4 Revisions to the Draft EIR

This chapter includes the revisions to the Draft EIR. These revisions have been made in response to comments or based on review by the EIR preparers. The revisions appear here in the order they appear in the Draft EIR. Text additions are noted in underline and text deletions appear in strikeout.

The County has refined the proposed General Plan based upon agency and public comments. The changes to the Plan as described in Appendix A do not alter the conclusions presented in the Draft EIR regarding significant environmental impacts or mitigation measures and therefore do not trigger recirculation. Revisions to the Draft EIR are described in Table 4-1 and organized by chapter, page and table or figure, where applicable. Certain revised pages (including revised figures) have been appended to the end of this chapter, for clarity purposes; these pages are referenced in the table.

TABLE 4-1: REVISIONS TO THE DRAFT EIR

Chapter/Section	*Page*	*Table/Figure*	*Revision*
2	2-2		The new Castro Valley General Plan area includes approximately ~~38~~ 11 square miles of urbanized land area within the boundaries described above. The planning area is the urbanized area within the County's Urban Growth Boundary, including the Castro Valley Census Designated Place (CDP) as well as the Five Canyons neighborhood and Hillcrest Knolls, as shown in Figure 2.1-2. The Five Canyons neighborhood, which was previously included in the Cherryland-Fairview sub-regional area, and Hillcrest Knolls, previously in Ashland, ~~but is~~ are now within the Castro Valley Planning Area. ~~These boundaries largely follow the area that was proposed for incorporation in 2002. In addition to excluding the Canyonlands and other areas outside of the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) that Alameda County voters approved in 2000, the current planning area also excludes the Fairmont Terrace area just east of Interstate 580.~~

2	2-2		The Central Business District Specific Plan—which Alameda County adopted in 1991 to implement the existing Castro Valley General Plan—provides standards, criteria, and guidelines that govern development in the community's central area, including the ~~Eden~~ Sutter Medical Center area. (Note: All references to Eden Medical Center are revised to say Sutter Medical Center Castro Valley.
2	2-2		The new Plan is also intended to implement amendments to the County's Housing Element that the Board of Supervisors adopted in ~~2003~~ 2005.
2	2-3	Figure 2.1-1	Regional Context figure revised
2	2-5	Figure 2.1-2	Castro Valley Planning Area map revised
2	2-9		Complete a streetscape improvement project on Castro Valley Boulevard that adds street trees, lights, banners, ~~billboards~~, medians, bulb-outs and other such features and removes billboards to make it a beautiful boulevard.
2	2-13	Figure 2.3-1	Castro Valley Proposed General Plan Land Use map revised
2	2-15	Table 2.3-1 through 2.3-3	Land Use Classifications Tables revised
2	2-24		As shown in Table 2.4-1, the Castro Valley Plan Area will accommodate a population of approximately ~~64,935~~ 67,191 people at buildout, an increase of about ~~7.9~~ 9.5 percent over the estimated 2005 population of ~~60,200~~ 61,357. Over a 20-year period, the addition of about ~~4,735~~ 5,834 people represents an average annual growth rate of ~~0.4~~ 0.5 percent, a lower rate than that experienced by Castro Valley over the last 15 years (1990-2005), which was around 1.6 percent.
2	2-24	Table 2.4-1	Table 2.4-1: Households and Population at Buildout revised

2	2-25		Approximately ~~22,780~~ 23,226 households currently reside in the Castro Valley Plan Area, based on Alameda County CMA estimates. The proposed General Plan would add around ~~2,005~~ 2,394 households increasing the total number of households in Castro Valley to ~~24,785~~ 25,620 by 2025. In contrast to much of the planning area's growth in the past, these units would be added through infill development, primarily from the redevelopment of under-built sites, additional units on lots that are already developed, subdivision of large lots, and development on vacant lots. The housing mix for units added during the planning period is presented in Table 2.4-2. Around 43 percent of Castro Valley's new housing units (900 units) are expected to be added in the central business district, almost doubling the housing stock in that area. Outside of the central business district, the construction of single-family and multi-family units at an average rate of 55 units per year over the next 20 years will result in the projected addition of 800 new single-family units and 310 new multi-family units. The new single-family units will primarily be created through the subdivision of existing single-family lots, most of which already include one unit.
2	2-26	Table 2.4-2	Table 2.4-2: Residential Buildout through 2025 revised
2	2-26		Castro Valley is projected to accommodate approximately ~~1,460~~ 1,600 new jobs at buildout, an increase of 16 percent over the Alameda County CMA's estimate of 9,275 jobs in the community in 2005. About half of the new employment (~~675~~ 812 jobs) will be generated by an estimated net increase of 200,000 square feet in Castro Valley's commercial floor area, which represents a 22 percent increase above the community's current commercial floor area

			of 919,000 square feet.
2	2-26	Table 2.4-3	Table 2.4-3: Projected Employment Growth revised
2	2-27	Table 2.4-4	Table 2.4-4: Commercial Buildout through 2025 revised
2	2-27		About 33 percent of the projected new employment will occur outside of the Castro Valley CBD, much of it from jobs not located in stores or offices: • The 2000 Census reported that 3.7 percent of Castro Valley's employed residents worked at home. The General Plan projects that the number of residents who work at home will increase to 5 percent in both existing and new units, based on increasing demand and technology available for working from home. This will result in ~~389~~ about 570 home occupations, or ~~27~~ 35 percent of Castro Valley's job growth. • Home-based employment (gardeners, cleaning services, etc.) is expected in one of every 8 new households. This will create ~~259~~ the equivalent of about 90 new jobs, or ~~18~~ 6 percent of the job growth. • The remaining ~~nine~~ 9 percent of the job growth will be in education and health services. School employment is expected to increase slightly (36 jobs), to reflect minimal increases in the total number of students over the next 20 years based on projected demographic trends. ~~Eden~~ Sutter Medical Center does not project any increase in total employment because the hospital does not plan to increase the number of beds. An in-crease of 100 jobs was assumed to be conservative, since the hospital is planning to re-build its facilities, and more modern facilities may attract more patients. The Plan also proposes the creation of a Hospital and Medical Office District and includes policies intended to optimize the role of ~~Eden~~ the Medical Center as a catalyst for health-related development.

			The combination of the central business district development and the distributed addition of other jobs results in the anticipated net increase of ~~1,460~~ about 1,600 Provide civic uses and community facilities such as churches, schools, and day care within residential neighborhoods while minimizing the impacts of those facilities on residences in the immediately surrounding area.jobs in Castro Valley over the next 20 years.
2	2-15 through 2-24	Tables 2.3-1 through 2.3-3	Tables 2.3-1 through 2.3-3: Land Use Classifications revised
2	2-28		The proposed General Plan addresses ~~eight~~ nine major topics…. • Land Use and ~~Community~~ Development • Community Character and Design • Circulation • Biological Resources • Community Facilities, Parks and Schools ~~and Community Services~~ • Public Services and ~~Facilities~~ Utilities • Natural Hazards and Public Safety; ~~and~~ • Noise; and • Air Quality and Climate Change
2	2-29		The land use and community development policies are intended to achieve the following goals: Promote a sustainable land use pattern that responds to existing and future needs of the Castro Valley community. Provide for a variety of housing types that will meet anticipated needs while preserving and enhancing the livability and character of Castro Valley's neighborhoods. Provide residents and businesses with access to a wide variety of commercial goods and services, and increase opportunities for Castro Valley residents to work in the

			community where they live. Retain and enhance neighborhood commercial land uses within residential neighborhoods. Improve the Central Business District to create a pedestrian-oriented district of local shops, restaurants, and services with a distinctive small-town character that reflects Castro Valley's history and culture. Support the upgrade and modernization of Sutter Medical Center Castro Valley in order to provide health services and jobs for the community. Ensure that the hospital site and surrounding sites in the Professional-Medical District are constructed and designed to achieve the community's goals for improving the area along Lake Chabot Road, and to minimize any negative effects on the surrounding community. Provide a wide range of retail sales and services to meet community needs on sites where there is good automobile access and impacts on residential uses can be minimized.
2	2-30		• Prepare <u>or require</u> specific plans, precise plans, or special design guidelines for the following areas: – Madison Common. – EMBUD Site – Johns Drive Area – Crow Canyon Road Area – Jensen Ranch; <u>and</u> – <u>Fairmont Area</u>
2	2-41	Table 2.5-1	Table 2.5-1

			Alameda County Housing Element (~~2001 rev.~~ 2003 rev. 2009)
3.1	3.1-1		Castro Valley's Urban Area encompasses ~~6,014~~ 6,880 acres, most of which are devoted to residential uses (see Figure 3.1-1, Existing Land Uses). Single-family residential uses occupy ~~2,818~~ about 3,000 acres with another ~~425~~ 700 acres used for multi-family development and ~~11~~ 20 acres of mobile home parks. Commercial, medical/dental services and industrial/auto-related uses take up approximately ~~4~~ 3 percent of Castro Valley's land area. Public and quasi-public land uses, including schools, libraries, and churches, comprise about ~~3~~ 12 percent of the land area and ~~12~~ 11 percent is occupied by parks and open space. About ~~294~~ 257 acres, or ~~5.2~~ 4 percent, of the land in Castro Valley is vacant.
3.1	3.1-2	Table 3.1-1	Table 3.1-1 revised
3.1	3.1-7		**Specific Plan for the Upper Madison Avenue/Common Road Area ~~(1975)~~ (2006)** In 2006, the ~~The~~ County ~~is currently updating~~ adopted an updated version of the plan, under the new title of the Madison Area Specific Plan, in order to strengthen its provisions to protect the character of the area. The substantive changes proposed include new policies to preserve existing geologic features, regulations regarding site development review, the encouragement of area residents to form homeowner maintenance associations to manage common areas and infrastructure, and design guidelines that aim to reduce peak stormwater runoff.
3.1	3.1-7		The Eden Area Plan covers the unincorporated land in western Alameda County between the cities of San Leandro and Hayward and to the west of the Castro Valley planning area. ~~The~~ An early draft of the Plan ~~originally~~ included the Fairmont Campus, and the residential neighborhoods between Foothill Freeway and Stanton Avenue ~~Castro~~

