National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior

Golden Gate National Recreation Area

Categorical Exclusion Approval and Decision to Implement

MEMORANDUM

To: Project NEPA File

Through: Laura E. Joss, General Superintendent

From: Larry Miranda, Environmental Protection Specialist

Date: June 10, 2020

Subject: Categorical Exclusion Approval for Designation of Electrical Bicycle Routes and Associated Use Restrictions

PEPC: 94816 - Designation of Routes and Use Restrictions for E-bikes, Marin/San Francisco/San Mateo Counties

Introduction: This memorandum completes National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) review and documentation requirements for *Designation of Routes and Use Restrictions for E-bikes, Marin/San Francisco/San Mateo Counties*

Informed Decision-Making: The full administrative record is available in the Planning & Environmental Programs Division Compliance Office, Fort Mason, Building 101, San Francisco, CA 94123.

Project Proposal: This project proposes to allow visitors to use e-bikes on certain routes within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area that are currently open to traditional bicycles, subject to speed limits, group size limits and other use restrictions.

Categorical Exclusion: On the basis of the potential impacts assessed in Attachment A and the information in the administrative record, this project is Categorically Excluded (CE) from further NEPA analysis and documentation in accordance with the *NPS NEPA Handbook (2015), Section 3.3. D.3. Actions Related to Visitor Use: Minor changes in programs and regulations pertaining to visitor activities.*

Supporting information for this determination is in the following attachments:

- Attachment A: Project Background and Proposal
- Attachment B: Park Trails Prohibited, Restricted and Approved for E-bikes Use by County
- Attachment C: Environmental Screening and Extraordinary Circumstances Forms
- Attachment D: NHPA Section 106 Assessment of Effect
- Attachment E: No Effects Memorandum for Federally Listed Species

CE Justification:

The proposed changes would expand recreational opportunities and accessibility by permitting e-bikes in certain areas where traditional bikes are allowed, subject to restrictions such as speed limits and group size limits. These changes would have no potential for individually or cumulatively significant impacts to park resources or visitor safety.

Decision: On the basis of my review of the environmental impact analysis and information in the administrative record, I am categorically excluding the Project from further NEPA analysis. No exceptional circumstances in Section 3-5 of the NPS NEPA Handbook (2015) apply.

Signature LAURA JOSS Digitally signed by LAURA JOSS Date: 2020.06.17 16:18:30 -07'00'

Date June 17, 2020

Laura E. Joss
General Superintendent

Intentionally Left Blank

ATTACHMENT A

Project Background and Proposal

Background

On August 30, 2019 the Deputy Director of the National Park Service announced a new electric bicycle (e-bike) policy for national parks that would expand recreational opportunities and accessibility. The policy supports Department of the Interior (DOI) Secretary's Order 3376, signed, August 29, 2019, that directs DOI bureaus to create a clear and consistent e-bike policy on all federal lands managed by the Department. The policy also supports Secretary's Order 3376 to increase recreational opportunities on public lands.

This new policy encourages parks to allow visitors to use e-bikes in generally the same manner as traditional bicycles. Under the policy, the operator of an e-bike may only use the motor to assist pedal propulsion. The motor may not be used to propel an e-bike without the rider also pedaling, except in locations open to public motor vehicle traffic.

The new policy defines 3 classes of e-bikes as follows:

Class 1: Electric bicycle equipped with a motor that provides assistance only when the rider is pedaling and ceases assistance when the bicycle reaches the speed of 20 miles per hour.

Class 2: Electric bicycle equipped with a motor that may be used exclusively to propel the bicycle and ceases assistance when the bicycle reaches the speed of 20 miles per hour.

Class 3: Electrical bicycle equipped with a motor that provides assistance only when the rider is pedaling and ceases assistance when the bicycle reaches the speed of 28 miles per hour.

Bicycles with electric motors of 750 watts (1 h.p.) or more of power and not included as Class 1, Class 2 or Class 3 in the classification system above would be managed as motor vehicles under 36 CFR 4.10, i.e., motor vehicles are allowed on park roads and on routes and areas designated for off-road motor vehicle use.

Benefits of E-bikes:

E-bikes advance "Healthy Parks Healthy People" goals to promote parks as a health resource by supporting a healthy park experience that is accessible, desirable, and relatable to people of all abilities, and by minimizing human impact through the expansion of active transportation options in parks. Specifically, e-bikes can:

- Increase bicycle access to and within parks. e-bikes make bicycle travel easier and more efficient, because they allow bicyclists to travel farther with less effort.
- Expand the option of bicycling to more people. E-bikes provide a new option for people who want to ride a bicycle but might not otherwise do so because of physical fitness, age, or convenience, especially at high altitude or in hilly or strenuous terrain.
- Mitigate environmental impacts. When used as an alternative to gasoline- or diesel-powered modes of transportation, e-bikes can reduce greenhouse gas emissions and fossil fuel consumption, improve air quality, and support active modes of transportation for park staff and visitors. Similar to traditional bicycles, e-bikes can decrease traffic congestion, reduce the demand for vehicle parking spaces, and increase the number and visibility of cyclists on the road.

In furtherance of this new policy, the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GOGA) is proposing to allow visitors to use e-bikes on designated routes subject to use restrictions such as speed limits and group size limits.

The following provisions would be adopted in the park’s Compendium and would govern the use of e-bikes in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

- The Compendium would define an e-bike as a two- or three-wheeled cycle with fully operable pedals and an electric motor of less than 750 watts (1 h.p.) that provides propulsion assistance.
- The following restrictions would apply to the ese and operation of e-bikes in the park:
    - Except where use of motor vehicles by the public is allowed, using the electric motor to move an e-bike without pedaling is prohibited.

- A person operating an e-bike is subject to the following sections of 36 CFR Part 4 that apply to the use of traditional bicycles: sections 4.12, 4.13, 4.20, 4.21, 4.22, 4.23, and 4.30(h)(2)- (5).
- Except as specified in the Compendium, the use of an e-bike within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area is governed by the laws of the State of California (including Section 24016 and Division 11, Chapter 1, Article 4 of the California Vehicle Code).
- The maximum number of e-bicyclists in any one group is 10. Larger groups of e-bicyclists must divide into groups not larger than 10.
- The speed limit for e-bicycles in developed and undeveloped areas is 15 mph except that e-bicycles shall not exceed 5 mph around any blind curve and on all roads and paved paths in the following San Francisco County areas: McDowell Road, Fort Mason; Great Meadow, Fort Mason; Mason Avenue Bike Path on Sidewalk, Crissy Field; Crissy Field Promenade; Battery East Trail

- The Compendium would designate by name the routes that are open, partially open and closed to e-bike use. The routes are listed below.

