

A. Facility Refinements Assessment

**TABLE A-1
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE EASTSIDE TRAIL REDUCTION (ALTERNATIVES 1-4)**

Environmental Impact	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
Section 4.2: Delta Hydrology and Water Quality		
4.2.1: The project alternatives would not adversely alter deliveries of water to other users.	=	No change in effects related to the deliveries of water to other users, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not result in any changes in operations. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
4.2.2: The project alternatives would not result in significant adverse changes in Delta water quality causing the violation of a water quality standard.	=	No change in effects on Delta water quality, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not result in any in-Delta construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
4.2.3: The project alternatives would not result in changes to Delta water quality that would result in significant adverse effects on beneficial uses.	=	No change in effects on beneficial uses, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not result in any in-Delta construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
4.2.4: Diversions of Delta water under the project alternatives would not result in a significant reduction of Delta water levels.	=	No change in effects on Delta water levels, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not result in changes that would affect Delta water levels. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
4.2.5: The project alternatives would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant adverse cumulative effects on deliveries of water to other users, changes in Delta water quality, or change in Delta water levels.	=	No change in effects to cumulative Delta hydrology and water quality effects. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
Section 4.3: Delta Fisheries and Aquatic Resources		
4.3.1: In-channel construction activities associated with the proposed new Delta Intake structure would increase short-term localized suspended sediment, turbidity, and possibly contaminant concentrations within Old River, which would increase exposure of various life stages and species of fish to temporarily degraded water quality conditions.	=	No change in effects on Delta fisheries or aquatic resources, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not require any in-channel construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
4.3.2: Underwater sound-pressure levels generated during cofferdam installation for the new Delta Intake could result in behavioral avoidance or migration delays for special-status fish species.	=	No change in effects resulting in behavioral avoidance or migration delays for special-status fish species, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not require any in-channel construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
4.3.3: Dewatering of the cofferdam for the new Delta Intake could result in stranding of fish.	=	No change in effects on the stranding of fish associated with dewatering, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not require any in-channel construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
4.3.4: The new Delta Intake structure and associated fish screens in Old River would physically exclude fish from a small area of existing aquatic habitat and modify existing aquatic habitat.	=	No change in effects on the physical exclusion of fish from a small area of existing aquatic habitat or to the modification of existing aquatic habitat resulting from fish screens, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not require any in-channel construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.

**TABLE A-1
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE EASTSIDE TRAIL REDUCTION (ALTERNATIVES 1-4)**

Environmental Impact	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
Section 4.3: Delta Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (cont.)		
4.3.5: The new Delta Intake structure and associated fish screens in Old River would modify hydraulic conditions next to the intake structure, but would not disorient special-status fish or attract predatory fish.	= No change in effects that would result in the disorientation of special-status fish or on the attraction of predatory fish, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not result in any modifications to the hydraulic conditions. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: NI Alternative 4: NI
4.3.6: Operation of the project alternatives would not result in changes to Delta hydrologic conditions that affect Delta fish populations or quality and quantity of aquatic habitat within the Sacramento-San Joaquin River system, including the Delta.	= No change in effects on Delta fish populations or quality and quantity of aquatic habitat within the Sacramento-San Joaquin River system, including the Delta, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not result in any changes to Delta hydrologic conditions. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS
4.3.7: Operation of the new screened intake, or changes to diversions at existing intakes, could affect direct entrainment or impingement of fish.	= No change in effects on direct entrainment or impingement of fish, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not result in any changes in operations. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: B Alternative 2: B Alternative 3: SU Alternative 4: LS
4.3.8: Fish screen maintenance activities would not significantly increase fish entrainment at the new Delta Intake or the expanded Old River Intake.	= No change in effects on fish entrainment at the new Delta Intake or the expanded Old River Intake, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not result in any additional fish screen maintenance activities. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: NI
4.3.9: The project, when combined with other planned project alternatives, or projects under construction in the area, could cumulatively contribute to substantial adverse impacts to Delta fisheries and aquatic resources.	= No change in effects to cumulative Delta fisheries and aquatic resources effects. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, these impacts would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation for Alternatives 1, 2, and 4 and Significant and Unavoidable for Alternative 3. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Section 4.3, Mitigation Measure 4.3.1, pp. 4.3-55 through 4.3-56, Mitigation Measure 4.3.2, pp. 4.3-58 through 4.3-59, and Mitigation Measure 4.3.3, pp. 4.3-59; Section 4.13, Mitigation Measure 4.13.2, pp. 4.13-18; Section 4.5, Mitigation Measure 4.5-1a, pp. 4.5-19 through 4.5-20; and Section 4.6, Mitigation Measure 4.6.2b, pp. 4.6-103). No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: SU Alternative 4: LS
Section 4.4: Geology, Soils and Seismicity		
4.4.1: The project facilities would be designed and engineered in accordance with seismic code requirements. As a result, the project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking or seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and landslides.	= No change in effects related to strong seismic ground shaking or seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and landslides, since no additional people or structures would be exposed to these types of risks. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS
4.4.2: During construction and operations, the project could result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	< Potential for slightly decreased effects on soil erosion and less potential loss of topsoil, since a reduced Eastside Trail would require slightly less construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
4.4.3: Project components could be located on expansive or corrosive soils or on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or could become unstable as a result of the project or construction activities; however, those components would not likely result in onsite or offsite landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse, and would not create substantial risks to life or property.	= No change in effects related to expansive or corrosive soils or on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or could become unstable, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not expose project components to these types of risks. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS

**TABLE A-1
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE EASTSIDE TRAIL REDUCTION (ALTERNATIVES 1-4)**

Environmental Impact	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
Section 4.4: Geology, Soils and Seismicity (cont.)		
4.4.4: The proposed project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative effects associated with erosion, topsoil loss or increased exposure to seismic or other geohazard risks.	< Potential for slightly decreased cumulative effects related to soil erosion, topsoil loss and exposure to seismic or other geohazard risks, since a reduced Eastside Trail would require slightly less construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS
Section 4.5: Local Hydrology, Drainage and Groundwater		
4.5.1: During construction, the project alternatives could violate water quality standards through increased erosion and sedimentation to local waterways, release of fuels or other hazardous materials during construction, or dewatering of excavated areas that could result in substantial water quality degradation.		
4.5.2: Construction and operation of the project alternatives would not deplete local groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge.	< Potential for slightly decreased effects on water quality. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
4.5.3: Project alternatives would not substantially alter drainage patterns but reservoir expansion would increase the reservoir shoreline area subject to erosion.	= No change in effects on groundwater supplies or groundwater recharge. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS
4.5.4: Project alternatives would not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff during operation.	< Potential for slightly decreased effects on drainage patterns. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS
4.5.5: Project Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 could place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Insurance Rate Map, which could impede or redirect flood flows.	< Potential for slightly decreased effects related to runoff water. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
4.5.6: The project alternatives would not substantially increase the exposure of people and/or structures to risks associated with inundation by dam or levee failure.	= No change in effects related to flood hazard, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not affect the exposure of project components to these types of risks. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS
4.5.7: Construction and operation of the project alternatives would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative effects on drainage, flooding, groundwater recharge or water quality degradation in the project area.	< Potential for slightly decreased cumulative effects related to local hydrology, drainage and water quality associated with the potential for reduced effects identified above. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS

**TABLE A-1
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE EASTSIDE TRAIL REDUCTION (ALTERNATIVES 1-4)**

Environmental Impact	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
Section 4.6: Biological Resources		
4.6.1: Project construction would affect the following NCCP habitat types (CDFG sensitive plant communities in parentheses): Natural Seasonal Wetland (i.e., bulrush-cattail series, northern claypan vernal pool, bush seepweed and saltgrass series), Valley/Foothill Riparian (i.e., Fremont cottonwood series and valley oak series), Grassland (i.e., purple needlegrass series) and Valley/Foothill Woodland Forest (i.e., blue oak series).	<	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
4.6.2: Project construction could affect potentially jurisdictional wetlands or waters, and streambeds and banks regulated by CDFG.	<	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
4.6.3: Project construction could affect populations of special-status plant species including brittlescale, San Joaquin spearscale, Brewer's dwarf-flax, and rose-mallow.	=	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
4.6.4: Project construction would result in impacts on California red-legged frog and California tiger salamander, including aquatic breeding habitat and upland aestivation habitat for these species.	<	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
4.6.5: Project construction would result in direct and indirect impacts on existing populations of and habitat for the western pond turtle.	<	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
4.6.6: Project construction under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would result in direct and indirect impacts on listed vernal pool fairy shrimp and their habitat, and on the non-listed midvalley fairy shrimp and curved-foot hygrotus diving beetle.	<	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
4.6.7: Project construction would have temporary and permanent impacts on potential San Joaquin kit fox habitat and permanently reduce potential regional movement opportunities in one location for this species.	<	Alternative 1: LSM/SU Alternative 2: LSM/SU Alternative 3: LSM/SU Alternative 4: LSM/SU
4.6.8: Project construction would result in temporary and permanent loss of habitat for burrowing owls.	<	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
4.6.9: Project construction and operation activities would result in direct and indirect impacts on existing populations of and habitat for the golden eagle, bald eagle, and Swainson's hawk.	=	Alternative 1: LSM/B Alternative 2: LSM/B Alternative 3: LSM/B Alternative 4: LSM/B