			~~Valley,~~ but in 2007, in response to a request from residents of this area, the Board of Supervisors adjusted the Eden Plan area boundary to shift the area above I-580 into the Castro Valley planning area. ~~its authority was superseded by the 1985 Castro Valley General Plan.~~ The County ~~Plan was~~ adopted the revised Eden Area Plan in ~~1981~~ as the General Plan for the Central Metropolitan, Eden, and Washington Planning Units~~ and is in the process of being updated by the County~~. The Eden Area Plan's policies on land use, circulation and parks bear a relationship to the proposed Castro Valley General Plan. ~~The County has prepared a proposed new Eden Area General Plan that was under review as of this writing.~~
3.1	3.1-19		The Proposed General Plan Land Use Diagram is presented in Figure ~~2.3-1~~ 4-2 in Chapter 4.
3.1	3.1-22		As a result of changes to the boundaries of the Eden and Castro Valley General Plans, Fairmont Drive and Miramar Avenue are now within the Castro Valley Planning Area. Hillcrest Knolls and Fairmont Terrace Parks provide 3.0 acres of local park space within a half-mile walk for almost all residents in the Hillcrest Knolls, Fairmont, and El Portal neighborhoods.
3.2	3.2-1	Table 3.2-1	Table 3.2-1 revised.
3.2	3.2-2	Table 3.2-2	Table 3.2-2 revised.
3.2	3.2-1		Castro Valley has about ~~322~~ 325 acres of local (neighborhood) and community parks…
3.2	3.2-13		With full implementation of the proposed General Plan, the number of acres of local and ~~school~~ community parkland per 1,000 residents would ~~increase from 1.4 to 1.7~~ remain at about 5.0 acres per 1,000. This ~~increase would be due, in large park, to~~ will result from the proposed development of 9.7 acres of new neighborhood parkland to serve the northwestern part of the Planning Area. The Plan also proposes to add ~~25~~ more than 5 acres of community parkland and

			recreation facilities, including open areas to serve downtown residents, shoppers, and workers and a new multi-use trail connected to Carlos Bee Park on land in the former Route 238 Corridor. Castro Valley has an existing population of approximately ~~60,200~~ 61,360 residents and about ~~322~~ 325 acres of local and community parks and recreation facilities, an overall ratio of 5.3~~5~~ acres per 1,000 residents. Under the General Plan, the Castro Valley population is expected to increase to about ~~64,935~~ 67,200 residents, which would require the addition of ~~6.6~~ 8.0 acres of neighborhood parks and about ~~19~~ 23 acres of acres of new community parkland to maintain the current parkland ratio. The General Plan proposes to increase local and school park acreage by ~~30~~9.7 acres and to add ~~25~~ about 5 acres of community parkland. Most of the additional local park acreage would result from the development of a new neighborhood park on the surplus EBMUD property or a comparable site in the northwestern part of Castro Valley. The new community parkland would include a new multi-use trail connected to Carlos Bee Park on land in the former Route 238 Corridor. This would ~~increase~~ maintain the current ratio for local and school parks and exceed the County's minimum standard of 5 acres of parkland for every 1,000 residents ~~community parks to 1.7 and 4.1 respectively~~. Although the amount of local and school park acreage would still fall short of HARD's standard of 2.0 acres per 1,000 residents, the overall ratio would exceed the HARD standard as shown in Table 3.2-8.
3.2	3.2-18		Route 238 Corridor Trail. Incorporate a multi-use trail into the plans for development on land in the former Route 238 Corridor.
3.2	3.2-14	Table 3.2-8	Table 3.2-8 revised
3.3	3.3-1		There are ~~16~~ 21 public schools that serve Castro Valley----~~10~~ 12 elementary schools, ~~three~~ five middle schools, and ~~three~~ four high schools…Most of El Portal Ridge, the

			Fairmont area, and Hillcrest Knolls is served by the San Lorenzo Unified School District and a few students in the northernmost part of Hillcrest Knolls attend schools in the San Leandro Unified School District.
3.3	3.3-2	Table 3.3-1	Table 3.3-1 revised
3.3	3.3-6		6. ACFD Station 3,(1430 164th Avenue). This station, which is located outside the planning area, serves Hillcrest Knolls, El Portal Ridge, and the Fairmont Area.
3.3	3.3-9		The Castro Valley and Oro Loma Sanitary Districts handles refuse collection and disposal in the Planning Area. The Districts collects solid waste, hauls it to the Davis Street Transfer Station and then to the Altamont Landfill east of Livermore. The Districts' solid waste programs is are mainly funded by user fees…As of 2007, the per capita disposal rate in unincorporated Alameda County was 3.9 pounds per person per day, below the County's target of 4.9 lbs/person/day. Since 2005, tonnage to the Altamont Landfill has decreased by about 2,000 tons per year. CVSD's total tonnage in 2008 was 26,088. (Castro Valley Sanitary District Annual Report, 2008-2009)…Public education is primarily administered by the Castro Valley Unified School District with the Hayward, San Lorenzo, and San Leandro Unified School Districts serving some sections of Castro Valley. Police protection is provided by the County Sheriff through the County's Extended Police Protection county Service Area and the Alameda County Fire Department provides fire and paramedic service to most of the Planning Area except for the Five Canyons area, which is within the Fairview Fire Protection District. Water supply services are provided by EBMUD while wastewater and solid waste services are the responsibility of the Castro Valley and Oro Loma Sanitary Districts.
3.3	3.3-11		To ensure that new development does not adversely affect the County's ability to provide police and fire services, the total

			projected population under the proposed General Plan at buildout in 2025 (~~64,935~~ 67,191) was divided by 1,000 and then multiplied by the existing ratio of police or fire personnel (1.4 and 1.2, respectively) necessary to maintain the existing ratios for police and fire personnel…Under the proposed General Plan, the projected population would be ~~64,935~~ 67,191 in the year 2025.
3.3	3.3-12		Both ABAG and the State Department of Finance project a decline in Alameda County's school-age population, which can be expected in Castro Valley as well. Youth, or school-aged children, would constitute approximately 18 percent of Castro Valley's population in 2025 down from 20.3 percent in 2000. It is assumed, based on Castro Valley enrollment data, that approximately 87 percent of the youth population would be enrolled in public school in 2025. Table 3.3-3 distributes youth population by grade range and calculates projected demand for public schools in 2025. Due to projected declines in the school age population, despite the anticipated increase in total population, ~~Implementation of the draft Plan could increase~~ total enrollment in the public schools serving Castro Valley can be expected to decline by ~~574~~ about 255 students by year 2025, which is about ~~almost 6~~ 1.5 percent ~~above~~ below the public school enrollment in ~~2004-2005~~ 2008-2009. At the same time, however, there This is an average increase of about 24 students in each of the elementary schools and 54 students in each of the middle schools. While specific capacity of Castro Valley schools is not known, as stated above, Castro Valley middle schools are already at capacity with few spaces available.
3.3	3.3-12	Tables 3.3-2 and 3.3-3	Tables 3.3-2 and 3.3-3 revised
3.3	3.3-16		Alameda County requires development to comply with the requirements of the State's model water efficient landscaping ordinance.

			The Castro Valley Sanitary District also encourages developers to use the Bay-Friendly Landscaping Guidelines for new development. New policy and action: Policy 9.32 Water Conservation. Support efforts to conserve water by encouraging new development to incorporate measures that will reduce water usage and educating the public about the importance of water conservation. Action 9.3-2 Water Conservation. Reduce the need for developing new water supply sources by requiring new development to incorporate water conservation measures to decrease peak water use. These measures may include, but are not limited to: • Requiring water efficient plumbing fixtures and appliances; • Adopting and implementing a water efficient landscaping ordinance in compliance with State law; • Requiring efficient irrigation systems; and • Facilitating the use of recycled water irrigation systems.
3.4	3.4-21		This section describes the current (2006) transportation network and summarizes the effects on the future transportation and circulation system associated with the General Plan Update.
3.4	3.4-21		Arterial roadways include Castro Valley Boulevard, Redwood Road, Lake Chabot Road, Grove Way, Foothill Expressway, Fairmont Drive, and Crow Canyon Road.
3.4	3.4-22		Collectors usually serve shorter trips and collect trips from residential streets and distribute them to arterials. Collectors include Center Street, Norbridge Avenue, Stanton Avenue, 150th Avenue and Somerset Avenue.
3.4	3.4-23	Figure 3.4-1	Figure 3.4-1 Local Streets, Traffic Volumes,

			and Classifications revised
3.4	3.4-28		~~Six~~ Eight AC Transit bus routes, NX 4, M, 50, 80, 84, 87, 91 and 93, travel through Castro Valley, and four additional routes serve the surrounding area. AC Transit buses serve the Castro Valley BART station and downtown as well as recreation activities at Don Castro Park (AC Transit route 80), and the Cull Canyon bike & hike trails (AC Transit route 87). The ~~frequency of these~~ routes ~~is~~ generally run every 15 to 30 minutes. The transit lines are shown in Figure 3.4-2.
3.4	3.4-29		The Bicycle Master Plan also proposed a Class 3a Rideway on Miramar Avenue between Stanton Avenue and Foothill Boulevard and Class 2 bike lanes on Foothill Boulevard north of Miramar Avenue and on Fairmont Drive between Foothill Blvd and Hesperian Blvd. The latter connects to Bay Fair BART via 14th Street.
3.4	3.4-31	Figures 3.4-2 and 3.4-3	Figures 3.4-2 Existing Transit Network and 3.4-3 Bicycle Network revised
3.4	3.4-33		The plan identifies key pedestrian activity corridors in Castro Valley, including Castro Valley Boulevard, Redwood Road, Lake Chabot Road, Center Street, Seven Hill Road, Somerset Avenue, Heyer Avenue, ~~and~~ Anita Avenue, Fairmont Drive, Miramar Avenue, Manchester Road, Roland Avenue and Foothill Boulevard. Specifically, four priority projects have been identified in the Castro Valley area including Marshall Elementary School – Safe Routes to School, Stanton Elementary School – Safe Routes to School, Castro Valley Boulevard Streetscape Improvements, and Hillcrest Knolls Walkability Study.
3.4	3.4-36 and 3.4-38	Tables 3.4-6, 3.4-8 and 3.4-9	Tables 3.4-6, 3.4-8 and 3.4-9 revised
3.4	3.4-41		~~Policy 6.1-3 Make land use decisions that promote a multi-modal transportation system and reduce reliance on the privte automobile.~~

			~~Allow higher density development near transit and mixed use.~~ Action 6.1-3 Develop an alternative multimodal composite level of service standard or approved list of flexible level of service mitigation options that would apply within the infill opportunity zone.
3.4	3.4-42		Action 6.3-3 Consider converting Miramar Avenue and 167th-Stanton into a one-way couplet, or other traffic calming strategy, to reduce impacts of traffic between areas west of I-580 and Sutter Medical Center Castro Valley.
3.4	3.4-42		(a) Stanton/Norbridge Avenues and Castro Valley Boulevard ~~would~~ operate at LOS E with an average delay of 70.7 seconds per vehicle and LOS F with an average delay of 99.5 seconds per vehicle during the AM and PM peak hours, respectively under the existing conditions. It would operate at LOS F with and without the Proposed Project during both peak hours. Vehicles would experience an increase in average delay by 52.8 seconds and ~~47.3~~ 48.6 seconds during no project and with project conditions, respectively, in the AM peak hour and an increase by 88.5 seconds and ~~84.7~~ 93 seconds during the PM peak hour. As the substandard operation is a pre-existing condition and the impact of the Proposed Project is less than that of the No Project condition in the AM peak hour and would increase delay by less than 5 seconds compared to the No Project in the PM peak hour, the project impact is considered less than significant.
3.4	3.4-44		Policy 6.4-2 Promote carpooling and vanpooling to reduce reliance on the private automobile
3.4	3.4-45		Action 6.4-2 Work with AC Transit, BART, the Castro Valley, San Lorenzo, and Hayward School Districts, other major employers, colleges, and Alameda County cities to establish a transit pass program for em ployees and students.

