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## Amendments to the General Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Adopted</th>
<th>Resolution No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 21, 2003</td>
<td>03-9742</td>
<td>Deletion of Policy 2-P-18 Establishing Maximum Lot Coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 7, 2003</td>
<td>03-9859</td>
<td>Amendment to the General Plan Land Use Diagram for the Lawlor Estates Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 17, 2003</td>
<td>03-9967</td>
<td>Amendment to Chapter Thirteen: Housing Element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 7, 2004</td>
<td>04-10121</td>
<td>Amendment to the General Plan Land Use Diagram for the Highlands Ranch Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 4, 2004</td>
<td>04-10164</td>
<td>Amendments to Chapters One through Twelve for the General Plan Clean-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1, 2004</td>
<td>04-10174</td>
<td>Amendment to Chapter Thirteen: Housing Element, for the reporting period 1999-2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 29, 2004</td>
<td>04-10192</td>
<td>Amendment to the General Plan Land Use Diagram for the Vista del Mar Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 19, 2005</td>
<td>05-10371</td>
<td>Amendments to the General Plan Land Use Diagram; Chapter Five: Downtown Element; and Chapter Eight: Open Space, Youth and Recreation Element for the Mariner Walk Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Adopted</td>
<td>Resolution No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 8, 2005</td>
<td>(Not applicable)</td>
<td>Amendments to Chapter One: Introduction and Overview; Chapter Two: Land Use Element; Chapter Three: Growth Management Element; and Chapter Thirteen: Housing Element as approved by popular vote under the City of Pittsburg Voter Approved Urban Limit Line and Prezoning Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 21, 2005</td>
<td>05-10424</td>
<td>Amendment to the General Plan Land Use Diagram for the East Leland Subdivision II Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 21, 2005</td>
<td>05-10426</td>
<td>Amendments to the General Plan Land Use Diagram; Chapter Five: Downtown Element; Chapter Eight: Open Space, Youth and Recreation Element; and Chapter Nine: Resource Conservation Element for the Black Diamond Mixed Use Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 12, 2005</td>
<td>05-10425</td>
<td>Amendments to the General Plan Land Use Diagram and Chapter Five: Downtown Element for the Harbor Park Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 19, 2006</td>
<td>06-10565</td>
<td>Amendment to the General Plan Land Use Diagram for the Mirant Power Generation Plant Annexation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 18, 2006</td>
<td>06-10685</td>
<td>Amendments to the General Plan Land Use Diagram; Chapter Two: Land Use Element; Chapter Five: Downtown Element; and Chapter Eight: Open Space, Youth and Recreation Element for the East Third Street Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 16, 2007</td>
<td>07-10700</td>
<td>Amendments to the General Plan Land Use Diagram; Chapter Two: Land Use Element; Chapter Three: Growth Management Element; and Chapter Eight: Open Space, Youth and Recreation Element related primarily to the City of Pittsburg Voter Approved Urban Limit Line and Prezoning Act and associated Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Adopted</td>
<td>Resolution No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 21, 2007</td>
<td>07-10779</td>
<td>Amendments to the General Plan Land Use Diagram; Chapter Two: Land Use Element; Chapter Five: Downtown Element; Chapter Eight: Open Space, Youth and Recreation Element; Chapter Ten: Health and Safety Element; and Chapter Thirteen: Housing Element in conjunction with Phase II of the Comprehensive Zoning Code Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1, 2009</td>
<td>09-11223</td>
<td>Amendment of Chapter Thirteen: Housing Element, for the reporting period 2007-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 3, 2009</td>
<td>09-11249</td>
<td>Amendments to Chapter One: Introduction; Chapter Three: Growth Management Element; and Chapter Seven; Transportation Element of the General Plan in conjunction with the Contra Costa Transportation Authority, Measure J Growth Management Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 5, 2009</td>
<td>09-11285</td>
<td>Amendment to Chapter Two: Land Use Element of the General Plan and Changing the Land Use Designation of 17.75 Acres Located at 1375 California Avenue, for Antioch Building Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 19, 2009</td>
<td>09-11303</td>
<td>Amendment to Chapter Two: Land Use Element, and Chapter Seven: Transportation Element of the General Plan in Conjunction with the Railroad Avenue Specific Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 6, 2010</td>
<td>10-11487</td>
<td>Amendments to the 2007-2014 Housing Element, Chapter 13 of the General Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABAG</td>
<td>Association of Bay Area Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADT</td>
<td>Average Daily Trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAAQMD</td>
<td>Bay Area Air Quality Management District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART</td>
<td>Bay Area Rapid Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCDC</td>
<td>Bay Conservation and Development Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BID</td>
<td>Business Improvement District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNSF</td>
<td>Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMP</td>
<td>Best Management Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>California Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCCFPD</td>
<td>Contra Costa County Fire Protection District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCTA</td>
<td>Contra Costa Transportation Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCCTA</td>
<td>Contra Costa County Transit Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCWD</td>
<td>Contra Costa Water District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG</td>
<td>Community Development Block Grant Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA</td>
<td>California Environmental Quality Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>Capital Improvement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMA</td>
<td>Congestion Management Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMP</td>
<td>Congestion Management Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNEL</td>
<td>Community Noise Equivalent Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNWS</td>
<td>Concord Naval Weapons Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVP</td>
<td>Central Valley Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDSD</td>
<td>Delta Diablo Sanitation District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBMUD</td>
<td>East Bay Municipal Utility District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBRPD</td>
<td>East Bay Regional Park District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIR</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELIHPA</td>
<td>Emergency Low-Income Housing Preservation Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>Floor Area Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA</td>
<td>Federal Emergency Management Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gpd</td>
<td>Gallons per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCD</td>
<td>California Department of Housing and Community Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOV</td>
<td>High Occupancy Vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUD</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Housing &amp; Urban Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAFCo</td>
<td>Local Agency Formation Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIHPRAH</td>
<td>Low-Income Housing Preservation and Resident Homeownership Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUST</td>
<td>Leaking Underground Storage Tank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgd</td>
<td>Million gallons per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTC</td>
<td>Metropolitan Transportation Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDUSD</td>
<td>Mount Diablo Unified School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRB</td>
<td>Mortgage Revenue Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAICS</td>
<td>North American Industrial Classification System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>Notice of Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPDES</td>
<td>National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEHDC</td>
<td>Pittsburg Economic and Housing Development Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUD</td>
<td>Planned Unit Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG&amp;E</td>
<td>Pacific Gas and Electric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>Planned Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUSD</td>
<td>Pittsburg Unified School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTPC</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Planning Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWQCB</td>
<td>California Regional Water Quality Control Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROG</td>
<td>Reactive Organic Compounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>Right of Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLSF</td>
<td>Small-Lot Single Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLIC</td>
<td>Spills, Leaks, Investigations and Cleanup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOI</td>
<td>Sphere of Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCA</td>
<td>California Trade and Commercial Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDM</td>
<td>Transportation Demand Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOD</td>
<td>Transit-Oriented Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSM</td>
<td>Transportation Systems Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPLAN</td>
<td>Transportation Planning Committee of East Contra Costa County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULL</td>
<td>Urban Limit Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPRR</td>
<td>Union Pacific Railroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UST</td>
<td>Underground Storage Tank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1 INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

