

Castro Valley GENERAL PLAN

Draft Environmental Impact Report

Prepared for the Alameda County
Community Development Agency

State Clearinghouse No. 2006032036

| April 2007

Castro Valley GENERAL PLAN

Draft Environmental Impact Report

Prepared for the Alameda County Community Development Agency

by Kahn/Mortimer/Associates and
Dyett & Bhatia

State Clearinghouse No. 2006032036

| April 2007

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

E.1	Proposed Project	E-1
	Key Features of the Proposed General Plan	E-2
	Estimated Buildout of the Proposed General Plan.....	E-4
E.2	Impacts and Mitigations	E-5
E.3	Alternatives to the Proposed Plan	E-12
E.4	Areas of Controversy	E-12

I Introduction

I.1	Purpose of EIR	I-1
I.2	General Plan Process & Public Involvement	I-2
I.3	Approach	I-2
I.4	Issues Discussed the EIR	I-3
I.5	Documents Incorporated by Reference	I-4
I.6	Organization of EIR	I-5

2 Project Description

2.1	Regional Location and Planning Boundaries	2-1
2.2	Purpose and Objectives of the Proposed General Plan	2-2
	Plan Purpose	2-2
2.3	Proposed General Plan	2-7
	Key Initiatives.....	2-8
	General Plan Land Use Classifications	2-10
2.4	Buildout Under the Proposed General Plan	2-23
	Population Growth and Housing	2-24
	Employment	2-26
2.5	Key Policies of the Proposed Plan	2-27
	Land Use and Community Development.....	2-28
	Community Character and Design.....	2-34
	Circulation.....	2-35
	Biological Resources	2-36
	Parks, Schools, and Community Services.....	2-36
	Public Services and Facilities.....	2-38

	Natural Hazards and Public Safety	2-39
	Noise and Air Quality.....	2-40
2.6	Proposed Plan Implementation	2-41
3	Settings, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures	
3.1	Land Use.....	3.1-1
	Environmental Setting.....	3.1-1
	Physical Setting	3.1-1
	Regulatory Setting.....	3.1-5
	Impact Analysis.....	3.1-19
	Significance Criteria.....	3.1-19
	Methodology and Assumptions	3.1-19
	Summary of Impacts	3.1-20
	Impacts and Mitigation Measures	3.1-20
	References	3.1-27
3.2	Parks, Open Space and Recreation	3.2-1
	Environmental Setting.....	3.2-1
	Physical Setting	3.2-1
	Regulatory Setting.....	3.2-8
	Impact Analysis.....	3.2-13
	Significance Criteria.....	3.2-13
	Methodology and Assumptions	3.2-13
	Summary of Impacts	3.2-13
	Impacts and Mitigation Measures	3.2-13
	References	3.1-19
3.3	Public Facilities and Services.....	3.3-1
	Environmental Setting.....	3.3-1
	Physical Setting	3.3-1
	Regulatory Setting.....	3.3-9
	Impact Analysis.....	3.3-10
	Significance Criteria.....	3.3-10
	Methodology and Assumptions	3.3-10
	Summary of Impacts	3.3-11
	Impacts and Mitigation Measures	3.3-11
	References	3.1-18
3.4	Transportation and Circulation	3.4-1
	Environmental Setting.....	3.4-1

Physical Setting	3.4-1
Regulatory Setting.....	3.4-33
Impact Analysis.....	3.4-34
Significance Criteria.....	3.4-34
Methodology and Assumptions	3.4-34
Summary of Impacts	3.4-35
Impacts and Mitigation Measures	3.4-38
References	3.1-49
3.5 Biological Resources	3.5-1
Environmental Setting.....	3.5-1
Physical Setting	3.5-1
Regulatory Setting.....	3.5-10
Impact Analysis.....	3.5-16
Significance Criteria.....	3.5-16
Methodology and Assumptions	3.5-17
Summary of Impacts	3.5-17
Impacts and Mitigation Measures	3.5-18
References	3.1-31
3.6 Fire Hazards.....	3.6-1
Environmental Setting.....	3.6-1
Physical Setting	3.6-1
Regulatory Setting.....	3.6-2
Impact Analysis.....	3.6-2
Significance Criteria.....	3.6-2
Methodology and Assumptions	3.6-2
Summary of Impacts	3.6-5
Impacts and Mitigation Measures	3.6-5
References	3.6-8
3.7 Air Quality.....	3.7-1
Environmental Setting.....	3.7-1
Regulatory Setting.....	3.7-1
Physical Setting	3.7-9
Impact Analysis.....	3.7-13
Significance Criteria.....	3.7-13
Methodology and Assumptions	3.7-14
Summary of Impacts	3.7-14
Impacts and Mitigation Measures	3.7-14

References	3.7-25
3.8 Noise	3.8-1
Environmental Setting.....	3.8-1
Physical Setting	3.8-1
Regulatory Setting.....	3.8-5
Impact Analysis.....	3.8-6
Significance Criteria.....	3.8-6
Methodology and Assumptions	3.8-6
Summary of Impacts	3.8-6
Impacts and Mitigation Measures	3.8-6
References	3.8-12
3.9 Seismic, Soils, and Landslide Hazards.....	3.9-1
Environmental Setting.....	3.9-1
Physical Setting	3.9-1
Regulatory Setting.....	3.9-9
Impact Analysis.....	3.9-10
Significance Criteria.....	3.9-10
Methodology and Assumptions	3.9-11
Summary of Impacts	3.9-11
Impacts and Mitigation Measures	3.9-12
References	3.9-15
3.10 Hydrology, Flooding, and Water Resources.....	3.10-1
Environmental Setting.....	3.10-1
Physical Setting	3.10-1
Regulatory Setting.....	3.10-6
Impact Analysis.....	3.10-11
Significance Criteria.....	3.10-11
Methodology and Assumptions	3.10-12
Summary of Impacts	3.10-12
Impacts and Mitigation Measures	3.10-12
References	3.10-25
3.11 Hazardous Materials	3.11-1
Environmental Setting.....	3.11-1
Physical Setting	3.11-1
Regulatory Setting.....	3.11-4
Impact Analysis.....	3.11-13
Significance Criteria.....	3.11-13

