Facilities Services
1936 University Avenue Suite #300
Berkeley, CA 94720-1380

RE: Comments on UC Berkeley's 2020 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) Draft Environmental Impact Report

Dear Ms. Lawrence:

As a resident of the Berkeley Hills I am writing you today to express my opposition to the 100-unit high-density housing development proposed in the UC 2020 LRDP. The contiguous area to this development is zoned for very low-density housing, and for good reason. This is a single-family residential district. Because we live in one of the most high-risk fire zones in the United States, it is essential that we maintain adequate egress from our neighborhood, as well as access for emergency vehicles. Already, we have seen an intolerable increase in parking problems, and traffic congestion near the Grizzly Peak Boulevard, Centennial Drive area due to growth from the UC Space Sciences lab. The addition of 100 high-density housing units, along with the automobile traffic they will create is simply not acceptable.

It is also critical that we stop further destruction of the upper Strawberry Creek Watershed. Construction of impermeable surfaces, such as buildings and parking lots, will increase run-off and will detrimentally impact the City of Berkeley's aging infrastructure. Sections of the proposed development site sits on an aquifer (underground lake) that, in times of emergency, such as a break on the EBMUD water line at the Caldecott Tunnel, could provide potable water for the entire city of Berkeley. Additionally, this site sits next to the Lawrence Hall of Science Fault Zone, between the Hayward/Wildcat Canyon fault lines – hardly a logical place for housing. Finally, further destruction of one of the few remaining open spaces in Berkeley is intolerable.

The City of Berkeley is experiencing an historical residential housing vacancy rate. There is also a great deal of construction of condominiums and townhouses in progress, all of which are within walking distance to campus. It makes much more sense to utilize available housing within the stated objectives of the LRDP ("within one mile from campus") than to begin an environmentally unsound and costly project that will only have negative impacts on the city infrastructure and potentially put people's lives at risk during a fire or other emergency.

In view of the above, please explain how you are planning to mitigate all the health and safety hazards created for the neighborhood including inadequate egress in the case of fire and/or earthquake, increased traffic, noise, pollution, lack of infrastructure, and lack of parking, which will ensue due to the increase in population from the proposed high-density housing project.

Yours truly,

[signature] 16 MOSSWOOD RD.
Signature Address

LETTER C245

June 6, 2004

RECEIVED
JUN 17 2004
PHYSICAL & ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING

Jennifer Lawrence
University of California, Berkeley
Facilities Services
1936 University Avenue Suite #300
Berkeley, CA 94720-1380

RE: Comments on UC Berkeley's 2020 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) Draft Environmental Impact Report

Dear Ms. Lawrence:

As a resident of the Berkeley Hills I am writing you today to express my opposition to the 100-unit high-density housing development proposed in the UC 2020 LRDP. The contiguous area to this development is zoned for very low-density housing, and for good reason. This is a single-family residential district. Because we live in one of the most high-risk fire zones in the United States, it is essential that we maintain adequate egress from our neighborhood, as well as access for emergency vehicles. Already, we have seen an intolerable increase in parking problems, and traffic congestion near the Grizzly Peak Boulevard, Centennial Drive area due to growth from the UC Space Sciences lab. The addition of 100 high-density housing units, along with the automobile traffic they will create is simply not acceptable.

It is also critical that we stop further destruction of the upper Strawberry Creek Watershed. Construction of impermeable surfaces, such as buildings and parking lots, will increase run-off and will detrimentally impact the City of Berkeley's aging infrastructure. Sections of the proposed development site sits on an aquifer (underground lake) that, in times of emergency, such as a break on the EBMUD water line at the Caldecott Tunnel, could provide potable water for the entire city of Berkeley. Additionally, this site sits next to the Lawrence Hall of Science Fault Zone, between the Hayward/Wildcat Canyon fault lines – hardly a logical place for housing. Finally, further destruction of one of the few remaining open spaces in Berkeley is intolerable.

The City of Berkeley is experiencing an historical residential housing vacancy rate. There is also a great deal of construction of condominiums and townhouses in progress, all of which are within walking distance to campus. It makes much more sense to utilize available housing within the stated objectives of the LRDP ("within one mile from campus") than to begin an environmentally unsound and costly project that will only have negative impacts on the city infrastructure and potentially put people's lives at risk during a fire or other emergency.

In view of the above, please explain how you are planning to mitigate all the health and safety hazards created for the neighborhood including inadequate egress in the case of fire and/or earthquake, increased traffic, noise, pollution, lack of infrastructure, and lack of parking, which will ensue due to the increase in population from the proposed high-density housing project.

Yours truly,

[signature] 16 Mosswood Road, Berkeley
Signature Address

LETTER C246

June 6, 2004

RECEIVED
JUN 17 2004
PHYSICAL & ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING

Jennifer Lawrence
University of California, Berkeley
Facilities Services
1936 University Avenue Suite #300
Berkeley, CA 94720-1380

RE: Comments on UC Berkeley's 2020 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) Draft Environmental Impact Report

Dear Ms. Lawrence:

As a resident of the Berkeley Hills I am writing you today to express my opposition to the 100-unit high-density housing development proposed in the UC 2020 LRDP. The contiguous area to this development is zoned for very low-density housing, and for good reason. This is a single-family residential district. Because we live in one of the most high-risk fire zones in the United States, it is essential that we maintain adequate egress from our neighborhood, as well as access for emergency vehicles. Already, we have seen an intolerable increase in parking problems, and traffic congestion near the Grizzly Peak Boulevard, Centennial Drive area due to growth from the UC Space Sciences lab. The addition of 100 high-density housing units, along with the automobile traffic they will create is simply not acceptable.

It is also critical that we stop further destruction of the upper Strawberry Creek Watershed. Construction of impermeable surfaces, such as buildings and parking lots, will increase run-off and will detrimentally impact the City of Berkeley's aging infrastructure. Sections of the proposed development site sits on an aquifer (underground lake) that, in times of emergency, such as a break on the EBMUD water line at the Caldecott Tunnel, could provide potable water for the entire city of Berkeley. Additionally, this site sits next to the Lawrence Hall of Science Fault Zone, between the Hayward/Wildcat Canyon fault lines – hardly a logical place for housing. Finally, further destruction of one of the few remaining open spaces in Berkeley is intolerable.

The City of Berkeley is experiencing an historical residential housing vacancy rate. There is also a great deal of construction of condominiums and townhouses in progress, all of which are within walking distance to campus. It makes much more sense to utilize available housing within the stated objectives of the LRDP ("within one mile from campus") than to begin an environmentally unsound and costly project that will only have negative impacts on the city infrastructure and potentially put people's lives at risk during a fire or other emergency.

In view of the above, please explain how you are planning to mitigate all the health and safety hazards created for the neighborhood including inadequate egress in the case of fire and/or earthquake, increased traffic, noise, pollution, lack of infrastructure, and lack of parking, which will ensue due to the increase in population from the proposed high-density housing project.

Yours truly,

Bruce Hayes — 1411 Grizzly Peak Blvd
Signature — Address
Bruce Hayes — Berkeley, Ca 94708

LETTER C247

June 12, 2004

RECEIVED
JUN 17 2004
PHYSICAL & ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING

Jennifer Lawrence
University of California, Berkeley
Facilities Services
1936 University Avenue Suite #300
Berkeley, CA 94720-1380

RE: Comments on UC Berkeley's 2020 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) Draft Environmental Impact Report

Dear Ms. Lawrence:

As a resident of the Berkeley Hills I am writing you today to express my opposition to the 100-unit high-density housing development proposed in the UC 2020 LRDP. The contiguous area to this development is zoned for very low-density housing, and for good reason. This is a single-family residential district. Because we live in one of the most high-risk fire zones in the United States, it is essential that we maintain adequate egress from our neighborhood, as well as access for emergency vehicles. Already, we have seen an intolerable increase in parking problems, and traffic congestion near the Grizzly Peak Boulevard, Centennial Drive area due to growth from the UC Space Sciences lab. The addition of 100 high-density housing units, along with the automobile traffic they will create is simply not acceptable.

It is also critical that we stop further destruction of the upper Strawberry Creek Watershed. Construction of impermeable surfaces, such as buildings and parking lots, will increase run-off and will detrimentally impact the City of Berkeley's aging infrastructure. Sections of the proposed development site sits on an aquifer (underground lake) that, in times of emergency, such as a break on the EBMUD water line at the Caldecott Tunnel, could provide potable water for the entire city of Berkeley. Additionally, this site sits next to the Lawrence Hall of Science Fault Zone, between the Hayward/Wildcat Canyon fault lines – hardly a logical place for housing. Finally, further destruction of one of the few remaining open spaces in Berkeley is intolerable.

The City of Berkeley is experiencing an historical residential housing vacancy rate. There is also a great deal of construction of condominiums and townhouses in progress, all of which are within walking distance to campus. It makes much more sense to utilize available housing within the stated objectives of the LRDP ("within one mile from campus") than to begin an environmentally unsound and costly project that will only have negative impacts on the city infrastructure and potentially put people's lives at risk during a fire or other emergency.

In view of the above, please explain how you are planning to mitigate all the health and safety hazards created for the neighborhood including inadequate egress in the case of fire and/or earthquake, increased traffic, noise, pollution, lack of infrastructure, and lack of parking, which will ensue due to the increase in population from the proposed high-density housing project.

Yours truly,

Joyce Morton — 165 Avenida Dr. Berk 94708
Signature — Address

LETTER C248

June 6, 2004

RECEIVED
JUN 17 2004
PHYSICAL & ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING

Jennifer Lawrence
University of California, Berkeley
Facilities Services
1936 University Avenue Suite #300
Berkeley, CA 94720-1380

RE: Comments on UC Berkeley's 2020 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) Draft Environmental Impact Report

Dear Ms. Lawrence:

As a resident of the Berkeley Hills I am writing you today to express my opposition to the 100-unit high-density housing development proposed in the UC 2020 LRDP. The contiguous area to this development is zoned for very low-density housing, and for good reason. This is a single-family residential district. Because we live in one of the most high-risk fire zones in the United States, it is essential that we maintain adequate egress from our neighborhood, as well as access for emergency vehicles. Already, we have seen an intolerable increase in parking problems, and traffic congestion near the Grizzly Peak Boulevard, Centennial Drive area due to growth from the UC Space Sciences lab. The addition of 100 high-density housing units, along with the automobile traffic they will create is simply not acceptable.

It is also critical that we stop further destruction of the upper Strawberry Creek Watershed. Construction of impermeable surfaces, such as buildings and parking lots, will increase run-off and will detrimentally impact the City of Berkeley's aging infrastructure. Sections of the proposed development site sits on an aquifer (underground lake) that, in times of emergency, such as a break on the EBMUD water line at the Caldecott Tunnel, could provide potable water for the entire city of Berkeley. Additionally, this site sits next to the Lawrence Hall of Science Fault Zone, between the Hayward/Wildcat Canyon fault lines – hardly a logical place for housing. Finally, further destruction of one of the few remaining open spaces in Berkeley is intolerable.

The City of Berkeley is experiencing an historical residential housing vacancy rate. There is also a great deal of construction of condominiums and townhouses in progress, all of which are within walking distance to campus. It makes much more sense to utilize available housing within the stated objectives of the LRDP ("within one mile from campus") than to begin an environmentally unsound and costly project that will only have negative impacts on the city infrastructure and potentially put people's lives at risk during a fire or other emergency.

In view of the above, please explain how you are planning to mitigate all the health and safety hazards created for the neighborhood including inadequate egress in the case of fire and/or earthquake, increased traffic, noise, pollution, lack of infrastructure, and lack of parking, which will ensue due to the increase in population from the proposed high-density housing project.

Yours truly,

Signature

#1 ORCHARD LANE
Address BK. 94704
(PANORAMIC HILL)

- THE UNIVERSITY'S NEWLY-JOINED TEAM "HILL CAMPUS" DISCUSTS ME.

LETTER C249

June 6, 2004

RECEIVED
JUN 17 2004
PHYSICAL & ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING

Jennifer Lawrence
University of California, Berkeley
Facilities Services
1936 University Avenue Suite #300
Berkeley, CA 94720-1380

RE: Comments on UC Berkeley's 2020 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) Draft Environmental Impact Report

Dear Ms. Lawrence:

As a resident of the Berkeley Hills I am writing you today to express my opposition to the 100-unit high-density housing development proposed in the UC 2020 LRDP. The contiguous area to this development is zoned for very low-density housing, and for good reason. This is a single-family residential district. Because we live in one of the most high-risk fire zones in the United States, it is essential that we maintain adequate egress from our neighborhood, as well as access for emergency vehicles. Already, we have seen an intolerable increase in parking problems, and traffic congestion near the Grizzly Peak Boulevard, Centennial Drive area due to growth from the UC Space Sciences lab. The addition of 100 high-density housing units, along with the automobile traffic they will create is simply not acceptable.

It is also critical that we stop further destruction of the upper Strawberry Creek Watershed. Construction of impermeable surfaces, such as buildings and parking lots, will increase run-off and will detrimentally impact the City of Berkeley's aging infrastructure. Sections of the proposed development site sits on an aquifer (underground lake) that, in times of emergency, such as a break on the EBMUD water line at the Caldecott Tunnel, could provide potable water for the entire city of Berkeley. Additionally, this site sits next to the Lawrence Hall of Science Fault Zone, between the Hayward/Wildcat Canyon fault lines – hardly a logical place for housing. Finally, further destruction of one of the few remaining open spaces in Berkeley is intolerable.

The City of Berkeley is experiencing an historical residential housing vacancy rate. There is also a great deal of construction of condominiums and townhouses in progress, all of which are within walking distance to campus. It makes much more sense to utilize available housing within the stated objectives of the LRDP ("within one mile from campus") than to begin an environmentally unsound and costly project that will only have negative impacts on the city infrastructure and potentially put people's lives at risk during a fire or other emergency.

In view of the above, please explain how you are planning to mitigate all the health and safety hazards created for the neighborhood including inadequate egress in the case of fire and/or earthquake, increased traffic, noise, pollution, lack of infrastructure, and lack of parking, which will ensue due to the increase in population from the proposed high-density housing project.

Yours truly,

Mary Hochstim Love
Signature
David Love

104 Hill Rd., Berkeley, Ca. 94708
Address

LETTER C250

June 6, 2004

Jennifer Lawrence
University of California, Berkeley
Facilities Services
1936 University Avenue Suite #300
Berkeley, CA 94720-1380

RE: Comments on UC Berkeley's 2020 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) Draft Environmental Impact Report

Dear Ms. Lawrence:

As a resident of the Berkeley Hills I am writing you today to express my opposition to the 100-unit high-density housing development proposed in the UC 2020 LRDP. The contiguous area to this development is zoned for very low-density housing, and for good reason. This is a single-family residential district. Because we live in one of the most high-risk fire zones in the United States, it is essential that we maintain adequate egress from our neighborhood, as well as access for emergency vehicles. Already, we have seen an intolerable increase in parking problems, and traffic congestion near the Grizzly Peak Boulevard, Centennial Drive area due to growth from the UC Space Sciences lab. The addition of 100 high-density housing units, along with the automobile traffic they will create is simply not acceptable.

It is also critical that we stop further destruction of the upper Strawberry Creek Watershed. Construction of impermeable surfaces, such as buildings and parking lots, will increase run-off and will detrimentally impact the City of Berkeley's aging infrastructure. Sections of the proposed development site sits on an aquifer (underground lake) that, in times of emergency, such as a break on the EBMUD water line at the Caldecott Tunnel, could provide potable water for the entire city of Berkeley. Additionally, this site sits next to the Lawrence Hall of Science Fault Zone, between the Hayward/Wildcat Canyon fault lines – hardly a logical place for housing. Finally, further destruction of one of the few remaining open spaces in Berkeley is intolerable.

The City of Berkeley is experiencing an historical residential housing vacancy rate. There is also a great deal of construction of condominiums and townhouses in progress, all of which are within walking distance to campus. It makes much more sense to utilize available housing within the stated objectives of the LRDP ("within one mile from campus") than to begin an environmentally unsound and costly project that will only have negative impacts on the city infrastructure and potentially put people's lives at risk during a fire or other emergency.

In view of the above, please explain how you are planning to mitigate all the health and safety hazards created for the neighborhood including inadequate egress in the case of fire and/or earthquake, increased traffic, noise, pollution, lack of infrastructure, and lack of parking, which will ensue due to the increase in population from the proposed high-density housing project.

Yours truly,

Jane Bendix
Signature

Jane Bendix
3 Orchard Ln.
Berkeley, CA 94704-1821
Address

11.2C.241-250 RESPONSE TO COMMENT LETTERS C241 THRU C250

The University received 138 form letters signed by individuals, objecting to the proposal for up to 100 faculty housing units in the Hill Campus: C111-C121, C125-C159, C161-C165, C167-C171, C173-C179, C182-C183, C194-C216, C219-C239, C241-C250, C257, C259, C263-C264, C267, C278-C279, C282-C283, C285-C293, and C300. A few of these letters, such as C111, include brief postscript comments, primarily objecting to the number of current UC employees whom the writers assert are parking on city streets to avoid paying UC parking fees.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT LETTERS C241 THRU C250

See Thematic Response 8 for a comprehensive response to comments on Hill Campus development. Due partly to comments received and partly to its uncertain near-term feasibility, faculty housing has been deleted as a potential future Hill Campus use in the 2020 LRDP. As noted in Thematic Response 8, the site formerly designated H1 has been redesignated as a reserve site, while former site H2 has been redesignated as part of the surrounding research zone.

LETTER C251

JThomas621@aol.com
06/18/2004 12:04 AM

To: 2020LRDP@cp.berkeley.edu
cc:
Subject: comments on LRDP

Dear Ms. Lawrence,

Attached please find my comments on the 2020 LRDP. I am also sending a hard copy with signature by mail.

