



CITY OF
HAYWARD
HEART OF THE BAY

WS #3

DATE: October 9, 2007
TO: Mayor and City Council
FROM: Director of Public Works
SUBJECT: Bicycle Master Plan Update

RECOMMENDATION

That Council reviews and comments on this report.

BACKGROUND

The new Bicycle Master Plan Update will bring up-to-date the existing Plan that was approved in 1997. As sufficient time has passed since the current plan was approved and most of its proposed bikeways have been implemented, it has become necessary to plan for future bicycle facilities.

The Master Plan defines a proposed network of bicycle paths (Class I bikeway), bicycle lanes (Class II bikeway), and bicycle routes (Class III bikeway) to provide for the safe movement of bicyclists in Hayward, and provides recommendations for an implementation plan. The proposed network is shown in Figure 6-1 of the draft plan (see Exhibit A).

The recommended facilities for the bicycle network were based on public input and from information contained in the various neighborhood plans, as well as City projects and studies, such as the Route 238 Corridor Improvement Project and the South Hayward BART Concept Plan. In some cases, alternate routing was selected to provide a parallel route to streets where high auto traffic volumes or narrow pavement widths would cause unsuitable conditions for bicyclists. For example, the bicycle lane on Calaroga Avenue runs parallel to Hesperian Boulevard; the bicycle lane on Dixon Street runs parallel to Mission Boulevard.

The Bicycle Master Plan Update was prepared to identify new opportunities throughout the City for the provision of bicycle facilities. Since City funds are limited, it is critical to keep the plan current in order to be eligible to obtain funding from local, state, or federal sources.

An Initial Study and Negative Declaration was prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines (see Exhibit B). No significant environmental impacts are expected to result from the implementation of the Master Plan.

On June 11, 2007, a public meeting was held as part of the process of developing an updated Master Plan. The meeting was advertised in the newspaper and on the City's website, and meeting notices with copies of the Draft Bicycle Master Plan Update were provided to the Hayward Unified School District, the Hayward Area Recreation & Parks District, the Association of Bay Area Governments, the Alameda County Congestion Management Agency, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, the East Bay Regional Park District, and the Hayward Area Planning Association. Notices were also sent to local bicycle shops and bicycle advocacy organizations including the East Bay Bicycle Coalition, Bay Area Bicycle Coalition, and the California Bicycle Coalition.

Comments received during the public meeting included a request for the installation of a Class III bike route on C Street between the BART station and Foothill Boulevard (this bike route will be included in the plan); a request for the installation of a Class II bike lane on C Street between the BART station and Filbert Street (these bike lanes will be included in the plan); and that the D Street bike lanes are too narrow. Bike lanes on D Street were installed during the street's reconstruction, per the standards at that time. Staff will field-check these bike lanes to include wider lane striping at the time D Street is scheduled for repaving.

On July 12, 2007, the Planning Commission reviewed the Master Plan. The Planning Commission recommended approval of the Negative Declaration and adoption of the Bicycle Master Plan Update. The document reviewed by the Planning Commission contained references to the two partial grade separations included in the Route 238 Corridor Improvement Project. Since that time, Council concurred with staff's recommendation to revise the Route 238 Corridor Improvement project description and exclude the grade separations. Consequently, prior to the final distribution, references to the grade separations will be deleted from the Bicycle Master Plan Update.

Additionally, staff has been working with the residents of Fairway Park on traffic calming strategies. One recommendation supported by the residents is to narrow Brae Burn Avenue, Gresel Street, and Rousseau Street from four lanes to two lanes. This will provide an opportunity to install Class II bike lanes on these streets.

Since the proposed update to the Bicycle Master Plan will provide a broader vision, strategies, and actions for the improvement of bicycling in Hayward, and since it is consistent with the General Plan policies as well as recommendations contained in the various neighborhood plans, staff will be recommending that Council adopts the Bicycle Master Plan Update and approves the Initial Study and Negative Declaration. Depending on comments received from Council, the Plan will be presented to Council for formal approval on November 6, 2007.


FISCAL IMPACT

Implementation of the new Bicycle Master Plan facilities is estimated to cost \$1.6 million. Some projects may be eligible for state funding and others may be funded as part of other projects, such as the Route 238 Corridor Improvement Project, or through Measure B Funding restricted to pedestrian and bicycle improvements.

NEXT STEPS


Any significant project will most likely require outside funding. Staff will continue to pursue the various grant funding applications for implementation of the projects included in the Bicycle Master Plan Update. In anticipation of the adoption of the Bicycle Master Plan Update, staff submitted a grant application to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District for Transportation for Clean Air funds for construction of the B Street bicycle lane and other smaller projects. Staff recently learned that the grant was approved for \$95,000. Upon execution of a fund transfer agreement between Hayward and the Alameda County Congestion Management Agency, the project may commence.

Prepared by:




Morad Fakhrai, Deputy Director of Public Works

Recommended by:



Robert A. Bauman, Director of Public Works

Approved by:



Gregory P. Jones, City Manager

Exhibits: A: Proposed Bicycle Master Plan
B: Initial Study and Negative Declaration

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST FORM

Project title: City of Hayward Bicycle Master Plan Update

Lead agency name and address: City of Hayward
777 "B" Street
Hayward, CA 94541-5007

Contact persons and phone number: Luis Samayoa, (510) 583-4769

Project location: Citywide

Project sponsor's name and address: City of Hayward
777 "B" Street
Hayward, CA 94541

General plan designation: N/A

Zoning: N/A

Description of project: City of Hayward Bicycle Master Plan Update (hereafter referred to as the Plan).

