What is the Draft SEIR?
The Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) discusses the environmental impacts of Bayer's proposed development plan on its Berkeley campus. It is one part of the process of evaluating Bayer's proposed 30-year extension of its Development Agreement (DA). The SEIR was prepared by the City of Berkeley Department of Planning & Development with the assistance of Rincon Consultants Inc., following California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. The full document is available on the City of Berkeley’s website.

Why is Bayer seeking an extension of its Development Agreement?
The current DA between Bayer and the City of Berkeley is set to expire in February 2022. That agreement set the stage for Bayer’s long-term investment in establishing the region as a biopharmaceutical hub. Today, more than 100 biotechnology companies are located in Berkeley and neighboring Emeryville alone. The DA included commitments from Bayer to go beyond typical environmental mitigations and serve as a true community partner as well as a major employer.

The proposed DA extension would encompass all properties that comprise Bayer’s campus and provide a streamlined and consistent development process for additional infrastructure investments by Bayer on the 46-acre site.

The development plan has three goals:
1. To maximize the productive utilization of the land areas and current buildings to take new treatments through biotech development and manufacturing;
2. To maximize Bayer’s ability to attract and retain top talent and partners by ensuring that the Berkeley campus facilities are at the forefront of scientific innovation and that the campus configuration supports the biotech development and manufacture of medicines that improve patient outcomes, and
3. To promote the health of employees through improvements to open space, pedestrian and bicycle configuration, and other amenities.

What did the SEIR evaluate?
The SEIR evaluated the environmental impact the proposed development would have on 14 issue areas, proposed mitigation measures, and analyzed the environmental impact after mitigations.

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology & Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology & Water Quality
- Noise
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Utilities & Service Systems
What did the SEIR conclude?
An SEIR rates environmental impact in four categories:
- Significant and unavoidable
- Less than significant with mitigation incorporated
- Less than significant
- No impact

The SEIR for the proposed Bayer development projects found that, **“The proposed amended DA would not result in significant and unavoidable adverse environmental impacts. All of the proposed project’s impacts can either be mitigated to a less-than-significant level or would be less than significant. Therefore, other alternatives are not necessary to reduce or avoid significant impacts.”**

What alternatives were considered?
Although the SEIR found that alternatives to the proposed amended DA are not necessary to reduce or avoid significant environmental impacts, the lead agency is required to evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives as part of the SEIR process. The CEQA guidelines require these alternatives to include evaluating the impact of not approving the project as well as reasonable alternatives intended to reduce any significant environmental impacts of the proposed project.

The SEIR evaluated three alternatives. **Because the proposed project does not pose unavoidably significant environmental impacts, and so none of the alternatives are necessary to avoid a potentially significant impact.**

1. **No Project/No Construction Alternative.** This option assumes that the proposed amended DA would not be adopted and there would be no change to the existing configuration of the Bayer Campus. Without any construction on the site, any environmental impacts from construction would be eliminated, making this alternative environmentally superior. However, no construction would mean that Bayer would continue to maintain existing buildings and mechanical equipment that are less energy-efficient than the new construction planned under the proposed project. **SEIR finding:** this alternative does not meet any of the three project objectives.

2. **No Project/Zoning Conformance Alternative.** This option assumes that the proposed amended DA is not approved and the Use Permit for Bayer’s South Properties would remain in effect, so buildout would continue according to the standards set by Berkeley Municipal Code. This likely would result in intermittent development and less buildout than the proposed amended DA. **SEIR finding:** this alternative would not be environmentally superior and does not fully meet the three project objectives.

3. **Reduced Parking Alternative.** This option assumes that the planned parking structure between Dwight Way, Seventh Street, Parker Street and Eighth Street is not constructed, resulting in 675 fewer parking spaces. Among the changes in the environmental impact, this alternative would reduce the number of vehicle trips to and from the property, reducing mobile emissions and making this alternative environmentally superior. **SEIR finding:** This alternative generally meets the three project objectives but could conflict with the objective to maximize Bayer’s ability to attract and retain top talent and partners.