Janice Thomas LRDP. comment letter 6-11-04.c

LETTER C251
Continued

Janice Thomas

37 Mosswood Road
Berkeley, CA 94704

June 17, 2004

Ms. Jennifer Lawrence
Co-Director, 2020 LRDP EIR
Facilities Services
1936 Univerity Avenue #300
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720-1382

Re: UC Berkeley's 2020 Long-Range Development Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Report

Dear Ms. Lawrence,

It is a painful process to read this LRDP and study its Draft EIR in light of the experience I have had as a proximate neighbor of the University of California at Berkeley. I appreciate this opportunity to comment, but it is a right that I am guaranteed by law, as otherwise I have no faith this University administration would grant this privilege. I have noticed the gradual undoing of environmental protections in the 19 years of living nearby and have experienced manipulative encounters that have eroded public planning processes to the point of meaninglessness. It is therefore with great difficulty and a sense of futility that I continue to participate during this public comment period.

This administration boldly announces that the LRDP will cause significant impacts to "air quality, cultural resources, noise, traffic, and transportation". Yet it chooses not the environmentally superior alternative (L-1) of reduced enrollment and research growth. It claims these impacts are unavoidable when in fact the choice is clearly avoidable and not even well defended. The plan enables an influx of research money that will continue the nascent trend of devolution into a research park rather than an undergraduate and graduate campus of higher education and learning. C251-1 C251-2

The extent of the impacts to the City was learned only gradually upon studying the LRDP and its Draft EIR. The FACT SHEET from the Public Affairs and University Relations Office was not much help as it neglected to mention that, even with mitigations, implementing the plan would result in five significant impacts.

In the instance of the two public hearings, the general public was given a chance to make formal oral comment but was not given the opportunity to have questions answered publicly. Instead, the public was invited to ask questions privately to staff on the side- C251-3

lines and during breaks from public comment. In each instance of asking questions, the reply included the phrase, "but don't quote me on this". This format, it seems obvious to say, is not therefore a public meeting, but rather a series of private conversations. And this being an early step in the process failed to educate the public, and as a result, everything that hinged upon this incomplete undertstanding was compromised. C251-3

The LRDP and its companion Draft EIR are highly technical documents that have taken some period of time for lay people such as myself to study and absorb. Clarification from the UCB staff would have been helpful. I am disappointed and angered by the staff's neglect of the public especially in light of the obscene expansion into the city proposed by this long range plan. Only upon carefully reading the LRDP is it clear that it allows more development off-campus (1,350,000 gsf) than on-campus (1,100,000 gsf). C251-4

I am writing in a state of awe that this administration believes it can continue to encroach into the City without at some point hurting the University itself. Unchecked growth into the city environs is pure hubris, which at some point will be corrected through forces beyond either the university's, the city's, or anybody's control. One of the most flagrant examples is to intensify use of Memorial Stadium despite being bisected by the Hayward Fault, being built largely on fill, being within 100 feet of Strawberry Creek, and having the effect of essentially trapping Strawberry Canyon hillside neighborhoods in the event of a disaster.

The administration boldly asserts its ambitious plans and does so in the name of an institutional mission. It states that external research funds have increased "in real terms by an average of 3.6% per year." It also provides data showing as much as a 60.5% increase in academic staff and visitors (Table 3.1-1 and 3.1-2 summary). Indeed "long-term trends in sponsored research" is the stated reason for not choosing the environmentally superior alternative.

However, the argument does not go far enough. First, it cannot be assumed that research growth is necessarily of direct benefit to student education. Indeed, research may support the "institutional entity" while not supporting the "academic mission" per se. A full accounting of funding sources would do much to clarify the relationship between private and public interests. The LRDP needs to also specify the number of students engaged in the research which grows at this exponential pace. C251-5

A walk through the Haas School of Business is a vivid example of how corporate sponsors have supported the university's growth and, it would appear, usurp its mission. Names of Fortune 500 companies and their CEOs define rooms, hallways, and other spaces. Whole buildings are named after donors. This is all very well and good if the university is merely a research park with student education as a sideline, but as a public university with its related perks, e.g. constitutional exemptions from zoning, it is wanting. If this university wants to go private, then do so, but not under the guise of a public mission.

Given the increasing privatization of this public institution, and the loss of the moral high ground, I think it's a mistake to not choose the environmentally superior alternative. The environmentally feasible alternative is to lower enrollment "to a level commensurate with our academic standards and our land and capital resources" and "to lower employment growth." This seems like the sensible thing to do. Instead the university administrators live off the good will of the past when the University of California at Berkeley really was a public entity.

Given that this LRDP would allow encroachment into the City, we are left wanting a proper explanation. This document fails to give us that explanation. This process fails to honor us with an explanation. We are given a process, and a "hearing", with seemingly no one listening.

Instead, our fair city administrators are admonished by this university, it would seem, rather than the other way around. They, and we, are to feel beholden by the revenue this university generates and by all the people, who come in during the day to buy goods, partake of services, etc. This is hogwash. It is a cold and materialistic viewpoint, which ignores quality of life issues and environmental impacts, which are equally essential.

With respect to specifics of the long range plan and its environmental review document, I have the following comments:

In general, the LRDP framework for studying land use zones is confusing. The 22-acre Memorial Stadium is included in the City Environs area even though it is "owned by the university" and even though "the areas within the City Environs are similar in consisting mostly of city blocks served by city streets..." (page 3.1-5). Given that the City Environs is "mostly" city blocks, including Memorial Stadium which is accessed partly by university-owned roads (Centennial, Rim, Gayley) is not a neat fit. C251-6

The City Environs land use framework is further subdivided into sections north, west, and south. Of these zones, Memorial Stadium is included in the Adjacent Blocks South. This is not just misleading, it is wrong. The Stadium is *east* of the Campus Park as numerous figures (e.g. Figure 3.1-1) clearly show.

The LRDP and Draft EIR need to inform the reader of the boundaries of the Southside Plan. As you know, the eastern boundary is Piedmont Way, and therefore, anything east of this boundary is not covered or considered in the Southside Plan. This is another reason why it is inaccurate and incorrect to include Memorial Stadium in the Adjacent Blocks South which is discussed in relation to the Southside Plan. C251-7

To fully understand the environmental impacts associated with intensified use and continued development of Memorial Stadium, the land use framework should describe Memorial Stadium as a separate entity and not just part of the City Environs Adjacent Block South. The Stadium's size and the impacts associated with its use justify separating it from other land use zones as otherwise the LRDP is improperly vague. No where, for example, is it clear that the Stadium is at an elevation relative to most of the C251-8

population of the City. No where is it clear that the Stadium is located at the mouth of a canyon and within 25 feet of a hillside neighborhood. No where is it clear that Strawberry Creek is within 100 feet of the stadium and that the Hayward Fault runs through it. This LRDP thus obfuscates key pieces of existing development and the campus and as a result impacts are not identified, and hence not mitigated. C251-8

Memorial Stadium is one such piece of "existing development" which needs to be described in greater detail. It is, for one, a 22-acre site, which is a fact that would seem to be of relevance. Whether or not there are currently nighttime events at this 22-acre site would help to define the existing conditions of the existing development and should be included. Correspondence from four chancellors to the Panoramic Hill Association supports the conclusion that there is a historic pattern of use, and around which residential neighborhoods have developed, that is non-commercial and limited to intercollegiate football. These are some of the features and existing detail, which should clearly determine the scope of future development at the Stadium and the type of impacts such development would have.

Because of the deficiencies in describing the existing development at Memorial Stadium, impacts are underestimated in just about every category. This is especially true in the areas of aesthetic impacts (that cannot be mitigated given that hillside residences are at eye-level), seismic impacts, public safety, biological resources, hydrology, and noise. Because the elevation of the stadium is not revealed and because the proximate relationship to a hillside neighborhood is not disclosed, shields and cut-offs will not mitigate light and glare impacts to below significance. In general, references should be provided in the Final EIR which provide proof that shields and cut-offs reduce light and glare in hillside environments. C251-9

LRDP maps frequently failed to identify the area of the map where Memorial Stadium would be located. For example, Figure 4.5-3 shows the Campus Park and the Clark Kerr Campus, but does not identify the Stadium and as such does not reveal that the Stadium and nearby intercollegiate fields and the Strawberry Canyon Recreation Area are *located in a liquefaction hazard zone*. Neither does Figure 4.5-1 show where the Stadium is *in relation to the Hayward Fault* although the Clark Campus and the Campus Park are clearly so identified. In other words, the LRDP and its Draft EIR are selective, and dare I say strategic, rather than objective and comprehensive even at the descriptive level. C251-10

The Final EIR needs to more fully describe the transportation corridors that will service Memorial Stadium, the Hill Area, and the environs of both. This area already has serious access and egress issues, which are made worse by added developed, intensified use, and change of use of existing development. Only one road cuts east through the canyon, a road that will presumably carry an exodus of people depending on the origin of the next disaster. Moreover, the exodus will be blocked by Campus Park on the west, by the Canyon on the east, and by two lane residential streets on corridors running east and west. Yet these inadequate infrastructure conditions are what the university planners depend upon to build the University's future. C251-11

The housing zone framework is likewise flawed in a way that is especially ridiculous when applied to the Hill Area. The Hill Area lacks grocery stores, dry cleaners, etc. Moreover, transit options to the Hill Area are exceedingly limited. As such, mass transit will not meaningfully reduce traffic impacts in the Hill Area environs. C251-12

By looking at only two variables (distance from the center of the Campus Park and commute time to the Campus Park), the housing zone framework is crude and poorly tied to other policies and LRDP objectives. For example, if UC Berkeley's challenges are in fact "to preserve the character and livability of the city" and "to ensure each capital investment represents the optimal use of public resources" and "to build a strong and vital intellectual community and "to preserve our ***extraordinary*** legacy of landscape and architecture" (emphasis added), then faculty housing should not be built near Grizzly Peak. Instead, faculty housing should be closer to the Campus Park in order to meet the challenges head-on. Even those Visiting Scholars conducting research at the Mathematical Sciences Research Laboratory or the Space Sciences Laboratory would benefit from being housed near the Campus Park Community. Living accommodations for faculty and academic staff could be made from rehabilitated structures, e.g. the Anna Head School for Girls, so as to preserve our architectural heritage. In other words, the LRDP provides no inherent justification for building new housing in a remote area far away from the Campus Park. Faculty housing could be located elsewhere. C251-13

It is not only unnecessary to build faculty housing near Grizzly Peak; it is unwise. People who live in the vicinity are already threatened by limited egress along Grizzly Peak and Centennial Drive. Egress down Centennial Drive is further complicated by stadium usage and the possibility that egress could be further limited by mass evacuation scenarios of 60,000 people. To invite further disaster by adding 100 housing units, and potentially 200 vehicles, and at least that many individuals, is reckless and irresponsible. Hillside housing is certainly glamorous and would undoubtedly appeal to potential visiting scholars and faculty, but you have not made your case that it is **necessary** to build at this location.

Moreover, there is no plausible argument that justifies building parking lots where refurbished historic structures should be instead. Hopefully, potential faculty and visiting scholars could be recruited on the basis of housing that brings them closer to the Campus Park community, and city amenities, e.g. famous restaurants, independent bookstores, the Pacific Film Archives, lectures, Zellerbach Hall, noon day concerts, lectures, running trails through wild open space in Strawberry Canyon, swimming pools, etc. Also, the LRDP should provide information about any and all Memoranda of Understanding between the UCB faculty and administration about parking to hopefully illuminate why parking preferences are driving housing decisions. C251-14

In general, the area around the Stadium and the Hill Area is gradually being intensively developed by this University without the benefit of any plan other than the LRDP. Examples of development in the eastern end of the campus environs include the following: (1) The last LRDP introduced a disproportionate amount of parking into the area. (2) "Future use changes" of Memorial Stadium would be experienced primarily in C251-15

the eastern end of the campus environs. (3) Proposed faculty housing in the Hill Area is consistent with this pattern. (4) A proposed stop light at Piedmont Way and Bancroft Way would erode the suburban ambience of the area and intensify the impacts associated with development in the area. (5) Building in the open space adjacent to the western facade at Memorial Stadium would require removal of a grove of trees that serves to soften the transition zone between the large coliseum and the perimeter of the Campus Park. (6) Three intersections in this area that would have an unacceptable ("F") level of service (Table 4.12-9) if the LRDP is implemented and are as follows: (a) Stadium Rim Road and Gayley Road, (b) Bancroft Way and Piedmont Avenue, and (c) Derby Street and Warring Street. In these ways, the University plans to further degrade the area of what might best be called East of Campus. C251-15

By not looking at the eastern end of the campus environs as a separate and distinct area but instead inappropriately incorporating it into "adjacent blocks south", it is difficult to appreciate the overall impacts to that part of town. The justification given in the LRDP is that most of the area is owned by the University. This is not a legitimate explanation as the University is obligated per CEQA to identify all impacts independently of whether or not they are owned by the University.

The eastern end of the campus environs is neglected in this LRDP to such an extent that in some of the figures the Panoramic Hill neighborhood has been literally disappeared. For example, Figure 3.1-4 shows Canyon Road, one small section of Panoramic Way, and one side of Mosswood Road, with the rest of the neighborhood omitted. This is altogether unacceptable. If any part of the neighborhood is to be included, then it all should have been included, as it is misleading otherwise. Meanwhile, other buildings even four blocks south of the Campus Park are featured in the same figure. C251-16

The Draft EIR also fails to identify numerous historic resources in the Panoramic Hill neighborhood. The historic resources are especially relevant given that the one exception to the mitigation for light and glare impacts would be "those areas where such features would be incompatible with the visual and/or historic character of the area" (page 4.1-19).

Listed in the State Historic Properties Directory and coded either 3S or 4S, these historic resources include the following:

1 Canyon Road – Torrey house (1905)
9 Canyon Road – Hutchinson house, Dean Hayes house (1908)
15 Canyon Road – Charles Rieber house (1904)
4 Mosswood Lane – Steilberg cottage (1930)
Orchard Lane – Mosswood Path
11 Mosswood Lane – WL Jepson house (1930)
13 Mosswood Road – Feldman house (1975)
21 Mosswood Road – Parsons house and Mauser farmhouse (1890)
29 Mosswood Road – Parsons house (1923)
1 Orchard Lane – Steilberg family home (1922)

These properties are located near (within 25 feet in some cases) the Stadium as Sanborn maps would show.

The aesthetic impact analysis fails to differentiate between light and glare impacts from different types of athletic and recreational fields. The University proposed to install 282 TV broadcast quality lighting at Memorial Stadium (see enclosed) in 1999 and 2000, which expands the scope far beyond other intercollegiate playing fields, e.g. rugby. Instead of discussing a range of "lighted athletic/recreational facilities", the Draft EIR instead lumps these facilities together and provides light and glare mitigations that would be less effective in the hillside context of the 22-acre intercollegiate football stadium. C251-17

The view impact analysis is also inadequate. The LRDP and Draft EIR identify view impacts from three perspectives: "public views into the Campus Park, public views out from the Campus Park, and public views of significant visual features within the Campus Park" (page 4.1-7). This analysis totally fails to identify any other view impacts from any other perspective. On Panoramic Way and Mosswood Road alone, views of the Campanile and the Golden Gate Bridge would be blocked by large light arrays at Memorial Stadium. Certainly, the University is entitled to block views, but it must at least document the impact before doing so. C251-18

Neither does the Draft EIR analyze the impacts to Hill Area biological resources from "future use changes at Memorial Stadium." As a matter of fact, nowhere in the biological resources section is Memorial Stadium even mentioned in relation to the Hill Area. In fact, the light and glare, increased noise, and traffic and construction would have considerable impact on biological resources in the Hill Area. C251-19

Failing to include Memorial Stadium in the watershed boundary (Figure 4.7-1) compromises the analysis of hydrology and water quality impacts. Significantly, no mention is made of the historic contamination of the creek from Stadium toilet usage during game days. Moreover, no migitations are identified which would prevent contamination of the creek during future construction at the Stadium. In general, per Berkeley creek ordinance, the Draft EIR should report the distance from the centerline of the culverted creek to the Stadium. C251-20

A mistake is found on page 4.7-11 where Memorial Stadium is erroneously described as "Hearst Memorial Stadium." Do the authors mean the "Hearst Greek Theater" or "Memorial Stadium"? C251-21

In closing, the LRDP is a disappointment by virtue of its level of growth in enrollment and research. The environmentally superior alternative should have been selected, as the current incarnation of the LRDP cannot be justified. The environmental review document for the LRDP is also a disappointment in that it failed to adequately describe the environmental context of the project, failed to identify all relevant impacts, and thereby also failed to adequately mitigate those impacts. Finally, the encroachment into the eastern end of the campus environs is especially problematic, as this area has been C251-22

intensively developed in a piecemeal way and without benefit of an area plan and will be even more intensively developed if this LRDP is implemented. Your consideration of these problems and issue would be appreciated.

C251-22

Yours sincerely,

Janice Thomas

enclosure

CALIFORNIA MEMORIAL STADIUM PERMANENT LIGHTING FOR FOOTBALL PROJECT
PROPOSED PROJECT STATISTICS

The following table lists the specifications of each light pole and fixture assembly shown on the site plan (see other side).

