

3 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

PROJECT INFORMATION

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Project Title: | Wildcat Canyon Regional Park Bike Trail Project |
| 2. Lead Agency Name and Address: | East Bay Regional Park District
2950 Peralta Oaks Court, Oakland, California 94605 |
| 3. Contact Person and Phone Number: | Suzanne Wilson
510-544-2609 |
| 4. Project Location: | 5755 McBryde Avenue, Richmond, California
Wildcat Regional Park |
| 5. Project Sponsor’s Name and Address: | NA (Lead Agency is sponsor) |
| 6. General Plan Designation: | NA |
| 7. Zoning: | NA |
| 8. Description of Project:
(Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.) | Refer to Chapter 2, “Project Description.” |
| 9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:
(Briefly describe the project’s surroundings) | Refer to Section 2.2, “Project Location and Setting.” |
| 10. Other public agencies whose approval is required:
(e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement) | Refer to Section 2.4, “Permit, Approvals, and Required Action.” |
| 11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?

The District will prepare an EIR for the project and will facilitate the consultation process in accordance with Assembly Bill (AB) 52 (Statutes of 2014). | |

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. Where checked below, the topic with a potentially significant impact will be addressed in an environmental impact report.

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forest Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards / Hazardous Materials |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> None | <input type="checkbox"/> None with Mitigation Incorporated |

DETERMINATION

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 revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED 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 "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact 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. 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, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier **EIR** or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier **EIR** or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Date

Printed Name

Title

Agency

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 “Earlier Analyses,” as described in (5) below, 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.

3.1 AESTHETICS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. Aesthetics.				
Except as provided in Public Resources Code section 21099 (where aesthetic impacts shall not be considered significant for qualifying residential, mixed-use residential, and employment centers), would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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"/>
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage points.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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"/>

3.1.1 Environmental Setting

VISUAL CHARACTER AND QUALITY

The criteria for describing visual character and quality are vividness, intactness, and unity:

- ▶ **Vividness:** visual power or memorability of landscape components as they combine in striking or distinctive visual patterns.
- ▶ **Intactness:** visual integrity of the natural and human-built landscape and its freedom from encroaching elements. This factor can be present in well-kept urban and rural landscapes, as well as in natural settings.
- ▶ **Unity:** visual coherence and compositional harmony of the landscape considered as a whole.

The project area is within Wildcat Canyon Regional Park, situated along the Wildcat Creek watershed and the surrounding hills and ridges. Wildcat Canyon Regional Park extends from the Tilden Nature Area above the Berkeley hills in the south to historic Alvarado Park at the north end in Richmond. It includes a significant portion of the paved Nimitz Way extending from Inspiration point in Tilden Regional Park. The project alignment would go through open grassland within Wildcat Canyon Regional Park along a southwest facing ridgeline with views of the San Francisco Bay. The project is centrally located within the park and is accessed from the Alvarado Staging Area via the Wildcat Creek Trail or by way of the Nimitz Trail from the Inspiration Point Staging Area. Overall, because the project site is within and surrounded by a natural, undeveloped landscape with few human intrusions, vividness, intactness, and unity are generally high. Therefore, visual quality in the project area is also high. Views of the project site are available from Vista Heights Road, Rifle Range Road, and the Rifle Range Road Trail within Wildcat Canyon Regional Park.

SCENIC HIGHWAYS

A highway may be designated as “scenic” depending on how much of the natural landscape travelers can see, the scenic quality of the landscape, and the extent to which development intrudes on travelers’ enjoyment of the view. The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) maintains a list of eligible highways and officially designated scenic highways in California. No officially designated state scenic highways are within the City of Richmond or in the vicinity of the project site (Caltrans 2018; City of Richmond 2011). The nearest officially designated scenic highway to the project site is Route 24, located approximately 7 miles southeast. Views of the project site are not available from Route 24 because of distance, intervening landscape features, and topography.

3.1.2 Discussion

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

A scenic vista is defined as a viewpoint that provides expansive views of a highly valued landscape for the benefit of the general public. The project site is located within Wildcat Canyon Regional Park, situated along the Wildcat Creek watershed and the surrounding hills and ridges, with high quality views of natural features including grasslands, rolling hillsides, and the San Francisco and San Pablo bays. There are few surrounding scenic vistas with potential views of the project site. Public views of the Wildcat Canyon Regional Park are from the trails within the vicinity of the project site and from Vista Heights Road and Rifle Range Road.

Construction could result in temporary visual effects to scenic vistas viewed from along the trails, such as Rifle Range Road Trail. Construction equipment, including a mini-excavator and trail dozer, along with other construction materials, could degrade views from scenic vistas by reducing visual intactness and unity characteristics of the natural area. However, temporary visual impacts from construction would be limited to the project site and areas of intervening hillsides and vegetation would help to visually screen construction equipment and activities. In addition, construction equipment would only be present within the project area during the temporary construction period (less than one year). Therefore, construction effects on scenic vistas would not be substantial.

Long-term changes to views from scenic vistas would occur from the permanent trail features that would be constructed, including the proposed fencing along the trail. The fences and trail would be constructed from material that is visually similar to existing recreational facilities and cattle trails in the area to maintain an aesthetically coherent environment and maintain a high-level of visual intactness and unity. The boulder and rock materials would be used along the trail to create features that would match existing on-site materials as shown in Figure 2-5. All project features would visually blend with the existing visual character due to their placement and materials, including wood, metal, rocks, boulders, and stone, visual impacts. Overall, the project features would be small and low profile in the landscape, similar to existing features in size and color scheme as shown in Figure 2-4. The proposed single directional mountain bike trail would enhance viewer access to the park and the trail visitors’ recreational experience, which would be beneficial for appreciation of the region’s scenic quality.

Because visual effects of construction would be temporary, new trail features would be designed to match the aesthetic quality of existing recreational features, and existing landscape and vegetation within Wildcat Canyon Regional Park would obscure views from surrounding scenic vistas, the project would have a **less-than-significant** impact on scenic vistas.

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

No officially designated state scenic highways are within the City of Richmond or in the vicinity of the project site (Caltrans 2018; City of Richmond 2011). The nearest officially designated scenic highway to the project site is Route 24, located approximately 7 miles southeast. Given the distance from the project site and intervening landscape

conditions, motorists using this roadway would not have views of the project site. Therefore, **no impact** to scenic resources within a state scenic highway would occur with implementation of the project.

c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage points.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

Construction activities could result in temporary visual effects to public views of the project site from the existing trail system in Wildcat Canyon Regional Park. Specifically, the presence of construction equipment could reduce visual intactness and unity characteristics of the natural area. However, as described under criterion a), temporary visual impacts from construction would be limited to the project site, and areas of intervening hillsides and vegetation would help to visually screen construction equipment and activities. In addition, construction equipment would only be present on the project site during the temporary construction period (anticipated to be less than a year).

The project would improve visitor experience and would support existing bike riders in Wildcat Canyon Regional Park by constructing a single directional mountain bike trail, ultimately to relieve pressure on existing trails and minimize conflict (actual and perceived) with other trail users. Without specific design considerations to maintain the natural aesthetic, a project like this could result in long-term visual impacts to the visual character and quality of the project site and its surroundings. However, as described in criterion a), project features would be specifically designed to blend with the existing visual character due to their placement and materials, including wood, metal, rocks, boulders, and stone, limiting visual impacts of the project area (see Figures 2-4 and 2-5). The project would allow for a single directional mountain bike trail and would continue to provide the public opportunities to enjoy the high-quality natural views of Wildcat Canyon Regional Park.

The visual impact from construction would be temporary and minimal due to the view-obscuring character of existing hills and vegetation cover in the area. The long-term visual impacts from permanent project features would be minor due to the site-sensitive design and building materials similar in size and color to features in the park. Trail improvements would provide improved access and opportunities for the public to enjoy the natural landscape. Therefore, the project would have a **less-than-significant** impact on the quality of public views of the site and its surroundings.

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

Project construction activities would occur during daylight hours, limiting the need for exterior lighting during construction. During the shorter days of the late fall and winter months, exterior lighting may be required; however, any construction lighting would be temporary and pointed toward construction activities. Although construction equipment and vehicles may create glare that could adversely affect daytime views of the project area; glare created from construction equipment would be temporary and intermittent, and the intervening hillsides and vegetation would limit glare impacts to surrounding recreational viewers within the park and any public roadways.

No new lighting fixtures would be installed as part of the project features; therefore, the project would not create a new, permanent source of light. The turns in the steep downhill portion may be built from wood or metal. The proposed materials that would be used for the trail features would not cause glare given the rough texture and dark color. Other materials, such as wood, stone, boulders, and rocks would be chosen to visually blend in with the surrounding natural environment and would not cause glare. The boulder and rock materials would be used along the trail to create features that would match existing on-site materials. Therefore, the project would have a **less-than-significant** impact related to light and glare.

3.2 AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. Agriculture and Forest Resources.				
<p>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, as updated) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.</p> <p>In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.</p> <p>Would the project:</p>				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

3.2.1 Environmental Setting

FARMLAND

The project site is mapped by the California Department of Conservation (DOC) as Grazing Land and Other Land (DOC 2024a). The EBRPD uses prescribed grazing by cattle, sheep, and goats to reduce fire fuels and maintain habitat conditions in Wildcat Canyon Regional Park (CalCAN 2023). In addition, EBRPD manages cattle grazing within and surrounding the project site through the Wildland Management Policies and Guidelines (EBRPD 2001). Livestock grazing occurs year-round and is compatible with recreational trails and resource management within Wildcat Canyon Regional Park. The project site is not under a Williamson Act contract (DOC 2024b).

FOREST LAND AND TIMBERLAND

"Forest land" is defined in Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 12220(g) as land that can support 10 percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits. Forest land within Wildcat Canyon Regional Park is limited to the riparian forest of alder, willow, creek dogwood, and bay laurel present in the gorge of Wildcat Creek (EBRPD 2024b). However, no substantial woodland or forest habitat is present within the project site.

"Timberland" is defined in PRC Section 4526 as land, other than land owned by the federal government and land designated by the board as experimental forest land, which is available for, and capable of, growing a crop of trees of any commercial species used to produce lumber and other forest products, including Christmas trees. EBRPD does not carry out timberland production activities in Wildcat Canyon Regional Park or any of their managed lands, and no timberlands are located within the project site (EBRPD 2024a).

3.2.2 Discussion

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

As discussed above in Section 3.2.1, "Environmental Setting," the project site is mapped by the DOC as Grazing Land and Other Land (DOC 2024a). No designated Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance is present within the project site or regional park boundaries. In addition, implementation of the project would not alter existing cattle grazing within the project vicinity. Rather, cattle grazing would continue throughout the park and used as a vegetation management technique on lands adjacent to the proposed trail alignment. There is no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance in the project vicinity and implementation of the project would not convert agricultural land uses to non-agricultural use; there would be **no impact**.

b) **Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?**

As discussed above in Section 3.2.1, "Environmental Setting," the project area is mapped by the DOC as Grazing Land and Other Land (DOC 2024a). No designated Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance is present within the project site or boundaries of the regional park. In addition, implementation of the project would not alter existing cattle grazing within the project area. Because no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance is present throughout the project site, implementation of the project would not convert any of these agricultural land uses to non-agricultural use; there would be **no impact**.

c) **Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?**

The project site consists of an open hillside with a few trees, small low shrubs, and grasses and does not include forested areas (EBRPD 2024a). As discussed above in criterion b), the project site is zoned PR, "Parks and Recreation" (City of Richmond 2012b). The project area is not zoned as forest land, timberland, or timberland production. In addition, no existing timberland production operations occur in Wildcat Canyon Regional Park (EBRPD 2024a). Therefore, the project would have no impact on timberland (as defined by PRC section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g)). Additionally, the project would not conflict with existing zoning or cause rezoning of forest land. There would be **no impact**.

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

While Wildcat Canyon Regional Park contains many forested areas, no distinct woodland or forest habitat is present within the project site. No tree removal would occur, and EBRPD would continue to manage the landscape, consistent with current practices. Therefore, the project would not result in a loss of forest land nor conversion of forest land to non-forest use. There would be **no impact**.

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

As discussed above under criterion a), the project site is classified as Grazing Land and Other Land by the DOC (DOC 2024a). EBRPD would continue to manage grazing during project operation and would continue to implement management approaches to maintain grazing management in tandem with public access, as detailed in EBRPD's Wildland Management Policies and Guidelines. Livestock grazing is a known consideration for the project and exclusion fencing would be included as part of project construction (EBRPD 2024a). The project would not involve other changes to the existing environment that could affect other agricultural or forestry resources within the project area. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

3.3 AIR QUALITY

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. Air Quality.				
Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied on to make the following determinations.				
Are significance criteria established by the applicable air district available to rely on for significance determinations?				
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes		<input type="checkbox"/> No	
Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) 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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.3.1 Environmental Setting

The District has determined that an EIR will be prepared and that potential impacts associated with air quality will be evaluated therein. The EIR will include a detailed description of the environmental setting.

3.3.2 Discussion

a) **Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?**

Potentially significant. The EIR will include a detailed analysis of potential impacts.

b) **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?**

Potentially significant. The EIR will include a detailed analysis of potential impacts.

c) **Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?**

Potentially significant. The EIR will include a detailed analysis of potential impacts.

- d) **Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?**

Potentially significant. The EIR will include a detailed analysis of potential impacts.

Working Draft

3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. Biological Resources.				
Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, 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 Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.4.1 Environmental Setting

The District has determined that an EIR will be prepared and that potential impacts associated with biological resources will be evaluated therein. The analysis will be based on detailed studies, which will inform a comprehensive description of the environmental setting that will be provided in the EIR.

3.4.2 Discussion

- a) Have a substantial adverse effect, 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 Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Potentially significant. The EIR will include a detailed analysis of potential impacts.

