



ALAMEDA COUNTY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AGENCY  
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

**INITIAL STUDY AND NEGATIVE DECLARATION**  
**Environmental Checklist Form & Initial Study**  
**Prepared Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)**

**A. PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

**1. Project title:** General Plan Amendments to the Alameda County General Plan, specifically the Incorporation of the Community Climate Action Plan (CCAP) and prescribed policies and programs pursuant thereto.

**2. Project location:** Unincorporated Alameda County, all lands generally, and as prescribed for individual measures contained within the CCAP.

**3. Project sponsor's name and address:** Alameda County, 1221 Oak Street, Oakland, California

**4. General Plan designations:** All designations in the East County Area Plan, Castro Valley Area Plan and Eden Area Plan.

**5. Zoning:** All zoning designations generally and as appropriate based on the details of specific individual measures contained within the CCAP.

**6. Proposal:** Amend the General Plan by adoption of the CCAP and with regard to policies and programs to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases (GHG) due to human activities, including mobile and stationary sources.

**The following discussion and project description** is taken substantially from the Alameda County Community Climate Action Plan (CCAP) (Final), June 2011. That document is incorporated herein by reference, and will be referenced many times in this environmental document.

\*\*\*\*\*

The Alameda County Board of Supervisors provisionally adopted the Community Climate Action Plan in June 2011 in response to scientifically-supported concerns about the causes and effects of climate change. In earlier years, the Board had unanimously adopted the Climate Protection Leadership Resolution (R-2006-04) and the Cool Counties Climate Stabilization Declaration (R-2007-336), which directed staff to inventory the county's greenhouse gas emissions, to work across agencies to develop a plan for reducing those emissions, and set a goal of reducing emissions by 80 percent by the year 2050. Alameda County's Strategic Vision was also adopted by the Board of Supervisors in November 2008 to provide a multi-year, comprehensive road map that establishes Alameda County as one of the best counties in which to live, work, and do business. The County recognized that in order to achieve such a vision, climate action must be at the forefront.

The CCAP outlines a course of action to reduce community-wide greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions generated within the unincorporated areas of Alameda County. Successful implementation of the CCAP

will reduce GHG emissions to 15 percent below 2005 levels by 2020 and set the County on a path toward reducing emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050.

The CCAP is written to:

- ▶▶ Provide clear guidance to County staff regarding when and how to implement key provisions of the plan
- ▶▶ Demonstrate Alameda County's commitment to comply with State GHG reduction efforts
- ▶▶ Inspire residents and businesses to participate in community efforts to reduce GHG emissions

In order to prevent dangerous levels of climate change, humanity now needs to dramatically reduce global GHG emissions throughout the coming decades. Between 1990 and 2005, GHG emissions generated in the unincorporated portions of Alameda County grew as population increased. People drove further and more frequently, and consumed more energy in their homes and businesses. If this trend continues, the county will generate considerably more emissions in 2020 and 2050. In order to contribute to global climate protection efforts, the County and its residents and businesses will have to redefine business-as-usual and set a new trajectory toward a low-emissions community.

The CCAP defines a path to achieve the county's GHG reduction targets and outlines the detailed implementation steps in the following six action areas: land use, transportation, energy, water, waste, and green infrastructure.

## **TRANSPORTATION STRATEGIES & MEASURES:**

### **Walking and Bicycling**

Walking and bicycling are climate neutral modes of travel, and thus will be key strategies to reduce transportation-related GHG emissions. Pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure is currently limited in many portions of the unincorporated county. To encourage residents to shift from their cars to these alternative modes, the County will need to improve pedestrian and bicycle network connectivity and safety conditions. The Walking and Bicycling strategy contains the following measures:

- ▶▶ **T-1** Improve bicycle infrastructure near community activity areas
- ▶▶ **T-2** Develop appropriate bicycle infrastructure for high traffic intersections and corridors
- ▶▶ **T-3** Increase the number of bicycle racks and storage facilities in underserved civic and commercial area
- ▶▶ **T-4** Enhance pedestrian infrastructure within easy walking distance from community activity centers
- ▶▶ **T-5** Expand the Traffic Calming Program to improve pedestrian safety
- ▶▶ **T-6** Improve pedestrian connectivity and route choice in neighborhoods
- ▶▶ **T-7** Work with school districts to develop a School Alternative Transportation Plan by improving/expanding walking school bus, safe routes to school program, and school bus services

### **Public Transit**

Riding on public transit, such as BART, bus, or train, generates considerably fewer GHG emissions than automobile travel. For residents and employees to switch from their cars to public transit, it needs to be convenient, comfortable, and reliable. The County will work with relevant transit agencies to identify and remove existing barriers to ridership and improve the overall transit experience. The Public Transit strategy contains the following measures:

- ▶▶ **T-8** Conduct a public transit study and implement ridership enhancement programs
- ▶▶ **T-9** Work with AC transit to increase service frequency on select bus routes

►► **T-10** Provide transit buses with signal prioritization devices to facilitate time effective public transit service

►► **T-11** Work with AC Transit to provide transit with essential improvements including shelters, route information, benches, and lighting

►► **T-12** Work with public transit agencies to better accommodate bicycles

### **Ridesharing**

“Ridesharing” is a general term that refers to more than one person sharing a ride in one vehicle, the most common form of which is carpooling, in which participants travel together, share costs, and often take turns driving. Vanpooling is a more formal form of ridesharing and involves more riders, formalized schedules and payments, and is often organized with the assistance of employers. This practice results in the generation of considerably fewer GHG emissions than if each passenger drives separately. The County will work to expand rideshare matching systems and develop rideshare stations to facilitate this important travel mode. The Ridesharing strategy contains the following measure:

►► **T-13** Enhance rideshare infrastructure and services to increase community participation in this important travel mode

### **Parking Management**

As the availability of cheap and abundant parking has a tendency to increase automobile ownership and use, parking fees can help reverse this relationship, and decrease congestion-inducing driving behavior and increase use of other travel modes. The County will, therefore, explore reducing parking requirements for mixed-use, pedestrian, and transportation-oriented development areas can also remove a barrier to project completion and improve the overall quality of the community. The County will revise parking standards to encourage these types of development. The Parking Management strategy contains the following measure:

►► **T-14** Reduce minimum parking requirements for mixed-use, pedestrian and transit-oriented development.

## **LAND USE STRATEGIES & MEASURES:**

### **Transit-Oriented Development**

Transit-oriented development (TOD) refers to the creation of compact, walkable communities centered around high-quality light rail, train, or bus transit systems. Research by the San Francisco Bay Area Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) in 2006 indicates that persons in households living less than ½ mile from major transit stations drive approximately half as much as those living further away. The County will use a variety of incentives and regulations to focus new growth in these areas and ensure that development is well designed, pedestrian-friendly, and compatible with existing neighborhoods. The Transit-Oriented Development strategy contains the following measures:

►► **L-2** Facilitate the establishment of mixed-use, pedestrian-, and transit-oriented development near major transit stations or transit corridors.

►► **L-3** Reduce restrictions on second units in single-family residential districts near transit stations, major bus route corridors, neighborhood commercial centers, and central business districts.

### **Neighborhood Commercial District**

Neighborhood commercial districts that provide a diversity of shops and services help neighborhood residents spend less time in their cars. Research\* indicates that average daily shopping and errand trips in well-served neighborhoods are less than half the distance than in neighborhoods with low levels of

diversity. This research also indicates residents who live within a ¼ mile of vibrant neighborhood centers are more likely to walk or bike in order to purchase daily goods and services. Enhancing the quality and diversity of uses in Alameda County's neighborhood commercial centers will help decrease transportation-related GHG emissions and improve residents' quality of life. The County will facilitate improvements to existing neighborhood commercial centers by developing small business incentive programs, removing regulatory barriers that may impede high quality mixed-use development, and establishing design guidelines for neighborhood centers. The County will also work to identify potential locations for new neighborhood commercial centers in underserved areas of the west county. The Neighborhood Commercial District strategy contains the following measures:

- ▶▶ **L-4** Increase the diversity of uses in neighborhood-serving commercial centers.
- ▶▶ **L-5** Improve the vitality of mixed-use neighborhood-serving commercial centers through increased density allowances and enhanced design.
- ▶▶ **L-6** Conduct land use and market analyses to identify sites within expansive residential areas that could support new or expanded neighborhood commercial centers.

## **BUILDING ENERGY STRATEGIES & MEASURES:**

### **Community Energy**

Making fundamental changes to the community's energy system could reduce large quantities of building-related GHG emissions. The key strategies are integrating smart grid technology into homes and businesses, and incorporating district energy systems in mixed-use districts. The Community Energy strategy contains the following measures:

- ▶▶ **E-1** Work with PG&E and Alameda County cities to accelerate smart grid integration in the community.
- ▶▶ **E-2** Evaluate the potential for district energy systems and develop an implementation plan.

### **Energy Efficiency in Existing Residential Buildings**

Approximately 80 percent of the housing stock in the unincorporated county was built prior to the adoption of California's Title 24 energy standards in 1978. Improving the energy efficiency of the county's existing housing stock will reduce considerable amounts of GHG emissions, while also decreasing home energy bills. The County will establish a program to educate homeowners about energy efficiency upgrades, facilitate home energy audits and efficiency upgrades, and provide financial incentives. The Energy Efficiency in Existing Residential Buildings strategy contains the following measures:

- ▶▶ **E-3** Develop a comprehensive outreach program to facilitate voluntary home energy efficiency improvements.
- ▶▶ **E-4** Identify and develop financing programs that encourage energy efficiency and renewable energy.
- ▶▶ **E-5** Expand outreach to low-income homeowners regarding energy efficiency and weatherization programs.
- ▶▶ **E-6** Identify and implement opportunities to improve efficiency of rental units.

### **Energy Efficiency in Existing Commercial Buildings**

Improvements to commercial building energy efficiency will help community businesses reduce long-term energy costs and provide important GHG emissions reductions. The County will provide a comprehensive commercial energy conservation program that provides education, outreach, and financial incentives. The County expects that educational programs and financial incentives will encourage many

businesses to invest in efficiency improvements. The Energy Efficiency in Existing Commercial Buildings strategy contains the following measures:

►► **E-7** Develop and implement an outreach and financial assistance program that encourages businesses to invest in efficiency improvements.

### **Energy Performance in New Construction**

New buildings offer a significant opportunity for achieving high levels of energy efficiency through advanced materials and design. The County will require a high level of energy performance in all new construction and will provide incentives for exemplary buildings. The Energy Performance in New Construction strategy contains the following measures:

►► **E-8** Renew the County Green Building Ordinance.

►► **E-9** Provide incentives for buildings that exceed the California Title-24 standards for energy efficiency by 30 percent (Tier 2).

►► **E-10** Require new construction to use building materials containing recycled content.

►► **E-11** Require new commercial parking lots to incorporate heat gain-mitigating design strategies.

►► **E-12** Require all new multi-unit buildings and major renovations to existing multi-unit buildings to be “sub-metered” in order to enable each individual unit to monitor energy consumption.

### **Renewable Energy**

To achieve the County’s GHG reduction target, the county will need to reduce the use of fossil fuel-based energy, through expanding renewable energy generation within the unincorporated county. The County will develop a renewable energy program that educates residents and businesses about the potential for solar energy generation and provides financing mechanisms. The strategy will primarily focus on solar photovoltaic and solar hot water systems. The Renewable Energy strategy contains the following measures:

►► **E-13** Establish Solar EmPowerment Districts that remove barriers to and facilitate the installation of solar photovoltaic systems.

►► **E-14** Facilitate the installation of solar hot water heating systems on large commercial buildings.

►► **E-15** Develop a comprehensive residential renewable energy program that provides outreach, financing, and other forms of assistance.

### **Green Jobs**

To achieve the County’s GHG reduction target, the County will need to increase “green jobs.”

►► **E-16** Develop a green jobs program.

## **WATER STRATEGIES & MEASURES:**

### **Water Conservation - Building and Landscape Efficiency**

Replacing antiquated water fixtures, appliances, and irrigation systems can generate valuable water conservation benefits. The County will encourage property owners to make water efficiency upgrades in existing buildings and landscapes. As landscapes for new buildings present opportunities for considerably reducing potable water consumption, the County will require that large landscape projects incorporate best practices in both design and operation. Additionally, the County will expand water conservation educational and rebate programs. The Water Conservation - Building and Landscape Efficiency strategy contains the following measures:

►► **WT-1** Encourage residents and businesses to conserve water in existing buildings and landscapes.

- ▶▶ **WT-2** Require new landscape projects to reduce outdoor potable water use by 40 percent.
- ▶▶ **WT-3** Adopt an ordinance that allows the installation and use of greywater (recycled) systems for subsurface irrigation.

#### **Water Conservation - Consumer Education**

Research from the University of Delaware demonstrates that water utility customers most often use their utility bills to check for unusual consumption or to evaluate the effect of conservation measures. The Water Conservation - Consumer Education strategy contains the following measure:

- ▶▶ **WT-4** Work with EBMUD and Zone 7 to redesign the water bill format to encourage water conservation in residential and commercial users.

### **WASTE STRATEGIES & MEASURES:**

#### **Waste Reduction and Diversion**

Alameda County has one of the highest waste diversion rates in the nation. To accomplish the 90 percent waste diversion target by 2030, the County will expand existing outreach, construction and demolition waste, and food waste programs. The County will also emphasize the improvement of waste services for residents and businesses in rural areas. The Waste Reduction and Diversion strategy contains the following measures:

- ▶▶ **WS-1** Increase solid waste reduction and diversion to 90 percent by 2030.
- ▶▶ **WS-2** Strengthen the Construction and Demolition Debris Management Ordinance.
- ▶▶ **WS-3** Develop a food waste collection program and an ordinance that requires all household and commercial food wastes and food soiled paper to be placed in organics carts.

#### **Extended Producer Responsibility**

If manufacturers were to improve the recyclability of their products and packaging, substantial GHG emission reductions could be achieved. The County will urge the State and Federal governments to create legislation that requires extended producer responsibility and improves the recyclability of products and packaging. The Extended Producer Responsibility strategy contains the following measure:

- ▶▶ **WS-4** Work with StopWaste.Org, Alameda County cities, and other organizations to urge adoption of legislation that requires extended producer responsibility and improves the recyclability of products and packaging.

### **GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE STRATEGIES & MEASURES:**

#### **Urban Forest**

Trees beautify neighborhoods, increase property values, reduce noise and air pollution, create privacy, and establish habitat for bird species. The urban forest also mitigates GHG emissions, primarily through sequestering carbon as trees grow, but also through providing shading for buildings and paved areas (i.e., streets, sidewalks, parking lots, etc.), which reduces air conditioning loads and associated energy consumption. The County will develop an Urban Forest Management Plan and increase tree-planting efforts in Castro Valley, Cherryland, Ashland, and San Lorenzo through the following measure:

- ▶▶ **G-1** Expand the urban forest (e.g., street trees and trees on private lots) in order to sequester carbon and reduce building energy consumption.

#### **Carbon Sequestration in Natural Areas**

Establishing and restoring riparian forests, wetlands (primarily in western areas), and other types of habitat can improve ecosystem function, and result in increased carbon sequestration potential, as well as other ecosystem services, such as water filtration, air purification, urban heat island attenuation, and erosion prevention. A variety of publicly-owned lands in eastern and western portions of the unincorporated county offer excellent opportunities for ecosystem restoration. The County will evaluate the carbon sequestration potential of future restoration projects and apply these sequestration levels to the achievement of the County's GHG emissions reduction target, through the following measure:

- ▶▶ **G-2** Include carbon sequestration as an objective within County-led natural area restoration projects.

### **Community Gardens and Urban Agriculture**

Alameda County recognizes the importance of community food security and providing residents with the ability to grow or purchase fresh produce. Increasing the availability of locally grown and seasonal food is an important way to reduce GHG emissions associated with food production, storage, and distribution. The County will work to increase the number of community gardens and urban-edge farms, as well as establish farmers markets in strategic areas of the community.

- ▶▶ **G-3** Establish a local community garden program to increase local food security and provide local recreation amenities.
- ▶▶ **G-4** Work with local farmers and agricultural non-profits to develop urban-edge farming opportunities in the unincorporated county.
- ▶▶ **G-5** Work with local organizations to establish farmers' market sites in the unincorporated county.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Most of the measures described in the CCAP** are either (1) programs designed to improve existing infrastructure and programs to ease the reduction of fossil fuel use and reduce the emissions of GHGs, or (2) programs to facilitate citizens' abilities to make changes that will also help reduce GHG emissions. As such, these measures and policies would have no substantial or significant adverse physical / environmental effects of their own and would purely result in GHG reduction and in some cases, incidentally reduce other pollutant emissions as well. In the interests of clarity and brevity, these measures can be excluded from specific mention in most sections of this analysis. These innocuous measures include the following:

### **Bicycles and Pedestrians**

- ▶▶ **T-1** Improve bicycle infrastructure near community activity areas
- ▶▶ **T-2** Develop appropriate bicycle infrastructure for high traffic intersections and corridors
- ▶▶ **T-3** Increase the number of bicycle racks and storage facilities in underserved civic and commercial area
- ▶▶ **T-4** Enhance pedestrian infrastructure within easy walking distance from community activity centers
- ▶▶ **T-5** Expand the Traffic Calming Program to improve pedestrian safety
- ▶▶ **T-6** Improve pedestrian connectivity and route choice in neighborhoods
- ▶▶ **T-7** Work with school districts to develop a School Alternative Transportation Plan by improving/expanding walking school bus, safe routes to school program, and school bus services

### **Public Transit**

- ▶▶ **T-8** Conduct a public transit study and implement ridership enhancement programs

- ▶▶ **T-9** Work with AC transit to increase service frequency on select bus routes
- ▶▶ **T-10** Provide transit buses with signal prioritization devices to facilitate time effective public transit service
- ▶▶ **T-11** Work with AC Transit to provide transit with essential improvements including shelters, route information, benches, and lighting
- ▶▶ **T-12** Work with public transit agencies to better accommodate bicycles

### **Ridesharing**

- ▶▶ **T-13** Enhance rideshare infrastructure and services to increase community participation in this important travel mode

### **Neighborhood Commercial District**

- ▶▶ **L-6** Conduct land use and market analyses to identify sites within expansive residential areas that could support new or expanded neighborhood commercial centers.

### **Community Energy**

- ▶▶ **E-1** Work with PG&E and Alameda County cities to accelerate smart grid integration in the community.
- ▶▶ **E-2** Evaluate the potential for district energy systems and develop an implementation plan.

### **Energy Efficiency in Existing Residential Buildings**

- ▶▶ **E-3** Develop a comprehensive outreach program to facilitate voluntary home energy efficiency improvements.
- ▶▶ **E-4** Identify and develop financing programs that encourage energy efficiency and renewable energy.
- ▶▶ **E-5** Expand outreach to low-income homeowners regarding energy efficiency and weatherization programs.
- ▶▶ **E-6** Identify and implement opportunities to improve efficiency of rental units.

### **Energy Efficiency in Existing Commercial Buildings**

- ▶▶ **E-7** Develop and implement an outreach and financial assistance program that encourages businesses to invest in efficiency improvements.

### **Energy Performance in New Construction**

- ▶▶ **E-8** Renew the County Green Building Ordinance.
- ▶▶ **E-9** Provide incentives for buildings that exceed the California Title-24 standards for energy efficiency by 30 percent (Tier 2).
- ▶▶ **E-10** Require new construction to use building materials containing recycled content.
- ▶▶ **E-11** Require new commercial parking lots to incorporate heat gain-mitigating design strategies.
- ▶▶ **E-12** Require all new multi-unit buildings and major renovations to existing multi-unit buildings to be “sub-metered” in order to enable each individual unit to monitor energy consumption.

### **Renewable Energy**



▶▶ **E-13** Establish Solar EmPowerment Districts that remove barriers to and facilitate the installation of solar photovoltaic systems.

▶▶ **E-14** Facilitate the installation of solar hot water heating systems on large commercial buildings.

▶▶ **E-15** Develop a comprehensive residential renewable energy program that provides outreach, financing, and other forms of assistance.

### **Green Jobs**

▶▶ **E-16** Develop a green jobs program.

### **Water Conservation - Building and Landscape Efficiency**

▶▶ **WT-1** Encourage residents and businesses to conserve water in existing buildings and landscapes.

▶▶ **WT-2** Require new landscape projects to reduce outdoor potable water use by 40 percent.

▶▶ **WT-3** Adopt an ordinance that allows the installation and use of greywater (recycled) systems for subsurface irrigation.

### **Water Conservation - Consumer Education**

▶▶ **WT-4** Work with EBMUD and Zone 7 to redesign the water bill format to encourage water conservation in residential and commercial users.

### **Waste Reduction and Diversion**

▶▶ **WS-1** Increase solid waste reduction and diversion to 90 percent by 2030.

▶▶ **WS-2** Strengthen the Construction and Demolition Debris Management Ordinance.

▶▶ **WS-3** Develop a food waste collection program and an ordinance that requires all household and commercial food wastes and food soiled paper to be placed in organics carts.

### **Extended Producer Responsibility**

▶▶ **WS-4** Work with StopWaste.Org, Alameda County cities, and other organizations to urge adoption of legislation that requires extended producer responsibility and improves the recyclability of products and packaging.

### **Urban Forest**

▶▶ **G-1** Expand the urban forest (e.g., street trees and trees on private lots) in order to sequester carbon and reduce building energy consumption.

### **Carbon Sequestration in Natural Areas**

▶▶ **G-2** Include carbon sequestration as an objective within County-led natural area restoration projects.

### **Community Gardens and Urban Agriculture**

▶▶ **G-3** Establish a local community garden program to increase local food security and provide local recreation amenities.

▶▶ **G-4** Work with local farmers and agricultural non-profits to develop urban-edge farming opportunities in the unincorporated county.

►► **G-5** Work with local organizations to establish farmers' market sites in the unincorporated county.

\*\*\*\*\*

**The preceding list of CCAP measures, except where noted in the analysis below, can be effectively ruled out as potential sources of adverse impacts to the environment.** No significant land use changes would occur, nor would land use policies or zoning ordinance changes be required to administer these policies. No changes in density of use or significant generation of traffic would occur as a result of these policies. No alterations to air quality or water quality / runoff volumes would result, and changes to the visual environment would be minor and in most cases invisible. No adverse changes to infrastructure or public services and utilities would occur as a result of these measures. **By and large, each of these measures individually, and even moreso taken together, represent an improvement in safety, air quality, visual quality and most importantly, GHG reduction.**

This exercise leaves a small number of measures that could potentially result in environmental impacts, although even these, taken together with the foregoing list of measures, represent improvements to air quality and GHG emissions. These measures are the specific new policies and programs that are discussed in the analysis section of this document, and include the following five measures:

#### **Parking Management**

►► **T-14** Reduce minimum parking requirements for mixed-use, pedestrian and transit-oriented development.