	Methodology and Assumptions	3.11-13
	Summary of Impacts	3.11-13
	Impacts and Mitigation Measures	3.11-13
	References	3.11-17
3.12	Cultural Resources	3.12-1
	Environmental Setting.....	3.12-1
	Physical Setting	3.12-2
	Regulatory Setting.....	3.12-5
	Impact Analysis.....	3.12-8
	Significance Criteria.....	3.12-8
	Methodology and Assumptions	3.12-8
	Summary of Impacts	3.12-8
	Impacts and Mitigation Measures	3.12-9
	References	3.12-12
3.13	Visual Quality	3.13-1
	Environmental Setting.....	3.13-1
	Physical Setting	3.13-1
	Regulatory Setting.....	3.13-2
	Impact Analysis.....	3.13-2
	Significance Criteria.....	3.13-2
	Methodology and Assumptions	3.13-3
	Summary of Impacts	3.13-3
	Impacts and Mitigation Measures	3.13-3
	References	3.13-7
4	Alternatives	
4.1	Description of Alternatives.....	4-1
	Alternatives Considered and Rejected.....	4-2
	Reduced Travel Lanes on Castro Valley Boulevard.....	4-4
	No Project Alternative.....	4-6
4.2	Comparison of Alternatives.....	4-8
	Land Use	4-8
	Parks and Open Space.....	4-11
	Public Facilities and Services.....	4-13
	Transportation and Circulation.....	4-14
	Biological Resources	4-19
	Hazards	4-19

Air Quality and Noise.....	4-20
Seismic, Geological, and Landslide Hazards.....	4-20
Hydrology and Water Resources.....	4-21
Cultural Resources and Visual Quality.....	4-21
References.....	4-21

5 CEQA Required Analysis

5.1 Growth Inducement.....	5-1
5.2 Potentially Significant Irreversible Changes.....	5-2
5.3 Cumulative Impacts.....	5-2
Land Use.....	5-3
Parks, Open Space and Recreation.....	5-3
Public Facilities and Services.....	5-3
Transportation.....	5-4
Seismic, Soils, and Landslide Hazards.....	5-4
Hydrology, Flooding, and Water Resources.....	5-4
Air Quality.....	5-4
Cultural Resources.....	5-5
Visual Quality.....	5-5
5.4 Impacts Found To Be Not Significant.....	5-5
5.5 Unavoidable Significant Impacts.....	5-5
5.6 Changes in Land Use That Would Commit Future Generations.....	5-6

6 Report Authors

7 Persons and Organizations Consulted

Appendix A: Notice of Preparation

Appendix B: Response to Notice of Preparation

Appendix C: Alameda County Congestion Management Agency CMP Analysis

Appendix D: General Plan Implementation Actions

List of Tables

Table E-1: Population, Households and Jobs at Buildout.....	E-4
Table E-2: Commercial Development at Buildout.....	E-6
Table E-3: Summary of Impacts and General Policies.....	E-9
Table 2.3-1: Land Use Classifications – Residential	2-15
Table 2.3-2: Land Use Classifications – Public and Open Space	2-18
Table 2.3-3 Land Use Classifications – Commercial and Central Business District.....	2-19
Table 2.4-1: Households and Population at Buildout.....	2-24
Table 2.4-2: Residential Buildout through 2025.....	2-25
Table 2.4-3: Projected Employment Growth.....	2-26
Table 2.4-4: Commercial Buildout through 2025	2-26
Table 2.5-1: Castro Valley General Plan Correspondence	2-40
Table 3.1-1: Castro Valley Existing Land Use	3.1-2
Table 3.2-1: Estimated Park and Open Space Acreage in Castro Valley.....	3.2-1
Table 3.2-2: Existing Local and School Parks.....	3.2-2
Table 3.2-3: Community Parks.....	3.2-3
Table 3.2-4: Special Use Facilities and Community Centers.....	3.2-4
Table 3.2-5: Regional Parks.....	3.2-7
Table 3.2-6: HARD Park Acreage/Population Standards for Park Facility Acquisition & Development.....	3.2-8
Table 3.2-7: Alameda County Park Dedication Fee Schedule	3.2-9
Table 3.2-8: Summary of Park Standards and Park Needs	3.2-14
Table 3.3-1: Castro Valley K-12 Public Schools	3.3-2
Table 3.3-2: Projected Population by Age Category for Castro Valley (2025)	3.3-12
Table 3.3-3: Projected K-12 Public School Enrollment by Grade Range	3.3-12
Table 3.4-1: Level of Service Descriptions	3.4-25
Table 3.4-2: Freeway Segment Operations - Existing Conditions	3.4-25
Table 3.4-3: Roadway Segments Operations - Existing Conditions - AM Peak Hour.....	3.4-26
Table 3.4-4: Roadway Segments Operations - Existing Conditions - PM Peak Hour	3.4-26
Table 3.4-5: Existing Intersection Operations.....	3.4-27