Pittsburg’s General Plan was last comprehensively updated in 1988. To respond to growth and planning challenges, the City began the process to update its General Plan in September of 1997. Key objectives of this update process include:

- Articulating a strategy for growth and development that provides a sound basis for decision-making for detailed studies (such as specific plans), annexations, and project approvals;
- Supporting the City’s objectives for economic development, and outlining strategies for revitalizing Downtown and other infill areas;
- Balancing development and conservation in the hillsides;
- Effectively utilizing regional transit expansion opportunities; and
- Ensuring that Plan policies are mutually supportive, internally consistent and in accordance with State law.
1.1 EVOLUTION OF PITTSBURG

Pittsburg began along the Suisun Bay/Delta shoreline as a 10,000-acre land grant from the government of Mexico in 1839, and grew into a settlement. Originally named New York of the Pacific, the City’s name was changed to New York Landing when it was a way station during the Gold Rush days. The City's reputation as an industrial area was established in 1855 when coal was discovered in the southern hills, and its name changed to Black Diamond. However, the prime industrial base of the City came in 1911 with the opening of the first steel mill, and the final name change to Pittsburg (after the hub of the steel industry on the east coast: Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania).

During World War II, Camp Stoneman was built in Pittsburg. Forty-five thousand servicemen were stationed at the camp, which was a major point of embarkation for the Pacific Theater. At the end of the war, the level of activity declined in Pittsburg as it did in other wartime boomtowns, signaling an end to much of the prosperity the City had known. There was a slight resurgence of activity at Camp Stoneman during the Korean Conflict, but after the end of the Conflict in 1954, the camp was placed on inactive status and many local businesses closed or relocated, often to neighboring communities where commercial development was occurring.

Pittsburg experienced rapid population growth during the 1970s and 1980s, evolving into a bedroom community for employment centers in west and central Contra Costa County. Population in the City’s Sphere of Influence (SOI) grew 43 percent between 1985 and 1995, about 70 percent faster than Contra Costa County’s already rapid growth rate. In the last five years, as development has extended to City limits, the pace of Pittsburg’s growth has slowed, even as other east and central county cities such as Brentwood, Antioch, and Clayton continue their dramatic growth.

Many other changes have also occurred in the last decade. Extension of Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) service to Bay Point has given Pittsburg a new transportation option. Redevelopment of the City’s Downtown has provided residents with a more vital historic activity center and increased waterfront access.
Residential growth in southwestern Pittsburg has expanded local housing opportunities and altered views of and within the City.
1.2 PURPOSE AND REQUIREMENTS OF GENERAL PLAN

GENERAL PLAN PURPOSE

The Pittsburg General Plan addresses issues related to physical development, growth, and conservation of resources in the City’s Planning Area. The General Plan:

• Outlines a vision of long-range physical and economic development and hillside and resource conservation that reflects the aspirations of the community;
• Provides strategies and specific implementing actions that will allow this vision to be accomplished;
• Establishes a basis for judging whether specific development proposals and public projects are in harmony with Plan policies and standards;
• Allows City departments, other public agencies, and private developers to design projects that will enhance the character of the community, preserve and enhance critical environmental resources, and minimize hazards; and
• Provides the basis for establishing and setting priorities for detailed plans and implementing programs, such as the Zoning Ordinance, specific plans, and the Capital Improvement Program.

GENERAL PLAN REQUIREMENTS

State law (California Government Code Sec. 65300) requires each California city and county to prepare a general plan. A general plan is defined as “a comprehensive, long-term plan for the physical development of the county or city, and any land outside its boundaries which in the planning agency's judgment bears relation to its planning.” State requirements call for general plans that “comprise
an integrated, internally consistent and compatible statement of policies for the adopting agency.”

A city's general plan has been described as its constitution for development – the framework within which decisions on how to grow, provide public services and facilities, and protect and enhance the environment must be made. California's tradition of allowing local authority over land use decisions means that the state's cities have considerable flexibility in preparing their general plans.

While State planning laws allow considerable flexibility, they do establish some requirements for the issues that general plans must address. California Government Code Sec. 65302 establishes both the content of general plans and rules for their adoption and subsequent amendment. Together, state law and judicial decisions establish three overall guidelines for general plans.

• **The General Plan Must Be Comprehensive.** This requirement has two aspects. First, the general plan must be **geographically** comprehensive. That is, it must apply throughout the entire incorporated area and it should include other areas that the City determines are relevant to its planning. Second, the general plan must address the **full range of issues** that affects the City's physical development.

• **The General Plan Must Be Internally Consistent.** This requirement means that the general plan must fully integrate its separate parts and relate them to each other without conflict. “Horizontal” consistency applies as much to figures and diagrams as to the general plan text. It also applies to data and analysis as well as policies. All adopted portions of the general plan, whether required by state law or not, have equal legal weight. None may supersede another, so the general plan must resolve conflicts among the provisions of each element.

• **The General Plan Must Be Long-range.** Because anticipated development will affect the City and the people who live or work there for years to come, state law requires every general plan to take a long-term perspective.
GENERAL PLAN FORMAT

California Government Code Sec. 65302 requires that a general plan address seven mandatory elements listed as: land use, circulation, conservation, open space (includes recreation), safety, noise, and housing. Specific issue areas are prescribed for each mandatory element. California Government Code Sec. 65303 gives local legislative bodies the authority to also incorporate into the General Plan any optional elements that relate to the physical development of the jurisdiction. This General Plan includes five optional elements listed as: growth management, urban design, downtown, economic development, and public facilities. The Pittsburg General Plan is organized as follows, addressing each of the mandatory elements and several optional elements:

Mandatory Elements

Land Use (Chapter 2)
This element includes proposed use classifications, distribution of land uses via the General Plan diagram, buildout projections, and land use and subarea policies. Location of public facilities is addressed in Chapter 11: Public Facilities and areas subject to flooding hazards are defined in Chapter 10: Health and Safety. Timber production does not occur within the Planning Area, and is therefore not addressed in the Land Use Element.