County Planning proposes to work with the Economic Development Agency to evaluate and revise its parking requirements to better accommodate mixed-use or Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) projects, and bring the analysis to public review. The County will also evaluate shared parking strategies as a way to facilitate higher density/intensity development in appropriate areas. The following three actions are proposed:

- Conduct an evaluation of the County's parking policies and their effects on mixed-use, TOD, and similar development.
- Reduce parking requirements in areas targeted for mixed-used and TOD development, while ensuring that neighborhoods are not adversely affected. The actual requirements for mixed use parking should be accurately evaluated.
- Evaluate potential for shared parking strategies in the unincorporated county.

The evaluations described in these proposals are beyond the scope of this CEQA analysis, but the net result would be some reduction in parking requirements in certain key areas near transit hubs and for facilities that share uses and services on a complementary schedule or basis. This measure is in general self-mitigating, but the reduction of parking is a physical alteration that should be discussed where appropriate.

#### **Transit-Oriented Development**

►► **L-2** Facilitate the establishment of mixed-use, pedestrian-, and transit-oriented development near major transit stations or transit corridors.

To facilitate TOD, the County will establish partnerships; develop a guiding vision; and work to reduce regulatory, land assembly, and infrastructure barriers. To ensure that TOD projects achieve the

community's objectives, the County will develop specific plans and design guidelines for each TOD site. As part of this process, the County will conduct an audit of the existing zoning code, development standards, and other regulations and evaluate their compatibility with TOD, such as height restrictions, setbacks, and open space and parking requirements. The County will also consider establishing minimum densities and floor-area ratios in order to prevent underutilization of these areas. While ensuring the protection of public health, safety, and welfare, the County will revise standards that act as regulatory barriers. The County will work with existing owners to assemble multiple parcels into usable properties. The County will also take a leadership role and invest in basic infrastructure improvements, streetscaping, and other amenities in order to provide developers with confidence that the public sector is making a commitment to the project areas. The following four actions are proposed:

- Conduct audit of existing zoning, development standards, etc. for compatibility for TOD.
- Develop and adopt specific plans for each TOD area.
- Develop TOD land assembly program.
- Create TOD infrastructure investment program that identifies and implements basic infrastructure improvements needed to attract TOD developers.

The evaluation of the individual programs specified in these actions are beyond the scope of this analysis, but generally, the main potential for an impact under this Measure is the performance indicator that specifies a target of 700 new residential units within ½ mile of a major transit station by the year 2020. Major transit stations in or near the County are few, those being the Castro Valley BART station, the Bayfair BART station and (if one includes unincorporated lands adjacent to City of Hayward incorporated lands), the Amtrak station in Hayward. This means that many new units would need to be placed in just a few locations.

►► **L-3** Reduce restrictions on second units in single-family residential districts near transit stations, major bus route corridors, neighborhood commercial centers, and central business districts.

The County will amend area plans, the zoning code and relevant specific plans to allow second units in R-1, RS-5, and CBD Sub-Area (11 districts within ½ mile walking distance of major transit stations, neighborhood commercial centers, and the Castro Valley Central Business District). Additionally the County will review second unit development standards (e.g., parking requirements) and consider revising standards that staff deem restrictive to second unit development and are not essential for the protection of health, safety, and welfare of the community. The County will inform affected property owners of these changes.

As with L-2, the main potential for an impact under L-3 results from the performance indicator that specifies a target of 200 new residential units, in this case second units within ½ mile of a major transit station or other transportation hubs and commercial destinations by the year 2020.

►► **L-4** Increase the diversity of uses in neighborhood-serving commercial centers.

The County will develop business incentive programs targeted at attracting small businesses to neighborhood commercial centers and improving existing uses. A retail tenant improvement program would provide incentives to attract key retail businesses, while the business improvement assessment district program would assist merchants and property owners establish BIDs in neighborhood commercial centers. The BIDs would be voluntary, self-imposed assessment districts and the collected fees would pay for maintenance, security, and management. These districts would be developed in cooperation with community groups and the Chamber of Commerce.

As with the L-2 and L-3, the potential for impact comes as a result of the target goal for this measure, which is 150,000 square feet of new commercial uses in neighborhood centers county-wide. This measure is not concentrated in one or two locations, but could be spread across many neighborhoods.

►► **L-5** Improve the vitality of mixed-use neighborhood-serving commercial centers through increased density allowances and enhanced design.

County will revise development standards that act as barriers to mixed-use projects, and establish clear and concise design guidelines that ensure compatibility of such projects with adjacent residential uses.

The County will process General Plan and Area Plan amendments designed to achieve an increase in maximum floor-area ratios to 2.0:1 in Neighborhood Commercial designations. The County will also evaluate other development standards including, but not limited to, parking requirements, building height limits, setbacks, and landscaping requirements.

The Eden Area Plan identifies five commercial districts to serve as community activity centers that attract residents, employees, shoppers, and visitors. The maximum floor-area ratios are 1.0:1 throughout these districts. The County will process General Plan and Area Plan amendments designed to achieve an increase of floor-area ratios to 2.0:1 in these districts. The Plan currently allows appropriate levels of residential density within these districts.

The County will establish design guidelines for mixed-use projects in neighborhood commercial centers to facilitate the development of high-quality projects and help ensure compatibility with surrounding residential districts. They will also emphasize effective transitions from single-family areas to higher intensity mixed-use and commercial areas.

This Measure has the following targets:

- Amount of new mixed-used development in neighborhood districts: 150,000 square feet of neighborhood-serving commercial uses and 300 residential units by 2020.
- Amount of new residential unit development in existing neighborhood districts: 1,200 residential units by 2020

Again, the physical targets of this measure provide the potential for environmental impact.

Each of these foregoing measures changes either density or development standards for their districts. These changes, depending on the extent of the change, could result in potential temporary impacts to the environment, although their effects combined with the other measures described in the CAP would contribute to GHG reductions. **Therefore, the analysis section of this document will primarily focus on these five measures.**

**Note – it is important to remember** that the CCAP by itself is quantitatively neutral on development, having instead the goal to minimize GHG emissions wherever possible. The CAP does not encourage or discourage development on its own; instead, *it encourages the County to focus development that is already anticipated in the County General plan documents* to areas and to styles that can be optimized for public transportation use and energy efficiency. In other words, taken out of context, these measures ostensibly have potential for impact; however, when matched to existing policies in the CVGP and the EAGP, the potential for new impact becomes less-than-significant. These issues will be explored in the section analysis below. This information will be revisited several times in the analysis.

**7. Land uses and setting:** The general plan amendments would apply to all unincorporated lands under jurisdiction of Alameda County, including urban, suburban and rural, on lands under all General Plan Designations.

**8. Other public agencies whose approval may be required:** None.

**B. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forest Resources             | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources       | <input type="checkbox"/> Climate Change and Green-house Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology /Soils             | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials                | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology and Water Quality        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning      | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources                            | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population and Housing     | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services                              | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation and Traffic | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

**C. LEAD AGENCY DETERMINATION:**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☒ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made to the project, including mitigation measures. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

---

Signature

---

Date

**D. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS:**

The Environmental Checklist and discussion that follows is based on sample questions provided in the CEQA Guidelines (Appendix G) which focus on various individual concerns within 17 different broad environmental categories, such as air quality, climate change, cultural resources, land use, public services, noise and traffic (and arranged in alphabetical order). The Guidelines also provide specific direction and guidance for preparing responses to the Environmental Checklist. The sample questions are meant to be used to meet the requirements for an initial study when the criteria set forth in CEQA Guidelines have been met. Substantial evidence of potential environmental impacts that are not listed in the checklist must also be considered. The sample questions are intended to encourage thoughtful assessment of impacts, and do not necessarily represent thresholds of significance. Each environmental checklist question (ECQ) will be cross-referenced in the text of the study (e.g., ECQ 3.a refers to the first question in Section 3, Air Quality; ECQ 6.a.i refers to the first subsection of the first question in Section 6, Geology and Soils).

Each question in the Checklist essentially requires a "yes" or "no" reply as to whether or not the project will have a potentially significant environmental impact of a certain type, and, following a Checklist table with all of the questions in each major environmental heading, citations, information and/or discussion that supports that determination. The Checklist table provides, in addition to a clear "yes" reply and a clear "no" reply, two other "in-between" replies, including one that is equivalent to "yes, but with

changes and mitigation measures that the proponent and the Lead Agency have agreed to, *no*”, and another “no” reply that requires a greater degree of discussion, supported by citations and analysis of existing conditions, threshold(s) of significance used and project effects than required for a simple “no” reply. Each possible answer to the questions in the Checklist, and the different type of discussion required is discussed below:

- a) Potentially Significant Impact. Checked if a discussion of the existing setting (including relevant regulations or policies pertaining to the subject) and project characteristics with regard to the environmental topic demonstrates, based on substantial evidence, supporting information, previously prepared and adopted environmental documents, and specific criteria or thresholds used to assess significance, that the project will have a potentially significant impact of the type described in the question.
- b) Less Than Significant With Mitigation. Checked if the discussion of existing conditions and specific project characteristics, also adequately supported with citations of relevant research or documents, determine that the project clearly will or is likely to have particular physical impacts that will exceed the given threshold or criteria by which significance is determined, but that with the incorporation of clearly defined mitigation measures into the project, that the project applicant or proponent has agreed to, such impacts will be avoided or reduced to less-than-significant levels.
- c) Less Than Significant Impact. Checked if a more detailed discussion of existing conditions and specific project features, also citing relevant information, reports or studies, demonstrates that, while some effects may be discernible with regard to the individual environmental topic of the question, the effect would not exceed a threshold of significance which has been established by the Lead or a Responsible Agency. The discussion may note that due to the evidence that a given impact would not occur or would be less than significant, no mitigation measures are required.
- d) No Impact. Checked if brief statements (one or two sentences) or cited reference materials (maps, reports or studies) clearly show that the type of impact could not be reasonably expected to occur due to the specific characteristics of the project or its location (e.g. the project falls outside the nearest fault rupture zone, or is several hundred feet from a 100-year flood zone, and relevant citations are provided). The referenced sources or information may also show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved. A response to the question may also be “No Impact” with a brief explanation that the basis of adequately supported project-specific factors or general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a basic screening of the specific project).

The discussions of the replies to the Checklist questions must take account of the whole action involved in the project, including off-site as well as on-site effects, both cumulative and project-level impacts, indirect and direct effects, and construction as well as operational impacts. Except when a “No Impact” reply is indicated, the discussion of each issue must identify:

- a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
- b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance, with sufficient description to briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration (Section 15063(c)(3)(D) of the Guidelines). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

- a) *Earlier Analysis Used.* Identify and state where they are available for review.
- b) *Impacts Adequately Addressed.* Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
- c) *Mitigation Measures.* For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.



1. AESTHETICS Would the project:	YES: Potentially Significant Impact	NO: Less Than Significant with Mitigation	NO: Less Than Significant Impact	NO: No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			✗	
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a designated state scenic highway corridor?			✗	
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			✗	
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			✗	

**Setting:** The County of Alameda has a combination of urban, suburban and rural areas encompassing a wide range of topography, vegetation, built structures and other visual elements that contribute to many different visual environments. There are many different officially designated state scenic highways in the County, including Interstate 580 north of San Leandro (outside the Plan areas), Interstate 680 between the Contra Costa County line and Mission Boulevard in Fremont, State Route 84 between Interstates 680 and Mission Boulevard. A very short, 0.4-mile long segment of Interstate 580 immediately west of the San Joaquin County line is also designated as a state scenic route, and the remainder of I-580 through the County to San Leandro is designated as eligible but not as an official route.<sup>1</sup> There are many scenic and historic resources, as well as stands of trees and other geographical features along these scenic routes; prominent rock outcroppings are not a common feature, but may be an element in some individual locations. The County has also adopted a Scenic Route Element as part of its General Plan that designates many roadways and highways as scenic routes for local purposes.<sup>2</sup> The visual character and quality of most rural areas of the County, separate from state and county designations of scenic routes, is considered sensitive to development.

There is a substantial complement of rural buildings and development in the Plan areas that affects, and in various degrees either enhances or degrades, existing scenic vistas, visual character and qualities, both within, along and outside its scenic routes and corridors.

The urban and suburban areas have a wide variety of residential and commercial districts, and a small number of industrial districts ranging from light to heavy industry. In many cases, these various districts are in close juxtaposition to one another, or blended together.

**Light and Glare.** The cities in the Plan areas contribute greatly to nighttime light pollution (i.e., glare that causes discomfort for viewers, obscures high-contrast scenes and makes fainter stars less visible), while some of the rural parts of the Plan areas provide good nighttime star clarity. However, existing rural development with yard and operational lights, nighttime arena uses, and street and road lights in some locations (major highways and intersections, in particular) can also adversely compromise these qualities.

**Regulatory Setting:** The state scenic highway designations are for routes that have been recognized by the State of California after having been nominated by Alameda County, and where the County has

<sup>1</sup> California State Department of Transportation: [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic\\_highways/index.htm](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic_highways/index.htm)

<sup>2</sup> County of Alameda *Scenic Route Element of the General Plan*, May, 1966.

adopted a Corridor Protection Program. To serve the state Program, the County *Scenic Route Element* contains policies to avoid excessive discretionary interpretation and establish an effective strategy to maintain the scenic character of the corridor. The formally required elements of the protection program include: 1) Regulation of land use and density of development; 2) Detailed land and site planning; 3) Control of outdoor advertising; 4) Careful attention to and control of earthmoving and landscaping; and 5) The design and appearance of structures and equipment.<sup>3</sup> The intended benefits of the program include the prevention of incompatible land uses such as junkyards, dumps and gravel pits, ensuring appropriate siting, landscaping or screening of unsightly activities where necessary, prohibiting billboards and regulating business signs to be compatible with scenic views, regulating grading and development on steep slopes and along ridgelines, and otherwise promoting harmonious development.<sup>4</sup>

*The East County Area Plan (ECAP), Castro Valley General Plan (CVGP) and Eden Area General Plan (EAGP)* also provide policies intended to protect visual and other aesthetic resources. The ECAP established the LPA and RM land use designations when it was first adopted in 1994, and included several policies protecting visual resources, such as Policy 105 to preserve major ridgelines in open space use, Policy 107, that disallows any structure to project above such ridgelines, and Policies 110 and 111 which protect stands of mature trees and disallow structures to exceed the height of any surrounding woodland tree canopy. In November 2000, the voter-approved initiative Measure D amended the ECAP, adding and subtracting substantial numbers of individual policies, for the purpose of protecting open space and agricultural land resources.<sup>5</sup>

The LPA and RM land use designations as amended by Measure D require residential development to be within a two-acre building envelope, and specify that agricultural facilities may only be located outside that envelope if necessary for agricultural uses, which itself substantially minimizes the visual effects of new building development on such lands. Measure D added Policies 106 and 108, which respectively address protection of views from public roads, trails and parks, and promote clustering of structures to be least visible from such views, with an exception for “agricultural structures to the extent it is necessary for agricultural purposes that they be located in more visible areas”. Policies 115 and 116 were also added, the first of which specifies that the visual effects of development should be minimized through appropriate use of materials, landscaping and screening, and that exterior lighting be located, designed and shielded so as to confine direct light only within the subject parcel. Policy 116 states that development shall be located and designed to the maximum extent possible to conform to natural landforms and topography, and minimize grading.<sup>6</sup>

Measure D integrated certain amended ECAP land use designations and policies into the CVGP with regard to the Castro Valley and Palomares Canyonlands areas. In particular, Measure D incorporated the Resource Management land use designation in the ECAP into the CVGP, as well as ECAP’s Policies 106, 108, 115 and 116 as described above.

The urban areas of the County are addressed in two General Plan Documents, the *Castro Valley General Plan (CVGP)* and the *Eden Area General Plan (EAGP)*. These two plans have an array of policies and programs that direct the County to consider visual quality and preservation of visually distinctive features during planning and application processes.

---

<sup>3</sup> op. cit., <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/faq.htm>

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/can\\_do.htm](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/can_do.htm)

<sup>5</sup> Alameda County, *East County Area Plan*, adopted by the County of Alameda Board of Supervisors May 5, 1994; amended by voter initiative Measure D, November 7, 2000 – revised ECAP adopted May 2002.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., pp. .

*Castro Valley.* There are physical features that reflect the agricultural and small-town character of Castro Valley before it became a suburban bedroom community. These include some remaining agricultural sites, undeveloped hillsides and canyons, neighborhoods with streets without curbs and sidewalks, and mature trees in front yards and along streets. A number of policies are found in the CVGP to help preserve and enhance neighborhood character. Policy 5.2-1 is designed to help ensure that new residential development is consistent with the desired community character, protects sensitive biological resources, and is not subject to undue natural hazards. Policy 5.2-2 ensures that residential development projects comply with all adopted design standards and guidelines. Policy 5.2-3 dictates that exceptions to design standards and guidelines will only be considered through a discretionary review process, and only approved if there are site-specific conditions that make it physically infeasible to follow the standards or guidelines; and the proposed design provides an equal or better design solution in terms of livability for residents and impacts on neighboring properties. Pursuant to these policies are a number of Actions to implement these policies through development standards, design criteria, development review and enforcement. All of these policies speak to the issue of character and aesthetics in the residential areas of the community.

Castro Valley has a fully functional but aging downtown and commercial area. Revitalizing the Central Business District (CBD) is one of the primary community objectives for the next 20 years. Additional pedestrian access, new retail, restaurant, and entertainment uses, and major streetscape improvements are necessary to transform the CBD into the town center envisioned by the community. In addition to the CBD, there are pockets of commercial development intermixed with the residential neighborhoods. Renovating these areas with new development and improvements is another top priority for the community.

Policies to enable these objectives include Policy 5.3-1 - Undertake capital improvement projects such as street redesign, community landscaping, and other similar projects in order to improve the appearance of Castro Valley and foster a community identity unique to Castro Valley; Policy 5.3-2 - Create programs to improve the visual appearance of the private properties on Castro Valley Boulevard through façade improvements, new signs, and reducing the number of billboards; Policy 5.3-3 - Ensure that commercial and mixed-use development projects comply with all adopted design standards and guidelines; and Policy 5.3-4 – Development in neighborhood commercial areas shall be designed to be compatible with the surrounding residential area and minimize impacts on adjoining residential properties, with respect to height, bulk, building massing, architectural design, building orientation, parking location, signage, and other features. As with the residential policies, a number of Actions are specified to implement these policies through development standards, design criteria, development review and enforcement, and all speak to the issue of character and aesthetics in the commercial areas of the community.

Part of the long-term vision for the community is to improve the overall appearance and establish a consistent and unified look for Castro Valley. Much of this objective can be accomplished through street design, gateways, and landscaping. A handful of policies address these concerns generally, including Policy 5.4-1, to undertake capital improvement projects such as street redesign, community landscaping, and other similar projects in order to improve the appearance of Castro Valley and foster a community identity unique to Castro Valley; Policy 5.4-2 – to ensure that when County, State, Federal and other agencies undertake street improvement projects, projects include landscaping and other design improvements that mitigate the visual impacts of paved roadways and improve the appearance of the community; and Policy 5.4-3 – to retain and improve existing landscaping in street rights of way that retain the “small-town” and “natural hillside character” of Castro Valley. Several Actions are specified to implement these policies.

*Eden Area:* The Eden Area is a broad area of various residential neighborhoods, small commercial districts and a small number of industrial uses. Single-family, multi-family and mobile home residential

are all included in the area, and many various types of commercial are found in the area, as well as areas that are mixed use. Land use in this area includes few major commercial centers (those being along East 14<sup>th</sup> Street and Hesperian Boulevard) and a number of mixed-use clusters and isolated commercial parcels on various roadways. Aesthetic goals for this area are similar to those for Castro Valley, in essence to enhance the character of the area by improving the building stock and general appearance of the neighborhoods, and to help to restore and maintain consistency of character.

The Eden Area General Plan has a multitude of policies for land use, as a result of the extremely varied types of development mixes that have been constructed over the years; the concepts for visual appearance and character are woven into those policies. There are far too many such policies to list here, but following are some pertinent examples for residential development:

*\* Goal LU-4 Preserve the quality and character of existing Neighborhoods in the Eden Area:*

*Policies:*

P1. The County shall advance the ongoing conservation, maintenance and upgrading of Neighborhoods through its direct policies and actions.

P2. New residential construction should be of a high-level of craftsmanship and use exterior materials and façade designs that enhance the appearance of each Neighborhood.

P5. Permit applications for alterations, additions and infill development shall be reviewed to ensure that they enhance the character and quality of Neighborhoods.

P7. The County shall utilize its Design Guidelines as an implementation tool to require higher quality and more appropriately scaled development in the Eden Area.

*Actions:*

A1. Develop and implement design guidelines to maintain the desirable qualities and character of existing neighborhoods.

A2. Conduct a study to explore the feasibility of creating “Preservation Corridors” to preserve the look and feel of existing neighborhoods.

*Goal LU-5 Allow appropriately scaled development in Neighborhoods.*

*Policies*

P2. New residential projects in Neighborhoods should enhance the existing character of the area and have high quality site planning and architectural design. Architectural diversity and variety, including variations in lot sizes, setbacks, orientation of homes and other site features should be allowed to maintain visual interest.

*Actions*

A1. Develop design guidelines for infill development in Neighborhoods. Guidelines should provide principles for addressing existing buildings and the street, and designing attractive and appropriate building facades.

*Design Guidelines.* The Alameda County Community Development Agency has initiated an Illustrated Design Guidelines and Development Standards project to establish design review guidelines for new construction and redevelopment projects in the County. The Design Guidelines will be used by developers to assist in the design of projects and by County staff, County decision-makers and the general

public to review applications for proposed projects. The key goal is to provide clarity and certainty about site planning and architectural design expectations.

The project area includes unincorporated western Alameda County, generally west of the East Bay hills, south of the city of San Leandro, north of the city of Hayward. It consists of the communities of Ashland, Castro Valley, Cherryland, Fairview and San Lorenzo. The area is approximately 22 square miles of urban and suburban land, with residential uses, built largely between the 1950s to the present, being the predominant land use.