Pole	*Mounting Height (feet)*	*Pole Size (feet)*	*Elev. (feet)*	*Pole Bottom Diameter (inches)*	*Pole Top Diameter (inches)*	*Diameter of base above ground (inches)*	*# of Light Fixtures per Assembly*	*Light Assembly Dimensions (feet)*
A1	132	130	2	29	11.9	60	36 (9 x 4)	22 x 10
A2	130	130	0	32	14.9	60	45 (9 x 5)	22 x 12
A3	133	130	3	32	14.9	60	45 (9 x 5)	22 x 12
A4	132	114	18	27	12.0	60	36 (9 x 4)	22 x 10
B1	133	80	53	20.7	15.8	0	24 (8 x 3)	19.5 x 7
B2	134	70	64	18.4	13.4	0	24 (8 x 3)	20 x 7
B3	135	70	65	18.4	13.4	0	24 (8 x 3)	20 x 7
B4	133	70	63	18.4	13.4	0	24 (8 x 3)	20 x 7
B5	133	70	63	18.4	13.4	0	24 (8 x 3)	19.5 x 7

Notes:

Pole – Refers to pole locations as shown on site plan.
Mounting Height (feet) – Top of pole in relationship to center point of field, i.e. the top of pole A1 is 132 feet above the ground-level center point of the field. The top of the light assemblies will be a few inches below the top of the pole.
Pole Size (feet) – Actual height of pole from bottom to top.
Elev. (feet) – Ground height of pole in relationship to center point of field, i.e. the bottom of pole A1 is 2 feet higher than the ground-level center point of the field.
Pole Bottom Diameter (inches) – Diameter of each pole at its bottom. Actual dimension used in revised simulations are indicated above. As published in the Initial Study, dimensions of 27 inches at base for "A" poles and 18 inches at the base for "B" poles were assumed. Revised simulations add a maximum of five inches at pole bottom.
Pole Top Diameter (inches) – Diameter of each pole at its top. Actual dimension used in revised simulations are indicated above. As published in the Initial Study, dimensions of 6 inches for all poles were assumed. Revised simulations add a maximum of 9.8 inches at pole top.
Diameter of Base Above Ground (inches)) - The bases for poles A1, A2, A3 and A4 are 60 inches in diameter and will project 6 to 12 inches above ground. The bases for poles B1-B5 are flush with the ground.
# of Light Fixtures per Assembly – 24-light assemblies are 8 fixtures wide by 3 high; 36-light assemblies are 9 wide by 4 high; 45-light assemblies are 9 wide by 5 high.
Light Assembly Dimensions (feet) – Maximum dimension of each assembly. Overall dimensions may vary depending on the tilt of the lights when installed and adjusted.

11.2C.251 RESPONSE TO COMMENT LETTER C251

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C251-1

As explained in section 5.1.6, alternative L-1, although the superior alternative from an environmental standpoint, does not fully meet the objectives of the 2020 LRDP.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C251-2

Research is not a discrete enterprise apart from education at UC Berkeley. Rather, it is integral to both UC Berkeley's mission as a University and to the provision of both graduate and undergraduate education. See response B7-20 for a more extensive response to this point.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C251-3

The purpose of the public hearings conducted for the Draft EIR was to enable the public to comment orally and also to have the benefit of hearing others' comments. However, it would not be responsible for the University to respond directly to those comments at the hearing. First, many of the comments were substantive and required at least some review of the analyses in the Draft EIR in order to prepare a substantive response: given the complex and technical nature of these analyses it is not possible for staff to do this in "real time".

Second, as expected some topics generated many comments: some differed in their perception of the problem, while others differed in exactly how to address the problem. In preparing its responses to these comments, the University must understand and address the full range of comments on each topic: since the public hearings occurred before the close of the comment period, it was not possible to respond to comments made at the hearing.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C251-4

The writer's comments on the general content of the 2020 LRDP are noted.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C251-5

Research is not a discrete enterprise apart from education at UC Berkeley. Rather, it is integral to both UC Berkeley's mission as a University and to the provision of both graduate and undergraduate education. See response B7-20 for a more extensive response to this point.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C251-6

The writer's comments are noted. The areas of the North and South Adjacent Blocks east of Gayley, although entirely owned by the University, differ in character from the Campus Park. They are separated from the Campus Park by public streets (or University roads with similar functions), and they include a substantial amount of housing, both characteristics more similar to the Adjacent Blocks than the Campus Park.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C251-7

The comment on the Southside Plan boundary is incorrect. As shown in the figures in the July 2003 draft of the Southside Plan, the eastern boundary of the Southside Plan Area is the rear lot lines of properties along Prospect St.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS C251-8 AND C251-9

At this point no specific project at Memorial Stadium has yet been defined to a level of detail adequate to support project level CEQA review. See Thematic Response 1 for an explanation of how the program level analysis in the 2020 LRDP and its EIR would inform project level review of a future project at Memorial Stadium. While Figures 4.5-1 and 4.7-1 do not show buildings due to scale of the maps, the close proximity of the Hayward Fault and Strawberry Creek to Memorial Stadium is evident.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C251-10

Figures 4.5-1 and 4.5-3 do not show individual buildings, but it is clear the Stadium lies astride the Hayward Fault and is in a liquefaction hazard zone.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C251-11

See Thematic Response 1. The purpose of project-level review is to more accurately reflect the specific characteristics of the project in question. Any such review of future projects at the Stadium or in the Hill Campus would be examined in light of the program-level analysis prepared for the 2020 LRDP to ensure all potential significant impacts have been identified and addressed. Thematic Response 8 responds to this and other comments regarding emergency access in the Hill Campus. Due partly to comments received and partly to its uncertain near-term feasibility, faculty housing has been deleted as a potential future Hill Campus use in the 2020 LRDP. As noted in Thematic Response 8, the site formerly designated H1 has been redesignated as a reserve site, while former site H2 has been redesignated as part of the surrounding research zone.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS C251-12 AND C251-13

See Thematic Response 8 for a comprehensive response to comments on Hill Campus development. Due partly to comments received and partly to its uncertain near-term feasibility, faculty housing has been deleted as a potential future Hill Campus use in the 2020 LRDP. As noted in Thematic Response 8, the site formerly designated H1 has been redesignated as a reserve site, while former site H2 has been redesignated as part of the surrounding research zone.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C251-14

See Thematic Response 9. The parking program in the 2020 LRDP is not driven by "memoranda of understanding" with the faculty, but rather by an analysis of demand given the mission of the University and the objectives of the 2020 LRDP.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C251-15

This comment appears to refer to both a future, as yet undefined project at the Stadium and the traffic mitigation measures identified in the Draft EIR. The writer seems to contend the impacts of future projects and mitigations in the Stadium vicinity would not be adequately evaluated because they would be overshadowed by development in the balance of the Adjacent Blocks South.

Thematic Response 1 describes the relationship of the 2020 LRDP and its EIR to project level review. UC Berkeley complies with all CEQA notification requirements when a project is proposed; further UC Berkeley seeks to cultivate a positive relationship with neighbors of the Stadium at all times. When projects are proposed meetings are held and information is routinely exchanged.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C251-16

Figures 3.1-4 and 3.1-11 have been revised in the Final EIR in response to the writer's comment. The tabulation of cultural resources in chapter 4.4 is limited to the Campus Park, Hill Campus, Adjacent Blocks, Southside and Housing Zone, but any project level review of any future project under CEQA would assess the potential for impacts to all affected properties, whether inside or outside these zones.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS C251-17 THRU C251-20

The mitigations prescribed in the Draft EIR for the 2020 LRDP are consistent with a program level analysis. Any future projects would be examined in light of the program-level analysis prepared for the 2020 LRDP to ensure all potential significant impacts have been identified and addressed. At this point no specific project at Memorial Stadium has yet been defined to a level of detail adequate to support project level CEQA review.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C251-21

The typo is corrected in the Final EIR.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C251-22

These remarks summarize the more detailed comments above.

LETTER C252

RONALD B. MOSKOVITZ
2960 CLAREMONT AVENUE
BERKELEY, CA 94705

June 17, 2004

Ms. Jennifer Lawrence
Environmental Planning Manager
UC Berkeley Facilities Services
1936 University, No. 300
Berkeley, CA 94720

Dear Ms. Lawrence:

At the request of several neighbors, I am writing as one of the two attorneys who negotiated on behalf of my neighbors the 1982 Declaration of Covenants and Restrictions that cover the Clark Kerr Campus (then the site of the California Schools for the Deaf and Blind).

As you are by no doubt now aware, many of the neighbors and neighborhood organizations that are contiguous to the Clark Kerr Campus and therefore beneficiaries of the 1982 Declaration are deeply suspicious of the 2020 Long Range Development Plan process and fear that it will be used to undercut the restrictions in the 1982 Declaration. As a result they have been carefully watching the use of the Campus and expressed concerns about not acting more aggressively on minor violations of the covenants (such as the requirement for on site parking and the overly long stay of the "temporary" child care center on the northwest corner of the site). C252-1

My neighbors were particularly concerned with the mere listing of Alternative L-8, More Intensive Development of Clark Kerr Campus, page 5.1-22 of the draft EIR, even though the alternative is noted as "infeasible." They hope the University does indeed recognize that its neighbors would in fact seek to enforce the 1982 Declaration in necessary. C252-2

I also want you to know that I have been very pleased with what the University has done on the Clark Kerr Campus and feel that those of us who supported the University's plan in 1982 have been well vindicated. I hope the University will help keep the divisiveness of that era by burying Alternative L-8.

With deepest appreciation for the University's treatment of the Clark Kerr Campus to date, I remain

Very truly yours,

Ronald B. Moskovitz

Date: 6-18-04 by:
Project No.:
File Name: 2020 LRDP - DEIR: Env Public Comments
cc: file - orig + cc; JKL, KO, JEL

11.2C.252 RESPONSE TO COMMENT LETTER C252

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C252-1

The writer's comment is noted.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C252-2

Section 3.1.14 is explicitly clear on the matter of the Clark Kerr Campus under the 2020 LRDP:

> In 1982 the University executed a Declaration of Covenants and Restrictions with neighboring property owners and a Memorandum of Understanding with the City of Berkeley, both of which commit the University to a site plan and land use program on the Clark Kerr Campus for a period of 50 years. While many of its 26 buildings require extensive repairs and upgrades, no significant change in either the use or physical character of the Clark Kerr Campus is proposed in the 2020 LRDP.

Alternative L-8, which would include more intensive development of the Clark Kerr Campus, is rejected as infeasible in the Draft EIR because of the agreements cited by the writer.

LETTER C253

Laurence Frank
<lgfrank@berkeley.edu
>

To: 2020lrdp@cp.berkeley.edu
cc:
Subject: Destruction of the Grizzly Peak - Summit Road neighborhood

06/18/2004 11:47 AM

Gentlepersons:

I have been a University employee since 1975 and a resident of Summit Road since 1992. I am absolutely appalled that the University is planning on building a city in the hills, destroying this neighborhood, trashing the woodlands, and putting seral hundred people virtually on top of the most active earthquake fault in the country and in one of the most dangerous fire zones. This is an extraordinarily stupid idea; although the University might own land up here, it is a nonsensical place to build one hundred houses. **C253-1**

You have been inundated with logistical arguments against this development - the infrastructure simply cannot deal with that number of people and that amount of traffic. However, I am equally concerned about the destruction of the environment - does anyone from the University realize that the whole area is an Ecological Reserve?? Today, little is more precious than open space on the edge of metropolitan areas. Why destroy this one, when there are plenty of sites near the bay on both sides of the freeway, some of them owned by the University, which would be far more suitable for a development such as this? **C253-2**

You have been given scores of excellent reasons to abandon this folly, and I won't reiterate them here. I want to register my very strong opposition to this development, and pledge to do everything I can to fight it.

Sincerely yours,

==========
Dr. Laurence Frank, Director
Laikipia Predator Project and
Kilimanjaro Lion Conservation Project

Museum of Vertebrate Zoology
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720
USA

Tel: (510) 848-0418
Fax: (510) 642-8321

11.2C.253 RESPONSE TO COMMENT LETTER C253

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS C253-1 AND C253-2

See Thematic Response 8 for a comprehensive response to comments on Hill Campus development. Due partly to comments received and partly to its uncertain near-term feasibility, faculty housing has been deleted as a potential future Hill Campus use in the 2020 LRDP. As noted in Thematic Response 8, the site formerly designated H1 has been redesignated as a reserve site, while former site H2 has been redesignated as part of the surrounding research zone.

The writer also contends the "whole area" of the Hill Campus is an "ecological reserve". As shown in figure 3.1-10 and described on page 3.1-35 of the Draft EIR, the 2020 LRDP not only preserves but in fact expands the boundary of the Ecological Study Area. Any future development of academic or support space in the Hill Campus under the 2020 LRDP would be located outside the Ecological Study Area.

LETTER C254

Norah Foster <nfoster@library.berkeley.edu>

06/18/2004 11:48 AM

To: 2020lrdp@cp.berkeley.edu, jlawrence@cp.berkeley.edu, kobanion@cp.berkeley.edu, lustig@uhs.berkeley.edu, hmitchel@uclink4.berkeley.edu, vlh@uclink.berkeley.edu, Permaul@uclink.berkeley.edu, stoll@uclink.berkeley.edu
cc: AssemblyDistrictassemblymember.hancock@assembly.ca.gov, mayor@ci.berkeley.ca.us, elliec@abag.ca.gov, dfay@aacma.ca.gov, sheminger@mtc.ca.gov, dfastenau@rides.org, bikeburch@hotmail.com, kduron@bart.gov.ord, rfernandez@actransit.org
Subject: Comments to LRDP/DEIR 2020/ Request for 2nd round after July;

June 14, 2004

Dear UCB Administrators:

INTRODUCTION:
Please note that comments are in red; quotes from the LRDP/DEIR are in black.

Because of the overwhelming and egregious omissions and lack of proofs of this LRDP/DEIR which are quoted in detail, particularly L-1 and L-2, as an individual & member of IAT, (Improve Alternative Transportation) I would firstly like to request a second round of comments be allowed after the revised LRDP/DEIR is completed, but before the final is submitted to the regents. We would assume that if necessary the regents approval could also be moved forward from November 2004 to January of 2005. **C254-1**

The state plan is called the Clean Air Plan (CAP). The CAP requires satisfactory progress in attaining state ambient T air quality standards. This includes a five percent per year reduction in emissions or a demonstration that all feasible measures have been proposed for implementation. The LRDP/DEIR can achieve this reduced standard with appropriate changes as noted below by increasing alternative transportation but that this five per cent reduction standard will be violated if the plan remains unchanged.

"PARKING IMPACTS LRDP Impact TRA-11: Implementation of the 2020 LRDP could induce a "mode shift" to driving by some commuters who currently take transit, bicycle or walk." This would be inconsistent with the intent of the 2020 LRDP. The mitigation described below would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. The net increase of 2,300 spaces planned under the 2020 LRDP would increase the planned future commuter parking supply from 6,424 spaces without the 2020 LRDP 30 up to 8,724 spaces with the 2020 LRDP. This parking increase is designed to meet the needs of future growth in campus headcount, which would generate a parking demand of 1,745 spaces 31 and to reduce an existing parking deficit, reducing University generated demand on non-University parking (primarily Downtown parking facilities or on-street parking) by 555 spaces. ...this EIR assumes that the increase in the University parking supply could induce a "mode shift" to driving by some commuters who currently take transit, bicycle or walk. "

UC Berkeley is increasing the parking supply almost 33% to 2300 spaces which will also increase drive alone trips to campus 33%. If you look at the plan to include the Underhill parking, the increase is 42% or 3090 spaces. The mitigations planned will not help reduce pollutants (e.g. traffic signals) and may in fact induce accidents as speeding driven vehicles try to "beat" the changing lights. **C254-2**

This planning includes a regressive mode shift away from alternatives to **C254-3**

driving. I and the IAT (Improve Alternative Transportation) (See separate letter) argue that the annual 5% reduction in CAP (Clean Air Plan) cannot be achieved with a 42% increase in driving. UCB is risking state violations of the CAP. There is neither a sufficient cap on UCB population growth or sufficient funding for alternative transportation by UCB. The current status quo plan called euphemistically the Best Practice "same or equivalent" methods that the Parking and Transportation Office "New Directions" planning which we see as now as failing to reduce SOV (Single Occupancy Vehicles) significantly. UCB currently has a 51% non-driver population and we challenge the University to set a goal of 80% non-drivers. We strongly urge major significant revisions to most of the transportation sections in the LRDP/DEIR by reducing the parking space plans and increasing the use of alternative transportation over and above the "same or equivalent" alternatives used currently. Combinations of alternatives must also be considered. C254-3

"1. Introduction; Section 1-1 EIR scope
"If not significant affects would occur...no subsequent documents would be required".

Anything that the LRDP/DEIR deems "as infeasible or to offer no significant environmental effects over the 2020 LRDP/DEIR " may be dismissed and discouragingly "no subsequent documents would be required". C254-4
These statements as too broad without adequate definition of "less than significant" and irresponsible at both dismissing the reduction possibility for air pollution and in studying and quantifying true alternative mitigations; Close study of such uses as capping overall UC population growth, along with capping parking at current levels, subsidized transit eco-passes, more UC bus shuttles along major trunk lines as needed, light rail &/or people "movers", safe bike parking and safe bike paths/route, lower cost vans and car pools; Also housing made affordable within walking distance or to a transit stop to include faculty and staff & many other new alternative transportation ideas for reducing auto traffic. These are egregious omissions for a world class university. Therefore, the LRDP/DEIR should recommend that major studies be done to increase alternative transportation options and the resultant drop in driving/parking needs.

"2.2 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY
Particular areas of concern identified during the scoping period included the following:
... Air Quality: potential air quality impacts resulting from construction and new traffic
generated as a result of implementing the 2020 LRDP " and" Traffic: impacts of additional campus development on local and regional traffic conditions; impacts associated with providing additional campus parking."