Circulation (Chapter 7: Transportation)
This element includes existing and proposed locations of the roadway system, transit, bikeways and pedestrian paths, as well as transportation demand management programs.

Conservation (Chapter 9: Resource Conservation)
This element includes analysis of biological resources, drainage and erosion, water quality, air quality, and historical resources. Flood control is addressed in Chapter 10: Health and Safety, and water supply is discussed in Chapter 11:
Public Facilities. Access to the Suisun Bay waterfront is addressed in Chapter 8: Open Space, Youth and Recreation.

Open Space (Chapter 8: Open Space, Youth and Recreation)

This element addresses public parks, trails and open space, waterfront access, recreational and cultural programs, and educational facilities. Policies requiring preservation of open space for natural resources are contained within Chapter 9: Resource Conservation, and policies requiring open space for health and safety are contained within Chapter 10: Health and Safety.

Safety (Chapter 10: Health and Safety)

Geology and seismicity, flood control, hazardous materials, and emergency management are all addressed in this element. Geologic, seismic, and flooding hazards are all addressed in this element. Geologic, seismic, and flooding hazards are mapped. Fire protection and water supply are addressed in Chapter 11: Public Facilities.

Noise (Chapter 12)

This element includes discussion of noise measurement, existing and projected noise contours, and noise mitigation policies.

Housing (Chapter 13)

This element consists of updated information on demographic trends, housing characteristics, housing costs, development potential, constraints, and special housing needs. The Housing Element also includes goals, plans and programs for housing development in the City, and a summary of accomplishments of the last Housing Element in 1990.
Optional Elements

Growth Management (Chapter 3)
This element addresses growth and expansion, traffic standards, and public facility standards, pursuant to the Contra Costa County Transportation Sales Tax Expenditure Plan (Measure J) adopted by County voters in 2004, as amended by the Contra Costa County Transportation Authority. This element also addresses the Voter Approved Urban Limit Line passed by the voters of the City of Pittsburg.

Urban Design (Chapter 4)
Views and ridges, hillside development policies, key corridors, mixed-use districts, and neighborhood design are all addressed in this element.

Downtown (Chapter 5)
This element is intended to replace the 1986 Downtown Specific Plan, and addresses Downtown development strategies, streetscape and waterfront design, access and parking.

Economic Development (Chapter 6)
Economic development opportunities, trends and prospects, and an economic development strategy are presented in this element.

Public Facilities (Chapter 11)
Water supply, wastewater collection, solid waste, fire protection, and public utilities are all addressed in this element.

Goals and Policies
Each Element of the General Plan is organized to provide a short description of existing conditions, followed by goals and policies.
• **Goals** present broad policy direction, a larger end-state the City is hoping to achieve.

• **Policies** provide more specific direction on how to achieve goals. Policies outline actions, procedures, programs, or techniques to attain the goals. Some policies include quantitative statements that can be implemented by City staff.

• **Text** below various policies simply provides further discussion of and potential implementation for the policy statement.

In some elements, such as Land Use, growth projections are also included.
1.3 REGIONAL LOCATION AND PLANNING BOUNDARIES

REGIONAL LOCATION

Pittsburg is located along the Sacramento River in eastern Contra Costa County. The northern portion of the City is relatively flat, increasing in elevation as it expands into the southern hills. The hills form the northern tip of the Diablo Range, which extends from Contra Costa County to Santa Clara County. Major transportation corridors include State Route 4, the Burlington Northern & Santa Fe (BNSF) railroad, and the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) rail line. Figure 1-1 shows the City’s regional location.

PLANNING BOUNDARIES

Pittsburg’s Planning Area includes 41.1 square miles of land, within which lie both the SOI and the City corporate limits. The inclusion of land within the Planning Area but outside City limits does not necessarily mean that the City is contemplating annexation of those lands. Pittsburg’s SOI extends over 18.2 square miles and includes the unincorporated community of Bay Point, northwest of the City. Certain unincorporated lands lying outside the current SOI—such as undeveloped areas adjacent to Bay Point and Antioch—may be considered for annexation to the City, upon request by the landowner or developer. City limits spanned 15.6 square miles in year 2000. The Planning Area boundaries coincide with those of Antioch and Clayton, and with the Concord Naval Weapons Station, which is within Concord City limits.

Several geographic features distinguish the Planning Area. The Sacramento River forms the northern boundary; Browns Island, located across New York Slough, is visible from the waterfront. Steep hills—reaching an elevation of almost 1,900 feet—provide a distinctive backdrop to the south, and define the limits of urban development. The Black Diamond Mines Regional Preserve marks the southeastern limits of the Planning Area. Figure 1-2 shows the Planning Area and planning boundaries in physical relief.
1.4 GENERAL PLAN THEMES

Responding to the objectives and issues raised during the community participation process, the General Plan is structured around several themes, which form the basis of goals and policies included in the various elements:

- **Employment Growth.** While industrial activity in Pittsburg continues to be strong, the City’s economy is in transition from manufacturing to services. Existing large industrial uses are far more efficient and less labor-intensive than in the past. Job-growth in the heavy industry sector may be limited due to more efficient production methods, strict environmental regulations, and public attitude opposing heavy industry. Retail trade and services are expected to be the fastest-growing employment sectors in the coming decades, and will have positive impacts on the City’s fiscal base. Three big-box retail centers have already located along State Route 4, and the General Plan will allow for continued expansion of existing sectors.

  Office and service establishments in Pittsburg are generally small-scaled, and integrated with strip malls along Railroad Avenue and East Leland Road. Pittsburg lacks larger-scaled office and business parks. However, the General Plan provides sites for these business commercial centers in a variety of locations – near the Bay Point BART station, along State Route 4, as well as on infill and potential redevelopment sites.

- **Downtown and Waterfront Revitalization.** Pittsburg’s waterfront location has been central to its growth and development. Coal was transported from Black Diamond Mines along Railroad Avenue for shipping; the juncture of Railroad Avenue and the Sacramento River Delta became the natural location for Pittsburg’s Downtown. Although Downtown experienced a decline following World War II, redevelopment activities have contributed to the recovery of the historic core.
The General Plan builds on Downtown’s many positive attributes and seeks to improve visual and physical connection to the water and access from surrounding neighborhoods, and a development pattern that lends itself to pedestrian scale and comfort. The General Plan delineates a new waterfront park and marine commercial uses east of Downtown along Third Street. It also seeks growth in Downtown’s population base from about 4,000 in 1999 to almost 8,000 at Plan buildout.