"Design Guidelines" are a set of discretionary statements and "Development Standards" are a set of threshold requirements. Both are intended to guide land development to achieve a desired level of quality for the physical environment.

Design Guidelines function to preserve and enhance the desired character of existing neighborhoods and improve the aesthetic and functional quality of new development projects. Design Guidelines and Development Standards cover both urban and suburban development and should be organized primarily according to land use and building typology, such as industrial, residential, commercial and mixed-use development.

These Design Guidelines, functioning as a ordinance to enable compliance of new development with the General Plan, would apply to all projects proposed pursuant to the General Plan and to the CAP. They would provide a level of assurance that all projects proposed in the West County would achieve the best possible level of aesthetic quality.

Impacts: For the purpose of this analysis, a "substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista" (ECQ 1.a) would result if it can be reasonably seen that the additional construction of transit-friendly residential development and mixed-use residential / commercial development encouraged under the CAP would conflict with the Development Standards set forth in the *Scenic Route Element*, such as the substantial blocking of an "outstanding distant view", visual dominance over such a view, or placement of a strongly negative visual element (e.g., junk yard, utility substation or massing of utility poles and wires) within such a view.

Development that would result in placement of new development in contravention of the policies of the ECAP and CVGP as described above may also be considered to have potentially significant adverse effects on scenic vistas (ECQ 1.a), and/or the visual character or quality of sites and their surroundings (ECQ 1.c). Similar development related to the CAP that is within 1,000 feet of the designated state scenic highway rights-of-way in the County would be considered to have a potentially significant adverse impact on scenic resources within a state scenic highway corridor (ECQ 1.b). New and additional *project*-related development that substantially decreases night sky clarity by light pollution and thereby adversely affects nighttime views would be considered potentially significant as well (ECQ 1.d). This assessment is meant only to be on a general basis and not specific to any particular site.

**Measure T-1**, which would result in reduced requirements for parking for certain residential units near major transit hubs, would not affect visual character or result in modifications of views of scenic vistas. It would not result in any increases of light or glare.

**Measure L-2** specifies a target of 700 new residential units within ½ mile of a major transit station by the year 2020, most likely either near the Castro Valley or Bayfair BART stations and/or just north of the Hayward Amtrak station. **Measure L-3** specifies a target of 200 new residential units, in this case second units within ½ mile of a major transit station or other transportation hubs and commercial destinations by the year 2020, possibly scattered among a number of appropriate locations. **Measure L-4** has a target goal of 150,000 square feet of new commercial uses in neighborhood centers county-wide, not necessarily concentrated in one or two locations, but which could be spread across many neighborhoods. **Measure**

**L-5** would encourage 150,000 square feet of neighborhood-serving commercial uses and 300 residential units combined as mixed use by 2020 in neighborhood districts, and an additional 1,200 units of new residential unit development in existing neighborhood districts by 2020.

None of the residential or commercial development suggested in the CAP would be located on such a site, or be large enough in dimension, to block scenic vistas or intrude upon views from a scenic highway. All the development would be located solidly in the urbanized areas, and would be subject to dimensional requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and the new Design Guidelines, expected to be adopted in 2013 (see more on Design Guidelines below).

Countywide, or even across the urbanized west-central portion of Alameda County, this level of development across the area is not a large quantity or proportion of urban development relative to what exists at present, and individually no one unit or commercial space created under these Measures would be out of character generally within the context of the urban areas; and **with or without the CAP, this level of additional development is expected to occur anyway – the CAP policies are simply designed to steer this new development toward specific transit-friendly locations and locations proximate to destinations such as commercial centers and gathering places.**

However, some of these units and commercial spaces would be clustered at specific locations and in specific settings, according to the CVGP and EAGP, and the visual impact, whether adverse or beneficial, could be commensurate with the density and size of the development at that location.

To the extent that the General Plan documents encourage development as described in the CAP – the hundreds of high density units near BART stations and transit hubs, mixed use at logical locations and neighborhood nodes – the net impact of the proposed development has already been assessed under each general plan, and the plans themselves contain policies designed to mitigate any impacts that may result. To the extent that the CAP modifies the General Plan in any way, it is also true that any policies already included to preserve neighborhood beauty and character would also apply to any adjusted locations for development recommended by the CAP. No development could occur without the formal review required under the policies described above. Moreover, with the adoption of the Design Guidelines expected in 2013, very specific and detailed requirements would be brought to bear upon any new development.

No matter where development might be located, issues of light pollution and glare would need to be addressed. Current practice for lighting impacts includes use of full-cutoff light standards to prevent light from radiating horizontally or above; designing and locating light fixtures so that illumination is even, deep-shadow-free and directed only toward the area of interest; and wherever possible, use of motion detectors to extinguish lights when not needed. If these methods are judiciously used, no light pollution or unnecessary glare would result, and nighttime safety considerations would be fulfilled.

As a result of these policies and the Design Guidelines currently in latter review, **no significant impact to visual quality, aesthetics or light and glare would occur. The impacts would be less-than-significant.**

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

<b>2. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES</b> In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Resource Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the Project:	YES: Potentially Significant Impact	NO: Less Than Significant with Mitigation	NO: Less Than Significant Impact	NO: No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				✗
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				✗
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				✗
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				✗
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?				✗

Setting: All of the rural, grazing, farming, viticulture, and other specialty agricultural areas including horse boarding, breeding and training facilities, are in the "A" (Agriculture) zone district. The A district requires a minimum parcel size of 100 acres; the more remote areas of the county, where large parcels are predominant or otherwise more suitable, have combining or overlay "B-E" districts requiring either 160- or 320-acre minimum parcel sizes.

Virtually all of these lands are located in the East County.

Impacts:

None of the Measures recommended in the CAP would affect the agriculture or open space qualities of the East County, and none of the five measures that could affect the density and location of development or the parking available for second units would affect lands outside the urban growth boundary. **No significant impacts to agriculture or forest resources would occur.**

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

<b>3. AIR QUALITY</b> Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:	YES: Potentially Significant Impact	NO: Less Than Significant with Mitigation	NO: Less Than Significant Impact	NO: No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			✗	
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			✗	
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				✗
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			✗	
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				✗

**Setting:** Alameda County is subject to the Bay Area Clean Air Plan, first adopted in 1991 by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), and updated periodically since then. Two air quality plans are currently in effect, the 2005 Ozone Strategy, and the *2010 Bay Area Clean Air Plan* (BACAP). These plans provide measures to reduce air pollutant emissions from industrial facilities, commercial processes, motor vehicles and other sources, and in general seek to meet state and federal air quality standards. The California Clean Air Act of 1988 requires such plans to work towards achieving and maintaining the state ambient air quality standards. The *2010 Clean Air Plan* provides new pollution control strategies to reduce ozone, particulate matter (PM), air toxics, and greenhouse gases in a single, integrated plan, and assesses the region's progress towards improved air quality. Other programs established by the District include the Community Air Risk Evaluation program to evaluate and reduce health risk from air toxics, measures aimed at climate protection through reduction of greenhouse gases, and review of local general plans and major development projects that may significantly harm air quality.<sup>7</sup>

The BAAQMD also measures air quality and provides an annual statement of the Bay Area's status with respect to air quality standards and numbers of violations in the prior year. As of 2011, the Bay Area is designated as a "non-attainment" area for both the federal and state 8-hour ozone standards and the state 1-hour ozone standard, which is based on measures of ozone precursors known as reactive organic gases (ROG), organic hydrocarbon compounds, not including methane, that react rapidly in the atmosphere to form photochemical smog or ozone. However, the Bay Area has "attainment" status for the state and federal standards for carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), and sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>).<sup>8</sup>

For particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>, referring respectively to 10-micron and 2.5-micron diameter particles), the Bay Area also has "non-attainment" status under the state standards. For the federal PM<sub>10</sub> standard for a 24-hour period, the Bay Area is considered "unclassified"; however, based on the current 24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub> standard (lowered in 2006), the Bay Area was designated as nonattainment, effective on December 14, 2009. As a result, the Air District must adopt a State Implementation Plan (SIP) within

<sup>7</sup> Bay Area Air Quality Management District, *Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan (CAP)*, December 2010.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., and *Air Quality Standards and Attainment Status* – [http://hank.baaqmd.gov/pln/air\\_quality/ambient\\_air\\_quality.htm](http://hank.baaqmd.gov/pln/air_quality/ambient_air_quality.htm).



three years (by the end of 2012) that demonstrates the Bay Area can achieve the current standard within another two years (by December 14, 2014).<sup>9</sup>

The 2005 Ozone Attainment Plan was prepared in cooperation with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), to provide means by which the Bay Area can attain the national ozone standard. The Plan provides a control strategy that includes District regulations on stationary sources, and incentive programs and other control measures to control mobile sources, along with transportation programs with local governments and transit agencies.

Impacts: The CAP by itself is neutral on development, having instead the goal to minimize GHG emissions (and by coincidence other concomitant pollutant emissions) wherever possible through traffic and trip reduction, building energy efficiency, enhancement of transit use and a host of more subtle methods. The CAP does not encourage or discourage development on its own; instead, *it encourages the County to focus development that is already anticipated in the County general plan documents* to areas and to styles that can be optimized for public transportation use and energy efficiency. In other words, taken out of context, these measures ostensibly have potential for impact; however, when matched to existing policies in the CVGP and the EAGP and when accompanied by the other measures included in the CAP, the potential for new impacts become greatly reduced and possibly not significant.

Due to the extensive number of policies in the CAP that are consistent with the *2010 Clean Air Plan*, the assessment of potential conflict between the *2010 Clean Air Plan* and the CAP depends on whether or not the proposed implementation of the policies of the CAP in support of the CVGP and the EAGP would result in more or fewer vehicle miles traveled or vehicle trip increases associated with anticipated expansion of residential and commercial uses as prescribed in the CVGP, EAGP and CAP. As discussed in this Initial Study under the heading of Transportation (Section 16), the projected vehicle trip increases associated with the CAP are limited and are associated with development accommodated by the already-approved General Plan documents, and is reasonably assumed to be slightly lower than the increase in trips associated with the baseline from the General Plan. In this way, the policies of the CAP overall are in conformance with the 2010 BAAQMD Clean Air Plan.

Specifically, this concept applies to the five key measures in the following ways:

**Measure T-1**, which would result in reduced requirements for parking for certain residential units near major transit hubs, would place practical (but not absolute) restrictions on the number of vehicles an occupant of a residential unit could have by limiting onsite parking for certain transit-accessible second units. This would not increase traffic or emissions, but may serve to reduce them compared to types of residential units that they may replace. **No significant impact would result from T-1.**

**Measure L-2** specifies a target of 700 new residential units within ½ mile of a major transit station by the year 2020, most likely either near the Castro Valley and Bayfair BART stations and/or just north of the Hayward Amtrak station. **Measure L-3** specifies a target of 200 new residential units, in this case second units within ½ mile of a major transit station or other transportation hubs and commercial destinations by the year 2020, possibly scattered among a number of appropriate locations.

These two measures would attempt to concentrate expected new residential development (identified already in the CVGP and EAGP) near transit nodes so as to reduce the need for vehicle trips. In terms of total emissions of pollutants, this would have the effect of reducing emissions compared to permitting of these units in random locations where transit may or may not be readily available.

---

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., Air Quality Standards and Attainment Status, footnote 10.

Because all vehicle trips would not be eliminated, the most important effect of these measures on air emissions would be to result in a small increase of localized concentrations of carbon monoxide at intersections that serve the areas where the residential units would locate. Alameda County is in attainment of state and federal air quality standards for carbon monoxide due to strict emission standards for all vehicles, and this pollutant has not been a significant concern for air quality anywhere in Alameda County in many decades. This level of development would have a negligible effect on carbon monoxide concentrations anywhere. **No significant impact would result from L-2 or L-3.**

**Measure L-4** has a target goal of 150,000 square feet of new commercial uses in neighborhood centers county-wide, not necessarily concentrated in one or two locations, but which could be spread across many neighborhoods. **Measure L-5** would encourage 150,000 square feet of neighborhood-serving commercial uses and 300 residential units combined as mixed use by 2020 in neighborhood districts, and an additional 1,200 units of new residential unit development in existing neighborhood districts by 2020.

The idea behind these two measures would be to match expected levels of relatively high-density residential units (already anticipated in the General Plan documents) that would or could not necessarily be located near all existing transit nodes, with new and existing neighborhood commercial uses (sales of food and necessities, small restaurants, etc) that could easily serve the residents with a high degree of pedestrian access, thereby reducing the need for vehicle trips by those residents to remote locations. While the overall levels of traffic and emissions as anticipated by the General Plan documents would increase no matter where these uses were to be located, using these measures as a template for matching uses would help to minimize that increase into the future, with a net reduction in pollutant emissions. **No significant impacts to air quality would result from implementation of L-4 and L-5.**

Odor is not the focus of the CAP, which contains no policies or programs aimed at controlling odor and its sources. It would neither increase nor decrease the incidence of odor-causing uses or activities. Likewise, none of the measures contained in the CAP would have any effect on dust and particulate emissions due to construction or other activities. In both of these cases, **no impact would occur.**

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are warranted.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project:	YES: Potentially Significant Impact	NO: Less Than Significant With Mitigation	NO: Less Than Significant Impact	NO: No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			x	
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian, aquatic or wetland habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?			x	
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			x	
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				x
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				x
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				x
g) Result in conversion of oak woodlands that will have a significant effect on the environment?				x

**Setting:** The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and more specifically the *Biological Resources Background Report* in Volume 2 of the *East County Area Plan* (ECAP) provide a thorough description of the biological resources in each of the main vegetative communities in the East County area, some of which extend into the Castro Valley Canyonlands. The ECAP Background Report generally groups the plant communities into six vegetation associations: grassland, woodland, scrub, cultivated land, alkali sink scrub, and mixed conifers. The woodland association has a few subcategories, including coast live oak forests, mixed evergreen forests, and riparian woodland. Each vegetative community contains specific grasses, flowers, shrubs, trees, and is considered to provide essential habitat features that support certain wildlife, including fishes, amphibians, reptiles, small to larger mammals, and a wide range of bird species. Riparian and seasonal wetlands are also recognized as associated with any one of these six main vegetative community types.<sup>10</sup>

Plant and wildlife species that have special protected status are also identified in the *Background Report*, such as described in ECQ 4.a – candidate, sensitive, or special status species identified by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), as well as by the California Native Plant Society's Inventory of Rare and Endangered Vascular Plants of California and in

<sup>10</sup> Alameda County Planning Department, *Draft Environmental Impact Report, East County Area Plan*, June 1993, pp. 5-7.1-7

the Natural Diversity Data Base maintained by the CDFG. The ECAP *Background Report* indicated that significant portions of the County had not been surveyed in detail for the presence of protected and unprotected plant and wildlife species, but that its extensive inventory of recognized special-status species plants, invertebrates, amphibians, reptiles, mammals and birds were sufficient to establish an Urban Growth Boundary.<sup>11</sup>

A more recent survey of biological resources in the East County area was developed for the recently adopted (2011) East Alameda County Conservation Strategy (EACCS)<sup>12</sup> which included a detailed aerial survey-based inventory of land cover types, including wetlands, rocky outcrops, woodlands, mixed chaparral and grazing lands. The inventory findings are consistent with the characterization of the wildlife and plant species and their habitats in the ECAP *Background Report*, and provides a current listing of the status of endangered or other special-status species. The EACCS is also described in more detail below.

*Regulatory Setting.* Both the ECAP and CVGP contain an extensive range of policies to protect open space and wildlife habitat from large-scale development, such as the growth boundary of the ECAP (Policy 1) to Policy 53 that requires the County to preserve “a continuous band of open space consisting of a variety of plant communities and wildlife habitats to provide comprehensive, rather than piecemeal, habitat conservation for all of East County.” These Plans contain other important policies that cover a broad range of issues with respect to biological resources and privately-held lands.<sup>13</sup>

The East Alameda County Conservation Strategy (EACCS) was completed in 2011 through a partnership with Alameda County, the three cities in the East County area, the Zone 7 Water Agency, other local agencies and the state and federal resource agencies (California DFG and USFWS). The EACCS is intended as a less formal habitat conservation plan, that serves to identify areas in eastern Alameda County that have important habitat conservation values, and to establish guiding biological principles for conducting conservation in these areas. The EACCS will enable willing landowners to implement long-term conservation in the form of permanent conservation easements to offset impacts from local land use, transportation, or other infrastructure projects. It also enables local projects to comply with state and federal regulatory requirements within a framework of comprehensive conservation goals and objectives, and to be implemented using consistent and standardized mitigation requirements. The EACCS is not a formal Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) or Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), but still serves similar purposes of enabling a coordinated and biologically sound approach to mitigation of various projects to support conservation and/or recovery of listed species, as well as streamline state and federal permitting, and guide strategies for avoiding and minimizing impacts on wildlife and plant habitat, and mitigating identified project impacts.<sup>14</sup>

In contrast to the rural East County and Castro Valley Canyonlands, the urbanized area of the CVGP and the EAGP, where all of the most intensive measures would be implemented, is virtually 100% urbanized landscape, with few significant habitats or corridors for wildlife and with no supporting lands for any special status species. The few potentially affected areas that could support unusual wildlife are local parks and drainage canals, and these are limited by their proximity to more extensive areas of semi-natural landscapes at the urban edge. A small number of natural or semi-natural waterways remain, including San Lorenzo Creek east of A Street and the City of Hayward Japanese Garden on the County / City of Hayward border, the same waterway upstream of Don Castro Regional Park, and Crow Creek and

---

<sup>11</sup> Ibid. p. 5-7.7 through 5-7.11

<sup>12</sup> <http://www.eastalco-conservation.org/documents/090611-eaccsfaq.pdf>

<sup>13</sup> Alameda County Planning Department, *East County Area Plan – A Portion of the Alameda County General Plan*, Volume 1 – Goals, Policies and Programs, May 5, 1994 as amended through May 2002, pp. 18-19, pp. 33-34.

<sup>14</sup> <http://www.eastalco-conservation.org/documents/090611-eaccsfaq.pdf>

Cull Creek just upstream of Crow Canyon Road. Only landscape trees and wildlife adapted to urban environments, such as squirrels, raccoons and various birds are present in significant numbers.

Impacts: Nearly all of the policy measures of the CCAP would apply primarily to the urbanize area of the County, with little if any application to rural or natural sites. The five primary measures under consideration -

**Measure T-1**, which would result in reduced requirements for parking for certain residential units near major transit hubs;

**Measure L-2**, which specifies a target of 700 new residential units within ½ mile of a major transit station by the year 2020, most likely either near the Castro Valley and Bayfair BART stations and/or just north of the Hayward Amtrak station;

**Measure L-3**, which specifies a target of 200 new residential units, in this case second units within ½ mile of a major transit station or other transportation hubs and commercial destinations by the year 2020;

**Measure L-4**, which has a target goal of 150,000 square feet of new commercial uses in neighborhood centers county-wide, which could be spread across many neighborhoods; and

**Measure L-5** which would encourage 150,000 square feet of neighborhood-serving commercial uses and 300 residential units combined as mixed use by 2020 in neighborhood districts, and an additional 1,200 units of new residential unit development in existing neighborhood districts by 2020 –

would all affect previously urbanized areas solely, with virtually no contact with areas of significant biological resources. These measures would have **no significant impact upon biological resources** in Alameda County.

Of the remaining measures, **Measure G-2**, which includes carbon sequestration as an objective within County-led natural area restoration projects, implies the greatest potential to affect biological resources. Measure G-2 recognizes that publicly-owned lands in eastern and western portions of the unincorporated county offer substantial opportunities for ecosystem restoration; and this measure directs the County to evaluate the carbon sequestration potential of future restoration projects and apply these sequestration levels to the achievement of the County's GHG emissions reduction target.

Measure G-2, however, does not require any project to restore land in such a way so as to maximize GHG sequestering potential, nor does it encourage habitat modification projects on areas that already support good quality habitat values. Instead, it is designed to track and measure GHG benefits of projects proposed and implemented by others in order to take advantage of the inherent GHG reduction values in order to reach GHG reduction targets. The presence of the policy may encourage projects to maximize GHG reduction through the planting of native vegetation that would utilize CO<sub>2</sub>, but under the reasonable assumption that any approved restoration project would provide tangible benefits to important biological habitats with few or no adverse impacts, it follows that this policy would not adversely affect habitat restoration, and would have **no significant impact on biological resources**.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation would be required.

5. CLIMATE CHANGE AND GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS Would the project:	YES: Potentially Significant Impact	NO: Less Than Significant With Mitigation	NO: Less Than Significant Impact	NO: No Impact
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			x	
b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				x

Setting: Climate change refers to changes in the Earth's weather patterns including the rise in the Earth's temperature due to an increase in heat-trapping or "greenhouse" gases in the atmosphere. Naturally-occurring greenhouse gases (GHGs) include water vapor, carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O) and ozone (O<sub>3</sub>), and as such, they serve essential functions of regulating and stabilizing the temperature of the Earth's oceans and atmosphere by both retaining radiant heat from the sun within the atmosphere and reflecting sunlight at a relatively consistent level. Ancient cycles of ice ages and climate change were recognized by early 19<sup>th</sup> Century scientists, and the "greenhouse" effect was first theorized in 1824 by a French mathematician, Joseph Fourier, but not labeled as such until the 1890s by a Swedish scientist, Svante Arrhenius. A century later, it has been widely accepted that although the Earth's natural climate constantly changes, human activities have vastly expanded the generation or release of GHGs by the burning of hydrocarbon fuels such as oil, gas and coal since the Industrial Revolution (i.e., about 1750). The International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has concluded that the global climate is changing at a rate unmatched in the past one thousand years, and that this change is due to human activity. Since the 20th century, new industrial processes produced substantial quantities of hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>) – chemicals used mostly for refrigerants, propellants and cleaning solvents – which have vastly greater ability to trap heat within the atmosphere.<sup>15</sup>

Climate change has already caused the average surface temperature of the Earth to increase by about one degree Fahrenheit over the last century, ocean water temperatures and mean sea levels have risen, and snow and ice cover has decreased at the poles and on mountain glaciers. The results have included changes to the seasons, such as a longer growing season, changes that have also affected some animal and plant habitats and their ranges. Without changes to the trends in climate change, surface temperatures are expected to increase anywhere from 1.4 to 5.8 degrees Fahrenheit by the end of the century.<sup>16</sup>

Most importantly, increases in global warming would be expected to result in more extreme precipitation and faster evaporation of water, disrupting water supplies, energy supply and demand, agriculture, forestry, natural habitat, outdoor recreation, air quality, and public health. Climate change also affects public health because the higher temperatures result in more air pollutant emissions, increased smog, and

<sup>15</sup> Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), <http://www.baaqmd.gov/Divisions/Planning-and-Research/Climate-Protection-Program/Science-of-Climate-Change.aspx>, [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History\\_of\\_climate\\_change\\_science](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_climate_change_science), <http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/background/history.html>

<sup>16</sup> Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), Science of Climate Change webpage.

associated respiratory disease and heart-related illnesses. Increasing temperatures threaten to erode the dramatic improvements in Bay Area air quality achieved over the past 50 years.<sup>17</sup>

Because the various GHGs have extremely different characteristics in the extent to which they trap heat in the atmosphere and consequently affect climate change, to quantify their relative effects, each one has been calculated for a Global Warming Potential (GWP) factor, starting from 1 for carbon monoxide, 21 for methane and 310 for nitrous oxide. HFCs and PFCs have vastly more GWP ‘weight’ – 6,500 times an equal amount of CO<sub>2</sub> – and sulfur hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>) ‘weighs in’ with an astonishing GWP of 23,900 times an equal weight in CO<sub>2</sub>. To help the various air pollution control districts in California quantify and categorize the GHGs of different uses and activities such as industry, power plants, urban land uses, transportation, domestic wood burning, etc., on a relatively even basis, each GWP factor is “translated” into CO<sub>2</sub>e equivalents (CO<sub>2</sub>e).