Routes with Continued Prohibitions on E-bike Use

In order to protect resources and public health and safety, the Superintendent's Compendium would continue to prohibit, or allow limited use of e-bikes on the routes listed below:

Marin County: Battery Yates Trail (top of battery) in Fort Baker; Dias Ridge Trail, between the Mt. Tamalpais State Park boundary near Muir Beach, open to Class 1 and 2 e-bikes only; Muir Woods National Monument; Deer Park Fire Road (Frank's Valley), between Muir Woods Road and Coastal Trail near Pan Toll (major portion is in Mt. Tamalpais State Park), open to Class 1 and 2 e-bikes only; Old Springs Trail, between Miwok Trail and Miwok Stables, open to downhill use only; Miwok Trail, between Miwok Stables and Highway 1, open to downhill use only from Tennessee Valley to County View trail; Willow Camp Fire Road between Stinson Beach and Ridgecrest Boulevard (major portion is in Mt. Tamalpais State Park), open to Class I and II e-bikes only; Middle Green Gulch Trail; and Point Bonita Trail.

San Francisco County*:* Crissy Field Lagoon Boardwalk; Fort Point Pier (Torpedo Wharf); and Lands End Coastal Trail

San Mateo County: Almeria Trail; Flattop Trail; Le Conte Trail; Farallone Trail; Corona Pedro Trail, San Carlos Trail, Sweeney Horse Trail, Sweeney Meadow Trail, Spine Trail; Milagra Ridge Trail; Milagra Battery (open to downhill use only); Milagra Creek Overlook; Milagra Summit Trail; Bootlegger's Steps; Timigtac Trail; Mori Bluff Trail; Mori Peak Trail; Mori Headlands Trail; Notch Trail; Alta Vista Trail; Ember Ridge Trail, San Vicente Trail, Farmers Daughter Trail, Ranchette Trail; and French Trail (open to downhill e-bike use only); Clipper Ridge Trail (open to downhill e-bike use only); and Phleger Estate. In addition, e-bikes must be walked on the portion of the Spine Trail through the Ember Ridge Equestrian Center and along Old San Pedro Mountain Road through Ocean View Farms.

Routes Designated for E-bike Use

E-bikes would be **allowed** on the following paved or unpaved trails/roads already open to traditional bikes:

Marin County

Marin Headlands and Fort Baker: Alta Trail (between Rodeo Avenue and Marin City); Baker-Barry Tunnel; Batteries Loop Trail; Fort Baker Bay Trail (between Golden Gate Bridge and Sausalito); Bobcat Trail (between Miwok Trail and Marincello Trail); Rodeo Valley Trail, between Capehart Bridge (north off of Bunker and McCullough intersection) and Bobcat Trail; Capehart and Smith Road Bridges connecting Bunker Road to Rodeo Valley Trail; Old Bunker Road (adjacent to the Roads & Trails Maintenance Yard to Battery Townsley); Slacker Ridge Trail (from McCullough Road to Slacker Hill); Julian Trail (fire road), between Conzelman Road at McCullough and the Fort Barry Rifle Range at Bunker Road; Coastal Trail (between Rodeo Beach Parking and Hill 88); Coastal Trail from Tennessee Valley to Kaashi Way, Muir Beach; Coyote Ridge Trail; Drown Road, Fort Baker; Hawk Camp Trail (between Bobcat Trail and Hawk Camp); Haypress Camp Trail (between Tennessee Valley Road and Haypress Campground); Kirby Cove Road; Marincello Trail between Tennessee Valley Parking Area and Bobcat Trail; Miwok Trail between Rodeo Lagoon and Old Springs Trail; Oakwood Valley Trail between Tennessee Valley Road and the junction with the Oakwood Meadow Trail; Old Springs Trail between Miwok Trail and Miwok Stable; Rodeo Avenue Trail between US Highway 101 and Alta Avenue; Marin Drive/Smith Road between Marinview and Miwok Trail; and Tennessee Valley Trail.

Muir Beach: Kaashi Way

San Francisco County

Presidio: Crissy Field Promenade; Coastal Trail from GG Bridge to intersection of Lincoln and Washington Blvds. (except Battery to Bluffs Trail Section); Coastal Trail, Fort Point, except Presidio Promenade; and Mason Street multi-use path

Fort Mason: Great Meadows paths and Fort Mason Bay Trail (formerly McDowell Road)

Lands End: El Camino Del Mar Trail

Fort Funston: Coastal Trail (except north of Horse Trail intersection)

San Mateo County

Milagra Ridge: Milagra Ridge Road; and Milagra Battery Trail (open to downhill e-bike use only)

Mori Point: Lishumsha Trail; Old Mori Trail; Upper Mori Trail and Coastal Trail

Sweeney Ridge: Sneath Lane; Baquiano Trail; Mori Ridge Trail; Sweeney Ridge Trail (except Notch Trail portion)

Rancho Corral De Tierra (Rancho): Old San Pedro Mountain Road (walked through Ocean View Farms); Ranch Road; and Deer Creek Trail

***** For more details and maps of specific areas and trails, go to https://www.nps.gov/goga/planyourvisit/maps.htm and https://www.parksconservancy.org/trails/golden-gate-national-recreation-area-trails.

Intentionally left blank

ATTACHMENT B

Designation of Park Routes Prohibited, Restricted or Approved for E-bikes Use by County