- **Hillside/Ridgeline Preservation.** The range of hills along the City’s southern boundary is one of Pittsburg’s most distinguishing features. As large tracts of undeveloped land suitable for housing within the City have become scarce, the City must develop planning tools to preserve the aesthetic appearance of the hills and direct development to appropriate locations. Recently, the hillsides have come under increasing development pressure. A majority of new growth in the hillsides will result from development that is already entitled; the General Plan delineates limited new growth in the hillsides. Based on sophisticated computer-based viewshed analysis, the General Plan also delineates areas that merit ridgeline and hillside protection, and includes other policies to ensure that development is in keeping with hillside character and constraints.

- **Jobs/Employed Residents Balance.** With over twice as many residents as available jobs, the Pittsburg SOI had a deficit of approximately 10,000 jobs in 2000. Large-scale projects, such as North Park Plaza and Century Plaza, have augmented the City’s commercial base, and in the last five years the City has added jobs at a faster rate than population growth. The General Plan seeks a close balance between jobs and employed residents at buildout.

- **Capitalizing on Regional Transportation Improvements.** The General Plan seeks to link employment growth to improvements in regional accessibility resulting from widening of State Route 4 and extension of BART. These links will support transit and encourage a reverse commute, as well as minimize impacts of commercial development on neighborhoods.
• **Enhanced Community Character.** The General Plan establishes specific urban design policies for major corridors, development in the hillsides, and for Downtown and neighborhood centers. Connections between neighborhoods, transitions between urban and open space areas, city and neighborhood edges, community orientation of development, building massing, and streetscapes are all addressed. Policies are also included for viewshed and ridgeline protection.

• **Increased linkages between different parts of the City.** The General Plan includes many improvements that will improve regional access, as well as connections between different neighborhoods. These include extension of Leland Road to the western City limit, San Marco Boulevard from State Route 4 to Bailey Road, Buchanan Bypass along the southeast City limit, and a Range Road/State Route 4 interchange.

### 1.5 THE PLANNING PROCESS

The City's planning process includes monitoring and updating the General Plan, implementing Plan policies, updating the Zoning Ordinance, and preparing other implementing ordinances, specific plans, design guidelines, and other studies called for in the General Plan. An annual General Plan Report will provide an overview of the status of the General Plan and its implementation.

Ordinances and documents the City must update or prepare upon adoption of the General Plan include:

• **Zoning Ordinance.** The Zoning Ordinance is one of the primary implementation tools of the General Plan, and is required by State law to be consistent with the General Plan. A focused update of the Zoning Ordinance, including a comprehensive revision of hillside development regulations, will be necessary in order to implement the new General Plan Diagram and land use classifications, land use policies, and policies relating to the intensity, bulk, and character of new development.
• **Specific and Area Plans.** The City jointly worked with Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART), adjacent cities, and other agencies to develop the Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station Area Specific Plan. Should BART choose to extend its rail service to the eastern edge of Pittsburg, the City will also contribute to the drafting of another BART Station Area Specific Plan. Additionally, the City will be contributing to the drafting of the Pittsburg/Antioch Industrial Area Specific Plan.

• **Redevelopment Plan.** The Los Medanos Community Development Project, the redevelopment project area, includes virtually all of the City’s non-residential land. Adopted redevelopment projects within the current 5-year Plan include a senior center, City park facilities, City gateways, roadway improvements, library remodel, Downtown museum, and storm drain improvements. The next update of the Redevelopment Plan will reflect General Plan policies and programs.

• **Capital Improvements Program.** The City’s Capital Improvement Program will identify prioritization, timing, and financing for public projects according to the growth management strategy set forth within the General Plan.

**AMENDMENTS TO THE GENERAL PLAN**

As the City’s guide for development, the General Plan is the heart of the planning process. It is intended to be a living document and, as such, will be subject to more site-specific and comprehensive amendments over time. Amendments also may be needed from time to time to conform to State or federal law passed after adoption, and to eliminate or modify policies that may become obsolete or unrealistic due to changed conditions (such as completion of a task or project, development on a site, or adoption of an ordinance or plan).

State law limits the number of times a jurisdiction can amend its general plan. Generally, no jurisdiction can amend any mandatory element of its general plan more than four times in one year, although each amendment may include more than one change to the general plan. This restriction, however, does not apply to amendments for:
Optional elements (such as the Growth Management, Urban Design, Downtown, and Economic Development elements of the Pittsburg General Plan);
• Allowing development of affordable housing; or
• Complying with a court decision.

DELT A PROTECTION COMMISSION
Per the Delta Protection Act of 1992, the California Delta Protection Commission (DPC) is required to review and approve proposed General Plan amendments affecting land within the Primary Zone, as shown in Figure 1-3. Browns Island, located along the northeastern shore of Suisun Bay, lies within the DPC’s Primary Zone. Browns Island is primarily owned by the State Lands Commission, leased to the East Bay Regional Park District; a portion of the Island is owned by the Port of Stockton.

Local governments must ensure that adopted General Plans, and any development approved or proposed under the General Plan, will be consistent with the DPC’s Land Use and Resource Management Plan and will NOT:
• result in wetland or riparian loss;
• result in degradation of water quality;
• result in increased nonpoint source pollution;
• result in the degradation or reduction of Pacific Flyway habitat;
• result in reduced public access, provided the access does not infringe on private property rights;
• expose the public to increased flood hazard;
• adversely impact agricultural lands or increase the potential for vandalism, trespassing, or the creation of public private nuisance on public or private land;
• result in the degradation or impairment of levee integrity; and
• adversely impact navigation.
ANNUAL REPORT

The California Government Code requires City staff to “provide an annual report to the legislative body on the status of the general plan and progress in its implementation” (Government Code Section 65400(b)). This report must be submitted to the Governor's Office of Planning and Research and the Department of Housing and Community Development. It must include an analysis of the progress in meeting the city's share of regional housing needs and local efforts to remove governmental constraints to maintenance, improvement, and development of affordable housing (Government Code Sections 65583, 65584).

In addition, any mitigation monitoring and reporting requirements prescribed by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) identified in the general plan environmental impact report (EIR) should be addressed in the annual report, because they are closely tied to plan implementation. Finally, the annual report should include a summary of all general plan amendments adopted during the preceding year and an outline of upcoming projects and general plan issues to be addressed in the coming year.