3.4	3.4-46		Action 6.4-13 Establish shuttle service between BART and County facilities at Fairmont. Evaluate feasibility of requiring all businesses with over 200 employees at a single location, or large scale new development over 100,000 square feet, to contribute to the cost of providing shuttle service from central employment locations to BART.
3.4	3.4-46 and 3.4-47		Action 6.5-4 Identify a funding source and schedule for implementing those high priority projects in the Countywide Bicycle Plan that would improve conditions for cyclists within the community ~~including widening curb lanes and/or constructing shoulders as necessary to provide bike lanes on:~~ ~~Lake Chabot Road;~~ ~~Redwood Road; and~~ ~~Crow Canyon Road~~.
3.4	3.4-47		Action 6.6-1 Prepare and implement a capital improvement program over the next 20 years that eliminates sidewalk gaps and improves substandard conditions in identified Pedestrian Activity Corridors within Castro Valley, prioritizing Heyer, Mable, Santa Maria, San Miguel, Anita, Orange, and Stanton Avenues; Proctor Road; Christensen Lane; and Marshall Street. Action 6.6-2 Install curbs, gutters, sidewalks, pedestrian crossing improvements and/or landscaping improvements along Somerset Avenue, Stanton Avenue, Miramar Avenue, 167th Avenue, Seven Hills Road, upper Lake Chabot Road, Heyer Avenue, and Center Street.
3.4	3.4-48		Policy 6.6-9 Plan Downtown projects to balance the needs of automobiles with pedestrian comfort and scale and to include pedestrian amenities that will create comfortable and pleasant places to walk.

3.4	3.4-49		Action ~~4.7-16~~4.7-5 Create a transit village adjacent to the BART station using the following strategies: • Amend the CBD Specific Plan to rezone Sub-area 8 to Transit Village (TOD-R); • Evaluate the feasibility of designating and developing the BART Station area as a "Transit Village" under State law in order to maximize funding opportunities;
3.4	3.4-49		Action 4.7-4 ~~4.7-15~~ Renovate and add new public and private facilities to create an integrated, attractive, pedestrian-oriented retail area, which serves as the heart of Castro Valley. Within this sub-area: • Amend the CBD Specific Plan to rezone Sub-area 7 to Core Pedestrian Re-tail (CBD-5); • Create a Village Green; • Add new retail space; • Consolidate parking behind structures; and • Build a new parking structure.
3.5	3.5-3	Figure 3.5-1	Figure 3.5-1 Biological Resources revised
3.5	3.5-19	Figure 3.5-2	Figure 3.5-2 Biological Resources Overlay Zone revised
3.6	3.6-2		In January 2009, the Alameda County Board of Supervisors adopted an ordinance accepting the State's Very High Fire Severity Zone Maps for two unincorporated areas in which the County Fire Department has responsibility, one of which includes lands in and around Hillcrest Knolls.
3,7	3,7-9		~~There are no~~ The only monitoring station~~s located within~~ in Castro Valley~~. The station at San Leandro~~ is located on the site of the

			Alameda County Hospital ~~is nearest to the planning area (located to~~ on the western edge of the planning area, ~~) and can be considered to be representative of the air quality in the planning area.~~
3.7	3.7-13		The California Air Resources Board recommends against locating sensitive uses within 500 feet of a freeway. This recommendation is based on a number of studies that identify an association with respiratory symptoms, asthma exacerbation, and decreases in lung function in children living near a freeway. In traffic-related studies, the health risk attributable to proximity was seen within 1000 feet and was strongest within 300 feet. California freeway studies show a decline of about 70 percent in particulate pollution levels at 500 feet. The BAAQMD's Thresholds of Significance (May, 2011) establish 500 feet as the minimum setback from freeways and high volume roadways necessary to reduce health risks to less than significant levels. The BAAQMD has also established Thresholds of Significance with respect to community risk and hazard impacts of toxic air contaminants. These require the Plan to identify special overlay zones around existing and planned sources of toxic air contaminants (TACs) and particulate matter (PM).
3.7	3.7-23		New policies to further reduce impact: Action 12.1-4 Site Design Criteria/Development Standards for Projects Adjacent to I-580. Establish site design criteria and standards for development sites adjacent to the Interstate 580 corridor through Castro Valley (particularly parcels located downwind of the prevailing winds) to help reduce potential adverse air quality impacts. Also consider if there are any odor sources near the sites and whether mitigations should be required. Examples of design requirements and mitigations include, but would not be limited to: • Orienting building openings and open areas, such as patios and decks, associated

			with sensitive land uses (residential, schools, hospitals, convalescent homes, parks, etc.) away from I-580; and • Requiring minimum landscaped setbacks for buffer areas. • Introducing landscaping and vegetation, which can absorb carbon monoxide, to buffer sensitive land uses. Action 12.1-5 BAAQMD's Dust Abatement Approach. Require sponsors of individual development projects requiring site development and/or environmental review to implement the BAAQMD's approach to dust abatement through conditions of approval. This calls for "basic" control measures that should be implemented at all construction sites, "enhanced" control measures that should be implemented in addition to the basic control measures at construction sites greater than four acres in area, and "optional" control measures that should be implemented on a case-by-case basis at construction sites that are large in area, located near sensitive receptors or which, for any other reason, may warrant additional emissions reductions (BAAQMD, 1999).
3.7	3.7-26		ADDITIONAL REFERENCE Bay Area Air Quality Management District, *California Environmental Quality Act, Air Quality Guidelines*, May 2011 <http://www.baaqmd.gov/~/media/Files/Planning%20and%20Research/CEQA/BAAQMD%20CEQA%20Guidelines_May%202011_5_3_11.ashx>
3.8	3.8-2		Noise Sources in Castro Valley ~~The major existing noise sources in Castro Valley are transportation-related. Interstate 580 (I-580) is the primary source of roadway noise but major thoroughfares with higher speeds, traffic volumes, and truck usage also generate notable levels of noise. These roadways include Castro Valley Boulevard, Lake Chabot Road (north of Strobridge Ave),~~

			~~Grove Way (east of Center Street), and Redwood Road/"A" Street. BART trains also generate significant levels of noise, although for a short duration. Because the BART tracks in Castro Valley are located within the median of I-580, these noise sources affect the same areas. Depending on meteorological conditions, however, residents living some distance from BART may also hear trains.~~ ~~Another noise source is the intermittent helicopter usage at Eden Medical Center. The Medical Center provides helicopter service for medical emergencies. The helistop, now located in the parking area northwest of the hospital, is used about two to three times a week for the transfer of critical need patients.~~ The dominant sources of noise throughout the community are transportation-related. For roadways, more noise is generated as vehicle speed and weight increase, although the noise is continuous and background in nature. Interstate 580 is the main source of roadway noise in Castro Valley, although major thoroughfares with higher speeds, traffic volumes, and truck usage also generate notable levels of noise. These roadways include Castro Valley Boulevard, Lake Chabot Road (north of Strobridge Avenue and east of Interstate 580/Foothill Expressway), Grove Way (east of Center Street), and Redwood Road/"A" Street. Areas above I-580/Foothill Expressway are exposed to traffic noise levels ranging from 68 to 73 dBA at a distance of 50 feet of the roadway during the day and 59 to 69 dBA at night according to noise measurements conducted by Illingworth & Rodkin for the Eden Area General Plan in 2006. Other roadways with higher than acceptable noise levels were 158th Avenue and Lake Chabot Road near I-580. Noise levels 50 feet from the roadway measured 64 to 69 dBA on 158th Avenue and 70 to 75 dBA on Lake Chabot Road. BART trains are another transportation feature that generates significant levels of noise, although for a short duration. In Castro Valley, the BART trains are located

			within the median of I-580 so these noise sources impact the same areas. Depending on meteorological conditions, residents living some distance from BART may also hear trains. Sutter Medical Center Castro Valley is the most significant noise source in the planning area that is not part of the transportation system. In addition to generating vehicle traffic, a noise source that is not regulated by the County Noise Ordinance, the noise impacts from hospital operations include loading dock activities, mechanical equipment, and flights to and from the helistop. A log of helicopter operations during a 21-month period in 2006-08 recorded 149 helicopter flights, about a third of which occurred between the hours of 7 p.m. to 7 a.m.
3.8	3-8-2		Figure 3.8-2 shows the expected future levels of noise generated by Castro Valley's transportation corridors. The map uses CNEL (Community Noise Equivalent Level) measurements, which are based on a noise measurement scale that reflects all noise received at the measurement point over a 24-hour period. Weighting factors of 5 and 10 dBA are applied to evening and night periods to allow for greater sensitivity to noise during these hours. As the map shows, weighted noise levels above 70 dB are ~~only~~ expected around I-580 and Fairmont Drive, with noise levels gradually dissipating to below 55 dB about a half a mile from the highway. Due primarily to traffic on I-580, noise levels along Foothill Boulevard are expected to continue to exceed 75 dba The major surface streets in Castro Valley will generate some noise as well, with receptors along Lake Chabot Road experiencing up to 55 dB, and along Redwood Road, Center Street, and Crow Canyon Road receiving up to 60 dB. The Central Business District is largely in a 60 dB zone, due to sound from I-580 and BART operations. Sutter Medical Center will continue to

			generate noise that affects residential areas to the north and west but some features incorporated in the new hospital should help to reduce the impact of mechanical equipment and loading dock activities. Despite the construction of a sound wall along Stanton Avenue, the noise received by nearby residents from delivery trucks using the loading dock on the west side of the new hospital will exceed County noise standards. The Stanton Avenue sound wall and a sound barrier around the central utility yard will reduce noise from mechanical equipment to levels that meet the county's exterior noise standards. In addition to the sound barrier around the yard, enclosures will be installed around emergency generators and boilers and rooftop HVAC equipment.
3.8	3-8-4		Helicopter Noise The draft General Plan does not include any proposals that would change the frequency of helicopter flights. ~~Eden Medical Center had proposed to temporarily relocate the helistop to the roof of its Lake Chabot Road parking structure during construction of a new hospital building and then to the roof of the new hospital. Due to increased construction costs, the Medical Center is now considering retaining and retrofitting the existing hospital instead of constructing a new building. Seismic repairs and reconstruction of the existing hospital building would probably be exempt from environmental review under CEQA.~~ The new helistop, 185 feet northeast of the current location, is not expected to increase noise levels but helicopter overflights at night will continue to disturb nearby residents. Changes in flight paths are, however, subject to approval by the California Department of Aeronautics, based on construction clearance considerations, wind directions, and minimizing impacts on nearby land use.
3.8	3.8-4		Construction Noise

			~~More than 2,000~~ About 2,400 additional dwelling units and close to 524,000 square feet of non-residential construction could occur under the proposed General Plan. About ~~a quarter~~ 45 percent of the dwelling units including new second units would be built in existing residential areas, ~~42~~ 37 percent ~~would be in new neighborhoods, and the rest would be~~ in the CBD, and the rest in neighborhood mixed-use areas and other new housing areas. This construction would expose existing residences and businesses to construction noise
3.8	3.8-7	Figure 3.8-2	Revised Figure 3.8-2 Future Noise Contours
3.8	3.8-9		About ~~58~~ 55 percent of the additional residential development projected under the draft Plan is expected to be in new multi-family development and ~~74 percent~~ more than two-thirds of these units are anticipated in and near the Central Business District (CBD).
3.9	3.9-2		In addition to the Hayward Fault, several others, including the west and east Chabot Faults and the so-called Carlos Bee Fault, cross the western part of the planning area to the east of the Hayward zone. Other regional faults, including the San Andreas, Calaveras or Rodgers Creek, could also affect Castro Valley. A moderate to major earthquake on any of these faults could topple buildings, disrupt infrastructure, cripple the transportation system, and trigger landslides. Geologists consider the Chabot and Carlos Bee faults inactive because there is no evidence of movement within the past 35,000 years.
3.9	3.9-4		Regions within Castro Valley that have high to very high levels of liquefaction susceptibility ~~include the western edge of the city and other~~ are, for the most part, low-lying lands along the creeks that flow into San Lorenzo Creek. These include areas underlain by alluvial deposits that are in the FEMA-mapped flood plains along Chabot, Castro Valley, Cull, and Crow Creeks and in

