Appendix B Negative Declaration (ND) for EBRPD WMP&G Document

LEAD AGENCY: East Bay Regional Park District

NAME OF PROJECT: Amendment to 1989 East Bay. Regional Park District (EBRPD) Master Plan to add a Wildland Management Policy

PROJECT LOCATION: Alameda and Contra Costa Counties

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The EBRPD Master Plan identifies various categories of parklands and establishes policies and procedures for acquiring, developing and managing these parklands. The proposed Master Plan amendment would add a new management policy regarding Park District wildlands.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None

DETERMINATION:

An Initial Study has been prepared under the direction of the East Bay Regional Park District's Planning/Stewardship Department in which the environmental effects of the proposed project have been evaluated. On the basis of this Initial Study, a copy of which is attached, the EBRPD has found that the proposed project (including any mitigation measures which will be incorporated in the project) would not have a significant effect on the environment and, therefore, does not require an Environmental Impact Report.

ATTEST: [Signature]

Chief, Planning/Stewardship

DATE: 6/15/92
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST/INITIAL STUDY

PROJECT TITLE: Amendment to 1989 East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD) Master Plan to add a Wildland Management Policy

PROJECT LOCATION: Alameda and Contra Costa Counties

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The EBRPD Master Plan identifies various categories of parklands and establishes policies and procedures for acquiring, developing and managing these parklands. The intent of the Wildland Management Policy is to conserve, manage and enhance important resource values such as soil, vegetation, wildlife and water to ensure that natural parkland ecosystems are maintained in a healthy and productive condition. The new policy identifies grazing, prescribed burning, mechanical treatment and integrated pest management as potential vegetation management tools. Grazing, because of its diversity of application, ease of use, availability and efficacy of control is the current practice for accomplishing the District's vegetation management objectives.

Neither the Master Plan nor amendment specify any specific action at any specific location or time. The Wildland Management Policy states that site-specific unit management plans will be prepared and evaluated through the Master Plan's existing Land Use-Development Plan process.

PROJECT IMPACT EVALUATION

An impact level has been assigned to each question below, assuming no mitigation. The impact category levels are: SIGNIFICANT; UNDETERMINED; NEGLIGIBLE; OR CUMULATIVE. Locations and descriptions of impacts, and feasible mitigations are explained below each question.

Would The PROJECT result in: Impact Level

1. Hazard because of geologic, hydrologic, or soil conditions (seismic risk, flooding, landslides)? Undetermined
2. Grading, excavation, fill, or change topsoil? Undetermined
3. Altered stream, lake, pond, aquifer, bay, or marsh? Undetermined
4. Changed site runoff rate or drainage pattern? Undetermined
5. Degraded water quality or increased erosion and sedimentation affecting any water body? Undetermined
6. Air quality deterioration or objectionable odors? Undetermined
7. Increased average noise levels or intrusive noise from equipment or traffic on or off site? Undetermined

8. Disturbance or removal of valuable vegetation or wildlife habitat (especially marsh or riparian)? Undetermined

9. Reduction of number or habitat of any rare, unique, or endangered plant or animal? Undetermined

Would The PROJECT result in:

10. Barrier to animal migration or species eliminated from the parkland? Undetermined

11. New species of plants or animals introduced to the detriment of the native flora and fauna? Undetermined

12. Effects on mosquito abatement program? Undetermined

13. Changes to wildfire conditions (intensity, frequency or hazard)? Undetermined

14. Damage to known or probable prehistoric or historic archaeologic resources? Undetermined

15. Change or restrict unique ethnic cultural or religious uses? Undetermined

16. A change to land use inconsistent with: city or county zoning; District parkland classification, Master Plan Units, Land Use-Development Plan; or adjacent land uses? Undetermined

17. Effects to human population distribution, growth rate or density, or quality/quantity of housing? Undetermined

18. A reduction in any type of recreational opportunity reduced parkland acreage, access, or facilities)? Undetermined

19. Altered views from surrounding communities or within the parkland (because of grading, construction, structures, vehicle encroachment)? Undetermined

20. Changes to vehicular, equestrian, bicycle, or pedestrian circulation or access? Undetermined

21. Changes to on or off site parking? Undetermined

22. Increased traffic? Undetermined

23. Hazard to pedestrians, equestrians, bicyclists, or motorists on trails or roads, or at intersections? Undetermined

24. A change in utility facilities or service levels? Undetermined

25. A change in levels of police or fire protection? Undetermined

26. Increased vandalism, trespass, or arson? Undetermined
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27. Exposure of people to natural or man-made health hazard; Undetermined
required emergency medical precautions; or increased risk of explosion
or release of hazardous substances?

28. Increased use or decreased availability of energy or any resource? Undetermined

Mandatory Findings of Significance

DOES THE PROJECT HAVE THE POTENTIAL TO:

29. Degrade the quality of the environment; substantially reduce the habitat No
of a fish or wildlife species; cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below
self-sustaining levels; threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community;
reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal;
or have a significant effect upon unique archaeologic resources?

30. Achieve immediate, but not long-term, environmental goals? No

31. Cause impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? No

32. Have direct or indirect environmental effects which will cause substantially No
adverse effects on human beings?

Public Agency Consultation and Possible Public Controversy

HAVE OTHER AGENCIES BEEN CONSULTED ABOUT THE PROJECT? (LIST NO
AGENCIES)

DOES THE PROJECT HAVE IDENTIFIED PUBLIC CONTROVERSY? NO
CEQA 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.

Special Note: The Master Plan amendment does not specify any specific action at any specific location or time. Thus, identification of impacts becomes speculative and, under Section 15145 of the State CEQA Guidelines, evaluation of impacts is terminated. The Master Plan does specify a parkland planning procedure to develop a Land Use-Development Plan and a Natural Resource Management Plan for each parkland. This procedure requires CEQA compliance at a point in time when specific actions are identified. This procedure is a form of tiering as permitted under Section 15152 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION WILL BE PREPARED.

I find the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

If you have any questions please contact me at (510) 635-0135, ext. 2321.

Date: 6/15/92

Maxine Terner
Chief, Planning/Stewardship Department

Reference: CAC, Title 14, Sections 15029.5, 15080, 15081