The Pittsburg General Plan Annual Report will be prepared by City staff at the beginning of each calendar year and submitted to the Planning Commission and City Council. The report must also be forwarded to the Governor's Office of Planning and Research, the state Department of Housing and Community Development, and the contra Costa Transportation Authority. Members of the public may submit verbal or written comments on the Annual Report at the Planning Commission and City Council public meetings to consider the Report.

Periodic Reviews

The City may also undertake periodic comprehensive reviews of the General Plan. The periodic review will determine how well the General Plan has performed, and whether policies related to development and conservation have been effective. Staff will analyze the effectiveness of implementation programs and strategies initiated to carry out the Plan, review growth trends since Plan adoption, assess future urban land needs, and review growth phasing. The periodic review will also determine if policy implementation, growth trends, and land demand warrant
revisions to individual elements or a comprehensive General Plan update.
1.6 RELATED STUDIES

As part of the General Plan preparation, several technical studies were conducted to document environmental conditions, and analyze prospects for economic development, community character and growth, and development alternatives. Studies prepared include:

- Existing Conditions and Planning Issues: June 1998;
- Fiscal Evaluation of Land Uses: January 1998;
- Sketch Plans: February 1998;
- Draft Environmental Impact Report: January 2001; and

While these background studies and environmental documents have guided Plan preparation, they do not represent adopted City policy.
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2 LAND USE

This element outlines the framework embodied by the City’s land use approach, describes the General Plan land use classification system, projects buildout of various land uses through 2020, and provides both city-wide and sub-area specific policies to guide land use decisions.

Pittsburg’s land use pattern is reflective of its history as an industrial center of Contra Costa County. The City’s Downtown and industrial center are near water and rail transportation corridors – the Sacramento River and the Burlington Northern & Santa Fe and Southern Pacific railroads. As the City grew southward, auto-oriented residential subdivisions became dominant, and regional streets and highways such as State Route 4 became major transportation routes.

With limited availability of vacant land within City limits, major land use challenges include Downtown revitalization, infill development, fostering land use/transportation linkages, and appropriate hillside development.
2.1 BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

LAND USE PATTERN

Much of Pittsburg’s land use pattern can be traced to its industrial heritage. Both the historic Downtown and adjacent industrial waterfront evolved along the shores of the Sacramento River, which was a shipping route for goods. The Southern Pacific Railroad is the dividing line between the gridiron street network of older portions of the City and the larger-scale industrial parks, commercial centers, and newer residential developments. The relatively small-scale Downtown gives way to larger, predominately single-use areas as one moves south through the City. Figure 2-1 illustrates the City’s existing land use distribution, as of 1999.

Residential and commercial developments throughout the City are characteristic of the period in which they initially developed. Smaller-scale neighborhoods in older sections of Downtown contrast with new residential subdivisions that have spread into the hills. Locally-owned stores coexist with larger retailers throughout the length of Railroad Avenue, the City’s main north-south artery. The advantages of visibility and vehicular accessibility are now encouraging large-scale commercial development in eastern Pittsburg along State Route 4.

Magnitude of Uses

The Pittsburg Planning Area comprises a total of 26,960 gross acres (42 square miles). Of this area, approximately 7,700 acres (12 square miles) lie within City limits (28 percent of the Planning Area). The community of Bay Point, the area West of Bay Point, and other vacant and unincorporated areas of the northwest planning area lie within the Sphere of Influence and encompass approximately 10,900 gross acres (17 square miles). Wetlands and Suisun Bay/Sacramento River environs account for 6,760 additional acres. Table 2-1 shows the land area distribution within the Planning Area.
Figure 2-1
Existing Land Use Distribution, 1998

Source: City of Pittsburg; Dyett & Bhatia, 1998
Residential and industrial uses are dominant in the developed portions of the Planning Area. As Chart 2-1 shows, residential uses comprised 32 percent of the City’s land area in 1998. Approximately 12 percent of the City was occupied by industrial uses, primarily in the northeastern parts of Pittsburg. Commercial uses, encompassing five percent of the City’s land area, were located principally along major transportation corridors such as Railroad Avenue and State Route 4. A total of 60 percent of the Planning Area (16,300 acres) consists of open spaces areas, including City parks, Suisun Bay wetlands, and vacant land within the unincorporated northwest areas.

**Residential Development**

With over a century of development, residential neighborhoods in Pittsburg represent a wide range of development patterns, ranging from traditional neighborhoods with a gridiron block pattern, such as Central Addition, to the

---

**Chart 2-1**  
Existing Land Area Distribution, City of Pittsburg, 1998

![Pie chart showing land use distribution](chart)

**Table 2-1**  
Existing Land Area Distribution, Pittsburg Planning Area, 1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>City Acreage</th>
<th>Percent of City Acreage</th>
<th>Total Acreage</th>
<th>Percent of Total Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Pittsburg</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>2,450</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>7,700</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Institution/Utility</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks/Open Space</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Development</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>1,820</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bay Point / West of Bay Point / Wetlands / Suisun Bay</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southern Hills</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,407</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Streets / Roadways</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,253</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Planning Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>26,960</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>26,960</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Dyett & Bhatia, 2000; Updated by City Staff, 2010.*
emerging commuter neighborhoods at the City’s fringe. The more recently
developed neighborhoods, especially at the City’s southern fringe, are typified by
suburban-style residential development – large expanses of residential
subdivisions with little or no other uses, with a layout dominated by cul-de-sacs
and few through-streets, and often built within peripheral walls. Because grocery
stores and other commercial uses are limited to Railroad Avenue and East Leland
Road, Pittsburg’s emerging residential neighborhoods are located at increasing
distances from basic shopping facilities.

A wide range of housing types—single-family homes, multifamily units, and
mobile homes—are present in the City. With 17,770 housing units on 2,450 net
acres, the average residential density in Pittsburg in 2000 stands at 7.2 housing
units per net acre. Low Density Residential uses, occupying 2,080 acres, comprise
about 85 percent of the land area devoted to residential uses in the City. Higher
density residential sites are scattered throughout the City; those south of State
Route 4 generally take the form of large residential complexes five acres or greater
in size.

**Commercial Development**

In addition to Downtown, commercial uses are concentrated along the City’s
major transportation corridors: Railroad Avenue, Leland Road, Loveridge Road,
and State Route 4.

- *Downtown Commercial.* Once the center of commerce in Pittsburg and Contra
  Costa County, commercial activity in Downtown has decreased in the last
  several decades. Although retail sales along Railroad Avenue and State Route
  4 have captured a larger market with retail chain and value-oriented centers,
  such as WalMart and Home Depot, the Downtown continues to feature
  specialty retail and service uses.