The Plan recommends a series of policies related to the City's bikeway network such as planning, utilization of existing resources, facility design, multi-modal integration, safety, education, and support facilities, as well as specific programs, implementation, maintenance, and funding strategies. In addition to these policy recommendations, the Plan designates a bicycle route network that connects parks, schools, neighborhoods, and commercial districts throughout the City of Hayward.

The Bicycle Master Plan is a planning and feasibility study that attempts to guide future action by the City Council. As such, it does not authorize any projects, nor does it commit funding to any project or activity contained the Plan. Further action towards implementation of any of the programs or projects contained in the Plan at the later direction of Council would involve preparation of environmental documentation under CEQA at the time the project is considered.

Surrounding land uses and setting: The Plan policies address streets and off-street routes that traverse residential, commercial and industrial areas, connecting parks, schools, neighborhoods, and commercial districts throughout the City.

Other public agencies whose approval is required: None required

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:


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

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

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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


Signature

June 16, 2007
Date

Luis Samayoa
Printed name

City of Hayward
For

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	---	---	------------------

I. LAND USE AND PLANNING. *Would the proposal:*

a) Conflict with general plan designation or zoning? <i>The project is already referred in the general plan as a component of the circulation element.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

This project addresses the concerns expressed in Neighborhood Plans.

b) Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

c) Be incompatible with existing land use in the vicinity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

d) Affect agricultural resources or operations (e.g., impacts to soils or farmlands, or impacts from incompatible land uses)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

e) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

II. POPULATION AND HOUSING. *Would the proposal:*

a) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

b) Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

c) Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

III. GEOLOGIC PROBLEMS. *Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:*

a) Fault rupture?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

b) Seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

c) Seismic ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazard?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Landslides or mudflows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Subsidence of land?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expansive soils?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Unique geologic or physical features?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IV. WATER. Would the proposal result in:				
a) Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Discharge into surface waters or other alteration of surface water quality (e.g., temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations or through substantial loss of groundwater recharge capability?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Impacts to groundwater quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	---	---	------------------

V. AIR QUALITY. *Would the proposal:*

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change in climate? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Create objectionable odors? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION. *Would the proposal result in:*

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion?
<i>The purpose of the bicycle master plan is to reduce vehicle trips or traffic congestion.</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| a) Hazards to safety from design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Insufficient parking capacity onsite or offsite? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Rail, waterborne or air traffic impacts? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

VI. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. *Would the proposal result in impacts to*

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats (including but not limited to plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Locally designated species (e.g., heritage trees)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Locally designated natural communities (e.g., oak forest, coastal habitat, etc.)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Wetland habitat (e.g., marsh, riparian, and vernal pool)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

VIII. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES. *Would the proposal:*

a) Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Use nonrenewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

IX. HAZARDS. *Would the proposal involve:*

a) A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to, oil, pesticides, chemicals or radiation)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

X. NOISE. *Would the proposal result in:*

a) Increases in existing noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of people to severe noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

XI. PUBLIC SERVICES. *Would the proposal have an effect upon or result in a need for new or altered government services in any of the following areas:*

a) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Other government services?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. *Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities?*

a) Power or natural gas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Communications systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Sewer or septic tanks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Storm water drainage?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Solid waste disposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Local or regional water supplies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

XIII. AESTHETICS. *Would the proposal?*

a) Affect a scenic vista or scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Create light or glare?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

XIV. CULTURAL RESOURCES. *Would the proposal:*

a) Disturb paleontological resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Disturb archaeological resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique cultural values?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

XV. RECREATION. *Would the proposal:*

- a) Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities?
- b) Affect existing recreational opportunities?

XVI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

- a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?
- b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals?
- c) 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)
- d) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

XVII. EARLIER ANALYSES.

- a) Earlier analyses used.
- b) Impacts adequately addressed.
- c) Mitigation measures.

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Notice is hereby given that the City of Hayward finds that no significant effect on the environment as prescribed by the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended will occur for the following proposed project:

I. *PROJECT DESCRIPTION:*

City of Hayward Bicycle Master Plan Update.

II. *FINDING PROJECT WILL NOT SIGNIFICANTLY AFFECT ENVIRONMENT:*

That the proposed project will have no substantial effect on the area's resources, cumulative or otherwise.

III. *FINDINGS SUPPORTING DECLARATION:*

The proposed policies would result in Bicycle improvements to roadways and signage along existing City right-of-way. These improvements would retain or improve the existing character and quality of City streets.

IV. *PERSON WHO PREPARED INITIAL STUDY:*

Luis A. Samayoa, P.E., Associate Civil Engineer

Name/Title

June 16, 2007

Date

V. *COPY OF INITIAL STUDY IS ATTACHED*

For additional information, please contact the City of Hayward, 777 "B" Street, Hayward, California 94541-5007 or telephone the City Clerk at (510)583-4400.

**DUE TO THE LENGTH OR COLOR
OF THE REFERENCED EXHIBIT, IT
HAS BEEN ATTACHED AS A
SEPARATE LINK.**