**TABLE A-1
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE EASTSIDE TRAIL REDUCTION (ALTERNATIVES 1-4)**

Environmental Impact	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
Section 4.6: Biological Resources (cont.)		
4.6.10: Project construction and increased reservoir water levels would result in temporary and permanent loss of potential and occupied habitat for Alameda whipsnakes.	<	Potential for slightly decreased effects on Alameda whipsnake habitat in grassland areas of the watershed. No change in conclusions or mitigation. Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
4.6.11: Project construction activities could result in direct and indirect impacts on the valley elderberry longhorn beetle and its habitat.	=	No change in effects on VELB or their habitat since no VELB habitat is located in grassland trail area. No change in conclusions or mitigation. Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
4.6.12: Project construction activities could affect active breeding bird nest sites and new powerlines could affect migratory birds.	<	Potential for slightly decreased effects on breeding bird nest sites (grassland provides nesting and foraging habitat for some bird species). No change in effects related to migratory birds since reduction of the Eastside Trail would not require new powerlines. No change in conclusions or mitigation. Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
4.6.13: Project construction activities under Alternatives 1 and 2 could affect designated critical habitat for listed species (vernal pool fairy shrimp and Contra Costa goldfields).	=	No change in effects to designated critical habitat for listed species (vernal pool fairy shrimp and Contra Costa goldfields) since no critical habitat for listed species occurs in the watershed). No change in conclusions or mitigation. Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: NI Alternative 4: NI
4.6.14: Project construction activities could affect nonlisted special-status reptile species (San Joaquin coachwhip and coast horned lizard).	<	Potential for slightly decreased effects on habitat for nonlisted special-status reptile species (San Joaquin coachwhip and coast horned lizard) that may occur in the watershed grasslands. No change in conclusions or mitigation. Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
4.6.15: Project construction activities could affect nonlisted special-status mammal species (American badger, special-status bats, and San Joaquin pocket mouse).	<	Potential for slightly decreased effects on nonlisted special-status mammal species (American badger, special-status bats, and San Joaquin pocket mouse), since grassland provides grassy open areas for badger and pocket mouse burrows. No change in conclusions or mitigation. Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
4.6.16: Draining the reservoir during project construction under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 could affect Pacific Flyway species, including waterfowl and shorebirds.	=	No change in effects to Pacific Flyway species as reduction of the Eastside Trail would have no effect on the draining of the reservoir during construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation. Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS
4.6.17: The project would not result in conflicts with local and regional conservation plans, or local plans or ordinances protecting biological resources.	=	No change in effects on local and regional conservation plans since a reduced Eastside Trail would not result in any changes related to local & regional conservation plans & ordinances protecting biological resources. No change in conclusions or mitigation. Alternative 1: NI Alternative 2: NI Alternative 3: NI Alternative 4: NI
4.6.18: Project construction would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative effects on special-status species and habitats.	<	Potential for slightly decreased cumulative effects related to biological resources associated with the potential for reduced effects identified above. No change in conclusions or mitigation. Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS

**TABLE A-1
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE EASTSIDE TRAIL REDUCTION (ALTERNATIVES 1-4)**

Environmental Impact	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
Section 4.7: Land Use		
4.7.1: The proposed project and alternatives would not physically divide an existing community.	=	Alternative 1: NI Alternative 2: NI Alternative 3: NI Alternative 4: NI
4.7.2: Facility siting and operation under the proposed project and alternatives would not conflict with any applicable land use plans.	=	Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS
4.7.3: Construction activities within designated Airport Land Use Compatibility Zones near the Byron Airport could cause potential temporary height impacts by conflicting with FAR Part 77 surfaces during construction.	=	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
4.7.4: Construction activities within the AIA for Byron Airport could cause potential temporary flight hazards through the creation of glare or distracting lights; the generation of dust or smoke, which could impair pilot visibility; or could attract an increased number of birds.	=	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
4.7.5: The proposed project and alternatives would not contribute to cumulative land use impacts.	=	Alternative 1: NI Alternative 2: NI Alternative 3: NI Alternative 4: NI
Section 4.8: Agriculture		
4.8.1: Project construction would temporarily impact the agricultural use of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.	=	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LS
4.8.2: The project would permanently convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to nonagricultural use.	=	Alternative 1: SU Alternative 2: SU Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LS
4.8.3: The project would not conflict with zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract.	=	Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: NI
4.8.4: The project would involve changes in the environment that, due to their location or nature, could contribute to cumulative impacts from conversion of Important Farmland to nonagricultural uses.	=	Alternative 1: SU Alternative 2: SU Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LS

**TABLE A-1
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE EASTSIDE TRAIL REDUCTION (ALTERNATIVES 1-4)**

Environmental Impact	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
Section 4.9: Transportation and Circulation		
4.9.1: Project construction activities would intermittently and temporarily increase traffic congestion due to vehicle trips generated by construction workers and construction vehicles on area roadways.	=	No change in effects related to traffic congestion during construction, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not result in an increase in traffic congestion. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
4.9.2: Project construction activities under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 would intermittently and temporarily impede access to local streets or adjacent uses, including access for emergency vehicles and could substantially increase traffic hazards due to construction in or adjacent to roads or possible road wear.	=	No change in effects related to service disruptions, including access for emergency vehicles, a substantial increase traffic hazards due to construction in or adjacent to roads or possible road wear during construction, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not result in an increase in service disruptions related to construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
4.9.3: Traffic associated with operation of project facilities, including the expanded recreation facilities, would not exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.	=	No change in effects related to level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not result in a change of operations. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
4.9.4: Construction of project alternatives, when combined with construction of other future projects, could contribute to construction-related short-term cumulative impacts to traffic and transportation (traffic congestion, access, and traffic safety).	=	No change in cumulative effects related to transportation and circulation. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
Section 4.10: Air Quality		
4.10.1: Construction of project alternatives could generate short-term emissions of criteria air pollutants: ROG, NOx, CO, and PM10 that could contribute to existing nonattainment conditions and further degrade air quality. However, project alternatives would not exceed federal general conformity <i>de minimis</i> standards for emissions.	<	Potential for slightly decreased effects related to criteria air pollution emissions due to slightly less trail construction activity. Impacts remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
4.10.2: Operation of project alternatives would not result in emissions of criteria air pollutants at levels that would substantially contribute to a potential violation of applicable air quality standards or to nonattainment conditions.	=	No change in effects related to violation of air quality standards, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not result in a change in operations. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
4.10.3: Construction and/or operation of project alternatives would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	=	No change in effects related to exposing sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not increase the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
4.10.4: Operation of project alternatives would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.	=	No change in effects related to objectionable odors, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not increase the exposure of people to objectionable odors. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
4.10.5: Construction and operation of project alternatives would not result in a cumulatively considerable increase in greenhouse gas emissions.	=	No change in effects related to greenhouse gas emissions, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not increase the production greenhouse gas emissions from construction and operation of the alternatives. No change in conclusions or mitigation.

**TABLE A-1
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE EASTSIDE TRAIL REDUCTION (ALTERNATIVES 1-4)**

Environmental Impact	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
Section 4.10: Air Quality (cont.)		
4.10.6: Construction and operation of the project alternatives could result in cumulatively considerable increases of criteria pollutant emissions.	= No change in cumulative effects related to air quality. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
Section 4.11: Noise		
4.11.1: Construction of facilities under the proposed project and alternatives could generate noise levels that exceed the Contra Costa County or Alameda County noise standards at nearby sensitive receptors if construction activities are carried out during noise-sensitive hours, causing sleep disturbance and/or annoyance.	= No change in effects related to exceeding noise standards during construction, since a reduced Eastside Trail would result in slightly less construction activity. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
4.11.2: Operation of the project and alternatives would generate traffic, stationary source, and area source noise similar to existing noise associated with operation of Los Vaqueros Reservoir system and would not exceed County noise requirements.	= No change in effects related to exceeding noise standards during operations, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not result in a change in operations. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS
4.11.3: Project construction would not expose persons to or generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels.	= No change in effects related to exposing persons to or generating excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels, since a reduced Eastside Trail would result in slightly less construction activity. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS
4.11.4: The proposed project or alternatives would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to noise levels during either construction or operation.	= No change in cumulative effects related to noise. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS
Section 4.12: Utilities and Public Service Systems		
4.12.1: Construction or operation of project alternatives could temporarily disrupt utilities and public service systems such that a public health hazard could be created or an extended service disruption could result.	= No change in effects related to the temporary disruption of utilities and public service systems, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not result in any increase in temporary utility and public service disruptions. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
4.12.2: Project alternatives would not require or result in construction of new or expanded utility infrastructure or public service facilities that would result in substantial adverse physical impacts.	= No change in effects related to the construction of new or expanded utility infrastructure or public service facilities since a reduced Eastside Trail would not require any new utility infrastructure or public service facilities. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS
4.12.3: Construction of the project alternatives could increase solid waste generation such that the capacity of local landfills would be exceeded or the project would not comply with state regulations related to solid waste.	= No change in effects related solid waste generation, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not result in an increase in solid waste generation. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
4.12.4: Construction of the project alternatives could make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative effects on public services and utilities, or local landfill capacity.	= No change in cumulative effects related to public services and utilities, or local landfill capacity. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM

