

2 Summary of Impacts

The EIR identifies the potential environmental impacts of implementing the new Castro Valley Plan and their level of significance. Because the proposed Plan contains policies and actions that are intended to mitigate potential impacts to less than significant levels, based on the analysis in the EIR, no additional mitigation measures are required. Table 2-1 lists the impacts the EIR identified with the associated General Plan policies and actions.

Table 2-1 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 4.7-2, 5.3-6, 5.3-7, 5.3-8, 4.7-3, 4.7-4, 4.7-8, and 4.10-1	Not Applicable—No Mitigation Required
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, 6.2-1, 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 6.2-3, 8.2-1 and 4.9-10	Not Applicable—No Mitigation Required
3.13-3 The Plan may conflict with policies in the County's Resource Conservation, Open Space, and Agriculture elements.	Less than Significant		Not Applicable—No Mitigation Required
3.13-4 Changes to land use designation along certain roads may conflict with the Alameda County Scenic Routes Element.	Less than Significant	Policies 5.2-4, 5.2-5 Action 5.2-12, 4.10-4	Not Applicable—No Mitigation Required
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, 4.10-2, 4.6-3, and 5.3-9	Not Applicable—No Mitigation Required
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—No Mitigation Required
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—No Mitigation Required
3.3-3 Implementation of the proposed Plan would result in new resi-	Less than	Policies 9.3-1, 9.3-2,	Not Applicable—

Table 2-1 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	Action 9.3-2	No Mitigation Required
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, 9.4-8, and 9.5-3 Action 9.5-2	Not Applicable— No Mitigation Required
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, 9.6-2 and 9.6-3	Not Applicable— No Mitigation Required
3.4 Transportation			
3.4-1 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would increase traffic along I-580.	Less than Significant	Policies 6.1-1, 6.2-2 Action 6.2-3	Not Applicable— No Mitigation Required
3.4-2 Implementation of the proposed General Plan would increase traffic along local roadways.	Less than Significant	Policies 6.2-1, 6.3-1 Actions 6.1-3, 6.1-4, 6.2-3, 6.2-4, 6.2-6, 6.2-7, 6.2-8	Not Applicable— No Mitigation Required
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— No Mitigation Required
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— No Mitigation Required
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— No Mitigation Required
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— No Mitigation Required
3.5-3 Implementation of the proposed General Plan could result in	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,	Not Applicable—

Table 2-1 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>
substantial adverse effects on special status bat species or their habitat.		7.3-3, and 7.3-4 Actions 7.1-2, 7.1-3, and 7.3-1	No Mitigation Required
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— No Mitigation Required
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— No Mitigation Required
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— No Mitigation Required
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— No Mitigation Required
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— No Mitigation Required
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— No Mitigation Required

Table 2-1 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>
3.7-4 Development pursuant to the 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.	Less than Significant	Policies 4.9-8, 11.2-3, and 11.2-4 Actions 11.2-3 and 4.5-2	Not Applicable— No Mitigation Required
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— No Mitigation Required
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— No Mitigation Required
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— No Mitigation Required
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— No Mitigation Required
3.9-2 Development under the proposed General Plan would be subject to risk from settlement and/or subsi-	Less than Significant		Not Applicable— No Mitigation

Table 2-1 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>
ence of land, lateral spreading, or expansive soils, creating substantial risks to life or property.			Required
3.9-3 Buildout of the proposed General Plan may result in soil erosion.	Less than Significant		Not Applicable—No Mitigation Required
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—No Mitigation Required
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—No Mitigation Required
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—No Mitigation Required
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—No Mitigation Required
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—No Mitigation Required

Table 2-1 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>
3.10-6 The General Plan does not propose development that would expose people and building to significant risk due to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.	Less than Significant	Policy 10.3-1 Actions 10.3-1, 10.3-2, 10.3-3, and 10.3-5	Not Applicable— No Mitigation Required
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— No Mitigation Required
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— No Mitigation Required
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— No Mitigation Required
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— No Mitigation Required
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— No Mitigation Required
3.13-2 Multi-unit 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— No Mitigation Required

Table 2-1 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>
3.13-3 Encouragement of school recreation fields and public parks for dual use may result in nighttime activities that require strong lights, which may create a visual annoyance. Residential development in formerly agricultural parcels along Crow Canyon Road may also result in nighttime lighting that would disrupt the visual character of that scenic route.	Less than Significant	Policies 4.2-7 and 4.4-1	Not Applicable—No Mitigation Required
3.13-4 The reconstruction of the Castro Valley Medical Center to meet State seismic standards, which is accommodated by the proposed Plan, will result in building heights and siting that could have a significant impact on visual character.	Less than Significant	Policies 4.8-2 and 4.8-4 Action 4.8-1	Not Applicable—No Mitigation Required
3.14 Climate Change			
3.14-1 Implementation of the Castro Valley General Plan will increase the number of residents and employees in the Planning Area, which will result in an increase in the total emission of greenhouse gases that could have a significant impact on climate change.	Less than Significant	Policies 12.2-1 through 12.2-4 and Actions 12.2-1 through 12.2-7	Not Applicable—No Mitigation Required