***The following routes would retain existing prohibitions on or allow limited use of e-bikes**

Trail Name	County	Location	E-bike Restrictions	Surface Material	Gradient	Line of Sight	Trail Length (miles)	Width	Public Safety and Resource Concerns	E-bike Use Decisions
Old Springs Trail between Miwok Trail and Miwok Stables	Marin	Headlands	Allow Downhill only	Natural surface trail with several low bridges	Steep in sections	Short particularly in steep locations	1.2	Narrow 4-6' wide	Currently popular trail for both e-bikes (unofficial) and traditional bikes (official); all bike users need to walk near horse stables; enforcement issues	Downhill e-bikes likely to go at same speed as all bikes; alternative routes available for uphill e-bike use; allow and enforce downhill e-bike use
Miwok Trail between Miwok Stables and Highway 1	Marin	Headlands	Allow Downhill only (Tennessee Valley to County View Trail)	Natural Surface	Steep in sections	Short particularly in steep locations	3.19	Narrow 4-6' wide	Narrow trail with poor sightlines and steep conditions.	Downhill e-bikes likely to go at same speed as all bikes; alternative routes available for uphill e-bike use; allow and enforce downhill e-bike use
Dias Ridge Trail between Mt. Tamalpais (Tam) State Park boundary and Hwy 1 near Muir Beach	Marin	Muir Woods NM/Mt. Tam SP	Allow Downhill only	Natural surface	Steep in sections particularly near Hwy 1	Short particularly in steep sections near base of trail	1.57	Narrow 4-6' wide	Narrow trail with poor sightlines and steep conditions; connections with Mt. Tam SP trail	Important to be consistent with adjacent State Park regulations. e-bikes restricted to Class I and II. Alternative routes available for uphill e-bike use.
Middle Green Gulch Trail (above Zen Center) Uphill Only	Marin	Muir Beach	Continue to prohibit e-bikes	Natural surface	Steep in some sections	Short particularly in steep sections near base of trail	1.64	Narrow 4-6' wide	Narrow trail with poor sightlines and steep conditions.	Uphill bike use is currently only permitted bike use; Concern over uphill e-bike use conflicts with other trail users
Coastal Trail, Land's End up to, but not including, hiking only portion and El Camino Del Mar Trail	SF	Lands End	Continue to prohibit e-bikes	Natural surface and paved in some locations	Moderate grades	Long sight lines in most locations	0.95 + 0.34	Wide trail in most locations	Currently high pedestrian use. Concern for conflicts of increase in bicycle use, if E-bikes are allowed.	Coastal Trail is not open to Eagle's Point to bikes. Bikes currently required to turn around.

Trail Name	County	Location	E-bike Restrictions	Surface Material	Gradient	Line of Sight	Trail Length (miles)	Width	Public Safety and Resource Concerns	E-bike Use Decisions
Le Conte Trail	San Mateo (SM)	Rancho	Continue to prohibit e-bikes	Natural surface	Moderate and steep grades	Short in some areas and long in open areas	0.41	Narrow 4-6' wide	Current conditions are often muddy; trail is narrow and has limited lines of sight in some locations; expect e-bike use would potentially cause resource impacts to vegetation and wildlife (including California red legged frog; Pacific chorus frog) because of muddy narrow conditions and could raise safety issues.	Not recommended for e-bike use. Rancho Master Plan/EA (date TBD) process to evaluate future bike use and trail alignments
Farallone Trail	SM	Rancho	Continue to prohibit e-bikes	Natural surface	Moderate and steep grades	Long sight lines in most areas	0.71	Narrow 4-6' wide and wider in some locations	The trail passes through the heart of a population of critically endangered Hickman's potentilla. E-bikes may cause direct impacts to potentilla individuals and the overall population. In addition, other portions of this trail are seasonally very muddy and have similar issues to those noted for Le Conte Trail above.	Not recommended for e-bike use. Rancho Master Plan/EA (date TBD) process to evaluate future bike use and trail alignments
Corona Pedro Trail	SM	Rancho	Continue to prohibit e-bikes	Natural surface	Moderate and steep grades	Short in some areas and long in open areas	0.8	Narrow 4-6' wide	This trail only makes sense as a route in conjunction with the Farallone Trail. See notes above.	Not recommended for e-bike use. Rancho Master Plan/EA (date TBD) process to evaluate future bike use and trail alignments
Spine Trail	SM	Rancho	Continue to prohibit e-bikes	Natural surface	Very steep	Short particularly in steep locations	2.7	Narrow 4-6' wide	Dead end trail with no established connections; high equestrian use, potential for conflicts with e-bikes	Not recommended for e-bike use. Rancho Master Plan/EA (date TBD) process to evaluate future bike use and trail alignments
Ember Ridge Trail	SM	Rancho	Continue to prohibit e-bikes	Natural surface	Steep	Short particularly in steep locations	0.28	Narrow 4-6' wide	High equestrian use, potential for conflicts with e-bikes	Not recommended for e-bike use. Rancho Master Plan/EA (date TBD) process to evaluate future bike use and trail alignments
San Vicente Trail	SM	Rancho	Continue to prohibit e-bikes	Natural surface	Moderate and steep grades	Short particularly in steep locations	1.62	Narrow 4-6' wide	High equestrian use, potential for conflicts with e-bikes	Not recommended for e-bike use. Rancho Master Plan/EA (date TBD) process to evaluate future bike use and trail alignments
Farmers Daughter Trail	SM	Rancho	Continue to prohibit e-bikes	Natural surface	Moderate and steep grades	Short particularly in steep locations	1.24	Narrow 4-6' wide in some locations	High equestrian use, potential for conflicts with e-bikes	Not recommended for e-bike use. Rancho Master Plan/EA (date TBD) process to evaluate future bike use and trail alignments

Trail Name	County	Location	E-bike Restrictions	Surface Material	Gradient	Line of Sight	Trail Length (miles)	Width	Public Safety and Resource Concerns	E-bike Use Decisions
Ranchette Trail	SM	Rancho	Continue to prohibit e-bikes	Natural surface	Moderate and steep grades	Long sightlines	0.32	Narrow 4-6' wide	High equestrian use, potential for conflicts with e-bikes	Not recommended for e-bike use. Rancho Master Plan/EA (date TBD) process to evaluate future bike use and trail alignments
Clipper Ridge Trail	SM	Rancho	Allow Downhill only	Natural surface	Steep	Short particularly in steep locations	2.15	Narrow 4-6' wide	Low equestrian use; unlikely to have conflict with other users	Downhill e-bikes likely to go at same speed as all bikes; alternative routes available for uphill e-bike use; allow and enforce downhill e-bike use
French Trail	SM	Rancho	Allow Downhill only	Natural surface	Steep	Short particularly in steep locations	1.5	Narrow 4-6' wide	Low equestrian use. Unlikely to have conflict with other users	Downhill e-bikes likely to go at same speed as all bikes; alternative routes available for uphill e-bike use; allow and enforce downhill e-bike use
Flat Top Trail	SM	Rancho	Continue to prohibit e-bikes	Natural surface	Steep	Short particularly in steep locations	0.78	Narrow 4-6' wide	Narrow trail with poor sightlines and steep conditions.	Not recommended for e-bike use. Rancho Master Plan/EA (date TBD) process to evaluate future bike use and trail alignments
Almeria Trail	SM	Rancho	Continue to prohibit e-bikes	Natural surface	Moderate and steep grades	Short particularly in steep locations	0.35	Narrow 4-6' wide	Narrow trail with poor sightlines and steep conditions.	Not recommended for e-bike use. Rancho Master Plan/EA (date TBD) process to evaluate future bike use and trail alignments
San Carlos Trail	SM	Rancho	Continue to prohibit e-bikes	Natural surface	Moderate and steep grades	Long in most areas	0.21	Narrow 4-6' wide	Narrow trail with poor sightlines and steep conditions.	Not recommended for e-bike use. Rancho Master Plan/EA (date TBD) process to evaluate future bike use and trail alignments
Sweeney Horse Trail	SM	Sweeney Ridge	Continue to prohibit e-bikes	Natural surface	Moderate and steep grades	Long in most areas	0.71	Narrow 4-6' wide	Narrow trail with poor sightlines and steep conditions. Low equestrian use	Not recommended for e-bike use.
Sweeney Meadow Tail	SM	Sweeney Ridge	Continue to prohibit e-bikes	Natural surface	Moderate and steep grades	Long in most areas	0.49	Narrow 4-6' wide	Narrow trail with poor sightlines and steep conditions. Low equestrian use	Not recommended for e-bike use.
Milagra Battery Trail	SM	Milagra Ridge	Allow Downhill only	Natural surface	Moderate and steep grades	Short particularly in steep locations	0.7	Narrow 4-6' wide	Narrow trail with poor sightlines and steep conditions and mission blue butterfly host plants near the trail.	Downhill e-bikes likely to go at same speed as all bikes; alternative routes available for uphill e-bike use; allow and enforce downhill e-bike use
Muir Woods National Monument	Marin	Mill Valley	No bikes are allowed	Asphalt, natural, boardwalk	Various – Main trail has moderate grades and others steep	Various and short in steep locations		Various.	Highly visited by pedestrians and congested on boardwalks and trails.	Bikes, including e-bikes, are prohibited in the Monument