- b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Potentially significant. The EIR will include a detailed analysis of potential impacts.

- c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

Potentially significant. The EIR will include a detailed analysis of potential impacts.

- 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?

Potentially significant. The EIR will include a detailed analysis of potential impacts.

- e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

Potentially significant. The EIR will include a detailed analysis of potential impacts.

- 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?

Potentially significant. The EIR will include a detailed analysis of potential impacts.

3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. Cultural Resources.				
Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially disturb human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.5.1 Environmental Setting

The District has determined that an EIR will be prepared and that potential impacts associated with cultural resources will be evaluated therein. The EIR will include a comprehensive description of the environmental setting.

3.5.2 Discussion

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

Potentially significant. The EIR will include a detailed analysis of potential impacts.

- b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

Potentially significant. The EIR will include a detailed analysis of potential impacts.

- c) Substantially disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Potentially significant. The EIR will include a detailed analysis of potential impacts.

3.6 ENERGY

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. Energy.				
Would the project:				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

3.6.1 Environmental Setting

Energy Types and Sources

California relies on a regional power system composed of a diverse mix of natural gas, renewable, hydroelectric, and nuclear generation resources. One-third of energy commodities consumed in California is natural gas. In 2022, total utility-scale electric generation for California was 287,220 gigawatt-hours (GWh), up 3.4 percent (9,456 GWh) from 2021. Utility-scale renewable generation increased 10.2 percent (9,520 GWh) in 2022 to 102,853 GWh from 93,333 GWh in 2021, solar generation increased 24.1 percent (9,492 GWh) to 48,950 GWh in 2022 from 39,458 GWh in 2021. Renewable and non-GHG (nuclear and large hydroelectric) resources accounted for 54.2 percent of total energy generation, compared to 52.1 percent in 2021 and, overall, all hydroelectric generation including imports accounted for 10.4 percent (29,758 GWh) of total system electric generation in 2022 (CEC 2023).

ENERGY USE FOR TRANSPORTATION

In 2021, the transportation sector comprised the largest end-use sector of energy in the State totaling 37.8 percent, followed by the industrial sector totaling 23.2 percent, the residential sector at 20.0 percent, and the commercial sector at 19.0 percent (EIA 2023). On-road vehicle use comprises about 90 percent of the petroleum consumed in California.

ENERGY USE AND CLIMATE CHANGE

Scientists and climatologists have produced evidence that the burning of fossil fuels by vehicles, power plants, industrial facilities, residences, and commercial facilities has led to an increase of the earth’s temperature. For an analysis of greenhouse gas production and the project’s impacts on climate change, refer to Section 3.8, “Greenhouse Gas Emissions.”

FEDERAL REGULATIONS

The Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 1975 established nationwide fuel economy standards to conserve oil. Under this act, the National Highway Traffic and Safety Administration (NHTSA) is responsible for revising fuel economy standards and establishing new vehicle economy standards. The Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) program was established to determine vehicle manufacturers’ compliance with the government’s fuel economy standards. Three Energy Policy Acts have been passed, in 1992, 2005, and 2007, to reduce dependence on foreign petroleum, provide tax incentives for the development of alternative fuels, and support energy conservation. As of March 31, 2022, NHTSA has finalized the CAFE Standards for model years (MY) 2024-2026. The new standards will increase fuel efficiency 8 percent

annually for MYs 2024-2025 and 10 percent annually for MY 2026. The new standards will also increase the estimated fleetwide average by nearly 10 miles per gallon for MY 2026, relative to MY 2021 (NHTSA 2022).

STATE REGULATIONS

See Section 3.8, "Greenhouse Gas Emissions," for a detailed summary of relevant statewide regulations that pertain to GHG emissions, which are directly correlated with energy consumption.

State of California Energy Action Plan

The California Energy Commission (CEC) is responsible for preparing the State Energy Plan, which identifies emerging trends related to energy supply, demand, conservation, public health and safety, and the maintenance of a healthy economy. The current plan is the 2003 California Energy Action Plan (2008 update). The plan calls for the state to assist in the transformation of the transportation system to improve air quality, reduce congestion, and increase the efficient use of fuel supplies with the least environmental and energy costs. To further this policy, the plan identifies a number of strategies, including assistance to public agencies and fleet operators in implementing incentive programs for zero-emission vehicles and addressing their infrastructure needs, and encouragement of urban design that reduces VMT and accommodates pedestrian and bicycle access.

Local Regulations

On April 25, 2012, the Richmond City Council adopted a new General Plan to guide the City's sustainable growth and development. The General Plan contains an Energy and Climate Change Element that outlines goals to achieving increased energy efficiency, renewable energy utilization, and reducing energy consumption. These goals are focused primarily on reducing energy consumption in the building energy and transportation sectors. In addition, the City of Richmond adopted a Climate Action Plan (CAP) in 2016 which aims to reduce Richmond's GHG emissions. CAPs are developed for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions primarily in the building and mobile sectors. All energy consumption associated with the project would be subject to applicable City rules and regulations.

3.6.2 Discussion

a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

The project would increase energy consumption for temporary construction activities related to vehicle use and material transport. However, construction activities would be temporary and would not increase long-term energy or fuel demand. Construction activities would consume the necessary amount of fuel/energy to complete work in an efficient and timely manner.

The project would not require the use of electricity or natural gas during operations. Although the proposed trail would result in increased fuel use as a result of increased vehicle-based visitation to Wildcat Canyon Regional Park, fuel consumption would not be considered wasteful or inefficient. Because the project would provide a high-quality public access and recreation resource for the region and would not increase electrical demand, natural gas use, or new vehicles trips above baseline conditions. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency

The project would result in an additional biking trail in an existing recreational area with existing facilities for biking and walking/hiking. The project would not generate additional vehicle trips or include energy-consuming infrastructure and would thus not result in the consumption of fossil fuels. The project does not include buildings or other structures that would use energy or would need to comply with renewable energy regulations such as solar ready buildings and similar State programs. Therefore, the project would not conflict with the City of Richmond's energy programs for residential and businesses. There would be **no impact** from a conflict with a state or local plan for renewable energy.

3.7 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. Geology and Soils.				
Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause 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 California Geological Survey Special Publication 42.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994, as updated), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.7.1 Environmental Setting

The project site is located in Wildcat Canyon Regional Park, an existing regional park in the City of Richmond. The City of Richmond is characterized by a large flat area (the Bay Plain) and a series of four southeast-northwest tending ridges. From west to east, these are the San Pablo-Potrero Hills Ridge, the Berkeley Hills, the San Pablo Ridge, and the Sobrante Ridge. Wildcat Canyon Regional Park is located between the Berkeley Hills and San Pablo Ridge (City of Richmond 2011).

The Orinda Formation is the underlying rock material in the project area. The Orinda Formation consists of materials ranging from partially consolidated (partially rocklike) claystone, siltstone, sandstone and conglomerates to unconsolidated clay, silt, sand and gravel. A layer of tuff (compacted volcanic fragments) is present within the Orinda Formation. Expansive soil occurs in clay soils and results in the shrinking and swelling of such soils with change in moisture conditions. The shrinking and swelling cause problems with building foundations, slabs-on-grade, and pavement, unless identified and addressed during design and correctly undertaken during construction. Expansive soil is prevalent in the Bay Plain area.

Liquefaction may occur when loose, unconsolidated, saturated fine- to medium-grained sandy soils are subjected to ground vibrations during a seismic event. This usually occurs in areas where the groundwater table is within 50 feet below the ground surface, and is generally associated with uncompacted, saturated, or nearly saturated, non-cohesive sandy and silty soils. When loose soil sediments are shaken, a sudden increase in pore water pressure causes the soils to lose strength and behave as a liquid. The soil map units delineated within the project site primarily consist of Los Gatos loam, Los Osos clay loam, Millsholm loam, and Tierra loam (NRCS 2024). These soils are all loams, which are fertile soils consisting of a mixture of clay and sand with organic matter. These soils are distributed across the project site according to topography and source geology. Portions of the project site are classified by the state of California as being within a liquefaction zone (CGS 2024); however, the liquefaction potential of the project site is classified as Zone III, "Probably Absent" (City of Richmond 2011). Furthermore, the soils at the project site are generally well-drained, which is a soils characteristic that is not generally conducive to the risk of liquefaction (NRCS 2024).

The project site is located within an earthquake fault zone (CGS 2024; DOC 2024c). The Hayward Fault Zone runs approximately along the west ridge of Wildcat Canyon within the City. It crosses through Parchester Village and extends into San Pablo Bay. The Wildcat fault, considered an inactive branch of the Hayward fault, runs approximately parallel to the Hayward fault. The Hayward Fault Zone is the southern extension of a fracture zone that includes the Rodgers Creek fault (north of San Pablo Bay), the Healdsburg fault (Sonoma County), and the Maacama fault (Mendocino County). The Hayward fault trends to the northwest within the East Bay, extending from San Pablo Bay in Richmond, 60 miles south to San Jose. The Hayward fault in San Jose converges with the Calaveras fault, a similar type fault that extends north to Suisun Bay. The Hayward fault is designated by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act as an active fault (City of Richmond 2011).

Other inactive faults within the City include the San Pablo fault, the Franklin fault, and the Pinole fault. The San Pablo fault is thought to traverse the southwest portion of Richmond transecting the Ford Peninsula in Marina Bay and the northern side of the San Pablo Peninsula. The San Andreas Fault is located approximately 15 miles to the west and could produce serious ground shaking and other earthquake-related hazards (City of Richmond 2011).

The project site is located within the Coast Ranges Geomorphic Province. This region extends from Northern California to the Transverse Ranges in Southern California. The terrain was created by tectonic forces that compressed ancient sedimentary deposits into a sub-parallel series of anticlines (concave downward) and synclines (concave upward). These folds were subsequently right-laterally faulted, uplifted, and eroded into their present configuration (City of Richmond 2011). The sediment and rock formations underlying the City of Richmond are known to be rich in subsurface paleontological resources (City of Richmond 2011).

Landsliding is a form of ground failure where there is a relatively rapid downslope movement of a mass of soil, rock and rock debris. The term is also used here to include mudslides and earthflows. Landsliding is affected by the degree of water saturation, strength of rocks, slope angle, mass and thickness of deposit and type and extent of vegetative cover. The project site is identified as being located within a landslide zone (CGS 2024).

Regulations

The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act of 1972 (PRC Section 2621-2630) intends to reduce the risk to life and property from surface fault rupture during earthquakes by regulating construction in active fault corridors and prohibiting the location of most types of structures intended for human occupancy across the traces of active faults. The act defines criteria for identifying active faults, giving legal support to terms such as active and inactive and

establishes a process for reviewing building proposals in Earthquake Fault Zones. Before a project can be permitted in a designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, cities and counties must require a geologic investigation to demonstrate that proposed buildings would not be constructed across active faults. The Act addresses only the hazard of surface fault rupture.

The intention of the Seismic Hazard Mapping Act (SHMA) of 1990 (PRC Section 2690–2699.6) is to reduce damage resulting from earthquakes. While the Alquist-Priolo Act addresses surface fault rupture, the SHMA addresses other earthquake-related hazards, including ground shaking, liquefaction, and seismically induced landslides. Cities and counties are prohibited from issuing development permits for projects in Seismic Hazard Zones until appropriate site-specific geologic or geotechnical investigations have been carried out and measures to reduce potential damage have been incorporated into development plans.

The California Building Code (CBC) (California Code of Regulations, Title 24) is based on the International Building Code (IBC). Specific minimum seismic safety and structural design requirements are set forth in Chapter 16 of the CBC. The CBC identifies seismic factors that must be considered in structural design. Chapter 18 of the CBC regulates the excavation of foundations and retaining walls, while Chapter 18A regulates construction on unstable soils, such as expansive soils and areas subject to liquefaction. Appendix J of the CBC regulates grading activities, including drainage and erosion control. The CBC contains a provision that provides for a preliminary soil report to be prepared to identify "...the presence of critically expansive soils or other soil problems which, if not corrected, would lead to structural defects." (CBC Chapter 18 Section 1803.1.1.1).

3.7.2 Discussion

- a) **Directly or indirectly cause 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 California Geological Survey Special Publication 42.)**
- and
- ii) **Strong seismic ground shaking?**

The project site is within a seismically active area, located adjacent to the seismically active Hayward fault zone and Hayward fault, which runs approximately along the west ridge of Wildcat Canyon (City of Richmond 2011; CGS 2024). The Hayward fault is designated by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act as an active fault (City of Richmond 2011). The two primary ways that a project could result in the risk of loss, injury, or death from fault rupture or strong seismic ground shaking would be a change in use of an area that would exacerbate the risk of fault rupture or magnitude of ground shaking, or the placement of structures that could be damaged or collapse, causing loss, injury, or death, in the event of fault rupture or ground shaking.

The project would not alter the existing uses in Wildcat Canyon Regional Park as it would provide an additional trail for existing bike riders. Therefore, the project would not exacerbate the risk of fault rupture or magnitude of seismic ground shaking by this mechanism. In addition, the project does not include structures designed for human occupancy. Therefore, the project would not exacerbate existing risks associated with fault rupture or seismic shaking. Therefore, this impact would be **less than significant**.

iii) **Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?**

Liquefaction and other seismic-related ground failure events primarily affect structures. As described in Section 3.7.1, "Environmental Setting," soils within the project site are well-drained, and the liquefaction potential of the project site

soils is classified as Zone III, "Probably Absent" (City of Richmond 2011). In addition, the project includes a new bike trail and thus would not include structures that would be situated on soils prone to liquefaction. Therefore, impacts related to liquefaction would be **less than significant**.

iv) Landslides?