			Eden and Hollis Canyon in the eastern part of the planning area as shown in Figure 3.9-1.
3.9			NEW SECTION Based on maps that dam owners are required to file with the State Office of Emergency Services, several Castro Valley neighborhoods are susceptible to flooding that could occur as a result of dam failure. Such failures are typically associated with seismic activity. The Upper San Leandro and Chabot Reservoirs are the largest facilities that could affect the planning area but most of the areas subject to inundation are undeveloped lands outside the County's Urban Growth Boundary. Two other reservoirs, Almond and South, pose a potential threat to residential neighborhoods.
3.9	3.9-4		The areas with the highest susceptibility to landslides in Castro Valley are in the upland areas in the northern and eastern parts of the planning area and in steep hillside areas above Foothill Boulevard in the El Portal and Fairmont Ridge neighborhoods as illustrated in Figure 3.9-1. The State Division of Mines and Geology's Seismic Hazard Zone map (July 2003) identifies the area to the south of the County Justice Center and northeast of Alameda County Medical Center as particularly susceptible to earthquake based on previous occurrence of landslide movement, geologic conditions and proximity to the Hayward Fault.
3.9	3.9-5	*Figure 3.9-1*	Revised Figure 3.9-1 Soils and Seismic Hazards
			Maximum anticipated ground shaking intensities within the Castro Valley area are illustrated in Figure 3.9-2. Ground shaking could be Category X, Very Violent, in the westernmost areas of Castro Valley closest to the Hayward Fault; and Category IX, Violent, in the entire western half of Castro Valley. In the eastern half of Castro Valley, ground shaking is predicted to be Category VIII, Very Strong. Based upon the MM intensity scale, damage in areas immediately

			bordering the fault could be significant.
3.9	3.9-15		ADD TO PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN POLICIES THAT REDUCE THE IMPACT Action 10.3-4 Use of Soils and Seismic Hazards Map at County's Planning Counter. Place a copy of Figure 10-3, Soils and Seismic Hazards, at the County's Planning Counter to advise project applicants in Castro Valley that the property is in an area at risk for liquefaction, landslides or ground-shaking. Action 10.3-5 Adoption of Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan. Adopt and amend as needed a Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan in order to maintain eligibility for full federal assistance in the event of a natural disaster, per the requirements of the federal Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000. Action 10.3-6 Steep Slopes. On sites with existing slopes greater than 30 percent, require grading so that no development is located where the slope exceeds 30 percent. Action 10.3-7 Re-vegetation. Aspects of all development in hillside areas, including grading, vegetation removal and drainage, should be carefully controlled in order to minimize erosion, disruption to natural slope stability, and landslide hazards: • Ensure re-vegetation of cut-and-fill slopes to control erosion. • Plant materials for revegetation should not be limited to hydro-seeding and mulching with annual grasses. Trees add structure to the soil and take up moisture while adding color and diversity. • Ensure blending of cut-and-fill slopes within existing contours, and provision of horizontal variation, in order to mitigate the artificial appearance of engineered slopes. • Ensure structural integrity of sites previously filled before approving

			redevelopment.
3.9	3.9-15		ADDITIONAL REFERENCES Association of Bay Area Governments, *Dam Failure Inundation Hazard Map for Castro Valley*, http://www.abag.ca.gov/cgi-bin/pickdamx.pl ESA Consultants Inc./William Lettis & Associates, "Seismic Evaluation of South Reservoir Embankments", East Bay Municipal Utility District, December 1996
3.10	3.10-3	Figure 3.10-1	Figure 3.10-1 revised.
3.10	3.10-25		ADDITIONAL REFERENCE Alameda County Public Works Agency, *Stormwater Quality Control Requirements*. Available at <http://www.acgov.org/pwa/brochure%209_05%20final.pdf>
3.11	3.11-1		Activities at Sutter Medical Center Castro Valley are expected to continue involving a variety of chemical compounds and products that are considered hazardous materials. These include chemicals, biological wastes, and radioactive materials. Hazardous materials that are not consumed and can not be reused are picked up on a regular basis and transported by licensed transporters to offsite disposal and/or recycling facilities.
3.11	3.11-2		As indicated in Table 3.11-1, there are 19 LUFT sites, 37 hazardous material handling facilities, one facility listed with the EPA for air emissions, and one SLIC facility within Castro Valley. There is also one Castro Valley site on the State Department of Toxic Substances Control's (DTSC) Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List - Site Cleanup (Cortese List). DTSC has issued an order requiring remediation following investigations that showed contamination by tetrachloroethylene associated with the dry cleaning establishment located on the site.

3.11	3.11-2	Table 3.11-1	Table 3.11-1 revised.
3.11	3.11-4		According to the EPA's Resource Conservation and Recovery Act information site, there are ~~37~~ 40 facilities in Castro Valley that have reported hazardous waste activities, of which ~~23~~ 25 are small quantity generators, ~~3~~ 4 are large quantity generators, and 6 are transporters. The majority of these sites are auto-oriented commercial uses or dry-cleaning facilities.
3.11	3.11-7	Figure 3.11-1	Figure 3.11-1 Hazardous Materials Sites revised.
3.11	3.11-14		Implementation of the proposed General Plan is anticipated to result in a moderate increase in Castro Valley's population, particularly in areas that have been in predominantly non-residential use. In addition, the Plan proposes creation of a new Professional-Medical District in the area near Castro Valley Boulevard that includes the ~~Eden~~ Sutter Medical Center Castro Valley. The amount of hazardous ….There ~~are no~~ is one site~~s~~ within Castro Valley that ~~are~~ is on the DTSC's Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List - Site Cleanup (Cortese List).
3.11	3.11-14		Build-out of Castro Valley under the proposed Plan is projected to increase the number of residents by about ~~5,000~~. 5,800 This additional population would likely result in the increased usage of common household hazardous materials, such as cleaning solutions, pool supplies, pesticides, herbicides, solvents, paints, and vehicle lubricants and fuel.
3.11	3.11-15		As previously indicated, ~~37~~ 40 facilities in Castro Valley report handling hazardous materials. Twenty~~-three~~ –five of these facilities are small quantity generators and ~~three~~ four are large quantity generators.
3.11	3.11-16		~~No land within~~ One site in the Planning Area, a commercial dry cleaning establishment, is on the DTSC's Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List - Site Cleanup (Cortese

			List).
3.11	3.11-17		ADDITIONAL REFERENCE Environmental Science Associates, *Sutter Medical Center, Castro Valley, Replacement Hospital Project, Draft Environmental Impact Report (SCH 2008052019),* Prepared for County of Alameda, December 2008.
3.12	3.1203		The Alameda County Parks, Recreation & Historical Commission has designed 41 sites within Castro Valley as Structures of Merit. Several of these sites are also listed in the State Historical Resources Inventory (SHRI) but other properties lack such protection. A list of landmarks and contributing buildings prepared by County consultants includes 19 in Castro Valley. Another 21 properties have been identified as potential structures of merit. In all, 56 properties are on a list of sites in the unincorporated area that the County Parks, Recreation, and Historic Resources Commission (PRHC) has selected for documentation. This information would be provided to the State Office of Historic Preservation to determine their eligibility for listing in the California Historic Resources Inventory. The properties that may be eligible for inclusion in the State Inventory include 19th century barns and farmhouses in the canyons, Victorian-era cottages, early 20th century bungalows, and a variety of commercial buildings dating from the 1920's and 1930's such as the Chabot Theater and the former feed store building at 2544 Castro Valley Boulevard. Some of the sites are located in neighborhoods and districts, like the western portion of Castro Valley Boulevard, that have retained their distinctive character because they include clusters of buildings that are typical of a particular style that was prevalent during a period of historical significance.
3.12	3.12-4		• Fairmont Hospital, 1936. William G.

			Corlett was the architect for several of the ward buildings that were built by the Works Project Administratiion. Corlett and his firm designed a number of school, hospital, and other public projects built under the WPA including the Alameda County Courthouse and Berkeley High School's Community Theatre.
3.12	3.12-7		The County ~~has not adopted~~ is considering adoption of an ordinance that provides for the designation of landmarks ~~or regulation~~ and review of projects that propose demolition or alteration of historic or potentially historic structures. After reviewing and receiving comments on a first draft of the ordinance, the Commission recommended that the draft be revised to make participation voluntary. Owners whose property is listed on the draft County Register of Historic Resources would be given an opportunity to opt out of the program within 90 days following the adoption of the ordinance. Properties not listed on the draft Register could only be included with the property owner's consent. ~~As a result~~ At present, the County uses the environmental review process to evaluate and mitigate impacts on potentially historic and cultural resources on a case-by-case basis.
3.12	3.12-12 and 3.12-13		ADDITIONAL REFERENCES Alameda County Parks, Recreation & Historical Commission, *Alameda County Landmarks & Contributing Buildings Identified in 2005-2008 Comprehensive Survey* Alameda County Parks, Recreation & Historical Commission, *Alameda County Landmarks & Contributing Buildings Identified in Previous Historic Surveys* Alameda County Parks, Recreation & Historical Commission, *Alameda County Structures of Merit*, October 17, 2007 Alameda County Parks, Recreation &

