



LEAD AGENCY:
CITY OF EL CERRITO
10890 San Pablo Avenue
El Cerrito, CA 94530
Telephone: (510) 215-4330 • FAX: (510) 233-5401

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST
(Per California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA Section 15063)

1. **Project title:** Ohlone Greenway Master Plan
2. **Lead agency name and address:** City of El Cerrito, 10890 San Pablo Avenue, El Cerrito, CA 94530
3. **Contact person and telephone number:** Melanie Mintz, Environmental Services Manager, (510) 215-4382
4. **Project location:** Along the existing Ohlone Greenway, within the City and BART right-of-way from the city's northern to southern city limits.
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** City of El Cerrito, 10890 San Pablo Ave, El Cerrito, CA 94530
6. **General plan designation:** Parks and Open Space
7. **Zoning:** PS (Public/Semi-Public)
8. **Description of project:** The El Cerrito Ohlone Greenway is an approximately 2.7-mile, 21-acre linear park and multi-use path that runs underneath the elevated Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) tracks on City and BART owned right-of-way. The path and linear park were built and vegetated in stages between the 1960's and 1990's by BART, the City of El Cerrito and volunteers.

The proposed Master Plan was developed under the direction of the City's Parks and Recreation Department by the City's Department of Public Works with the purpose of articulating the overall vision and goals for the Greenway such that future enhancements and improvements contribute cohesively to the vision and goals. The document does not provide detailed design for each area of the Greenway, but provides guidelines and programmatic recommendations with the goal of ensuring that future design efforts and improvements are carried forward in a coherent and consistent manner that reflects the community's values.

The Master Plan includes several sections, including: Introduction; Site Analysis, Master Plan Design Vision, Design Guidelines, Public Improvement Studies, Implementation and an Appendix.

It was prepared based upon information gathered through several public meetings as well as meetings with specific user groups and internal departments and divisions, such as Maintenance and Public Safety.

At its October 22, 2008 public meeting, the El Cerrito Parks and Recreation Commission recommended the Plan be adopted by City Council. Following public review and Planning Commission adoption of the CEQA document, the Plan will be brought to Council with a staff recommendation for adoption.

NOTE: The Master Plan depicts consolidation of the existing two separate paths into one multi-use path. This trail consolidation project will be completed as a part of a separate project (the BART Earthquake Safety Program Retrofit project). A Categorical Exemption was filed for this component of the BART Earthquake Safety Program Retrofit project in July, 2008.

9. **Surrounding land uses and setting:** Highly urbanized on former railroad right-of-way surrounded by single-family residential uses, multi-family residential uses, schools, parks and commercial uses as well as 2 BART stations.
10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required:** Specific elements would require approval and/or coordination with the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District, i.e. installation of lighting and/or surveillance cameras, if final design specifies they be installed on BART facilities, would need approval and a permit. The Ohlone Greenway Master Plan does not require approval of any other agency aside from the El Cerrito City Council.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Circulation | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population and Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities & Service Systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geological Problems | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy & Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Water | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | | |

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect(s) on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated." An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there **WILL NOT** be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project.

Prepared by: _____ Date: _____

Printed Name: Sean Moss, Associate Planner

Reviewed by: _____ Date: _____

Printed Name: Melanie Mintz, Environmental Services Manager

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then

the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|---|---|---|----------------------|
|--|---|---|---|----------------------|

I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project site is not part of a scenic vista. The project site is below elevated BART tracks. Any scenic views over the project area are obstructed by the elevated tracks. The Ohlone Greenway Master Plan does not propose any structures or landscaping higher than the existing elevated tracks.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The site does not contain any significant scenic resources. No portion of the project site is within or in the vicinity of a scenic highway.