Portions of the project site are in areas of mapped historic landslides, as well as an area identified as exposed to seismic-related landslide risk pursuant to the SHMA (CGS 2024). The project would not result in a change in use of the area and therefore would not create a new or increased risk of landslide. Moreover, implementation of the project would not involve substantial ground-disturbing activities that would modify topography or cause loading that could increase the probability of a landslide occurring. Therefore, project related risks associated with loss, injury, or death from landslides would be low and the impact would be **less than significant**.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Soil erosion is a naturally occurring process. The agents of soil erosion are water and wind, each contributing a significant amount of soil loss. The effects of erosion are intensified with an increase in slope (as water moves faster, it gains momentum to carry more debris), the narrowing of runoff channels (which increases the velocity of water), and by the removal of groundcover (which leaves the soil exposed to erosive forces). As such, there is the risk of erosion within the project vicinity. Soft surface features (fences) and trail corridor clearing activities are proposed at the project site. However, as described in Chapter 2, "Project Description," the trail would be constructed with frequent grade changes, dips, and rollers to minimize water flow distances along the trail surface and minimize erosion. All bermed turns would have a roller and drain installed directly before and after the berm to collect and move water off the trail.

Project construction would involve ground disturbing activities including grading and clearing, which could result in soil erosion and loss of topsoil. Construction would be designed to minimize disturbance to existing vegetation, and any disturbed areas outside of the trail tread and features during construction would be revegetated and restored once construction is complete. However, without additional measures, project ground disturbing activities may result in erosion and loss of topsoil. Implementation of Mitigation Measures HYD-1 would reduce impacts to **less than significant with mitigation incorporated**.

Implement **Mitigation Measure HYD-1: Soil Erosion Control Plan**, as described in Section 3.10, "Hydrology and Water Quality" under item (a).

Significance After Mitigation

Mitigation Measures HYD-1 would require the preparation and implementation of a Soil Erosion Control Plan. This plan would require implementation of best management practices during construction, including erosion control measures. Implementation of this mitigation measures would ensure that the project would not result in erosion or loss of topsoil. Therefore, the impact would be **less than significant with mitigation incorporated**.

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?

Landslide-related hazards associated with the proposed trail are addressed under item a)(iv), above. Soil susceptibility to liquefaction within the project area is addressed under item a)(iii), above. Soil units within the project vicinity do not exhibit other properties that would lead to unstable or hazardous soil conditions. In addition, the project would not create unstable conditions because no structures are proposed. Impacts related to unstable soils would be **less than significant**.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994, as updated), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?

As described in Section 3.7.1, "Environmental Setting," expansive soil occurs in clay soils and result in the shrinking and swelling of soils in moisture conditions, which causes problems with building foundations, slabs-on-grade, and pavement. The soils on the project site are loams that contain clay content that would swell when wet and shrink when dry (NRCS 2024). However, the project would consist of a new single-directional mountain bike trail in Wildcat Canyon Regional Park, and no structures are proposed. Because the project would not include structures and the trail would be built to safely support mountain bikers, the project would not create substantial risks to life or property. This impact would be **less than significant**.

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?

The proposed project would not involve the installation of any septic system or other form of wastewater disposal. Therefore, there would be **no impact**.

f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

As described in Section 3.7.1, "Environmental Setting," the sediment and rock formations underlying the project site are sedimentary rocks and are known to be rich in subsurface paleontological resources (City of Richmond 2011). However, subsurface disturbance activities associated with the project would not extend below 3-feet for construction of the trail. The sections of the trail requiring fencing along steeper hillsides would require depths closer to 3 feet to add poles for the fencing, but the minor excavations associated would be limited in their overall extent because the soft surface features they would support are minor (fence poles). Therefore, the likelihood of encountering a unique paleontological or geologic resource is low. However, there is a potential for paleontological resources to be discovered at the project site during project construction and implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would reduce impacts to **less than significant with mitigation incorporated**.

Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Protocol for the Unanticipated Discovery of Paleontological Resources

The following shall be implemented in the event of the unanticipated discovery of a paleontological resource during project construction:

1. Work at the location of the find shall be halted immediately within 50 feet of the find. A no work zone shall be established using appropriate flagging to delineate the boundary of this zone, which shall measure at least 50 feet in all directions from the find.
2. The East Bay Regional Park District shall retain the services of a paleontologist who meets the Society for Vertebrate Paleontology's criteria for a qualified professional paleontologist (Society of Vertebrate Paleontology 1995) to evaluate the find. The qualified professional paleontologist shall follow the Society for Vertebrate Paleontology's guidelines for the treatment of the find. Treatment may include preparation and recovery of fossil materials for donation to an appropriate museum or university collection. A report documenting the find and any recommendations shall be prepared and submitted to the Esat Bay Regional Park District. The East Bay Regional Park District shall be responsible for ensuring the paleontologist's recommendations are implemented.

Significance After Mitigation

Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would require work to stop upon discovery of a paleontological resource, evaluation of the find by a qualified professional paleontologist, and implementation of any recommendations to protect paleontological resources. Therefore, impacts would be less than **significant with mitigation incorporated**.

3.8 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions.				
Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.8.1 Environmental Setting

The District has determined that an EIR will be prepared and that potential impacts associated with greenhouse gas emissions will be evaluated therein. The EIR will include a detailed description of the environmental setting.

3.8.2 Discussion

- a) **Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?**

Potentially significant. The EIR will include a detailed analysis of potential impacts.

- b) **Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?**

Potentially significant. The EIR will include a detailed analysis of potential impacts.

3.9 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and/or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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"/>
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 or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) 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"/>
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.9.1 Environmental Setting

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The State Water Resources Control Board’s (SWRCB) GeoTracker website provides data relating to leaking underground storage tanks and other types of soil and groundwater contamination, along with associated cleanup activities. No hazardous materials sites are within 1,000 feet of the project site (SWRCB 2024a). The California Department of Toxic Substances Control’s (DTSC) Envirostor website provides data related to hazardous materials spills and clean ups. No hazardous material spills or clean ups are recorded within 1,000 feet of the project site (DTSC 2023).

SCHOOLS

The closest school to the project site is the Madera Elementary School located approximately 0.6 miles southwest. Other schools in the vicinity of the project site include Wildcat Canyon Community School located approximately 1.4 miles to the northwest.

AIRPORTS

No airports or private airstrips are within the project vicinity. The closest public airports to the project site are the Buchanan Field Airport located approximately 12.8 miles to the northeast, Oakland International Airport located approximately 15.6 miles south, and San Rafael Airport, located approximately 13.8 miles northwest.

EMERGENCY RESPONSE AND EVACUATION PLANS

The Contra Costa County Office of Emergency Services (OES) is responsible for supporting emergency response and disaster readiness within the County and has prepared a Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP) which serves as a guide for the county to become more resilient to the impacts of natural, human-caused, and technological hazards (Contra Costa County 2018). In addition, the EBRPD Fire Department provides a high level of service to EBRP's regional parks. The EBRPD Fire Department responds with the neighboring agencies in Alameda and Contra Costa counties and provides emergency response when called upon by CAL Fire and the Office of Emergency Services. The EBRPD Fire Department identifies evacuation tips and resources from CAL FIRE on their website to assist with emergency preparedness (EBRPD 2019). There are 10 fire stations throughout EBRPD's regional parks. The nearest station to the project site is Fire Station #9 located at 5755 McBryde Avenue, Richmond within Wildcat Canyon Regional Park and approximately 1.8 miles northwest of the proposed trail alignment.

3.9.2 Discussion

a) **Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?**

Construction of the single directional mountain bike trail would require the use of limited quantities of common hazardous materials, such as fuels, oils, lubricants, or other fluids associated with the operation and maintenance of construction vehicles or mechanical equipment. The transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials could result in accidents or upset of hazardous materials that could create hazards to people or the environment. The extent of the hazard would depend in large part on the type of material, the volume released, and the mechanism of release (e.g., spill on the ground in the project area versus a spill on a road during transport). The use of these hazardous materials would be temporary and intermittent over the project construction period (i.e., up to 12 months), and no long-term routine transport, use, or disposal would occur. In addition, construction activities would comply with the California Environmental Protection Agency's Unified Program, which requires that any significant vehicle oil spills be reported to the local Certified Unified Program Agency for Contra Costa County and be properly cleaned up (CalOES 2014), and all hazardous materials would be used, stored, and disposed of in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local laws. Operation of the project would not require the routine transport, use, or disposal of significant quantities of hazardous materials. Therefore, the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment through the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials and the impact would be **less than significant**.

b) **Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and/or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?**

Project construction would involve ground-disturbing activities including excavation and clearing, which could potentially release hazardous materials into the environment if present. No hazardous materials sites are known to

occur in the project vicinity as discussed below under criterion d). Wildcat Canyon Regional Park is generally undeveloped, with the exception of the existing recreational features (nearby trails), and it is unlikely that unknown hazardous materials are present within the project vicinity. However, if an unknown hazardous waste site is uncovered, it could create a significant hazard to the environment or public if accidentally released during construction ground-disturbing activities. In the unlikely event that evidence of hazardous waste is encountered during construction, EBRPD would implement the applicable requirements of the Comprehensive Environmental Release Compensation and Liability Act and the California Code of Regulations Title 22 regarding the safe handling and disposal of waste. Therefore, the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment and this impact would be **less than significant**.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

The project site is not within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school. The closest school to the project site is the Madera Elementary School located approximately 0.6 miles southwest. The project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

As discussed in the Environmental Setting above, no hazardous materials sites listed on the SWRCB's GeoTracker database or the DTSC's EnviroStor database are present within the project site or within 1,000 feet of the project site. The project would therefore not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment from being located on or near a hazardous materials site. **No impact** would occur.

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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?

The project area is not within an airport land use plan, or within 2 miles of an existing airport. The closest public airport to the project site is the Buchanan Field Airport located approximately 12.8 miles to the northeast. The project would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area. **No impact** would occur.

f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

The project site is located in the northwest portion of Wildcat Regional Park. The 1.4-mile directional flow bike trail is not located near a population center. The Contra Costa County Office of Emergency Services, a division of the Sheriff's Department, is responsible for planning, outreach, and training as it relates to Disaster Management and Emergency Preparedness. The proposed project includes construction of a 1.4-mile directional flow bike trail within Wildcat Regional Park and would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?

As discussed in Section 3.20, "Wildfire," the project site is not within a FHSZ classified as Very High (CAL FIRE 2024). Wildcat Canyon Regional Park currently experiences regular visitation. The project includes developing a single directional mountain bike trail that would accommodate existing riders in the park. Although the project would increase the number of visitors exposed to existing wildfire hazards the project would not substantially alter the risk of wildfire (i.e., not exacerbate the existing risk, recognizing the types of recreation activity would not change) because the project would result in additional mountain bikers in Wildcat Canyon Regional Park. Furthermore, the project does not involve construction of residential or commercial structures or any other structures for human occupation. Park visitors would use the trail for a limited duration of time during operational hours. Construction of the trail would follow the EBRPD's best management practices (BMPs) to minimize fire danger in fire-prone wildlands (e.g., prohibiting work on red flag days, warning the public of fire danger on high fire days, establishing pump truck requirements). Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to significant hazards involving wildfires and the impact would be **less than significant**.

3.10 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. Hydrology and Water Quality.				
Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
i) Result in substantial on- or offsite erosion or siltation;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) 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; or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.10.1 Environmental Setting

SURFACE WATER

The project site is in the Pinole Creek-Frontal San Pablo Bay Estuaries and San Pablo Creek Watersheds. The Pinole Creek-Frontal San Pablo Bay Estuaries Watershed is approximately 36,006 acres while the San Pablo Creek Watershed is approximately 26,102 acres (EPA 2024b). Waterbodies in the vicinity of the project site include San Pablo Creek and San Pablo Reservoir to the east and Wildcat Creek to the west. Both San Pablo Reservoir and Wildcat Creek are listed as Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 303(d) impaired waterbodies (San Francisco Bay Area RWQCB 2024). In addition,

there are multiple unnamed tributaries to Wildcat Creek in the vicinity of the project site. Furthermore, there is a stock pond north of and adjacent to the project site.

The project area is characteristic of the prevailing climate in the City of Richmond and greater Contra Costa County, which is Mediterranean, characterized by extended periods of precipitation during the winter months and very little precipitation from spring through autumn. During periods of precipitation in the winter, local waterways—including numerous ephemeral drainages—will flow, while these same waterways exhibit greatly reduced flows or no flow throughout the summer and into the early autumn. There are roadside ditches that collect runoff and may be wet for extended periods through the winter and early spring.

The San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) designates beneficial uses for water bodies in its Basin Plan. Beneficial uses identified in the Basin Plan for San Pablo Creek include freshwater replenishment, cold freshwater habitat, fish migration habitat, preservation of rare or endangered species, fish spawning, warm freshwater habitat, wildlife habitat, and water contact recreation, water contact non-recreation. Beneficial uses identified in the Basin Plan for San Pablo Reservoir include municipal and domestic supply, commercial and sport fishing, cold freshwater habitat, fish spawning, warm freshwater habitat, wildlife habitat, and water contact recreation, water contact non-recreation. Finally, beneficial uses identified in the Basin Plan for Wildcat Creek include freshwater replenishment, cold freshwater habitat, fish migration habitat, preservation of rare or endangered species, fish spawning, warm freshwater habitat, wildlife habitat, and water contact recreation, water contact non-recreation.

GROUNDWATER

The project site and greater Wildcat Canyon Regional Park are not within a Department of Water Resources (DWR) designated groundwater basin. The closest DWR designated groundwater basin is the Santa Clara Valley Groundwater Basin (Basin Number 2-9.02), which is located west of Wildcat Canyon Regional Park and encompasses the City of Richmond (SWRCB 2024b).