**TABLE A-1
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE EASTSIDE TRAIL REDUCTION (ALTERNATIVES 1-4)**

Environmental Impact	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
Section 4.13: Hazardous Materials / Public Health		
4.13.1: Construction of the project and alternative components would disturb subsurface soils and groundwater; if hazardous substances are present in the disturbed areas, construction workers and the public could be exposed to these substances.	=	Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS
4.13.2: Project construction and operation could, through routine transport, use or disposal, accidentally release hazardous materials, thereby exposing construction workers, project personnel, and the public to hazardous materials, or accidentally releasing hazardous materials into the soil, groundwater, and/or a nearby surface water body.	<	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
4.13.3: Improper handling or use of flammable or combustible materials such as internal combustion equipment could result in wildland fires, exposing people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death.	<	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
4.13.4: Construction and operation of project power supply facilities would not locate electrical transmission facilities within 150 feet of a school.	=	Alternative 1: NI Alternative 2: NI Alternative 3: NI Alternative 4: NI
4.13.5: The project alternatives would not contribute to cumulative impacts associated with release of hazardous materials or other hazards.	<	Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS
Section 4.14: Visual/Aesthetic Resources		
4.14.1: The project alternatives would not have a substantial, demonstrable negative aesthetic effect on a scenic vista or from a county-designated scenic highway or route.	=	Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS
4.14.2: The project alternatives would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings, except Alternative 4 due to the borrow area in Kellogg Valley.	=	Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LSM
4.14.3: The project alternatives would not create a new source of substantial light but Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 could create a new source of substantial glare that could adversely affect views in the area.	=	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LS
4.14.4: The project alternatives would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects on visual/aesthetic resources in the project area or broader region.	=	Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS

**TABLE A-1
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE EASTSIDE TRAIL REDUCTION (ALTERNATIVES 1-4)**

Environmental Impact	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
Section 4.15: Recreation		
4.15.1: Construction of the project alternatives would result in a short-term reduction of recreational opportunities in the project area due to construction activities outside the watershed and closure of the watershed to the public during the construction period, but would enhance recreational opportunities in the long-term.	=	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
4.15.2: The project alternatives would not 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.	=	Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS
4.15.3: No other reasonably foreseeable future projects would also reduce recreational opportunities in the project area, similar to those opportunities affected by the project alternatives, or increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities; therefore, there does not appear to be the potential for the project alternatives to contribute to a cumulative effect on recreation facilities, opportunities or experience.	=	Alternative 1: LS Alternative 2: LS Alternative 3: LS Alternative 4: LS
Section 4.16: Cultural and Paleontological Resources		
4.16.1: Construction and management of project components would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical and/or unique archaeological resource as defined in Section 15064.5 or historic property or historic district, as defined in Section 106 of the NHPA (36 CFR 800), or in a previously undiscovered cultural resource.	<	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
4.16.2: Ground-disturbing activities could encounter and destroy paleontological resources in certain geologic formations underlying the project area.	<	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
4.16.3: Construction and management of project components could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.	=	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM
4.16.4: Construction and management of project components would contribute to adverse cumulative impacts to cultural and/or paleontological resources.	<	Alternative 1: LSM Alternative 2: LSM Alternative 3: LSM Alternative 4: LSM

**TABLE A-1
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE EASTSIDE TRAIL REDUCTION (ALTERNATIVES 1-4)**

Environmental Impact	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
Section 4.17: Socioeconomic Effects		
4.17.1 Project construction could temporarily generate new income and local employment that could benefit Contra Costa County's economy.	<	Potential for slightly decreased beneficial effects on local income and employment. A reduced Eastside Trail would slightly decrease the amount of project construction which could reduce beneficial effects. This change would be minor and benefits similar to those described in the Draft EIS/EIR would still occur. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
4.17.2: Loss of agricultural land use associated with project construction and development could affect Contra Costa County and Alameda County's economy.	=	No change in effects to the local agricultural economy since a reduced Eastside Trail would not affect agricultural land inside the watershed. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
4.17.3: Short-term loss of recreation income associated with project construction could affect Contra Costa County's economy.	<	Potential for slightly decreased beneficial effects on the local economy since a reduced Eastside Trail would result in slightly less construction activity. This change would be very minor and benefits similar to those described in the Draft EIS/EIR would still occur. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
4.17.4 Construction of the project alternatives, when combined with construction of other future projects, could have a potentially beneficial effect on income and local employment.	<	Potential for slightly decreased beneficial effects on local income and employment, when combined with construction of other future projects since a reduced Eastside Trail would result in slightly less construction activity. This change would be minor and not affect impact levels. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
4.17.5: Construction of the project alternatives, when combined with construction of other future projects, could have a potential cumulative effect on Contra Costa County's economy as a result of temporary loss of agricultural land uses.	=	No changes in effects to the local agricultural economy. A reduced Eastside Trail would not affect agricultural land uses since there is no agricultural land inside the watershed. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
4.17.6 Construction of the project alternatives, when combined with construction of other future projects, could have a potential cumulative effect on Contra Costa County's economy as a result of temporary recreational impacts.	=	No changes in cumulative related to socioeconomic effects. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
Section 4.18: Environmental Justice		
4.18.1: Construction and operation of the project alternatives would result in air quality, noise, and/or other environmental impacts related to traffic and other construction activities that would not disproportionately affect nearby minority and/or low-income communities.	=	No changes in effects of environmental impacts that would disproportionately affect minority and/or low income communities, since a reduced Eastside Trail would not result in any new impacts to nearby minority and/or low-income communities. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
4.18.2: Construction and operation of the project alternatives would not disproportionately affect local employment opportunities for minority and/or low-income communities in the vicinity of the project.	<	Potential for slightly decreased beneficial effects on local employment opportunities. A reduced Eastside Trail would slightly decrease the amount of project construction work which could reduce beneficial effects. This change would be minor and benefits similar to those described in the Draft EIS/EIR would still occur. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
4.18.3: Construction and operation of the project alternatives when combined with construction of other past, present, and probable future projects, would result in air quality, noise, and/or other environmental impacts related to traffic and other construction activities that would not disproportionately affect nearby minority and/or low-income communities.	=	No changes in effects of environmental impacts to minority and/or low income communities. No change in conclusions or mitigation.

**TABLE A-1
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE EASTSIDE TRAIL REDUCTION (ALTERNATIVES 1-4)**

Environmental Impact	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
Section 4.18: Environmental Justice (cont.)		
4.18.4: Construction and operation of the project, when combined with construction of other past, present, and probable future projects, would not disproportionately affect local employment opportunities for minority and/or low-income communities in the vicinity of the project.	>	Alternative 1: NI Alternative 2: NI Alternative 3: NI Alternative 4: NI
Section 4.19: Indian Trust Assets		
4.19.1: The project would not affect Indian Trust Assets.	=	Alternative 1: NI Alternative 2: NI Alternative 3: NI Alternative 4: NI
Section 4.20: Growth-Inducing Effects		
4.20.1: Construction and operation of the proposed project would not result in direct or indirect growth-inducing effects.	=	Alternative 1: NI Alternative 2: NI Alternative 3: NI Alternative 4: NI

**TABLE A-2
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE WESTSIDE TRAIL REALIGNMENT (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

Environmental Impact	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
Section 4.2: Delta Hydrology and Water Quality		
4.2.1: The project alternatives would not adversely alter deliveries of water to other users.	= No change in effects related to the deliveries of water to other users since a realigned Westside Trail would not result in any changes in operations. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
4.2.2: The project alternatives would not result in significant adverse changes in Delta water quality causing the violation of a water quality standard.	= No change in effects on Delta water quality since a realigned Westside Trail would not result in any in-Delta construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
4.2.3: The project alternatives would not result in changes to Delta water quality that would result in significant adverse effects on beneficial uses.	= No change in effects on beneficial uses since a realigned Westside Trail would not result in any in-Delta construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
4.2.4: Diversions of Delta water under the project alternatives would not result in a significant reduction of Delta water levels.	= No change in effects on Delta water levels since a realigned Westside Trail would not result in changes that would affect Delta water levels. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
4.2.5: The project alternatives would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant adverse cumulative effects on deliveries of water to other users, changes in Delta water quality, or change in Delta water levels.	= No change in cumulative effects on deliveries of water to other users, changes in Delta Water Quality, or change in Delta water levels. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
Section 4.3: Delta Fisheries and Aquatic Resources		
4.3.1: In-channel construction activities associated with the proposed new Delta Intake structure would increase short-term localized suspended sediment, turbidity, and possibly contaminant concentrations within Old River, which would increase exposure of various life stages and species of fish to temporarily degraded water quality conditions.	= No change in effects on water quality conditions as a result of construction activities since a realigned Westside Trail would not require any in-channel construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: NI
4.3.2: Underwater sound-pressure levels generated during cofferdam installation for the new Delta Intake could result in behavioral avoidance or migration delays for special-status fish species.	= No change in effects on behavioral avoidance or migration delays for special-status fish species since a realigned Westside Trail would not require any in-channel construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: NI
4.3.3: Dewatering of the cofferdam for the new Delta Intake could result in stranding of fish.	= No change in effects on the stranding of fish associated with dewatering since a realigned Westside Trail would not require any in-channel construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: NI
4.3.4: The new Delta Intake structure and associated fish screens in Old River would physically exclude fish from a small area of existing aquatic habitat and modify existing aquatic habitat.	= No change in effects on the physical exclusion of fish from a small area of existing aquatic habitat or to the modification of existing aquatic habitat resulting from fish screens since a realigned Westside Trail would not require any in-channel construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: NI
4.3.5: The new Delta Intake structure and associated fish screens in Old River would modify hydraulic conditions next to the intake structure, but would not disorient special-status fish or attract predatory fish.	= No change in effects on the disorientation of special-status fish or on the attraction of predatory fish since a realigned Westside Trail would not result in any changes to Delta hydrologic conditions. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: NI