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed project is a master plan for future renovation of the Ohlone Greenway. The goal of the project is to provide a framework for improving the visual character of the site by providing guidelines and programmatic recommendations for future improvements to recreational facilities and landscaping.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: Proposed lighting will meet industry standards for limiting lighting spill to adjacent properties and minimizing glare. The Ohlone Greenway Master Plan calls for "a complete lighting plan to be designed by a qualified source." (Page 38.) Thus, the impact of proposed lighting improvements will be less than significant.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

| Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|
|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|

Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

Discussion: The site is currently developed as a recreational use. The site is not depicted as farmland on any current maps. The project will not convert any farmland.

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project site is not zoned for agricultural use. No portion of the project site is under a Williamson Act contract.

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project site is currently developed as a recreational use. The site is within an urbanized area and is not in the vicinity of any farmland. The City of El Cerrito Zoning Ordinance does not contain any exclusively agricultural zoning district and El Cerrito does not contain any exclusively agricultural land use.

III. AIR QUALITY -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) has air jurisdiction over the project site. The Bay Area is currently designated as a non-attainment area for federal and State ozone standards. BAAQMD has developed the *2001 Bay Area Ozone Attainment Plan* and the *2000 Bay Area Clean Air Plan* to address ozone non-attainment. The project is consistent with these plans and conforms to all growth assumptions in the plans regarding population, employment, and regional vehicle miles traveled.

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project involves renovation of an existing recreational, non-motorized transportation corridor. Aside from Maintenance and Public Safety vehicles, the corridor does not serve motorized vehicles. Operation of the project will not involve any combustion or process which will generate air pollution, thus the project will not contribute substantially to an

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|---|---|---|----------------------|
|--|---|---|---|----------------------|

existing or projected air quality violation.

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The Bay Area is under non-attainment status for ozone (O₃), particulate matter (PM₁₀), and fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) under State standards and under marginal attainment status for the federal 8-hour ozone standard. Construction of the multi-use trail portion of the Master Plan is not a part of this project and will be constructed by BART as part of the BART retrofit project. Construction of the creek restoration portions of the Master Plan may produce construction equipment exhaust and dust emissions. Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) CEQA Guidelines note that short-term construction-period emissions are expected to impede attainment of federal or State standards for ozone and carbon monoxide. Dust emissions are regulated under BAAQMD's Regulation 6, which prohibits visible particulate emissions where the particulates are deposited on real property other than that of the person responsible for the emissions. Construction of the remaining portions of the Master Plan involve landscaping, construction of play structures and construction of other small recreational facilities. No heavy construction equipment is anticipated as part of these activities and therefore, no significant pollutant emissions are expected.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: Sensitive receptors are facilities and land uses that include members of the population that are particularly sensitive to the effects of air pollution, such as children, the elderly, and persons with illnesses. The Ohlone Greenways is adjacent to schools (Fairmount School, Cougar Field), an assisted living facility (El Cerrito Royale), and residential areas. However, the project is not expected to generate substantial pollutant concentrations. See discussion of Item c).

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: Operation of the project will not cause any objectionable odors. Off-leash dog areas within the Master Plan will adhere to the *Guidelines for Establishment and Maintenance of Successful Off-Leash Dog Exercise Areas* and will contain disposal bags and clear display of dog waste policies. No other recreational facilities in the Master Plan are expected to generate objectionable odors. Some odors may result from construction related activities. However, these odors will be temporary in nature and are not expected to affect a substantial number of people in any instance.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES --

Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect,

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|---------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: The El Cerrito General Plan EIR does not identify any special status species as inhabiting the vicinity of the project site. The project site is a former railroad corridor that has been developed as a recreational corridor. Due to the nature of the site, it is not habitat for special status species.

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: Implementation of improvements to open water channels, as identified in the Master Plan, would be subject to the Joint Aquatic Resource Permit Application (JARPA) process, would incorporate permit conditions, and would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis for any short-term adverse effect to riparian habitat. This would reduce adverse effects to a less-than-significant level. The goal of all riparian alteration contemplated in the Plan is to improve the quality of natural habitat as outlined in Section D—Ecological Approach Guidelines of the Ohlone Greenway Master Plan.