Table 3.4-6: Daily Vehicle Trips and Vehicle Miles of Travel For Buildout (2025) Conditions	3.4-36
Table 3.4-7: Freeway Segment Operations	3.4-37
Table 3.4-8: Roadway Segment Operations	3.4-37
Table 3.4-9: Intersection Operations	3.4-38
Table 3.5-1: Listed Species and Associated Vegetation	3.5-11
Table 3.7-1: State and National Criteria Air Pollutant Standards, Effects and Sources	3.7-4
Table 3.7-2: Attainment Status of the Bay Area for State and National Ambient Air Quality Standards	3.7-5
Table 3.7-3: Ozone Air Quality Data Summary (2001 – 2005) for the Project Area	3.7-10
Table 3.7-4 Summary of Ozone Data for the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin, 1996 – 2005	3.7-11
Table 3.7-5 CAP TCMs to be Implemented by Cities and Counties	3.7-21
Table 3.7-6 Buffer Zone Distances for Potential Odor Sources	3.7-22
Table 3.7-7 Estimated Carbon Monoxide Concentrations at Most Impacted Intersections in the Planning Area for the PM Peak Hour	3.7-25
Table 3.8-1: Alameda County Exterior Noise Standards	3.8-4
Table 3.9-1: Modified Mercuri Intensity Scale	3.9-3
Table 3.10-1: Beneficial Uses for Water Bodies in the Project Area	3.10-7
Table 3.11-1: Location of LUFT, Air Emissions, and SLIC Sites within the Planning Area	3.11-2
Table 4.2-1: New Land Use Classifications w. Draft Plan and Reduce Travel Lane Alternative	4-9
Table 4.2-2: Buildout (2025) Comparison: Proposed Plan and Alternatives	4-11
Table 4.2-3: Parkland at Buildout (2025): Proposed Plan and Alternatives	4-12
Table 4.2-4: Projected Population by Age Category for Castro Valley (2025)	4-13
Table 4.2-5: Daily Vehicle Trips and Vehicle Miles of Travel for Buildout (2025) Conditions	4-15
Table 4.2-6: Freeway Segment Operations	4-16
Table 4.2-7: Roadway Segment Operations	4-17
Table 4.2-8: Intersection Operations w. Proposed Project	4-18

List of Figures

Figure 2.1-1: Regional Context Map	2-3
Figure 2.1-2: Castro Valley Planning Area	2-5
Figure 2.3-1: Proposed General Plan Land Use.....	2-13
Figure 3.1-1: Existing Land Uses	3.1-3
Figure 3.1-2: 1985 General Plan: Medium and High Density Residential	3.1-9
Figure 3.1-3: 1985 General Plan: Convenience Commercial	3.1-11
Figure 3.1-4: CBD Specific Plan, 1993	3.1-13
Figure 3.1-5: CBD Specific Plan: Residential Land Use	3.1-15
Figure 3.2-1: Parks and Community Services	3.2-5
Figure 3.3-1: Schools and School Districts	3.3-3
Figure 3.4-1: Local Streets, Traffic Volumes, and Classifications	3.4-23
Figure 3.4-2: Existing Transit Network and Facilities	3.4-31
Figure 3.4-3: Bicycle Network.....	3.4-31
Figure 3.5-1: Biological Resources.....	3.5-3
Figure 3.5-2: Biological Resources Overlay Zone.....	3.5-19
Figure 3.6-1: Wildfire Hazards	3.6-3
Figure 3.8-1: Typical Sound Levels	3.8-3
Figure 3.8-2: Future Noise Contours	3.8-7
Figure 3.9-1: Slopes and Seismic Hazards.....	3.9-5
Figure 3.9-2: Earthquake Shaking Scenario.....	3.9-7
Figure 3.10-1: Floodplains, Creeks and Drainages.....	3.10-3
Figure 3.11-1: Hazardous Materials Sites.....	3.11-7
Figure 4-1: Plan: Streetscape Conversion to Two Lanes	4-5
Figure 4-2: Section: Potential Streetscape Conversion to Two	4-5

This page has been intentionally left blank.

Executive Summary

E.1 PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed Castro Valley General Plan is intended to replace the existing General Plan, which was adopted in 1985. The proposed Plan is an Area Plan for Castro Valley, which will become part of the Alameda County General Plan. It is composed of goals, policies, a land use diagram, other graphic figures and maps, and implementation actions to guide future development within the Planning Area through the year 2025.

Castro Valley, an unincorporated sub-area of Alameda County, is centrally located in the western part of the County. Castro Valley is bounded by the City of San Leandro and the unincorporated communities of Ashland and Cherryland to the west, the City of Hayward and unincorporated Fairview to the south, the East Bay Regional Park District to the north, and Contra Costa County and the Dublin Planning Area to the east.

The proposed General Plan addresses eight major topics: Land Use and Community Development; Community Character and Design; Circulation; Biological Resources; Parks, Schools and Community Facilities; Public Services and Facilities; Natural Hazards and Public Safety; and Noise and Air Quality. These topics fulfill the State requirements for general plan elements, except for the Housing Element which is part of the countywide Alameda County General Plan.

KEY FEATURES OF THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN

The following list of 15 key initiatives was developed through the three-year public planning process:

1. Valleys, Creeks, Canyons, and Hillsides Preserved

Establish a framework of legal, managerial, and operational protections for the community's natural resources, including the valleys, creeks, canyons, and hillsides, as well as views to those resources. Ensure that there is ongoing stewardship and maintenance.

2. Greening Castro Valley

Plant street trees, install planted medians, create parks and open views to green spaces, and create parks, so that Castro Valley has a green landscaped character that makes it attractive and harkens back to its rural beginnings.

3. Design Standards and Guidelines for New Housing

Establish a comprehensive detailed framework of zoning regulations, development standards and guidelines used in the review of all new housing projects to ensure that new residential development fits with the desired character for Castro Valley.

4. Preserve Resources that Embody Castro Valley's Historic Rural Character

Castro Valley evolved from a rural agricultural area to become a suburban residential community. While there are few "historic resources" eligible for listing on the State and federal registers, there are some resources that can be preserved or enhanced to retain a connection with the community's historic rural character. These include the natural hillside and canyon resource areas, as well as specific sites or structures such as the Adobe Arts Center, the Strobridge House, and the row of early 20th century commercial storefronts on the western end of Castro Valley Boulevard.