**TABLE A-2
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE WESTSIDE TRAIL REALIGNMENT (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

Environmental Impact	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
Section 4.3: Delta Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (cont.)		
4.3.6: Operation of the project alternatives would not result in changes to Delta hydrologic conditions that affect Delta fish populations or quality and quantity of aquatic habitat within the Sacramento-San Joaquin River system, including the Delta.	= No change in effects on Delta fish populations or quality and quantity of aquatic habitat within the Sacramento-San Joaquin River system, including the Delta a realigned Westside Trail would not result in any changes to Delta hydrologic conditions. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
4.3.7: Operation of the new screened intake, or changes to diversions at existing intakes, could affect direct entrainment or impingement of fish.	= No change in effects to direct entrainment or impingement of fish since a realigned Westside Trail would not result in any changes to operations. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
4.3.8: Fish screen maintenance activities would not significantly increase fish entrainment at the new Delta Intake or the expanded Old River Intake.	= No change in effects on fish entrainment at the new Delta Intake or the expanded Old River Intake since a realigned Westside Trail would not result in any additional fish screen maintenance activities. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: NI
4.3.9: The project, when combined with other planned project alternatives, or projects under construction in the area, could cumulatively contribute to substantial adverse impacts to Delta fisheries and aquatic resources.	= No change in effects related to cumulative effects to Delta fisheries and aquatic resources. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
Section 4.4: Geology, Soils and Seismicity		
4.4.1: The project facilities would be designed and engineered in accordance with seismic code requirements. As a result, the project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking or seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and landslides.	= No change in effects related to strong seismic ground shaking or seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and landslides, since no additional people or structures would be exposed to these types of risks. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
4.4.2: During construction and operations, the project could result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	> Potential for slightly increased effects to soil erosion and loss of topsoil due to additional trail length. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, these impacts would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Section 4.5, Mitigation Measures 4.5.1a and b, pp. 4.5-19 through 4.5-21; Mitigation Measure 4.5.2, pg. 4.5-29; and Section 4.6, Mitigation Measures 4.6.2a-b, pp. 4.6-102 through 4.6-103). No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LSM
4.4.3: Project components could be located on expansive or corrosive soils or on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or could become unstable as a result of the project or construction activities; however, those components would not likely result in onsite or offsite landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse, and would not create substantial risks to life or property.	= No change in effects related to unstable soils since a realigned Westside Trail would not expose project components to these types of risks. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
4.4.4: The proposed project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative effects associated with erosion, topsoil loss or increased exposure to seismic or other geohazard risks.	> Potential for slightly increased cumulative effects. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, these impacts would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Section 4.5, Mitigation Measures 4.5.1a and b, pp. 4.5-19 through 4.5-21; Mitigation Measure 4.5.2, pg. 4.5-29; and Section 4.6, Mitigation Measures 4.6.2a-b, pp. 4.6-102 through 4.6-103). No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS

**TABLE A-2
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE WESTSIDE TRAIL REALIGNMENT (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

Environmental Impact	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
Section 4.5: Local Hydrology, Drainage and Groundwater		
4.5.1: During construction, the project alternatives could violate water quality standards through increased erosion and sedimentation to local waterways, release of fuels or other hazardous materials during construction, or dewatering of excavated areas that could result in substantial water quality degradation.	>	Alternative 4: LSM
4.5.2: Construction and operation of the project alternatives would not deplete local groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge.	=	Alternative 4: LS
4.5.3: Project alternatives would not substantially alter drainage patterns but reservoir expansion would increase the reservoir shoreline area subject to erosion.	=	Alternative 4: LS
4.5.4: Project alternatives would not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff during operation.	>	Alternative 4: LSM
4.5.5: Project Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 could place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Insurance Rate Map, which could impede or redirect flood flows.	=	Alternative 4: LS
4.5.6: The project alternatives would not substantially increase the exposure of people and/or structures to risks associated with inundation by dam or levee failure.	=	Alternative 4: LS
4.5.7: Construction and operation of the project alternatives would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative effects on drainage, flooding, groundwater recharge or water quality degradation in the project area.	>	Alternative 4: LS
Section 4.6: Biological Resources		
4.6.1: Project construction would affect the following NCCP habitat types (CDFG sensitive plant communities in parentheses): Natural Seasonal Wetland (i.e., bulrush-cattail series, northern claypan vernal pool, bush seepweed and saltgrass series), Valley/Foothill Riparian (i.e., Fremont cottonwood series and valley oak series), Grassland (i.e., purple needlegrass series) and Valley/Foothill Woodland Forest (i.e., blue oak series).	>	Alternative 4: LSM
4.6.2: Project construction could affect potentially jurisdictional wetlands or waters, and streambeds and banks regulated by CDFG.	>	Alternative 4: LSM

**TABLE A-2
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE WESTSIDE TRAIL REALIGNMENT (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

Environmental Impact	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
Section 4.6: Biological Resources (cont.)		
4.6.3: Project construction could affect populations of special-status plant species including brittlescale, San Joaquin spearscale, Brewer's dwarf-flax, and rose-mallow.	>	Alternative 4: NI
4.6.4: Project construction would result in impacts on California red-legged frog and California tiger salamander, including aquatic breeding habitat and upland aestivation habitat for these species.	>	Alternative 4: LSM
4.6.5: Project construction would result in direct and indirect impacts on existing populations of and habitat for the western pond turtle.	=	Alternative 4: LSM
4.6.6: Project construction under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would result in direct and indirect impacts on listed vernal pool fairy shrimp and their habitat, and on the non-listed midvalley fairy shrimp and curved-foot hygrotrus diving beetle.	=	Alternative 4: NI
4.6.7: Project construction would have temporary and permanent impacts on potential San Joaquin kit fox habitat and permanently reduce potential regional movement opportunities in one location for this species.	>	Alternative 4: LSM/SU
4.6.8: Project construction would result in temporary and permanent loss of habitat for burrowing owls.	>	Alternative 4: LSM
4.6.9: Project construction and operation activities would result in direct and indirect impacts on existing populations of and habitat for the golden eagle, bald eagle, and Swainson's hawk.	>	Alternative 4: LSM/B
4.6.10: Project construction and increased reservoir water levels would result in temporary and permanent loss of potential and occupied habitat for Alameda whipsnakes.	>	Alternative 4: LSM

**TABLE A-2
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE WESTSIDE TRAIL REALIGNMENT (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

Environmental Impact	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
Section 4.6: Biological Resources (cont.)		
4.6.11: Project construction activities could result in direct and indirect impacts on the valley elderberry longhorn beetle and its habitat.	>	Alternative 4: LSM
4.6.12: Project construction activities could affect active breeding bird nest sites and new powerlines could affect migratory birds.	>	Alternative 4: LSM
4.6.13: Project construction activities under Alternatives 1 and 2 could affect designated critical habitat for listed species (vernal pool fairy shrimp and Contra Costa goldfields).	=	Alternative 4: NI
4.6.14: Project construction activities could affect nonlisted special-status reptile species (San Joaquin coachwhip and coast horned lizard).	>	Alternative 4: LSM
4.6.15: Project construction activities could affect nonlisted special-status mammal species (American badger, special-status bats, and San Joaquin pocket mouse).	>	Alternative 4: LSM
4.6.16: Draining the reservoir during project construction under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 could affect Pacific Flyway species, including waterfowl and shorebirds.	=	Alternative 4: NI
4.6.17: The project would not result in conflicts with local and regional conservation plans, or local plans or ordinances protecting biological resources.	=	Alternative 4: NI
4.6.18: Project construction would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative effects on special-status species and habitats.	>	Alternative 4: LS

**TABLE A-2
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE WESTSIDE TRAIL REALIGNMENT (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