- *Community Commercial.* Many of Pittsburg’s community shopping centers are
  located along Railroad Avenue, south of State Route 4. Few neighborhoods in
  the City are within a five- to ten-minute walk (1/4 mile-1/2 mile) of a major
  grocery store.

- *Regional Commercial.* Larger-scale warehouse and big-box retail centers are
concentrated in the State Route 4 corridor, between Loveridge and Somersville Roads.

- **Business Commercial.** Only 64 acres in the City are currently devoted to business and office uses. Generally, office uses in Pittsburg are either intermixed with other commercial businesses or serve as buffers between busy arterials and residential neighborhoods. The City currently does not have any large-scale office developments.

- **Service Commercial.** Service commercial areas often feature automobile repair, contractors’ services, and other heavy maintenance activities. Service commercial areas within the City include: East Tenth Street in Downtown; West Tenth Street, west of Downtown; Harbor Street, south of State Route 4; and Pittsburg-Antioch Highway, north of Century Boulevard.

**Industrial Development**

Pittsburg is known for its steel, petroleum, and chemical industries. Originally located along New York Slough to facilitate shipping, industrial uses continue to dominate the waterfront. Major manufacturing operations such as USS-Posco and the Dow Chemical plant are located along the eastern waterfront, while the Mirant (formerly PG&E) power plant, a visual landmark, dominates the western waterfront. Physical and visual buffering between industrial facilities and residential neighborhoods continues to be a major issue.

**TRANSIT-ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT (TOD)**

The concept of transit-oriented development (TOD) is based on the assumption that small, dense urban districts near transit platforms will result in greater transit ridership. The City’s Downtown maintains the potential for TODs, as bus routes are expanded and concentrated within Downtown neighborhoods. The City’s BART station also presents tremendous opportunity for TODs, because of the BART system’s connectivity to employment and housing centers throughout the region.
Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station Specific Plan

The Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station opened in fall of 1996, becoming the eastern terminus of BART’s Concord line. Shortly thereafter, the Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station Area Specific Plan was written to facilitate continued orderly growth of the station area, stimulate revitalization activities in the unincorporated Bay Point community, and capitalize on special opportunities presented by the presence of a BART Station. The Specific Plan Area consisted of approximately 295 acres of land that are adjacent to the Station or along major access routes to the Station. Major components emphasized in the Specific Plan included Land Use, Circulation, Urban Design, and Implementation. Development proposals will be reviewed based on the merits of their plans to meet the broad goals of providing housing, office, and commercial activities.

The policies throughout the Specific Plan facilitate creation of a high intensity mixed use area in the immediate vicinity of the BART Station, with the intention of serving residents as well as BART commuters. Land Use policies focus on new development ideas as well as redevelopment and revitalization of existing land uses in order to take advantage of the Station Area’s unique transportation opportunities and advantages, and to ensure a high quality environment for residents. Circulation policies balance local and regional circulation needs, while prioritizing local needs in terms of traffic circulation, access to transit, and pedestrian and bicycle circulation. In particular, such policies encourage greater accessibility to transit and non-automotive travel. The Urban Design Element of the Specific Plan focuses on establishing a cluster of mixed-use neighborhoods around the BART Station, and linking these and nearby neighborhoods in order to establish a sense of cohesion and identity. This section of the Specific Plan consists of a series of concepts (such as a Transit Plaza, a Linear Park, and a Neighborhood Commercial District) that will achieve various urban design and other Specific Plan objectives.

The City and BART have also proposed an extension of the current rail line to Railroad Avenue. Should this proposal move forward, the City will have the opportunity to develop a specific plan for the Railroad Avenue BART station area, with a dense mix of compatible land uses and transit-oriented design regulations.
GROWTH AND ANNEXATION

Since the 1988 General Plan was adopted, Pittsburg has witnessed six major expansions of its City boundaries, totaling approximately 2,780 acres:

- **Northeast River subarea.** In 1990, 1,170 acres were annexed for industrial development;
- **West Central subarea.** In 1991, 190 acres were annexed for construction of a mobile home park;
- **Buchanan subarea.** In 1997, 160 acres of Highlands Ranch were annexed for residential development;
- **Southwest Hills subarea.** In 1990, 1,030 acres were annexed for the San Marco project. In 1992, 130 acres were annexed along the western municipal boundary. Then in 1996, 100 acres were annexed south of Oak Hills.

As part of the 1996 Contra Costa County General Plan, the County delineated an Urban Limit Line (ULL) to identify areas appropriate for urban expansion and preserve open space in the southern hills. However, the County ULL does not reflect topographic or environmental constraints. Recently (year 2000) the County amended its ULL, removing several hundred acres of the southern hills from planned urban growth areas. This General Plan seeks to define appropriate limits for urban growth based on land use considerations and environmental and topographic constraints.
**Major Development Projects, 2000**

The City has a substantial inventory of residential projects with development approvals, as well as several planned commercial and industrial complexes. The two largest residential projects—San Marco and Alves Ranch (Vista del Mar)—are both located in the Southwest Hills subarea. A total of 4,000 housing units are in the pipeline. Business and Community Commercial districts are also planned for the southwestern portion of the City along State Route 4, within the proposed San Marco and Alves Ranch projects. Two major industrial projects are located along the industrial waterfront area – Los Medanos Energy Center and Delta Energy Center.

**PLANS AND PROGRAMS OF ADJACENT JURISDICTIONS**

Pittsburg lies adjacent to the Planning Area boundaries of three nearby cities in Contra Costa County: Concord, Antioch, and Clayton. Several long-range planning policies in Concord and Antioch may have an effect on Pittsburg. In Concord, plans for conversion of the Naval Weapons Station to civilian uses may directly impact Pittsburg because of the facility’s size and proximity to Pittsburg. However, the Weapons Station Restricted Federal Easement, an area surrounding weapons bunkers with the potential for critical damage, overlaps a small portion of the Pittsburg Planning Area. This easement in the southern hills prohibits construction of all development, including infrastructure and roadways. In addition, potential business park and regional commercial development in eastern Concord may affect Pittsburg, by saturating the commercial development market and increasing the amount of traffic on State Route 4.