Trail Name	County	Location	E-bike Restrictions	Surface Material	Gradient	Line of Sight	Trail Length (miles)	Width	Public Safety and Resource Concerns	E-bike Use Decisions
Deer Park Fire Road (Frank's Valley), between Muir Woods Road and Coastal Trail near Pan Toll (major portion is in Mt. Tamalpais State Park)	Marin	Adjacent to Muir Woods NM	Currently e-bikes prohibited	Natural surface	Moderate grades	Long sight lines	0.64	Wide trail/fire road conditions	No public safety and resource concerns on wide fire road.	Open to Class 1 and 2 e-bikes only
Willow Camp Fire Road between Stinson Beach and Ridgecrest Boulevard (major portion is in Mt. Tamalpais State Park)	Marin	North of Stinson Beach	Currently e-bikes prohibited	Natural surface	Moderate and steep grades	Both short and long sight lines	1.99	Wide trail/fire road conditions	No public safety and resource concerns on wide fire road.	Open to Class 1 and 2 e-bikes only
Point Bonita Trail	Marin	Trail to the Point Bonita Lighthouse	No bikes allowed, including e-bikes	Various – natural surface, paved, bedrock, tunnel, bridge	Flat to steep	Both long and short sight lines	.55	Varies, 4-6' wide in some locations	N/A because all bikes are currently and will continue to be prohibited.	All bikes, including e-bikes, will continue to be prohibited
Battery Yates Trail (top of battery) in Fort Baker	Marin	Sausalito	No bikes allowed, including e-bikes	Natural surface	Moderate grades	Both long and short sight lines	.15	Narrow 4-6' wide	N/A because no bikes are currently and will continue to be prohibited.	All bikes, including e-bikes, will continue to be prohibited

***The following routes would be designated as open for e-bike use**

Trail Name	County	Location	Trail Length (miles)
Alta Trail between Rodeo Avenue and Marin City	Marin	Headlands	1.49
Baker-Barry Tunnel	Marin	Headlands	0.45
Batteries Loop Trail	Marin	Headlands	0.44
Fort Baker Bay Trail between Golden Gate Bridge and Sausalito	Marin	Headlands	1.91
Bobcat Trail between Miwok Trail and Marincello Trail	Marin	Headlands	2.79
Rodeo Valley Trail between Capehart Bridge (north off of Bunker and McCullough intersection) and Bobcat Trail	Marin	Headlands	0.96
Capehart and Smith Road Bridges connecting Bunker Road to Rodeo Valley Trail	Marin	Headlands	0.2
Old Bunker Road (adjacent to the Roads & Trails Maintenance Yard to Battery Townsley)	Marin	Headlands	0.85
Slacker Ridge Trail: from McCullough Road to Slacker Hill	Marin	Headlands	0.43
Julian Trail (Fire road): between Conzelman Road at McCullough and the Fort Barry Rifle Range at Bunker Road	Marin	Headlands	1.76
Coastal Trail between Rodeo Beach Parking and Hill 88	Marin	Headlands	1.76
Coastal Trail from Tennessee Valley to Kaashi Way, Muir Beach	Marin	Headlands	2.85
Coyote Ridge Trail	Marin	Headlands	0.75
Drown Road, Fort Baker	Marin	Headlands	0.6
Hawk Camp Trail (between Bobcat Trail and Hawk Camp	Marin	Headlands	0.68
Haypress Camp Trail (between Tennessee Valley Road and Haypress Campground)	Marin	Headlands	0.57
Kirby Cove Road	Marin	Headlands	0.93
Marincello Trail between Tennessee Valley Parking Area and Bobcat Trail	Marin	Headlands	1.45
Miwok Trail between Rodeo Lagoon and Old Springs Trail	Marin	Headlands	1.89
Oakwood Valley Trail between Tennessee Valley Road and Oakwood Pond (Does not include Oakwood Meadow Trail between Pond and Alta Avenue)	Marin	Headlands	0.66
Rodeo Avenue Trail between US Highway 101 and Alta Avenue	Marin	Headlands	0.69
Tennessee Valley Trail.	Marin	Headlands	1.83
Marin Drive/Smith Road between Marinview and Miwok Trail	Marin	Headlands	0.05
Kaashi Way	Marin	Muir Beach	0.53
Coastal Trail, from GG Bridge to intersection of Lincoln and Washington Blvds., except Battery to Bluffs Trail Section	Presidio	SF	0.55

Trail Name	County	Location	Trail Length (miles)
Coastal Trail, Fort Point, except Presidio Promenade	SF	Presidio	0.43
Mason Street multi-use path	SF	Presidio	1.26
Crissy Field Promenade	SF	Presidio	1.15
Great Meadows paths and Fort Mason Bay Trail (formerly McDowell Road)	SF	Ft. Mason	1.17
Coastal Trail (except north of Horse Trail intersection)	SF	Ft. Funston	0.9
El Camino Del Mar Trail	SF	SF	0.5
Milagra Ridge Road	SM	Milagra	1.04
Lishumsha Trail	SM	Mori	0.19
Old Mori Trail	SM	Mori	0.5
Upper Mori Trail	SM	Mori	0.34
Coastal Trail	SM	Mori	0.68
Sneath Lane	SM	Sweeney	1.71
Baquiano Trail	SM	Sweeney	0.98
Mori Ridge Trail	SM	Sweeney	1.24
Sweeney Ridge Trail (except Notch Trail portion)	SM	Sweeney	1.58
Old San Pedro Mountain Road	SM	Rancho	0.68
Ranch Road	SM	Rancho	0.72
Deer Creek Trail	SM	Rancho	0.65