Environmental Impact	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
Section 4.7: Land Use		
4.7.1: The proposed project and alternatives would not physically divide an existing community.	= No change in effects related to existing communities since a realigned Westside Trail would not divide an existing community. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: NI
4.7.2: Facility siting and operation under the proposed project and alternatives would not conflict with any applicable land use plans.	= No change in effects related to applicable land use plans since a realigned Westside Trail would not result in conflicts with applicable land use plans. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
4.7.3: Construction activities within designated Airport Land Use Compatibility Zones near the Byron Airport could cause potential temporary height impacts by conflicting with FAR Part 77 surfaces during construction.	= No change in effects related to aviation policies since a realigned Westside Trail would not result in conflict with any aviation policies. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
4.7.4: Construction activities within the AIA for Byron Airport could cause potential temporary flight hazards through the creation of glare or distracting lights; the generation of dust or smoke, which could impair pilot visibility; or could attract an increased number of birds.	= No change in effects related to flight hazards since a realigned Westside Trail would not result in any temporary flight hazards. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LSM
4.7.5: The proposed project and alternatives would not contribute to cumulative land use impacts.	= No change in cumulative effects related to land use. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: NI
Section 4.8: Agriculture		
4.8.1: Project construction would temporarily impact the agricultural use of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.	= No change in effects to the agricultural use of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance since there are no agricultural lands within the watershed. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
4.8.2: The project would permanently convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to nonagricultural use.	= No change in effects related to the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to nonagricultural use since there are no agricultural lands within the watershed. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
4.8.3: The project would not conflict with zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract.	= No change in effects to zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract since there are no agricultural lands within the watershed. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: NI
4.8.4: The project would involve changes in the environment that, due to their location or nature, could contribute to cumulative impacts from conversion of Important Farmland to nonagricultural uses.	= No change in cumulative effects related to agricultural effects. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
Section 4.9: Transportation and Circulation		
4.9.1: Project construction activities would intermittently and temporarily increase traffic congestion due to vehicle trips generated by construction workers and construction vehicles on area roadways.	= No change in effects related to traffic congestion during construction, since a realigned Westside Trail would not result in an increase in traffic congestion. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
4.9.2: Project construction activities under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 would intermittently and temporarily impede access to local streets or adjacent uses, including access for emergency vehicles and could substantially increase traffic hazards due to construction in or adjacent to roads or possible road wear.	= No change in effects related to service disruptions, including access for emergency vehicles and could substantially increase traffic hazards due to construction in or adjacent to roads or possible road wear during construction, since a realigned Westside Trail would not result in an increase in service disruptions related to construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS

**TABLE A-2
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE WESTSIDE TRAIL REALIGNMENT (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

Environmental Impact	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
Section 4.9: Transportation and Circulation		
4.9.3: Traffic associated with operation of project facilities, including the expanded recreation facilities, would not exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.	=	No change in effects related to level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways, since a realigned Westside Trail would not result in a change in operations. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
4.9.4: Construction of project alternatives, when combined with construction of other future projects, could contribute to construction-related short-term cumulative impacts to traffic and transportation (traffic congestion, access, and traffic safety).	=	No change in cumulative effects related to traffic and transportation. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
Section 4.10: Air Quality		
4.10.1: Construction of project alternatives could generate short-term emissions of criteria air pollutants: ROG, NOx, CO, and PM10 that could contribute to existing nonattainment conditions and further degrade air quality. However, project alternatives would not exceed federal general conformity <i>de minimis</i> standards for emissions.	>	Potential for slightly increased effects related to criteria air pollution emissions. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, these impacts would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Section 4.10, Mitigation Measures 4.10.1, pg. 4.10-28 through 4.10-29). No change in conclusions or mitigation.
4.10.2: Operation of project alternatives would not result in emissions of criteria air pollutants at levels that would substantially contribute to a potential violation of applicable air quality standards or to nonattainment conditions.	=	No change in effects related to violation of air quality standards, since a realigned Westside Trail would not result in a change in operations. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
4.10.3: Construction and/or operation of project alternatives would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	=	No change in effects related to exposing sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations, since a realigned Westside Trail would not increase the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
4.10.4: Operation of project alternatives would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.	=	No change in effects related to objectionable odors, since a realigned Westside Trail would not increase the exposure of people to objectionable odors. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
4.10.5: Construction and operation of project alternatives would not result in a cumulatively considerable increase in greenhouse gas emissions.	=	No change in effects related to greenhouse gas emissions, since a realigned Westside Trail would not increase the production of greenhouse gas emissions from the construction and operation of the alternatives. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
4.10.6: Construction and operation of the project alternatives could result in cumulatively considerable increases of criteria pollutant emissions.	=	No change in cumulative effects related to air quality. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
Section 4.11: Noise		
4.11.1: Construction of facilities under the proposed project and alternatives could generate noise levels that exceed the Contra Costa County or Alameda County noise standards at nearby sensitive receptors if construction activities are carried out during noise-sensitive hours, causing sleep disturbance and/or annoyance.	=	No change in effects related to exceeding noise standards during construction, since a realigned Westside Trail would not result in an increase in noise during construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
4.11.2: Operation of the project and alternatives would generate traffic, stationary source, and area source noise similar to existing noise associated with operation of Los Vaqueros Reservoir system and would not exceed County noise requirements.	=	No change in effects related to exceeding noise standards during operations, since a realigned Westside Trail would not result in an increase in noise that would exceed noise standards. No change in conclusions or mitigation.

**TABLE A-2
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE WESTSIDE TRAIL REALIGNMENT (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

Environmental Impact	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
Section 4.11: Noise (cont.)		
4.11.3: Project construction would not expose persons to or generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels.	=	Alternative 4: LS
4.11.4: The proposed project or alternatives would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to noise levels during either construction or operation.	=	Alternative 4: LS
Section 4.12: Utilities and Public Service Systems		
4.12.1: Construction or operation of project alternatives could temporarily disrupt utilities and public service systems such that a public health hazard could be created or an extended service disruption could result.	=	Alternative 4: LSM
4.12.2: Project alternatives would not require or result in construction of new or expanded utility infrastructure or public service facilities that would result in substantial adverse physical impacts.	=	Alternative 4: LS
4.12.3: Construction of the project alternatives could increase solid waste generation such that the capacity of local landfills would be exceeded or the project would not comply with state regulations related to solid waste.	=	Alternative 4: LSM
4.12.4: Construction of the project alternatives could make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative effects on public services and utilities, or local landfill capacity.	=	Alternative 4: LSM
Section 4.13: Hazardous Materials / Public Health		
4.13.1: Construction of the project and alternative components would disturb subsurface soils and groundwater; if hazardous substances are present in the disturbed areas, construction workers and the public could be exposed to these substances.	=	Alternative 4: LS
4.13.2: Project construction and operation could, through routine transport, use or disposal, accidentally release hazardous materials, thereby exposing construction workers, project personnel, and the public to hazardous materials, or accidentally releasing hazardous materials into the soil, groundwater, and/or a nearby surface water body.	>	Alternative 4: LSM
4.13.3: Improper handling or use of flammable or combustible materials such as internal combustion equipment could result in wildland fires, exposing people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death.	>	Alternative 4: LSM

**TABLE A-2
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE WESTSIDE TRAIL REALIGNMENT (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

Environmental Impact	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
Section 4.13: Hazardous Materials / Public Health (cont.)		
4.13.4: Construction and operation of project power supply facilities would not locate electrical transmission facilities within 150 feet of a school.	= No change in effects related to the placement of electrical transmission facilities within 150 feet of a school since the realigned Westside Trail would not result in the placement of any power supply facilities. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: NI
4.13.5: The project alternatives would not contribute to cumulative impacts associated with release of hazardous materials or other hazards.	> Potential for slightly increased cumulative effects related to hazardous materials and public health; however, cumulatively considerable impacts remain less than significant. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
Section 4.14: Visual/Aesthetic Resources		
4.14.1: The project alternatives would not have a substantial, demonstrable negative aesthetic effect on a scenic vista or from a county-designated scenic highway or route.	= No change in effects related to aesthetic effects on a scenic vista or from a county-designated scenic highway or route. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
4.14.2: The project alternatives would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings, except Alternative 4 due to the borrow area in Kellogg Valley.	= No change in effects related to degrading existing visual character or quality since the realigned Westside Trail would not introduce any new components. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LSM
4.14.3: The project alternatives would not create a new source of substantial light but Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 could create a new source of substantial glare that could adversely affect views in the area.	= No change in effects related to adding new light or glare since the realigned Westside Trail would not result in any new source of substantial light or glare. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
4.14.4: The project alternatives would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects on visual/aesthetic resources in the project area or broader region.	= No change in cumulative effects related to visual or aesthetic resources. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
Section 4.15: Recreation		
4.15.1: Construction of the project alternatives would result in a short-term reduction of recreational opportunities in the project area due to construction activities outside the watershed and closure of the watershed to the public during the construction period, but would enhance recreational opportunities in the long-term.	= No changes in effects related to loss of recreation areas since the realigned Westside Trail would not result in the loss of recreational opportunities there would be no adverse effects on existing recreation and long-term benefits would still occur. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LSM
4.15.2: The project alternatives would not 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.	= No changes in effects related to increased use of existing parks or recreational facilities since the realigned Westside Trail would not result in increased use of existing parks or recreational facilities there would be no adverse effects on existing recreation and long-term benefits would still occur. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
4.15.3: No other reasonably foreseeable future projects would also reduce recreational opportunities in the project area, similar to those opportunities affected by the project alternatives, or increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities; therefore, there does not appear to be the potential for the project alternatives to contribute to a cumulative effect on recreation facilities, opportunities or experience.	= No change in cumulative effects related to recreational facilities, opportunities or experiences. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS

**TABLE A-2
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE WESTSIDE TRAIL REALIGNMENT (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