Recognizing that the increase of 42% new trips to campus will significantly increase air pollution, there is no mitigation for this problem in the LRDP/DEIR. C254-5

"2-2 Berkeley General Plan and the Southside Plan.
Noise: potential noise impacts from construction.
Housing: housing impacts associated with an increased campus population.
Fire and Emergency Response: potential impacts on the ability of fire and emergency
services to access the Hill Campus in the event of a disaster; potential impacts
to fire services in general.
Schools: impacts of potential increases in school-aged children on the school districts

serving the 2020 LRDP area.
Traffic: impacts of additional campus development on local and regional traffic
conditions; impacts associated with providing additional campus parking.
Utilities and Service Systems: potential impacts of additional campus development
on the capacity of sewer, storm drainage and other service systems.
All of these issues were considered in the preparation of the 2020 LRDP. To the extent
these issues have environmental impacts, they are also addressed in this EIR.
2.3 SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS
Under CEQA, a significant impact on the environment is defined as a substantial, or
potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area
affected by the project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise,
and objects of historic and aesthetic significance. Implementation of the 2020 LRDP
has the potential to generate significant environmental impacts in a number of areas. This EIR identifies these potential impacts and presents mitigation measures. Potential impacts are summarized in Table 2-1 at the end of this chapter.
2.4 CONTINUING BEST PRACTICES AND MITIGATION MEASURES
This EIR details continuing best practices and mitigation measures that would reduce
potential impacts to less than significant levels, except where impacts are significant and
unavoidable. These measures are summarized in Table 2-1. They will be the subject of
a Mitigation Monitoring Program.
2.5 UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS
This EIR identifies significant unavoidable impacts in the following topic areas: air quality,
cultural resources, noise, traffic and transportation.
2.6 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT
This Draft EIR analyzes four alternatives to the proposed 2020 LRDP, as follows:
L-1 Reduced enrollment and employment growth from 2020 LRDP levels
L-2 No new parking and more transit incentives
L-3 Diversion of some future growth to remote sites
L-4 No project (as required by CEQA)"

"LRDP Impact AIR-1: Implementation of the 2020 LRDP would not violate the carbon monoxide standard or expose sensitive receptors to substantial CO concentrations.
Continuing Best Practice AIR-1: UC Berkeley shall continue to implement the same or equivalent alternative transit programs, striving to improve the campus mode split and reduce the use of single occupant vehicles"

The implementation of a 42% increase in trips in the LRDP/DEIR would indeed violate the CO concentrations. C254-6
Furthermore, the best practice of "same or equivalent" SEE ABOVE - Continuing Best Practice AIR-1planning is again irresponsible for the leadership and a level of concern for reducing air particulates. UC Berkeley must increase over the "same or equivalent" levels its alternative transit programs or be derelict in its duties to our students, faculty staff and community. I dispute the level of "LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT" in the LRDP/EIR that air pollution and that CO concentrations would NOT

violate the standard. I challenge the LRDP/EIR findings and ask that a study be conducted to analyze the increases. C254-6

"LRDP Impact AIR-5: Operational emissions from implementation of the 2020 LRDP may hinder the attainment of the Clean Air Plan. This would be a significant and unavoidable impact.
Continuing Best Practice AIR-5: UC Berkeley will continue to implement transportation control measures such as supporting voluntary trip-reduction programs, ridesharing, and implementing improvements to bicycle facilities.
LRDP Mitigation Measure AIR-5: UC Berkeley will work with the City of Berkeley, ABAG and BAAQMD to ensure that emissions directly and indirectly associated with the campus are adequately accounted for and mitigated in applicable air quality planning efforts."

Again, no real plan to reduce emissions is noted. Since the impact is noted as "significant and unavoidable", I challenge UCB that this impact is completely AVOIDABLE in 3 ways. C254-7
1. Significantly increasing alternative transportation with subsidies and Office of Capital Projects mitigation funding to induce all drivers to shift to other modes. While there is currently a policy about bicycle parking mitigation for new buildings, UCB needs a much stronger mitigation policy for buildings and new projects including heavy transportation subsidy funding for all types of alternative transportation.
2. Building no new parking /capping parking space growth this year with a cap on head count; adding some minimal limited disabled and visitor spaces in areas only around new buildings only if other parking is reduced. C254-8
3. Capping the growth of all students/faculty to current levels. Planning for a possible .5-3% annual increase of researchers with staff would be reasonable for continuing UCB excellence. Encouraging a student population "shift" from undergraduates to upper division and graduate students would ensure high scholarship and excellence at UCB. C254-9

"LRDP Impact TRA-5: The 2020 LRDP is expected to generate new transit demand, or alter locations where local transit demand occurs. Given the provisions of the 2020 LRDP and campus best practices, however, significant service problems are not anticipated.LTS " Continuing Best Practice TRA-5: The University shall continue to work to coordinate local transit services as new academic buildings, parking facilities, and campus housing are completed, in order to accommodate changing demand locations or added demand.LTS"

IAT argues that this new transit trip demand will be SIGNIFICANT (not LTS (Less than significant)) and shuttle transit and increasing subsidies to transit services must be increased and must be added to reduce SOV. This involves more than "continuing to work" but increased involvement with shuttles and specific mitigation with increased funding improvements for all commuter routes for students, faculty, researchers and staff. C254-10

"LRDP Impact TRA-6: The 2020 LRDP would increase vehicle trips and traffic congestion at the intersections listed below, leading to substantial degradation in level of service. The mitigations, if implemented with review and approval of the City Traffic Engineer, would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level.
LRDP Impact TRA-6-a: The signalized Cedar Street/Oxford Street intersection, which would operate at LOS E during the AM peak hour regardless of the project, and degrade from LOS D to LOS E during the PM peak hour. The project would increase the intersection volume by 7 percent during the AM peak hour, and 7 percent during the PM peak hour.

S LRDP Mitigation Measure TRA-6-a: The University will work with the City of Berkeley to redesign and, on a fair share basis, implement changes to either the westbound or northbound approach of the Cedar Street / Oxford Street intersection to provide a left-turn lane and a through lane. The University will contribute fair share funding for a periodic (annual or biennial) traffic count to allow the City to determine when an intersection redesign is needed. With the implementation of this mitigation measure, the intersection will operate at LOS B during the AM peak hour and LOS D during the PM peak hour.
LTS
LRDP Impact TRA-6-b: The all-way stop-controlled Durant Avenue/ Piedmont Avenue intersection, which would degrade from LOS D to LOS F during the AM peak hour. The project would increase the intersection volume by 10 percent during the AM peak hour.
S LRDP Mitigation Measure TRA-6-b: The University will work with the City of Berkeley to design and, on a fair share basis, install a signal at the Durant Avenue /Piedmont Avenue intersection, when a signal warrant analysis shows the signal is needed. The University will contribute fair share funding for a periodic (annual or biennial) signal warrant check at this and other impact intersections, to allow the City to determine when a signal is warranted. With the implementation of this mitigation measure, the intersection will operate at LOS B during both AM and PM peak hours.
LTS
" UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY
2 0 2 0 LRDP DRAFT E I R 2 REPORT SUMMARY
TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND CONTINUING BEST PRACTICESImpact Significance Before Mitigation Mitigation Measures and Continuing Best PracticesSignificance With Mitigation
TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC
LRDP Impact TRA-6-b: The all-way stop-controlled Durant Avenue/ Piedmont Avenue intersection, which would degrade from LOS D to LOS F during the AM peak hour. The project would increase the intersection volume by 10 percent during the AM peak hour.
S LRDP Mitigation Measure TRA-6-b: The University will work with the City of Berkeley to design and, on a fair share basis, install a signal at the Durant Avenue /Piedmont Avenue intersection, when a signal warrant analysis shows the signal is needed. The University will contribute fair share funding for a periodic (annual or biennial) signal warrant check at this and other impact intersections, to allow the City to determine when a signal is warranted. With the implementation of this mitigation measure, the intersection will operate at LOS B during both AM and PM peak hours.
LTS "LRDP UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY 2 0 2 0 LRDP DRAF T E I R 2 R EPORT SUMMAR Y TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND CONTINUING BEST PRACTICES Impact Significance Before Mitigation Mitigation Measures and Continuing Best Practices Significance With Mitigation LTS = Less Than Significant S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact 2-49 TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC
LRDP Impact TRA-6-d: The eastbound approach of the side-street stop-controlled Addison Street/Oxford Street intersection from LOS A to LOS E during the AM peak hour and LOS C to LOS E during the PM peak hour. The project would increase the intersection volume by 12 percent during the AM peak hour, and 10 percent during the PM peak hour.
S LRDP Mitigation Measure TRA-6-d: The University will work with the City of Berkeley to design and, on a fair share basis, install a signal at the Addison Street/Oxford Street intersection, and provide the necessary provisions for coordination with adjacent signals along Oxford Street. The University will contribute fair share funding for a periodic

(annual or biennial) signal warrant check at this and other impact intersections,
to allow the City to determine when a signal and the associated coordination improvements are warranted. With the implementation of this mitigation measure, the intersection will operate at LOS A during both AM and PM peak hours.
LTS
LRDP Impact TRA-6-e: The eastbound approach of the side-street stop-controlled Allston Way/Oxford Street intersection would degrade from LOS D to LOS E during the AM peak hour. The intersection would continue to operate at LOS E during the PM peak hour. The project would increase the intersection volume by 11 percent during the AM peak hour, and 8 percent during the PM peak hour.
S LRDP Mitigation Measure TRA-6-e: The University will work with the City of Berkeley to design and, on a fair share basis, install a signal at Allston Way/Oxford Street intersection, and provide the necessary provisions for coordination with adjacent signals along Oxford Street. The University will contribute fair share funding for a periodic (annual or biennial) signal warrant check at this and other impact intersections, to allow the City to determine when a signal and the associated coordination improvements are warranted. With the implementation of this mitigation measure, the intersection will operate at LOS A during both AM and PM peak hours.
LTS
2-50 LTS = Less Than Significant S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact
TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC LRDP Impact TRA-6-f: The eastbound approach of the side-streetstop-controlled Kittredge Street/Oxford Street intersection from
LOS C to LOS F during the AM peak hour. The intersection would continue to operate at LOS F during the PM peak hour. The project would increase the intersection volume by 14 percent during the AM peak hour, and 10 percent during the PM peakhour.
S LRDP Mitigation Measure TRA-6-f: The University will work with the City of Berkeley to design and, on a fair share basis, install a signal at the Kittredge Street/Oxford Street intersection, and provide the necessary provisions for coordination with adjacent signals along Oxford Street. The University will contribute fair share funding for a periodic (annual or biennial) signal warrant check at this and other impact intersections, to allow the City to determine when a signal and the associated coordination improvements are warranted. With the implementation of this mitigation measure, the intersection will operate at LOS A during both AM and PM peak hours. LTS
LRDP Impact TRA-6-g: The northbound approach of the side-street stop-controlled Bancroft Way/Ellsworth Street intersection would degrade from LOS D to LOS E during the PM peak hour. The project would increase the intersection volume by 19 percent during the AM peak hour, and 10 percent during the PM peak hour.
S LRDP Mitigation Measure TRA-6-g: The University will work with the City of Berkeley to design and, on a fair share basis, install a signal at the Bancroft Way/Ellsworth Street intersection, and provide the necessary provisions for coordination with adjacent signals along Bancroft Way. The University will contribute fair share funding for a periodic (annual or biennial) signal warrant check at this and other impact intersections, to allow the City to determine when a signal and the associated coordination improvements are warranted. With the implementation of this mitigation measure, the intersection will operate at LOS B during both AM and PM peak hours.LTS
LRDP Impact TRA-7: Development under the 2020 LRDP would contribute to the projected unacceptable delay at the all-way stop-controlled

Bancroft Way/Piedmont Avenue intersection, which is projected to operate at LOS F during both AM and PM peak hours regardless of the project. The project would increase the intersection volume by 11 percent during the AM peak hour, and 5 percent during the PM peak hour. The mitigation would, if implemented with review and approval of the City Traffic Engineer, reduce this impact to a less than significant level. the City of Berkeley to design and, on a fair share basis, install a signal at the Bancroft Way/Piedmont Avenue intersection, and provide an exclusive left-turn lane and an exclusive through lane on the northbound approach. The University will contribute fair share funding for a periodic (annual or biennial) signal warrant check at this and other impact intersections, to allow the City to determine when a signal and the associated capacity improvements are warranted. With the implementation of this mitigation measure, the intersection would operate at LOS B during both AM and PM peak hours. SU
LTS = Less Than Significant S
= Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact 2-51
LRDP Impact TRA-7: Development under the 2020 LRDP would contribute to the projected unacceptable delay at the all-way stop-controlled Bancroft Way/Piedmont Avenue intersection, which is projected to operate at LOS F during both AM and PM peak hours regardless of the project. The project would increase the intersection volume by 11 percent during the AM peak hour, and 5 percent during the PM peak hour. The mitigation would, if implemented with review and approval of the City Traffic Engineer, reduce this impact to a less than significant level.the City of Berkeley to design and, on a fair share basis, install a signal at the Bancroft Way/Piedmont Avenue intersection, and provide an exclusive left-turn lane and an exclusive through lane on the northbound approach. The University will contribute fair share funding for a periodic (annual or biennial) signal warrant check at this and other impact intersections, to allow the City to determine when a signal and the associated capacity improvements are warranted. With the implementation of this mitigation measure, the intersection would operate at LOS B during both AM and PM peak hours.
LRDP Impact TRA-8: The 2020 LRDP would increase vehicle trips and traffic congestion at the intersections listed below, leading to substantial degradation in level of service. These impacts are significant and unavoidable.

The signalized University Avenue / Sixth Street intersection, which is projected to operate at LOS F during both AM and PM peak hours regardless of the project. The project would increase the intersection volume by 7 percent during the AM peak hour, and 6 percent during the PM peak hour.
The signalized University Avenue / San Pablo Avenue intersection, which is projected to operate at LOS F during both AM and PM peak hours regardless of the project. The project would increase the intersection volume by 8 percent during the AM peak hour, and 6 percent during the PM peak hour. S
Magnitude of impact reduced through trip reduction measures. No feasible design measures.
SU
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY2020 LRDP DRAF T E I R
LRDP Impact TRA-9: Housing projects in the 2020 LRDP Housing Zone could increase vehicle trips and traffic congestion in the vicinity of

project sites, which could lead to substantial degradation in level of service.
The mitigation would reduce this impact to a less than significant level."

IAT argues that the increase will be SIGNIFICANT in specific areas surrounding the new parking garages if adequate alternative transportation is not added. **C254-11**

"LRDP Mitigation Measure TRA-9: Prior to approving any development outside the City Environs, the University will conduct a traffic study to assess the localized traffic impacts of this development. Mitigations required to ensure that the housing project does not cause LOS deterioration exceeding the stated impact levels would be implemented, if necessary. LTS
LRDP Impact TRA-10: Development under the 2020 LRDP would cause the following Alameda County CMP Designated System and MTS roadways listed below to exceed the level of service standard established by the CMA. This impact is significant and unavoidable.
Ashby Avenue westbound, between Adeline Street and San Pablo Avenue.
Ashby Avenue eastbound, Between College Avenue and Domingo Street.
University Avenue westbound, between MLK Jr. Way and I-80
San Pablo Avenue northbound, between Gilman Street and Marin Avenue
Shattuck Avenue southbound, between Dwight Way and Adeline Street
Shattuck Avenue southbound, between Hearst Avenue and University Avenue (MTS only)
Dwight Way westbound, between MLK Jr. Way and Sixth Street(MTS only)S
Magnitude of impact reduced through trip reduction measures. No feasible design measures.SU
"LRDP Impact TRA-11: Implementation of the 2020 LRDP could induce a"mode shift" to driving by some commuters who currently take transit, bicycle or walk. This would be inconsistent with the intent of the2020 LRDP. The mitigation would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

LRDP Mitigation Measure TRA-11: The University will implement the following measures to limit the shift to driving by existing and potential future non-auto commuters:
Review the number of sold parking permits in relation to the number of campus parking spaces and demographic trends on a yearly basis, and establish limits on the total number of parking permits sold proportionate to the number of spaces, with the objective of reducing the ratio of permits to spaces over time as the number of spaces grows, thus ensuring that new supply improves LTS"the existing space-to-permit ratio without encouraging modechange to single occupant vehicles. As new parking becomes operational, assign a portion of the new or existing parking supply to short-term or visitor parking, thus targeting parkers who choose on-street parking now, and also effectively reserving part of the added supply for non-commuters."

IAT argues that this is "profit" driven internal planning without concern for the mode shift. It adds drivers, parking permits and parking spaces which is polluting and congesting. This conveniently insures that parking will be available instead of capped. This is a negative mitigation and continues the paradigm that top priority is the parking and it's income. "Conveniently reserving space for non-commuters" is not reducing auto congestion or air quality impacts. **C254-12**

"As new parking becomes operational, assign a portion of the new or existing parking supply to short-term or visitor parking, thus targeting

parkers who choose on-street parking now, and also effectively reserving part of the added supply for non-commuters. Expand the quantity of parking that is available only after 10:00 a.m., to avoid affecting the travel mode use patterns of the peak hour commuting population, as new parking inventory is added to the system. Review and consider reductions in attended parking as new parking
inventory is added to the system and other impacts do not reduce parking supply."

IAT regards these plans above as "regressive" for air quality, reduction of congestion ; They will increase the convenience of driving trips to campus; Shifting walkers and alternative transportation users to DRIVING is a SIGNIFICANT negative impact. Shifting parking to income producing local use is also negative in that it continues the pollution and congestion overall problems. Attendant parking would also be reduced or eliminated by an overall mode shift to alternative transportation. C254-13

LRDP Impact TRA-12: The level of pedestrian growth associated with the LRDP may require physical and operational modifications to the intersections
and roadways in the immediate campus vicinity and on major pedestrian routes serving UC Berkeley, to ensure adequate capacity for pedestrian movement and adequate design to protect pedestrian safety. The mitigation would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. S LRDP Mitigation Measure TRA-12: The University shall prepare a strategic pedestrian improvement plan that outlines the expected locations and types of pedestrian improvements that may be desirable to accommodate 2020 LRDP growth. The plan shall be flexible to respond to changing conditions as the LRDP builds out, and shall contain optional strategies and improvements that can be applied to specific problems that arise as the LRDP builds out. The University shall develop the Plan in consultation with the City of Berkeley, and work with the City to implement plan elements as needed during the life of the LRDP on a fair share basis. LTS"

IAT agrees with this mitigation but it should be SIGNIFICANT, if a mode shift from driving to walking and alternative commuting is successful. C254-14

"5.1 2020 LRDP ALTERNATIVES
The analyses presented in Chapter 4 of this EIR finds the 2020 LRDP would result in
significant and unavoidable impacts with respect to:
Air Quality: Operational impacts from the combined total of vehicular, stationary,
and area sources may hinder the attainment of the regional Clean Air Plan. The 2020 LRDP, in combination with other cumulative projects, would result in a cumulatively considerable increase of non-attainment pollutants and
thereby conflict with the most recent Clean Air Plan. Further, with the incorporation
of diesel particulate matter into air risk analyses, the 2020 LRDP would contribute to a cumulatively considerable increase in toxic air contaminants."