Bay Point, a community in Pittsburg’s SOI, has expressed a desire to incorporate. In light of this, land uses in this General Plan either reflect existing uses for the area or are consistent with the adopted County General Plan. The incorporation of Bay Point would likely have little effect on Pittsburg, as there are no major shopping or employment centers within the small, unincorporated community.
2.2 GENERAL PLAN DIAGRAM AND USEASSIFICATIONS

GENERAL PLAN LAND USE FRAMEWORK

General Plan Diagram

The land use framework of the General Plan is embodied in the General Plan Diagram (Figure 2-2), which is a graphic representation of the themes and policies in the Plan. A calculated distribution of land use acreages, according to the General Plan Diagram, is shown in Table 2-2. The General Plan Diagram designates the proposed general location, distribution, and extent of land uses through buildout, which is expected by about 2020. As required by State law, land use classifications, shown as color/graphic patterns, letter designations, or labels on the Diagram, specify a range for housing density and building intensity for each type of designated land use. These density/intensity standards allow circulation and public facility needs to be determined; they also reflect the environmental carrying-capacity limitations established by other elements of the General Plan.

The Diagram is to be used and interpreted only in conjunction with the text and other figures contained in the General Plan. The legend of the General Plan Diagram abbreviates the land use classifications described below, which represent an adopted part of the General Plan. The General Plan Diagram is not necessarily parcel-specific, and uses on sites less than one acre in size are generally not depicted on the Diagram. The interpretation of consistency with the General Plan on sites less than one acre in size will be done through the Zoning Ordinance and the Zoning Map.

Magnitude of Uses

The Pittsburg Planning Area comprises a total of 26,960 gross acres (42 square miles). Approximately 20,028 acres (33 square miles) of this will be located within the City or southern hills. More than half of this will remain in Open Space and Parks. Table 2-3 shows the General Plan land area distribution for the entire Planning Area (including Bay Point and other land). For land distribution by sub area, see Table 2-7.
Chart 2-2 shows that Park and Open Space uses will be dominant within the City of Pittsburg, comprising a combined 52 percent of the City’s land area in 2020. Approximately 24 percent of the City will be occupied by residential uses, while commercial and Public/Institutional/Utility will encompass 5 and 5 percent, respectively.
City of Pittsburg General Plan

NOTE: Map includes all amendments through December 2011
**Land Use Framework Guiding Principles**

The General Plan Diagram embodies several ideas and principles. These include:

- **Compact urban form.** All growth, with the exception of the Bay Point unincorporated community and a small amount of clustered low-density residential hillside development, is contiguous to existing City limits.

- **Promotion of Downtown as a focus of activity.** Plan policies seek to increase Downtown population, as well as non-residential activity, to enhance vitality and provide a market for commercial uses. Policies that promote development standards that build on Downtown’s traditional urban pattern are identified.

- **Modulated development intensities that reflect accessibility.** Development intensities are modulated to reflect accessibility to transit and services. The General Plan designates highest intensities in Downtown and around the Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station, and lowest intensities in the constrained hillside areas.

- **Promotion of infill development.** In order to minimize encroachment into the hillsides, reverse and prevent blight, promote economic development, and efficiently provide services, the Plan encourages use and revitalization of vacant and underutilized sites. These include areas in and around Downtown (West Tenth Street and Harbor Street), around Railroad Avenue and East Leland Road, the Pittsburg/Bay Point BART station, and complementary and viable uses on vacant sites in existing neighborhoods.

- **Increased connectivity between and within neighborhoods.** Major arterial streets are designated to result in increased connectivity between neighborhoods in different subareas. In addition, policies for locating local streets are included to ensure neighborhood-level connections while providing flexibility to project developers.

- **Designation of mixed-use and pedestrian-oriented activity centers.** New neighborhood centers are envisioned in the form of mixed-use pedestrian-oriented centers. Designated centers include the area surrounding the West Leland Road/San Marco Boulevard intersection. In addition, mixed-use or multi-use development is encouraged surrounding the proposed location of Railroad Avenue BART Station, between East Leland Road and State Route 4.
• *Increased diversity in housing types.* The General Plan seeks to expand the range of housing types currently available in Pittsburg through designation of sites for low-density hillside development, as well as higher-density residential development in selected locations. This allows for a diverse range of housing opportunities for residents of different social/economic sectors. Plan policies also provide for increased flexibility in single-family development by encouraging small-lot (Downtown and arterial corridors) or executive-style and custom/estate (Southern Hills) housing design.

• *Protection of ridgelines and creeks, and expansion of the trail and park network.* The General Plan identifies major and minor ridgelines, and establishes development guidelines to protect them. Additionally, the Plan identifies a network of open space along creeks in new growth areas that will be realized over time. These open space areas will also facilitate development of a network of bikeways and pedestrian trails.

• *Flexibility and mixed-use areas.* To provide flexibility and encourage mixed-use development, the use and intensity regulations provide variable development standards and incentives for mixed-use development in locations such as Downtown and neighborhood centers.

**DENSITY/INTENSITY STANDARDS**

The General Plan establishes density/intensity standards for each use classification. Residential density is expressed as housing units per gross acre. Gross acreage includes all identified areas within the specific land use designation, including public and/or private streets and other rights-of-way or easements. Gross acreage is measured to the centerline of any abutting peripheral street (not including State Route 4).

Maximum permitted ratio of gross floor area to site area, called Floor Area Ratio (FAR), is specified for non-residential uses. FAR is a broad measure of building bulk that controls both visual prominence and traffic generation. It can be clearly translated to a limit on building bulk in the Zoning Ordinance and is independent of the type of use occupying the building.
Density (housing units per gross acre) and intensity (FAR) standards are for gross developable land (that is, including streets and other rights-of-way), but excluding areas subject to physical or environmental constraints, which include ridgelines and steep hillside slopes, creek corridors and floodways, and areas dedicated for greenways or habitat protection.

**Maximum Density/Intensity Not Automatic**

The density/intensity standards do not imply that development projects will be approved only at the maximum density or intensity specified for each use. Zoning regulations consistent with General Plan policies and/or site conditions may reduce development potential within the stated ranges. Examples of conditions that may limit attainment of the maximum densities/intensities include, but are not limited to:

- Development standards established in the Zoning Ordinance (such as for heights and setbacks, or minimum habitable space) may limit building size;
- The Zoning Ordinance and Zoning Map may break down a single General Plan land use classification into two or more districts with intermediate maximums; and
- The Zoning Ordinance may establish intermediate maximum densities/intensities, with attainment of the General Plan maximum subject to specific performance, design, or other criteria.
- Site constraints due to environmental hazards, infrastructure limitations, and/or compatibility with neighborhood land uses may place limitations on the size and/or density of projects.
Additionally, density bonuses provided to development projects for provision of public facilities, infrastructure, or services beyond that which is required may allow development in excess of stated General Plan densities and FARs. Gross density standards and assumed averages for residential categories are listed in Table 2-4. Design standards specified in the Urban Design Element and/or the Zoning Ordinance should also be consulted in addition to the density/intensity standards in this element.