			Historical Commission, *Draft Alameda County Register: Properties Selected by the PRHC to Have a DPR 523 Form Drafted and Additional Properties*, 2007 Draft Historic Preservation Ordinance for the County of Alameda, December 2007, May 2011 <http://www.acgov.org/cda/planning/landuseprojects/phpo.htm>
3.14	3-14		New section on Climate Change
4.2	4-9		• Mixed use development on neighborhood commercial sites at Lake Chabot ~~and~~ near Seven Hills Road~~s~~, Redwood Road and James Street, on Foothill Boulevard near Miramar and Fairmont, and Heyer Avenue and Center Street; and • Reduced residential development in areas with slopes over 30 percent, riparian corridors, and lands in designated high fire hazard areas. Most of these land use changes would result from the adoption of zoning regulations to conform to proposed changes in land use under either the draft Plan or the Reduced Travel Lane Alternative. ~~Table 4.2-1~~ Tables 2.3-1, 2.3-2, and 2.3-3 describe the proposed new land use classifications. Table 4.2-1 deleted.
4.2	4-11	Table 4.2-2	Table 4.2-2 revised
4.2	4-12		The total amount of parkland and permanent open space would, however, be significantly lower under the No Project Alternative because all existing parks would continue to be classified as residential land. The ~~undeveloped 25-acre EBMUD property, which the draft Plan proposes as a neighborhood park, would also be classified as residential land in the No Project Alternative~~ draft Plan retains the residential designation for the EBMUD property but requires that development of the site be subject to preparation of a specific or master

			plan that reserves part of the property for a park to serve the surrounding neighborhood as well as the new residents…. Table 4.2-3 compares the projected total parkland acreage in the Planning Area assuming that the park dedication requirement is the only program used to implement parkland goals under the No Project alternative and ~~half of the new units are single-family dwellings~~ the EBMUD site is developed with housing and a 10-acre park.
4.2	4-12	Table 4.2-3	Table 4.2-3 revised.
4.2	4-13		Under the No Project alternative, ~~1,328 (53.6 percent)~~ more than two-thirds of the housing units added by 2025 would be single-family residential units compared with ~~794 (38.0~~ about 1,000 new single-family homes (about 41 percent) under either the draft Plan or the Reduced Lane Alternative. Moreover, the draft Plan proposes more development on smaller lots, including a new land use classification that would allow small-lot subdivisions. Under the No Project Alternative, more new units would be provided in areas where single-family development predominates. Because the amount of water used by single-family development is higher than the usage in multi-family units and development on larger single-family lots requires more for irrigation, water consumption and wastewater generation can both be expected to be higher under the No-Project Alternative. The No-Project Alternative would also have a somewhat greater impact on public schools. Assuming an average household size of 2.62 persons for the proposed project under both alternatives and no change in the proportion of the population between the ages of 5 to 19, the ~~additional public school enrollment~~ school age population at build-out in 2025 ~~would is projected to be 875~~ could generate about 120 more youth population under the 1985 Plan (No Project) ~~compared with 570 for~~ than either the proposed Plan or the Reduced Lanes alternative as shown in Table

			4.2-4. The increase in the Castro Valley Unified School District could be about 570 under the proposed Plan compared with 875 under the No Project alternative. Because it was not possible to determine the number of students from Castro Valley who attend public schools in the San Lorenzo and Hayward Unified School Districts, it is not possible to gauge the effect of the proposed Plan on those schools. Because the proposed Plan includes policies that would reduce the number of new units that could be built on steeply sloped lots, it can be expected that the number of new single family homes built in areas within the San Lorenzo and San Leandro Districts (Hillcrest Knolls, Fairmont Terrace, and part of El Portal Ridge), the proposed Plan could have less of an enrollment impact on those schools. This is probably a conservative estimate because the model used to generate population and development projections is not sensitive to differences in average household size between single-family and multi-family units. In fact, because a larger proportion of the units would be single-family homes under the No Project alternative, it is reasonable to assume that there may be more children in the average household.
4.2	4-13	Table 4.2-4	Table 4.2-4 revised.
4.2	4-15		The number of vehicle trips generated and vehicle miles traveled are anticipated to be ~~slightly higher~~ about the same under the No Project Alternative, ~~than with~~ the proposed General Plan ~~or~~ and the Reduced Lane Alternative. (See Table 4.2-5) This is due to the slightly higher numbers of households and jobs under the ~~No Project alternative~~ proposed Plan as shown in Table 4.2-2. Although the VMT per household is anticipated to be lower under the proposed Plan with more development occurring in and around the CBD, the total number of daily vehicle trips and miles traveled is projected to be about the same under either the draft Plan or the Reduced Lane Alternative.

4.2	4-15	Table 4.2-5	Table 4.2-5: Daily Vehicle Trips and Vehicle Miles of Travel for Build-out (2025) Conditions revised
4.2	4-17 and 4-18	Tables 4.2-7 and 4.2-8	Tables 4.2-7: Roadway Segment Operations and 4.2-8: Intersection Operations w. Proposed Project revised
4.2	4-20		CLIMATE CHANGE In 2005, emission from transportation accounted for more than two-thirds of the total estimated greenhouse gas emissions generated by Castro Valley residents and employees. During the 20 year planning period, from 2005 to 2025, implementation of the General Plan is projected to result in an increase of about 2,400 dwelling units, a 9.5 percent increase in population from 61,400 to 67,200, and the net addition of 202,300 of non-residential floor area. The Plan also anticipates the addition of about 1,600 jobs, a 17.3 percent increase. These figures are only slightly higher than increases projected under the 1985 Plan (the No Project alternative). Moreover, based on ABAG projections 2005, Castro Valley's share of the population and jobs in the unincorporated area will decline from about 39 percent of the unincorporated area's service population to 36 percent. At build-out, due to increases in population and employment, implementation of the proposed Castro Valley General Plan could increase total emissions by about 6 percent. but would result in about a 4 percent decline in emissions per capita. Compared with the No Project alternative, per capita emissions would be slightly lower under either the Proposed Plan or the Reduced Lane Alternative because the Plan incorporates a variety of measures that would encourage increased use of alternatives to the private automobile. Measures that could further reduce GHG emissions include improvements to the bicycle/pedestrian infrastructure and increased multi-family development close to BART and other

			transit.
5.1	5-1		The proposed Plan would directly result in increased population, employment and economic growth throughout Castro Valley, especially in the CBD and residential areas with vacant or under-developed lots. The Plan would have the following specific impacts on growth: • Under build-out conditions in 2025, the proposed Plan is projected to add ~~4,735~~ 5,834 new residents to the 2005 population. This is ~~1,035~~ 2,134 more than ABAG's projected 2025 population; however the ABAG projection ~~it~~ does include about 2,560 Five Canyons area residents who were not included in the Castro Valley Planning Area at the time ABAG's projections were generated. • Under build-out conditions in 2025, the proposed Plan would add ~~2,090~~ 2,442 housing units to the number of units in 2005. This also exceeds ABAG's projections due to the inclu-sion of the Five Canyons area and the fact that ABAG's 2005 projections did not re-flect the County's approval of higher densities in the CBD. • Under build-out conditions in 2025, the Plan would add ~~1,460~~ about 1,600 new jobs, a ~~16~~ 17 percent increase over the estimated 9,275 existing in 2005. ~~This is 151 fewer employees than ABAG projected.~~ These increases in population, housing and employment are relatively modest and would not induce growth in surrounding unincorporated communities or cities. The additional housing would help Castro Valley to provide its fair share of the regional housing allocated to Alameda County's unincorporated area. More than half of the new units would be multi-family and mixed-use development in the Central Business District and most of the remainder would be infill development on the few remaining vacant sites or redevelopment of already built-out sites in the rest of Castro Valley. Even with the projected addition of ~~1,460~~

			about 1,600 jobs, Castro Valley will remain a predominantly residential community with more than three times as many employed residents as jobs.
5.3	5-3		The draft Plan envisions ~~building~~ the construction of about ~~approximately 2,090~~ 2,400 new housing units over the build-out period until the year 2025. The addition of new housing units reflects specific changes that Alameda County adopted in 2005 to ensure that it would be able to accommodate its share of the Regional Housing Needs Assessment for the County's unincorporated areas. The draft Plan proposes to provide employment opportunities as well as housing in a community that is well-served by transit and regional transportation routes. No mitigation would be necessary.
Appendix C	1		The traffic forecasts were based on the most recent version (during the period when the comments on the NOP were issued) of the Countywide Model, which uses Association of Bay Area Government's (ABAG) Projections 2002 (P'02) socio-economic forecasts. Modifications to the model network for the Year 2025 analysis, as discussed and approved by the ACCMA, include the removal of the Hayward Bypass and modifications to I-580 ramps in Castro Valley associated with the Redwood Road interchange project. The socio-economic data for Castro Valley were modified for the 2025 forecasts. The table below summarizes the changes in land use in Castro Valley for the Baseline (original ACCMA model), No Project (revised to reflect 1985 General Plan), and With Project (General Plan Update). Most of the land added to the Planning Area is within traffic zones that were included in the forecasts presented in the 2007 DEIR. As a result, the difference in population and employment projections is negligible.
Appendix C	1	Table 1	Table 1 revised.

Table 2.3-1: Residential Land Use Classifications

Land Use Category	Description	Corresponding Existing Zoning	Proposed Zoning	Maximum Density (Units per Net Acre)
Rural Residential	This designation is intended to retain opportunities for rural living with very low density, one-family detached housing on large lots greater than 20,000 square feet in size. The primary purpose is residential with the secondary purpose being crops, orchards, and gardens, and limited animal-keeping.	R-1(B-40); R-1(B-E, CSU, RV); R-1(L, B-E)	RR-40; RR-20	1-2
Hillside Residential	This designation is used in areas of steep slopes and/or high fire hazard areas to ensure that adequate mitigations are identified for the development of one-family detached dwellings. Lots range from 5,000 to 10,000 square feet resulting in residential densities between 4 and 8 units per net acre. Minimum lot sizes are to be based on the slope.	R-1 (B-E, CSU, RV); R-1 (B-E)	RH-10: minimum 10,000 sf lot; RH-8: minimum 8,000 sf lot; RH-7.5: minimum 7,500 sf lot; RH-6.5: minimum 6,500 sf lot; RH-5: minimum 5,000 sf lot	4-8
Residential - Single Family	This land use category provides for and protects established neighborhoods of one-family dwellings. Community facilities compatible with low-density residential uses ranging from 4 to 8 units per net acre are allowed.	R-1 (BE) R-1 (5000)	R-1-7.5: minimum 7,500 sf lot; R-1-5: minimum 5,000 sf lot	6-8

Table 2.3-1: Residential Land Use Classifications

Land Use Category	Description	Corresponding Existing Zoning	Proposed Zoning	Maximum Density (Units per Net Acre)
Residential - Small Lot	This designation is intended to provide for and protect small lot subdivisions where a variety of housing types are located on lots between 2,500 and 5,000 square feet in size. Housing types include one-family detached, duplexes, townhouses, and rowhouses. Residential densities range from 8 to 17 units per net acre.	RS; R-2; RS(D-35); RS(D-25)	RSL-5: One-family detached, duplexes and townhouses with maximum 5,000 sf lot area per unit; RSL-3.5: Small one-family detached with 3,500 to 5,000 square foot lot per unit; RSL-2.5: Duplexes and townhouses with 2,500 square foot lot per unit	8-17
Residential - Low Density Multifamily	This designation is intended for high density townhouses, and low density multi-family residential uses such as garden apartments and condominiums. Typical lot sizes are 2,000 square feet per unit. Residential densities range from 18 to 22 units per net acre.	R-3; RS(D-20)	RLM	18-22
Residential - Medium Density Multifamily	This designation is intended for medium density apartments and condominiums. Typical lot sizes are 1,500 square feet per unit. Residential densities range from 23 to 29 units per net acre.	RS(D-3); RS(D-15)	RM	23-29

Table 2.3-1: Residential Land Use Classifications

Land Use Category	Description	Corresponding Existing Zoning	Proposed Zoning	Maximum Density (Units per Net Acre)
Residential - Mixed Density	This land use category is intended to provide a variety of housing types near commercial business districts while maintaining the existing character and development pattern of the neighborhood. The housing types include one-family dwellings, duplexes, townhomes, and two-story multi-family residential uses. Residential densities range from 8 to 29 units per net acre based on the lot width, depth, and size.	R-1; R-2; R-3; R-4; RS; RS(D-25); RS(D-3); RS(D-35)	RMX	8-29
Residential - Downtown Mixed Use	The Downtown Mixed Use land use category allows for a vertical mix of uses that is uniquely appropriate to the central business district. The primary use is high density multi-family residential with densities ranging from 30 to 60 units per net acre. Ground floor commercial uses are required along Castro Valley Boulevard west of Forest Avenue or Norbridge. Landscaped front yards are required along Castro Valley Boulevard east of Forest Avenue. Ground floor commercial uses are encouraged along other high-traffic streets.	Portions of CBD Sub-area 10	CBD-RMU-40; CBD-RMU-60	30-60; ** 1.0 FAR*

Table 2.3-1: Residential Land Use Classifications

Land Use Category	Description	Corresponding Existing Zoning	Proposed Zoning	Maximum Density (Units per Net Acre)
Residential – Downtown Low Density	This designation is for the existing single-family neighborhoods within the CBD Specific Plan Area. Lot sizes are typically 5,000 square feet. One-family detached dwellings and duplexes are allowed.	Portions of CBD Sub-area 11	CBD-R-1 or R-1	10
Residential – Downtown Medium Density	This designation is applied to existing residential areas close to Castro Valley Boulevard commercial areas and the BART station. Housing types include townhouses, condominiums and apartments. Residential densities range dependent on lot size and width.	Portions of CBD Sub-area 11	CBD-RMX or RMX	8-29

* FAR = Floor Area Ratio. Floor Area Ratio is equal to the total square feet of floor area divided by the total square feet of lot area. Floor area excludes areas devoted to parking.