Air quality would NOT be impacted if trip and auto driving were reduced, as noted earlier by IAT. Our air quality is precious particularly for the sick, babies and children. Increases in allergies has been noted in the bay area and have been attributed to the smog. Areas where air pollutants are strong, are detrimental to the health of people who exercise outdoors. Again, the Clean Air Plan and the "cumulatively considerable increase in toxic air contaminants" is a major avoidable impact with IAT C254-15

implemented mitigations to alternative transportation. C254-15

" Traffic: Traffic generated by implementation of the 2020 LRDP would contribute
to unacceptable, and unavoidable, delays at two intersections and would unavoidably exceed CMA service standards on five CMP designated roadway segments and two MTS roadway segments. Potentially significant impacts would occur at seven other intersections, and unacceptable conditions could be exacerbated at an eighth intersection; however, these could be mitigated at the
discretion of the City of Berkeley."

IAT does not agree with plans for increased auto traffic, therefore this alternative would be entirely unnecessary if traffic is reduced via alternative transportation. Some mitigations for increased pedestrian and bicycle traffic safety might be necessary, however, to add. C254-16

>" 5.1.1 ALTERNATIVE L-1: LOWER ENROLLMENT AND EMPLOYMENT GROWTH"
"5.1-4 L-1 TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC
This alternative would result in a somewhat lessened deterioration of traffic operations
in comparison to the 2020 LRDP. The lower campus headcount, relative to the 2020
LRDP, would reduce the expected future congestion at the impacted intersections and
on the CMA designated system segments included as part of the Alameda County Congestion Management Plan. The lower increments of growth in program space and
parking would also reduce local traffic impacts due to the reduction in construction activity.
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY
2 0 2 0 LRDP DRAF T E I R
5 . 1 2 02 0 LRDP ALTERNATIVE S
Local traffic operation impacts would also be lessened due to the fact the number of
new student beds would remain the same as in the 2020 LRDP. Lower enrollment growth, without a drop in planned new university housing, would enable a greater
percentage of students to reside in walking distance of campus or along transit corridors
(i.e. within the Housing Zone). The lessened traffic operation impacts and the decrease
in overall campus headcount, relative to the 2020 LRDP, would also improve pedestrian
and bicycle circulation.
This alternative would reduce the significance of LRDP Impacts TRA-2 through TRA-
12, but not necessarily to a less than significant level. In general, the mitigation measures
associated with these impacts would still be required."
5.1.2 ALTERNATIVE L-2: NO NEW PARKING AND MORE TRANSIT INCENTIVES
The impacts on vehicular circulation identified in Chapter 4.12 are due to a combination
of headcount growth and an increase in the parking inventory. The growth in campus
headcount is expected to result in an increase in the number of vehicle trips to the
campus, while the location of new parking influences the routes and destinations of
those new vehicle trips.

Several comments submitted in response to the Notice of Preparation (NOP)1 suggest
the increase in the parking inventory may itself induce new vehicle trips. Since demand
for university parking in many locations presently exceeds the supply, the difficulty of
finding parking may serve as a disincentive to drive-alone trips and, conversely, as an
incentive for alternative modes of travel.
Other commentors suggest the same type of transit price subsidy now offered to students through the UC Berkeley Class Pass program should also be offered to UC
Berkeley employees, and suggest that such a program, often described as the 'EcoPass',
could result in a significant reduction in vehicle trips."

It is strange that the LRDP makes these L-1-L4 completely separate scenarios. By themselves, each mitigation is found not acceptable. UCB should be looking at combinations of mitigations. Why was this not done? The leadership for the long range outlook could be a combination of 5.1L-1 and L-2, thus significantly reducing the impacts of overgrowth with l-1 with some allowance for research/staff growth (.5-3% annual) and in L-2 by encouraging major mode shifts, and new creative alternative transportation and housing programs heavily subsidized by the University to reward non-drivers, UC would become the leader in the nation. We could then achieve a 80% non-driver status and reduce the need for parking, reduce trips and traffic accidents over the Berkeley streets and reduce air pollution. This would increase the need for pedestrian lighting, paths and safety, increase the need for more bus shuttle services, safe bike parking and paths and free transit passes, inexpensive van and carpool permits and more involvement in cooperation with the transit services in the bay area.

C254-17

"L-1 AIR QUALITY
Development under Alternative L-1 would result in a 2020 campus headcount equal to
roughly 96 percent of the headcount projected under the 2020 LRDP. As described in
Section 4.2.7 under LRDP Impact AIR-5, any campus growth may not be consistent with the most recent Clean Air Plan and may result in a significant impact. Because it is
possible that the air district will not attain air quality standards with the inclusion of this
project in the plan, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable.
Although the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines do not require the quantification of emissions associated with a plan, daily emissions associated with Alternative L-1 were
estimated and are reported below in Table 5.1-4 for informational purposes. To evaluate
the criteria pollutant emissions from Alternative L-1, the growth ratio of Alternative L-1
to the 2020 LRDP was applied to the total operational and construction emissions from
the 2020 LRDP. Note that the 2020 LRDP emissions represent the increment of emissions from 2020 LRDP growth above the existing emissions. The following table
summarizes Alternative L-1 emissions.
TABLE 5.1-4
OPERATIONAL & CONSTRUCTION CRITERIA POLLUTANT EMISSIONS: ALTERNATIVE L-1"
"As with the 2020 LRDP, mitigation of these impacts would be implemented, but the

impact would remain significant and unavoidable.
The cumulative risk from stationary and area source toxic air contaminant emissions,
discussed in Section 4.2.9 of this EIR, under Cumulative Impact AIR-4, may be somewhat reduced proportional to the reduction in program space. However, existing
emissions for LBNL and UC Berkeley exceed the 10 in one million standard for a 70-
year exposure. Given that the primary contribution to cumulative risk is diesel particulate
matter, a slower rate of program renewal and improvement, and concomitant replacement of existing emergency diesel generators, may not be beneficial to an overall
reduction in this cumulative impact."
It is clear that the impact remains "significant and unavoidable". Again IAT would solve these air pollution problems with significant mode shifts and population caps. The impact would then be LTS and avoidable. We also approve of the "slower rate of renewal". C254-18

"L-1 TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC
This alternative would result in a somewhat lessened deterioration of traffic operations
in comparison to the 2020 LRDP. The lower campus headcount, relative to the 2020
LRDP, would reduce the expected future congestion at the impacted intersections and
on the CMA designated system segments included as part of the Alameda County Congestion Management Plan. The lower increments of growth in program space and
parking would also reduce local traffic impacts due to the reduction in construction activity.
Local traffic operation impacts would also be lessened due to the fact the number of
new student beds would remain the same as in the 2020 LRDP. Lower enrollment growth, without a drop in planned new university housing, would enable a greater
percentage of students to reside in walking distance of campus or along transit corridors
(i.e. within the Housing Zone). The lessened traffic operation impacts and the decrease
in overall campus headcount, relative to the 2020 LRDP, would also improve pedestrian
and bicycle circulation.This alternative would reduce the significance of LRDP Impacts TRA-2 through TRA-12, but not necessarily to a less than significant level. In general, the mitigation measures
associated with these impacts would still be required."

If enough subsidization for non-drivers were made available, the mode shift would be significant. Again, this is where UC needs to take a leadership role to avoid the impact of auto traffic, congestion, parking space costs and air pollution. Allowing UC to maintain "the same or equivalent" current alternative transportation programs, will only mean a failure for these programs. C254-19

A major commitment of campus mitigation funds for these programs must be made. Plans for increased pedestrian and bicycle routes would
be wonderful, quiet and beautiful planning success. UC would be lauded as the number one pollution reducer and transportation leader in the
nation. The last paragraph indicates that the alternatives would not necessarily be to a less than significant level. If UC allows these

parking spaces and growth plans to continue and refuses to find a major funding for alternative subsidization, Berkeley will continue to fail and produce pollution and congestion. C254-19

".. Provide the housing, parking, and services we require to support a vital intellectual community and promote full engagement in campus life.
The amount of housing proposed in L-1 is the same as in the 2020 LRDP. The slower
rates of growth in L-1 would result in fewer net new parking spaces, since the increment
of new parking proposed in the 2020 LRDP is derived partly from the existing parking deficit
and partly from projected future demand based on growth in enrollment and employment.
As with program space, if enrollment and employment do in fact grow at the slower
rates projected in L-1, the amount of net new parking in L-1 would be adequate: however,
UC Berkeley expects growth to occur as projected in the 2020 LRDP, and in this event the amount of net new parking in L-1 would be adequate to address the current
parking deficit, but not to meet future demand."

Again, the need for MAJOR mode shift is necessary in order to address future demand of perhaps a .5-3% annual research/staff population growth by 2020. Another guideline for UC population control would be to enlarge the upper division and graduate levels while reducing the undergraduate levels. This would enhance the status of scholarship levels at UC Berkeley while decreasing overall growth. Undergraduates could shift to very inexpensive community colleges or state universities for the first two years. Each year a shift of 5-10% of the die-hard drivers would be induced to switch to alternative transportation, thus ending the need for future new expensive parking. New models for alternative transportation must be included; Free light rail, people movers, shuttles across campus, bike paths overall the campus, safe bike parking and paths, van and carpool discounts, shuttles from distant parking areas, even bear transit along major AC routes to carry any overloaded AC routes in commute times. Free ecopasses for all types of transit must be fully subsidized. When these major changes and increases to funding for alternatives are made, the modest increased growth will actually result in a drop of parking demand for the UC population in the long run and solve the problem of handling the future "demand". C254-20

5.1.2 ALTERNATIVE L-2: NO NEW PARKING AND MORE TRANSIT INCENTIVES
The impacts on vehicular circulation identified in Chapter 4.12 are due to a combination
of headcount growth and an increase in the parking inventory. The growth in campus
headcount is expected to result in an increase in the number of vehicle trips to the
campus, while the location of new parking influences the routes and destinations of
those new vehicle trips.
Several comments submitted in response to the Notice of Preparation (NOP)1 suggest
the increase in the parking inventory may itself induce new vehicle trips. Since demand
for university parking in many locations presently exceeds the supply, the difficulty of
finding parking may serve as a disincentive to drive-alone trips and, conversely, as an

incentive for alternative modes of travel.
Other commentors suggest the same type of transit price subsidy now offered to students through the UC Berkeley Class Pass program should also be offered to UC
Berkeley employees, and suggest that such a program, often described as the 'EcoPass',
could result in a significant reduction in vehicle trips."
"5 . 1 2 02 0 LRDP ALTERNATIVE S"
"5.1-8
In Alternative L-2, no new university parking would be constructed under the auspices
of the 2020 LRDP. The Southside/Downtown TDM Study2 could guide development of new or expanded incentive programs, parking management programs, or transit improvement programs, by UC Berkeley alone or in collaboration with the city of
Berkeley. However, the changes in campus headcount through 2020 would be the same
as in the 2020 LRDP, and therefore the figures for program space, as well as for
housing, would also be the same as in the 2020 LRDP. Clearly, further reductions in
vehicle trips might be achieved if headcount growth were also reduced, as in L-1, but
this alternative serves the purpose of isolating and maximizing the effects of less new
parking."

Again, we advocate both l-1 headcount reduction and parking reductions, so that the counts would not be the same. **C254-21**

"TABLE 5.1-5 Estimated Projected 2020 ALTERNATIVE L-2: HEADCOUNT 2001-2002
2020 LRDP Alternative L-2 Regular Term Students 31,800 33,450 33,450
Faculty 1,760 1,980 1,980 Academic Staff 3,040 4,880 4,880 Nonacademic Staff 8,140 8,950 8,950 Visitors & Vendors 1,200 2,000 2,000
Total Regular Terms Headcount 45,940 51,260 51,260
Net Growth by 2020 5,320 5,320
Total Employment 12,940 15,810 15,810
Net Growth by 2020 2,870 2,870
TABLE 5.1-6 Actual + Foreseeable Projected 2020
ALTERNATIVE L-2: PROPOSED SPACE 2001-2002 2020 LRDP Alternative L-2
Program Space (GSF) 12,100,000 14,300,000 14,300,000
Net Growth by 2020 2,200,000 2,200,000
Net Lab Space Growth by 2020 700,000 700,000
Housing (bed spaces) 8,190 10,790 10,790
Net Growth by 2020 2,600 2,600
Parking (auto spaces) 7,690 9,990 7,690
Net Growth by 2020 2,300 0
TABLE 5.1-7
ALTERNATIVE L-2: PROGRAM Program Space (GSF) Parking (spaces)"
"5.1-9
L-2 AIR QUALITY
Reduced parking on campus may decrease the total vehicle miles traveled for this
alternative, if people would use more transit options without the availability of parking.
This would be a benefit to air quality, but the total operational emissions from all
sources would not be reduced to below a level of significance. No matter what the
reduction in vehicular emissions, non-vehicular source emissions would remain

unaccounted for in projections informing the Clean Air Plan.
The cumulative risk from stationary and area source toxic air contaminant emissions,
discussed in Section 4.2.9 of this EIR, under Cumulative Impact AIR-4, would not be
reduced in this alternative. While a potential increase in transit-related diesel particulate
emissions may occur, as described in Section 4.2.7, overall, mobile source emissions are
lessening to meet new regulatory standards, as discussed under Cumulative Impact AIR-3."

We dispute the argument that reduction in the vehicular emissions would not significantly impact the Clean Air Plan. As buses continue to use new clean air standards and major mode shift occur by 2020 to 80% overall commuter mode use to alternative transportation.; Overall, emissions would be significantly reduced. C254-22

"L-2 CULTURAL RESOURCES
The potential cultural resource impacts under Alternative L-2 would in general be the
same as described for the 2020 LRDP. The Best Practices and Mitigation Measures
described in Chapter 4.4 regarding historical, archaeological and paleontological
resources would apply under Alternative L-2 and, in general, would avoid significant
impacts. The special circumstances under which demolition or alteration of a significant
resource is unavoidable would also have roughly the same potential to occur in L-2,
since the building program is identical to the 2020 LRDP except for parking.
L-2 NOISE If no new parking is constructed there would be a reduction in the amount of construction noise. The conclusion that the impact would be significant and unavoidable for the LRDP also applies to Alternative L-2 because the application of mitigation measures
would not be sufficient to avoid a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels.
All other conclusions regarding the noise for the LRDP would be the same for Alternative L-2."
We agree that the reduction to construction noise is a great plus!

"L-2 TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC
Under this alternative, every effort would be made to accommodate growth through
shifting commuters to transportation alternatives3 and new parking would not be
constructed. . This would create a new significant parking impact, under the Standard
of Significance “Would the project result in inadequate parking capacity?” The existing
shortage of parking compared to demand would be exacerbated by future growth in
campus headcount proposed under the 2020 LRDP. Construction-period impacts would remain significant impacts as construction materials storage and staging areas,
and lots that could be used for construction worker attendant parking, would be scarcer.
Visitors and retail shoppers may experience greater parking difficulties in the vicinity of

campus. 4
With additional transit incentives, and no new university parking, a greater percentage of
the campus population would likely use transit to travel to and from campus. A shift to
more transit use would reduce the expected future congestion at the impacted intersections.
However, there is also some potential for local traffic congestion to increase, as
the result of longer searches for available spaces by those who continue to drive."

We dispute the argument that if there is a major mode shift to alternative transportation "there is also some potential for local traffic congestion to increase, as the result of longer searches for available spaces by those who continue to drive." The numbers would be in the mode shift; AGAIN, if significant numbers of drivers gave up driving, more parking spaces would be available to the total pool of drivers thus ending the great parking space hunt and street congestion, air pollution problems" "Construction-period impacts would remain significant impacts as construction materials storage and staging areas, and lots that could be used for construction worker attendant parking, would be scarcer." If the overall mode shift occurs, if parking spaces would be capped at the current cap (without 1000 at Underhill), even construction parking could be available or carved from the open construction areas themselves temporarily as currently utilized. This would then be a less than significant impact. **C254-23**

"5.1-10 Thus, LRDP Impacts TRA-6, TRA-7 and TRA-8 would likely remain significant
impacts. There could be new significant impacts on AC Transit and/or BART service, if
the ridership grows to a level that cannot be supported by current and planned future
service levels, due to the combination of transit incentives and lack of new parking to
serve a larger campus headcount."

We encourage UC to work closely with all the transit authorities and other cities to ensure adequate funding for main campus transit routes as a part of the overall alternative transportation planning. Again, bicycles mitigations, Bear Transit and other alternative transportation mitigations must be increased to allow maximum mode shift from cars and not overload any one transit authority. **C254-24**

L-2 OTHER ANTICIPATED EFFECTS
AESTHETICS
The potential aesthetic impacts under Alternative L-2 would in general be the same as
described for the 2020 LRDP since the amount of new program space and housing would be the same as under the 2020 LRDP. The Best Practices and Mitigation Measures described in Chapter 4.1 would apply under Alternative L-2 and mitigate any
potential impacts to less than significant levels.
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES
No significant unavoidable adverse impacts on biological

.. Plan every new project to respect and enhance the character, livability, and
cultural vitality of our City Environs.
The increase in parking demand due to growth in enrollment and employment, without

any increase in the parking supply, would likely result in more UC Berkeley students and
employees parking in the districts around campus, particularly unregulated residential
districts. Commentors on the NOP already perceive this as a serious problem, and it
might be expected to worsen under L-2, unless incentives such as the EcoPass induce
substantial numbers of single drivers to shift to alternate modes. Based on past surveys
of both students and employees, UC Berkeley considers the potential of such programs
to be modest, given the already low drive-alone rate at UC Berkeley and the relatively
low priority of cost as a mode selection factor.
The relationship of Alternative L-2 to the other objectives would not differ significantly
from the 2020 LRDP, except as described above with respect to significant environmental

C254-25

The previous failure of programs goes along with the top priority of "profit" for building selling more parking permits, more parking spaces, a lack of vision, poor publicity, and minimal funding for alternative transportation. For example, bus drivers were not adequately informed about the 1999 pilot staff ecopass plan for the Rockridge Bart bus line; Thus, some drivers were rude to passengers attempting to use the new pass system and forced them off the buses. Many UC commuters were unware of the program. UC looks upon the loss of permit holders as a loss of income rather than a success at less congestion and cleaner air.