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: See discussion for item b)

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The El Cerrito General plan EIR does not identify the City's creeks as potential anadromous fish habitat. Downstream conditions preclude the creeks along the Greenway from supporting a fisheries population. The Ohlone Greenway Master Plan contains guidelines for landscape improvements. These guidelines include utilizing native plant habitat areas and landscaping designed to encourage local fauna. Thus, the project will improve habitat for other wildlife species.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|---|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? <u>Discussion:</u> The project is consistent with all local ordinances. The project implements several goals and policies of the El Cerrito General Plan as outlined in Section G of the Ohlone Greenway Master Plan. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? <u>Discussion:</u> The project would not conflict with any habitat conservation plans. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in '15064.5? <u>Discussion:</u> The project site is currently developed as a recreational use and does not contain any historical resources eligible for listing on a national, state or local register. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to '15064.5? <u>Discussion:</u> The project site has been previously disturbed and is not listed as an archeological site. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? <u>Discussion:</u> The project site has been previously disturbed with no recorded paleontological discovery. A search of the University of California, Museum of Paleontology's online locality search yielded no recorded localities within the vicinity of the project site. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? <u>Discussion:</u> The project site has been previously disturbed with no recorded discoveries of human remains. If Native American remains were discovered, the Native American Heritage Commission and the County Coroner would be notified in accordance with State law. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| iv) Landslides? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: Although not a part of the project, some of the improvements proposed in the Ohlone Greenway Master plan are intended to coincide with the retrofit of the BART tracks which are elevated over the project. The retrofit of the BART tracks is a separate project. However, the elevated track retrofit will occur before any improvements are constructed as a result of the master plan. Thus, any risk of loss, injury or death as a result of ground shaking, liquefaction, fault rupture or landslide will be improved over current conditions. New structures proposed by the master plan will be constructed to current seismic safety standards.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The site does not currently experience a significant amount of soil erosion. The master plan proposes creek improvements which will lessen the potential for soil erosion. Proposed irrigation will be designed to minimize erosion. No other components of the master plan will impact soil erosion.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: There is no known landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse in the vicinity if the project. The Ohlone Greenway Master Plan will not impact soil stability.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|---|---|---|----------------------|
|--|---|---|---|----------------------|

substantial risks to life or property?

Discussion: Most of the low-lying areas of El Cerrito contain expansive soils. However, due to the projects site's former use as a railroad corridor and the presence of the existing elevated BART tracks, soil conditions on the site have been modified to minimize safety concerns. The project involves a minimal number of structures which will be subject to the Uniform Building Code. All such structures will be constructed to current Uniform Building Code Standards.

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project does not propose any septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project involves a master plan for future improvements to a recreational trail facility. One of the goals of the master plan is to reduce maintenance requirements, i.e. through the appropriate selection of plants. Maintenance of the improved facility will follow the same City policies as the existing facility. Any potentially hazardous materials used in construction would be handled in compliance with hazardous materials regulations.

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: See Discussion for item a)

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: See Discussion for item a)

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|---|---|---|----------------------|
|--|---|---|---|----------------------|

or the environment?

Discussion: The project site is not on a list of hazardous sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project site is not within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public or public use airport. The nearest public airport is Oakland International Airport which is approximately 11 miles from the project site.

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project is not in the vicinity of a private airstrip. The nearest private airstrip is approximately 35 miles from the project site in Brentwood, CA.

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project would not interfere with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The project does not propose any obstacles to emergency response. The project will improve emergency response by providing a wider multi-use trail which will be utilized by emergency vehicles.

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project is located in an urbanized area and is not adjacent to any wildlands. The project is not within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Area as denoted on the City of El Cerrito's Special Study Area Map.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project would not violate and water quality standards. All improvements under

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

the master plan will comply with the water quality standards of Contra Costa Clean Water program's NPDES permit.