3.10.2 Discussion

a) **Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?**

The project would involve the construction and operation of an approximately 1.4-mile downhill single track mountain bike trail. Waterbodies in the vicinity of the project site include San Pablo Creek and San Pablo Reservoir to the east and Wildcat Creek to the west. Both San Pablo Reservoir and Wildcat Creek are listed as Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 303(d) impaired waterbodies (San Francisco Bay Area RWQCB 2024). In addition, there are multiple unnamed tributaries to Wildcat Creek in the vicinity of the project site and a stock pond north of and adjacent to the project site. Once operable the proposed trail would include features (e.g., bermed turns) that would recontour the existing ground surface and thus alter the existing drainage pattern. However, the trail would be constructed with frequent grade changes, dips, and rollers to minimize water flow distances along the trail surface and erosion. All bermed turns would have a roller and drain installed directly before and after the berm to collect water and allow groundwater recharge. As such, the project has been designed to maintain groundwater quality.

Project construction would involve ground disturbing activities including grading and clearing, which could degrade surface or groundwater quality if soil erosion and associated sediment-laden runoff, fuel, or other construction-related pollutants and contaminants are not adequately controlled, and accidentally or unintentionally entered downstream receiving waterbodies. Construction would comply with all applicable regulations related to water quality and would be designed to minimize disturbance to existing vegetation, and any disturbed areas outside of the trail tread and features during construction would be revegetated and restored once construction is complete. However, given the project's hillside location and proximity to various waterbodies downslope of the project site, project construction would have the potential to violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or

otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality. Implementation of Mitigation Measures HYD-1 would reduce impacts to **less than significant with mitigation incorporated**.

Mitigation Measure HYD-1: Soil Erosion Control Plan

Prior to commencing project construction, the East Bay Regional Park District shall prepare a Soil Erosion Control Plan (Plan) that addresses temporary construction-related erosion control. The Plan shall include winterization, dust, erosion and pollution control measures conforming to the California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA) Best Management Practices Handbook for Construction. The Plan shall be incorporated into the project's construction documents. The construction plans shall specify erosion and sediment control measures, including best management practices (BMPs) to control short-term construction-related water quality impacts. The Plan shall be implemented by the construction contractor for the project throughout the duration of construction. BMPs shall include, at a minimum, the following:

- ▶ Minimize the extent of surface disturbance of soil and vegetation and use existing access and maintenance roads wherever feasible.
- ▶ Stabilize grading areas as soon as possible following completion of disturbance with seeding, mulching, and installation of erosion control materials such as erosion control blankets and straw rolls or other approved and effective methods. Only native seed and plant materials shall be used, unless otherwise approved by a qualified biologist.
- ▶ Delineate clearing limits, easements, setbacks, environmentally sensitive areas, and drainage courses by marking them in the field, and installing exclusion fencing, silt fencing, and/or coir logs or straw rolls.
- ▶ If rainfall is expected to occur, implement temporary sediment control measures such as additional silt fencing, straw rolls, covering stock piles, and directing runoff to sediment detention structures to filter and remove sediment.
- ▶ Place, slope, and cover any stockpiled soil so that it would not be subject to accelerated erosion.
- ▶ Avoid accidental discharge of all project-related materials and fluids into local waterways by using straw rolls or silt fences, constructing berms or barriers around construction materials, or installing geofabric in disturbed areas with long, steep slopes.

Significance After Mitigation

Mitigation Measures HYD-1 would require the preparation and implementation of a Soil Erosion Control Plan. This plan would require implementation of a BMPs during construction, including erosion control measures, that would filter construction runoff that could impact water quality. The implementation of this mitigation measure would ensure that the project would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality. Therefore, the impact would be **less than significant with mitigation incorporated**.

b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

The project involves the construction and operation of an approximately 1.4-mile single directional mountain bike trail within Wildcat Canyon Regional Park. The project would not result in an increase in impervious surfaces, and therefore would not interfere with groundwater recharge. In addition, the project would not deplete groundwater supplies because no groundwater would be used during project construction, and the project does not propose any new amenities requiring ongoing water supply (e.g., drinking fountain). Furthermore, the project site is not within a DWR designated groundwater basin. Therefore, the project would not impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin and there would be **no impact**.

- c) **Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:**

- i) **Result in substantial on- or offsite erosion or siltation;**

The project would involve the construction of a new downhill single directional mountain bike trail that would include various features, such as bermed turns, tabletops, and rollers. As discussed under item (a), project construction would involve ground disturbing activities including grading and clearing, which could result in erosion and siltation of downstream receiving waterbodies. Construction would be designed to minimize disturbance to existing vegetation, and any disturbed areas outside of the trail tread and features during construction would be revegetated and restored once construction is complete. However, given the project's hillside location and proximity to various waterbodies downslope of the project site, project construction would have the potential to substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site and result in substantial on- or offsite erosion or siltation. Implementation of Mitigation Measure HYD-1 would reduce impacts to **less than significant with mitigation incorporated**.

During operation, the proposed trail features (e.g., bermed turns) would recontour the existing ground surface and thus alter the existing drainage pattern. However, the proposed trail would be constructed with frequent grade changes, dips, and rollers to minimize water flow distances along the trail surface and erosion. All bermed turns would have a roller and drain installed directly before and after the berm to collect and move water off the trail. The roller and drain features would allow users a slight uphill portion of trail tread to reduce speed and alert users of an upcoming feature. Undulation in the tread surface would provide for frequent drainage of the trail. As such, the project has been designed to minimize erosion and prevent substantial alteration of existing drainage patterns during operation. Therefore, the operation of the project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or result in substantial on- or offsite erosion or siltation.

Implement **Mitigation Measure HYD-1: Soil Erosion Control Plan**, as described under item (a).

Significance After Mitigation

Mitigation Measures HYD-1 would require the preparation and implementation of a Soil Erosion Control Plan. This plan would require implementation of BMPs during construction, including erosion control measures, that would filter construction runoff that could impact water quality. The implementation of this mitigation measures would ensure that the project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or result in substantial on- or offsite erosion or siltation. Therefore, the impact would be **less than significant with mitigation incorporated**.

- ii) **Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;**

As discussed under item (c)(i), any disturbed areas outside of the trail tread and features during construction would be revegetated and restored, which would reduce the rate and amount of runoff from the trail. In addition, the proposed trail would be constructed with frequent grade changes, dips, and rollers to minimize water flow distances along the trail surface and erosion. All bermed turns would have a roller and drain installed directly before and after the berm to collect and move water off the trail. The roller and drain features would allow users a slight uphill portion of trail tread to reduce speed and alert users of an upcoming feature. Undulation in the tread surface would provide for frequent drainage of the trail. Furthermore, the project would not result in an increase in impervious surfaces that could increase runoff compared to existing conditions. Therefore, the project would not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite. This impact would be **less than significant**.

iii) 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;

As discussed under item (c)(i), any disturbed areas outside of the trail tread and features during construction would be revegetated and restored, which would reduce the rate and amount of runoff from the trail. In addition, the proposed trail would be constructed with frequent grade changes, dips, and rollers to minimize water flow distances along the trail surface and minimize erosion. All bermed turns would have a roller and drain installed directly before and after the berm to collect and move water off the trail. The roller and drain features would allow users a slight uphill portion of trail tread to reduce speed and alert users of an upcoming feature. Undulation in the tread surface would provide for frequent drainage of the trail. Furthermore, the project would not result in an increase in impervious surfaces that could increase runoff compared to existing conditions. Moreover, the project involves the construction of new recreational uses and would not create additional sources of polluted runoff. Therefore, the project would not 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. This impact would be **less than significant**.

iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?

The proposed project involves the construction of a new downhill single-track mountain bike trail. No new structures or other features are proposed that could impede or redirect flows. As described above under item (c)(i), the proposed project would not substantially alter existing draining patterns and would not create impervious surfaces that could increase runoff and exacerbate flood flows. In addition, the project is located in FEMA Zone X, which is identified as an area of minimal flood hazard, and therefore is not located in a floodplain or other flood hazard area (FEMA 2023). Therefore, the proposed project would not alter drainage patterns in a manner that could impede or redirect flood flows. This impact would be **less than significant**.

d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

The project is located inland from the coast and is not in proximity to major waterbodies (e.g., San Francisco Bay). The nearest large body of water is the San Pablo Reservoir, which, at 1.5 miles from the project at its nearest point is well outside of the range of impact if a seiche were to be observed at the reservoir. Moreover, the proposed trail is upslope of San Pablo Reservoir and separated from this waterbody by approximately 600 feet of elevation. Therefore, the project is outside of the range of a seiche or tsunami. In addition, the project is located in FEMA Zone X, which is identified as an area of minimal flood hazard, and therefore is not located in a floodplain or other flood hazard area (FEMA 2023). Furthermore, the project involves the construction of new recreational uses and would not be a source of additional pollutants. Therefore, the project would not risk the release of pollutants due to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or flood hazard, and **no impact** would occur.

e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

The project is within the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Bay Area RWQCB and would be subject to the Basin Plan. If the project were to significantly impact water quality and diminish the beneficial uses listed in the Basin Plan, the project could conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the Basin Plan. As discussed above under item (a), project construction would involve ground disturbing activities including grading and clearing, which could result in erosion and siltation of downstream receiving waterbodies. Construction would be designed to minimize disturbance to existing vegetation, and any disturbed areas outside of the trail tread and features during construction would be revegetated and restored once construction is complete. However, given the project's hillside location and proximity to various waterbodies downslope of the project site, project construction would have the potential to degrade water quality. Therefore, project construction would conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan, and the impact would be **potentially significant**.

Once operational, the trail would require periodic maintenance to uphold the trail and ensure the safety of users. The trail would be maintained by a combination of machine and hand tools as needed. These types of maintenance activities would be similar to those that currently occur at other trail segments within the regional park and would require little mechanical equipment or sources of pollution that could enter waterways.

Furthermore, the project site is not within a DWR designated groundwater basin and would not result in an increase in impervious surfaces that could interfere with groundwater recharge. The project does not involve any uses that would have the potential to pollute groundwater resources potentially underlying the proposed trail. Therefore, operation of the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.

Implement **Mitigation Measure HYD-1: Soil Erosion Control Plan**, as described under item (a).

Significance After Mitigation

Mitigation Measures HYD-1 would require the preparation and implementation of a Soil Erosion Control Plan. This plan would require implementation of BMPs during construction, including erosion control measures, that would filter construction runoff that could impact water quality. The implementation of this mitigation measure would ensure that the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. Therefore, the impact would be **less than significant with mitigation incorporated**.

3.11 LAND USE AND PLANNING

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. 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"/>
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.11.1 Environmental Setting

The project is located in Wildcat Canyon Regional Park, an existing regional park in the city of Richmond managed by the EBRPD. The area proposed for the trail alignment is currently vacant and covered with grazed and weeded grasses along the hillside.

Wildcat Canyon Regional Park consists of 25 miles of trails (mostly fire roads), including 2.5 miles of paved trail on Nimitz Way and 6 miles of single-track trails in the Tilden Nature Area, as well as a children’s playground and several picnic and barbeque facilities. Existing trails within the park are available for hiking, bicycling, and equestrian use, subject to restrictions in certain areas.

All bikes are prohibited in the area of the Tilden Nature Area’s Environmental Education Center and Little Farm on Wildcat Canyon’s south end and on any single-track trail in the Tilden Nature Area. To access Wildcat Creek Trail from the south, bikers must use the Loop Road above the Environmental Education Center and Little Farm to Jewel Lake. Mountain bikes are not allowed on the Laurel fire road connecting the Nimitz Way to the Loop Road. Mountain bikes are permitted on all other fire roads in Wildcat Canyon, as well as Havey Canyon Trail, which is a wide single-track.

The project site and greater Wildcat Canyon Regional Park have a General Plan land use designation of “Parks and Recreation” and a zoning designation of PR, “Parks and Recreation” (City of Richmond 2012a, 2012b). The “Parks and Recreation” land use designation includes publicly owned local and regional parks as well as privately owned recreational facilities such as golf courses. Small-scale recreation-supporting uses such as rental shops, bike repair facilities, small restaurants, interpretation centers and museums are also permitted (City of Richmond 2012c). The City of Richmond land use designations immediately adjacent to Wildcat Canyon Regional Park include “Agriculture” to the east, “Richmond Hills Initiative Area” and “Parks and Recreation” to the north, and “Hillside Residential” and “Neighborhood Mixed-Use” to the west.

3.11.2 Discussion

a) Physically divide an established community?

The proposed project involves the construction and operation of an approximately 1.4-mile directional flow bike trail in the northwest portion of Wildcat Canyon Regional Park. There are no established communities located within the regional park, and the project would not extend into any adjacent communities outside of the regional park. All proposed improvements would occur within the existing park boundaries. Therefore, the project would not physically divide an established community. **No impact** would occur.

b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

The project site and immediate surrounding area have a General Plan land use designation of "Parks and Recreation" and are zoned PR, "Parks and Recreation" (City of Richmond 2012a, 2012b). The "Parks and Recreation" land use designation includes publicly owned local and regional parks as well as privately owned recreational facilities such as golf courses. Small-scale recreation-supporting uses such as rental shops, bike repair facilities, small restaurants, interpretation centers and museums are also permitted (City of Richmond 2012c).

The project proposes to provide a new approximately 1.4-mile single directional mountain bike trail within Wildcat Canyon Regional Park to relieve pressure on existing trails and minimize conflict (actual and perceived) with other trail users. The proposed bike trail would be consistent with the uses permitted within the "Parks and Recreation" land use designation. As such, the project would not require any changes to the underlying General Plan land use or zoning designations for the site. Moreover, the project would be consistent with all applicable policies from the Parks and Recreation Element of the City's General Plan. In addition, the project would be consistent and minimize conflicts with the other uses (e.g., hiking) in Wildcat Canyon Regional Park. Furthermore, the project would include installation of trail fencing along specific sections of the proposed trail to reduce conflicts with livestock that currently graze within the regional park.