5. Traffic Calming

Allow traffic flow so that auto circulation is convenient for residents, but control the volume and speed of traffic on streets to maximize safety and ensure that the nature of the traffic fits with the character of the area. Develop a traffic calming program that includes education and enforcement as well as control devices such as signals, new sidewalks, speed limits, traffic humps, and roundabouts.

6. Walkable Town Center

Create a central pedestrian-friendly shopping and restaurant area on a few blocks along Castro Valley Boulevard and key side streets, including Castro Village Shopping Center. Over time add and relocate buildings, sidewalks, and parking so that the area has a pedestrian environment. Add a plaza and features that create a public gathering place that can be identified as the heart of the community. If at all possible, create a place for a new post office as part of this area.

7. Beautiful Castro Valley Boulevard

Complete a streetscape improvement project on Castro Valley Boulevard that adds street trees, lights, banners, billboards, medians, bulb-outs and other such features to make it a beautiful boulevard. Establish or continue other programs that improve the appearance of the commercial area, including: Façade Improvement Program; Billboard Reduction Program; Revised Sign Regulations; and Design Review Guidelines for commercial projects.

8. New Shops and Restaurants in Castro Valley

Establish a business attraction program to bring new shops, restaurants, and services to Castro Valley, that helps existing businesses expand or upgrade, and new businesses to get established. The Redevelopment Agency should work to facilitate the provision of adequate sites, parking, and maintenance.

9. Castro Valley Community Center

Build the community library on Norbridge Street. Over time, add other facilities on the site to create a full community center, such as: a community meeting room, facilities for seniors and teenagers, and other features that will make this an inviting gathering place for the Castro Valley community.

10. Castro Valley Parks/Recreation Centers

Over the next twenty years, add at least one new neighborhood park in the underserved western area of Castro Valley, and a large community gym/recreation center. Add quality after-school facilities to make fuller use of existing schools and parks.

11. Lake Chabot Road Medical District

Allow the rebuilding of Eden Hospital so it can continue to provide high-quality medical and emergency services in structures that can withstand earthquakes. The hospital and the citizens of Castro Valley should form a working committee to ensure that the new campus and surrounding sites create an attractive and functional medical district with medical offices, retail, restaurants, and supportive housing. Establish standards and guidelines to ensure that the medical facility construction and operation does not negatively impact the surrounding residential neighborhoods.

12. Castro Valley Neighborhood Centers

Renovate or rebuild on the neighborhood commercial sites in Castro Valley so that there are convenience stores and services close to residences, and the properties look attractive and well maintained so they contribute to the community. Establish zoning that allows the construction of housing or other uses that make the renovation or rebuilding financially viable; and work with project applicants to facilitate the renovation through all means available, including Redevelopment Agency tools.

13. Housing In and Around the Town Center

Adding new housing in and around the town center is a way to meet housing needs for smaller and more affordable units, and offer housing choice where residents can walk to shops and transit. It will also help support downtown businesses by locating customers within walking distance. The neighborhood between Somerset and Castro Valley Boulevard, the BART station, and some of the existing mobile home parks all offer potential housing sites. New housing should fit in with the desired character of the area – in attractive buildings no more than 2-4 stories tall, with open space.

14. An Improved Look for Castro Valley

Improve the general appearance of Castro Valley by establishing and funding several types of programs: Streetscape Improvements, Planting Programs, Façade Renovation, New Sign Regulations, and Gateway Entry Structures.

15. Enforcement

Enforce the zoning regulations, conditions of zoning permit approval, traffic regulations, and all the other types of agreements that the community has adopted through public participation and/or legislation. Establish more thorough Plan Check and Inspections procedures to make sure that buildings are built as approved; public notice is provided when project designs are substantially revised, etc.

ESTIMATED BUILDOUT OF THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN

Full development under the proposed Plan is referred to as “buildout.” The proposed Plan is not intended to specify or anticipate when buildout will actually occur; nor does the designation of a site for a certain use necessarily mean the site will be built or redeveloped with that use before the 2025 planning horizon. Buildout also does not reflect the maximum capacity that the Planning Area could theoretically accommodate but rather the most likely level of development based on trends, permit history, demographics and other relevant factors.

The overall community development strategy for the next two decades focuses on infill residential and commercial development. Consistent with the regional “smart growth” goals, the strategy aims to:

- Allow higher density and mixed-use development in the Central Business District and near the BART station;
- Accommodate a variety of housing types and households in residential areas;
- Encourage the renovation of existing, older commercial sites and the development of new commercial uses to meet existing and future demand for retail, restaurants, services and employment;
- Maintain the existing and clarify the desired character of whole neighborhoods; and
- Protect environmentally sensitive areas and significant biological resources.

Based on the community development strategy, plus Alameda County and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) data, growth projections were prepared for the planning horizon.

Residential Development and Buildout Households

The expected residential growth rate is based on a weighted average of recent residential development rates in Castro Valley and the availability of housing sites. Approximately 2,090 net new housing units are anticipated by 2025. This is a nine percent increase over the 23,200 existing units, which represents an average annual growth rate of 0.5 percent or approximately 100 units per year. These new units would support about 2,000 new households.

Buildout Population

By 2025 Castro Valley’s population is expected to increase by 4,735, almost 8 percent, to a total of about 64,935 people. This represents an average annual growth rate of 0.4 percent. This is a lower rate than experienced by Castro Valley over the last 15 years which was approximately 1.6 percent.

Buildout Employment

As seen in Table E-1, Castro Valley is projected to accommodate approximately 1,460 new jobs by 2025, an increase of almost 16 percent over the 2005 estimate of 9,275 jobs. This represents an average annual growth rate of about 0.8 percent.