Environmental Impact	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
Section 4.16: Cultural and Paleontological Resources		
4.16.1: Construction and management of project components would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical and/or unique archaeological resource as defined in Section 15064.5 or historic property or historic district, as defined in Section 106 of the NHPA (36 CFR 800), or in a previously undiscovered cultural resource.	<	Alternative 4: LSM
4.16.2: Ground-disturbing activities could encounter and destroy paleontological resources in certain geologic formations underlying the project area.	=	Alternative 4: LSM
4.16.3: Construction and management of project components could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.	=	Alternative 4: LSM
4.16.4: Construction and management of project components would contribute to adverse cumulative impacts to cultural and/or paleontological resources.	>	Alternative 4: LSM
Section 4.17: Socioeconomic Effects		
4.17.1 Project construction could temporarily generate new income and local employment that could benefit Contra Costa County's economy.	>	Alternative 4: B
4.17.2: Loss of agricultural land use associated with project construction and development could affect Contra Costa County and Alameda County's economy.	=	Alternative 4: LS
4.17.3: Short-term loss of recreation income associated with project construction could affect Contra Costa County's economy.	=	Alternative 4: LS
4.17.4 Construction of the project alternatives, when combined with construction of other future projects, could have a potentially beneficial effect on income and local employment.	>	Alternative 4: B
4.17.5: Construction of the project alternatives, when combined with construction of other future projects, could have a potential cumulative effect on Contra Costa County's economy as a result of temporary loss of agricultural land uses.	=	Alternative 4: LS

**TABLE A-2
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE WESTSIDE TRAIL REALIGNMENT (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

Environmental Impact	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
Section 4.17: Socioeconomic Effects (cont.)		
4.17.6 Construction of the project alternatives, when combined with construction of other future projects, could have a potential cumulative effect on Contra Costa County's economy as a result of temporary recreational impacts.	>	Alternative 4: LS
Section 4.18: Environmental Justice		
4.18.1: Construction and operation of the project alternatives would result in air quality, noise, and/or other environmental impacts related to traffic and other construction activities that would not disproportionately affect nearby minority and/or low-income communities.	=	Alternative 4: LS
4.18.2: Construction and operation of the project alternatives would not disproportionately affect local employment opportunities for minority and/or low-income communities in the vicinity of the project.	>	Alternative 4: NI
4.18.3: Construction and operation of the project alternatives when combined with construction of other past, present, and probable future projects, would result in air quality, noise, and/or other environmental impacts related to traffic and other construction activities that would not disproportionately affect nearby minority and/or low-income communities.	=	Alternative 4: LS
4.18.4: Construction and operation of the project, when combined with construction of other past, present, and probable future projects, would not disproportionately affect local employment opportunities for minority and/or low-income communities in the vicinity of the project.	>	Alternative 4: NI
Section 4.19: Indian Trust Assets		
4.19.1: The project would not affect Indian Trust Assets.	=	Alternative 4: NI
Section 4.20: Growth-Inducing Effects		
4.20.1: Construction and operation of the proposed project would not result in direct or indirect growth-inducing effects.	=	Alternative 4: NI

**TABLE A-3
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE SECONDARY CORE BORROW AREA ZONE (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

Environmental Impact	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
Section 4.2: Delta Hydrology and Water Quality		
4.2.1: The project alternatives would not adversely alter deliveries of water to other users.	= No change in effects related to the deliveries of water to other users since the secondary core borrow area would not result in any changes in operations. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
4.2.2: The project alternatives would not result in significant adverse changes in Delta water quality causing the violation of a water quality standard.	= No change in effects on Delta water quality since the secondary core borrow area would not result in any in-Delta construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
4.2.3: The project alternatives would not result in changes to Delta water quality that would result in significant adverse effects on beneficial uses.	= No change in effects on beneficial uses since the secondary core borrow area would not result in any in-Delta construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
4.2.4: Diversions of Delta water under the project alternatives would not result in a significant reduction of Delta water levels.	= No change in effects on Delta water levels since the secondary core borrow area would not result in changes that would affect Delta water levels. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
4.2.5: The project alternatives would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant adverse cumulative effects on deliveries of water to other users, changes in Delta water quality, or change in Delta water levels.	= No change in cumulative effects cumulative effects related to Delta hydrology and water quality. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
Section 4.3: Delta Fisheries and Aquatic Resources		
4.3.1: In-channel construction activities associated with the proposed new Delta Intake structure would increase short-term localized suspended sediment, turbidity, and possibly contaminant concentrations within Old River, which would increase exposure of various life stages and species of fish to temporarily degraded water quality conditions.	= No change in effects on Delta fisheries or aquatic resources since the secondary core borrow area would not require any in-channel construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: NI
4.3.2: Underwater sound-pressure levels generated during cofferdam installation for the new Delta Intake could result in behavioral avoidance or migration delays for special-status fish species.	= No change in effects to behavioral avoidance or migration delays for special-status fish species since a secondary core borrow area would not require any in-channel construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: NI
4.3.3: Dewatering of the cofferdam for the new Delta Intake could result in stranding of fish.	= No change in effects on the stranding of fish associated with dewatering since a secondary core borrow area would not require any in-channel construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: NI
4.3.4: The new Delta Intake structure and associated fish screens in Old River would physically exclude fish from a small area of existing aquatic habitat and modify existing aquatic habitat.	= No change in effects on the physical exclusion of fish from a small area of existing aquatic habitat or to the modification of existing aquatic habitat resulting from fish screens since a secondary core borrow area would not require any in-channel construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: NI
4.3.5: The new Delta Intake structure and associated fish screens in Old River would modify hydraulic conditions next to the intake structure, but would not disorient special-status fish or attract predatory fish.	= No change in effects that would result in the disorientation of special-status fish or on the attraction of predatory fish since a secondary core borrow area would not result in any modifications to the hydrologic conditions. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: NI

**TABLE A-3
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE SECONDARY CORE BORROW AREA ZONE (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

Environmental Impact	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
Section 4.3: Delta Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (cont.)		
4.3.6: Operation of the project alternatives would not result in changes to Delta hydrologic conditions that affect Delta fish populations or quality and quantity of aquatic habitat within the Sacramento-San Joaquin River system, including the Delta.	=	Alternative 4: LS
4.3.7: Operation of the new screened intake, or changes to diversions at existing intakes, could affect direct entrainment or impingement of fish.	=	Alternative 4: LS
4.3.8: Fish screen maintenance activities would not significantly increase fish entrainment at the new Delta Intake or the expanded Old River Intake.	=	Alternative 4: NI
4.3.9: The project, when combined with other planned project alternatives, or projects under construction in the area, could cumulatively contribute to substantial adverse impacts to Delta fisheries and aquatic resources.	=	Alternative 4: LS
Section 4.4: Geology, Soils and Seismicity		
4.4.1: The project facilities would be designed and engineered in accordance with seismic code requirements. As a result, the project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking or seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and landslides.	=	Alternative 4: LS
4.4.2: During construction and operations, the project could result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	>	Alternative 4: LSM
4.4.3: Project components could be located on expansive or corrosive soils or on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or could become unstable as a result of the project or construction activities; however, those components would not likely result in onsite or offsite landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse, and would not create substantial risks to life or property.	=	Alternative 4: LS
4.4.4: The proposed project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative effects associated with erosion, topsoil loss or increased exposure to seismic or other geohazard risks.	>	Alternative 4: LS

**TABLE A-3
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE SECONDARY CORE BORROW AREA ZONE (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

Environmental Impact	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
Section 4.5: Local Hydrology, Drainage and Groundwater		
4.5.1: During construction, the project alternatives could violate water quality standards through increased erosion and sedimentation to local waterways, release of fuels or other hazardous materials during construction, or dewatering of excavated areas that could result in substantial water quality degradation.	>	Alternative 4: LSM
4.5.2: Construction and operation of the project alternatives would not deplete local groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge.	=	Alternative 4: LS
4.5.3: Project alternatives would not substantially alter drainage patterns but reservoir expansion would increase the reservoir shoreline area subject to erosion.	=	Alternative 4: LS
4.5.4: Project alternatives would not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff during operation.	>	Alternative 4: LSM
4.5.5: Project Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 could place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Insurance Rate Map, which could impede or redirect flood flows.	=	Alternative 4: LS
4.5.6: The project alternatives would not substantially increase the exposure of people and/or structures to risks associated with inundation by dam or levee failure.	=	Alternative 4: LS
4.5.7: Construction and operation of the project alternatives would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative effects on drainage, flooding, groundwater recharge or water quality degradation in the project area.	>	Alternative 4: LS
Section 4.6: Biological Resources		
4.6.1: Project construction would affect the following NCCP habitat types (CDFG sensitive plant communities in parentheses): Natural Seasonal Wetland (i.e., bulrush-cattail series, northern claypan vernal pool, bush seepweed and saltgrass series), Valley/Foothill Riparian (i.e., Fremont cottonwood series and valley oak series), Grassland (i.e., purple needlegrass series) and Valley/Foothill Woodland Forest (i.e., blue oak series).	>	Alternative 4: LSM
4.6.2: Project construction could affect potentially jurisdictional wetlands or waters, and streambeds and banks regulated by CDFG.	>	Alternative 4: LSM

**TABLE A-3
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE SECONDARY CORE BORROW AREA ZONE (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