When alternative programs fail and they are determined beforehand shown to be a "low priority" and the efforts to create better priorities are not made. Flexibility is necessary to allow a gradual shift to a new mode- for example allowing free occasional parking permits for non-drivers. Changing the priorities from parking to alternative transportation is the way to make this program begin to work for the entire UC population. Other benefits for alternative transportation should be emphasized: For example, a fitness program could be worked out together with the recreation sports and health centers, emphasizing the importance of exercise (walking /biking). Furthermore, a environmentally conscious campaign, to encourage less driving which might be less self-interest as socially conscious interest for cleaner air, should be made. Priorities can change. UC needs to ensure that this happens.

L-3 AIR QUALITY
Localized carbon monoxide and particulate matter impacts would decrease because
some trips would divert to Richmond Field Station. However, other vehicle emissions
(NOx and ROG) are more of a regional air quality issue due to the fact that some
pollutants are transported downwind of the emission source (unlike carbon monoxide
and particulate matter, which disperse rapidly). Since the total student, staff, and faculty
population would not change but some would be merely displaced, the total vehicle
emissions would remain roughly the same as the 2020 LRDP. There would be a slight
change in miles traveled since Richmond Field Station is located four miles

north of the
Campus, but this would not cause a substantial change in total emissions. The cumulative risk from stationary and area source toxic air contaminant emissions,
discussed in Section 4.2.9 of this EIR, under Cumulative Impact AIR-4, may be somewhat reduced proportional to the reduction in program space on the Campus. However, existing emissions for LBNL and UC Berkeley exceed the 10 in one million
standard for a 70-year exposure. Given that the primary contribution to cumulative risk
is diesel particulate matter, a slower rate of program renewal and improvement on the
Campus because of off-site development under this Alternative, and concomitant replacement of existing emergency diesel generators, may not be beneficial to an overall
reduction in this cumulative impact. Toxic air contaminant emissions would increase in
the vicinity of the Richmond Field Station.

Overall, again increasing toxic air contaminants at ANY site should be stopped with planning including the Richmond Field station."The cumulative risk from stationary and area source toxic air contaminant emissions,discussed in Section 4.2.9 of this EIR, under Cumulative Impact AIR-4, may be somewhat reduced proportional to the reduction in program space on the Campus." **C254-26**

This factor is of major concern and is hidden in the middle of the paragraph.

"Because the same amount of parking would be added as in the 2020 LRDP, parking
impacts would remain essentially the same, although the relative demand for the new
parking would be slightly lower and thus the pressure for non-auto commuters to shift
modes would be slightly lower. The construction-related impacts would be slightly
lessened due to lower construction levels on campus. The alternative would result in a new significant impact related to shuttle service between the RFS and the Campus Park, as it is likely that additional shuttle vehicles and more frequent service would be required to link the two sites. The current shuttle's fare is not covered by the Class Pass Program. The additional fare and the inconvenience of the shuttle may cause people to use their personal vehicles. This in turn would have the effect of increasing congestion at the study intersections, especially to the north and west of the Campus Park.
In addition, this alternative could produce traffic congestion impacts in the vicinity of
the RFS, particularly because that site is not as well-served by transit (BART and AC
Transit buses) as the Campus Park, nor as well located within bicycling/walking distance
of substantial housing opportunities.

If alternatives remote parking could be made for shuttles to the main campus, people living in those vicinities would reduce travel emissions. To be successful, the shuttles would need to be frequent and fast relative to auto traffic. This would involve perhaps even a way to increase special parking for UC people at BART parking stations in other remote areas where UC people might be encouraged to park and take BART. If transit increases succeed, a mitigation may be needed with curb cuts/and **C254-27**

new bus loading areas. C254-27

"5.1.5 ALTERNATIVES WITHDRAWN FROM CONSIDERATION
During the scoping process, other alternatives were considered, but as a result of
qualitative analysis were determined either to be infeasible or to offer no significant
environmental benefits over the 2020 LRDP or Alternatives L-1 through L-4, and were
therefore not analyzed quantitatively.

We dispute the argument that L1-L-4 were infeasible or offered no significant environmental benefit. Again, the combination of L1-L4 were not considered. Complete disregard for a combination of alternatives is a major oversight in this LRDP/EIR. C254-28

Indeed, the environmental benefits would be profound with major reduced vehicle trips to campus. The inability of planning is evident in envisioning the necessary changes necessary to produce a major mode shift of travel. There indeed would be significant environmental benefits, if a paradigm shift toward making and funding the alternatives were made.

"ALTERNATIVE L-5: LESS NEW UNIVERSITY HOUSING
TRAFFIC A strategy of building less new university housing is likely to make traffic conditions worse, because the LRDP Housing Zone is designed to ensure the location of this new housing encourages alternate modes of travel to and from campus. If less new university housing is built in the LRDP Housing Zone, more students would likely live farther
from campus, in places less convenient to transit, and would be more likely to drive.

We agree that less new housing is not a good alternative and agree that it would increase drivers.

ALTERNATIVE L-6: MORE NEW UNIVERSITY HOUSING

We dispute the need to increase rents and would like to see the use of the planned increased fees or researching new grants & or endowments for students, faculty and staff be used to subsidize this housing. The closer UC people live to campus the less driving problems are created. Some new discount housing for staff would be a major help to low income staff. C254-29

5.1.6 2020 LRDP ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE
For this reason, despite the potential environmental advantages of Alternative L-1, the
2020 LRDP represents the best balance of institutional objectives and environmental
stewardship.

Oddly, the reduction of head count is found to be the most superior alternative ignoring that increases of growth cannot be accommodated by a simple mode shift to alternative transportation. IAT disputes this L-1 as the best choice although it is also feasible . Lack of vision in alternative transportation is degrading Berkeley. C254-30

If excellence is a goal and growth of research population is what needed to keep UCB at the top, the choice for the most superior alternative should really be L-2! No new parking and increased transit alternatives. Again, a best solution for UC is a combination of L1 & L2 which would bring about both educational and research goals as well as improving environmental C254-31

C254-31

impacts.

C254-32

Lastly, We expect that major changes will be made to the final LRDP/DEIR concerning alternative transportation additions we have included and that the parking space quota increases be eliminated. The egregious omissions and concerns noted here require the LRDP/DEIR authors respond with a detailed analysis of each point within this commentary.

This will involve a major investment of time and work by the authors of the LRDP, but if we truly want to preserve our air quality, end the auto congestion crisis and improve our transportation needs, these detailed additions and changes must be made.

Norah Foster,
(with approval of Steve Geller, Elinor Levine, and Joan Gatten) Staff at LBNL -UCB.
P.S.
Please see the letter/comments also sent from the Improve Alternative Transportation Committee.

Norah R.J.Foster, Manager, Graduate Services, 208 Doe Library Berkeley, CA 94720
nfoster@library.berkeley.edu 510 642-4481, FAX 510 643-0315
"Our separate struggles are really one. A struggle for freedom, for dignity and for humanity.'" - Martin L. King in a telegram to Cesar Chavez

11.2C.254 RESPONSE TO COMMENT LETTER C254

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C254-1
The CEQA Guidelines describe the circumstances that merit recirculation of an EIR (CEQA Guidelines 15088.5). Significant new information has not been added to the EIR; recirculation, therefore, is not warranted.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C254-2
Air quality impacts of the 2020 LRDP are analyzed in section 4.2.7 of the Draft EIR. Mitigation measures proposed in the Draft EIR to improve vehicle level of service would be implemented in accordance with applicable safety codes. The 2020 LRDP may result in an increase in vehicular traffic, but the Draft EIR includes measures to ensure that any increase that does occur is handled as safely as possible. Analysis of possible accident risks due to possible increases in traffic attributable to LRDP implementation would be speculative, and is not required by CEQA.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C254-3
UC Berkeley concurs that a goal should be to reduce present levels of parking demand; this policy appears at page 3.1-29 of the Draft EIR. See also Thematic Response 3 regarding LRDP alternatives.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C254-4
The writer is referred to responses to comment letter B7a for a description of the joint City/UC Transportation Demand Management Study, its menu of alternative transit programs, and its relationship to the 2020 LRDP EIR. With regard to the request that UC Berkeley cap population growth, the 2020 LRDP includes a policy to stabilize enrollment at page 3.1-13.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C254-5
Air quality implications of added vehicle trips are analyzed at page 4.2-20, 4.2-26 to 28 and 4.2-31 to 32 of the Draft EIR. Where appropriate, mitigations are also proposed.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C254-6
Please see response to comment C254-5, above. See Thematic Response 10 regarding transportation alternatives.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS C254-7 THRU 9
Please see response to comment B7-102.

The writer's recommendations regarding appropriate capital project policies are noted.

The project proposed as the 2020 LRDP has been carefully crafted to respond to the mission of the University of California, Berkeley. The writer's additional recommendations would alter the proposed project by reducing enrollment or parking, compromising UC Berkeley's ability to meet its mission.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C254-10
See Thematic Response 10 regarding transportation alternatives.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C254-11
The writer's opinions are noted. A proposed parking garage would be subject to project-specific environmental review. See Thematic Response 1 regarding the role of the LRDP EIR in project-specific review.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C254-12
The writer's opinions are noted. UC Berkeley expects the 2020 LRDP parking program will allow parking to be available, as well as "capped".

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C254-13
UC Berkeley agrees that shifting walkers and alternative transportation users to driving is a negative impact. The noted mitigations at TRA-11 are intended to prevent this outcome.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C254-14
Please see page 4.0-2 to 4.0-3 of the 2020 LRDP Draft EIR, explaining the format for the impact discussions..

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C254-15
Please see response to comments 254-7 thru 254-9, above.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C254-16
See Thematic Response 3 regarding LRDP alternatives.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C254-17
The writer's preference for an alternative program that reduces enrollment growth while expanding subsidies for housing and transit is noted.

UC Berkeley is committed to improvement of its alternative transit programs. Given cost and authority constraints, however, improvements implemented by UC Berkeley are unlikely to result in the scale of mode shift envisioned by the comment. Alternative L-2 appropriately presents the alternative of "no new parking and more transit incentives." The writer's additional recommendations would alter the proposed project by reducing enrollment, compromising UC Berkeley's ability to respond to its mission.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C254-18
Please see response to comment 254-17, above.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C254-19
The writer's preference for an alternative program that reduces enrollment growth while expanding subsidies for housing and transit is noted.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C254-20
The writer's recommendations regarding the campus enrollment plan, and alternative transit programs, are noted. The City/UC TDM study presents a full menu of strategies for shifting drivers to alternative transportation. In Chapter 8, the TDM study also indicates the effectiveness of each potential strategy. The more effective strategies are either the more costly, or outside the authority of the University to unilaterally implement.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C254-21
Please see response to comment 254-17, above.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C254-22
The writer's opinions are noted.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C254-23
The analysis referred to by the commentor assumes no new parking, and some increase in alternative transit users, but not enough to constitute "a major mode shift." See Response to comment 254-20, above.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C254-24
UC Berkeley is eager to work with other agencies to implement alternative transit program improvements. Recently, UC Berkeley and AC Transit announced the Bear Pass program for UC faculty and staff. Other innovations are sought and welcomed.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C254-25
The writer's opinions and assessment of outreach related to alternative transit programs are noted. UC Berkeley is eager to consider additional options to increase the attractiveness of alternative transit. Please see Thematic Response 10 regarding the Rockridge Shuttle and conclusions of the related survey.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C254-26
UC Berkeley disagrees with the writer's assessment that the cumulative significance of toxic air contaminants is hidden. See the discussion at page 4.2-33 to 4.2-34 of the Draft EIR, and at page 6-1.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C254-27
See the discussion of satellite parking in Thematic Response 3, LRDP Alternatives.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C254-28
See response to comment 254-27, above.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C254-29
The writer's support for staff housing discounts is noted.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS C254-30 THRU 31
See response to comment 254-17, above.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C254-32
Please see above responses to the comments in letter C254.

LETTER C255

JAVICARS@aol.com
06/18/2004 12:05 PM

To: 2020LRDP@cp.berkeley.edu
cc: gordon.wozniak@sbcglobal.net
Subject: Constructing new dormitorys

Dear Ms. Lawrence,

As a native Berkeley resident, homeowner and investment real estate broker I recommend the construction of new dorm rooms be dropped and UC should work on better utilization of their existing housing. C255-1

It is my understanding that UC housing is not subsidized in the same way as other departments so that it needs to pay for itself. Funds for housing come from a different source and have different requirements attached to them.

As an investment real estate broker who primarily sells apartment buildings in the Berkeley area I frequently take an informal poll on the number of vacancies from the larger investors. My estimate of the current vacancy factor is approximately 5.75%. This will probably grow with the new housing coming on line within the next year C255-2

The doms are running a serious vacancy factor now. Most students only stay the required year in dorms and move to private housing because it is affordable and allows more flexibility. I cannot see how they will compete with the older housing stock which will adjust their prices much lower than the dorms. Another competitor will be the 525 new units under construction. Building new dorms would be an irresponsible use of tax payer's money and resources.

I am also concerned as a homeowner, about the additional tax burden on Berkeley homeowners and the strain on City resources. This is not mention the traffic congestion and parking which has become noticeably worse in the past few years. C255-3

Please let me know if you need more information on any of the above to develop a better use of scarce public funding.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jon Vicars

Jon A. Vicars
ERI Investment Real Estate
2980 College Ave. Suite 5
Berkeley, CA 94705
510-849-9280
510-849-2678 fax

11.2C.255 RESPONSE TO COMMENT LETTER C255

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS C255-1 AND C255-2

The growth in the number of students is one, but not the only, reason for the proposed increase in student housing. University student housing near campus also provides students with the community of peers and mentors, and the access to academic resources, they require to excel. The targets for student housing in the 2020 LRDP reflect the longterm goals established in the UC Berkeley Strategic Academic Plan.

However, because the state provides no funds for student housing, the entire cost of construction, operation, and maintenance must be supported by rents. UC Berkeley's goals to improve the cost and quality of housing must therefore be balanced by the need to keep rents at reasonable levels and avoid building surplus capacity. The 2020 targets, and the pace at which we achieve them, may be adjusted in the future to reflect changes in market conditions and demand for University housing. The completion of the 1,100 new student beds now under construction will provide the first test of demand, since these units will come on line after a period of substantial private housing construction in the campus vicinity.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C255-3

See Thematic Response 4 regarding fiscal impacts, and Thematic Response 7 regarding land acquisition and tax exemption.

Telegraph
AREA ASSOCIATION

LETTER C256

June 18, 2004

Ms. Jennifer Lawrence
Co-Director 2020 LRDP EIR
Facilities Services
1936 University Avenue, #300
University of California, Berkeley
Berkeley, CA 94720-1382

Dear Ms. Lawrence:

On behalf of the Telegraph Area Association (TAA), please accept these comments in response to our review of the University of California's 2020 Long Range Development Plan EIR.

TAA is a broad coalition of residents, merchants, property owners, students, churches, service providers, the City of Berkeley, the University of California, and other individuals and organizations working to achieve a safe, attractive, and economically vital neighborhood for living, working, study, worship, shopping and recreation.

As a community development organization, TAA's current mission is to bring together the diverse stakeholders in the Southside neighborhoods of Berkeley to improve the quality of community and family life and to revitalize the economy of the area. TAA provides opportunities for area stakeholders to become actively involved in the following program areas: economic development, public safety, community planning, parking and transportation, housing advocacy, community social services advocacy, promotion and the arts and leadership development.

TAA's core funders are the City of Berkeley, the University of California and a varied group of foundations, businesses, and individuals. We are very grateful for the University's continued financial support and their partnering with us in our continuing efforts to make the Telegraph Avenue Area a safe, attractive, clean and supportive neighborhood for its many users.

Because our constituency is so diverse, it would be difficult for TAA's Committees to prioritize their concerns regarding the UC LRDP. However, we do request that the UC

2509 HASTE ST. BERKELEY, CA 94704 ◆ Tel: 510-649-9500 ◆ Fax: 510-649-9518 ◆ EMAIL: taa@telegraphberkeley.org
WEBSITE: www.telegraphberkeley.org

LDRP take into consideration the attached TAA Community Planning and Economic Development Joint Recommendations on Southside Planning, dated June 6, 2000, most of which we believe is still valid today for any development which impacts the Telegraph Avenue Area. Please find a copy attached to this letter.

Our June 6, 2000 recommendations in general state: TAA supports plans and actions which ensure that Telegraph Avenue remains a pedestrian-friendly prominent entrance to the University; the revitalization of the commercial district; increase affordable housing; development of public transit; maintenance of an adequate supply of short-term public parking, and the quality of life for both students and long term residents.