Table E-1: Population, Households and Jobs at Buildout

	<i>Estimated 2005¹</i>	<i>Increase 2005-2025</i>	<i>Buildout³</i>
Housing units	23,200	2,090	25,290
Households ²	22,780	2,005	24,785
Population	60,200	4,735	64,935
Jobs	9,275	1,459	10,735

1. Estimates of households, household size, population, and jobs are based on the Alameda County Congestion Management Agency's 2005 data, which are considered to be the most accurate representation of Castro Valley's current status. This data is based on ABAG's 2002 projections for job and housing growth in the Bay area, which are similar in methodology to ABAG's 2005 projections. An average household size of 2.62 is assumed in order to exercise caution in buildout estimates, although by the end of the planning period the average size is projected to be 2.60.
2. A vacancy rate of 2 percent is assumed in calculating future households, based on a vacancy rate of 1.8 percent, as reported in the 2000 US Census.
3. To project population at buildout, the number of new housing units was added to current housing units. Households were then calculated by multiplying total housing units by 0.98 to take the assumed 2 percent vacancy rate into account. The households were then multiplied by the assumed average household size.

Sources: Existing Information from CMA 2005, projected from ABAG 2003 numbers. Projected growth from Dyett and Bhatia, 2005, based on parcel by parcel analysis of development potential under the new Castro Valley General Plan.

Commercial Development at Buildout

New commercial development and redevelopment is targeted for areas at the BART station site and other general, neighborhood and community commercial sites. The BART site will accommodate almost half of the new development. The Central Business District will lose about 15 percent of its commercial development due to the transition from a commercial district to a mixed-use district with about 900 new housing units. Commercial areas outside of the CBD will receive the majority of the growth.

Table E-2: Commercial Development at Buildout

<i>Location</i>	<i>Existing Building Square Footage</i>	<i>Estimated New Square Footage</i>	<i>Existing Square Footage Demolished for Redevelopment</i>	<i>Total Net New Square Footage</i>
BART Site	0	97,800	0	97,800
CBD	245,250	49,000	85,838	-36,800
Other	673,747	377,100	235,811	141,300
Total	918,997	523,900	321,649	202,300

Source: Dyett & Bhatia, 2006

E.2 IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS

This EIR identifies potential environmental impacts and their level of significance. However, the proposed Plan contains policies and actions that are intended to mitigate potential impacts to less than significant levels. Based on the analysis, no additional mitigation measures are required. Table E-3 lists the impacts with the associated General Plan policies and actions.

Table E-3 Summary of Impacts and General Plan Policies

<i>Environmental Impact</i>	<i>Significance before Mitigation</i>	<i>General Plan Policies and Actions that Reduce Impact's Significance</i>	<i>Significance after Mitigation</i>
3.1 Land Use			
3.1-1 The proposed Plan makes policy and land use changes to areas covered by specific and redevelopment plans.	Less than Significant	Actions 4.7-9, 4.7-10, 4.7-11, 4.7-12, 4.7-13, 4.7-19, 4.7-20, and 4.3-1	Not Applicable
3.1-2 The proposed Castro Valley General Plan may not be compatible with the policies of the Eden Area General Plan.	Less than Significant	Policies 6.1-1, 6.1-4, 6.1-5, 6.2-1, 8.2-1, 8.2-4, 8.2-10, 6.5-1, 6.5-3, 6.6-1, 6.6-3, 6.6-4, 6.6-5, 6.6-6, and 6.6-7 Actions 8.2-1 and 4.9-10	Not Applicable
3.1-3 The Plan may conflict with policies in the County's Resource Conservation, Open Space, and Agriculture elements.	Less than Significant		Not Applicable
3.1-4 Changes to land use designation along certain roads may conflict with the Alameda County Scenic Routes Element.	Less than Significant	Policies 4.2-1, 4.2-5, and 4.2-7 Action 4.3-4	Not Applicable
3.2 Parks			
3.2-1 Future development could result in increased use of existing parks and recreation facilities, causing deterioration of park facilities.	Less than Significant	Policies 8.2-1, 8.2-2, 8.2-3, 8.2-4, 8.2-5, 8.2-6, 8.2-7, 8.2-8, 8.2-9, 8.2-10, 8.2-11, 8.2-12, 8.2-13, 8.2-14, 8.3-1, 8.3-2, 8.3-3, 8.4-3, and 8.4-4 Actions 8.2-1, 8.2-2, 8.2-3, 8.2-4, 8.2-5, 8.2-6, 8.2-7, 8.2-8, 8.2-9, 8.2-10, 8.2-11, 8.2-12, 8.3-1, 8.3-2, 8.3-3, 8.3-4, 8.4-1, 8.4-4, 8.4-5, 4.3-2, 4.5-8, and 4.7-4	Not Applicable
3.3 Public Facilities			
3.3-1 Increased residential development may require new or expanded school facilities.	Less than Significant	Policies 9.1-1, 9.1-3, 9.1-5, 8.4-1 and 8.4-6	Not Applicable
3.3-2 Implementation of the proposed Plan would increase the population, amount of development, and number of jobs in the Planning Area, which would require additional police and fire services.	Less than Significant	Policies 9.1-1, 9.1-4, 9.2-1, 9.2-2, 9.2-3, 9.2-4, 9.2-5, 9.2-6, and 9.2-7 Actions 9.2-1, 9.2-2, 9.2-3, 9.2-4, and 9.2-6	Not Applicable
3.3-3 Implementation of the proposed Plan would result in new resi-	Less than Significant	Policies 9.3-1, 9.3-3, 9.3-4 and	Not