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project does not involve groundwater extraction. The amount of impervious surface in the proposed project is not substantially greater than the existing impervious surface. Improvements to creeks and swales proposed in the master plan will be designed to hold water on site longer than existing conditions and may increase groundwater recharge.

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: Any alterations to creeks will not substantially change drainage patterns. All creek improvements will be designed to improve safety, decrease flooding, improve water quality, decrease erosion and improve habitat. The Ohlone Greenway master plan identifies methods which will minimize erosion and flooding such as swales, use of appropriate landscaping, and rain gardens.

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: See discussion for item c)

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project is not expected to generate substantially more runoff than the existing conditions. Proposed improvements are expected to retain more water on site through the use of swales, rain gardens and other techniques identified in the Ohlone Greenway Master Plan.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

Implementation of the master plan will likely decrease runoff.

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The Ohlone Greenway Master Plan identifies several techniques for improving water quality. The plan identifies components of sustainability and ecological approach. All proposed improvements will implement these plan principles. The project will not degrade water quality.

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project does not contain housing. The project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area.

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project site is not within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on FEMA's Flood Insurance Rate Map for the project site. There is no Flood Hazard Boundary Map available for the project site.

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: There are no levees or dams on or in the vicinity of the project site. The project involves a master plan for future improvements to a recreational facility. The master plan identifies improvements to existing creeks within the project site. Future improvements will improve flooding conditions for these creeks. No portion of the site is within a 100-year flood hazard area.

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The only bodies of water in the vicinity of the project site are intermittent creeks. The project site is not in the immediate vicinity of lakes, reservoirs, or any other bodies of water which would be subject to seiches. The project site is approximately 0.8 miles from San Francisco Bay at the nearest point. Due to the project's location over 11 miles from the Golden Gate and the presence of notable land features such as Angel Island, Point Isabel and Albany Bulb in the direct path between the project and the Golden Gate, it is expected that the impact of a tsunami event to the project site would be less than significant. There is no known history or risk of mudflow in the project vicinity.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|---|---|---|----------------------|
|--|---|---|---|----------------------|

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Physically divide an established community? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project site is a recreational trail which runs the length of the City of El Cerrito. The proposed project will improve connectivity throughout the City by improving crossings of the trail and improving connections to the trail.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The City of El Cerrito has land use authority over the project site. The project is consistent with the El Cerrito General Plan, El Cerrito Zoning Ordinance and all adopted land use plans.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: There are not adopted habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans for the project site.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project does not involve mineral extraction. The City of El Cerrito General Plan does not identify any mineral resources in the vicinity of the project. The project will not have any impact on mineral resources.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: See discussion for item a)

XI. NOISE -- Would the project result in:

- a) Exposure of persons to or generation

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|--------------------------|
| of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: The loudest existing noise source in the project site is the BART tracks. The noise levels of BART operation as measured in the El Cerrito General Plan are within the allowed range for outdoor sports and recreation uses. The Ohlone Greenway master plan does not propose any uses which would have noise levels above those of the existing BART operation.

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The site does not currently experience substantial groundborne vibration or groundborne noise. The most likely source of such noise would be BART operation. The proposed BART retrofit project will further minimize groundborne vibration on the project site.

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The recreational uses proposed for the site are similar in nature to the existing uses and will produce similar noise levels. New uses include small dog areas and playground structures. Dog areas will be designed in accordance with the *Guidelines for Establishment and Maintenance of Successful Off-Leash Exercise Areas*. Dog areas have been conceptually sited as far from residential uses as possible. Dog areas will be subject to limited hours of operation. Noise generated by dog areas will not exceed noise generated by BART operation and is not expected to surpass allowed general plan levels or create significant ambient noise. New playground structures have also been conceptually sited to maximize distance to residential uses.

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: Construction related activities may result in an increase in ambient noise. However, compliance with the City's established hours of construction would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public use airport. The nearest public use airport, Oakland International Airport, is approximately 11

miles from the project site.