* For more details and maps of specific areas and trails, go to https://www.nps.gov/goga/planyourvisit/maps.htm

ATTACHMENT C

Environmental Screening and Extraordinary Circumstances Forms

Resources considered if e-bikes are allowed on parkwide trails and roads	Potential for Impact	Potential Issues & Impacts
Air Air Quality	Potential	Beneficial impacts: Using e-bikes as an alternative to gasoline- or diesel-powered modes of transportation, e-bikes can reduce greenhouse gas emissions and fossil fuel consumption, improve air quality, and support active modes of transportation for park staff and visitors. Some research has shown that e-bikes are replacing car trips, thus reducing emissions (Cherry and MacArthur 2019).
Biological Nonnative or Exotic Species	Potential	E-bikes present the same low risk of spreading non-native/invasive species as traditional bicycles. If a bicycle goes off trail or rides in contact with roadside plants, there is a potential to spread invasive species. However, this has not been documented as a significant problem in the park, therefore there is no expectation it will arise as a problem with e-bikes.
Biological Species of Special Concern or Their Habitat	Potential	E-bikes will be monitored and prohibited off-trails or roads, which would protect adjacent habitat and species of special concern from habitat disturbance, trampling, and potential injury to plants or wildlife. Some areas of trail are additionally protected by trailside fencing. Because we are expecting e-bikes to remain on trail, no adverse impacts to listed species are expected and no formal USFW ESA Section 7 consultation is required. If e-bike use results in additional off-trail impacts, this would need to be revisited.
Biological Vegetation	Potential	As with traditional bikes, if e-bikes remain on designated trails and roads, impacts to vegetation, wildlife, special status species and habitat would be low. If e-bikes or traditional bicycles ride off-trail and in prohibited areas, there is potential to crush vegetation and habitat. However, this has not been documented as a significant problem in the park, therefore there is no expectation it will arise as a problem with e-bikes. e-bike monitoring will be implemented to ensure e-bikes remain on trails and roads.
Biological Wildlife and/or Wildlife Habitat including terrestrial and aquatic species	Potential	No impacts would occur to wildlife along trails that would be closed to e-bikes. Where allowed, e-bikes are required to remain on trail and adhere to bicycle speed limits, thereby minimizing impacts to adjacent habitat and wildlife. There may be impacts from e-bikes on wildlife including potential death or injury of wildlife crossing trails, but the potential is not expected to exceed current impacts from traditional bikes.
Cultural Archeological Resources	None	Impact: No Potential to Cause Effects with the following stipulation: • If it becomes necessary to remove, change, relocate, replace, and/or add signs, or perform any other ground disturbing activities, additional NEPA/NHPA reviews may be required.
Cultural Cultural Landscapes	None	Impact: No Potential to Cause Effects with the following stipulation: • If it becomes necessary to remove, change, relocate, replace, and/or add signs, additional NEPA/NHPA reviews may be required.
Cultural Ethnographic Resources	None	Impact: No Potential to Cause Effects with the following stipulation: • If it becomes necessary to remove, change, relocate, replace, and/or add signs, additional NEPA/NHPA reviews may be required.
Cultural Museum Collections	N/A	Type text here June 1
Cultural Prehistoric/historic structures	None	No Potential to Cause Effects.

Resources considered if e-bikes are allowed on parkwide trails and roads	Potential for Impact	Potential Issues & Impacts
Geological Soils, Geologic Features, and Processes	Potential	Impact: e-bikes would be allowed on trails and roads open to traditional bikes. E-bikes may cause some soil disturbance in the trail prism, but the potential is not expected to exceed current impacts from traditional bikes. No potential impacts for geologic features or processes.
Lightscapes	Potential	Potential impacts to lightscapes and night skies would be low to negligible parkwide
Human Health and Safety	Potential	The conclusion of recent research on e-bikes and safety varies widely. Some findings state that e-bike riders exhibit nearly identical safety behavior as regular bike riders and should be regulated in similar ways (Langford 2015) and that both users of both technologies have very high traffic violations. Another study found that current evidence suggests e-bike users are exposed to greater risks than regular bicycles, though the precise nature and magnitude of this effect is largely unknown and likely depends on the type (i.e. performance) of the e-bike, among other factors (Fishman and Cherry 2015). Other research states that there is a lack of crash data on e-bike use which makes the issue of safety speculative or that there is no definitive positive or negative safety impact from e-bikes but other data states that e-bikes enable riders to bike for longer periods of time, thus increasing accidents (Cherry and MacArthur 2019). There is also conflicting data about how much faster e-bikes travel than traditional bicycles. In unregulated areas, higher speeds with e-bikes could lead to accidents and crashes; but it is difficult to say with certainty that the incidence would be greater than with traditional bikes. In the case of Golden Gate, e-bikes would be subject to the same speed limits as regular bikes, which is 15 m.p.h. except around blind curves and in designated high-use areas where the speed limit is 5 m.p.h. Given that e-bikes were regulated based on use on paved roads and paths previously, and is new technology, there is sparse research on its impacts and safety on unpaved trails. By reducing the physical demand to operate a bicycle, e-bikes have expanded access to recreational opportunities, particularly to those with limitations stemming from age, illness, disability or fitness, especially in more challenging environments, such as high altitudes or hilly terrain.
Socioeconomic Land Use, Minority and low-income populations, size, migration patterns, etc.	Potential	Allowing e-bikes is unlikely to result in substantial visitation increases or decreases or effects to surrounding communities; or limit park use to minority/low income populations.
Soundscapes Soundscapes	Potential	Like traditional bikes, the tires and drive chains on e-bikes produce varying degrees of sound. E-bikes produce varying degrees of sound from their electric motors. E-bikes that have their motor on the rear wheel will be generally quieter than the ones with their motor on the front wheel. The light hum of the motor could be detected by hikers on a trail or road, but the noise would be temporary as the e-bike passes by, but would vary with terrain, vegetation type, time of use, and density of visitors.
Viewsheds Viewsheds	Potential	Allowing e-bikes on administrative roads/trails would not appreciably change current park viewsheds on roads and trails that already allow traditional bikes.
Visitor Use, Experience, and Recreational Resources	Potential	Beneficial impacts on visitor use, experience, and recreation by allowing use of e-bikes where appropriate and safe in the park. Many of the trails and roads that would be opened to e-bikes are already multi-use routes where visitors are currently accustomed to sharing their experience with other user groups.