The State of California has actively initiated legislation since the 1990s, such as the California Energy Commission’s 1997 *Global Climate Change Report: Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Strategies for California*. In September 2000 Senate Bill 1771 (SB 1771) created the California Climate Action Registry as a non-profit organization to help California agencies such as the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) establish GHG emissions baselines and annual inventories of such emissions. After several other conferences, legislation signed by Governor Gray Davis, Air Resource Board rules and regulations passed through 2005, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signed Executive Order S-3-05, which initiated the development of a Climate Action Team of different state agencies and a goal of reducing GHGs in the state to 80 percent of its 1990 levels by 2050. The following year Assembly Bill 32 was signed into law to require that GHGs be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) estimated the quantity of 1990 GHG emissions to be 427 MMT/Yr of CO<sub>2</sub>e, but without action to reduce current GHG trends, it is predicted they could reach 600 MMT/Yr of CO<sub>2</sub>e by 2020. The targeted reduction therefore is almost 30 percent below 1990 levels.<sup>18</sup>

The state program to reach these goals – the AB 32 Scoping Plan approved in 2008 – includes transportation-related strategies to regulate emissions from new passenger vehicles and trucks, reduce carbon in fuels and employ alternative fuels. Other strategies involve carbon trading, renewable energy, energy efficiency, fees on major GHG sources, and raising building and appliance standards. The Scoping Plan, intended to be adopted by 2012, also encourages local government to take corresponding actions, particularly through adoption of local Climate Action Plans (CAPs).<sup>19</sup> The County of Alameda adopted a Climate Action Plan in August 2011, but is not currently in effect, pending review pursuant to CEQA.

Also in 2008, Senate Bill 375 (SB 375) was signed into law with specific regional targets, for 2020 and 2035, to reduce GHGs from passenger vehicles. Under this legislation, urbanized regions in the state (such as the nine-county Bay Area) and their associated Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs – such as the Association of Bay Area Governments or ABAG) are encouraged to develop integrated land use, housing and transportation plans that meet those SB 375 targets by reducing suburban sprawl and promoting sustainable growth patterns, such as transit-oriented development and revitalizing existing communities, in order to minimize vehicle miles traveled (VMT). New projects in these regions that meet the criteria of SB 375 may be relieved of certain CEQA review requirements.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Ibid.

<sup>18</sup> California Environmental Protection Agency, *Climate Action Team Executive Summary – Report to Governor Schwarzenegger and the California Legislature*, March, 2006.

<sup>19</sup> California Air Resources Board/Arnold Schwarzenegger, Governor, State of California, *Climate Change Scoping Plan - A Framework for Change*, December 2008. ES-1-4, p. 26.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid, website: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/sb375.htm>.

In 2006 the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD, or Air District) completed an inventory of GHGs for a base year of 2002 that estimated that CO<sub>2</sub> is the source of 89.9 percent of Bay Area GHGs, with a CO<sub>2</sub>e of 76.79 million metric tons per year (MMT/Yr). Methane was the source of approximately 4.5 percent of GHGs, at about 3.83 MMT/Yr, and nitrous dioxide (N<sub>2</sub>O) at 5.0 percent. The highest GWP-factored GHGs, HFCs, PFCs and SF<sub>6</sub> were together estimated as generating 0.51 MMT/Yr, or about 0.6 percent of the total. By major sources or categories of activities, about 50 percent of GHGs were derived from transportation, 25.7 percent from industrial and commercial uses and activities, 10.9 percent from domestic activities, and 5.6 to 7.2 percent for power plants and oil refining, respectively.<sup>21</sup> The volume and characteristics of GHGs generated from agricultural activities has not been quantified in the Bay Area, or for any individual air district in California. However, the 1990 state inventory of GHGs indicate that agriculture generated approximately 5 percent of statewide GHG emissions from a combination of animal wastes, energy use, crop residue burning, livestock, soil management practices and decomposition of organic matter.<sup>22</sup>

The Air District's *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines*, provides thresholds of significance for assessing the impacts of land use proposals and plans on greenhouse gases. Under these thresholds, a general plan's operational-related annual GHG emissions are deemed to be *less than cumulatively significant* if the project meets any of three thresholds: 1) it is in a community with an adopted "Qualified Climate Action Plan" and the project conforms with that Plan (and its qualified "GHG Reduction Strategy"); 2) its quantified emissions are 1,100 metric tons per year (MT/yr) or less of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>e); or 3) it is a mixed use project with quantified emissions of 4.6 MT/Yr of CO<sub>2</sub>e or less per service population (i.e., including residents and employees). If a Climate Action Plan has not been adopted, *and* the project would exceed one of the two quantified thresholds, the project would be considered as having a *cumulatively significant impact* on global climate change.<sup>23</sup> Although the Alameda County CAP has not been formally adopted, pending completion of CEQA documentation, for the purpose of the MDN/IS the County's CAP is deemed to be in place. However, the CAP contains very few measures that relate to agricultural uses or uses that might be located in agricultural areas.

**Impacts:** While it is conceivable that, in the short term, GHG emissions could be increased by the four key development measures taken by themselves and without context:

**Measure L-2**, which specifies a target of 700 new residential units within ½ mile of a major transit station by the year 2020, most likely either near the Castro Valley and Bayfair BART stations and/or just north of the Hayward Amtrak station;

**Measure L-3**, which specifies a target of 200 new residential units, in this case second units within ½ mile of a major transit station or other transportation hubs and commercial destinations by the year 2020;

**Measure L-4**, which has a target goal of 150,000 square feet of new commercial uses in neighborhood centers county-wide, which could be spread across many neighborhoods; and

**Measure L-5** which would encourage 150,000 square feet of neighborhood-serving commercial uses and 300 residential units combined as mixed use by 2020 in neighborhood districts, and an additional 1,200 units of new residential unit development in existing neighborhood districts by 2020 –

---

<sup>21</sup> Bay Area Air Quality Management District, *Source Inventory of Bay Area Greenhouse Gas Emissions – Base Year 2002*, February 2010.

<sup>22</sup> California Air Resources Board, *Staff Report – California 1990 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Level and 2020 Emissions Limit*, November 16, 2007, p. 6.

<sup>23</sup> Bay Area Air Quality Management District, *California Environmental Quality Act – Air Quality Guidelines*, June 2010, pp. 2-1 to 2-3, including Table 2-1.



...It must be recognized that these four important measures are designed not to create new development that is not already envisioned as inevitable growth, but rather to direct that inevitable development into locations and settings where the GHG emissions of that growth could be minimized by proximity to public transportation and essential goods and services. Vehicle Trips would be reduced compared to the same level of development under the existing policies, and this alone would reduce GHG rather than increasing them.

The remainder of all of the other proposed Measures, both alone and taken in conjunction with the first four measures described, have all been designed and calculated to reduce Countywide GHG emissions annually on a progressive basis through the year 2020 and beyond, so that GHG emissions would not only stop increasing but actually diminish by the target goal of almost 244,000 tons per year of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent by 2020.

All of the measures in the Plan, taken individually or collectively, would have **no significant adverse impact on GHG emissions or climate change.**

Mitigation Measures: With no significant impacts expected to GHG Emissions and Climate Change as a result of the Climate Action Plan, no mitigation measures are required.

6. CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project:	YES: Potentially Significant Impact	NO: Less Than Significant With Mitigation	NO: Less Than Significant Impact	NO: No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?			✗	
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?			✗	
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			✗	
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			✗	

**Setting:** The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA, 1970, as amended, Section 21084.1) identifies historic resources as those listed in or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources, based on a range of criteria, such as association with events or patterns of events that have made significant contributions to broad patterns of historical development in the United States or California, including local, regional, or specific cultural patterns (California Register Criterion 1). Alternatively, structures which are directly associated with important persons in the history of the state or the country (Criterion 2), which embody the distinctive characteristics of type, period or other aesthetic importance (Criterion 3), or which has the potential to reveal important information about the prehistory or history of the state or the nation (such as archaeological sites) may qualify as a historic resource (Criterion 4). In addition to meeting at least one of the above criteria, structures must typically be over 50 years old (a state guideline rather than a statutory requirement) and have retained sufficient historic integrity to be clearly evident as a historic resource through a combination of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association with historic patterns. The definition of “integrity” in this context is based on criteria established by the National Register of Historic Places, which include, in basic terms, historical patterns and events (Criterion A), association with important persons in the past (Criterion B) and distinctive characteristics unique to a type, period, style, method of construction, the work of a recognizable master builder, or possessing high artistic value (Criterion C).

Alameda County conducted a survey in 1993 to identify properties in the East County area which might meet the state criteria for listing in state Register, the *Preliminary Inventory of Historical Resources: Eastern Alameda County* in 1993<sup>24</sup>, which was substantially updated in 2005 as the *East Alameda County Cultural Resource Survey*. The *Survey* encompasses the unincorporated areas east of the San Leandro Hills, and generally conforms to the boundaries of the ECAP, and thereby does not encompass the Castro Valley Canyonlands area. The *Survey* provides an overview of the history of the area from the Mission period forward. When the *Survey* was completed, 35 properties were identified that appear eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources, and should be the subject of a standard historic evaluation protocol if not already completed. Another 148 properties were identified as important enough to warrant additional investigations and preparation of the standard review protocol, established by the state Department of Parks and Recreation (and thusly known as a DPR form).<sup>25</sup> Of the 35 “keeper”

<sup>24</sup> Alameda County Planning Department, *Preliminary Inventory of Historical Resources: Eastern Alameda County*, 1993.

<sup>25</sup> Alameda County Community Development Agency, *East Alameda County Cultural Resource Survey*, Prepared by Corbett, Michael R., June 117, 2005, pp 23-24.

properties (appropriate for candidacy for the state Register), over 10 were categorized as consisting of combined residential and agricultural properties, and over 40 such properties were among the 145 other sites that appear worthy of further investigation. Although the urban and suburban areas of Castro Valley have been surveyed for historic resources, the Canyonlands have yet to be surveyed.

The County of Alameda has adopted a Historic Preservation Ordinance, which established a voluntary Alameda County Register of Historic Resources, as a voluntary list of historic properties, for which demolition or substantial alteration that alters its historic significance would be a significant adverse environmental impact. However, the Register has not yet been fully implemented. There has been a set of properties tentatively chosen for inclusion on the County Register, but the list requires approval by the Board of Supervisors to be adopted, which has not happened at the time of this writing.

The East County and Castro Valley Canyonlands areas of the County contain many areas in which archaeological resources have been documented, which has been summarized in the County's publication, *Archaeology in Alameda County: A Handbook for Planners* (1976). The Handbook includes a map that identifies extreme, high, moderate and low levels of archaeological sensitivity throughout the County based on known sites and professional interpretation of natural features. The map in the *Handbook* identifies several areas in the Castro Valley Canyonlands and throughout the East County as having higher "extreme" and "high" levels of archaeological sensitivity.<sup>26</sup> These areas of the County are known to have been inhabited by native peoples speaking the Chochenyo language, related to the Costanoan family of languages that extended from the Delta south to the Monterey area. Grazing under the control of Mission San Jose (in the Fremont area) was widespread in the East County by the late 1700s, which continued with a similar Spanish-Mexican influence under five large ranchos that continued until the mid-1800s with California statehood.<sup>27</sup>

Regulatory Setting: Section 15064.5 of CEQA requires certain basic measures to be completed in the event of discovery of archaeological or paleontological resources (including human remains). These procedures provide for temporary protection of any resource that is discovered until a determination can be made about its importance. These procedures are also considered necessary to address the potential of discovering presently unknown human remains that may have been interred outside of formal cemeteries or paleontological resources.

Each existing General Plan element (Castro Valley General Plan - CVGP, Eden Area General Plan – EAGP and the East County Area Plan - EACP) already contains policies designed to protect cultural and historical resources in the event of project construction or incidental discovery. For example, the Eden Area General Plan (EAGP) contains the following policies under Land Use Goal LU-6, all of which fully cover the necessity to protect and conserve historical and cultural heritage of the County:

**EAGP Policies:**

- P1. Historic or culturally significant buildings and other resources in the Eden Area should be preserved.
- P2. To the extent possible, the County shall cause no substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in 15064.5 of the California Environmental Quality Act [...] through its direct or indirect actions.

---

<sup>26</sup> Alameda County Planning Department, *Archaeology in Alameda County: A Handbook for Planners*, October, 1976. Map.

<sup>27</sup> Alameda County Planning Department, *Draft Environmental Impact Report, East County Area Plan*, June 1993, p. 5-9.1

- P3. To the extent possible, unique paleontological resources, sites or unique geologic features shall not be directly or indirectly destroyed or significantly altered.
- P4. The County should make the Eden Area a top priority when conducting historic and cultural resources inventories in the county.
- P5. Prior to the completion of a professionally-prepared historic survey, property owners of potentially significant historic resources shall be required to prepare professional historic surveys prior to demolition of any structure. Potentially significant historic resources may be defined as those resources identified in professionally prepared surveys or where additional evidence suggests that the property or structure may be significant.
- P6. New development, alterations and remodeling projects on or adjacent to historic properties should be sensitive to historic resources and should be compatible with the surrounding historic context.
- P7. The County should support the development of local history projects, including the collection of oral histories from local residents.

Each of the other area General Plan documents contain similar policies that, collectively, apply to the entire County.

Impacts: While the CCAP neither supports nor enhances any given level of new development significantly, it does redirect some development from places where GHG emissions might be maximized to places where GHG emissions would be reduced. This probable change of location has an as-yet undefined effect on cultural and historic resources, and it is impossible to say with any precision what these effects could be, whether more or less adverse, or the same. Construction which involves excavation and earthmoving has the greatest potential for disturbance of ancient cultural resources, while aboveground redevelopment and reconstruction will more likely affect existing historic structures and districts rather than buried cultural artifacts. The CCAP could affect projects that result in both types of disturbance due to redirecting of development to more favorable GHG reduction areas – but again, it is not possible to say with any precision whether the effect would be more or less adverse overall.

Fortunately, existing policies such as those described above and contained in the EAGP, the CVGP and the ECAP supply the necessary preexisting policy and action guidance required for any project to monitor and correct its impacts on cultural and/or historic resources. These policies and implementation actions, coupled with existing laws and CEQA environmental review requirements, would substantially avert the potential for significant effects as a result of construction or grading, whether or not the CCAP is integrated onto the General Plan. As a result, no significant impact would occur to historic or cultural resources from formal amendment of the CCAP into the General Plan.

Mitigation Measures. Existing policies for cultural and historic preservation in the General Plan would not be displaced by any of the new policies or measures defined in the CCAP, and would collectively serve to reduce the potential loss of archaeological, cultural or paleontological resources from any development made possible by the CCAP to a *less than significant* level, and no further mitigation measures are required.

<b>7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS</b> Would the project:	YES: Potentially Significant Impact	NO: Less Than Significant With Mitigation	NO: Less Than Significant Impact	NO: No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			✗	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			✗	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			✗	
iv) Landslides?			✗	
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			✗	
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			✗	
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?			✗	
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?			✗	

**Setting:** The ECAP, CVGP and EAGP areas of Alameda County contain several seismic faults and other related geological hazards such as potential liquefaction, landslides, subsidence, and expansive soil. Although the well-known San Andreas Fault is located west of San Francisco Bay and outside the boundaries of the area, modest to large ruptures on it and its associated subsidiary faults can be noticeable and cause damage throughout the Bay Area, as occurred in the 1989 Loma Prieta Earthquake. As parts of the San Andreas Fault system, the Greenville, Calaveras and Hayward Faults are well-documented fault zones that traverse Alameda County, the latter primarily along the western base of the East Bay Hills. The California Division of Mines and Geology has estimated the maximum credible earthquake magnitude on these three faults to be 6.7 to 7.5 on the established Richter Magnitude Scale. Several other potentially active smaller faults lie within the area, such as the Las Positas, Pleasanton, Mission and Verona faults, which could result in earthquakes with a magnitude of 5.5 to 6.8.<sup>28</sup>

Ruptures may occur within designated “Special Studies Zones” (also known or referred to as Alquist-Priolo zones, based on state legislation of that name in 1972) that overlie the known faults. Strong ground shaking may occur on many other properties in the area and have damaging effects on buildings, especially when the underlying geology is characterized by alluvial or water-saturated materials. The effects of earthquakes also can cause ground failures such as landslides, subsidence (adverse settling due to subsurface soil conditions) and liquefaction in certain soil conditions. Liquefaction occurs when water-saturated sediments, especially fine sandy layers near the ground surface (30 to 45 deep at most) lose

<sup>28</sup> Alameda County Planning Department, *Draft Environmental Impact Report, East County Area Plan*, June 1993, p. 5-11.1-3

cohesive strength and become nearly liquid, and cannot support adequately support pavements or structures.<sup>29</sup>

Other soil and geological hazards, not related to seismic activity, include erosive soil conditions, expansive soils (shrink-swell effects), and soil conditions that, when used for septic tank leach fields, do not provide adequate percolation of waste water or filtering relative to the level or position of nearby water wells. Clayey soils are often not compatible with septic systems, because they constrict percolation. Soil erosion or loss of topsoil may also occur in many rural areas of the County, without adequate controls on stormwater runoff or irrigation.

The County adopted a joint Seismic Safety/Safety Element in November 1976 as part of its General Plan, to establish policies on geological and seismic safety hazards, as well as wildland fires, structural fires and flooding. The Element was updated in August 1992 to include a section on hazardous materials; and then in January 2013, the County adopted a Safety Element that combines these considerations and expands upon them to suit modern needs and regulations. The Element identifies goals of reducing risks to life, property and natural resources, reducing the adverse effects of such hazards, and informing the public of such hazards. Objectives and implementation measures are also set forth to protect areas subject to severe environmental hazards from being developed with incompatible land uses, and ensure environmental analysis and investigations in areas of known or suspected hazards. Some policies aim to reduce risks to existing development from geological hazards while others address public information and emergency response preparedness.

Each existing General Plan element (Castro Valley General Plan - CVGP, Eden Area General Plan – EAGP and the East County Area Plan - EACP) already contains policies designed to address geology and soils issues in the event of project construction or earthmoving. For example, the Eden Area General Plan (EAGP) contains the following policies under Public Safety Goal SAF-1, all of which fully cover the necessity to address geological, seismic and geotechnical issues:

**EAGP Policies:**

- P1. Site specific geologic hazard assessments, conducted by a licensed geologist, shall be completed prior to development approval in areas with landslide and liquefaction hazards [...] and for development proposals submitted in Alquist-Priolo Zones [...] Hazards to be mapped include:
  - ♦ Seismic features
  - ♦ Landslide potential
  - ♦ Liquefaction potentialMitigation measures needed to reduce the risk to life and property from earthquake induced hazards should be included.
- P2. Buildings shall be designed and constructed to withstand ground shaking forces of a minor earthquake without damage, of a moderate earthquake without structural damage, and of a major earthquake without collapse of the structure. The County shall require that critical facilities and structures (e.g. hospitals, emergency operations centers) be designed and constructed to remain standing and functional following an earthquake...[...]
- P3. All construction in the Eden Area shall conform with the Uniform Building Code and the Alameda County Building Code, which specify requirements for seismic design, foundations and drainage.

---

<sup>29</sup> Ibid., p. 5.11.2-4.

- P4. To the extent feasible, major infrastructure including transportation, pipelines, and water and natural gas mains, shall be designed to avoid or minimize crossings of active fault traces and to accommodate fault displacement without major damage that could result in long-term service disruptions.
- P5. The County shall encourage the retrofitting of existing structures and other seismically unsafe buildings and structures to withstand earthquake ground-shaking.
- P6. New development in areas with the potential for landslides or liquefaction hazards, as indicated in Figure 8-2, shall not be approved unless the County can determine that feasible measures will be Implemented to reduce the potential risk to acceptable levels, based on site-specific analysis. The County shall review new development proposals in terms of the risk caused by seismic and geologic activity.
- P7. In order to minimize off-site impacts of hillside development, new construction on landslide-prone or potentially unstable slopes shall be required to implement drainage and erosion control provisions to avoid slope failure and mitigate potential hazards.

Each of the other area General Plan documents contain similar policies that, collectively, apply to the entire County.

Impacts: New development with or without the direction of the CCAP could occur in areas with any number of geological or soil hazards. Each new development or substantial construction project would require review and would result in a referral of the application to the County's Grading Division of the Public Works Agency, which assesses individual proposals and their setting (location relative to known geological or seismic hazards) to determine if detailed soils or geotechnical analysis would be required, and if a peer review by Grading Division or their designated consultant should also be required. Typically, United States Geological Survey (USGS) reference maps are consulted for known landslides, faults, liquefaction hazard zones, soil conditions (such as shrink-swell effects or corrosive soils). When required, additional on-site exploratory study may also result in the discovery of additional hazards, or conclude that proposed development would not pose any risk of geotechnical hazards. Because most of the possible development guidance provided by the CCAP would tend to move development away from rural areas and into areas with urban services, such as sanitary sewer, percolation studies are unlikely to be required to be prepared by the proponent or by the Alameda County Health Care Services Agency, Environmental Health Services Department.