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

Discussion: The project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. The nearest private airstrip is approximately 35 miles from the project site in Brentwood, CA.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING --

Would the project:

- a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

Discussion: The project contains only recreational uses. The project contains no housing or employment uses. The project does not extend any infrastructure and does not have potential to induce substantial growth.

- b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Discussion: The project site contains recreational uses and does not contain housing. The project will not require construction of replacement housing.

- c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Discussion: The project site contains recreational uses and does not contain housing. The project will not require construction of replacement housing.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

- a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- Fire protection?

| | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Police protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Schools? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Parks? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Other public facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: The project will not generate demand for additional fire protection, police protection or school capacity. The project will improve emergency response times to the Ohlone Greenway by planning for a wider multi-use recreational trail, which can be more easily utilized by police and emergency vehicles, if needed. The project will not affect response times to other areas. The project will provide enhanced park and recreational facilities to the Ohlone Greenway and will not impact any other park facilities.

XIV. RECREATION --

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project is a master plan for future improvements to a recreational corridor. The proposed improvements are intended to upgrade the corridor and compensate for years of use and deterioration of recreational facilities. The project will improve recreational facilities and will not cause substantial physical deterioration. Improved long term maintainability and sustainability is a key feature of the proposed improvements.

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project is a master plan for future improvements to a recreational corridor. The project will not require expansion of recreational facilities beyond those planned in the master plan and analyzed in this document.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC --

Would the project:

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project proposes improvements to an existing recreational corridor. The proposed uses are similar to the existing uses. The ITE Trip Generation Manual calculated estimated trip generation for City Parks as a function of acreage. The proposed project does

not increase the acreage of the Ohlone Greenway. Based on ITE trip generation standards and the nature of the proposed recreation uses, the project is not expected to substantially increase the number of trips to/from the project site, impact the congestion or the capacity of roads or increase level of service on any road. The project site is an existing Class 1 recreational trail. Most trips to/from the project site utilize alternative modes of transportation, such as bicycling, walking or BART.

b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

Discussion: See discussion for item a)

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

Discussion: The project will have no effect on air traffic patterns. The nearest public airport, Oakland International Airport, is approximately 11 miles from the project and the nearest private airstrip is approximately 35 miles from the project, in Brentwood, CA.

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

Discussion: The project will improve safety by creating a straighter and wider multi-use trail. The trail will not be constructed with any sharp curves or hazardous conditions. Intersection safety will be improved through the use of pedestrian bulb-outs, truncated domes at curb ramps, and crosswalk flashers. The project will decrease hazards to Ohlone Greenway users.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

Discussion: The project will improve emergency access to the Ohlone Greenway by creating a multi-use trail which can be utilized by emergency vehicles. The project will not affect emergency access outside of the Ohlone Greenway.

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

Discussion: The project proposes a plan for future improvements to a recreational corridor. The recreational uses proposed are consistent with the existing uses. The project does not contain any off-street parking. On-street parking capacity is currently adequate to serve the project site and parking demand is not expected to increase as a result of the project.

g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

Discussion: The proposed project will enhance alternative transportation by improving a major corridor for alternative modes of transportation. The project is consistent with all policies, plans and programs which support alternative transportation, including the City's Circulation Plan for Bicyclists and Pedestrians.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:

- a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

Discussion: The project proposes the addition of one restroom facility with men's and women's restrooms. If the facility is plumbed, it would be the primary generator of wastewater for the project. The project is served by EBMUD's Oakland Wastewater Treatment Plant, which is permitted by the RWQCB. Portable facilities would also meet regulatory requirements.

- b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Discussion: The project is served by the Oakland EBMUD Wastewater Treatment Plant. The project proposes the addition of one restroom facility. This facility will be the primary wastewater generator for the project. The addition of one restroom facility will not require expansion of the Oakland EBMUD Wastewater Treatment Plant or a new facility.