Resources considered if e-bikes are allowed on parkwide trails and roads	Potential for Impact	Potential Issues & Impacts
Water Floodplains	None	Allowing e-bikes on roads and trails would have little or no impacts on the functioning of any floodplains within the park and does not result in adding any structures to a floodplain.
Water Marine or Estuarine Resources	None	Allowing e-bikes on roads and trails would have little or no impacts on marine or estuarine resources within the park because trails where e-bikes are allowed either do not pass through marine or estuarine areas or where trails do pass through these areas they are well protected by fencing and physical barriers.
Water Water Quality or Quantity	None	Allowing e-bikes on roads and trails would have no impacts on water quantity because no additional water would be needed to allow this use. Allowing e-bikes on designated roads and trails would have negligible impacts on water quality within the park because e-bikes are required to remain on trail. There is no indication that allowing e-bikes on designated routes would result in substantial changes in the amount of bike use on trails.
Water Wetlands	Potential	E-bikes present the same low risk of wetland impacts as traditional bicycles because the trails open to traditional bikes and e-bikes either avoid wetlands or, where they pass through wetlands, the trails are constructed so that use by bicycles minimizes impacts to wetlands. The risk would be greater if bicycle or e-bike users go off designated roads and trails. However, this has not been documented as a significant problem in the park, therefore there is no expectation it will arise as a problem with e-bikes. Park expects monitoring programs will indicate if usage is increasing especially in off-trail areas which may trigger management changes.
Wilderness Wilderness	N/A	There is no designated Wilderness

References

https://peopleforbikes.org/our-work/statistics/statistics-category/?cat=e-bike-statistics

Cherry and MacArthur 2019
E-bike safety. A review of Empirical European and North American Studies; A white paper prepared for PeopleForBikes; By Christopher R. Cherry; Department of Civil and Env. Engineering; University of Tennessee 321 John D. Tickle Building, Knoxville, TN 37995-2313, USA; email: cherry@utk.edu; John H. MacArthur' Transportation Research and Education Center; Portland State University;1900 SW Fourth Ave., Suite 175, Portland, OR 97207; email: macarthur@pdx.edu; October 15, 2019; (https://trec.pdx.edu/research/project/1041/National_Electric_Bike_Owner_Survey_)

Langford 2015
Risky riding: Naturalistic methods comparing safety behavior from conventional bicycle riders and electric bike riders; Langford BC1, Chen J2, Cherry CR3; Accid Anal Prev. 2015 Sep;82:220-6. doi: 10.1016/j.aap.2015.05.016. Epub 2015 Jun 17; https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26093098

Fishman and Cherry 2016
Elliot Fishman & Christopher Cherry (2016) E-bikes in the Mainstream: Reviewing a Decade of Research, Transport Reviews, 36:1, 72-91, DOI: 10.1080/01441647.2015.1069907; https://doi.org/10.1080/01441647.2015.1069907

June 17, 2020

Extraordinary Circumstances Review		
If implemented, would the proposal...	Yes/No	Notes
Have significant impacts on public health or safety?	No	
Have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation, or refuge lands; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (Executive Order 11990); floodplains (Executive Order 11988); national monuments; migratory birds; and other ecologically significant or critical areas?	No	
Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources (NEPA section 102(2)(E))?	No	
Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?	No	
Establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects?	No	
Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant, environmental effects?	No	Other public use limits and restrictions are proposed to the 2020 Superintendent's Compendium under PEPC ID 89612. The public use limits and restrictions proposed in PEPC ID 89612 have independent merit and are needed regardless of changes in e-bike use. Together, the cumulative impacts will remain less than significant.
Have significant impacts on properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, as determined by either the bureau or office?	No	
Have significant impacts on species listed or proposed to be listed on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species?	No	See Attachment E, USFWS/NMFS ESA No Effects Memo
Violate a federal, state, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment?	No	Allowing e-bikes would not violate any federal, state, local, or tribal environmental laws.
Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (EO 12898)?	No	Not applicable for e-bike use.
Limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (EO 130007)?	No	Not applicable for e-bike use.
Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native invasive species known to occur in the area or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and Executive Order 13112)?	No	

ATTACHMENT D

NHPA Section 106 Assessment of Effect

Letter of NHPA Section 106 Compliance Completion

H4217 (GOGA-CRMM)

4/02/2020

Memorandum

To: Larry Miranda, Project Manager

From: General Superintendent via Chief of Cultural Resources , Golden Gate NRA

Subject: NHPA Clearance: Designation of Routes and Use Restrictions for E-bikes, Marin/San Francisco, San Mateo Counties (PEPC 94816)

The Cultural Assessment Team has reviewed the proposed project/action and completed its certification for compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act through our Park Programmatic Agreement. We have determined that there will be No Potential to Cause Effects to historical, cultural, or archeological resources, provided you meet all stipulations identified below.

The subject proposed project/action(s), therefore, is/are now cleared for all NHPA compliance requirements as presented. Project plans and specifications are approved and construction and/or project implementation can commence once you have met any NEPA requirements, as well as all stipulations identified below.

For the proposed project actions to be within compliance requirements during construction and/or project implementation, the following cultural resource stipulations must be adhered to:

- If it becomes necessary to remove, change, relocate, replace, and/or add signs, or preform any other ground disturbing activities, additional NEPA/NHPA reviews may be required.

For complete compliance information see PEPC Project 94816.

If you have any questions, please contact CRM Specialist (Curator) Bob Holloway at 415-561-4976.

Gordon White Digitally signed by Gordon White, Chief of Cultural Resources
Date: 2020.04.03 17:45:40 -07'00'

Attachment

ASSESSMENT OF ACTIONS HAVING AN EFFECT ON HISTORIC PROPERTIES

A. DESCRIPTION OF UNDERTAKING

1. Park: Golden Gate National Recreation Area

2. Project Description:

Project Name: Designation of Routes and Use Restrictions for E-bikes, Marin/San Francisco/San Mateo Counties

Prepared by: Bob Holloway **Date Prepared:** 04/02/2020 **Telephone:** 415-561-4976
PEPC Project Number: 94816

Locations:

County, State: Marin, CA
County, State: San Francisco, CA
County, State: San Mateo, CA

Describe project:

On August 30, 2019 the Deputy Director of the National Park Service announced a new electric bicycle (E-bike) policy for national parks that would expand recreational opportunities and accessibility. The policy supports Department of the Interior (DOI) Secretary's Order 3376, signed, August 29, 2019, that directs DOI bureaus to create a clear and consistent E-bike policy on all federal lands managed by the Department. The policy also supports Secretary's Order 3366 to increase recreational opportunities on public lands.