Table E-3 Summary of Impacts and General Plan Policies

<i>Environmental Impact</i>	<i>Significance before Mitigation</i>	<i>General Plan Policies and Actions that Reduce Impact's Significance</i>	<i>Significance after Mitigation</i>
dential and commercial development, which could increase the demand for water beyond available distribution capacity.	Significant	9.3-5	Applicable
3.3-4 New development may exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (SFBRWQCB).	Less than Significant	Policies 9.4-1, 9.4-2, 9.4-3, 9.4-4, 9.4-5, and 9.4-6	Not Applicable
3.3-5 New development would result in increased demand for solid waste disposal at the County landfill.	Less than Significant	Policy 9.6-1 Actions 9.6-1 and 9.6-2	Not Applicable
3.4 Transportation			
3.4-1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would increase traffic along I-580.	Less than Significant		Not Applicable
3.4-2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would increase traffic along local roadways.	Less than Significant	Policies 6.2-1, 6.4-1, 6.4-2, 6.4-3, and 6.4-4	Not Applicable
3.4-3 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would increase traffic at the study intersections.	Less than Significant	Policies 6.2-2, 6.5-1, 6.5-2, 6.5-3, 6.5-4, 6.5-5, 6.6-1, 6.6-2, 6.6-3, 6.6-4, 6.6-5, 6.6-6, and 6.6-7	Not Applicable
3.4-4 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would make parking less convenient in the Central Business District, which could have an impact on traffic conditions.	Less Than Significant	Policies 4.7-10 and 6.3-2 Actions 4.7-15 and 4.7-16	Not Applicable
3.5 Biological Resources			
3.5-1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could result in substantial adverse effects on steelhead, western pond turtle, California tiger salamander, California red-legged frog, or their habitat.	Less than Significant	Policies 7.1-1, 7.1-3, 7.1-5, 7.1-7, 7.1-8, 7.1-10, 7.2-1, 7.2-2, 7.2-4, and 7.2-5 Actions 7.1-2, 7.1-3, 7.2-1, 7.2-5, and 7.2-6	Not Applicable
3.5-2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could result in disturbance to nesting raptors, special-status nesting birds, or yellow warbler.	Less than Significant	Policies 7.1-1, 7.1-3, 7.2-1, 7.2-2, 7.2-4, 7.1-2, 7.1-11, 7.3-1, 7.3-2, 7.3-3, and 7.3-4 Actions 7.1-2, 7.1-3, 4.3-5, and 7.3-1	Not Applicable
3.5-3 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could result in substantial adverse effects on special status bat species or their habitat.	Less than Significant	Policies 7.1-1, 7.1-2, 7.1-3, 7.1-11, 7.2-4, 7.3-1, 7.3-2, 7.3-3, and 7.3-4	Not Applicable

Table E-3 Summary of Impacts and General Plan Policies

<i>Environmental Impact</i>	<i>Significance before Mitigation</i>	<i>General Plan Policies and Actions that Reduce Impact's Significance</i>	<i>Significance after Mitigation</i>
		Actions 7.1-2, 7.1-3, and 7.3-1	
3.5-4 Future development could result in direct impacts to Alameda whipsnake or habitat for this listed species.	Less than Significant	Policies 7.1-1, 7.1-2, 7.1-3, 7.1-11, 7.2-4, and 7.3-4 Actions 7.1-2 and 7.1-3	Not Applicable
3.5-5 Implementation of the General Plan could adversely impact sensitive natural communities and special status plant species and trees.	Less than Significant	Policies 7.1-1, 7.1-2, 7.1-3, 7.1-11, 7.2-4, 7.3-1, 7.3-2, 7.3-3, and 7.3-4 Actions 7.1-2, 7.1-3, 7.3-1, 7.3-3, and 7.3-4	Not Applicable
3.5-6 Implementation of the General Plan could adversely affect riparian areas, wetlands and "other waters of the United States."	Less than Significant	Policies 7.1-1, 7.1-3, 7.1-5, 7.1-10, 7.2-2, 7.2-4, and 7.2-5 Actions 7.1-2, 7.1-3, 7.2-3, 7.2-5, 7.2-6, 7.2-7, and 7.3-5	Not Applicable
3.6 Fire Hazards			
3.6-1 Development in the northern, eastern, and southeastern areas of Castro Valley where residential areas border wooded areas may increase risk from wildland fires.	Less than Significant	Policy 10.1-1 Actions 10.1-1, 10.1-2, 10.1-3, 10.1-4, 10.1-5, 10.1-6, 10.1-7, 10.1-8, 10.1-9, 10.1-11, 10.1-12, and 10.1-13	Not Applicable
3.7 Air Quality			
3.7-1 Construction and demolition activities associated with new development under the proposed General Plan would generate and expose sensitive receptors to short-term emissions of criteria pollutants, including suspended and inhalable particulate matter and equipment exhaust emissions.	Less than Significant	Policy 11.2-5 Action 11.2-5	Not Applicable
3.7-2 Development under the proposed General Plan would be consistent with the population and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) assumptions used in the regional air quality plan.	Less than Significant	Policies 11.2-1, 11.2-2, 6.1-3, 6.1-4, 6.2-1, 6.3-1, 6.4-1, 6.5-1, 6.6-1, 4.5-3, 4.7-7, 4.7-8, 4.7-9, and 4.9-8 Actions 11.2-1, 11.2-2, 6.1-4, 6.1-5, 6.4-1, 6.4-2, 6.4-3, 6.4-4, 6.4-8, 6.4-9, 6.4-10, 6.4-11, 6.4-12, 6.4-13, 6.4-15, 6.5-3, 4.5-1, and 4.7-1	Not Applicable
3.7-3 The proposed General Plan would be consistent with the Clean Air Plan Transportation Control Measures (TCMs).	Less than Significant	Same as Impact 3.7-2	Not Applicable
3.7-4 Development pursuant to the	Less than	Policies 4.9-8, 11.2-3, and 11.2-4	Not