- c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Discussion: The project is served by existing stormwater facilities owned by the City of El Cerrito. The project is not expected to increase stormwater runoff. See discussion for item e) of the Hydrology and Water Quality section of this document. The project will not require an expansion of stormwater facilities.

- d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

Discussion: The proposed project will use water only for irrigation and drinking fountains and potentially for limited bathroom facilities. The proposed landscaping is designed to minimize water usage. The proposed irrigation and plumbing systems will also be designed to minimize water usage in accordance with the sustainability principles of the Ohlone Greenway Master Plan. Sufficient water supplies are available to serve the project; no new or expanded entitlements would be required.

- e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

Discussion: The project is served by the Oakland EBMUD Wastewater Treatment Plant. The project proposes the addition of one restroom facility. This facility will be the primary wastewater generator for the project. The addition of one restroom facility will not have a

negative impact on EBMUD's wastewater processing capacity.

- f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

Discussion: Solid waste removal is handled by East Bay Sanitation Company and the City's maintenance division. Waste from the site will be deposited at West Contra Costa Landfill, which has capacity to serve the project. Although additional garbage receptacles are included as part of the project, because the recreational project's recreational uses are similar to the existing uses, solid waste generation is not expected to increase. Recycling receptacles are also included as part of this project, thereby potentially reducing the amount of solid waste.

- g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Discussion: The project will comply with all federal, state, and local regulations regarding solid waste. East Bay Sanitation Company currently complies with all federal, state, and local solid waste regulations, and will continue to do so in its processing of the project's solid waste.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE --

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

Discussion: As discussed throughout this document, all proposed improvements will be consistent with the principles identified in the master plan to improve habitat. The project will not have an impact on examples of California history and prehistory.

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

Discussion: The project will not have cumulatively considerable impacts. The project would improve existing conditions in many categories of this checklist. A check of the City of El Cerrito's planning and building application database did not identify any proposed projects in the vicinity of the project which would have impacts large enough to be significant when considered cumulatively with those of the project.

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

Discussion: This document did not identify any impacts which would cause substantial direct or indirect adverse impacts on human beings.

References Cited/Source List

The following information is available in the Planning Division files on the project and can be reviewed at the Planning Division counter, located at 10890 San Pablo Avenue in El Cerrito:

Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), 2009. Ambient Air Quality Standards and Bay Area Attainment Status. Website:

http://www.baaqmd.gov/pln/air_quality/ambient_air_quality.htm. January 8.

Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), 1996 (Amended 1999). *BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans*. April.

Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), 2009. 2001 Ozone Attainment Plan. Website: <http://www.baaqmd.gov/pln/plans/ozone/2001/index.htm>. January 7.

California Department of Transportation, 2009. California Scenic Highway Program. Website: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic_highways/scenic_hwy.htm. January 15.

California department of Toxic Substance Control, 2009. Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. Website:

http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/search.asp?cmd=search&reporttype=CORTESE&site_type=CSITES%2COPEN%2CFUDS%2CCLOSE&status=ACT%2CBKLG%2CCOM&reporttitle=HAZARDOUS%20WASTE%20AND%20SUBSTANCES%20SITE%20LIST. January 8.

East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD), 2009. Wastewater Treatment. Website: <http://www.ebmud.com/wastewater/treatment>. January 13.

El Cerrito, City of, 2008. *Zoning Ordinance*. March.

El Cerrito, City of, 1999. *General Plan*. August

El Cerrito, City of, 1999. *General Plan, Final EIR*. August.

El Cerrito, City of, 2000. Special Study Map.

University of California, Museum of Paleontology, 2009. UCMP Specimen Search. Website: <http://ucmpdb.berkeley.edu>. January 6.

University of California, Davis, Program in Veterinary Behavioral Medicine, Center for Animals in Society. *Guidelines for Establishment and Maintenance of Successful Off-Leash Exercise Areas*.