Specifically then we would like to draw your attention to recommendations #3, #6, #13, #14, #16 and #17 which respectively deal with the issues impacted by the LRDP: neighborhood serving businesses, harmony with historical context, provision of more UC housing, retention and improvement of People's Park, encouraging the use of public transit, and efficiently sharing and managing parking resources. C256-1

TAA encourages the University of California in the LRDP to adhere to the provisions of the City of Berkeley's General Plan and the Draft Southside Plan. We acknowledge that the University faces an enormous undertaking in addressing both the financial and development challenges of implementing the 2020 LRDP. We strongly recommend that the University work closely with the City of Berkeley and community groups like TAA, business improvement districts and other quality of life advocates to ensure that the projects proposed in the Plan are implemented with the minimum negative impact on the lives of residents, merchants, students, visitors and other organizations (churches, schools, etc.) which share neighborhood space with the University. Further, TAA is committed to working with the University and City of Berkeley to develop plans and programs that address the stresses and concerns of the Southside Community in this anticipated period of growth and change. C256-2

Sincerely,

M. Karoline De Martini

M. Karoline De Martini
Executive Director, Telegraph Area Association

Attachment

LETTER C256
Attachment

Telegraph Area Association
Community Planning Committee
Economic Development Committee

Joint Recommendations on Southside Planning to TAA Board June 6, 2000

We support plans and actions which ensure: that Telegraph Avenue remains a pedestrian-friendly prominent entrance to the University; the revitalization of the commercial district; increased affordable housing; development of public transit; and maintenance of an adequate supply of short-term public parking.

Specifically:

1) Encourage the visual and pedestrian connection between the commercial district and upper and lower Sproul Plaza.
2) Because the continuing vitality of the Telegraph commercial district is in the best interest of the University long term, urge the University to adopt policies which:
   - limit commercial development on campus to types of businesses which do not compete with Avenue businesses,
   - invite and give preference to local businesses to compete for all commercial opportunities which may arise on campus, including both permanent on-campus installations and off-campus providers.
3) Solicit a variety of neighborhood-serving businesses such as a green grocer, enabling residents to shop for daily needs in the area. C256-3
4) Support local hiring utilizing the City of Berkeley First Source Employment Program and other community-based organizations. Encourage the training and hiring of local residents and students.
5) Work with the Street Vendors Committee and the City to enforce handcrafted standards for merchandise; to encourage new vendors with well-crafted and unique products; and to design and enforce placement standards for the Christmas Fair.
6) Pursue facade grants to restore Telegraph Area store-fronts in harmony with the historic context of the Area. C256-4
7) Improve procedures and design review guidelines for new construction and alterations to reflect the historic character of the Area. (See p. 184 & 185 of Draft Southside Plan.)
8) Improve linkage of the Parker to Dwight block to upper Telegraph Avenue by streetscape changes and signage.

9) Work with the City and the University to obtain funding for 10 informational kiosks to be set up in the Area.
10) Advocate for the maintenance of the University Art Museum, the Pacific Film Archive and the Hearst Museum of Anthropology in their current or nearby locations.
11) Enhance and support Telegraph Area as a major regional draw for books, music, fashion, and culture.
12) Support the diversity of small, community-based businesses in Sather Gate Mall. Support the creation of an entrance directly to Telegraph from the Mail. This will allow for the building of more public restrooms on the site and allow 24-hour access to them from Telegraph.
13) Encourage me provision of more housing for UC staff, students, faculty, and non-university employees, some of which should be available for owner occupancy. C256-5
14) Retain People's Park as open space; as a commons for the Southside, which would open on surrounding historic and landmark structures. Improve as a city park which is user-friendly and safe. Improve or replace and possibly relocate the bathrooms and park facility. Provide increased lighting in the park and on all the streets surrounding the park. C256-6
15) Encourage late night usages on the Avenue including shopping and cultural events.
16) Public transportation
    a. Encourage unproved AC transit in area, including late night and 24-hour availability as well as shuttle bus services. C256-7
    b. Encourage light-rail up Telegraph in conjunction with AC Transit planning, optimizing transit from Jack London Square up Telegraph to Bancroft and downtown Berkeley.
17) Parking
    a. Develop shared parking agreements between the City, the University and private parking providers to efficiently share and better utilize existing Southside parking, particularly short-term, customer parking. (Policy TP-E1 Draft Southside Plan, p. 96) C256-8
    b. Create visible and clearly worded signage to guide people to use the University and other lots.
    c. Adopt a policy of no net loss of short-term customer parking spaces.
18) Maintain Bancroft and Durant as one-way streets.

11.2C.256 RESPONSE TO COMMENT LETTER C256

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C256-1

These remarks serve as an introduction to more detailed comments below.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C256-2

As noted in section 3.1.14, UC Berkeley is committed to using the Southside Plan as its guide for the location and design of future projects in the Southside. With respect to the Berkeley General Plan, Best Practice LU-2c ensures any new project would be subject to further CEQA review if it "... includes a use not permitted within the city general plan designation or has a greater number of stories and/or lesser setback dimensions than could be permitted for a project under the city zoning ordinance as of July 2003."

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C256-3

Land use in private properties is not within the jurisdiction of UC Berkeley, although the University does encourage mixed-use projects where private uses, particularly at street level, can enhance the economic and cultural vitality of the city. The Manville Apartments project is one example.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C256-4

Grants to private enterprises for façade improvements is not within the jurisdiction of UC Berkeley.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C256-5

The 2020 LRDP includes up to 2,500 new University student beds and up to 100 new University faculty units. The University already has several programs in place to encourage home ownership, as described in section 4.10.4.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C256-6

People's Park would be retained as open space under the 2020 LRDP.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C256-7

The University supports improved AC Transit bus service, and also provides a number of complementary services though its own transportation programs, as described in Thematic Response 10. UC Berkeley is an active participant in the plans for enhanced transit in the Telegraph corridor, but does not currently have a position on the specific technology to be used.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C256-8

No net loss of short-term parking is expected as the result of the 2020 LRDP: on the contrary, the number of such spaces in the UC Berkeley inventory would increase. Improvements in parking signage and wayfinding systems, and shared parking models, are under consideration within the context of the 2020 LRDP parking program.

LETTER C257

June 6, 2004

Jennifer Lawrence
University of California, Berkeley
Facilities Services
1936 University Avenue Suite #300
Berkeley, CA 94720-1380

RE: Comments on UC Berkeley's 2020 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) Draft Environmental Impact Report

Dear Ms. Lawrence:

As a resident of the Berkeley Hills I am writing you today to express my opposition to the 100-unit high-density housing development proposed in the UC 2020 LRDP. The contiguous area to this development is zoned for very low-density housing, and for good reason. This is a single-family residential district. Because we live in one of the most high-risk fire zones in the United States, it is essential that we maintain adequate egress from our neighborhood, as well as access for emergency vehicles. Already, we have seen an intolerable increase in parking problems, and traffic congestion near the Grizzly Peak Boulevard, Centennial Drive area due to growth from the UC Space Sciences lab. The addition of 100 high-density housing units, along with the automobile traffic they will create is simply not acceptable.

It is also critical that we stop further destruction of the upper Strawberry Creek Watershed. Construction of impermeable surfaces, such as buildings and parking lots, will increase run-off and will detrimentally impact the City of Berkeley's aging infrastructure. Sections of the proposed development site sits on an aquifer (underground lake) that, in times of emergency, such as a break on the EBMUD water line at the Caldecott Tunnel, could provide potable water for the entire city of Berkeley. Additionally, this site sits next to the Lawrence Hall of Science Fault Zone, between the Hayward/Wildcat Canyon fault lines – hardly a logical place for housing. Finally, further destruction of one of the few remaining open spaces in Berkeley is intolerable.

The City of Berkeley is experiencing an historical residential housing vacancy rate. There is also a great deal of construction of condominiums and townhouses in progress, all of which are within walking distance to campus. It makes much more sense to utilize available housing within the stated objectives of the LRDP ("within one mile from campus") than to begin an environmentally unsound and costly project that will only have negative impacts on the city infrastructure and potentially put people's lives at risk during a fire or other emergency.

In view of the above, please explain how you are planning to mitigate all the health and safety hazards created for the neighborhood including inadequate egress in the case of fire and/or earthquake, increased traffic, noise, pollution, lack of infrastructure, and lack of parking, which will ensue due to the increase in population from the proposed high-density housing project.

Yours truly,

Melanie Bellah 10 Mosswood Rd.

Signature Address

11.2C.257 RESPONSE TO COMMENT LETTER C257

The University received 138 form letters signed by individuals, objecting to the proposal for up to 100 faculty housing units in the Hill Campus: C111-C121, C125-C159, C161-C165, C167-C171, C173-C179, C182-C183, C194-C216, C219-C239, C241-C250, C257, C259, C263-C264, C267, C278-C279, C282-C283, C285-C293, and C300. A few of these letters, such as C111, include brief postscript comments, primarily objecting to the number of current UC employees whom the writers assert are parking on city streets to avoid paying UC parking fees.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT LETTER 257

See Thematic Response 8 for a comprehensive response to comments on Hill Campus development. Due partly to comments received and partly to its uncertain near-term feasibility, faculty housing has been deleted as a potential future Hill Campus use in the 2020 LRDP. As noted in Thematic Response 8, the site formerly designated H1 has been redesignated as a reserve site, while former site H2 has been redesignated as part of the surrounding research zone.

LETTER C258

Ernest Sotelo
<e.sotelo@worldnet.att.net>
06/18/2004 12:50 PM

To: "2020 LRDP" <"2020 LRDP"@cp.berkeley.edu>
cc:
Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Report of UCB's Long Range Development Plan.

21 Mosswood Road
Berkeley, CA 94704-1819

Ms Jennifer Lawrence
University of California, Berkeley
Facilities Services
1936 University Avenue Suite #300
Berkeley CA 94720-1380

Dear Ms Lawrence,

I object to the installation of lights for television broadcasts at the Memorial Stadium.These lights are addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Report of UCB's Long Range Development Plan. Under *Areas of Controversy*, the Report includes: "light and glare impacts from future use changes at Memorial Stadium." The report goes on to say that light and glare would be mitigated to be less than significant by using "shields and cut-offs." C258-1

I wish to bring to your attention the lights at the intercollgiate rugby field. When those lights were installed, I objected to them on the basis of the adverse intrusion of light and glare into my home and those of my neighbors. My living room is at about the same elevation as the light clusters of the rugby field. Initially the light and glare was more than intolerable. In response to the complaints from my neighbors and myself, the University installed shields and cut-offs. The first set installed were a complete failure. The shields and cut-offs finally installed mitigated, to a degree, the determental effect of the lights. However, the determintal effect of the lights was not reduced to a less than significant level.

The proposed stadium lights would be just as objectionable, if not more so. The distances and elevations from my house to the proposed lights would be approximately the same as to the rugby field lights. In addition, the stadium light clusters would have more lamps than those on the rugby field clusters. This would be for the clusters facing my house.

There would be other detrimental impacts from the proposed stadium lights:

- In daylight these execrable stadium lights would dominate the view from my neighborhood. C258-2
- When used, there would be the concurrent noise from the stadium, the public address system and the spectators. Now, the noise might be comparable to that when football games are played during the day. However, the noise would be more objectionable at night when we are entitled to peace and quiet. C258-3
- Traffic in the vicinity of the Memorial Stadium including Panoramic Hill would be C258-4

impossible during night games. Again there traffic is a severe problem during day games. During night games, the traffic problem would be exacerabated. C258-4

- Then there is the vital need to provide some means of evacuating Panoramic Hill in event of an emergency such as Oakland Hills fire. At present, evacuation from Panoramic Hill would be marginal at best if a fire crossed Claremont Canyon. It would be marginal if the evacuation was attempted during daylight hours. If evacuation were to be attempted during a night football game, some loss of life would occur. C258-5

I strongly urge that the installation of lights for television broadcasts at the Memorial Stadium be abandoned.

Very truly yours,
Ernest Sotelo

11.2C.258 RESPONSE TO COMMENT LETTER C258

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS C258-1 AND C258-2

At this point no specific project at Memorial Stadium has yet been defined to a level of detail adequate to support project level CEQA review. See Thematic Response 1 for an explanation of how the 2020 LRDP and its EIR would be used in project level review.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS C258-3 THRU C258-5

These comments appear to follow from the assumption that new Stadium lighting would result in more night games at the Stadium. The writer's opposition to lighting at the Stadium is noted. Please see response to comments 258-1 and 258-2, above.

LETTER C259

Ernest Sotelo
<e.sotelo@worldnet.att.net>

To: "2020 LRDP" <"2020 LRDP"@cp.berkeley.edu>
cc:
Subject: Long Range Development Development Plan

06/18/2004 01:17 PM

Dear Ms Lawrence,
Attached are comments in opposition to the housing development proposed in the UC 2020 LRDP.

Very truly yours,
Ernest Sotelo

Long Range Development Plan.

June 6, 2004

Jennifer Lawrence
University of California, Berkeley
Facilities Services
1936 University Avenue Suite #300
Berkeley, CA 94720-1380

LETTER C259
Continued

RE: Comments on UC Berkeley's 2020 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) Draft Environmental Impact Report

Dear Ms. Lawrence:

As a resident of the Berkeley Hills I am writing you today to express my opposition to the 100-unit high-density housing development proposed in the UC 2020 LRDP. The contiguous area to this development is zoned for very low-density housing, and for good reason. This is a single-family residential district. Because we live in one of the most high-risk fire zones in the United States, it is essential that we maintain adequate egress from our neighborhood, as well as access for emergency vehicles. Already, we have seen an intolerable increase in parking problems, and traffic congestion near the Grizzly Peak Boulevard, Centennial Drive area due to growth from the UC Space Sciences lab. The addition of 100 high-density housing units, along with the automobile traffic they will create is simply not acceptable.

It is also critical that we stop further destruction of the upper Strawberry Creek Watershed. Construction of impermeable surfaces, such as buildings and parking lots, will increase run-off and will detrimentally impact the City of Berkeley's aging infrastructure. Sections of the proposed development site sits on an aquifer (underground lake) that, in times of emergency, such as a break on the EBMUD water line at the Caldecott Tunnel, could provide potable water for the entire city of Berkeley. Additionally, this site sits next to the Lawrence Hall of Science Fault Zone, between the Hayward/Wildcat Canyon fault lines – hardly a logical place for housing. Finally, further destruction of one of the few remaining open spaces in Berkeley is intolerable.

The City of Berkeley is experiencing an historical residential housing vacancy rate. There is also a great deal of construction of condominiums and townhouses in progress, all of which are within walking distance to campus. It makes much more sense to utilize available housing within the stated objectives of the LRDP ("within one mile from campus") than to begin an environmentally unsound and costly project that will only have negative impacts on the city infrastructure and potentially put people's lives at risk during a fire or other emergency.

In view of the above, please explain how you are planning to mitigate all the health and safety hazards created for the neighborhood including inadequate egress in the case of fire and/or earthquake, increased traffic, noise, pollution, lack of infrastructure, and lack of parking, which will ensue due to the increase in population from the proposed high-density housing project.

Yours truly,

Ernest Sotelo — 21 Mosswood Road Berkeley 94704

Signature — Address

11.2C.259 RESPONSE TO COMMENT LETTER C259

The University received 138 form letters signed by individuals, objecting to the proposal for up to 100 faculty housing units in the Hill Campus: C111-C121, C125-C159, C161-C165, C167-C171, C173-C179, C182-C183, C194-C216, C219-C239, C241-C250, C257, C259, C263-C264, C267, C278-C279, C282-C283, C285-C293, and C300. A few of these letters, such as C111, include brief postscript comments, primarily objecting to the number of current UC employees whom the writers assert are parking on city streets to avoid paying UC parking fees.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT LETTER 259

See Thematic Response 8 for a comprehensive response to comments on Hill Campus development. Due partly to comments received and partly to its uncertain near-term feasibility, faculty housing has been deleted as a potential future Hill Campus use in the 2020 LRDP. As noted in Thematic Response 8, the site formerly designated H1 has been redesignated as a reserve site, while former site H2 has been redesignated as part of the surrounding research zone.

LETTER C260

DBA
DOWNTOWN BERKELEY ASSOCIATION

Promoting Arts & Commerce in the Heart of the City

2230 Shattuck Avenue, Suite C, Berkeley, CA 94704 ◆ tel: 510.549.2230 ◆ fax: 510.549.2267
info@downtownberkeley.org ◆ www.downtownberkeley.org

June 14, 2004

Ms. Jennifer Lawrence
Co-Director 2020 LRDP EIR
Facilities Services
1936 University Ave. #300
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720-1382

Dear Ms. Lawrence:

Please accept these comments from the Downtown Berkeley Association in response to the 2020 Long Range Development Plan EIR. This letter is also endorsed by the Berkeley Business District Network.

The Downtown Berkeley Association (DBA) represents over 700 businesses in the Downtown district - the area from Oxford to Martin Luther King, and from Channing to Delaware. The DBA is a non-profit organization funded by a Business Improvement District (BID) to carry out a work plan of promotion and advocacy. DBA's membership includes businesses, property owners, non-profits, and financial institutions.

The Berkeley Business District Network (BBDN) is a networking group that invites representatives from all of Berkeley's business districts to work together to share information and resources to improve our City's commercial districts.

The following comments focus specifically on the Downtown Berkeley district. The DBA submits these comments with the goal of hearing your response, as well as to increase UC Berkeley's understanding of our organization and our vision for the Downtown Berkeley district. The DBA looks forward to develop a closer partnership with UC as you continue to expand into the Downtown Berkeley district.

Following are our comments on the 2020 LRDP EIR:

Main Street

The Downtown Berkeley Association is a Main Street Program which honors historic preservation and offers a four point program for economic development that focuses on Design, Promotion, Economic Development, and Organizational Development. C260-1

The DBA encourages UC to

- Embrace the concepts of Main Street and partner with the Downtown Berkeley community to enhance the district through participation in our organization. C260-1

Downtown Berkeley Identity
Downtown Berkeley is known as the Arts & Commerce district and is the City's hub for government, education, and transit. The district is rebounding and thriving after decades of blight to offer world class performances and more fine dining options. The Downtown Berkeley district will continue to grow in population and prestige with new projects proposed by the City of Berkeley, UC Berkeley, and private developers. Berkeley is known internationally, and our visitors seek out our City "center" – our Downtown. It is a benefit to all fore mentioned parties that Downtown Berkeley have a strong district identity as the "heart of the city".