Table E-3 Summary of Impacts and General Plan Policies

<i>Environmental Impact</i>	<i>Significance before Mitigation</i>	<i>General Plan Policies and Actions that Reduce Impact's Significance</i>	<i>Significance after Mitigation</i>
proposed General Plan would allow a mix of residential and non-residential uses in the Plan area, as well as locate sensitive land uses (including residential) adjacent to major transportation corridors, which could result in odor and toxic emissions problems at sensitive receptors.	Significant	Actions 11.2-3 and 4.5-2	Applicable
3.7-5 Development under the proposed General Plan would increase traffic along some roadways in the Planning Area, which in turn could result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and localized air quality impacts.	Less than Significant	Same as Impacts 3.7-2 and 3.7-4	Not Applicable
3.8 Noise			
3.8-1 New development under the proposed General Plan could expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of 60 dB for single family, duplex, and mobile homes; 65 dB for residential multi-family and high density residential, mixed use, motels, and hotels; 70 dB for schools, libraries, churches, hospitals, nursing homes, playgrounds, neighborhood parks, and office buildings, business, commercial and professional uses.	Less than Significant	Policies 11.1-1, 11.1-2, 11.2-3, and 11.2-4 Actions 11.1-1, 11.1-2, 11.1-3, 11.1-4, 11.1-5, 11.2-3, and 11.2-4	Not Applicable
3.8-2 Construction and demolition activities associated with new development under the proposed General Plan would potentially expose noise-sensitive uses to construction-related noise.	Less than Significant	Action 11.1-6	Not Applicable
3.9 Seismic, Soils, and Landslide Hazards			
3.9-1 Buildout of the proposed General Plan would expose people or structures to strong seismic groundshaking or seismic-related ground failure.	Less than Significant	Policy 10.3-1 Actions 10.3-1, 10.3-2, and 10.3-3	Not Applicable
3.9-2 Development under the proposed General Plan would be subject to risk from settlement and/or subsidence of land, lateral spreading, or	Less than Significant		Not Applicable

Table E-3 Summary of Impacts and General Plan Policies

<i>Environmental Impact</i>	<i>Significance before Mitigation</i>	<i>General Plan Policies and Actions that Reduce Impact's Significance</i>	<i>Significance after Mitigation</i>
expansive soils, creating substantial risks to life or property.			
3.9-3 Buildout of the proposed General Plan may result in soil erosion.	Less than Significant		Not Applicable
3.10 Hydrology, Flooding, and Water Resources			
3.10-1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would cause increased construction activity, which could violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements and substantially degrade water quality.	Less than Significant	Actions 4.2-2, 10.2-1, 10.2-2, 10.2-3, 10.2-4, and 10.2-5	Not Applicable
3.10-2 Excavation and dewatering that would occur during increased construction activity resulting from implementation of the proposed General Plan could substantially degrade surface water quality and interfere with groundwater recharge.	Less than Significant	Action 10.2-6	Not Applicable
3.10-3 New development could occur under the proposed General Plan that would result in additional releases of nonpoint source pollutants into the storm drain system or waterways, which could substantially degrade surface water quality. However, new development is not expected to add substantial sources of nonpoint pollutant runoff.	Less than Significant	Policies 9.4-2, 9.4-3, 9.4-4, 9.4-5, and 9.4-6 Actions 10.2-7, 10.2-8, 10.2-9, 9.4-1, 9.4-2, and 9.4-3	Not Applicable
3.10-4 New development that would occur under the proposed General Plan could alter drainage patterns and increase impervious surfaces, which would reduce infiltration and increase rates and amounts of runoff and pollutant levels. This could result in increased downstream flooding.	Less than Significant	Policies 7.1-1, 7.1-4, 7.1-5, 7.1-8, 7.1-10, 7.1-11, 7.2-1, 7.2-2, 7.2-3, 7.2-4, and 7.2-5 Actions 7.1-2, 7.1-3, 7.2-1, 7.2-4, 7.2-5, 7.2-6, 7.2-7, 7.3-2, 7.3-5, 10.2-10, 10.2-11, 10.2-12, 10.2-13, 10.2-14, 10.2-15, 10.2-16, 10.2-17, and 10.2-18	Not Applicable
3.10-5 The proposed General Plan does not propose residential uses or structures within 100-year flood hazard areas, nor would it expose people or structures to significant risk due to failure of a levee or dam.	Less than Significant	Action 10.2-20 Action 10.2-21	Not Applicable
3.10-6 The General Plan does not propose development that would	Less than Significant	Policy 10.3-1 Actions 10.3-1, 10.3-2, 10.3-3, and	Not Applicable