Environmental Impact	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
Section 4.6: Biological Resources (cont.)		
4.6.3: Project construction could affect populations of special-status plant species including brittlescale, San Joaquin spearscale, Brewer's dwarf-flax, and rose-mallow.	=	Alternative 4: NI
4.6.4: Project construction would result in impacts on California red-legged frog and California tiger salamander, including aquatic breeding habitat and upland aestivation habitat for these species.	>	Alternative 4: LSM
4.6.5: Project construction would result in direct and indirect impacts on existing populations of and habitat for the western pond turtle.	>	Alternative 4: LSM
4.6.6: Project construction under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would result in direct and indirect impacts on listed vernal pool fairy shrimp and their habitat, and on the non-listed midvalley fairy shrimp and curved-foot hygrotus diving beetle.	=	Alternative 4: NI
4.6.7: Project construction would have temporary and permanent impacts on potential San Joaquin kit fox habitat and permanently reduce potential regional movement opportunities in one location for this species.	>	Alternative 4: LSM/SU
4.6.8: Project construction would result in temporary and permanent loss of habitat for burrowing owls.	>	Alternative 4: LSM
4.6.9: Project construction and operation activities would result in direct and indirect impacts on existing populations of and habitat for the golden eagle, bald eagle, and Swainson's hawk.	>	Alternative 4: LSM/B

**TABLE A-3
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE SECONDARY CORE BORROW AREA ZONE (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

Environmental Impact	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
Section 4.6: Biological Resources (cont.)		
4.6.10: Project construction and increased reservoir water levels would result in temporary and permanent loss of potential and occupied habitat for Alameda whipsnakes.	>	Alternative 4: LSM
4.6.11: Project construction activities could result in direct and indirect impacts on the valley elderberry longhorn beetle and its habitat.	=	Alternative 4: LSM
4.6.12: Project construction activities could affect active breeding bird nest sites and new powerlines could affect migratory birds.	>	Alternative 4: LSM
4.6.13: Project construction activities under Alternatives 1 and 2 could affect designated critical habitat for listed species (vernal pool fairy shrimp and Contra Costa goldfields).	=	Alternative 4: NI
4.6.14: Project construction activities could affect nonlisted special-status reptile species (San Joaquin coachwhip and coast horned lizard).	>	Alternative 4: LSM
4.6.15: Project construction activities could affect nonlisted special-status mammal species (American badger, special-status bats, and San Joaquin pocket mouse).	>	Alternative 4: LSM
4.6.16: Draining the reservoir during project construction under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 could affect Pacific Flyway species, including waterfowl and shorebirds.	=	Alternative 4: NI
4.6.17: The project would not result in conflicts with local and regional conservation plans, or local plans or ordinances protecting biological resources.	=	Alternative 4: NI
4.6.18: Project construction would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative effects on special-status species and habitats.	>	Alternative 4: LS

**TABLE A-3
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE SECONDARY CORE BORROW AREA ZONE (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

Environmental Impact	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
Section 4.6: Biological Resources (cont.)		
4.6.18 (cont.)	pp. 4.6-115; Mitigation Measure 4.6.5, pp. 4.6-119; Mitigation Measures 4.6.7a, b and c, pp. 4.6-139 through 4.6-140; Mitigation Measure 4.6.8a and b, pp. 4.6-145 through 4.6-146; Mitigation Measures 4.6.9a and b, pp.4.6-151 through 4.6-153; Mitigation Measures 4.6.10a and b, pp. 4.6-157 through 4.6-158; Mitigation Measures 4.6.12a, b and c, pp. 4.6-162 through 4.6-164; Mitigation Measure 4.6.14, pp. 4.6-168; and Mitigation Measures 4.6.15a and b, pp. 4.6-170 through 4.6-172). No change in conclusions or mitigation.	
Section 4.7: Land Use		
4.7.1: The proposed project and alternatives would not physically divide an existing community.	=	Alternative 4: NI
4.7.2: Facility siting and operation under the proposed project and alternatives would not conflict with any applicable land use plans.	=	Alternative 4: LS
4.7.3: Construction activities within designated Airport Land Use Compatibility Zones near the Byron Airport could cause potential temporary height impacts by conflicting with FAR Part 77 surfaces during construction.	=	Alternative 4: LS
4.7.4: Construction activities within the AIA for Byron Airport could cause potential temporary flight hazards through the creation of glare or distracting lights; the generation of dust or smoke, which could impair pilot visibility; or could attract an increased number of birds.	=	Alternative 4: LSM
4.7.5: The proposed project and alternatives would not contribute to cumulative land use impacts.	=	Alternative 4: NI
Section 4.8: Agriculture		
4.8.1: Project construction would temporarily impact the agricultural use of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.	=	Alternative 4: LS
4.8.2: The project would permanently convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to nonagricultural use.	=	Alternative 4: LS
4.8.3: The project would not conflict with zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract.	=	Alternative 4: NI
4.8.4: The project would involve changes in the environment that, due to their location or nature, could contribute to cumulative impacts from conversion of Important Farmland to nonagricultural uses.	=	Alternative 4: LS

**TABLE A-3
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE SECONDARY CORE BORROW AREA ZONE (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

Environmental Impact	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
Section 4.9: Transportation and Circulation		
4.9.1: Project construction activities would intermittently and temporarily increase traffic congestion due to vehicle trips generated by construction workers and construction vehicles on area roadways.	=	No change in effects related to traffic congestion during construction, since a secondary core borrow area would not result in an increase in traffic congestion. No change in conclusions or mitigation. Alternative 4: LS
4.9.2: Project construction activities under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 would intermittently and temporarily impede access to local streets or adjacent uses, including access for emergency vehicles and could substantially increase traffic hazards due to construction in or adjacent to roads or possible road wear.	=	No change in effects related to service disruptions, including access for emergency vehicles and could substantially increase traffic hazards due to construction in or adjacent to roads or possible road wear during construction, since a secondary core borrow area would not result in an increase in service disruptions related to construction. No change in conclusions or mitigation. Alternative 4: LS
4.9.3: Traffic associated with operation of project facilities, including the expanded recreation facilities, would not exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.	=	No change in effects related to level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways, since a secondary core borrow area would not result in a change of operations. No change in conclusions or mitigation. Alternative 4: LS
4.9.4: Construction of project alternatives, when combined with construction of other future projects, could contribute to construction-related short-term cumulative impacts to traffic and transportation (traffic congestion, access, and traffic safety).	=	No change in cumulative effects related to transportation and circulation. No change in conclusions or mitigation. Alternative 4: LSM
Section 4.10: Air Quality		
4.10.1: Construction of project alternatives could generate short-term emissions of criteria air pollutants: ROG, NOx, CO, and PM10 that could contribute to existing nonattainment conditions and further degrade air quality. However, project alternatives would not exceed federal general conformity <i>de minimis</i> standards for emissions.	>	Potential for slightly increased effects related to criteria air pollution emissions due to additional borrow material excavation. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, these impacts would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Section 4.10, Mitigation Measures 4.10.1, pg. 4.10-28 through 4.10-29). No change in conclusions or mitigation. Alternative 4: LS
4.10.2: Operation of project alternatives would not result in emissions of criteria air pollutants at levels that would substantially contribute to a potential violation of applicable air quality standards or to nonattainment conditions.	=	No change in effects related to violation of air quality standards, since a secondary core borrow area would not result in a change in operations. No change in conclusions or mitigation. Alternative 4: LS
4.10.3: Construction and/or operation of project alternatives would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	=	No change in effects related to exposing sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations, since a secondary core borrow area would not increase the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. No change in conclusions or mitigation. Alternative 4: LS
4.10.4: Operation of project alternatives would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.	=	No change in effects related to objectionable odors, since a secondary core borrow area would not result in increase the exposure of people to objectionable odors. No change in conclusions or mitigation. Alternative 4: LS
4.10.5: Construction and operation of project alternatives would not result in a cumulatively considerable increase in greenhouse gas emissions.	=	No change in effects related to greenhouse gas emissions, since a secondary core borrow area would not increase the production of greenhouse gas emissions from construction and operation of the alternatives. No change in conclusions or mitigation. Alternative 4: LS
4.10.6: Construction and operation of the project alternatives could result in cumulatively considerable increases of criteria pollutant emissions.	=	No change in cumulative effects related to air quality. No change in conclusions or mitigation. Alternative 4: LSM

**TABLE A-3
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE SECONDARY CORE BORROW AREA ZONE (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