A large magnitude earthquake on one of the several Bay Area faults is capable of producing damaging, ***potentially significant*** levels of ground shaking on almost any given site in the County. Without appropriate assurance of review of development proposals, and implementation of corrective measures or site planning, the potential for new development to result in exposure of people or structures to potentially substantial adverse effects of an earthquake rupture, ground shaking or other forms of ground failure would be ***potentially significant***. The potential for loss of life or serious injury due to structural failure could be ***potentially significant***. New development may also result in ***potentially significant*** adverse effects due to erosion, unstable or problematic soil conditions (e.g., expansive, corrosive or without adequate drainage or percolation).

While the CCAP neither supports nor enhances any given level of new development significantly, it does redirect some development from places where GHG emissions might be maximized to places where GHG emissions would be reduced. This probable change of location would have an as-yet undefined effect on susceptibility to geological or geotechnical hazards, and it is impossible to say with any precision what these effects could be, whether more or less adverse, or the same. Such hazards can have effects of both new development and redevelopment or reconstruction. The CCAP could affect both types of projects, but primarily new construction, due to redirecting of development to more favorable GHG reduction areas

– but again, it is not possible to say with any precision whether the effect would be more or less adverse overall.

Fortunately, existing policies contained in the EAGP, the CVGP and the ECAP and the Safety Element, along with the County Uniform Building Code (UBC) supply the necessary preexisting policy, action and statutory guidance required for any project to design and build according to the geotechnical requirements of the site on which it is located. These policies and implementation actions, existing laws and CEQA environmental review requirements, would substantially avert the potential for significant effects as a result of construction or grading, whether or not the CCAP is integrated onto the General Plan. As a result, no significant impact would occur with respect to geological, soil or geotechnical issues from formal amendment of the CCAP into the General Plan.

Mitigation Measures: Existing policies and the Uniform Building Code would reduce the potential for adverse geotechnical and soil impacts to *less-than-significant* levels, and no additional mitigation is required.



8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Would the project:	YES: Potentially Significant Impact	NO: Less Than Significant With Mitigation	NO: Less Than Significant Impact	NO: No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				X
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				X
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?			X	
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?			X	
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				X

**Regulatory Setting:** State law defines hazardous waste materials as waste materials that may cause or substantially contribute to mortality or hazards to human health or the environment due to a combination of quantity, concentration, and its physical, chemical or infectious characteristics. The Alameda County Integrated Waste Management Plan (IWMP) provides an extensive glossary of the foregoing hazardous material reference terms.<sup>30</sup>

The California Water Board has authority over the treatment, storage, processing and disposal of solid waste to the extent it poses risks to water quality.<sup>31</sup>

State and local agencies responsible for managing hazardous wastes include the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), the Alameda County Waste Management Authority (ACWMA), and the Department of Environmental Health (part of the Health Services Agency). Coordination among these agencies to reduce risks of exposure and contamination is a key implementation measure; other

<sup>30</sup> Alameda County Waste Management Authority, *Alameda County Integrated Waste Management Plan, County-wide Element, including Siting Element & Summary Plan*, Adopted February 26, 2003, Updated April 2010 & Amended January 26, 2011, Appendix C, Glossaries.

<sup>31</sup> California, State of, Health and Safety Code, Sections 25117 & 25143.5; Water Code, Section 13172; Public Resources Code, Section 41781.2.

means include zoning controls and enforcement of the ACWMA's Solid Waste Management Plan (currently identified as the *County Integrated Waste Management Plan* (IWMP), discussed below and elsewhere in this Initial Study. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is the primary agency responsible for enforcing federal regulations on hazardous materials and wastes, and for evaluation and remediation of severe cases of contamination and hazardous waste releases. The US EPA works with state and County agencies to enforce materials handling and storage regulations and site cleanup requirements. The federal Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) has certain related responsibilities, and the Department of Transportation (DOT) is authorized to regulate safe transport of hazardous materials. However, it is very unlikely that any incident involving a release of hazardous material or other circumstances would require federal involvement.

The various General Plan area documents of Alameda County – ECAP, EAGP and CVGP - all include several policies regarding natural and environmental hazards and hazardous wastes, with policies to require site-specific analyses of new development proposals to reduce potential risks in areas of potential natural hazards (flooding, geologic, wildland fire, or other environmental hazards) unless feasible measures are implemented to reduce the risk to acceptable levels, or consider potential natural disasters. Each document also includes policies for the safe management and reduction of exposure to hazardous materials which, when followed, enable projects to self-mitigate any possible effects of hazardous materials on sensitive receptor sites.

For example, the EAGP has the following set of policies that address hazardous materials, and similar policies exist as necessary in the CVGP and ECAP as appropriate:

EAGP Policies:

- P1. The County shall strive to reduce hazardous waste using the following hierarchy of waste management strategies:
  - ◆ Reduce the sources of hazardous waste.
  - ◆ Recycle and reuse hazardous wastes.
  - ◆ Treat or incinerate residual hazardous waste.
  - ◆ Place reduced or untreatable waste in secure land disposal units.
- P2. New or expanding businesses shall be required to demonstrate compliance with the hierarchy of waste management strategies listed in Policy 1 of this Goal as a condition of receiving land use and business permits.
- P3. All existing hazardous waste generators shall be required to implement the hazardous waste management hierarchy listed in Policy 1 of this Goal to the maximum extent feasible, both technically and economically.
- P4. The County shall assist the Alameda County Waste Management Authority with the implementation of the *Alameda County Integrated Waste Management Plan* and the *Alameda County Hazardous Waste Management Plan*.
- P5. Adequate separation shall be provided between areas where hazardous materials are present and sensitive uses such as schools, residences and public facilities.
- P6. Developers shall be required to conduct the necessary level of environmental investigation to ensure that soil, groundwater and buildings affected by hazardous material releases from prior land uses and lead or asbestos in building materials will not have a negative impact on the natural environment or health and safety of future property owners or users. This shall occur as a pre-condition for receiving building permits or planning approvals for development on historically commercial or industrial parcels.
- P7. The safe transport of hazardous materials through the Eden Area shall be promoted by implementing the following measures:
  - ◆ Maintain formally-designated hazardous material carrier routes to direct hazardous materials
  - ◆ Prohibit the parking of empty or full vehicles transporting hazardous materials on County streets.
  - ◆ Require new pipelines and other channels carrying hazardous materials avoid residential areas and other immobile populations to the extent possible.

- ◆ Encourage businesses to ship hazardous materials by rail.
- P8. Emergency response plans shall be submitted as part of all use applications for any large generators of hazardous waste.
- P9. To the extent feasible, the County shall continue to support the removal of hazardous wastes from the solid waste stream in the Eden Area in accordance with Countywide plans.

The inclusion of the CCAP in the General Plan would neither displace these policies nor otherwise be nonconforming with them. These policies would remain in effect for any development or land use practices in the County.

The *Safety Element* of the Alameda County General Plan includes a hazardous materials section that establishes goals, objectives and implementation policies to reduce the risks of exposure of humans and natural resources to hazardous wastes. The *Safety Element* also provide an inventory and generalized mapping of hazardous land uses and fire areas and describes policies and principles intended to protect people and structures from hazardous materials and the threat of fire in the County.

The *Safety Element* states that the Hazardous Materials / Waste Program for waste generation was established by the County Board of Supervisors in 1985 and recognized by the State of California Department of Toxics Substances Control (DTSC) through a Memorandum of Understanding. In quick succession the county's hazardous materials management plan program, underground storage tank program, tiered permitting program, and risk management program also started.

The Alameda County Department of Environmental Health (ACDEH) Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) is the administrative agency that coordinates and enforces numerous local, state, and federal hazardous materials management and environmental protection programs in the county. The *Safety Element* contains information on Hazardous Materials Business Plans, the Household Hazardous Waste Program and disposal, the Hazardous Waste Generator Program, Underground and Aboveground Storage Tank Programs, the California Accidental Release Program, and Tiered Permitting for onsite disposal and remediation. The *Safety Element* contains an abundance of policies and specified actions to minimize residents' exposure to the harmful effects of hazardous materials and waste. These policies sometimes mirror and often complement those found in the Area Plans.

Class I hazardous wastes are disposed of outside Alameda County, primarily to the state facility near Kettleman City, and its transport is regulated by the state Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and the state Health Department. The state Highway Patrol responds to spills, with assistance from County or State agencies, depending on the nature of the spill; for example, the County Agriculture Department, under the authority of the Agriculture Commission, has jurisdiction in the case of spills of pesticides or other potentially hazardous agricultural materials, and a representative from the Regional Water Quality Control Board has authority regarding violation of water quality standards if adjacent streams or an underlying water table were at risk of potential contamination.<sup>32</sup> Storage and use of hazardous materials on an industrial scale requires a use permit from Alameda County, and is limited to the County's heavy industrial and manufacturing zone district (M-2, Heavy Industrial).

All of these policies and regulations would remain in place and not be compromised by any policy measure within, or activity implemented as a result of the CCAP.

*Aircraft and Airport Safety.* Each of the airports in Alameda County – Oakland International Airport, Hayward Executive Airport and Livermore Municipal Airport – all have Airport Land Use Compatibility

---

<sup>32</sup> California Department of Transportation, Office of Emergency Management Division of Maintenance, Maintenance Manual, July 2006, Chapter D5, [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/maint/manual/Ch\\_D5.pdf](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/maint/manual/Ch_D5.pdf)

Policy Plans (ALUCPs) which serve to guide the establishment of development in key hazard zones around airports. The ALUCPs are a requirement of the State Aeronautics Act (Public Utilities Code, Section 21670 et seq.) which specify the preparation of an ALUCP for nearly all public-use airports in the state (Section 21675). The intent of the ALUCP is to encourage compatibility between airports and the various land uses that surround them; and to provide guidance in determining appropriate land uses, appropriate structural heights and lighting requirements, noise limitation necessity and other critical characteristics of development that could affect, or be affected by, existing and anticipated future airport activities. The ALUCPs have legal bearing on land use policies and decisions in the surrounding areas, including portions of Alameda County. They modify the policies of the General Plans where conflicts between the airport activities and surrounding land uses could arise. Each policy contained within the ALUCP must be taken into account by prospective development, and the Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC), the decisionmaking body for airport land use issues, has the ability to review and make recommendations for projects located within the airport safety zones. In accordance with Section 21674(b) of the California Public Utilities Code, an ALUC has the authority "to coordinate planning at the state, regional and local levels so as to provide for the orderly development of air transportation, while at the same time protecting the public health, safety, and welfare"; to prepare and adopt airport land use plans; and to review and make recommendations concerning specified plans, regulations and other actions of local agencies and airport operators. When the ALUC makes recommendations for project design or approval, the lead agency is required to follow these recommendations unless a decision is made by the County Board of Supervisors to override the ALUC's decision on one or more of the ALUC's recommendations.

The policies of the ALUCP, when followed, would protect both airports and new development from possible safety and environmental conflicts. The inclusion of the CCAP within the General Plan would not alter these policies or the application thereof.

Physical Setting: The County contains a variety of urban and rural roads, highways and freeways on which hazardous materials, including industrial chemicals, fuels, oils, pesticides, fertilizers and household and agricultural waste materials are routinely transported. Owners of parcels anywhere in the County may receive and store some of these materials, and soil and groundwater on some parcels may have become contaminated by accidental releases of toxic materials by past or present owners, or by adjacent properties. A few parcels may have past or present use as oil or gas wells, which could be a potential source of hazardous material releases. Many parcels in the County are located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school and which could theoretically result in a release of hazardous materials.

The rural areas of the County are typically designated as within a State Responsibility Area (SRA) as defined by the California State Fire Code, making the California Department of Forestry and Fire (CDF) the primary service agency responsible for providing basic wildland fire protection. The fire season extends from late spring to fall, and tends to be the highest during summer or fall high wind conditions. The urban areas of the County are under the direct jurisdiction of the Alameda County Fire Department, who would first respond to calls in those areas. New development in any area must meet the basic requirements of the Fire Code, and the Fire Department may comment upon and provide recommendations for added fire safety measures in new development.

As stated above, the County has three active airports - Oakland International Airport, Hayward Executive Airport and Livermore Municipal Airport – and each of these have Safety Zones that overlap unincorporated County lands. The two airports with greatest potential for County contact are the Hayward Executive Airport and Livermore Municipal Airport, and of these two, the Hayward Executive Airport has more potential for contact since the four major land use measures of the CCAP –

**Measure L-2**, which specifies a target of 700 new residential units within ½ mile of a major transit station by the year 2020, most likely either near the Castro Valley BART station and/or just north of the Hayward Amtrak station;

**Measure L-3**, which specifies a target of 200 new residential units, in this case second units within ½ mile of a major transit station or other transportation hubs and commercial destinations by the year 2020;

**Measure L-4**, which has a target goal of 150,000 square feet of new commercial uses in neighborhood centers county-wide, which could be spread across many neighborhoods; and

**Measure L-5** which would encourage 150,000 square feet of neighborhood-serving commercial uses and 300 residential units combined as mixed use by 2020 in neighborhood districts, and an additional 1,200 units of new residential unit development in existing neighborhood districts by 2020 –

...most directly affect the urban core areas, near which the Hayward Executive Airport is located. The potential for land use modifications under these policies are significantly far less than for any other County airport. Of these four measures, only L-4 and L-5 have any reasonable chance to affect parcels near the Hayward Executive Airport. Measures L-2 and L-3, which would direct new residential development to points near specified transit hubs, would not impose possible policy conflicts on any airport.

Impacts: There are no policies or measures described in the CCAP that explicitly or implicitly promote actions involving hazardous materials, airport conflicts or increased risk of fire. There are policies that promote shifting of development from certain areas to others, the enhancement of public transportation and pedestrian/bicycle access, energy efficiency and renewable energy improvements, water conservation, waste reduction and recycling, and green infrastructure; none of these policies or measures involve or affect the regulation of hazardous materials, or risk of fire danger, and none of these measures seek to place or design construction that would be incompatible with airport operations and activities.

With respect to hazardous materials, which may be found associated with any land use, none of the policies would encourage the new or increased use of, or concentration of, hazardous materials, more than these chemicals or materials might currently be used or concentrated. Redirection of new residential and commercial development into specific locations designed to reduce GHG emissions would provide minor shifts in the locations where familiar household and retail hazardous materials would be found; but these materials are so highly regulated and routinely contained that their presence would provide no significantly increased cause for concern. Waste management activities, specifically recycling and composting, do not routinely involve any significant quantities of hazardous materials, and increased emphasis on these activities would not require any additional use or concentrations of hazardous materials. Under the policies for **Community Gardens and Urban Agriculture**, Measure **G-3** (Establish a local community garden program to increase local food security and provide local recreation amenities) and Measure **G-4** (Work with local farmers and agricultural non-profits to develop urban-edge farming opportunities in the unincorporated county), people could engage in activities that involve the possible use of various agricultural chemicals, but existing regulations on the packing, storage and use of these materials would provide adequate guidance to avoid significant impacts related to these materials. *In regard to the handling, use, storage or transportation of hazardous materials, no significant impacts would occur with CCAP implementation.*

Wildland Fire Safety concerns would not be modified by any of the policies found in the CCAP. The same fire codes and regulations would apply for residential or commercial development regardless of

where it is constructed or located. Measures to improve public transit, pedestrian and bicycle access would have no effect on wildland fire or emergency access, and in some cases could improve the access if, for example, streetlight cycle control for transit buses could also be placed into effect for emergency vehicles. Renewable energy programs and projects would be constructed according to existing building and fire codes. Recycling programs would increase, but would be concentrated in areas designed to accommodate them, which means that fire suppression and emergency access would be adequate. Agriculture and vegetation restoration like the programs described would not increase the challenge of response or fire suppression for those specific activities. *No significant impact to wildland fire issues would occur as a result of CCAP implementation.*

As discussed above, the only measures that could conceivably result in conflicts with any airport operations would be **Measure L-4**, which targets 150,000 square feet of new commercial uses in neighborhood centers county-wide, and **Measure L-5**, which encourages 150,000 square feet of neighborhood-serving commercial uses and 300 residential units combined as mixed use by 2020 in neighborhood districts, and an additional 1,200 units of new residential unit development in existing neighborhood districts by 2020. Either of these could result in enhanced development in a handful of areas near enough to the Hayward Executive Airport (along Hesperian Boulevard, A Street and near San Lorenzo Village west of Hesperian Boulevard) so that air traffic could be potentially affected. However, legally required adherence with the policies of the ALUCP for the Hayward Executive Airport for nearby development and land use within the airport safety zone would serve to fully mitigate the effect of new development in these zones. No significant impacts are expected to occur with respect to air traffic or airport operations as a result of the CCAP amendment to the General Plan or its implementation.

Mitigation Measures: In light of existing policies and regulations for hazardous materials, wildland fire safety and air transportation, *no new mitigation measures are required for Hazards and Hazardous Materials.*

<b>9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</b> Would the project:	YES: Potentially Significant Impact	NO: Less Than Significant With Mitigation	NO: Less Than Significant Impact	NO: No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards, conflict with water quality objectives, fail to meet waste discharge requirements, significantly degrade any surface water body or groundwater, or adversely affect the beneficial uses of such waters, including public uses and aquatic, wetland and riparian habitat?			✗	
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				✗
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site (i.e. within a watershed)?				✗
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff (e.g., due to increased impervious surfaces) in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site (i.e. within a watershed)?			✗	
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems due to changes in runoff flow rates or volumes?			✗	
f) Result in a significant increase in pollutant discharges to receiving waters (marine, fresh, and/or wetlands) during or following construction (considering water quality parameters such as temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity, and typical stormwater pollutants such as heavy metals, pathogens, petroleum derivatives, synthetic organics, sediment, nutrients, oxygen-demanding substances, and trash)?			✗	
g) Result in an increase in any pollutant for which a water body is listed as impaired under Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act?			✗	
h) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?			✗	
i) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?			✗	
j) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?			✗	
k) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				✗

**Setting:** The County contains a wide variety of creeks, water bodies, and surface and underground stormwater drainage systems in urban, rural and wild settings, which serve a wide range of purposes,

from sustaining the ecological quality of soil, plant and animal life, to irrigation, handling stormwater runoff, storing water for municipal, industrial and agricultural purposes, restoring groundwater and natural aquifers, recreation, and aesthetic values. These are most of the beneficial uses of water resources and water management systems that are the subject of the Checklist. The creeks and water bodies of the County are geographically divided into watersheds by the uppermost hills and ranges of the County, and almost all of the creeks flow westerly towards San Francisco Bay through the East Bay Hills; only the easternmost slopes of the Altamont Hills drain eastward into the San Joaquin River in San Joaquin County (and also eventually to the Bay). Most of the East County area flows into the Tri-Valley basin of Pleasanton, Livermore and Dublin, into the westward flowing Arroyo Mocho and Arroyo Valle, which combine with the southward flowing Alamo Creek into the Arroyo de la Laguna that flows south to Suñol. In the Suñol basin, this drainage joins Alameda Creek and flows eastward through Niles Canyon and beyond to San Francisco Bay. The Castro Valley Canyonlands drain along its creeks – Cull, Crow, Palomares and Eden Canyon Creeks, primarily – and then into San Lorenzo Creek, that flows along the south side of Castro Valley towards the Bay.

To prevent flooding and ensure rapid draining of stormwater from the County's urban areas, many of Alameda County's creeks were altered and replaced with engineered channels, with concrete sides and bottoms, and many smaller creeks exist only as underground box culverts. The Alameda County Flood Control District (ACFCD) was created in 1949 to provide flood control services for the County, and it owns and manages the larger, engineered creek channels, as well as many smaller channels and almost all stormwater drainage pipes. Such is the case in the urban areas covered by the CVGP and the EAGP, mostly the San Lorenzo Creek watershed; these are the areas where most of the development measures of the CCAP would be implemented. A few isolated natural stretches of creeks remain in the urban, suburban and semi-rural areas of the County, but the largest stretches of natural or unaltered, un-engineered creeks are in the more remote or rural agricultural areas of the County. The only measures that would have any physical impact on the rural areas would be those related to agriculture and habitat restoration designed to sequester carbon.

In rural areas much of the rainfall is absorbed into groundwater, where it flows to natural springs or creek banks and aquifers, but there are also few obstacles or filters to prevent the inflow of larger pieces of trash, debris, loose earth or other contaminants if such material is located in close proximity to a creek. Although streets, pavements and rooftops are widely spaced in rural areas, ground conditions, including slope, compaction, vegetation, irrigation, etc., may substantially affect the rate of runoff and the passage of pollution, trash and debris into creeks, and the resulting downstream water quality.

To protect and improve water quality, minimize flooding and in general provide better management of water resources in California and the United States, state and federal laws have respectively evolved over the past 40 years, since the passage of the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Act of 1969 in California and the Clean Water Act (CWA) in 1972 by the U.S. Congress. Both of these laws have been amended over time to provide local agencies the authority to achieve those objectives. The principle objective of the federal CWA is to reduce or eliminate water pollution in the nation's rivers, streams, lakes, and coastal waters, with laws regulating discharges of pollutants from industrial sources, municipal sources (including storm drain systems and outfalls from sewage treatment systems), agriculture (fertilizers, plant and animal waste, etc.), and setting minimum water quality standards for all "waters of the United States" (as defined very specifically in the CWA). The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) administers the CWA at an overall federal level, but the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), through its subsidiary Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs, or Water Boards), have local administrative and enforcement authority. The federal CWA requirements establish minimum standards and policies, while the State and Regional Boards carry them out with their own adopted laws, rules, regulations and standards, some of which exceed the federal requirements. One of the key functions of the CWA is the



National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit system, which is the main framework for regulating storm water discharges.<sup>33</sup>

The Porter-Cologne Act, which represents the California Water Code, gives the RWQCBs the responsibility for adopting, implementing, and enforcing regional water quality control plans (Basin Plans), which set forth the water quality standards of the state (those referenced in ECQ 9.a) and the objectives or criteria necessary to protect those beneficial uses within defined regions, such as the San Francisco Bay region. That region includes *almost* all of Alameda County; the eastern slopes of the Altamont Hills are subject to the San Joaquin regional basin plan. The California Water Code (Section 13220) formally give authority to the RWQCBs to issue NPDES permits to counties and large cities for each of the three main categories of potential pollution sources: construction, industry and municipal facilities including stormwater systems and treated sewage. Most private development in unincorporated Alameda County falls under construction and the General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity. Construction activity that disturbs one or more acres of soil – or less than an acre but which is part of a larger development – are required to obtain coverage under the General Permit. The permit is based on a project's overall risk and requires measures to prevent erosion and reduce sediment and other pollutants in their discharges.