** On sites with mixed-use development, commercial density (FAR) and residential density (units per acre) are allowed to be combined, provided that buildings meet all other development standards.

Source: Kahn/Mortimer/Associates and Dyett & Bhatia: 2010, Castro Valley Central Business District Specific Plan, 1993.

Table 2.3-2: Public and Open Space Land Use Classifications

Land Use Category	Description	Corresponding Existing Zoning	Proposed Zoning
Public Facilities	This land use designation includes land owned by public agencies or used for public facilities such as schools, community centers, fire stations, and utilities. The designation includes sites that are owned or used by the school districts for school-related purposes such as maintenance or corporation yards or are leased to private entities.	NA	PF

Table 2.3-2: Public and Open Space Land Use Classifications

Land Use Category	Description	Corresponding Existing Zoning	Proposed Zoning
Open Space - Parks	This designation provides for current and expected future locations for public parks of all sizes and types in the community. Parks may include a wide range of uses including active playing fields, recreation facilities including buildings, picnic areas, plazas, bicycle and walking trails, water features, passive green spaces, and landscaped areas.	NA	OS-P
Open Space - Natural	This designation provides for natural open spaces that have been identified for permanent conservation. These areas are typically established as part of Planned Unit Developments as permanent easements. These areas are intended for passive recreation only.	NA	OS-N
Biological Resources Overlay	The biological resources overlay zone delineates high, moderate, and low priority areas for habitat preservation in order to ensure maximum protection of biological resources.	NA	See Figure 7-2

Source: Kahn/Mortimer/Associates and Dyett & Bhatia: 2010

Table 2.3-3: Commercial and Central Business District Land Use Classifications

Land Use Category	Description	Corresponding Existing Zoning Districts	Proposed Zoning	Maximum Intensity (FAR*)
Commercial Land Uses				
Neighborhood Commercial Mixed Use	This designation applies to areas where the primary purpose is for neighborhood-serving retail and commercial service uses. Typical uses include but are not limited to convenience stores, small restaurants, hair salons, and fitness studios. Multi-family residential and live-work uses are allowed above the ground floor.	C-N	CNM	1.0; 22 units per net acre **

Table 2.3-3: Commercial and Central Business District Land Use Classifications

Land Use Category	Description	Corresponding Existing Zoning Districts	Proposed Zoning	Maximum Intensity (FAR*)
Community Service and Office	This land use category is intended for low-intensity office, administrative, retail, and personal service uses.	C-O	CS	1.0
Community Commercial	This designation is intended to provide a wide range of commercial goods and services to meet community needs generally in an auto-oriented setting. Typical uses include community-serving retail and commercial services, comparison retail, and office uses.	C-1; C-2; C-N; C-O	CC	1.5
General Commercial	This designation is intended for retail and service uses that meet the local, sub-regional, and regional demand. These uses are best located where there is the highest levels of automobile access.	C-2	CG	1.0
Central Business District Land Uses (Figure 4-7)				
Low-Intensity Retail	This designation allows land-extensive, auto-oriented uses near the freeway. Typical uses include retail, service, wholesale commercial, and industrial uses with some limited office uses.	CBD Sub-area 1	CBD-1	1.5
Heritage Retail	This designation supports existing pedestrian-oriented retail with continuous frontages. Ground floor retail, commercial services, or medical or dental offices are required. Live-work uses may be allowed behind or above the historic retail frontage on Castro Valley Boulevard or fronting San Carlos Avenue.	Portion of CBD Sub-Area 3	CBD-2	1.0

Table 2.3-3: Commercial and Central Business District Land Use Classifications

Land Use Category	Description	Corresponding Existing Zoning Districts	Proposed Zoning	Maximum Intensity (FAR*)
Downtown Community Commercial	This designation is intended to provide a wide range of commercial goods and services to meet community needs generally in an auto-oriented setting. Typical uses include retail and commercial services, comparison retail, and office uses.	Portions of CBD Sub-areas 2, 5, 7, 10	CC or CBD-3	2.0
Downtown General Commercial	This designation is intended for service-oriented commercial and office uses. Due to the location near Eden Hospital and the existing character, offices uses, in particular medical and dental offices, are encouraged. Live-work units may be allowed if determined to be appropriate with adjacent uses but not other types of residential uses.	Portion of CBD Sub-Area 3	CBD-4	2.0
Core Pedestrian Retail	This designation is intended for the intensive pedestrian-oriented retail and service uses that form the heart of the Castro Valley community. Ground floor offices uses will be limited. A public park and parking will be integrated into the Village District. Multi-family residential uses and administrative office uses are allowed above the ground floor or behind retail frontage.	Portion of CBD Sub-area 7	CBD-5	2.0; 30-60 units per net acre**
Entertainment -Theater	This designation is intended to support the regional theater with additional entertainment uses and complementary retail and restaurant uses. The district should be a pedestrian-oriented destination that is well served with parking.	Portion of CBD Sub-area 5	CBD-CE-1	2.0

Table 2.3-3: Commercial and Central Business District Land Use Classifications

Land Use Category	Description	Corresponding Existing Zoning Districts	Proposed Zoning	Maximum Intensity (FAR*)
Regional Retail and Entertainment	This designation is intended to provide for and protect the existing commercial recreation and entertainment uses. Complementary retail, hospitality, and office uses are allowed.	Portion of CBD Sub-area 2	CBD-CE-2	2.0
Professional-Medical Office	This designation provides for and protects the concentration of medical and professional office uses surrounding Eden Hospital. Complementary health-related professional and technical services, nursing homes, retail, and personal services such as fitness centers, day care, and restaurants, parking structures are encouraged.	CBD Sub-area 4	CBD-PM	2.0
Redwood Road Office Commercial	This designation supports high-intensity office development to provide employment opportunities between the Castro Valley BART station and downtown. Complementary retail, personal services such as day care and restaurants, parking structures, and other public facilities are encouraged. High density mixed use and residential uses are allowed west of Redwood Road, adjacent to the Transit Village.	CBD Sub-area 9	TOD-O	2.0

Table 2.3-3: Commercial and Central Business District Land Use Classifications

Land Use Category	Description	Corresponding Existing Zoning Districts	Proposed Zoning	Maximum Intensity (FAR*)
BART Transit Village	This designation is unique to the area adjacent to the Castro Valley BART station which will provide for high-intensity mixed use with residential, office, retail, and parking structures. Pedestrian access to and from the BART station and across Norbridge Avenue is a priority. The maximum residential density is 60 units per net acre.	CBD Sub-area 8	TOD-R	2.0; 30-60 units per net acre**
Downtown Civic and Community Center	This designation is intended for public facilities including the Castro Valley Library and Alameda County offices.	Portion of CBD Sub-area 10	PF	2.0

* FAR = Floor Area Ratio. Floor Area Ratio is equal to the total square feet of floor area divided by the total square feet of lot area. Floor area excludes areas devoted to parking.

** On sites with mixed-use development, commercial density (FAR) and residential density (units per acre) are allowed to be combined, provided that buildings meet all other development standards.

Source: Kahn/Mortimer/Associates and Dyett & Bhatia, 2010; Castro Valley Central Business District Specific Plan, 1993; Castro Valley Redevelopment Strategic Plan, 2006.

Table 2.4-1: Households and Population at Buildout

	Estimated 2005 [1]	Increase 2005-2025	Buildout 2025 [3]
Housing units	23,691	2,442	26,133
Average household size [2]	2.64	-	2.62
Households	23,226	2,394	25,620
Population	61,357	5,834	67,191

1. Estimates of households, household size, and population 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.

2. Assumes an average household size of 2.62, in order to exercise caution in buildout estimates.

3. 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.

4. 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 2002 numbers. Projected growth from Dyett & Bhatia, 2005, based on parcel by parcel analysis of development potential under the new Castro Valley General Plan.

Table 2.4-2 Residential Buildout through 2025

	Existing Units	New Single-Family Homes	New Second Units	New Multi-Family Units	Net New Units	Total Units (Existing and New)
CBD	1,100	-	-	900	900	2,000
Rest of Castro Valley	22,600	1000	100	430	1,530	24,130
Total	**23,700**	**1000**	**100**	**1,330**	**2,430**	**26,130**

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

Table 2.4-3: Projected Employment Growth

Type/Location	Number of New Jobs	Percentage

CBD and commercial areas	812	50
Hospital	99	6
Work from home	570	35
Home-based employment	91	6
Schools	36	2
Total	**1,608**	**100**

Source: Dyett & Bhatia, 2010

Table 2.4-4: Commercial Buildout through 2025

Location	Existing Building Square Footage	Existing Lot Square Footage	Projected Non-Residential FAR	Percent of Sites to be Redeveloped	Est. New Square Footage	Existing Square Footage Demolished for Redevelopment	Total Net New Square Footage
BART Site	0	488,927	0.20	100 percent	97,800	0	97,800
Mixed-Use Sites in CBD	245,250	1,398,855	0.10	35 percent	49,000	85,838	-36,800
Other Commercial	673,747	3,078,129	0.35	35 percent	377,100	235,811	141,300
Total	**918,997**	**4,965,910**	**-**	**-**	**523,900**	**321,649**	**202,300**

Source: Dyett & Bhatia, 2006

Table 3.2-1: Park and Open Space Acreage in Castro Valley, 2008

Type	Acreage
Local and School Parks	84
Community Parks[1]	240
Regional Parks	5,591