Therefore, the project would not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation. This impact would be **less than significant**.

3.12 MINERAL RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

3.12.1 Environmental Setting

No locally important mineral resource recovery sites are known to be located within the project vicinity. The project site is classified as Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ)-1 (Kohler-Antablin 1996). The MRZ-1 classification is used to designate areas where adequate geologic information indicates that no significant mineral deposits are present, or where it is judged that little likelihood exists for their presence (DOC 1987).

3.12.2 Discussion

- 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?**

The project site does not contain known mineral resources. The project would provide an approximately 1.4-mile directional flow bike trail in the northwest portion of Wildcat Canyon Regional Park. No mineral resources would be extracted or removed. The project would therefore have a **no impact** related to the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state.

- 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?**

As discussed above in Section 3.12.1, "Environmental Setting," the project site does not contain known mineral resources. The project would provide an approximately 1.4-mile directional flow bike trail in the northwest portion of Wildcat Canyon Regional Park. The project would not result in zoning or land use changes that would prevent the recovery of minerals or the loss of availability of a known mineral resource site. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

3.13 NOISE

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII.Noise.				
Would the project result in:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies, or a substantial temporary or permanent increase in noise levels above existing ambient levels that could result in an adverse effect on humans?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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"/>

3.13.1 Environmental Setting

ACOUSTIC FUNDAMENTALS

Acoustics is the scientific study that evaluates perception, propagation, absorption, and reflection of sound waves. Sound is a mechanical form of radiant energy, transmitted by a pressure wave through a solid, liquid, or gaseous medium. Sound that is loud, disagreeable, unexpected, or unwanted is generally defined as noise. Noise is typically expressed in decibels (dB), which is a common measurement of sound energy. Definitions of acoustical terms used in this section are provided in Table 3.13-1.

Table 3.13-1 Acoustic Term Definitions

Term	Definition
Noise	Noise is generally defined as sound that is loud, disagreeable, unexpected, or unwanted.
Decibel (dB)	Sound levels are measured using the decibel scale, developed to relate to the range of human hearing. A decibel is logarithmic; it does not follow normal algebraic methods and cannot be directly summed. For example, a 65-dB source of sound, such as a truck, when joined by another 65-dB source results in a sound amplitude of 68 dB, not 130 dB (i.e., doubling the source strength increases the sound pressure by 3 dB). A sound level increase of 10 dB corresponds to 10 times the acoustical energy, and an increase of 20 dB equates to a 100-fold increase in acoustical energy.
A-weighted decibel (dBA)	The human ear is not equally sensitive to loudness at all frequencies in the audible spectrum. To better relate overall sound levels and loudness to human perception, frequency-dependent weighting networks were developed, identified as A through E. There is a strong correlation between the way humans perceive sound and A-weighted sound levels. For this reason, the A-weighted sound levels are used to predict community response to noise from the environment, including noise from transportation and stationary sources, and are expressed as A-weighted decibels. All sound levels discussed in this section are A-weighted decibels unless otherwise noted.
Equivalent Noise Level (L_{eq})	The average noise level during a specified time period; that is, the equivalent steady-state noise level in a stated period of time that would contain the same acoustic energy as the time-varying noise level during the same period (i.e., average noise level).
Maximum Noise Level (L_{max})	The highest instantaneous noise level during a specified time period.

Source: Caltrans 2013.

Noise Generation and Attenuation

Noise can be generated by many sources, including mobile sources such as automobiles, trucks, and airplanes and stationary sources such as activity at construction sites, machinery, and commercial and industrial operations. As sound travels through the atmosphere from the source to the receiver, noise levels attenuate (i.e., decrease) depending on ground absorption characteristics, atmospheric conditions, and the presence of physical barriers. Sound from a localized source (i.e., a point source) propagates uniformly outward in a spherical pattern. The sound level attenuates at a rate of 6 dB for each doubling of distance from a point source. Sound levels attenuate at a rate of 3 dB for each doubling of distance from a line source. For acoustically absorptive sites such as soft dirt, grass, or scattered bushes and trees, an additional ground-attenuation value of 1.5 dB per doubling of distance is normally assumed. When added to the attenuation rate associated with a point source, the additional ground attenuation results in an overall drop-off rate of 4.5 dB per doubling of distance. This would hold true for point sources, resulting in an overall drop-off rate of up to 7.5 dB per doubling of distance.

Atmospheric conditions such as wind speed, wind direction, turbulence, temperature gradients, and humidity also alter the propagation of noise and affect levels at a receiver. Furthermore, the presence of a barrier (e.g., topographic feature, intervening building, and dense vegetation) between the source and the receptor can provide substantial attenuation of noise levels at the receiver. Natural (e.g., berms, hills, and dense vegetation) and human-made features (e.g., buildings and walls) may function as noise barriers.

Ground Vibration

Vibration is the periodic oscillation of a medium or object with respect to a given reference point. Ground-borne vibration is vibration of and through the ground. Ground-borne vibration can range from levels that are imperceptible by humans to levels that can create substantial damage to buildings and structures. Sources ground-borne of vibration include natural phenomena (e.g., earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, sea waves, landslides) and those introduced by human activity (e.g., explosions, machinery, traffic, trains, construction equipment). Vibration sources may be continuous, (e.g., operating factory machinery) or transient in nature (e.g., explosions). Vibration levels can be depicted in terms of amplitude and frequency, relative to displacement, velocity, or acceleration.

EXISTING NOISE SOURCES AND LEVELS

The project is located within the Wildcat Canyon Regional Park. Therefore, the project site and surrounding area are considered rural. The nearest public roadway is Vista Heights Road.

NOISE- AND VIBRATION-SENSITIVE LAND USES AND RECEPTORS

Noise- and vibration-sensitive land uses generally include those uses where noise exposure could result in health-related risks to individuals, places where a quiet setting is an essential element of the intended purpose (e.g., schools and libraries), and historic buildings that could sustain structural damage due to vibration. The project site is located in a regional park with no substantial noise generating uses. Noise- and vibration-sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project site include residents to the southwest and the Charter School of Morgan Hill. The Charter School of Morgan Hill is located 2 miles northeast of the project site. The closest sensitive receptor to the project site are existing residences located 0.20-mile (approximately 1,000 feet) southwest.

AIRPORTS AND PRIVATE AIRSTRIPS

There are no public airports or private airstrips within the project vicinity. The nearest airport is the San Rafael Airport, which is located approximately 12 miles northwest of the project site.

REGULATORY SETTING

Federal Regulations

Federal Transit Administration

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) provides guidance on evaluating human response to ground vibration. The FTA has set forth guidelines for maximum-acceptable vibration criteria for different types of land uses where people live or work. These guidelines are presented in Table 3.13-2.

Table 3.13-2 Groundborne Vibration Impact Criteria for Human Response

Land Use Category	Ground-Borne Vibration Impact Levels for Human Response (VdB re 1 microinch/second)		
	Frequent Events ¹	Occasional Events ²	Infrequent Events ³
Category 1: Buildings where vibration would interfere with interior operations.	65 ⁴	65 ⁴	65 ⁴
Category 2: Residences and buildings where people normally sleep.	72	75	80
Category 3: Institutional land uses with primarily daytime uses.	75	78	83

Notes: VdB re 1 microinch/second = vibration decibels referenced to 1 microinch/second and based on the root mean square (RMS) velocity amplitude.

¹ "Frequent Events" is defined as more than 70 vibration events of the same source per day.

² "Occasional Events" is defined as between 30 and 70 vibration events of the same source per day.

³ "Infrequent Events" is defined as fewer than 30 vibration events of the same source per day.

⁴ This criterion is based on levels that are acceptable for most moderately sensitive equipment such as optical microscopes. Vibration-sensitive manufacturing or research would require detailed evaluation to define acceptable vibration levels.

Source: FTA 2018.

In addition to vibration criteria, FTA has established construction noise criteria for residential uses. The FTA daytime construction noise criterion for residential receptors is 90 dB L_{eq} during daytime hours (FTA 2018: 179).

State Regulations

California Department of Transportation

In 2020, Caltrans published the Transportation and Construction Vibration Manual, which provides general guidance on vibration issues associated with construction and operation of projects in relation to human perception and structural damage (Caltrans 2020). Table 3.13-3 presents recommendations for levels of vibration that could result in damage to structures exposed to continuous vibration.

Table 3.13-3 Structural Damage Potential to Buildings at Various Groundborne Vibration Levels

Structure and Condition	PPV (in/sec)	
	Transient Sources	Continuous/Frequent Intermittent Sources
Extremely Fragile Historic Buildings, Ruins, Ancient Monuments	0.12	0.08
Fragile Buildings	0.2	0.1
Historic and Some Old Buildings	0.5	0.25
Older Residential Structures	0.5	0.3
New Residential Structures	1.0	0.5
Modern Industrial/Commercial Buildings	2.0	0.5

Note: Transient sources create a single isolated vibration event, such as blasting or drop balls. Continuous/frequent intermittent sources include impact pile drivers, pogo-stick compactors, crack-and-seat equipment, vibratory pile drivers, and vibratory compaction equipment.

Source: Caltrans 2020.

Local Regulations

Article 15.04.605, Noise, of the City of Richmond Code of Ordinances contains the City's established noise standards and regulations. The following City noise standards are applicable to the project:

Article 15.04.605.030 - General Standard.

No person shall make, or cause to suffer, or permit to be made upon any public property, public right-of-way or private property, any excessive noise, annoying noise, amplified sound or vibrations that are physically annoying to reasonable persons of normal sensitivity or that are so harsh or so prolonged or unnatural or unusual in their use, time or place as to cause or contribute to the unnecessary and unreasonable discomfort of any persons of normal sensitivity located at the lot line of the property from which these noises emanate or that interfere with the peace and comfort of residents or their guests, or the operators or customers in places of business in the vicinity, or that may detrimentally or adversely affect such residences or places of business. The purpose of this standard is to establish the principles and context for the application of noise limits, standards for noise exposure and land use compatibility, and requirements for reasonable noise attenuation measures, all which are intended to protect noise sensitive uses from excessive noise exposure from other uses.

Article 15.04.605.040 - Noise Limits.

A. Designated Noise Zones. The land uses listed below are assigned to the following noise zones:

1. *Noise Zone 1:* All hospitals, libraries, churches, and low density and medium density residential uses.
2. *Noise Zone 2:* Outdoor sports and recreation uses, parks and playgrounds, including such sport, recreation, park and playground areas at schools.
3. *Noise Zone 3:* All high density multi-family residential, mixed use, professional office, schools, and public institutional properties.
4. *Noise Zone 4:* All commercial uses, excluding professional office and mixed use development.
5. *Noise Zone 5:* All industrial uses.

B. Exterior and Interior Noise Standards.

1. The noise standards established in Table 15.04.605.040 [presented as Table 3.13-4], unless otherwise specifically indicated, shall apply to all land within a designated noise zone. They are intended to express limits on regularly occurring noise for the specified time periods, averaged over an hour, and do not apply to incidental, infrequent, or unexpected noise, which are subject to Chapter 9.52, Community Noise Ordinance, and to unamplified human voices. The general prohibitions and specific prohibitions contained in Chapter 9.52, along with the provisions for persistent noises in that Chapter, apply to all land uses and activities in the City, and, in the case of a conflict, the more restrictive provisions apply.

Table 3.13-4 Noise Standards DB(A) – Noise Levels for a Time Period Not Exceeding (minutes/hour)

Noise Zone		Time Period	Minutes/Hour			
			30	15	5	1
1	Exterior	7:00 a.m.—10:00 p.m.	60	65	70	75
		10:00 p.m.—7:00 a.m.	50	55	60	65
	Interior	7:00 a.m.—10:00 p.m.	—	—	55	60
		10:00 p.m.—7:00 a.m.	—	—	45	50
2	Exterior	7:00 a.m.—10:00 p.m.	65	70	75	80
		10:00 p.m.—7:00 a.m.	50	55	60	65
3	Exterior	Anytime	65	70	75	75
		Interior	Anytime	—	—	55
4	Exterior	Anytime	60	65	70	75
		Interior	Anytime	—	—	55
5	Exterior	Anytime	70	75	80	85
		Interior	Anytime	OSHA standards apply		

OSHA = Occupational Safety and Health Administration

1 This standard does not apply to private balconies of multi-family residences. Multi-family developments with balconies that do not meet the 65 CNEL are required to provide occupancy disclosure notices to all future tenants regarding potential noise impacts.

Source: City of Richmond 2024.

2. No use or activity shall create any noise or to allow the creation of any noise on property owned, leased, occupied or otherwise controlled by such person which causes the noise level when measured on any property within designated noise zones to exceed the applicable noise standard, unless the activity is exempt or a specific regulation applies.
3. In the event that the noise source and the affected property are within different noise zones, the noise standards of the affected property shall apply.
4. These noise standards may justify denial of an application and/or imposition of reasonable conditions of approval, including noise attenuation measures (see Section 15.024.605.080), to minimize or eliminate incompatibilities. Proposals for new development that would cause a specified standard to be exceeded may only be approved if the project would provide a substantial benefit to the City.
5. The noise exposure limits specified in Table 15.04.605.040 [presented as Table 3.13-4] do not apply to noise generated by automobile traffic or other mobile noise sources in the public right-of-way.
6. In the event the measured ambient noise level exceeds the applicable noise level standard in any category above, the applicable standards shall be adjusted so as to equal the ambient noise level (see Section 15.04.605.080(C)).

7. New development must incorporate noise-attenuation measures to achieve the applicable interior noise levels. See subsection 15.04.605.080(C).