The General Construction Permit requires preparation and implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for construction activities. The SWPPP must be prepared and approved by the Alameda County Public Works Agency (PWA) before construction begins. The Grading Department of the PWA has the authority under the County's NPDES program to require revisions to the SWPPP. The SWPPP must include specifications for Best Management Practices (BMPs) to be implemented during project construction. BMPs are measures undertaken to control degradation of surface water by preventing soil erosion or the discharge of pollutants from the construction area. This General Permit is implemented and enforced by the nine California Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs).

Impacts: Nearly all of the policy measures of the CCAP would apply primarily to the urbanize area of the County, with little if any application to rural or natural sites. The five primary measures under consideration -

**Measure T-1**, which would result in reduced requirements for parking for certain residential units near major transit hubs;

**Measure L-2**, which specifies a target of 700 new residential units within ½ mile of a major transit station by the year 2020, most likely either near the Castro Valley BART station and/or just north of the Hayward Amtrak station;

**Measure L-3**, which specifies a target of 200 new residential units, in this case second units within ½ mile of a major transit station or other transportation hubs and commercial destinations by the year 2020;

**Measure L-4**, which has a target goal of 150,000 square feet of new commercial uses in neighborhood centers county-wide, which could be spread across many neighborhoods; and

**Measure L-5** which would encourage 150,000 square feet of neighborhood-serving commercial uses and 300 residential units combined as mixed use by 2020 in neighborhood districts, and an additional 1,200 units of new residential unit development in existing neighborhood districts by 2020 –

---

<sup>33</sup> State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Water Quality, *Construction General Permit Fact Sheet for 2009-0009-DWQ as amended by 2010-0014-DWQ*, September 2, 2009 as modified on November 16, 2010, p. 3.

would all affect previously urbanized areas solely. These specific measures would have **no significant impact upon hydrological resources** in the rural and wild areas Alameda County.

In the Urban areas of the EAGP and the CVGP, new development with or without the direction of the CCAP could occur in areas with any number of hydrological issues. Each new development or substantial construction project would require review, either through the CEQA process and/or the Conditional Use Permit or Site Development Review or Subdivision processes, and would result in a referral of the application to the County's Grading Division and Clean Water Division of the Public Works Agency, which assess individual proposals and their setting to determine if detailed hydrological analysis would be required, and if a peer review by a designated consultant should also be required.

The CCAP neither supports nor enhances any given level of new development significantly, and overall there is no generalized impact one can deduce from CCAP policies. It does redirect some development from places where GHG emissions might be maximized to places where GHG emissions would be reduced. This probable change of location would have an as-yet undefined effect on susceptibility to hydrological or clean water effects, and it is impossible to say with any precision what these effects could be, whether more or less adverse, or the same. Such impacts can result of both new development and redevelopment or reconstruction. The CCAP could affect both types of projects, but primarily new construction, due to redirecting of development to more favorable GHG reduction areas – but again, it is not possible to say with any precision whether the effect would be more or less adverse overall.

Fortunately, existing policies contained in the EAGP, the CVGP and the ECAP, along with requirements for SWPPPs and water conservation and treatment requirements for landscaping supply the necessary preexisting policy and statutory guidance required for any project to design and build according to the hydrological requirements of the site on which it is located. These policies and implementation actions, existing laws and CEQA environmental review requirements, would substantially avert the potential for significant effects as a result of construction, grading or operation / occupancy, whether or not the CCAP is integrated onto the General Plan. As a result, **no significant impact would occur with respect to hydrological issues** from formal amendment of the CCAP into the General Plan.

Of the remaining measures, **Measure G-2**, which includes carbon sequestration as an objective within County-led natural area restoration projects, implies the greatest potential to affect hydrological resources. Measure G-2 recognizes that publicly-owned lands in eastern and western portions of the unincorporated county offer substantial opportunities for ecosystem restoration; and this measure directs the County to evaluate the carbon sequestration potential of future restoration projects and apply these sequestration levels to the achievement of the County's GHG emissions reduction target.

Measure G-2, however, does not require any project to restore land in such a way so as to maximize GHG sequestering potential, nor does it encourage hydrologic modification projects on areas that already resemble stable or natural hydrologic values. Instead, it is designed to track and measure GHG benefits of projects proposed and implemented by others in order to take advantage of the inherent GHG reduction values in order to reach GHG reduction targets. The presence of the policy may encourage projects to maximize GHG reduction through the planting of native vegetation that would utilize CO<sub>2</sub>, but under the reasonable assumption that any approved restoration project would provide either tangible benefits to, or no important changes to, hydrological values with few or no adverse impacts, it follows that this policy would not adversely affect hydrology in the rural or wild areas, and would have **no significant impact on hydrological resources**.

Mitigation Measures: *No mitigation measures are required.*

10. LAND USE AND PLANNING Would the project:	YES: Potentially Significant Impact	NO: Less Than Significant With Mitigation	NO: Less Than Significant Impact	NO: No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?				X
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			X	
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?			X	

**Setting:** Applicable land use plans include the *East County Area Plan* (ECAP), the *Castro Valley General Plan* (CVGP) and the *Eden Area General Plan* (EAGP), all of which already include extensive and abundant policies and restrictions directly intended to avoid and/or mitigate adverse environmental impacts of development and land use. It is beyond the scope of this analysis to review all of these policies as they address urban development or urban and rural land use, but the three plan documents are incorporated herein by reference.

It should be noted, however, that neither the CVGP nor the EAGP contain separate policies regarding land use or development outside of the Urban Growth Boundary demarcated by Measure D, except for the statements on the CVGP *Figures 1-1* and *1-2* that all areas outside Castro Valley's Urban Area but within its Planning Area are respectively designated as "Measure D" lands (*Figure 1-1*), or "Resource Management."<sup>34</sup> This is not critical for the great majority of measures contained in the CCAP as these measures almost all apply to the Urban Areas rather than the rural, wild areas. Many of those measures are represented and discussed under other topic headings in this MND/IS, such as in Section 6, Cultural Resources, and Section 7, Geology and Soils. The Alameda County *Zoning Ordinance* also serves in part to protect against adverse environmental effects.

**Zoning Ordinance.** The Alameda County Zoning Ordinance provides guidance for land use of all kinds (with the exception of Surface Mines, which in Alameda County and most jurisdictions are covered by separate Surface Mining Ordinances), and for development restrictions and limitations for every land use type. The Zoning Ordinance provides limits for height, lot coverage, setbacks, vehicle parking, slope development, fencing and other key development characteristics. In terms of general land use the Zoning Ordinance would have limited application, but would have substantial effect on details of development whether or not the CCAP measures are applied.

**Habitat Conservation Plan.** Alameda County does not have an adopted habitat conservation plan (HCP) or natural community conservation plan (NCCP), although it participated in development of the East Alameda County Conservation Strategy (EACCS). The EACCS is not a formal HCP or NCCP, and though it serves a similar purpose of coordinating the approach to mitigation of various projects to support conservation and/or recovery of listed species,<sup>35</sup> it does not establish policies or requirements that, if not served or complied with, would result in adverse environmental impacts. However, there are policies in the ECAP that serve the same purposes of conservation.

<sup>34</sup> Alameda County, *Castro Valley General Plan*, Figures 1-1 and 1-2, pp. 1-7 to 1-9.

<sup>35</sup> <http://www.eastalco-conservation.org/documents/090611-eaccsfaq.pdf>

Impacts:

*10a. None of the measures proposed would physically divide or otherwise place barriers within any established communities.* Such divisions might result from major new roadways, railways, major waterways and canals, removal of existing bridges or passageways for pedestrians, bicycles or vehicles, or traditionally incompatible major land uses. No such changes could be wrought by the proposed measures in the CCAP, and **no impact would occur.**

*10b. None of the measures proposed would conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect).*

The Castro Valley General Plan predicts a total of approximately 2,430 new residential units to be constructed in various locations through the end of the Plan date, 2025. Of these, 900 new units would be constructed in the downtown Central Business District, with the remainder according to general land availability and other applicable density designations. The EAGP projects, and accommodates for, 5,640 new dwelling units over its 20-year planning period, for a total of 8,070 new units across the urbanized area. The CCAP addresses the locations of only a fraction (2,100) of these dwelling units, and so could easily be accommodated within the constraints of the two plans.

Similarly, for commercial space, the CCAP calls for the co-location of a total of 300,000 square feet of commercial space within or adjacent to high density residential, either as mixed use or as neighborhood commercial placement. The EAGP alone projects and accommodates for 1.7 million square feet of mixed or combined commercial / industrial use, with the large majority of jobs (more than 11 to 1 ratio) going to commercial use. The CVGP projects an additional 202,000 square feet net increase in commercial space; the CVGP and EAGP combined new commercial space greatly exceeds the 300,000 square feet programmed under the Measures in the CCAP, and so the CCAP could be easily accommodated within the existing framework of the County General Plan. **No inconsistency would occur with respect to quantities of either residential or commercial development.**

It is worth reiterating at this point that the CCAP by itself is quantitatively neutral on development, having instead the goal to minimize GHG emissions wherever possible. The CAP does not encourage or discourage development on its own; instead, *it encourages the County to focus development that is already anticipated in the County General plan documents* to areas and to styles that can be optimized for public transportation use and energy efficiency. These measures, when matched to existing policies in the CVGP and the EAGP, present little or no potential for new significant impacts on the basis of quantity of development.

It is also worth noting that when a General Plan is amended, some possible inconsistencies are mitigated by the act of amendment itself – an amendment, either as a policy change or an overlay, can supersede a prior approval and if no other physical impact results from the amendment, the impact of “inconsistency” may be moot or made automatically less-than-significant. Nevertheless, this discussion addresses possible inconsistencies below in the interests of completeness.

As explained in the Introduction, out of the numerous measures proposed, only a handful could have impacts relative to land use. The great majority of measures would not address land use at all, instead focusing on transportation improvements, energy efficiency, renewable energy, better management of waste and water use, and green infrastructure. Only four measures actually address land use issues, and these are discussed individually below.

►► Measure L-2 - Facilitate the establishment of mixed-use, pedestrian-, and transit-oriented development near major transit stations or transit corridors.

Generally, the main potential for an impact under this Measure is the performance indicator that specifies a target of up to 700 new residential units within ½ mile of a major transit station by the year 2020. Major transit stations in the County are few, those being the Castro Valley and Bayfair BART stations and (if one includes unincorporated lands adjacent to City of Hayward incorporated lands), the Amtrak station in Hayward. This means that many new units would need to be placed in just a few locations.

Both the EAGP and the CVGP recognize the need for some concentration of new development near transit hubs, and the CCAP reiterates and more precisely defines the need and magnitude. In the EAGP, there are few opportunities, but there is some juxtaposition possible with High Density Residential (43 – 86 Dwelling Units per acre) adjacent to the Bayfair BART station, and the Hayward Amtrak stop, along the Meekland Avenue corridor north of A Street, where Medium Density Residential (10 - 22 Dwelling Units per acre) is permitted, and the Mixed Commercial use along Meekland Avenue also permits Medium Density Residential as a Secondary Use. Increases in density and Transit Hub Access are possible in these locations, which would help to meet the goal of this Measure for this Transit Hub.

In the CVGP, the major transit hub is the Castro Valley BART Station, located near the downtown area south of Castro Valley Boulevard and west of Redwood Road adjacent to the BART right of way. The CVGP identifies this area as ripe for higher density development, with many areas of density increase identified in the Downtown area near BART. Land use designations of Residential Mixed Density (8-29 DU / acre), Residential Downtown Mixed Use (30-60 DU / acre), Core Pedestrian Retail (30-60 DU / acre) and BART Transit Village (30-60 DU / acre) are included for lots reasonably close to the BART station, all of which are consistent with the concepts described in Measure L2. Significant density changes are approved as a matter of policy and shown on maps for several parcels located just north of the BART stations along Norbridge Avenue, which is the BART Transit Village. **These designations would permit hundreds of new dwelling units a short distance from the BART station, and represent internal consistency should the CCAP be amended to the County General Plan.**

►► L-3 Reduce restrictions on second units in single-family residential districts near transit stations, major bus route corridors, neighborhood commercial centers, and central business districts.

This Measure encourages the County to amend area plans, the zoning code and relevant specific plans to allow second units in R-1, RS-5, and CBD Sub-Area (11 districts within ½ mile walking distance of major transit stations, neighborhood commercial centers, and the Castro Valley Central Business District). As with L-2, the main potential for an impact under L-3 results from the performance indicator that specifies a target of 200 new residential units, in this case second units within ½ mile of a major transit station or other transportation hubs and commercial destinations by the year 2020.

This Measure would encourage a scattering of new very small residential units on already developed residential parcels in specific areas across the entire urbanized portion of the County, including both the Castro Valley and Eden Areas, in locations that would encourage and facilitate the use of alternative transportation. It would require some amendments to the Zoning Ordinance and certain Specific Plans, but these in themselves would not constitute significant impacts if other significant physical impacts to the environment would not result. The sum of up to 200 new secondary units, encouraged to redirect from other locations as necessary to take advantage of neighborhood commercial uses, transit hubs and downtown commercial, and applied evenly around the West County, would represent only minor relocations of possible units that would be realized without the CCAP amendment, would not affect

general land use, would not alter regional traffic patterns or congestion, and would have no other specific or regional impacts that would adversely affect the urban environment. **No inconsistency would occur.**

►► **L-4** Increase the diversity of uses in neighborhood-serving commercial centers.

The County will develop business incentive programs targeted at attracting small businesses to neighborhood commercial centers and improving existing uses. A retail tenant improvement program would provide incentives to attract key retail businesses, while the business improvement assessment district program would assist merchants and property owners establish BIDs in neighborhood commercial centers. The BIDs would be voluntary, self-imposed assessment districts and the collected fees would pay for maintenance, security, and management. These districts would be developed in cooperation with community groups and the Chamber of Commerce.

As with Measures L-2 and L-3, the potential for impact comes as a result of the target goal for this measure, which is 150,000 square feet of new commercial uses in neighborhood centers county-wide. This measure is not concentrated in one or two locations, but could be spread across many neighborhoods. Many sites in both the Castro Valley and Eden areas would be suitable for this type of enhancement using current Plan designations, and growth in these locations would provide basic goods and services at location amenable to walking or cycling. Vacant sites could be reused and commercial use renewed at many appropriate locations already designated for such uses. The wide dispersion of these enhancements would serve the basic needs of the community and fulfill the goals of the existing General Plan designations for these sites. **No degree of inconsistency with existing General Plan policies would occur.**

►► **L-5** Improve the vitality of mixed-use neighborhood-serving commercial centers through increased density allowances and enhanced design.

This Measure proposes to revise development standards that act as barriers to mixed-use projects, and establish clear and concise design guidelines that ensure compatibility of such projects with adjacent residential uses. In the Eden Area Plan, five commercial districts are identified to serve as community activity centers that attract residents, employees, shoppers, and visitors. The maximum floor-area ratios are 1.0:1 throughout these districts. The County will process General Plan and Area Plan amendments designed to achieve an increase of floor-area ratios to 2.0:1 in these districts. *The Plan currently allows appropriate levels of residential density within these districts, and so the proposed Measure is generally consistent for policies adopted for the Eden Area.* The County would again need to establish design guidelines for mixed-use projects in neighborhood commercial centers to facilitate the development of high-quality projects and help ensure compatibility with surrounding residential districts. These would also emphasize effective transitions from single-family areas to higher intensity mixed-use and commercial areas.

This Measure has the following targets:

- Amount of new mixed-used development in neighborhood districts: 150,000 square feet of neighborhood-serving commercial uses and 300 residential units by 2020.
- Amount of new residential unit development in existing neighborhood districts: 1,200 residential units by 2020

In combination with the increases of dwelling units and commercial space expected under Measures L-2, L-3 and L-4, these quantities are roughly in accordance with projected General Plan (EAGP) increases through 2025, do not exceed those projected values, would not concentrate these units or development such that any one area would see excessive development beyond that proposed in the General Plans, and

would not contribute to significant secondary environmental effects based on development levels not already foreseen in the General Plan.

**The CCAP would be in general conformance with the General Plan, and where amendments would be useful to pursue GHG reduction goals under the CCAP, no significant impacts would occur.**

*10c. No measures in the CCAP would conflict with the EACCS, and the great majority of measures address urban development or existing rural land uses. Only Measure G-2, which includes carbon sequestration as an objective within County-led natural area restoration projects, implies any potential of conflict with the requirements of the EACCS. Measure G-2 recognizes that publicly-owned lands in eastern and western portions of the unincorporated county offer substantial opportunities for ecosystem restoration; and this measure directs the County to evaluate the carbon sequestration potential of future restoration projects and apply these sequestration levels to the achievement of the County's GHG emissions reduction target.*

Measure G-2, however, does not require any project to restore land in such a way so as to avoid compliance with the EACCS, nor does it encourage adverse biological modification on areas that already include critical biological values. Instead, it is designed to track and measure GHG benefits of projects proposed and implemented by others in order to take advantage of the inherent GHG reduction values in order to reach GHG reduction targets. The presence of the policy may encourage projects to maximize GHG reduction through the planting of native vegetation that would utilize CO<sub>2</sub>, but under the reasonable assumption that any approved restoration project would provide either tangible benefits to, or no important changes to, critical biological values specified in the EACCS, with few or no adverse impacts, it follows that this policy would not conflict with the EACCS, and **no significant impact would occur.**

Mitigation Measures: No additional measures are required.

11. MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project:	YES: Potentially Significant Impact	NO: Less Than Significant With Mitigation	NO: Less Than Significant Impact	NO: No Impact
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				x
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				x

**Setting:** Alameda County has a number of areas that are designated as “Regionally Significant Construction Aggregate Resource Areas” and potential Mineral Resource Zones (MRZs) by the State of California Mining and Geology Board. In these areas, there is a high likelihood that deposits of gravel or hard rock of a high quality suitable for construction exist and could be extracted economically, or become available in the future. These areas are so designated because the State of California recognizes the high value of these deposits to the infrastructure and industry of the State, and seeks to ensure that these deposits remain available for permitted use when necessary and that these resources are protected from incompatible uses that may impede or preclude extraction of the resource. The State of California Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA) requires potentially incompatible uses to minimize their impacts on mineral resource availability through conditions of approval. A lead agency such as the County must prepare a written statement specifying its reason for permitting a potentially incompatible use, or a use that could threaten the ability to extract Regionally Significant Construction Aggregate Resources, at the time of the environmental analysis for the new use or otherwise at the time of approval, for submittal to the State Geologist and his Board for review.

In Alameda County, “regionally significant” mineral resources include extensive sand and gravel deposits, which are found primarily in ancient lakebeds and broad river channels (notably in the Livermore-Amador Valley and the Sunol Valley), and basaltic hard and fractured rock deposits that are found in limited locations on hillsides and ridgetops. Most of these deposits are either under extraction or permitted for future extraction, but a small number of remaining unpermitted deposits are found in scattered locations in Eastern Alameda County and remotely in the ridgelines extending southward from Castro Valley parallel to Palomares Canyon.

No regionally significant mineral resources are currently designated in the urban area, and no mining permits are currently extant in the urban area.

**Impacts:** The relative scarcity of unpermitted Regionally Significant Construction Aggregate Resource Areas in the County, coupled with the characteristic urban / suburban focus of the CCAP measures, make it very unlikely that these measures, or any proposal that may result from them, would intrude onto or within a proximity of any State-designated Regionally Significant Construction Aggregate Resource Area so as to result in a land use incompatibility. No measure would directly or indirectly affect any known mineral resource or any existing mineral extraction operation. **No significant impact to mineral resources would occur.**

**Mitigation Measures:** *No mitigation measures would be required.*



<b>12. NOISE</b> Would the project result in:	YES: Potentially Significant Impact	NO: Less Than Significant With Mitigation	NO: Less Than Significant Impact	NO: No Impact
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			✗	
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			✗	
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				✗
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				✗
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				✗
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				✗

**Setting:** The rural and agricultural areas of the East County and Castro Valley Canyonlands may be characterized as having low to medium noise levels, higher on average near the roadways in the area, and less so at distance from those roadways. In the narrower valleys and canyons, homes are generally located by necessity closer to the roads, but traffic volumes on those roads, with the exception of Crow Canyon Road, are very low. Generally, new development may result in new noise that could disturb existing residents, such as added traffic noise, new outdoor activities or commercial activities. Development may also result in the introduction of persons into environments with existing high noise levels. Temporary noise resulting from construction activity may also be significant.

The suburban/urban areas of the County, including Castro Valley and all of the Eden Area, are characterized by typical urban sounds at low to high levels – noise from vehicle traffic of greatly varying levels from day to night and weekday versus weekend, railroads, aircraft, occasional construction activities, and the sounds of commercial and domestic activities such as ventilation systems, lawnmowers and yard equipment, the sounds of people and children where outdoors activities take place (child care facilities, for example) and other miscellaneous noise sources. Parks experience the sounds of sports activities, unstructured children's play, and outdoor parties. As with the rural areas, new development may result in new noise that could disturb existing residents, such as added traffic noise, new outdoor activities or commercial activities, although in the urban setting such added uses would be less noticeable and would be mathematically less likely to result in a significant impact. Development may also result in the introduction of persons into environments with existing high noise levels.

The Alameda County Noise Element (a part of the County General Plan) provides definitions for specific concepts of environmental noise, such as  $L_{dn}$ , the day-night average noise level measured in decibels (dB), which is weighted to give more significance to nighttime noise. Other key terms include the dBA (weighted-average decibels), and Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) which is a measure of average community noise levels such as generated by a major roadway, transit corridor or airport runway. Another term is  $L_{10}$ , defined as the level of sound exceeded 10 percent of the time, such as during the

morning and evening peak hour traffic commute periods. Definitions of noise terms are also provided in the County Noise Ordinance.<sup>36</sup>

The Noise Element establishes Countywide goals, objectives and principles (or policies) to protect residents against excessive, unnecessary and unreasonable noises, and promotes compatibility among land uses through protection of sensitive land uses from unwanted noise. Separate policies for unincorporated areas authorize the County to adopt regulations on noise pollution, including high noise levels, frequencies and duration of noise. In general, however, the focus of the Noise Element is on incompatible land uses, and exposure to land uses to unwanted noise such as freeways.