Environmental Impact	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
Section 4.11: Noise		
4.11.1: Construction of facilities under the proposed project and alternatives could generate noise levels that exceed the Contra Costa County or Alameda County noise standards at nearby sensitive receptors if construction activities are carried out during noise-sensitive hours, causing sleep disturbance and/or annoyance.	= No change in effects related to exceeding noise standards during construction, since a secondary core borrow area would not result in noise levels that exceed local noise standards. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LSM
4.11.2: Operation of the project and alternatives would generate traffic, stationary source, and area source noise similar to existing noise associated with operation of Los Vaqueros Reservoir system and would not exceed County noise requirements.	= No change in effects related to exceeding noise standards during operations, since a secondary core borrow area would not result in changes to operations. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
4.11.3: Project construction would not expose persons to or generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels.	= No change in effects related to exposing persons to or generating excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels, since a secondary core borrow area would not expose persons to or generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
4.11.4: The proposed project or alternatives would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to noise levels during either construction or operation.	= No change in cumulative effects related to noise. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
Section 4.12: Utilities and Public Service Systems		
4.12.1: Construction or operation of project alternatives could temporarily disrupt utilities and public service systems such that a public health hazard could be created or an extended service disruption could result.	= No change in effects related to the temporary disruption of utilities and public service systems, since a secondary core borrow area would not result in any increase in temporary utility and public service facilities. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LSM
4.12.2: Project alternatives would not require or result in construction of new or expanded utility infrastructure or public service facilities that would result in substantial adverse physical impacts.	= No change in effects related to requiring or resulting in the construction of new or expanded utility infrastructure or public service facilities, since a secondary core borrow area would not require any new utility infrastructure or public service facilities. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
4.12.3: Construction of the project alternatives could increase solid waste generation such that the capacity of local landfills would be exceeded or the project would not comply with state regulations related to solid waste.	= No change in effects related solid waste generation, since a secondary core borrow area would not result in an increase in solid waste generation. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LSM
4.12.4: Construction of the project alternatives could make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative effects on public services and utilities, or local landfill capacity.	= No change in cumulative effects related to utilities and public service system. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LSM
Section 4.13: Hazardous Materials / Public Health		
4.13.1: Construction of the project and alternative components would disturb subsurface soils and groundwater; if hazardous substances are present in the disturbed areas, construction workers and the public could be exposed to these substances.	= No change in effects related to the exposure of hazardous substances present in the disturbed areas, since a secondary core borrow area would not result in exposing construction workers or the public to additional hazardous substances. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS

**TABLE A-3
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE SECONDARY CORE BORROW AREA ZONE (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

Environmental Impact	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
Section 4.13: Hazardous Materials / Public Health (cont.)		
4.13.2: Project construction and operation could, through routine transport, use or disposal, accidentally release hazardous materials, thereby exposing construction workers, project personnel, and the public to hazardous materials, or accidentally releasing hazardous materials into the soil, groundwater, and/or a nearby surface water body.	= No change in effects related to the accidental release of hazardous materials, since a secondary core borrow area would not result in an increase to the accidental release of hazardous materials. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LSM
4.13.3: Improper handling or use of flammable or combustible materials such as internal combustion equipment could result in wildland fires, exposing people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death.	= No change in effects related to wildland fires, since a secondary core borrow area would not expose people or structures to wildfires. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LSM
4.13.4: Construction and operation of project power supply facilities would not locate electrical transmission facilities within 150 feet of a school.	= No change in effects related to locating electrical transmission facilities within 150 feet of a school, since a secondary core borrow area would not result in the placement of any power supply facilities. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: NI
4.13.5: The project alternatives would not contribute to cumulative impacts associated with release of hazardous materials or other hazards.	= No change in cumulative effects related to hazardous materials and public health. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
Section 4.14: Visual/Aesthetic Resources		
4.14.1: The project alternatives would not have a substantial, demonstrable negative aesthetic effect on a scenic vista or from a county-designated scenic highway or route.	= No change in effects related to aesthetic effects on a scenic vista or from a county-designated scenic highway or route. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
4.14.2: The project alternatives would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings, except Alternative 4 due to the borrow area in Kellogg Valley.	> Potential for slightly increased effects on the existing visual character and quality, since a secondary core borrow area would result in the removal of soil. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, these impacts would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Mitigation Measure 4.14.2a, pg. 4.14-33). No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LSM
4.14.3: The project alternatives would not create a new source of substantial light but Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 could create a new source of substantial glare that could adversely affect views in the area.	= No change in effects related to adding new light or glare, since a secondary core borrow area would not result in new sources of substantial light or glare. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
4.14.4: The project alternatives would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to adverse effects on visual/aesthetic resources in the project area or broader region.	= No change in effects related to cumulative effects related to visual or aesthetic resources. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LS
Section 4.15: Recreation		
4.15.1: Construction of the project alternatives would result in a short-term reduction of recreational opportunities in the project area due to construction activities outside the watershed and closure of the watershed to the public during the construction period, but would enhance recreational opportunities in the long-term.	= No changes in effects related to loss of recreation opportunities, since a secondary core borrow area would not result in the loss of any additional recreation opportunities. No change in conclusions or mitigation.	Alternative 4: LSM

**TABLE A-3
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE SECONDARY CORE BORROW AREA ZONE (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

Environmental Impact	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
Section 4.15: Recreation (cont.)		
4.15.2: The project alternatives would not 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.	=	No changes in effects related to increased use of existing parks or recreational facilities, since a secondary core borrow area would not result in an increased use of existing recreational opportunities. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
4.15.3: No other reasonably foreseeable future projects would also reduce recreational opportunities in the project area, similar to those opportunities affected by the project alternatives, or increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities; therefore, there does not appear to be the potential for the project alternatives to contribute to a cumulative effect on recreation facilities, opportunities or experience.	=	No changes in effects related to cumulative effects on recreational facilities, opportunities or experiences. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
Section 4.16: Cultural and Paleontological Resources		
4.16.1: Construction and management of project components would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical and/or unique archaeological resource as defined in Section 15064.5 or historic property or historic district, as defined in Section 106 of the NHPA (36 CFR 800), or in a previously undiscovered cultural resource.	=	Potential for slightly increased effects on historical resources. There are no known cultural resources in the secondary core borrow area. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, these impacts would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Mitigation Measures 4.16.1a-h, pp. 4.16-48 through 4.16-50). No change in conclusions or mitigation.
4.16.2: Ground-disturbing activities could encounter and destroy paleontological resources in certain geologic formations underlying the project area.	>	Potential for slightly increased effects on paleontological resources. There are no known paleontological resources in the secondary core borrow area, however this area has moderate (with a very small area of high) paleontological sensitivity. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, these impacts would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Mitigation Measures 4.16.2a and b, pp. 4.16-50 through 4.16-51). No change in conclusions or mitigation.
4.16.3: Construction and management of project components could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.	>	Potential for slightly increased effects related to the disturbance of human remains and cumulative impacts. There are no known cultural resources in the secondary core borrow area. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, these impacts would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Mitigation Measure 4.16.3, pg. 4.16-55). No change in conclusions or mitigation.
4.16.4: Construction and management of project components would contribute to adverse cumulative impacts to cultural and/or paleontological resources.	>	Potential for slightly increased cumulative impacts. With implementation of mitigation measures in the Draft EIS/EIR, these impacts would remain Less Than Significant With Mitigation. (See Draft EIS/EIR, Vol. 2, Mitigation Measures 4.16.1a-h, pp. 4.16-48 through 4.16-50; Mitigation Measures 4.16.2a and b, pp. 4.16-50 through 4.16-51; and Mitigation Measure 4.16.3, pg. 4.16-55). No change in conclusions or mitigation.
Section 4.17: Socioeconomic Effects		
4.17.1: Project construction could temporarily generate new income and local employment that could benefit Contra Costa County's economy.	=	No changes in effects to local employment, since a secondary core borrow area would not create a source of new income and local employment. No change in conclusions or mitigation.
4.17.2: Loss of agricultural land use associated with project construction and development could affect Contra Costa County and Alameda County's economy.	=	No changes in effects to agricultural land use associated with project construction and development of a secondary core borrow area, since there is no agricultural land inside the watershed. No change in conclusions or mitigation.

**TABLE A-3
IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE SECONDARY CORE BORROW AREA ZONE (ALTERNATIVE 4 ONLY)**

Environmental Impact	Project Update Comparison	Impact to Alternatives
Section 4.17: Socioeconomic Effects (cont.)		
4.17.3: Short-term loss of recreation income associated with project construction could affect Contra Costa County's economy.	=	Alternative 4: LS
4.17.4: Construction of the project alternatives, when combined with construction of other future projects, could have a potentially beneficial effect on income and local employment.	=	Alternative 4: B
4.17.5: Construction of the project alternatives, when combined with construction of other future projects, could have a potential cumulative effect on Contra Costa County's economy as a result of temporary loss of agricultural land uses.	=	Alternative 4: LS
4.17.6: Construction of the project alternatives, when combined with construction of other future projects, could have a potential cumulative effect on Contra Costa County's economy as a result of temporary recreational impacts.	=	Alternative 4: LS
Section 4.18: Environmental Justice		
4.18.1: Construction and operation of the project alternatives would result in air quality, noise, and/or other environmental impacts related to traffic and other construction activities that would not disproportionately affect nearby minority and/or low-income communities.	=	Alternative 4: LS
4.18.2: Construction and operation of the project alternatives would not disproportionately affect local employment opportunities for minority and/or low-income communities in the vicinity of the project.	=	Alternative 4: NI
4.18.3: Construction and operation of the project alternatives when combined with construction of other past, present, and probable future projects, would result in air quality, noise, and/or other environmental impacts related to traffic and other construction activities that would not disproportionately affect nearby minority and/or low-income communities.	=	Alternative 4: LS
4.18.4: Construction and operation of the project, when combined with construction of other past, present, and probable future projects, would not disproportionately affect local employment opportunities for minority and/or low-income communities in the vicinity of the project.	=	Alternative 4: NI
Section 4.19: Indian Trust Assets		
4.19.1: The project would not affect Indian Trust Assets.	=	Alternative 4: NI
Section 4.20: Growth-Inducing Effects		
4.20.1: Construction and operation of the proposed project would not result in direct or indirect growth-inducing effects.	=	Alternative 4: NI