Article 15.04.605.060 - Additional Regulations for Specific Activities.

- A. Construction noise shall be limited to weekdays from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Pile driving and similar loud activities shall be limited to weekdays from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. General construction noise on projects repairing, renovating, or adding to residential structures with one to five dwelling units shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays, Sundays and federal holidays. Pre-construction activities, including loading and unloading, cleaning of mechanical toilets, deliveries, truck idling, backup beeps, yelling, and radios also are limited to these construction noise hours.
 1. No noise-producing construction activities shall be permitted outside of these hours or on Sundays and federal holidays unless a temporary waiver is granted by the Building Official or his or her authorized representative.
 2. More restrictive construction noise hours may be established as a conditional of approval of an administrative use permit or a conditional use permit when appropriate, given the surrounding neighborhood, the type of noise, or other unique factors.
 3. Trucks, vehicles, and equipment that are making or are involved with material deliveries, loading, or transfer of materials, equipment service, maintenance of any devices or appurtenances for or within any construction project in the City shall not be operated or driven on City streets outside of these hours or on Sundays and federal holidays unless a temporary waiver is granted by the Building Official.
 4. Any waiver granted shall take the potential noise impacts upon the surrounding neighborhood and the larger community into consideration.
 5. No construction or agricultural activity shall be permitted outside of these hours that creates construction noise, except in emergencies, including maintenance work on the City rights-of-way that might be required.
- C. Maintenance of real property operations may exceed the noise standards between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on any day except Sundays and between 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Sundays or a federal holiday.

3.13.2 Discussion

- a) **Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies, or a substantial temporary or permanent increase in noise levels above existing ambient levels that could result in an adverse effect on humans?**

For this analysis, short-term temporary noise levels generated by construction of the project were evaluated against the FTA recommended daytime construction noise level thresholds. These thresholds establish a sound level threshold of 90 dB L_{eq} at the property line of nearby residential land uses. Project construction would occur on weekdays between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. consistent with City Code Article 15.04.605.060. Project construction would involve the use of small construction equipment including a mini-excavator and trail dozer. For a conservative assumption of construction equipment, it was assumed that a full-sized dozer and excavator would be used simultaneously during project construction. These two pieces of construction equipment would generate a noise level of 84.1 dB L_{eq} at 50 feet and attenuate to 49.9 dB L_{eq} at 1,000 feet at the nearest sensitive receptor, single family residences, southwest of the project site. Therefore, construction of the project would not exceed FTA's construction

noise standard of 90 dB L_{eq} at the nearest sensitive receptors. The project would not generate substantial increases in temporary noise. See Appendix B for construction modeling details.

Project operation would result in an increase of trail users in Wildcat Canyon Regional Park. Noise from mountain biking includes persons conversing and noise from mountain bike using the trail. A slight increase in ridership in the project vicinity would not result in a distinguishable increase in noise at the nearest sensitive receptor. Therefore, operational noise from trail use would not exceed the City's exterior noise standard for Zone 1 uses, including low density residential uses, of 60 dB L_{eq} between 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. Trail maintenance would include a combination of machine and hand tools, as needed. Maintenance activities would be conducted by volunteers such as local bike clubs in addition to EBRPD trail crew. To account for noise from trail maintenance, modeling was conducted for the use of a chainsaw. A chainsaw would generate a noise level of 84 dB L_{eq} at 50 feet and attenuate to 49.7 dB L_{eq} at 1,000 feet at the nearest sensitive receptor. Therefore, trail maintenance activities would not exceed the City's exterior noise standard for Zone 1 uses, including low density residential uses, of 60 dB L_{eq} between 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. and 50 dB L_{eq} between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Therefore, the project would not generate substantial increases in permanent noise.

The proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in temporary or permanent noise. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Project construction would not involve the use of ground vibration-intensive activities, such as pile driving or blasting. FTA guidance for maximum acceptable VdB levels are primarily concerned with sleep disturbance in residential areas and can be avoided by keeping exposures at or below 80 VdB during typical sleeping hours, or if the vibration events are infrequent (i.e., 30 per day).

Project construction would include small construction equipment such as a mini-excavator and trail dozer. Based on FTA reference vibration levels for typical construction equipment, small dozers generate vibration levels of 0.003 in/sec PPV and 58 VdB at 25 feet (FTA 2018: 184). Based on the recommended FTA procedure for applying a propagation adjustment to this reference level, vibration from the use of a small dozer would exceed FTA significance criterion for structural damage (i.e., 0.20 PPV in/sec) within 2 feet and the criterion for impact of infrequent events on residences (i.e., 80 VdB) within 5 feet. See Appendix B for vibration modeling. Construction activities would not occur within 1,000 feet of sensitive receptors. In addition, construction would occur during daytime hours from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. during weekdays consistent with the Richmond Code. Therefore, residents approximately 1,000 feet from the project site would not be exposed to vibration during sleeping hours. The project would not result in the exposure of the existing off-site receptors to excessive ground vibration levels. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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?

The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public airport, public use airport, or a private airstrip. The nearest airport is the San Rafael Airport, which is located approximately 12 miles northwest of the project site. Therefore, the project would have no impact regarding the exposure of people residing or working in the project area to excessive aircraft-related noise levels. There would be **no impact**.

3.14 POPULATION AND HOUSING

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. Population and Housing.				
Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial unplanned 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

3.14.1 Environmental Setting

The proposed approximately 1.4-mile trail would be located in the western portion of Wildcat Canyon Regional Park north of Wildcat Creek Trail on the hillside near the intersection with the existing Mezue Road (Figure 2-2). The area proposed for the trail alignment is currently vacant and covered with grazed and weedy grasses along the hillside (EBRPD 2024a).

There are no residences or communities located in Wildcat Canyon Regional Park. The closest residences and community developments are located approximately 0.2 miles southwest of the proposed alignment. Wildcat Canyon Regional Park is located in the city of Richmond. As of July 2023, Richmond has a population of approximately 114,106 (US Census 2023).

3.14.2 Discussion

- a) **Induce substantial unplanned 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)?**

The project does not involve the development of new housing or commercial businesses that could lead to direct population growth. All the project features would be constructed to improve public access within the project site and would not contribute to infrastructure that could lead to unplanned population growth.

EBRPD would hire contractors to implement the project, but the work would be temporary, lasting only the length of construction. Construction workers would be from the local labor force, and the need for temporary workers would not induce population growth. EBRPD would not need to hire new staff members to implement the additional management activities required for operations and maintenance of the proposed trail. Therefore, the project would not be a source of employment for the region that could induce unplanned population growth. The project would not result in direct or indirect unplanned population growth, and **no impact** would occur.

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

The project site is within Wildcat Canyon Regional Park in undeveloped open space lands. No housing is present; therefore, the project would not displace existing people or housing and there would be **no impact**.

3.15 PUBLIC SERVICES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. Public Services.				
Would the project:				
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

3.15.1 Environmental Setting

FIRE PROTECTION

The EBRPD Fire Department serves EBRP’s 73 regional parks in Alameda and Contra Costa County. The EBRPD Fire Department consists of five Fire Captains that take command of emergency incidents; two Fire Lieutenants who lead engine companies in emergency response, training, and day to day operations; eight firefighters that responds to emergencies and operate apparatus; and on-call firefighters that hold other positions throughout EBRPD that receive fire training and can serve as firefighters when called upon (EBRPD 2024a). There are 10 fire stations throughout EBRPD’s regional parks. The nearest station to the project site is Fire Station #9 located at 5755 McBryde Avenue, Richmond within Wildcat Canyon Regional Park and approximately 1.8 miles northwest of the proposed trail alignment.

POLICE PROTECTION

The EBRPD Police Department serves and patrols EBRPD’s 73 regional parks in Alameda and Contra Costa County. During peak summer months the EBRPD Police Department is around 450 personnel including 158 full time employees, 77 of which are sworn police officers (EBRPD 2024b). There are an additional 151 Volunteer Trail Safety Patrols as well as seasonal lifeguards and on-call firefighters. The EBRPD Police Department is headquartered at Lake Chabot in Castro Valley but has deployment points throughout the region. The nearest deployment point to Wildcat Canyon Regional Park is the EBMUD San Pablo Reservoir approximately 4.5 miles southeast. The department includes an air support unit, marine patrol, mounted patrols, special enforcement unit, and investigations unit.

SCHOOLS

The closest school to the project site is the Sheldon Elementary School located approximately 1.6 miles north. Other schools in the vicinity of the project site include Murphy Elementary School located approximately 2 miles north, King Elementary School located approximately 2.6 miles southwest, and Highland Elementary School located approximately 2.6 miles northwest.

PARKS

The project site is within Wildcat Canyon Regional Park, which encompasses 2,789 acres throughout the Wildcat Creek watershed and the surrounding hills and ridges. The park extends from Tilden Nature areas above the Berkeley hills in the south to Alvarado Park at the north end of Richmond. The park is a popular destination for hikers, mountain bikers, and equestrians. The park is open from 5:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. and includes a parking lot for visitors.

3.15.2 Discussion

- a) **Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the 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?

The project is not growth inducing and does not include the development of new residences requiring increased fire protection. The project would result in additional mountain bike riders in Wildcat Canyon Regional Park. The increase in trail users would be accommodated by EBRPD Fire Department and new fire protection facilities would not be required. The project would not include any new sources of ignition. Therefore, the project would not increase the need for additional fire protection. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

Police protection?

The project is not growth inducing and does not include the development of new residences requiring increased police protection. The project would result in additional mountain bike riders in Wildcat Canyon Regional Park. The increase in trail users would be accommodated by EBRPD Police Department and new police protection facilities would not be required. The project would not change the hours the Park is open. Therefore, the project would not lead to the need for additional police protection services. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

Schools?

No impact. The project is not growth inducing and does not include the development of new residences requiring increased school services. Because the project would not induce population growth, the project would not result in an increase in demand for educational services such that new or physically altered schools would be necessary to maintain current service levels. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

Parks?

No impact. The project is not growth inducing and does not include the development of new residences that could require the development of new parks. Furthermore, the project would provide additional riding opportunities for mountain bikers. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

Other public facilities?

No impact. The project is not growth inducing and does not include the development of new residences. Because the project would not induce population growth, the project would not result in an increase in demand for other public facilities, such as libraries and community centers. **No impact** would occur.

Working Draft

3.16 RECREATION

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. Recreation.				
Would the project:				
a) 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"/>
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.16.1 Environmental Setting

The project site is surrounded by recreational opportunities. The proposed trail alignment is located in Wildcat Canyon Regional Park, a 2,789 acre park along the Wildcat Creek watershed. Wildcat Canyon Park includes recreational opportunities for hiking, mountain biking, and horseback riding. The project site is adjacent to the Tilden Nature Area in the Berkely Hills to the south. Tilden Nature Area offers hiking and mountain biking opportunities. The Kennedy Grove Regional Recreation area is located further east of the site. San Pablo Reservoir is located approximately 1 mile east of Wildcat Canyon Regional Park. The reservoir includes opportunities for boating, kayaking, fishing, hiking, picnics, and hiking.

3.16.2 Discussion

- a) **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?**

The project would not induce population growth in the region or develop new residences that could lead to the increased use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. The project would enhance recreational opportunities for the region by resulting in additional mountain biking opportunities in Wildcat Canyon Regional Park to meet existing need. The project would not cause a substantial physical deterioration to existing recreational facilities. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

- b) **Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?**

The project includes improving existing recreational opportunities in Wildcat Canyon Regional Park by adding a one-directional mountain bike only trail. The potential environmental effects of implementing the trail and recreation features are evaluated within this environmental document which determined that, with application of the mitigation measures identified herein, no significant environmental impacts would occur. Because impacts are addressed in other sections of this document, the impact would be **less than significant**.

3.17 TRANSPORTATION

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. Transportation.				
Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.17.1 Environmental Setting

The District has determined that an EIR will be prepared and that potential impacts associated with transportation will be evaluated therein. The analysis will be based on a technical study, which will help inform a comprehensive description of the environmental setting that will be provided in the EIR.

3.17.2 Discussion

- a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?

Potentially significant. The EIR will include a detailed analysis of potential impacts.

- b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3(b), which pertains to vehicle miles travelled?

Potentially significant. The EIR will include a detailed analysis of potential impacts.

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

Potentially significant. The EIR will include a detailed analysis of potential impacts.

- d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

Potentially significant. The EIR will include a detailed analysis of potential impacts.

3.18 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources.				
Has a California Native American Tribe requested consultation in accordance with Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1(b)?				
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.18.1 Environmental Setting

The District has determined that an EIR will be prepared. The District has not yet completed the AB 52 consultation process. The environmental setting will be informed by information received during that process and will be included in the EIR.

3.18.2 Discussion

Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

- a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?

Potentially significant. The EIR will include a detailed analysis of potential impacts.

- b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?

Potentially significant. The EIR will include a detailed analysis of potential impacts.

3.19 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIX. Utilities and Service Systems.				
Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have insufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand, in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Fail to comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.19.1 Environmental Setting

The project site is located within the Wildcat Canyon Regional Park with no major utility services, such as water, wastewater treatment, electricity, natural gas, or municipal stormwater drainage facilities.

The Contra Costa County Health Services Department, Environmental Health Program is certified by the California Department of Resources, Recycling and Recovery as the Local Enforcement Agency (LEA) for the county, which includes the city of Richmond and the project site. The LEA ensures that all solid waste disposal facilities and medical waste generators comply with applicable local, state and federal codes and regulations. The LEA protects the public health and safety of Contra Costa County residents and the environment by ensuring the collection, handling, storing, and disposing of residential, commercial and industrial solid waste is done in a way that prevents pollution and nuisance to air, water and land (HSD n.d.).