This new policy encourages parks to allow visitors to use E-bikes in generally the same manner as traditional bicycles. Under the policy, the operator of an e-bike may only use the motor to assist pedal propulsion. The motor may not be used to propel an e-bike without the rider also pedaling, except in locations open to public motor vehicle traffic.

The new policy defines 3 classes of E-bikes as follows:

Class 1: Electric bicycle equipped with a motor that provides assistance only when the rider is pedaling and ceases assistance when the bicycle reaches the speed of 20 miles per hour.

Class 2: Electric bicycle equipped with a motor that may be used exclusively to propel the bicycle and ceases assistance when the bicycle reaches the speed of 20 miles per hour.

Class 3: Electrical bicycle equipped with a motor that provides assistance only when the rider is pedaling and ceases assistance when the bicycle reaches the speed of 28 miles per hour.

Bicycles with electric motors of 750 watts (1 h.p.) or more of power and not included as Class 1, Class 2 or Class 3 in the classification system above would be managed as motor vehicles under 36 CFR 4.10, i.e., motor vehicles are allowed on park roads and on routes and areas designated for off-road motor vehicle use.

Benefits of E-bikes:

E-bikes advance "Healthy Parks Healthy People" goals to promote parks as a health resource by supporting a healthy park experience that is accessible, desirable, and relatable to people of all abilities, and by minimizing human impact through the expansion of active transportation options in parks. Specifically, E-bikes can:

Increase bicycle access to and within parks. E-bikes make bicycle travel easier and more efficient, because they allow bicyclists to travel farther with less effort.

Expand the option of bicycling to more people. E-bikes provide a new option for people who want to ride a bicycle but might not otherwise do so because of physical fitness, age, or convenience, especially at high altitude or in hilly or strenuous terrain.

Mitigate environmental impacts. When used as an alternative to gasoline- or diesel-powered modes of transportation, E-bikes can reduce greenhouse gas emissions and fossil fuel consumption, improve air quality, and support active modes of transportation for park staff and visitors. Similar to traditional bicycles, E-bikes can decrease traffic congestion, reduce the demand for vehicle parking spaces, and increase the number and visibility of cyclists on the road.

In furtherance of this new policy, the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GOGA) is proposing to allow visitors to use E-bikes on designated routes subject to use restrictions such as speed limits and group size limits.

The following provisions would be adopted in the park's Compendium and would govern the use of E-bikes in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

The Compendium would define an E-bike as a two- or three-wheeled cycle with fully operable pedals and an electric motor of less than 750 watts (1 h.p.) that provides propulsion assistance.

The following restrictions would apply to the Use and Operation of E-bikes in the park:

Except where use of motor vehicles by the public is allowed, using the electric motor to move an e-bike without pedaling is prohibited.

A person operating an e-bike is subject to the following sections of 36 CFR Part 4 that apply to the use of traditional bicycles: sections 4.12, 4.13, 4.20, 4.21, 4.22, 4.23, and 4.30(h)(2)- (5).

Except as specified in the Compendium, the use of an e-bike within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area is governed by the laws of the State of California (including Section 24016 and Division 11, Chapter 1, Article 4 of the California Vehicle Code).

The maximum number of e-bicyclists in any one group is 5. Larger groups of E-bicyclists must divide into groups not larger than 5.

The speed limit for e-bicycles in developed and undeveloped areas is 15 mph except that e-bicycles shall not exceed 5 mph around any blind curve and on all roads and paved paths in the following San Francisco County areas: McDowell Road, Fort Mason; Great Meadow, Fort Mason; Mason Avenue Bike Path on Sidewalk, Crissy Field; Crissy Field Promenade; Battery East Trail

The Compendium would designate by name the routes that are open, partially open and closed to E-bike use.

See detailed list of routes uploaded in PEPC with Continued Prohibitions on E-bike Use and Routes Designated for Limited E-bike Use; and list of routes Designated for E-bike Use.

Area of potential effects (as defined in 36 CFR 800.16[d])
All Park roads and trails within GGNRA.

3. Has the area of potential effects been surveyed to identify historic properties?

____ **No**
_X_ **Yes**

Source or reference: Presidio of San Francisco NR and NHL Nomination Forms, CLR and HRS

Rancho Corral de Tierra NR DOE
San Francisco Port of Embarkation NHL Nomination Form and HSR San Mateo County NR Nomination Form and HRS
Sutro Historic District CLI, CLR, CD, EA, RAS and Abbreviated CLR (Lands End) Sweeney Ridge Identified Cultural Landscape
China Beach Bath House NR DOE Dipsea Trail NR DOE

Forts Baker, Barry and Cronkhite NR District Nomination Form, CLR (Draft) and HRS Alcatraz Island NR and NHL Nomination Forms, CLI, CLR, FEIS and HRS
Fort Mason Historic District NR Nomination Form, CLI, CLR and SHS Fort Miley Military Reservation NR Nomination Form and CLR
Fort Point USCG Station CLI, CLR and HSR
Fort Point National Historic Site NHL Nomination Form, HSR and HFR Golden Gate Bridge NHL Draft Nomination Form
Golden Gate Dairy Ranch M NR DOE, CLI, Preservation Plan, PHR, and Combined Cultural Res. Report
Golden Gate Plaza, Fort Point Bluffs and Waterfront CLR Milagra Ridge Identified Cultural Landscape
Muir Woods Camino del Canyon Druid Heights Identified Cultural Landscape Muir Woods Camino del Canyon NR DOE
Muir Woods Hillwood Camp NR DOE
Muir Woods National Monument NR Nomination Form, CLI, CLR (Draft), and HRS Ocean Beach O'Shaughnessy Seawall and Esplanade NR DOE

A. Potentially Affected Resource(s):

Archeological Resources Present: Yes

Archeological Resources Notes: Resources are present within the greater Parkwide APE but will not be affected due to project being a park management document only.

Historical Structures/Resources Present: Yes

Historical Structures/Resources Notes: Resources are present within the greater Parkwide APE but will not be affected due to project being a park management document only.

Cultural Landscapes Present: Yes

Cultural Landscapes Notes: Resources are present within the greater Parkwide APE but will not be affected due to project being a park management document only.

Ethnographic Resources Present: Yes

Ethnographic Resources Notes: Resources are present within the greater Parkwide APE but will not be affected due to project being a park management document only.