In varied sections of the 2020 LRDP, Downtown Berkeley is referred to as a portion of the "Adjacent Blocks West". C260-2

- The DBA requests that whenever appropriate, the LRDP document and all communications place special attention and refer to our district as "Downtown Berkeley", and place section headers accordingly.

Housing

Downtown Berkeley offers an attractive site for transit oriented development with hundreds of new units currently under construction. The DBA strives for a residential population that offers balance in terms of age, income level, and long term tenancy. DBA also strives for a healthy retail environment that provides the range of products and services needed by our residents and our many visitors.

There is a symbiotic relationship between the residents and the retail environment. A mix of residents balanced by age, income, and long term tenancy will best support our current businesses, arts & entertainment offerings, and best support the on-going development of an improved retail environment with broad appeal.

Currently, the majority of Downtown Berkeley's tenants are undergraduate students. Therefore, we encourage that new housing be directed to residents who will represent a more stable population. C260-3

In reference to 2020 LRDP section 3.1.8

The DBA encourages UC to:
- Commit to bringing long term members of the Berkeley community into the new housing in the Downtown district. C260-4
- Develop new housing in Downtown Berkeley for "new untenured ladder faculty" and staff as a first and immediate priority, with secondary priority to graduate students (including those with families). C260-5
- Include the concept of a healthy retail environment as being an integral component of the "livability" issue for residents. C260-6

Campus Neighborhood's Retail Environment
A healthy retail environment will serve the needs of the community – including the new UC community. A strong retail environment provides necessary goods, services, and entertainment and, it also results in a safer and cleaner pedestrian environment.

A healthy business district needs to be cultivated - success is not to be taken for granted. Downtown Berkeley currently enjoys the success of our arts and entertainment offerings, and the growing number of high quality food establishments. However, the Downtown Berkeley retail environment faces challenges due to competition from neighboring shopping malls, corporate restructuring of large retailers, and growing trends in on-line sales. Additionally, neighboring cities have plans to develop their own arts and entertainment offerings. Downtown Berkeley's retail offerings are declining and this requires pro-active attention.

In reference to 2020 LRDP section 3.1.10

The DBA encourages UC to

- Plan housing to attract a balanced mix of resident population. C260-7
- Consider retail vitality to be part of the "key nodes of activity" and "livability". C260-8
- Consider the benefit of healthy retail districts to UC's residential and larger campus community. C260-9
- Have a comprehensive sense of facility location and how it impacts the retail environment. C260-10
- Ensure that all developments provide a continuous ground floor retail environment - offering public activity on the ground floor of all buildings to allow continuous activity along the streets. C260-11
- Adopt a "Shop Local" policy that is mandated throughout all levels of the administrative system. C260-12

Access to Downtown Berkeley

The DBA supports a balanced approach to transit and parking. Due to the existing condition of scarce land, and growing usage, the DBA urges that UC plan growth in a way that ensures ease and clarity of access to Downtown Berkeley and to the University.

The DBA encourages UC to

- Minimize congestion at arterial corridors and intersections throughout the City to allow ease of auto and bus access, and safety of bicycle and pedestrian access into the heart of the City. C260-13
- Aggressively pursue transit options to encourage maximum transit rider ship among faculty, staff and students. C260-14
- Create a clear gateway to the campus on University Avenue through the use of signage and other landscaping. C260-15

Transit

Trip reduction is critical for all partners in the Berkeley and University communities. This will greatly ease the entrance of new facilities, housing, and other developments into the core. In the last decade, Downtown Berkeley has had an increase in usage, and a decrease in our baseline of parking supply. As demands continue to increase, it is critical that the parking supply be available to our visitors.

The DBA encourages UC to

- Maximize connectivity to all transit options (bus, BART, Amtrak, Guaranteed Ride Home, City Share, and more), and maximize use of all transit systems such as the BEAR Shuttle. Perhaps the BEAR Shuttle's use could extend beyond the perimeter to serve the many new residents destined for the "20 minute" area. C260-16

- Give "newbies" the strongest regulations and incentives to develop transit habits from the beginning such as prohibiting all first and second year students from getting parking permits, and not allowing residents in the dormitories and core area to bring a car, continuing the Student Fast Pass for AC Transit. C260-17
- Require safe and secure bicycle parking in all new projects, residential, office, and parking, and any other type of development. C260-18
- Work with the City of Berkeley on trip reduction. C260-19

Parking

Regarding new parking facilities in the Downtown Berkeley district, the DBA encourages UC to

- Make parking garages attractive and engaging. As much parking as possible should be underground. Also, all other parking should be set back significantly so that it is not on the street. If it has to be on the street, there should be retail or activity at street level. C260-20
- Implement all possible strategies for coordinated management of parking facilities. C260-21

In reference to 2020 LRDP section 4.12.18

If UC builds or expands parking in the Downtown district, the DBA believes that it is important that a good portion of the new supply be dedicated to unrestricted visitor parking. **According to statistics on page 4.12.18, only 5.5% of UC's total parking supply is currently dedicated to visitors**. C260-22

In recent years, Downtown Berkeley's supply of public parking has been shrinking. It should be noted that the Kittredge Garage has been demolished and will re-open in 2006 with only 125 public spaces. At the same time, Downtown's usage has greatly increased, and will continue to increase for the new proposed Berkeley Art Museum, Hotel/Conference Center, and more.

Our experience is that the public does not use parking facilities that are available on a limited schedule (evenings and weekends) because they are not able to establish routines and habits. It would be preferable to have "unrestricted" parking with no time limitations on usage.

The DBA encourages UC to

- Ensure that 25-50% of new parking in the Downtown Berkeley district will be utilized for unrestricted visitor parking. C260-23
- Consider creative solutions to provide un-restricted visitor parking at all UC parking facilities in the Downtown district. (i.e. if there is a multi-level facility, perhaps the space could divided between full-time public access and permit parking.) C260-24
- Immediately install signage that clearly instructs and promotes the ability for visitors to park in the lots. C260-25
- Include safe and secure bicycle and motorcycle parking in all facilities. C260-26

Land Use and Design

- Create an attractive entry/gateway at University Avenue from the freeway, to the campus. C260-27
- Work with the City on streetscape development, especially on the Oxford edge, and down to Shattuck. Oxford has a monumental scale but needs better connections to the core. C260-28

- Look at invigorating the street life in the zone between campus and Downtown Berkeley to better integrate and connect the two entities and make the street life active. Plan for interface at all levels including land use, design, and public improvements. We welcome people and eyes on the street. Currently, there are dead zones from Hearst to Bancroft, and down the north side of Center Street. There are also UC buildings scattered throughout the Downtown with private ground floor space. University, Addison, and Center Street need attention. C260-29
- Develop architecture that is welcoming to the public, and sensitive to the context of the surrounding environment. A good example is the Law School apartments at Channing and Shattuck which has a great groundfloor C260-30
- Note that the City of Berkeley has a classic, historic, mostly early 20th century Downtown which is very important to the residents as well as to the University. There are many landmarked buildings as well as historically significant buildings that have not yet been landmarked that should be maintained as part of the historic fabric of the city. C260-31

Planning

There are a number of significant projects proposed for the Downtown Berkeley core including but not limited to a hotel/conference center, AC Transit Bus Rapid Transit, The Berkeley Art Museum, Freight & Salvage, additional new housing and arts facilities, and the potential for closure of Center Street (from Oxford to Shattuck) for pedestrian mall or daylighting of Strawberry Creek.

The DBA encourages UC to

- Follow the guidelines set in the City of Berkeley's General Plan, the Downtown Berkeley Improvements Plan, Downtown Berkeley Design Guidelines C260-32
- Note that the new City of Berkeley Arts & Culture Plan is pending approval in the near future. C260-33
- Work with the City of Berkeley to plan new projects in a comprehensive manner rather than on a project-by-project basis to ensure that there will be coordination in terms of land use, traffic engineering, and phasing of construction. C260-34

Public Safety

- Consider increase of UC Police presence in the Downtown Berkeley District, and work in partnership with the BPD. C260-35

Partnership

The DBA encourages UC to have an increased involvement in the downtown Berkeley community to correspond with the increase in physical presence. DBA is very interested to improve our communication with UC, and we would like UC to consider becoming more active with the Downtown Berkeley community through the DBA committees.

- Partner with the DBA on important issues such as Access (transit and parking) Economic Development, Promotion, Design, and Public Safety. C260-36
- Consider making an annual financial contribution to the Downtown Berkeley Association at a level proportional to the contributions of other members of our Business Improvement District. (All business license holders are assessed an annual fee based on revenue or other measure). C260-37

Thank you for your attention to these concerns. I look forward to hearing your response to these comments.

Cordially,

Deborah Badhia
Executive Director, Downtown Berkeley Association
Co-Chair, Berkeley Business District Network

Cc: City of Berkeley Mayor Tom Bates
Berkeley City Councilmembers
Arietta Chakos, City of Berkeley City Manager's Office

11.2C.260 RESPONSE TO COMMENT LETTER C260

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C260-1

If by the "concepts of Main Street" the writer means, in the words of the DBA website, "... to improve Downtown Berkeley as an attractive and historic public space that offers unique experiences through arts and commerce to its many local and international visitors ..." then the policies of the 2020 LRDP align completely with these concepts. For example, section 3.1.4 states:

> Given both its superior transit access and its established mixed-use character, downtown Berkeley should be the primary focus of future University investment in new research, cultural and service functions that require locations near, but not on, the Campus Park ... However, these future investments should be planned not merely to accommodate the program needs of the University, but also to invigorate the downtown and create an inviting, exciting 'front door' to the UC Berkeley campus. They should also be planned to enable University land and capital to be leveraged through creative partnerships with other public and private sector organizations.

This section goes on to cite a new University museum complex and a new hotel and conference center, both envisioned for downtown Berkeley sites, as examples of such investments.

The UC Berkeley Director of Community Relations serves as an ex officio member of the DBA board of directors.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C260-2

Although the writer does not provide a definition of "downtown Berkeley" the 2020 LRDP does often use this term to refer to the area just west of the Campus Park. However, "downtown Berkeley" as commonly perceived has very different dimensions than the Adjacent Blocks West, being considerably narrower in the north-south dimension and considerably wider in the east-west dimension. The boundary of the Adjacent Blocks West was limited to those blocks which directly abut the Campus Park, because these blocks as defined have a specific role in the 2020 LRDP land use strategy, as described in the Location Guidelines in section 3.1.16. We are unable, therefore, to reorganize the document as the writer requests.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS C260-3 THRU C260-5

While some of the up to 2,500 net new student beds in the 2020 LRDP could be built within the downtown, the cost of land and the need for new University program space adjacent to campus suggest this may be more the exception than the rule. The Housing Zone as defined in the 2020 LRDP includes many other sites which are as suitable for housing, but not for program space given their distance from the Campus Park.

The mix of occupants of new University housing in the downtown would depend on both the 2020 LRDP housing targets and the actual profile and magnitude of future demand, although both new graduate students and new faculty are identified as key new markets in section 3.1.8. The 2020 LRDP does not, however, anticipate a significant future increase in new student family housing.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C260-6

While the Campus Design Guidelines in section 3.1.17 are, in general, confined to the Campus Park, they do address the use and character of ground level frontages at its perimeter and on facing adjacent blocks:

> In the city general plan, several sections of blocks adjacent to campus are designated 'commercial': ground level spaces in University buildings within those areas should include retail and/or storefront services. Other University buildings at the campus perimeter or on adjacent blocks should house functions with a high frequency of human presence and activity at ground level.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS C260-7 THRU C260-11

See responses C260-3, C260-5 and C260-6.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C260-12

A number of factors shape UC Berkeley policies on the purchase of goods and services. For example, state law requires the University to comply with competitive bidding rules. The University must also ensure that small, disadvantaged, woman-owned, and disabled-veteran enterprises have the maximum practicable opportunity to participate in the performance of University contracts supported by federal funds. It is also University policy to meet its needs for goods and services at the lowest cost. Local goods and services may be purchased to the extent the aforementioned conditions can be met.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS C260-13 AND C260-14

See Thematic Response 10 regarding alternative transportation programs.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C260-15

The writer's comment is noted. Such a "gateway" sign already exists at the Center Street entrance, and a similar sign would be very suitable for the University Avenue entrance should funds become available.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C260-16

See Thematic Response 10 regarding alternative transportation programs. With regard to extending the shuttle to serve the Housing Zone, in fact the Housing Zone was defined to ensure these new residences would be adequately served by existing AC Transit routes.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C260-17

Student parking permits are already very restricted. Students living in UC Berkeley housing may only obtain a parking permit if they provide clear, documented evidence they require a car for medical, job or other extraordinary circumstances. Students not living in UC Berkeley housing may only obtain a student parking permit if they live outside a 2-mile radius from campus.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C260-18

The campus provides free California bicycle licensing, discounts on high quality bicycle locks, extensive bicycle parking, campus bicycle paths, bicycle enforcement, bicycle traffic school, and more. Starting this year, the University will provide secure bicycle parking in five locations on campus with a grant from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District: over 200 bike parking spaces will be furnished in covered, locked

cages or under security camera surveillance. In 2004-2005, UC Berkeley will begin developing the first campus bicycle access plan with a grant from the Alameda County Transportation Improvement Authority.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C260-19

UC Berkeley and the City of Berkeley collaborated on the 2001 Downtown/Southside TDM Study, which provides the foundation for many current UC Berkeley initiatives. UC Berkeley and the City of Berkeley continue to work together on transportation demand management initiatives. Current projects include:

- Providing new transit shelters at Bear Transit/AC Transit bus stops.
- Improving wayfinding systems for visitors to Berkeley.
- Funding intersection improvements at Oxford/Hearst and Arch/LeConte/Hearst.
- Working with AC Transit to define Bus Rapid Transit alignments in Berkeley.
- Collaborating on the City Bicycle Plan update and a new campus bicycle plan.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C260-20

See response C260-6 regarding retail frontages. While no new parking structures envisioned under the 2020 LRDP have yet been sited or designed, most are expected to be constructed as parts of mixed-use projects, with at least some of the parking located below grade, in order to optimize the use of University land.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C260-21

The writer's comment is noted.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS C260-22 THRU C260-26

While the writer's comment is noted, the University does not have the resources to provide parking beyond what it requires to serve its own mission. Moreover, the City of Berkeley, in its comment B7a-56, objected very strongly to what it misinterpreted as UC Berkeley's intent to do so.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C260-27

While the writer's comment is noted, University has no plans to install gateway signage outside University property, except in collaboration with the city.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C260-28

Section 3.1.13 of the 2020 LRDP includes the policy to "Partner with the City and LBNL on an integrated program of access and landscape improvements at the Campus Park edge." Oxford Street is one potential location for such improvements.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS C260-29 AND C260-30

See responses C260-1 and C260-6.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C260-31

The writer's comment is noted. The Draft EIR prescribes numerous measures to ensure the aesthetic and historic fabric of the City Environs is protected and enhanced, including Best Practices AES-1-a through AES-1-h, CUL-2-a through CUL-2-b, and LU-2-a through LU-2-e.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS C260-32 AND C260-33

As the Draft EIR notes, UC Berkeley is constitutionally exempt from local land use regulations, including municipal general plans; the University serves the entire state of California, and its mission can not always be met entirely within the parameters of municipal policy. However, compatibility with adjacent land uses is a matter of concern for the University, and it therefore voluntarily considers the 2020 LRDP's compatibility with the adjacent land uses in the City Environs. However, this does not mean the city should not have a strong advisory role, and the aforementioned Best Practices in the 2020 LRDP ensure that it would.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C260-34

Although some impacts of future University projects can not be fully evaluated until project-level information is available, the 2020 LRDP provides a context to help the University and the public understand these impacts in relation to long-term University goals and objectives, and thereby provides the comprehensive perspective advocated by the writer.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C260-35

As noted in section 4.11.4, the UC Berkeley police already work in close partnership with the City of Berkeley, and share policing responsibility for Telegraph Avenue and the Southside. UCPD and BPD partner to ensure adequate service levels in areas proximate to the campus. Patrol captains from each department confer several times a week about upcoming events, coverage and other relevant issues, and the chiefs also confer regularly. An existing written agreement assigns ten campus officers on a full time basis to work jointly with the city in the areas around campus: the need for an increased UC Berkeley police presence in downtown Berkeley would be considered within this framework.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS C260-36 AND C260-37

UC Berkeley is eager to work with DBA toward enhancing the economic and cultural vitality of downtown Berkeley.

LETTER C261

RECEIVED
JUN 18 2004
PHYSICAL & ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING

1510 SUMMIT Rd.
Berkeley, Calif
94708
June 18, 2004

Jennifer Lawrence, Facilities Services
University of California, Berkeley

Dear Jennifer Lawrence,

I am writing in regard to the Long Range Development Plan 2020.

I live on Lower Summit and I oppose building 100 houses + parking at the top of Strawberry Canyon at Grizzly Peak Blvd. The open space right by the park would be ruined & congested, parking would be much worse on our already congested small streets, and we would be burned up in the case of another disaster like the Oakland-Berkeley Hills fire. The wild life is thriving in our area and such a development would destroy it. Please do not build more houses at the edge of Tilden

C261-1

Sincerely,

(510) 841-8930 Joyce KRAUS, 1510 Summit Road, Berkeley Ca, 94708

11.2C.261 RESPONSE TO COMMENT LETTER C261

RESPONSE TO COMMENT C261-1

See Thematic Response 8 for a comprehensive response to comments on Hill Campus development. Due partly to comments received and partly to its uncertain near-term feasibility, faculty housing has been deleted as a potential future Hill Campus use in the 2020 LRDP. As noted in Thematic Response 8, the site formerly designated H1 has been redesignated as a reserve site, while former site H2 has been redesignated as part of the surrounding research zone.