Alameda County's Noise Ordinance prohibits specific noise levels of between 45 and 70 dBA from being exceeded for greater than specific numbers of minutes per hour depending on the receiving land use, with more limitations during nighttime than during daytime, and lower thresholds for noise exposure within commercial areas. For example, the exterior noise level for either a single- or multiple-family residence, school, hospital, church, public library, or commercial property may not exceed 60 dBA for more than 5 minutes in any one hour time period between 7 a.m. and 10 p.m., or 55 dBA for more than 15 minutes during the same time period. The Ordinance, however, exempts construction activities from such limits, provided they are limited to the hours of 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. on weekdays, and between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m. on Saturdays and Sundays.<sup>37</sup>

The ECAP also contains policies directly related to noise and development of agricultural facilities such as CHBTFs. Under the heading of Environmental Health, the Noise section has a stated goal to minimize East County residents' and workers' exposure to excessive noise, and related policies, such as Policy 289 to limit or appropriately mitigate new noise-sensitive development areas exposed to projected noise levels exceeding 60 Db, and Policy 289 to require noise studies as part of development review for projects located in areas exposed to high noise levels and in areas adjacent to existing residential or other sensitive land uses. Implementation Programs to carry out these policies include Program 104, to require the use of noise reduction techniques (such as buffers, building design modifications, lot orientation, soundwalls, etc.) to mitigate noise impacts resulting from both transportation-related and stationary sources.

Both the CVGP and the EAGP contain Noise Elements which extensively address noise issues in the suburban and urban core areas. For example, the EAGP contains policies too numerous to list separately, but which fall into the following goal categories:

- **Goal N-1 – Protect citizens from excessive noise** – includes policies to control the location of sensitive land use relative to noise sources; noise standards for interior and exterior spaces; standards for residential uses located near railways, freeways and aircraft operations; requirements for acoustical studies and architectural designs that incorporate noise reduction.
- **Goal N-2 – Minimize the noise impacts from the construction and operation of land uses** – includes policies to conduct noise analyses for new projects that include mitigation for noise effects; basic requirements for noise mitigation; noise-reducing site design techniques; construction activity minimum requirements near sensitive receptors and as a requirement of permit approval; and minimum noise standards for commercial and industrial land uses to avoid impacts on sensitive receptors.

---

<sup>36</sup> Alameda County , *Noise Element of the Alameda County General Plan*, Adopted by Board of Supervisors July 31, 1975, As Revised September 1975 and Amended May 5, 1994.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid., Section 6.60.040 and Table 6.60.040A and 6.60.040B.

- **Goal N-3 – Control sources of excessive noise from transportation sources** – Policies and actions are included to explore and utilize innovative approaches to reduce noise levels on local roadways and to design new roadway construction to “build in” noise reduction.
- **Goal N-4 – Minimize noise impacts created by the operations of the [Hayward and Oakland Airports]** – Encourages the airports to use mitigation for noise impacts and to participate in public hearings and forums to establish good neighbor policies and attitudes when designing new projects and conducting operations.

The CVGP contains comparable and commensurate levels of noise policies to protect sensitive land uses from excessive noise levels. These two documents and their respective Noise Elements are incorporated by reference into this discussion.

Impacts: The specific threshold of significance for noise effects for discreet projects is determined by state law, embodied in the Alameda County General Plan Noise Element, the respective noise elements for each Area Plan, and the Noise Ordinance. The Noise Element requires noise generated by new projects to meet the acceptable exterior noise levels standards of the Noise and Land Use Compatibility Guidelines. Of these standards, the levels for residential use are the lowest with a limit not to exceed 65 dB Ldn for one minute during the day (7 a.m. to 10 p.m.) or 60 dB Ldn for one minute during the evening (10 p.m. to 7 a.m.).<sup>38</sup> It is also generally accepted that increases of 3 dB or less in the CNEL are barely perceptible, and that only increases of 5 dB or greater constitute a significant adverse increase in the CNEL.

However, a better standard of significance for the potential noise effects of the CCAP would be whether or not the measures of the CCAP would be inconsistent with any policies of various General Plan documents – the Noise Element and the ECAP, EAGP and CVGP. Broadly speaking, the CCAP would be inconsistent with these policies if it encouraged development or construction or operations that would make the attainment of specified noise levels in these documents difficult or impossible; or if the CCAP set noise standards that are less rigorous, or would be less rigorously applied, than those in the various General Plan documents.

The CCAP contains no policies at all that address noise or sound levels, either as to standard or as to relaxation of existing standards. Amendment of the CCAP to the General Plan would have no overt effect upon, or make any changes to, any of the noise policies of the Noise Element, ECAP, CVGP or EAGP, and thus all of those existing policies would continue to apply to all projects and land uses in the County. **No direct impact to, or inconsistency with, existing noise policies would occur.**

The CCAP does have several measures that would redirect development – development already envisioned in the CVGP and the EAGP – to specific areas in such a way so as to reduce overall GHG emissions from those developments. These are the following Measures:

**Measure L-2**, which specifies a target of 700 new residential units within ½ mile of a major transit station by the year 2020, most likely either near the Castro Valley and Bayfair BART stations and/or just north of the Hayward Amtrak station;

**Measure L-3**, which specifies a target of 200 new residential units, in this case second units within ½ mile of a major transit station or other transportation hubs and commercial destinations by the year 2020;

---

<sup>38</sup> Alameda County, General Ordinance Code, Chapter 6.60.

**Measure L-4**, which has a target goal of 150,000 square feet of new commercial uses in neighborhood centers county-wide, which could be spread across many neighborhoods; and

**Measure L-5** which would encourage 150,000 square feet of neighborhood-serving commercial uses and 300 residential units combined as mixed use by 2020 in neighborhood districts, and an additional 1,200 units of new residential unit development in existing neighborhood districts by 2020.

Under these measures, residential units and commercial activities would be somewhat shifted and in some cases concentrated in locations to reduce vehicle traffic and GHG emissions. It is safe to say these actions in themselves would not increase or enhance overall noise sources, and with respect to traffic could also result in minor overall reductions in vehicular traffic noise as trip generation would be reduced; however, at the specific but as yet undetermined locations to which envisioned development would be directed, noise from outdoor activities associated with more concentrated residential and commercial land use could result in noise effects upon existing nearby sensitive receptors, and could subject new residents to existing elevated noise levels. On a project-specific basis, these impacts are somewhat speculative, and detailed studies cannot be performed before the projects are proposed.

However, with the existing Noise Ordinance and substantive general plan policies in place as described above, all of which would continue to apply to any new development (whether under existing plans or as amended by the CCAP), potential noise impacts would be fully analyzed and mitigated to the extent possible. Noise reduction measures would be incorporated into projects, positions of exterior spaces would be architecturally designed and adjusted to minimize noise on sensitive receptors and land uses, and the small number of projects that could be located near airports or railways would be identified for special treatment to minimize interior noise levels and exterior exposure. **Any noise impacts that might occur would be identified and mitigated to less-than-significant levels, and no significant noise impacts would occur as a result of amendment of the General Plan by the CCAP.**

Mitigation Measures: **No mitigation is required.**

<b>13. POPULATION AND HOUSING</b> Would the project:	YES: Potentially Significant Impact	NO: Less Than Significant With Mitigation	NO: Less Than Significant Impact	NO: No Impact
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				✗
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				✗
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				✗

**Setting:** The population of unincorporated Alameda County as of the 2010 U.S. Census was 141,607, which includes the urbanized areas of Castro Valley, Ashland, Cherryland, San Lorenzo, Fairview and Sunol, as well as numerous rural-residential and agricultural lands. Alameda County itself, including the major cities of Oakland, Alameda, San Leandro, Hayward, Fremont, etc., had a reported population of over ten times that – 1.51 million<sup>39</sup> While the major cities and portions of the unincorporated areas are relatively dense, the Castro Valley Canyonlands and the rural, unincorporated areas of the East County area range from very low density to extremely low density.

**Impacts:** The proposed GPA, the CCAP, concerns the reduction of GHG emissions by a variety of measures, the bulk of which affect transportation, renewable energy and energy efficiency, green technology and carbon sequestration. Only a fraction of the measures would affect new development, and none of these measures would either encourage population increases or displacement of persons or housing. There would be *no adverse impact* on housing supply or demand, or displacement of any persons.

**Mitigation Measures:** **None required.**

<sup>39</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, *2010 Census Demographic Profile Summary File*. Table prepared by Demographic Research Unit, California Department of Finance, in Table DP-1. Profile of General Demographic Characteristics: 2010

<b>14. PUBLIC SERVICES</b>				
Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:	YES: Potentially Significant Impact	NO: Less Than Significant With Mitigation	NO: Less Than Significant Impact	NO: No Impact
a) Fire protection?			✗	
b) Police protection?			✗	
c) Schools?				✗
d) Parks?				✗
e) Other public facilities?				✗

**Setting:** Fire protection in the County generally is provided by the Alameda County Fire Department, which has a wide range of fire stations and equipment spread throughout the unincorporated areas. Fire protection and risk management also includes provision of services related to hazardous materials, paramedic services, urban search and rescue, fire prevention, and public education. Prevention of fires, accidents and injuries before they occur is accomplished through fire prevention, building code enforcement, and public education. The Department operates 2 battalions, 16 fire stations, 16 engine companies, and 4 ladder truck companies. It also provides for review of Site Development Review proposals and building permits to ensure fire protection is adequate. The Department also has agreements for mutual cooperation with cities in the area, as well as with the State Department of Forestry for the rural and wildlands areas.

Law enforcement in the area is provided by the Alameda County Sheriff's Office, which also has a number of substations in the area. The Sheriff's Office provides numerous other services, including operations of the County Office of Emergency Services, operating the two County jails, Coroner services, and other duties.

The County constitutes a large geographic area, which is served by a variety of school districts, including:

- Castro Valley Unified School District (CVUSD);
- San Lorenzo Unified School District (SLUSD);
- Hayward Unified School District (HUSD);
- Pleasanton Unified School District in the western portion of the Livermore-Amador Valley;
- The single-site Sunol Glen Unified School District in the Sunol Area;
- Livermore Valley Joint Unified School District (LVJUSD) in the eastern portion of the Livermore-Amador Valley;
- The single-site Mountain House Elementary School District on the far eastern boundary of the County.

Park facilities in the County areas are provided by a mixture of park districts, primarily including the East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD), the Livermore Area Recreation and Park District (LARPd) serving the Livermore-Amador Valley area, and the Hayward Area Recreation and Park District (HARD) that serves Hayward and the unincorporated areas of Castro Valley and San Lorenzo. There are very few State parks in Alameda County, with state lands limited to the western shoreline, and the Carnegie State Vehicular Recreation Area in the extreme eastern portion of the County south of Tesla Road, but which is partially in San Joaquin County.

Other public services in the County include government services such as roadway development and maintenance, which is provided by the County Public Works Agency, Social Services, Environmental Health Services including Vector Control, and Agricultural Inspection and Planning services.

Impacts: The proposed General Plan Amendment, adoption of the CCAP as part of the General Plan, would have few impacts of any kind of public services generally. No new development or areawide increases in population or density beyond those of the existing General Plan would be encouraged by the Measures in the CCAP, and per capita service ratios would theoretically remain the same with or without the CCAP amendment. The shifting of the location of development encouraged by the CCAP would not, in itself, result in significant changes in difficulty of providing essential services such as police and fire services as long as prevailing building and fire codes continue to be followed as required by law, and demand for the use of schools, parks and other public facilities would be unaltered. New development would be generally steered away from the urban-rural interface by the CCAP Measures, which would instead tend to direct new development toward redevelopment around transit hubs and community commercial centers, so that wildland fire risk would not be enhanced and would not require special effort on the part of firefighters.

The major unusual aspect of the CCAP relative to other documents is the emphasis on renewable energy in the urban area, such as solar empowerment zones (Measure E-13) and the use of possible solar panels over parking lots (Measure E-11). As electrical installations, these types of projects would require specific consideration to minimize risk of electrical fire. However, as with any other electrical installation, conformance with the Building Codes would be required for any construction, and no specific increase in fire service would be required to accommodate these installations.

With no increases in areawide development or population compared to the potential under the existing General Plan, amendment of the General Plan by the CCAP would result in *less than significant* impacts on police and fire services, the facilities of the various Park districts, including the EBRPD, HARD or the LARPD, and on school services or facilities.

Mitigation Measures: **No mitigation measures are required.**

15. RECREATION Would the project:	YES: Potentially Significant Impact	NO: Less Than Significant With Mitigation	NO: Less Than Significant Impact	NO: No Impact
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				✗
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				✗

**Recreation:** As indicated in Section 14, there is no expectation that the proposed amendment of the CCAP to the General Plan would increase demand or need for additional recreation on parklands compared to that of the existing General Plan, and would have no effect on neighborhood parks or public recreational facilities. **There would be *no impact* on recreation. No mitigation measures are required.**



16. TRANSPORTATION Would the project:	YES: Potentially Significant Impact	NO: Less Than Significant With Mitigation	NO: Less Than Significant Impact	NO: No Impact
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?				x
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				x
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?				x
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			x	
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				x
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?				x

**Roadway Setting:** Alameda County is served by a complex network of freeways, highways and local roads and transit services. Local streets, roads and highways also accommodate varying levels of pedestrian and bicycle travel. Interstate freeways serving the unincorporated County include I-880, I-580, I-680, and I-80 to the north of area, and other key highways include State Route 84 (including both Vallecitos and Niles Canyon Roads), State Routes 238 and 185 (Hesperian Boulevard) in the Castro Valley / Eden areas, and numerous major local roadways that provide more direct access to communities and neighborhoods. Many of these roads are used as commuter travel routes, while others provide local access to the neighborhoods and commercial areas that serve the area. Still others are only lightly used as access to rural or rural residential areas and properties in the County.

Rail transit services include Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART), the major regional light rail facility serving the Castro Valley, Eden and East County areas and providing connections to other Bay Area locations. Major stations that serve the unincorporated areas include the Castro Valley station in downtown Castro Valley, the Bayfair BART station near the northern edge of the Eden Area; and the stations of the Tri-Valley, the Dublin and Pleasanton (Stoneridge) stations which, despite their locations in the cities, serve commuters and passengers from the unincorporated East County. Also, the Union Pacific Railroad routes that run north – south along the urban core of the East Bay and from Altamont Pass, through the Livermore-Amador Valley and into the urban core via Niles Canyon, provide a route for Amtrak rail service via the Capitol Corridor Express, along with the Altamont Corridor Express (ACE) trains that run four times daily from the Stockton area into the South Bay.

Surface transit services, specifically bus routes, are generally common throughout the urban core of Castro Valley and the Eden Area, and are provided by the Alameda - Contra Costa Transit District (AC Transit). AC Transit has regularly scheduled bus services throughout the area including heavy service at commute hours in the morning and evening. In the Tri-Valley / Livermore – Amador Valley area, the

Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority (LAVTA) runs its “Wheels” bus service on weekdays and weekends with routes tailored to various times and purposes, such as school, commuting and shopping. Communities served include the municipalities of Dublin, Livermore and Pleasanton, and by extension the unincorporated areas surrounding them.

Planning Program Setting: The County’s road and highway network is the subject of various federal, state and regional plans, as well as the County General Plan documents, which include planning policies regarding the transportation network. Federal and state funding of highways generally requires that regional plans meet specific standards, and past voter-approved initiatives also impose certain requirements, such as state Proposition 111 (approved in 1990) that required a Congestion Management Plan (CMP) in specified urban areas of California. Each local CMP must identify new highway and transportation projects to be included for funding in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). Other important state laws have been adopted in recent years to address the role of transportation in climate change and greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs), in particular SB 375, legislation approved in 2008 which requires better planning and decision-making to coordinate transportation networks and land use development patterns, while still meeting the housing needs of the region.<sup>40</sup> The County Climate Action Plan (CCAP) also was prepared, in part, pursuant to SB 375.

At the Bay Area regional level, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is responsible for preparing and implementing a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area, and updating it at least once every four years. The most recent RTP, adopted in 2009, is known as *Transportation 2035: Change in Motion*, and serves to identify how anticipated federal, state and local transportation funds will be spent in the region during the next 25 years. It establishes a region-wide network of regional roads and highways, defined as the Metropolitan Transportation System (MTS), within which is the Alameda County roadway network subset that is the subject of the Congestion Management Plan (CMP).<sup>41</sup>

The Alameda County Transportation Commission (ACTC) is currently responsible for maintaining and funding the County CMP, as well as planning and administration of county-wide transportation improvements approved by the voters under Measure B, which included specific projects to improve roadways, transit, and bicycle and pedestrian travel.<sup>42</sup> The ACTC is preparing a new Alameda Countywide Transportation Plan (CWTP) to guide the CMP, comply with SB 375, and identify priority projects and improvements.<sup>43</sup> The draft CWTP, released in March 2012 for review by the public and local agencies, includes a description of roadway characteristics, such as major areas of freeway congestion, measurements by hours of delay and travel speed, safety and existing measures to reduce and avoid congestion.<sup>44</sup>

The 2011 CMP update also requires a land use analysis program to enable analysis of large land use project proposals, so that local decision-makers can estimate the costs of mitigating traffic impacts, such as the costs of roadway improvements or a proportionate share in the context of cumulative development. While local jurisdictions remain responsible for land use decisions, the ACTC has the main responsibility for ensuring that the development and maintenance of publicly-funded roads and transportation services are adequately funded and adequately prioritized. An essential part of the CMP is its requirement that

---

<sup>40</sup> Alameda County Transportation Commission, [http://www.alamedactc.org/app\\_pages/view/1696](http://www.alamedactc.org/app_pages/view/1696), and *Administrative Draft - Alameda Countywide Transportation Plan*, September 1, 2011, p. 1-1.

<sup>41</sup> [http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/plan\\_bay\\_area](http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/plan_bay_area), and Alameda County Transportation Commission, *Draft Congestion Management Plan*, Sept. 2011, pp. ES-3 – ES-4.

<sup>42</sup> Alameda County Transportation Commission, *Draft Alameda Countywide Transportation Plan*, March 14, 2012, pp. 1-1 – 1-3.

<sup>43</sup> Alameda County Transportation Commission, *Planning Page*: <http://www.alamedactc.org>

<sup>44</sup> Op. cit., pp. 3-2 – 3-5.

local jurisdictions, including both individual cities and the County itself to monitor the roadway network to demonstrate conformance to the CMP, including Levels of Service standards on the CMP Network, policies and programs. Any jurisdiction that cannot show compliance with these requirements has 90 days to correct it, or prepare a Deficiency Plan to address the specific nature of the non-compliance.<sup>45</sup>

*County General Plan Considerations:*

The County General Plan area plans (ECAP, CVGP, EAGP) contain numerous policies that address transportation and transit, both directly by encouraging transit, bicycle and pedestrian facility expansions, encouraging the reduction of single-occupant vehicle trips and encouraging the maintenance of the best possible quality levels of service on roadways and at intersections; and indirectly by encouraging intelligent land use planning and transit-oriented development to enable residents to live in the community with minimal dependence on motor vehicles. The CCAP Measures also generally follow these guidelines, and so overall, if it were amended to the General Plan, it would be internally consistent with the General Plan as it presently exists.

For two reasons, the CCAP as a policy document would have a greater influence on the Castro Valley and Eden Areas than on the East County.

1 – The urban development measures contained in the CCAP are all focused on the areas where urban and suburban development in the unincorporated areas either already exists, or is located near transit hubs; and the only places where transit hubs are in close proximity to the urban development are in Castro Valley and the Eden Area; otherwise, the transit hubs are located in cities where the CCAP would not apply; and

2 – In the East County, most of the essential transportation facilities (roadways and transit hubs) directly serve urban development that is already in the urban core; no urban development or jurisdictional roadways are located on unincorporated lands in the East County. As a result, transportation-related CCAP measures, except for bicycle infrastructure on roadways, would have far less application in the East County than the jurisdictional urban areas of the Castro Valley and Eden Areas.

Thus, this analysis concentrates on the lands and roadways covered by the CVGP and the EAGP.

The CVGP and EAGP each contain many goals and policies related to transportation and the enhancement of alternative transportation modes. The EAGP, for example, contains the following general array of goals and policies, tailored to the communities of the Eden Area:

- **Goal CIR-1 – Provide attractive streets designed to serve a broad spectrum of land use patterns and travel modes** – includes policies to enhance roadways and new development to comfortably accommodate bicycles, transit and pedestrian modes as well as motor vehicles, and to adjust traffic control technologies to better accommodate bicycles and pedestrians.
- **Goal CIR-2 – Adopt and enforce Level of Service (LOS) standards that provide high mobility and accessibility for all travel modes** – includes policies to optimize LOS wherever possible.
- **Goal CIR-3 – Provide for efficient motor vehicles circulation** – Includes policies and actions to support regional efforts to improve the freeway, arterial and transit systems, along with measures to improve traffic congestion, street connectivity and emergency vehicle access.

---

<sup>45</sup> Ibid., p. 125.

- **Goal CIR-4 – Provide access and circulation along corridors and in Districts while respecting the intensity of adjacent development** – several policies to properly match street size, speed, access and parking to the adjacent developed environment.
- **Goal CIR-5 - Ensure that public transit is a viable alternative to driving...** - Numerous policies to encourage continued and improved transit service in the Plan area, including service frequency, hours and areas served are increased, and that opportunities for Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) be pursued.
- **Goal CIR-6 – Complete and enhance the pedestrian circulation network...** - Eleven major policies and four actions are included, designed to improve infrastructure, access, utility and attractiveness of facilities to encourage more pedestrian travel, and to direct future construction to follow TOD principles so that the pedestrian-transit network becomes a coherent and effective method of travel.
- **Goal CIR-7 – Promote bicycling as a form of transportation** – Seven major policies and three distinct actions are included to promote and enhance ease and opportunities for cycling, including street improvements, bicycle facilities and expanded bicycle path networks.
- **Goal CIR-8 – Promote adequate truck circulation while protecting neighborhoods from related impacts** – Several policies to coordinate and route truck traffic for efficiency and minimal effect on the community.
- **Goal CIR-9 – Minimize the negative effects of traffic on adjacent land uses and improve traffic safety** – Six policies and three actions would work to minimize the effects of traffic on neighborhoods using speed reduction, traffic calming, limiting roadway size to preserve neighborhood character, and using creative methods to mitigate noise and safety impacts.