5. The proposed action will: (check as many as apply)

No Destroy, remove, or alter features/elements from a historic structure
No Replace historic features/elements in kind
No Add non-historic features/elements to a historic structure
No Alter or remove features/elements of a historic setting or environment (inc. terrain)
No Add non-historic features/elements (inc. visual, audible, or atmospheric) to a historic setting or cultural landscape
No Disturb, destroy, or make archeological resources inaccessible
No Disturb, destroy, or make ethnographic resources inaccessible>
No Potentially affect presently unidentified cultural resources
No Begin or contribute to deterioration of historic features, terrain, setting, landscape elements, or archeological or ethnographic resources
No Involve a real property transaction (exchange, sale, or lease of land or structures)
Other (please specify): _____

6. Supporting Study Data:
(Attach if feasible; if action is in a plan, EA or EIS, give name and project or page number.)

B. REVIEWS BY CULTURAL RESOURCE SPECIALISTS

The park 106 coordinator requested review by the park's cultural resource specialist/advisors as indicated by check-off boxes or as follows:

[X] 106 Advisor
Name: Bob Holloway
Date: 04/02/2020
Comments: Reviewed as Admin Review with White, Gavette and Hoke and certified No Potential to Cause Effects with a stipulation.

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance **[ ]**
Assessment of Effect: _X_ No Potential to Cause Effect _No Historic Properties Affected _No Adverse Effect _Adverse Effect _Streamlined Review
Recommendations for conditions or stipulations: If it becomes necessary to remove, change, relocate, replace, and/or add signs, or preform any other ground disturbing activities, additional NEPA/NHPA reviews may be required.

[X] Archeologist
Name: Peter Gavette
Date: 04/02/2020
Comments: Reviewed as Admin Review

Peter Gavette

Digitally signed by PETER GAVETTE
Date: 2020.04.02 10:20:41 -07'00'

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance **[ ]**
Assessment of Effect: _X_ No Potential to Cause Effect _No Historic Properties Affected _No Adverse Effect _Adverse Effect _Streamlined Review
Recommendations for conditions or stipulations: If it becomes necessary to remove, change, relocate, replace, and/or add signs, or preform any other ground disturbing activities, additional NEPA/NHPA reviews may be required.

[X] Historical Architect
Name: Gordon White
Date: 04/02/2020
Comments: Reviewed as Admin Review

Gordon White

Digitally signed by Gordon White
Date: 2020.04.03 10:20:41 -07'00'

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance **[ ]**
Assessment of Effect: _X_ No Potential to Cause Effect _No Historic Properties Affected _No Adverse Effect _Adverse Effect _Streamlined Review
Recommendations for conditions or stipulations: If it becomes necessary to remove, change, relocate, replace, and/or add signs, or preform any other ground disturbing activities, additional NEPA/NHPA reviews may be required.

[X] Historical Landscape Architect
Name: Amy Hoke
Date: 04/02/20
Comments: Reviewed as Admin Review

Amy Hoke Digitally signed by Amy Hoke Date: 2020.04.02 10:20:41 - 07'00'

Check if project does not involve ground disturbance [ ]
Assessment of Effect: X No Potential to Cause Effect No Historic Properties Affected No Adverse Effect Adverse Effect Streamlined Review
Recommendations for conditions or stipulations: If it becomes necessary to remove, change, relocate, replace, and/or add signs, or preform any other ground disturbing activities, additional NEPA/NHPA reviews may be required.

No Reviews From: Curator, Historian, Other Advisor, Anthropologist

---

C. PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR'S REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Assessment of Effect:

X No Potential to Cause Effects
_____ No Historic Properties Affected
_____ No Adverse Effect
_____ Adverse Effect

2. Documentation Method:

[ ] A. Standard 36 CFR Part 800 Consultation
Further consultation under 36 CFR Part 800 is needed.

[ ] B. Streamlined Review Under the 2008 Servicewide Programmatic Agreement (PA)
The above action meets all conditions for a streamlined review under section III of the 2008 Servicewide PA for Section 106 compliance.

Applicable Streamlined Review Criteria
(Specify 1-16 of the list of streamlined review criteria.)

[ ] C. Undertaking Related to Park Specific or Another Agreement
The proposed undertaking is covered for Section 106 purposes under another document such as a park, region or statewide agreement established in accord with 36 CFR 800.7 or 36 CFR 800.14.

[ ] D. Combined NEPA/NHPA Process
Process and documentation required for the preparation of an EA/FONSI or an EIS/ROD to comply with Section 106 is in accord with 36 CFR 800.8.c.

[X] E. Memo to Project File

3. Consultation Information

SHPO Required: No
SHPO Sent:
SHPO Received:

THPO Required: No
THPO Sent:
THPO Received:

SHPO/THPO Notes:

Advisory Council Participating: No
Advisory Council Notes: N/A

4. Stipulations and Conditions:

N/A

5. Mitigations/Treatment Measures: Measures to prevent or minimize loss or impairment of historic/prehistoric properties: (Remember that setting, location, and use may be relevant.)

Required Mitigations - For the proposed project actions to be within compliance requirements during construction and/or project implementation, the following mitigations must be adhered to:

- If it becomes necessary to remove, change, relocate, replace, and/or add signs, or preform any other ground disturbing activities, additional NEPA/NHPA reviews may be required.

6. Assessment of Effect Notes:

Reviewed as Admin Review with White, Gavette and Hoke and certified No Potential to Cause Effects with a stipulation. If it becomes necessary to remove, change, relocate, replace, and/or add signs, or preform any other ground disturbing activities, additional NEPA/NHPA reviews may be required.

D. RECOMMENDED BY PARK SECTION 106 COORDINATOR:

Compliance Specialist:
NHPA Specialist
Bob Holloway CRM Specialist (Curator) **Date:** 4/02/2020

E. SUPERINTENDENT'S APPROVAL

The proposed work conforms to the NPS *Management Policies* and *Cultural Resource Management Guideline*, and I have reviewed and approve the recommendations, stipulations, or conditions noted in Section C of this form.

for **Superintendent:** Gordon White Digitally signed by Gordon White Date: 2020.04.03 10:20:41 -07'00'

Intentionally left blank

ATTACHMENT E

No Effects Determination Memorandum for Federally Listed Species

United States Department of the Interior

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Interior Region 10
Building 201, Fort Mason
San Francisco, CA 94123-0022

Memorandum

To: Larry Miranda, NEPA Program Manager

From: Alison Forrestel, Chief of Natural Resources and Science

Subject: No Effects Determination: E-bike Addition to Park Compendium

I have reviewed the Categorical Exclusion and all supporting documentation about the proposed changes to the Golden Gate National Recreation Area compendium to allow e-bikes on certain trails where traditional bicycles are currently allowed. Based on our expectation that e-bikes will stay within the trail prism (which is consistent with the park's experience managing traditional bicycles, which have been used on park roads and trails for many years) and that overall levels and patterns of bicycle (both traditional and e-bike) use will not substantially change with these compendium changes, the proposed actions should have no effects, either positive or negative, on federally listed species within the park.