Richmond Sanitary Service, an affiliate of Republic Services, Inc., provides residential and commercial municipal solid waste, recycling, and green waste collection services in the city of Richmond. Republic Services owns and operates through separate subsidiary corporations, a 21-acre site at the foot of Parr Boulevard in Richmond that includes the Golden Bear Transfer Facility. The Golden Bear Transfer Facility is a transfer point for the city's solid waste before being disposed of at the Keller Canyon Landfill in the City of Pittsburg (City of Richmond 2012). The landfill is operated by Republic Services, Inc. and accepts industrial, other designated, sludge (biosolids), agricultural,

construction/demolition, and mixed municipal waste. The maximum daily throughput for Keller Canyon Landfill is 3,500 tons and it has a remaining capacity of 63,408,410 cubic yards. The landfill is permitted through 2050 (CalRecycle 2024).

3.19.2 Discussion

- a) **Require or result in the relocation or construction of construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

The project does not propose the construction or relocation of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities. As described in Section 3.10, "Hydrology and Water Quality," the proposed trail would be constructed with frequent grade changes, dips, and rollers to minimize water flow distances along the trail surface and minimize erosion. All bermed turns would have a roller and drain installed directly before and after the berm to collect and move water off the trail. The roller and drain features would allow users a slight uphill portion of trail tread to reduce speed and alert users of an upcoming feature. Undulation in the tread surface would provide for frequent drainage of the trail. No additional stormwater drainage systems would be required. The potential environmental effects of construction and operation of the project, including the proposed drainage improvements, have been analyzed throughout this IS/MND. The installation of these drainage improvements would not result in any additional impacts beyond those analyzed and disclosed in this IS/MND. Although the project would result in additional ridership in the Park the project would not increase utility demand compared to existing conditions because mountain bike riders would not require utilities beyond the use of restrooms, as discussed under item c. Therefore, the project would not require the relocation or construction of new or expanded utilities and this impact would be **less than significant**.

- b) **Have insufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?**

The project would not require permanent or ongoing use of existing water supplies. Some water would temporarily be required for dust abatement during construction, which would be sourced from a water truck. No other water would be required for construction or operation. Therefore, **no impact** on existing water supplies would occur.

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

The project does not propose the construction of new restrooms or other uses that would generate wastewater. Wildcat Canyon Regional Park is served by existing restroom facilities located in various areas of the regional park. These existing restroom facilities would service the project. The project would result in an increase in visitation to Wildcat Canyon Regional Park. As such, the project would increase wastewater generation compared to existing conditions. However, restroom facilities would be used periodically by riders and a substantial increase in wastewater would not occur. Therefore, the project would not result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that it is unable to serve the project's projected demand, and impacts would be **less than significant**.

d), e) **Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals and comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?**

The closest landfill to the project site is the Keller Canyon Landfill, which has a maximum daily throughput of 3,500 tons and a remaining capacity of 63,408,410 cubic yards (CalRecycle 2024). Solid waste produced during construction of the project would be limited to trash generated by construction personnel. Construction crews would be small, and the trash generated from construction personnel would therefore be minimal.

During operation, the number of visitors to Wildcat Canyon Regional Park would increase over existing conditions with implementation of the project. Therefore, the project would increase solid waste generation compared to existing conditions. Trash generated by recreational users would typically consist of food and beverage waste, which would not change with the project. Given the ample existing capacity of the Keller Canyon Landfill, the limited amount of solid waste that would be generated during construction, and the fact that minimal solid waste generation would occur from an increase in trail users, the project would not generate solid waste in excess of local standards or capacity of local infrastructure or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals. Therefore, impacts would be **less than significant**.

3.20 WILDFIRE

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XX. Wildfire.				
Is the project located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as high fire hazard severity zones?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require the installation of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.20.1 Environmental Setting

The project is within Contra Costa County, which contains fire hazard areas as a result of the atmospheric humidity, slope steepness, vegetation, sun exposure, and wind speed throughout the County (Contra Costa County 2005). CAL FIRE wildfire statistics for 2023 show that there was one wildfire in the County that year, the Balfour Fire, which burned 74 acres (CAL FIRE 2024a). CAL FIRE has mapped Fire Hazard Severity Zones (FHSZ) for the entire state, including the project area. FHSZ delineations are based on an evaluation of fuels, fire history, terrain, housing density, and occurrence of severe fire weather. They are intended to identify areas where urban fires could result in catastrophic losses. FHSZs are categorized as: Moderate, High, and Very High. The project site is not located within a FHSZ in a state or local responsibility area (CAL FIRE 2024b).

3.20.2 Discussion

a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

The project would not include construction or operations on roadways used for emergency access and evacuation and thus would not interfere with vehicle movement during an emergency evacuation or response. The entirety of the project would occur inside Wildcat Canyon Regional Park. Temporary lane closures and heavy equipment in the public right-of-way would not occur. None of the project features would affect characteristics of the area that increase

wildfire risk or change the requirements for emergency access. Therefore, the project would not substantially impair an emergency response or emergency evacuation plan and there would be **no impact**.

b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

The project area is not within a designated FHSZ (CAL FIRE 2024b). However, the project site is in an area that consists of grassland habitats, which are susceptible to wildfire (Heady 1972). EBRPD actively manages wildfire risk through fuels management treatment including hazardous fuel removal and tree thinning. The EBRPD Fuels Management Plan outlines strategies for forest thinning; reducing vegetation with cattle, goat, and sheep grazing; removing hazardous trees; and clearing underbrush (EBRPD 2024). These treatments to reduce wildfire risk would be implemented for the project. In addition, smoking is prohibited within Wildcat Canyon Regional Park at all times pursuant to EBRPD regulations, and all internal combustion equipment used in the project area for construction would be equipped with federal- or state-approved spark arrestors pursuant to PRC 4442, which would minimize accidental wildfire ignitions. Therefore, impacts would be **less than significant**.

c) Require the installation of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?

The project would consist of a new single-directional mountain bike trail in Wildcat Canyon Regional Park. The project would not require the installation of associated infrastructure such as roads, fuel breaks, power lines, or other utilities that may exacerbate fire risk. There would be **no impact**.

d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

The project would result in new public access features that could potentially expose people and structures to risks from flooding or landslides due to runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes. However, as described under criterion b) and c) above, the project would not substantially exacerbate fire risk. Therefore, no substantial post-fire slope instability would occur. In addition, as described under criterion c) and d) in Section 3.10, "Hydrology and Water Quality," the project would not substantially alter drainage or expose people to risks related to runoff or floods. Furthermore, as described under criterion a) in Section 3.7, "Geology and Soils," the project would not expose people to significant risks related to landslides. Therefore, no substantial risks related to runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes would occur and the impact would be **less than significant**.

3.21 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance.				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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.)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.21.1 Discussion

a) Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Potentially significant. The EIR will include a detailed analysis of potential impacts.

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.)

Potentially significant. The EIR will include a detailed analysis of potential impacts.

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

Potential adverse effects to human beings would occur due to project-related construction impacts related to criteria air pollutant emissions, hazardous materials, and noise. However, as discussed in Section 3.3 project air quality emission would not be in excess of the BAAQMD thresholds for ROG, NO_x, PM₁₀, or PM_{2.5}, which are tied to achieving or maintaining attainment designations with the NAAQS and CAAQS, which are scientifically substantiated, numerical concentrations of criteria air pollutants considered to be protective of human health. Noise generated during project construction and operation would be minimal and less-than-significant. There are no known hazards on the project site that would impact human beings. Therefore, potential adverse effects on human beings as a result of the project would be **less than significant**.

4 REFERENCES

1 Introduction

No sources are referenced in this chapter.

2 Project Description

No sources are referenced in this chapter.

3 Environmental Checklist

No sources are referenced in this chapter.

3.1 Aesthetics

California Department of Transportation. 2018. *California State Scenic Highway System Map*. Interactive web map application. Available: <https://caltrans.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=465dfd3d807c46cc8e8057116f1aaca>. Retrieved August 8, 2024.

Caltrans. *See* California Department of Transportation.

City of Richmond. 2024. City of Richmond Zoning Information. Available: Geocortex Viewer for HTML5 (richmond.ca.us). Accessed August 8, 2024.

3.2 Agriculture and Forest Resources

CalCAN. *See* California Climate and Agricultural Network.

California Climate and Agriculture Network. 2023. Grazing Wildfire Reduction. Available: <https://calclimateag.org/using-grazing-animals-to-reduce-the-risk-of-wildfires/>. Accessed: August 8, 2024.

City of Richmond. 2012a. Land Use Designations. Available: <https://www.ci.richmond.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/8825/Map-32b---General-Plan-Land-Use-Map?bidId=>. Accessed: August 8, 2024.

_____. 2012b Zoning Map. Available: <http://geoweb02.ci.richmond.ca.us/Html5Viewer/Index.html?configBase=http://geoweb02.ci.richmond.ca.us/Geocortex/Essentials/REST/sites/ZoningInfoINTERNET/viewers/html5/virtualdirectory/Resources/Config/Default>. Accessed: August 8, 2024.

DOC. *See* California Department of Conservation.

California Department of Conservation 2024a. Farmland Mapping. Available: <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/agriculture/DataViewer/index.html>. Accessed: August 8, 2024.

_____. 2024b. Williamson Act Enrollment Finder. Available: <https://gis.conservation.ca.gov/portal/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=18f7488c0a9d4d299f5e9c33b312f312>. Accessed: August 8, 2024.

EBRPD. *See* East Bay Regional Park District.

East Bay Regional Park District. 2001. Wildland Management Guidelines. Available: E:\Projects\Miscproj\PDF Conversion Temp\Wildlife_Mgt_Policies&Guidlines\GUIDLINE.WPD (ebparks.org). Accessed: August 8, 2024.

- _____. 2024a. Wildcat Canyon Bike Trail. Available: <https://www.ebparks.org/projects/wildcat-canyon-regional-park-wildcat-bike-trail>. Accessed August 2024
- _____. 2024b. Wildcat Canyon Regional Park Map. Available: <https://www.ebparks.org/sites/default/files/WildcatCanyon-2023-03.pdf>. Accessed: August 8, 2024.

3.3 Air Quality

ABAG and MTC. See Association of Bay Area Governments and Metropolitan Transportation Commission.

- Bay Area Air Quality Management District. 2017a. CEQA Air Quality Guidelines. Available: [https://www.baaqmd.gov/~media/files/planning-and-research/ceqa/ceqa_guidelines_may2017-pdf.pdf](https://www.baaqmd.gov/~/media/files/planning-and-research/ceqa/ceqa_guidelines_may2017-pdf.pdf). Accessed March 4, 2024.
- _____. 2017b. *2017 Clean Air Plan: Spare the Air, Cool the Climate*. Available: <https://www.baaqmd.gov/~media/files/planning-and-research/plans/2017-clean-air-plan/attachment-a-proposed-final-cap-vol-1-pdf.pdf>. Accessed: July 18, 2024.
- _____. 2022. CEQA Air Quality Guidelines. Available: CEQA Thresholds and Guidelines Update (baaqmd.gov). Accessed July 2024

California Air Resources Board. 2013. *California Almanac of Emissions and Air Quality – 2013 Edition*. Available: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/our-work/programs/resource-center/technical-assistance/air-quality-and-emissions-data/almanac>. Accessed: July 18, 2024.

_____. 2022. State and Federal Area Attainment Maps. Available: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/documents/maps-state-and-federal-area-designations>. Accessed July 2024.

US Environmental Protection Agency. May 2024a. Criteria Air Pollutants. Available: <https://www.epa.gov/criteria-air-pollutants>. Accessed: July 18, 2024.

3.4 Biological Resources

- Alvarez, J. A., M. A. Shea, A. C. Murphy. 2005. "A Compilation of Observations of Alameda Whipsnakes Outside of Typical Habitat." *Transactions of the Western Section of the Wildlife Society* 41:21-25; 2005.
- Bulger, J. B., N. J. Scott Jr., and R. B. Seymour. 2003. "Terrestrial Activity and Conservation of Adult California Red-legged Frogs *Rana aurora draytonii* in Coastal Forests and Grasslands." *Biological Conservation* 110:85-95.
- Buskirk, J. 2002. "The Western Pond Turtle, *Emys marmorata*." *Radiata. Journal of DGHT-AG Schildkroten*. 11-2: 3–30.
- California Department of Fish and Game. 2012. *Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation*. State of California Natural Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Game. March.
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2018a. *Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Natural Communities*.
- _____. 2018b. *Considerations for Conserving the Foothill Yellow-Legged Frog*. Available: <https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=157562&inline>. Accessed February 20, 2023.
- _____. 2023. *Survey Considerations for California Endangered Species Act (CESA) Candidate Bumble Bee Species*. June 6, 2023. Available: <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/CESA/Resources>. Retrieved June 13, 2023.