Total	**5,915**

1. Does not include the 48.25 acres associated with community centers and special use facilities.

Table 3.2-2: Existing Local and Joint Use School Parks

Park Name/Location	Amenities	Acreage
Canyon Middle School, 1960 Cull Canyon Road*	Parking lot, ball fields, basketball courts, soccer fields, open lawn area	3.75
Carlos Bee Park, 1905 Grove Way	Picnic tables, group picnic area, barbecues, play area.	6.9
Castro Valley Elementary School, 20185 San Miguel Avenue*	Playfield	1.7
Castro Valley High School, 19400 Santa Maria Ave*	Parking lot, ball fields, basketball courts, soccer fields, restrooms, snack bar, swim center, open lawn area	2.5
Chabot School Playfield	Playfield	1.0
Deerview Park, 5780 Thousand Oaks	Picnic tables, group picnic area, barbecues, play area, basketball courts, open lawn area, par course.	6.2
Earl Warren Park, 4660 Crow Canyon	Picnic tables, barbecues, play area, parking lot, restrooms, open lawn area, dog park	8.4
Fairmont Terrace Park, Berkshire and Manchester	Picnic tables, play area, basketball courts, open lawn area	1.7
Five Canyons Park, Five Canyons Parkway	Ball fields, soccer fields, restroom/snack bar building, basketball court, walking path, picnic tables, barbecues, and children's play area.	12.0
Hillcrest Knolls, 150th and Van	Group picnic area, basketball court, play area	1.3

Table 3.2-2: Existing Local and Joint Use School Parks

Park Name/Location	Amenities	Acreage
Independent School, 4070 E. Castro Valley Blvd*	Ball fields, soccer fields, open lawn area	1.4
Laurel Park, 2652 Vergil	Play area, tot lot, open lawn area	5.0
Marshall School, 20111 Marshall*	Ball fields, soccer fields, open lawn area	3.6
Palomares Hills Park, 7050 Villareal	Ball field, picnic tables, group picnic area, barbecues, play area	6.3
Parsons Park, Almond and Walnut Roads	Picnic tables, children's play area, open lawn area, walking path	4.2
Proctor School, 17520 Redwood Road*	Ball fields, soccer fields, open lawn area	4.1
Ridge Trail Park, Rancho Palomares Drive	Half basketball court, sand volleyball, play structures, picnic area, pathway linked w/EBRPD trail system	2.3
Redwood School, 4400 Alma*	Ball fields, soccer fields, open lawn area	2.0
Strobridge School, 21400 Bedford*	Ball fields, soccer fields, restrooms, open lawn area	5.0
Vannoy School, 5100 Vannoy*	Ball fields, soccer fields, open lawn area	5.0
Total Local and School Parks		**84.4**

* School Park

Source: Hayward Area Recreation and Park District Master Plan, June, 2006; Alameda County Parks, Recreation & Historic Sites Directory, 2003; Larry Lepore, HARD Superintendent of Parks, November 29, 2005 and March 27, 2007.

Table 3.2-8: Summary of Park Standards and Park Needs[1]

Park Type	Acreage		*(Acres/1,000 residents[2])*			Total Acreage Needed to Maintain	
	Est. 2005	Proposed 2025	HARD Standard	Est. 2005	Proposed 2025	HARD Standard	2005 Acreage/1000
Local and School Parks	84.4	94.1	2.0	1.4	1.4	134.4	92.4
Community Parks	240.3	245.3	3.0	3.9	4.1	201.6	263.2
Total	324.7	344.4	--	5.3	5.8	336.0	355.6

Includes local, school and community parks only. Does not include the 43 acres associated with community centers or special use facilities.

Based on HARD's minimal standard.

Table 3.3-1: Castro Valley K-12 Public Schools

School	Enrollment	Teachers*	Capacity
Elementary Schools (K-5):			
Castro Valley	399	22.9	409
Chabot	437	22.0	431
Hillside Elementary (San Lorenzo USD)	485	25.6	547
Independent	594	28.0	602
Jefferson Elementary (San Leandro USD)	540	29.0	600
Jensen Ranch	378	18.6	382
Marshall	410	23.6	450
Palomares	131	6.0	138

Proctor	539	27.4	532
Stanton	406	19.5	440
Strobridge (Hayward USD)	542	27.4	600
Vannoy	380	23.3	n/a
Total Elementary	**5,421**	**273**	**5,511****
Middle Schools (6-8)			
Bancroft Middle School (San Leandro USD)	1,002	44.4	1230
Bret Harte (Hayward USD)	620	24.2	650
Canyon	1,328	63.2	NA
Creekside	795	32.6	800
Edendale Middle School (San Lorenzo USD)	717	33.3	889
Total Middle School	**4,462**	**198**	**4,897****
High Schools (9-12)			
Castro Valley High School	2,871	120.4	NA
Redwood Alternative	183	8.3	NA
Redwood Continuation	32	2.0	NA
San Leandro High School (San Leandro USD)	2,707	116.9	3,300
San Lorenzo High School (San Lorenzo USD)	1,495	67.6	1587
Total High School	**7,288**	**315**	**7,973****

Total Public Schools Enrollment	**16,991**	**763**	**18,381****

* Full-time equivalents

** Includes current enrollment where capacity information was not available.

Source: California Department of Education Data Partnership (CBEDS), 2008-2009 www.ed-data.k12.ca.us/; Fianal Draft, Eden Area General Plan, 2007; Beth Barlow, Castro Valley Unified School District, 2010.

Table 3.3-2: Projected Population by Age Category for Castro Valley (2025)

Age Class	*2025 Population*	*Percentage of Population*
Total 2025 Population	67,191	
Ages 5 through 9	3,964	5.9%
Ages 10 through 14	3,964	5.9%
Ages 15 through 19	4,233	6.3%
Total Youth Population (5-19)	**12,161**	**18.1%**

Source: 2002 ABAG Projections

Table 3.3-3: Projected K-12 Public School Enrollment by Grade Range

School	*Current Enrollment*	*Projected Enrollment**	*Change in Enrollment*
Elementary School	4,508	5,060	+552
Middle School	3,192	2,946	-246
High School	3,136	3,062	-74
Total	**10,836**	**10,581**	**-255**

*Assumes 87 percent of the population aged 5-19 is enrolled in public school and the same proportional distribution of total public school enrollment as 2008-2009.

Source: Kahn/Mortimer/Associates, 2010

Table 3.4-6: Daily Vehicle Trips and Vehicle Miles of Travel For Buildout (2025) Conditions

Scenario	*Households*[2]	*Employment*[2]	*Vehicle Trips*[2]		*VMT*[1]	
			AM	PM	AM	PM
Existing 2005	24,275	9,751	27,552	23,831	133,502	137,552
Proposed General Plan	26,687	11,615	30,719	26,549	144,243	151,582
No Project	26,751	11,531	30,982	26,779	145,335	152,164

[1] Includes external trips that start and/or end outside of Castro Valley but use local roadways in Castro Valley.

2 Household and employment figures are for the entire area within the boundaries of the traffic area zones (TAZ) that include Castro Valley, which is larger than the Castro Valley planning area.

NOTE: These population and employment projections for the proposed General Plan are slightly higher than the projections listed in Chapter 2: Project Description, resulting in a slightly larger number of vehicle trips and a slightly more conservative analysis of traffic impacts.

Source: Dowling Associates, Inc. 2011.

Table 3.4-8: Roadway Segment Operations

Link Location	Northbound/Eastbound						Southbound/Westbound					
	Existing		No Project		Project		Existing		No Project		Project	
	Vol	LOS	Vol	LOS	Vol	LOS	Vol	LOS	Vol	LOS	Vol	LOS
AM Peak Hour												
Castro Valley Blvd – west of Lake Chabot Rd	1,055	D	1,170	D	1,199	D	1,209	D	1,720	F	1,701	**F**
Castro Valley Blvd – east of Yeandle St	702	D	587	D	584	D	1,100	D	1,948	F	1,849	**F**
Redwood Rd south of Jamison Way	701	D	789	D	756	D	890	D	990	D	951	D
Redwood Rd –north of Grove Way	770	D	1,490	D	1,472	D	914	D	1,711	D	1,895	D
Center St – north of Fernwood Ct	1,143	F	1,143	F	1,154	**F**	1,111	F	1,251	F	1,275	**F**
Crow Canyon Rd – north of Manter Rd	1,798	D	1,821	D	1,820	D	1,634	C	1,849	D	1,856	D
Lake Chabot Rd – north of Congress Way	723	D	836	D	849	D	701	D	868	D	859	D
PM Peak Hour												
Castro Valley Blvd – west of	1,458	D	1,957	F	1,949	F	1,153	D	1,514	D	1,500	D

Lake Chabot Rd												
Castro Valley Blvd – east of Yeandle St	1,252	D	1,431	D	1,383	D	1,046	D	976	D	964	D
Redwood Rd –south of Jamison Way	1,071	D	1,111	D	1,096	D	821	D	1,016	D	995	D
Redwood Rd –north of Grove Way	1,050	D	1,746	D	1,603	D	1,146	D	2,229	E	2,239	**E**
Center St – north of Fernwood Ct	1,035	F	1,181	F	1,176	**F**	1,321	F	1,330	F	1,341	**F**
Crow Canyon Rd – north of Manter Rd	1,551	C	1,789	D	1,766	D	1,291	B	1,370	B	1,379	B
Lake Chabot Rd – north of Congress Way	719	D	946	D	984	D	735	D	958	D	950	D

Source: Dowling Associates, Inc., 2009.

Table 3.4-9: Intersection Operations

	Existing Conditions				*Year 2025 No Project*				*Year 2025 With Project*			
	AM Peak Hour		*PM Peak Hour*		*AM Peak Hour*		*PM Peak Hour*		*AM Peak Hour*		*PM Peak Hour*	
Intersection	*LOS*	*delay (sec)*	*LOS*	*delay (sec)*	*LOS*	*delay (sec)*	*LOS*	*delay (sec)*	*LOS*	*delay (sec)*	*LOS*	*delay (sec)*
Stanton-Norbridge Ave/Castro Valley Blvd	E	70.7	F	99.5	F	123.5	F	188	**F**	119.3	**F**	192.5
Lake Chabot Rd /	C	26.3	C	26.6	C	31.4	D	35.4	C	31.5	D	35.8

Castro Valley Blvd												
Redwood Rd / Castro Valley Blvd	D	42.6	D	51.4	D	44.4	E	57.3	D	43.3	**E**	55.6
Redwood Rd / Norbridge Ave	C	21.6	C	21.7	C	21.2	C	29.1	C	22.8	C	29.4
Center St / Grove Way	D	48	D	51.7	D	49.3	E	58.7	D	49.4	**E**	58.8

Source: Dowling Associates, Inc., 2009.