The CVGP contains a complementary set of policies and actions, again designed to address transportation and traffic issues related to Castro Valley including Castro Valley Boulevard and the urban core.

*Note - Level of Service Criteria.* To measure and describe the operational status of roadway networks, transportation engineers commonly use the level of service (LOS) grading system. Level of service may describe the operation of individual intersections, ranging from LOS A (indicating free-flow traffic conditions with little or no delay) to LOS F (representing over-saturated conditions where traffic flows exceed design capacity, resulting in long queues and delays). Level of service may also, in the case of roadways in the CMP network, be determined for specific roadway segments as an overall view of traffic levels. As discussed above, various existing General Plan policies require the County to maintain optimum levels of service (typically LOS D operations or better on all segments except major arterials, in which LOS E is deemed adequate) unless construction or corrective funds are unavailable or correction would result in adverse impacts to neighborhoods, alternative travel methods or the environment.

### Impacts

As stated earlier in this document in the introduction, project description and various sections, the CAP by itself is neutral on development, having instead the goal to minimize GHG emissions wherever possible. The CAP does not encourage or discourage development on its own; instead, *it encourages the County to focus development that is already anticipated in the County General plan documents* to areas and to styles that can be optimized for public and alternative transportation use, and energy efficiency. In other words, taken out of context, these measures ostensibly have potential for impact; however, when matched to existing policies in the CVGP and the EAGP, the potential for new impact becomes less-than-significant in general.

Here, it is worthwhile to take each impact category from Table 16 and examine the level of impact.

*16a. Would the program conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?*

Broadly speaking, the measures of the CCAP would modify existing policies designed to optimize land use and transportation facilities for the purposes of reducing GHG emissions by reducing trip generation by motor vehicles for future development. This would be accomplished by directing possible development toward transit hubs, requiring design of new development to discourage single-occupant motor vehicle ownership and use, matching high-density residential to neighborhood commercial uses to reduce the need to travel far for basic goods and services, enhancing opportunities for public transit establishment and use, and enhancing facilities and opportunities for pedestrians and bicycles. The net result would be an overall improvement in transportation systems and general conformance with existing policies to improve transportation systems. There is no reason to believe that any measure from the CCAP would be internally inconsistent with the General Plan documents for the ECAP, the EAGP or the CVGP. **No significant adverse impacts to General Plan conformance with respect to the transportation systems are expected to result from amendment of the CCAP to the General Plan.**

*16b. Would the program conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?*

The proposed General Plan amendment to adopt the CCAP would not reduce the capacity of any roadway, nor would it add more vehicles to the roadway network than the policies of and assumed growth under the existing adopted General Plans. The measures incorporated into the CCAP, which are designed to reduce vehicle trips and trip lengths, and to encourage people to use alternative transportation for as many uses as possible, would likely result in a reduction of congestion on local roadways overall and improved access for pedestrians and bicycles. **This would be in conformance with the Congestion Management Plan for the County, which incorporates General Plan estimates and most major roadways, and it would not be compromised.**

*16c. Would the program result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?*

The CCAP does not contain any measures of any kind that would affect air traffic patterns, air traffic levels or routes. **No impact would occur.**

*16d. Would the program substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?*

The CCAP would have no specific effects on basic roadway design or intersections Countywide, except as to encouraging safer designs for bicycles and pedestrians wherever possible. Looking at each of the following CCAP Measures:

- ▶▶ **T-1** Improve bicycle infrastructure near community activity areas
- ▶▶ **T-2** Develop appropriate bicycle infrastructure for high traffic intersections and corridors
- ▶▶ **T-3** Increase the number of bicycle racks and storage facilities in underserved civic and commercial area

- ▶▶ **T-4** Enhance pedestrian infrastructure within easy walking distance from community activity centers
- ▶▶ **T-5** Expand the Traffic Calming Program to improve pedestrian safety
- ▶▶ **T-6** Improve pedestrian connectivity and route choice in neighborhoods
- ▶▶ **T-7** Work with school districts to develop a School Alternative Transportation Plan by improving/expanding walking school bus, safe routes to school program, and school bus services

It is apparent that the overall goal of the CCAP is to increase safety for, and reduce conflicts between, pedestrian / bicycles and motor vehicles. **No significant impact with respect to traffic hazards is expected.**

*16e. Would the program result in inadequate emergency access?*

The CCAP has no measures that would affect emergency access in any way. Emergency access would continued to be designed into all new development, and no emergency access routes would be closed by this General Plan amendment. **No impact to emergency access would occur.**

*16f. Would the program conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?*

As explained above for 16a and 16b, the CCAP Measures would support and augment the policies and programs for improvement to transit, bicycles and pedestrian access and facilities across the urban area, with relatively little effect on the rural area. In some cases the new measures match existing policies, and in other cases would enhance them. **No adverse conflicts adopted plans, policies or program for transit, bicycles or pedestrian facilities would occur.**

**All Impacts for traffic and transportation would be less-than-significant.**

Mitigation Measures: **No mitigation measures are required.**

<b>17. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</b> Would the project:	YES: Potentially Significant Impact	NO: Less Than Significant With Mitigation	NO: Less Than Significant Impact	NO: No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				✗
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				✗
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			✗	
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				✗
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				✗
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				✗
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				✗

**Setting:** The San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board (SFRWQCB) is one of the various State Water Boards, and along with its other responsibilities, establishes standards for the generation of wastewater to and from wastewater treatment facilities, regulates the discharge of industrial pollutants into treatment facilities, and requires such facilities to meet specific standards for water discharged into San Francisco Bay and the Pacific Ocean. The Environmental Health Department of the Alameda County Health Services Agency oversees and inspects septic and leach field systems, which are utilized throughout the rural areas of the Castro Valley Canyonlands and the East County. These areas have very few if any connections to public wastewater treatment systems. The Health Department is responsible for ensuring that each such system complies with the Water Board requirements, and that the way they are located, designed, constructed, and operated effectively to prevent surfacing or percolating of sewage effluent in a manner that could adversely affect public health or safety.

The Alameda County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (ACFCWCD) manages the construction and maintenance of storm water drainage facilities; in the East County area Zone 7 of the ACFCWCD (generally known as the Zone 7 Water Agency) manages both water delivery and storm water drainage systems. The East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) manages water delivery to the urban and suburban areas of Alameda and Contra Costa Counties. Most of the rural areas of the County, including the East County and Castro Valley Canyonlands rely on on-site groundwater pumping for water supply and have no public water connection. Stormwater in the area flows generally into open creeks and water bodies, but may pass through or into improved downstream water channels such as Arroyo Mocho or San Lorenzo Creek.

The ACWMA's Solid Waste Management Plan (currently identified as the *Integrated Waste Management Plan* (IWMP)).<sup>46</sup> The IWMP identifies solid waste facilities and "wastesheds" within the county, and how the county will reach a state-mandated goal of 50% recycling, and a county-mandated goal of 75% recycling. Waste reduction and disposal facilities in the county that require Solid Waste Facility Permits must conform to policies and siting criteria contained in the IWMP. The IWMP includes, by reference, source reduction and recycling elements, household hazardous waste elements and non-disposal facility elements for each city and the unincorporated county area, as well as a plan that describes countywide diversion programs and landfill disposal needs. The IWMP was first adopted in 1997 and most recently amended in January 2011.

Alameda County is served by three active permitted landfills: the Altamont Landfill and Resource Recovery Facility, the Vasco Road Landfill and the Tri-Cities Recycling and Disposal Facility in Fremont. The total remaining permitted capacity for all three landfills is over 110 million cubic yards, which generally translates to several decades of remaining capacity as of the date of this report.

Impacts: As for many other impact categories, it is important to remember that the proposed general plan amendment to add the CCAP to the General Plan does not encourage or discourage development on its own; instead, *it encourages the County to focus development that is already anticipated in the County General plan documents* to areas and to styles that can be optimized for public transportation use and energy efficiency. In other words, taken out of context, these measures that ostensibly have potential for impact, when matched to existing policies in the CVGP and the EAGP, instead would result in less-than-significant effects.

Impact categories from Table 17:

*17a & b. Would the General Plan Amendment exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board, or require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?*

The General Plans for all areas of the County account for growth and development in terms of the wastewater treatment requirements that would be necessary through the respective ends dates of their planning horizons, including through the end date of the CCAP, which is year 2020. Because the CCAP proposes no level of growth or development beyond that already accommodated in the General Plans, it would have no significant effect on the need for additional wastewater treatment facilities in any area of the County. **There would be no significant impact on wastewater treatment capacity or the need for construction of new facilities.**

*17c. Would the General Plan Amendment require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?*

The overall net stormwater production of the County would not change with the adoption of the CCAP as part of the General Plan. The CCAP neither calls for additional development, nor does it encourage any level of redevelopment of degraded sites. The net result would be no net increase of hard surfaces and thus no net increase of stormwater runoff.

The possibility exists that the redirection of development under the CCAP from dispersed development to specific locations near transit hubs could concentrate that new development near stormwater capture facilities and waterways that are already near or at capacity for large storm events. In most cases, this

---

<sup>46</sup> Alameda County Waste Management Authority, *Integrated Waste Management Plan – Countywide Element*, Adopted February 26, 2003



would not be critical, because increased development on existing hardscapes would not yield a net increase in runoff quantities. However, in some cases where permeable soil or degraded hardscapes exist, new hardscapes could incrementally increase stormwater runoff locally.

Modern design and stormwater regulation for new development and redevelopment are in place. Alameda County requires all new construction and redevelopment to follow Stormwater mitigation regulations and imposes treatment and control measures pursuant to State law. Under the Municipal Regional Permit (MRP), Provision C.3, issued by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), all projects with impermeable surface footprint size greater than 10,000 square feet (or 5,000 sf for specific high-pollutant generators) must use a combination of site design for runoff reduction; onsite or adjacent treatment for pollutant removal; Hydromodification Management (HMM) for very large projects with more than 1 acre affected by development; and Source Control for every project that includes a pollutant source. The combination of possible measures to control and mitigate stormwater runoff effects are numerous – permeable pavements, preservation and establishment of vegetated areas; using cisterns or barrels to capture flows; reuse of rainwater and graywater; bioretention when other measures are not adequate; detention of flows when possible; etc – and any or all of these can be applied to yield a net zero increase of stormwater flows.

Any development or redevelopment of significant size, prescribed by the General Plan and directed into transit-friendly locations by the CCAP, would be subject to these Provision C.3 regulations. With this legal requirement in place for full mitigation of stormwater flows, there would be no net increase in basic requirements for local or regional stormwater flow facilities and **no significant impact as a result of the requirements to construct new facilities.**

*17d. Would the existing water suppliers have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?*

Since the CCAP would not increase development overall, it would not increase demand for water. Parts of the CCAP dealing with landscaping would actually result in a decreased water demand for yard irrigation, and so the tether would be net reduction in water requirements compared to the existing General Plan. **No significant effect would occur with respect to water supply.**

*17e. Would the CCAP result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?*

Since the CCAP would not increase development overall, it would not increase demand for wastewater treatment. **No significant effect would occur with respect to wastewater treatment.**

*17f. With the CCAP, would the Plan areas be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?*

Since the CCAP would result in no net increase in development within the County, and since the CCAP encourages greater levels of recycling and composting than the present condition, it would thus place no additional burden on County landfill space, **no significant effect would occur with respect to landfill capacity.**

*17g. Would the CCAP comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?*

There is no reason to believe that CCAP adoption and implementation would create compliance issues with any statutes and regulations related to solid waste. CCAP implementation would not materially alter the normal course of activity in Alameda County with respect to solid waste, except in some cases

recycling and composting would be enhanced. No hazardous materials would be generated as a result of the CCAP. **No impact to conformance with solid waste regulation would occur.**

**All Impacts for Utilities and Service Systems would be less-than-significant.**

Mitigation Measures: **No mitigation measures are required.**

	YES: Potentially Significant Impact	NO: Less Than Significant With Mitigation	NO: Less Than Significant Impact	NO: No Impact
<b>18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</b>				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?			✗	
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)			✗	
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			✗	

Discussion:

- Does the “project” have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment?

In this case, the project would be incorporation into the General Plan of, and subsequent implementation of, the Alameda County Community Climate Action Plan (CCAP), which includes all of the Measures included in the Project Description at the beginning of this document. The CCAP is specifically designed to reduce the impacts of new development already envisioned in the General Plan with respect to traffic and pollutant emissions, especially GHGs, to conserve energy, to encourage the installation of alternative energy wherever it is possible to do so effectively, to bring as many roadways and community facilities into the realm of easy pedestrian and bicycle access, to design new construction and paving to reduce the requirement for energy consumption in heating and cooling of air and water, and to reduce water use and waste in order to conserve energy. In effect, the CCAP is designed to avoid new impacts while mitigating existing effects of GHG emissions.

Based on the findings of this document and the goals of the CCAP, any potential to degrade the environment is unlikely. In the few instances where the measures of the CCAP to adjust the locations of development could concentrate the effects of that development such that an unintended effect could occur, other existing laws and regulations would be applicable and would serve to reduce those possible effects to levels of insignificance before construction and operations could commence. This report thus finds that **incorporation of the CCAP into the General Plan poses no potential to degrade the quality of the environment.**

- Does the “project” have the potential to substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal?

The proposed CCAP GPA has few measures that would affect critical habitat, biology or wildlife of any kind at any location. Development measures would tend to move new construction farther from habitat

areas and into existing urbanized zones, avoiding the possibility of damage to habitat or biology. Measures to improve energy efficiency, reduce traffic, improve alternative transportation, reduce water use, increase recycling and bring agriculture closer to the urban core would all be harmless to wildlife and habitat. The single measure that could affect wildland habitat, Measure **G-2** (Include carbon sequestration as an objective within County-led natural area restoration projects) would not alter the goal of restoration or reduce the suitability of lands for habitat and biological preservation.

**This report concludes that the proposed CCAP GPA does not have the potential to substantially affect biological resources as described.**

- *Does the “project” have the potential to eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?*

None of the measures described in the CCAP would affect cultural or historic resources to any greater extent than those already envisioned in the existing General Plan documents. It requires no loss of historic or cultural resources, nor does it require modification to such resources that would reduce the cultural, historical or architectural value of those resources. **The CCAP does not have the potential to eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.**

- *Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable?*

The CCAP is not a project per se, but a program of Measures designed to be applied across the County as appropriate in order to achieve a specific purpose, that of GHG emission reductions. Each individual measure would have only a modest effect, or in some cases no effect at all on GHG reduction – the actual strategy is to use all of the measures together in synergy to achieve the desired effect. On transportation, trip generation, pollutant and GHG emissions, water use and energy use, the CCAP would reduce the overall impacts of General Plan implementation, and for these categories would certainly have no negative cumulative effect.

In terms of land use and development, the overall impact of any one measure is the same as the cumulative effect of the plan. It does not alter the intended buildout or overall density of the General Plan, nor does it magnify any impact associated with and mitigated under the General Plan.

As in all General Plan documents, and as for any other programmatic action, the impacts analyzed in this report are already cumulative in nature, not applicable to any one location or project, but applicable to the entire County. As none of the impacts described in this document, either by themselves or in conjunction with one another, create a significant impact, it follows that **the program of the CCAP would result in no cumulatively considerable impacts.**

- *Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?*

If the CCAP as written is amended to the General Plan for Alameda County, and if all other existing policies and actions are maintained; and if all other existing regulations pertaining to environmental analysis, water quality, air quality, noise, cultural and historic resources, biological habitat, building and fire codes are implemented as required by statute, then **the proposed CCAP General Plan Amendment would have no substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.**

## **E. SOURCES**

Alameda County Community Development Agency, *East Alameda County Cultural Resource Survey*, Prepared by Corbett, Michael R., June 17, 2005.

Alameda County Congestion Management Agency, *Countywide Bicycle Plan*, October 26, 2006.

Alameda County Planning Department, *Archaeology in Alameda County: A Handbook for Planners*, October, 1976.

Alameda County Planning Department, *Draft Environmental Impact Report, East County Area Plan*, June 1993

Alameda County Planning Department, *Preliminary Inventory of Historical Resources: Eastern Alameda County*, 1993.

Alameda County Resource Conservation District, *The Equine CUP Streamlining Project*, October 2003

Alameda County Transportation Commission, *Draft Alameda Countywide Transportation Plan*, March 14, 2012.

Alameda County Transportation Commission, *Draft Congestion Management Plan*, Sept. 2011.

Alameda County Transportation Commission, [http://www.alamedactc.org/app\\_pages/view/1696](http://www.alamedactc.org/app_pages/view/1696)

Alameda County Transportation Commission, [http://www.alamedactc.org/app\\_pages/view/6241](http://www.alamedactc.org/app_pages/view/6241).

Alameda County Transportation Commission, *Planning Page*, <http://www.alamedactc.org>

Alameda County Waste Management Authority, *Alameda County Integrated Waste Management Plan, County-wide Element, including Siting Element & Summary Plan*, Adopted February 26, 2003, Updated April 2010 & Amended January 26, 2011.

Alameda County, *Castro Valley General Plan*, adopted March 27, 2012

Alameda County, *Climate Action Plan, Final Draft*, 2011

Alameda County, *Conservation Element*, 1976.

Alameda County, *East County Area Plan*, adopted by the County of Alameda Board of Supervisors May 5, 1994; amended by voter initiative Measure D, November 7, 2000 – revised ECAP adopted May 2002.

Alameda County, *Eden Area General Plan*, adopted March 30, 2010.

Alameda County, *General Ordinance Code, Chapter 6.60*.

Alameda County, *General Ordinance, Title 17 – Zoning Ordinance*.

Alameda County, *Noise Element of the Alameda County General Plan*, Adopted by Board of Supervisors July 31, 1975, As Revised September 1975 and Amended May 5, 1994.

Alameda County, *Safety Element of the County of Alameda General Plan*, January, 2013

Alameda County, *South Livermore Valley Area Plan*.

Association of Bay Area Governments, *Projections 2009*.

Bay Area Air Quality Management District, *Air Quality Standards and Attainment Status*, [http://hank.baaqmd.gov/pln/air\\_quality/ambient\\_air\\_quality.htm](http://hank.baaqmd.gov/pln/air_quality/ambient_air_quality.htm).

Bay Area Air Quality Management District, *Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan*, December 2010.

Bay Area Air Quality Management District, *California Environmental Quality Act – Air Quality Guidelines*, May, 2011 (update from June 2010).

Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Science of Climate Change webpage, <http://www.baaqmd.gov/Divisions/Planning-and-Research/Climate-Protection-Program/Science-of-Climate-Change.aspx>.

Bay Area Air Quality Management District, *Source Inventory of Bay Area Greenhouse Gas Emissions – Base Year 2002*, February 2010.

California Air Resources Board, *Staff Report – California 1990 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Level and 2020 Emissions Limit*, November 16, 2007, p. 6.

California Air Resources Board/Arnold Schwarzenegger, Governor, State of California, *Climate Change Scoping Plan – A Framework for Change*, December 2008. website: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/sb375.htm>.

California Department of Conservation, <ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2010/ala10.pdf>.

California Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit, *Table DP-1. Profile of General Demographic Characteristics: 2010*

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, *Fire and Resource Assessment Program, California's Forests and Rangelands: 2010 Assessment*, June, 2010 <http://frap.fire.ca.gov/assessment2010.html>

California Department of Transportation: [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic\\_highways/index.htm](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic_highways/index.htm)

California Department of Transportation, Office of Emergency Management Division of Maintenance, *Maintenance Manual*, July 2006, [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/maint/manual/Ch\\_D5.pdf](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/maint/manual/Ch_D5.pdf)

California Environmental Protection Agency, *Climate Action Team Executive Summary – Report to Governor Schwarzenegger and the California Legislature*, March, 2006.

California, State of, *Government Code, Sections 65300.5 and 65358 (b)*

California, State of, *Health and Safety Code, Sections 25117 & 25143.5; Water Code, Section 13172; Public Resources Code, Section 41781.2.*

citizens4openspace.org, *Save Agriculture and Open Space Lands*, Initiative Measure to be Submitted Directly to the Voters of Alameda County, November 7, 2000 General Election.

Dublin, City of, *Staff Report – Adoption of a Resolution approving the Tri-Valley Transportation Council Strategic Expenditure Plan 2011 Update and an Increase to the Tri-Valley Transportation Development Fee*. April 19, 2011

East Bay Regional Park District, <http://www.ebparks.org/hcp>

Institute of Transportation Engineers, *Trip Generation, 7th Edition: An ITE Informational Report*, 2003.

Metropolitan Transportation Commission, [http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/plan\\_bay\\_area](http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/plan_bay_area)

Metropolitan Transportation Commission, *Transportation 2035: Change in Motion*, April 2009.

San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, *Alameda Watershed Habitat Conservation Plan – Working Draft*, January 2010.

San Ramon, City of, *Transportation Services webpage*, <http://www.sanramon.ca.gov/transp/regtrplanning.htm> - Regional Transportation Planning Solutions – Tri-Valley Transportation Council.

State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Water Quality, *Construction General Permit Fact Sheet for 2009-0009-DWQ as amended by 2010-0014-DWQ*, September 2, 2009 as modified on November 16, 2010, p. 3.

State Water Resources Control Board, *Draft 2010 Integrated Report* (Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List/305(b) Report), April, 2010,

[http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water\\_issues/programs/tmdl/integrated2010/ir2010\\_factsheet.pdf](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/tmdl/integrated2010/ir2010_factsheet.pdf).

U.S. Census Bureau, *2010 Census Demographic Profile Summary File*.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Wastewater Management, *Compiled CAFO NPDES Regulations and Effluent Limitations Guidelines and Standards*, Nov. 2008

United States Federal Emergency Management Agency, National Flood Insurance Program, [http://www.floodsmart.gov/floodsmart/pages/media\\_resources/fact\\_calirain.jsp](http://www.floodsmart.gov/floodsmart/pages/media_resources/fact_calirain.jsp).

## **F. MITIGATION MEASURES TO BE INCLUDED IN THE PROJECT AND AGREED TO BY THE PROGRAM SPONSOR (ALAMEDA COUNTY):**

No additional mitigation measures are required for this proposal.

*Community Climate Action Plan (CCAP) General Plan Amendments  
Environmental Checklist Form & Initial Study*

*June 1, 2013*