- California Native Plant Society. 2024. Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California (online edition, v9.5). Available: <http://www.rareplants.cnps.org>. Accessed July 26, 2024.
- California Natural Diversity Database. 2024a. Results of electronic records search. Sacramento: California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Biogeographic Data Branch. Accessed July 17, 2024.
- _____. 2024b. Essential Connectivity Areas [ds 620] Sacramento: California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Biogeographic Data Branch. Retrieved July 26, 2024.
- City of Richmond. 2012. Richmond General Plan 2023. Conservation, Natural Resources, and Open Space Element. Richmond, CA.
- CDFG. See California Department of Fish and Game.
- CDFW. See California Department of Fish and Wildlife.
- CNDDDB. See California Natural Diversity Database.
- CNPS. See California Native Plant Society.
- East Bay Regional Park District. 2022.
- EBRPD. See East Bay Regional Park District.
- Fellers, G. M. and P. M. Kleeman. 2007. "California Red-Legged Frog (*Rana draytonii*) Movement and Habitat Use: Implications for Conservation." *Journal of Herpetology* 41: 276-286.
- Miller, A and J Alvarez. 2016. Habitat Use and Management Considerations for the Threatened Alameda Whipsnake (*Masticophis lateralis euryxanthus*) in Central California. *Western Wildlife*. 3: 29–32.
- Reese, D. A. and H. H. Welsh. 1997. "Use of Terrestrial Habitat by Western Pond Turtles, *Clemmys marmorata*: Implications for Management. *Proceedings: Conservation, Restoration, and Management of Turtles and Tortoises*." An International Conference held by the New York Turtle and Tortoise Society, pp. 352-357.
- SBI. See Swaim Biological Consulting, Inc.
- Swaim, K. E. 1994 (December). "Aspects of the Ecology of the Alameda Whipsnake (*Masticophis lateralis euryxanthus*)." Master's thesis. California State University, Hayward, California.
- Swaim, K. E., and McGinnis, S. M. 1992. "Habitat Associations of the Alameda Whipsnake." (*Masticophis lateralis euryxanthus*). *1992 Transactions of the Western Section of the Wildlife Society* 28: 107-111.
- Swaim, K; J. Howard, E. Britt, and C. Swaim. 2022. Assessing the response of the Alameda whipsnake, *Masticophis lateralis euryxanthus*, to fuels management and habitat variation within East Bay Regional Park District. Study Year 3 Report, Prepared for D. A. Bell, East Bay Regional Park District, Oakland, CA.
- Swaim Biological Consulting, Inc. 2012 (March). "Status of the Alameda Whipsnake (*Masticophis lateralis euryxanthus*) at the Proposed Oursan Ridge Conservation Bank and Vicinity, EBMUD, Contra Costa County, California." Prepared for EBMUD and Westervelt Ecological Services.
- US Fish and Wildlife Service. 2000 (October). "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants: Final Determination of Critical Habitat for the Alameda Whipsnake (*Masticophis lateralis euryxanthus*)." *Federal Register* 65(192):58933–58962.

- _____. 2005. *Revised Guidance on Site Assessments and Field Surveys for the California Red-Legged Frog*. Available: <https://ipac.ecosphere.fws.gov/guideline/survey/population/205/office/11420.pdf>. Accessed August 8, 2024.
- _____. 2006 (October). "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants: Designation of Critical Habitat for the Alameda Whipsnake." *Federal Register* 71(190):58176–58231.
- _____. 2011 (September). "Alameda Whipsnake (*Masticophis lateralis euryxanthus*) 5-Year Review: Summary and Evaluation." Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office. Sacramento, CA.
- Wilmers, C. C., Y. Wang, B. Nickel, P. Houghtaling, Y. Shakeri, M. L. Allen, J. Kermish-Wells, V. Yovovich, and T. Williams. 2013. "Scale Dependent Behavioral Responses to Human Development by a Large Predatory, the Puma." *PLoS ONE* 8(4):e60590.
- Xerces Society for Invertebrate Conservation. 2018. *A Petition to the State of California Fish and Game Commission to List the Crotch bumble bee (*Bombus crotchii*), Franklin's bumble bee (*Bombus franklini*), Suckley cuckoo bumble bee (*Bombus suckleyi*), and western bumble bee (*Bombus occidentalis occidentalis*) as Endangered under the California Endangered Species Act*. October 2018.
- Yovovich, V., M. L. Allen, L. T. Macaulay, and C. C. Wilmers. 2020. "Using Spatial Characteristics of Apex Carnivore Communication and Reproductive Behaviors to Predict Responses to Future Human Development." *Biodiversity and Conservation* 29: 2589–2603. Retrieved July 15, 2022.

3.5 Cultural Resources

No sources are referenced in this chapter.

3.6 Energy

US Energy Information Administration. 2023. California State Energy Profile. Available: <https://www.eia.gov/state/print.php?sid=CA>. Accessed December 1, 2023.

California Energy Commission. 2023. 2022 Total System Electric Generation. Available: <https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/california-electricity-data/2022-total-system-electric-generation>. Accessed: August 2, 2024.

3.7 Geology and Soils

California Geological Survey. 2024. The California Earthquake Hazards Zone Application. Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation. Available: <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/app/>. Retrieved August 6, 2024.

CGS. See California Geological Survey.

City of Richmond. 2011 (February). *General Plan Update. Draft Environmental Impact Report*. Available: <https://www.ci.richmond.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/59005/General-Plan-Draft-EIR>. Accessed August 7, 2024.

California Department of Conservation. 2024c. Fault Activity Map of California. Available: <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/fam/>. Retrieved August 6, 2024.

DOC. See California Department of Conservation.

Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2024. *Custom Soil Resources Report for Contra Costa County, California*.

NRCS. See Natural Resources Conservation Service.

3.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

California Air Resources Board. 2023. Current California GHG Emissions Inventory Data. Available:

<https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/ghg-inventory-data>. Accessed: July 18, 2024.

IPCC. See Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 2013. Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis.

Available: <https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar5/wg1/>. Accessed May 5, 2023.

———. 2014. Climate Change 2014 Fifth Assessment Report. Available:

https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/02/SYR_AR5_FINAL_full.pdf. Accessed May 5, 2023.

California Energy Commission. 2012. *Our Changing Climate: Vulnerability & Adaptation to the Increasing Risks of Climate Change in California*. Available: <http://www.energy.ca.gov/2012publications/CEC-500-2012-007/CEC-500-2012-007.pdf>. Accessed April 21, 2016.

California Natural Resources Agency. 2017 (May). *Draft Report: Safeguarding California Plan: 2017 Update*. Available: <http://resources.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/DRAFT-Safeguarding-California-Plan-2017-Update.pdf>. Accessed September 10, 2021.

———. 2018 (January). *Safeguarding California Plan: 2018 Update*. Available:

<http://resources.ca.gov/docs/climate/safeguarding/update2018/safeguarding-california-plan-2018-update.pdf>. Accessed September 10, 2021.

CNRA: See California Natural Resources Agency.

3.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

CAL FIRE. See California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection.

CalOES. See California Governor's Office of Emergency Services.

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. 2024. *Fire Hazard Severity Zone Viewer*. Online Application. Available:

<https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/03beab8511814e79a0e4eabf0d3e7247/>. Retrieved August 7, 2024.

California Department of Toxic Substances Control. 2023. *EnviroStor Database*. Available:

<https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>. Retrieved August 7, 2024.

California Governor's Office of Emergency Services. 2014 (February). *California Hazardous Materials Spill / Release Notification Guidance*. Available:

<https://www.placer.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/8904/California-Hazardous-Material-Spill-Release-Guidance-PDF>. Accessed August 7, 2024.

Contra Costa County. 2018 (January). *Contra Costa County Hazard Mitigation Plan. Volume 1—Planning Area-Wide Elements. Draft Final*.

DTSC. See California Department of Toxic Substances Control.

East Bay Regional Park District. 2019. Evacuation Tips and Resources – Be Prepared in Case of Emergency.

Available: <https://www.ebparks.org/about-us/whats-new/news/evacuation-tips-and-resources-be-prepared-case-emergency>. Accessed August 15, 2024.

EBRPD. See East Bay Regional Park District.

SWRCB. See State Water Resources Control Board.

State Water Resources Control Board. 2024a. *GeoTracker: Online Application for Hazardous Materials Sites*. Available: <https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/>. Retrieved August 7, 2024.

3.10 Hydrology and Water Quality

US Environmental Protection Agency. 2024b. How's My Waterway Webpage. Available: <https://mywaterway.epa.gov/>. Accessed August 14, 2024.

EPA. See US Environmental Protection Agency.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. 2023. Flood Insurance Rate Map for the City of Richmond, California. Map Numbers 06013C0233G and 06013C0241G. Available: <https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search?AddressQuery=wildcat%20canyon%20regional%20park%2C%20richmond%2C%20ca>. Accessed August 14, 2024.

FEMA. See Federal Emergency Management Agency.

San Francisco Bay Area Regional Water Quality Control Board. 2024. The 303(d) List of Impaired Water Bodies. Available: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay/water_issues/programs/TMDLs/303dlist.html. Accessed August 2024

SWRCB. See State Water Resources Control Board.

State Water Resources Control Board. 2023. Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) Status Map. Available: <https://gispublic.waterboards.ca.gov/portal/apps/storymaps/stories/35d50036fbfe44e5ac3b1a6e8c1e8d21>. Accessed August 14, 2024.

_____. 2024b. 2024 California Integrated Report. Available: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/water_quality_assessment/2024-integrated-report.html. Accessed August 14, 2024.

3.11 Land Use and Planning

City of Richmond. 2012a. Land Use Designations. Available: <https://www.ci.richmond.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/8825/Map-32b---General-Plan-Land-Use-Map?bidId=>. Accessed August 6, 2024.

_____. 2012b. Zoning Map. Available: <http://geoweb02.ci.richmond.ca.us/Html5Viewer/Index.html?configBase=http://geoweb02.ci.richmond.ca.us/Geocortex/Essentials/REST/sites/ZoningInfoINTERNET/viewers/html5/virtualdirectory/Resources/Config/Default>. Accessed August 6, 2024.

_____. 2012c. Richmond General Plan 2030, Land Use and Urban Design Element. Available: <https://www.ci.richmond.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/8809/30-Land-Use-and-Urban-Design-Element?bidId=>. Accessed August 6, 2024.

3.12 Mineral Resources

California Department of Conservation. 1987. *Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the San Francisco Monterey Bay Area, Special Report 146*. Division of Mines and Geology. Sacramento, CA.

DOC. See California Department of Conservation.

Kohler-Antablin, S. 1996. Generalized Mineral Land Classification Map of the South San Francisco Bay Production-Consumption Region. Revised Mineral Land Classification Map, Aggregate Resources Only. Monterey Bay Production-Consumption Region, Morgan Hill Quadrangle, Plate 1 of 29. California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology.

3.13 Noise

California Department of Transportation. 2013 (September). *Technical Noise Supplement to the Analysis Protocol*. Division of Environmental Analysis. Sacramento, Ca. Available: <https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/programs/environmental-analysis/documents/env/tens-sep2013-a11y.pdf>. Accessed July 26, 2024.

_____. 2020 (April). *Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual*. Sacramento, Ca. Available: <https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/programs/environmental-analysis/documents/env/tcvgm-apr2020-a11y.pdf>. Accessed: Jul 23, 2024.

City of Richmond. 2024. City of Richmond Municipal Code. Chapter 15.04, Series 600, Article 15.04.605 of the City of Richmond Municipal Code specifies the noise limits for each land use type.

Federal Transit Administration. 2018 (September). *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual*. FTA Report No. 0123. John A. Volpe National Transportation Systems Center. Available: https://www.transit.dot.gov/sites/fta.dot.gov/files/docs/research-innovation/118131/transit-noise-and-vibration-impact-assessment-manual-fta-report-no-0123_0.pdf. Accessed: July 20, 2024.

3.14 Population and Housing

EBRPD. See East Bay Regional Park District.

East Bay Regional Park District. 2024. Wildcat Bike Trail. Available: <https://www.ebparks.org/projects/wildcat-canyon-regional-park-wildcat-bike-trail>. Accessed August 8, 2024.

US Census. 2023. Richmond, CA. Available: <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/richmondcitycalifornia/PST045223>. Accessed August 6, 2024.

3.15 Public Services

East Bay Regional Park District. 2024a. Fire Department Operations. Available: <https://www.ebparks.org/public-safety/fire/operations>. Accessed June 2024.

_____. 2024b. Police Department. Available: <https://www.ebparks.org/public-safety/police>. Accessed June 2024

EBRPD. See East Bay Regional Park District.

3.16 Recreation

No sources are referenced in this chapter.

3.17 Transportation

City of Richmond. 2012. Richmond General Plan 2030, Circulation Element. Available: <https://www.ci.richmond.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/8810/40-Circulation-Element?bidId=>. Accessed August 16, 2024.

_____. 2021 (March). City of Richmond Guidelines and Procedures for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act. Available: <https://www.ci.richmond.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/307/CEQA-Guidelines-and-Procedures?bidId=>. Accessed August 16, 2024.

Contra Costa County. 2020 (June). Contra Costa County Transportation Analysis Guidelines. Available: <https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/70739/FINAL-CCC-Transportation-Analysis-Guidelines-v3-5-10-21?bidId=>. Accessed August 16, 2024.

3.18 Tribal Cultural Resources

No sources are referenced in this chapter.

3.19 Utilities and Service Systems

CalRecycle. See California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery.

California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery. 2024. Keller Canyon Landfill (07-AA-0032). Available: <https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/SolidWaste/SiteActivity/Details/4407?siteID=228>. Accessed August 2024.

HSD. N.d. Contra Costa Health Solid Waste Program. Available: Solid Waste Program | Contra Costa Health (cchealth.org). Accessed August 2024.

3.20 Wildfire

Contra Costa County. 2005. Contra Costa County General Plan 2005 - 2020. Available: <https://www.contracosta.ca.gov/4732/General-Plan>. Accessed July 2024

CAL FIRE. See California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. 2024a. 2023 Incident Archive. Available: <https://www.fire.ca.gov/incidents/2023>. Accessed July 2024

_____. 2024b. Fire Hazard Severity Zone Viewer. Available: <https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/03beab8511814e79a0e4eabf0d3e7247/>. Accessed July 2024

East Bay Regional Park District 2024. Wildfire Danger and Prevention. Available: <https://www.ebparcs.org/public-safety/fire/wildfire-danger-preventio>. Accessed July 2024

EBRPD. See East Bay Regional Park District.

Heady, H. F. 1972. *Burning and the Grasslands in California*. University of California, Berkeley.

3.21 Mandatory Findings of Significance

No sources are referenced in this chapter.