Table 3.11-1: Location of LUFT, Air Emissions, and SLIC Sites within the Planning Area

Name	*Location*
LUFT sites[1]	
Anthony Auto Service	19592 Center St., Castro Valley
VIP Service Stations	3889 Castro Valley Blvd., Castro Valley
Unocal	18950 Lake Cabot Rd., Castro Valley
Shell Xtra Oil Co.	3495 Castro Valley Blvd., Castro Valley
BP	3515 Castro Valley Blvd., Castro Valley
Merritt Tire Sales	3430 Castro Valley Blvd., Castro Valley
Unocal	20405 Redwood Rd., Castro Valley
Valley Car Wash	3369 Castro Valley Blvd., Castro Valley
Walt's Auto Tech	2896 Castro Valley Blvd., Castro Valley
Quality Tune UP	2780 Castro Valley Blvd., Castro Valley
Arco	2770 Castro Valley Blvd., Castro Valley
Varni Property	2691 Castro Valley Blvd., Castro Valley
BP	2504 Castro Valley Blvd., Castro Valley
Beacon	22315 Redwood Rd., Castro Valley
Alameda County Juvenile Hall	2200 Fairmont, San Leandro
Foothill Gas	16210 Foothill Blvd., San Leandro
Fairmont Hospital	15400 Foothill Blvd., San Leandro
Chevron	16304 Foothill Blvd., San Leandro
Chevron	2416 Grove Way, Castro Valley
Jiffy Lube	2492 Castro Valley Blvd., Castro Valley

Table 3.11-1: Location of LUFT, Air Emissions, and SLIC Sites within the Planning Area

Joseph Nesbitt Co.	2452 San Carlos Ave., Castro Valley
Castro Valley Auto House	20697 Park Way, Castro Valley
EB Scaffolding Co.	2552 San Carlos Ave., Castro Valley
Hazardous Material Handling Sites[2]	
John Lawrence Trucking	4214 Lawrence Dr., Castro Valley
Industrial Weed Control	17647 Trenton Dr., Castro Valley
Segotta Trucking, Inc.	17868 Trenton Dr., Castro Valley
Chevron	5269 Crow Canyon Rd., Castro Valley
Dry Clean USA	3937 E. Castro Valley Blvd., Castro Valley
Rite Aid Corp.	3848 Castro Valley Blvd., Castro Valley
SK Specialties	19840 Center St., Castro Valley
Don Guffey Trucking	4166 David St., Castro Valley
The Dry Cleaner	3300 E. Castro Valley Blvd., Castro Valley
Caltrans	21195 Center St., Castro Valley
Alameda County Office of Education	2300 Fairmont Dr, San Leandro
Chevron Station	3005 Grove, Castro Valley
Dons Body Shop	2944 Grove Way, Castro Valley
Marshall Steel Cleaners	20457 Redwood Rd., Castro Valley
Sherwin Williams	20650 Redwood Rd., Castro Valley
Mirandes One Hour Cleaners	21120 Redwood Rd., Castro Valley
Walgreens 101	3382 Castro Valley Blvd., Castro Valley
Rocky Auto Body	3142 Castro Valley Blvd., Castro Valley
Express Photo SVC	3028 Castro Valley Blvd., Castro Valley
Chevron Station	2920 Castro Valley Blvd., Castro Valley

Table 3.11-1: Location of LUFT, Air Emissions, and SLIC Sites within the Planning Area

Lamar and Co. Trucking Services Inc.	21054 Francis St., Castro Valley
Dry Clean Club of America	2960 Castro Valley Blvd., Castro Valley
Equilon Enterprises	2724 Castro Valley Blvd., Castro Valley
Service Maker of Hayward	2830 Castro Valley Blvd., Castro Valley
James Deangelis	2661 Renton Way No. K, Castro Valley
East Bay Magnetic Imaging	20130 Lake Chabot Rd., Castro Valley
Pac Bell	2610 Northbridge Ave., Castro Valley
Valley Cleaners of Castro Valley	2676 Castro Valley Blvd., Castro Valley
Tosco 30470	2445 Castro Valley Blvd., Castro Valley
RJ Quick Clean	2522 Castro Valley Blvd., Castro Valley
Tosco Northwest Co. No. 02486	2504 Castro Valley Blvd., Castro Valley
Castro Valley Unocal 76	2425 Castro Valley Blvd., Castro Valley
Tosco Northwest Co. No. 11131	21494 Foothill Blvd., Castro Valley
Walgreens 2401	21463 Foothill Blvd., Castro Valley
Castro Valley Auto House	20697 Park Way, Castro Valley
Don Williams & Son Auto Repair	N. 6th Street, Castro Valley
George Barrett	2439 Grove Way, Castro Valley
Robert C. Borris MD	2457 Grove Way Ste. 103A, Castro Valley
Air Emission Site[3]	
Fairmont Hospital	15400 Foothill Blvd, San Leandro
Tool Network, Inc	3659 Santa Maria Ct., Castro Valley
SLIC Sites[4]	
Castro Valley Auto House	20697 Park Way, Castro Valley

Table 3.11-1: Location of LUFT, Air Emissions, and SLIC Sites within the Planning Area

Note:

1. RWQCB listed Leaking Underground Fuel Tanks.
2. Facilities regulated by the U.S. EPA that handle materials designated as hazardous waste.
3. Facilities regulated by the U.S. EPA that release pollutants into the air.
4. RWQCB listed Spills, Leaks, Investigations, and Cleanups sites.

Sources: SWRCB Geotracker website: http://geotracker.swrcb.ca.gov; EPA Enviro/RCRA website: http://www.epa.gov/enviro/index.html; Dyett and Bhatia. 2006; Kahn/Mortimer/Associates, 2011

Table 4.2-2: Buildout (2025) Comparison: Proposed Plan and Alternatives

	Proposed Project	*No Project*	*Reduced Lane*
Total Housing Units	26,133	26,261	26,133
CBD	2,000	2, 000	2,000
Rest of Planning Area	24,130	24,261	24,130
Total Households	25,620	25,736	25,620
Household Population	67,191	67,859	67,191
Total Employment	10,884	10,800	10,884
CBD	5,665	5,670	5,665
Rest of Planning Area	5,219	5,130	5,219

Source: CMA 2005; Dyett & Bhatia, 2005; Dowling Associates, 2006, 2009; Kahn/Mortimer/Associates, 2010

1. Total housing units assumes 1.5% vacancy rate in 2005 based on 2000 Census and 2.0% at build-out in 2025

Table 4.2-3: Parkland at Build-Out, 2025: Proposed Plan and Alternatives

	Proposed Project	*No Project*	*Reduced Lane*
Total Population	67,191	67,859	67,191
Total Units	26,133	26,261	26,133
Local and Community Park Acres	336	330	336
Acres/1,000 Residents	5.0	4.9	5.0

Note: Includes local, school and community parks only. Does not include the 43 acres associated with community centers or special use facilities.

Source: Kahn/Mortimer/Associates, 2006, 2010

Table 4.2-4: Projected Population by Age Category for Castro Valley (2025)

Age Class	*Proposed Plan*	*No-Project Alternative*	*Reduced Lane Alternative*
Total 2025 Population	67,191	67,859	67,191
Ages 5 through 9 (5.9%)	3,964	4,004	3,964
Ages 10 through 14 (5.9%)	3,964	4.004	3,964
Ages 15 through 19 (6.3%)	4,233	4,275	4,233
Total Youth Population (5-19)	**12,161**	**12,283**	**12,161**

Source: 2002 ABAG Projections; Kahn/Mortimer/Associates, 2010

Table 4.2-5 Daily Vehicle Trips and Vehicle Miles of Travel For Build-out (2025) Conditions

Scenario	*Households*	*Employment*	*Vehicle Trips*		*VMT*[1]	
			AM	PM	AM	PM
Proposed General Plan	26,687	11,615	30,719	26,549	145,102	152,722
No Project	26,751	11,531	30,982	26,779	145,335	152,164

[1] Includes external trips that start and/or end outside of Castro Valley but use local roadways in Castro Valley.

[2] Household and employment figures are for the entire area within the boundaries of the traffic area zones (TAZ) that include Castro Valley, which is larger than the Castro Valley planning area.

NOTE: These population and employment projections for the proposed General Plan are slightly higher than the projections listed in Chapter 2: Project Description, resulting in a slightly larger number of vehicle trips and a slightly more conservative analysis of traffic impacts.

Source: Dowling Associates, Inc. 2006, 2011.

Table 4.2-7: Roadway Segment Operations

Link Location	Northbound/Eastbound						Southbound/Westbound					
	Existing		No Project		Project		Existing		No Project		Project	
	Vol	LOS	Vol	LOS	Vol	LOS	Vol	LOS	Vol	LOS	Vol	LOS
AM Peak Hour												
Castro Valley Blvd – west of Lake Chabot Rd	1,055	D	1,170	D	1,199	D	1,209	D	1,720	F	1,701	**F**
Castro Valley Blvd – east of Yeandle St	702	D	587	D	584	D	1,100	D	1,948	F	1,849	**F**
Redwood Rd south of Jamison Way	701	D	789	D	756	D	890	D	990	D	951	D
Redwood Rd – north of Grove Way	770	D	1,490	D	1,472	D	914	D	1,711	D	1,895	D
Center St – north of Fernwood Ct	1,143	F	1,143	F	1,154	**F**	1,111	F	1,251	F	1,275	**F**
Crow Canyon Rd – north of Manter Rd	1,798	D	1,821	D	1,820	D	1,634	C	1,849	D	1,856	D
Lake Chabot Rd – north of Congress Way	723	D	836	D	849	D	701	D	868	D	859	D
PM Peak Hour												
Castro Valley Blvd – west of Lake Chabot Rd	1,458	D	1,957	F	1,949	F	1,153	D	1,514	D	1,500	D
Castro Valley Blvd – east of Yeandle St	1,252	D	1,431	D	1,383	D	1,046	D	976	D	964	D

Redwood Rd – south of Jamison Way	1,071	D	1,111	D	1,096	D	821	D	1,016	D	995	D
Redwood Rd – north of Grove Way	1,050	D	1,746	D	1,603	D	1,146	D	2,229	E	2,239	**E**
Center St – north of Fernwood Ct	1,035	F	1,181	F	1,176	**F**	1,321	F	1,330	F	1,341	**F**
Crow Canyon Rd – north of Manter Rd	1,551	C	1,789	D	1,766	D	1,291	B	1,370	B	1,379	B
Lake Chabot Rd – north of Congress Way	719	D	946	D	984	D	735	D	958	D	950	D

Source: Dowling Associates, Inc., 2006, 2009.

Table 4.2-8: Intersection Operations w. Proposed Project

	Existing Conditions				*Year 2025 No Project*				*Year 2025 With Project*			
	AM Peak Hour		*PM Peak Hour*		*AM Peak Hour*		*PM Peak Hour*		*AM Peak Hour*		*PM Peak Hour*	
Intersection	*LOS*	*delay (sec)*	*LOS*	*delay (sec)*	*LOS*	*delay (sec)*	*LOS*	*delay (sec)*	*LOS*	*delay (sec)*	*LOS*	*delay (sec)*
Stanton-Norbridge Ave/Castro Valley Blvd	E	70.7	F	99.5	F	123.5	F	188	F	119.3	F	192.5
Lake Chabot Rd / Castro Valley Blvd	C	26.3	C	26.6	C	31.4	D	35.4	C	31.5	D	35.8
Redwood Rd / Castro Valley Blvd	D	42.6	D	51.4	D	44.4	E	57.3	D	43.3	E	55.6
Redwood Rd / Norbridge Ave	C	21.6	C	21.7	C	21.2	C	29.1	C	22.8	C	29.4
Center St / Grove Way	D	48	D	51.7	D	49.3	E	58.7	D	49.4	E	58.8

Source: Dowling Associates, Inc., 2006, 2009.

Appendix C

Table 1. Land Use Comparison

	Employed Residents	Households	Household Population	Total Employment
2025 CMA Baseline	39,544	25,444	67,217	11,618
2025 No Project	40,476	26,751	70,417	11,531
2025 CVGP Update	39,899	26,687	69,800	11,615

Source: Dowling Associates, Inc., 2006, 2009.