Table E-3 Summary of Impacts and General Plan Policies

<i>Environmental Impact</i>	<i>Significance before Mitigation</i>	<i>General Plan Policies and Actions that Reduce Impact's Significance</i>	<i>Significance after Mitigation</i>
expose people and building to significant risk due to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.		10.3-5	
3.11 Hazardous Materials			
3.11-1 Activities attributed to development under the General Plan could increase the transportation, use, and disposal of hazardous materials within Castro Valley.	Less than Significant	Actions 10.4-1, 10.4-2, 10.4-3, and 10.4-4	Not Applicable
3.11-2 Development on land impacted by petroleum hydrocarbons or other chemical constituents, or resulting in the demolition of existing buildings containing hazardous building materials, could potentially expose people or the environment to hazardous conditions.	Less than Significant		Not Applicable
3.12 Cultural Resources			
3.12-1 New development under the proposed General Plan has the potential to adversely affect historic resources that appear on State historical or archaeological inventories or may be eligible for inclusion on such lists.	Less than Significant	Policies 5.4-1, 5.4-3, and 5.4-5 Actions 5.4-1, 5.4-2, 5.4-4, and 5.4-6	Not Applicable
3.12-2 New development has the potential to disturb known or previously unidentified cultural resources that are not eligible for a federal or State listing but may have historic or cultural significance to the community or an ethnic or social group.	Less than Significant	Policy 5.4-2 Action 5.4-5	Not Applicable
3.13 Visual Quality			
3.13-1 Changes to land use and residential density could affect scenic vistas and visual character along scenic routes and from public viewpoints.	Less than Significant	Policies 4.4-1 and 4.5-5 Actions 4.5-4, 4.6-7, 4.9-5, 5.1-1 and 5.4-2	Not Applicable
3.13-2 Taller infill development may use glass or other reflective materials that would generate substantial glare and obscure visual resources.	Less than Significant	Policy 4.4-1 Actions 4.6-7, 4.7-11, 4.7-12 4.9-5 and 5.1-1	Not Applicable
3.13-3 Encouragement of school recreation fields and public parks for dual use may result in nighttime ac-	Less than Significant	Policies 4.2-7 and 4.4-1	Not Applicable

Table E-3 Summary of Impacts and General Plan Policies

<i>Environmental Impact</i>	<i>Significance before Mitigation</i>	<i>General Plan Policies and Actions that Reduce Impact's Significance</i>	<i>Significance after Mitigation</i>
<p>tivities that require strong lights, which may create a visual annoyance. Residential development in formerly agricultural parcels along Crow Canyon Road may also result in night-time lighting that would disrupt the visual character of that scenic route.</p>			
<p>3.13-4 The reconstruction of Eden Medical Center to meet State seismic standards, which is accommodated by the proposed Plan, may result in building heights and siting that could have a significant impact on visual character.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>	<p>Policies 4.8-2 and 4.8-4 Action 4.8-1</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>

E.3 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN

Two alternatives to the proposed Draft General Plan are described and evaluated in this EIR. A detailed comparison of the alternatives and associated impacts is provided in Chapter 4 of this EIR.

Castro Valley Boulevard Reduced Lane Alternative

The Castro Valley Boulevard Reduced Lane Alternative reduces the number of travel lanes on Castro Valley Boulevard to one-through lane in each direction between Wilbeam Avenue and Anita Street with diagonal parking and a two-way left turn lane between Wilbeam and San Miguel avenues. There would be associated reductions of two existing northbound turn lanes to one left turn lane. The street section would include a single travel lane in each direction, a two-way left-turn lane, bicycle lanes in each direction, and on-street parking on both sides of the street.

No Project Alternative

Consideration of the No Project alternative is required by CEQA for all EIRs. This alternative assumes the continued implementation of the 1985 General Plan as amended by Alameda County voters in 2000 with the adoption of Measure D. Other existing plans and policies that are incorporated in this alternative include the 1993 Castro Valley Central Business District Specific Plan as amended by the Board of Supervisors in 2005 to implement the countywide Housing Element, the existing Madison-Common Specific Plan, and several other countywide general plan elements and specific plans.

E.4 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

There are some areas of controversy that arose during the preparation of the Castro Valley General Plan. These may be raised during public hearings for adoption of the General Plan and

the Environmental Impact Report. Some related to potential environmental impacts while others were strictly related to differences about policy issues.

- ***Infill Development in Hillside Areas.*** Many residents are concerned that infill residential development in hillside areas will have an adverse impact on the existing character and scale of Castro Valley neighborhoods.
- ***Changes to Castro Valley Boulevard to Improve its Pedestrian Character.*** Two alternatives were considered for Castro Valley Boulevard – one which retained two travel lanes in each direction and another which narrowed the street to one travel lane in each direction in order to add parking and wider sidewalks. Residents and businesses were divided over which alternative should be selected. Many favored the one lane alternative in order to improve the pedestrian character of downtown and reduce through traffic on the Boulevard. , while others were concerned that this change would increase traffic congestion in the Downtown and divert traffic to adjacent residential neighborhoods.
- ***Traffic Congestion.*** Many residents raised serious concerns about the impacts of additional development on traffic congestion along Castro Valley Boulevard and at freeway entrances to I-580. They also expressed frustration at the amount of through traffic that uses Castro Valley Boulevard and other streets through residential neighborhoods to avoid congestion on I-580.
- ***Preservation of Commercial Sites within Castro Valley.*** Residents expressed strong opinions about preserving commercially-zoned land so that retail, restaurants, and personal services can be added in Castro Valley. They expressed concern about allowing residential and mixed-use development on neighborhood commercial sites and properties in the Central Business District.
- ***Revising School District Boundaries.*** Because schools contribute to community identity, some residents believe that the boundaries of the Castro Valley Unified School District should be modified to include areas south of I-580. Others are concerned that this would increase over-crowding in the Castro Valley District schools and are otherwise impractical.
- ***Downtown and BART Parking.*** Residents and businesses were concerned about the recommended future development of the BART property, and potential parking impacts such as a reduction in BART parking or parking spilling over onto residential streets.
- ***Classification and Zoning of Public Facilities.*** Public agencies raised concerns about rezoning their property from their current residential classification to a public facilities zone. They believe it would reduce their flexibility in the future use or sale of the property.
- ***Locations for General Commercial and Auto-Related Uses.*** Some residents expressed concern about auto-related uses and the impacts on pedestrian-oriented shopping areas. Others, however, believe that these businesses should be allowed to remain at locations where they have existed for a long time because they provide needed services to the community
- ***New Multifamily Residential Development.*** Residents were concerned that allowing new multifamily residential development on in-fill sites in existing residential neighborhoods would create severe parking shortages on existing streets in areas where parking is already limited.

[Page intentionally left blank.]