**LAND USE CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM**

The classifications in this section are meant to be broad enough to give the City flexibility in implementing policy, but clear enough to provide sufficient direction to carry out the General Plan. The City’s Zoning Ordinance contains more detailed provisions and standards to implement these classifications. More than one zoning district may be consistent with a single General Plan land use classification.

For residential uses, densities are stated as the number of housing units per gross acre of developable land. Development would be required within the density range (both maximum and minimum) stipulated in the classification. For non-residential and mixed uses, floor area ratios (FARs) are specified.

**Residential**

Seven residential land use classifications—including three for Downtown—are established to provide for development of a full range of housing types (mixed-use classifications that permit residential uses are included later in this section).

Second units (accessory dwellings) permitted by local regulation and a 25 percent density bonuses for provision of affordable housing are in addition to densities otherwise permitted. An additional 25 percent bonus is available for projects located within one-quarter mile of a BART station.

Assumed average densities listed are used to calculate probable housing unit and population holding capacity. Neither the averages nor the totals constitute General Plan policy. Population densities corresponding to the housing unit densities can be obtained by multiplying each housing unit by 3.1, the average projected
Pittsburg household size in 2020, according to the Association of Bay Area Governments’ (ABAG) Projections ‘02.

**Hillside Low Density.** Single-family (attached or detached) residential development in the southern hills built at a density of less than 5 units per gross acre. Maximum densities should be allowed only in flatter, natural slope areas or non-environmentally sensitive level areas. An open, natural character is encouraged by clustering homes and minimizing cut-and-fill of natural hillsides. The average density assumed for General Plan buildout calculations in this classification is 3 units per gross acre.

**Low Density.** Single-family residential units built at a density of 1 to 7 units per gross acre. Typical lots would be 6,000 square feet; the Zoning Ordinance may permit lots smaller than 6,000 square feet, if the proposed development meets specified community design standards in specific neighborhoods, such as Downtown, to promote compact development. This classification is mainly intended for detached single-family dwellings, but attached single-family units in selected or all areas may be permitted, provided that each unit has ground-floor living area, and private or common outdoor open space. The average density assumed for General Plan buildout calculations is 6 units per gross acre.

**Medium Density.** Housing at densities from 7 to 14 units per gross acre. Dwelling types may include one or two story garden apartments, townhouses, and attached or detached single-family residences. The Zoning Ordinance may permit zero lot-line or small-lot detached residential units in some or all areas. The average density assumed for General Plan buildout calculations is 12 units per gross acre.

**High Density.** Residential development at densities ranging from 14 to 25 units per gross acre. Subject to design review by the Planning Commission, additional discretionary density increases, up to a maximum project density of 40 units per gross acre, may be granted to projects that fulfill community objectives. A wide range of housing types, from single-family attached units to multi-family complexes are permitted. The average density assumed for General Plan buildout calculations is 20 units per gross acre.

**Downtown Low Density.** Housing densities from 4 to 12 units per gross acre.
Dwelling types may include attached or detached single-family housing and townhouses. The average density assumed for General Plan calculations is 8 units per gross acre.

**Downtown Medium Density.** Residential development at densities ranging from 12 to 18 units per gross acre. Dwelling types may include attached or detached single family townhouses, garden apartments, and other forms of multi-family housing. The average density assumed for General Plan buildout calculations is 16 units per gross acre.

**Downtown High Density.** Residential development at densities ranging from 18 to 30 units per gross acre. New high-density projects within Downtown should have transit-oriented amenities (such as covered bus stops at project entrance, where appropriate) and reduced parking requirements to encourage use of alternative modes of transportation. The average density assumed for General Plan buildout calculations is 24 units per gross acre. Subject to design review by the Planning Commission, additional discretionary density increases, up to a maximum project density of 40 units per gross acre, may be granted to projects that fulfill community objectives.

**Mixed Use**

This mixed use land use designation is established to allow for greater flexibility of land uses around and accessible by transit.

**Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station Area.** Encompasses approximately 54 acres located west of the Oak Hills Shopping Center, including the Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station parking lot. Residential densities up to 65 units per gross acre, or as approved by the Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station Specific Plan, are allowed on these properties. Maximum FAR for non-residential development is 1.0, or as approved by the Specific Plan.

**Railroad Avenue Specific Plan.** Encompasses approximately 97 acres located within a roughly one-half mile radius surrounding the Railroad Avenue/State Route 4 intersection. Residential densities between 15 and 65 dwelling units per acre are permitted and nonresidential FAR between 0.25 and 1.0 is permitted.
**Downtown.** Encompasses approximately 20 acres located in and near the Downtown. Residential densities between 12 and 30 units per acre are allowed on these properties. For properties located along West Tenth Street, maximum FAR for non-residential development is 0.6. For properties located along Railroad Avenue, maximum nonresidential FAR of 1.0, with maximum total FAR not to exceed 2.0.

**Commercial**

Six commercial land use designations are established; each of these serves a specific purpose, accommodating a broad range of uses.

Each commercial land use designation allows residential uses above ground floor office and retail uses (mixed use development). Subject to design review approval by the Planning Commission, the maximum allowable FAR in each land use designation could be increased, up to a maximum of 0.25 additional FAR, in order to accommodate a residential component. Higher FARs may be allowed as identified by specific subarea policies (see Section 2.5: Planning Subareas).

**Regional Commercial.** Provides commercial acreage for large-scale retailers and big-box retail centers, such as Home Depot, Best Buy, and auto dealerships, designed to attract shoppers from a wide market area. The Zoning Ordinance will provide adequate sites for regional commercial uses to ensure visibility and access from major transportation corridors, such as State Route 4, which are necessary for establishing a regional clientele.

**Community Commercial.** Intended to provide sites for retail shopping areas (primarily in shopping centers) containing a wide variety of businesses, including retail stores, eating and drinking establishments, commercial recreation, service stations, automobile sales and repair services, financial, business and personal services, motels, educational and social services. The Zoning Ordinance may limit certain commercial areas to neighborhood stores or non-automotive establishments.

**Downtown Commercial.** Accommodates specialty retail, personal services, restaurants, offices, financial organizations, institutions, and other businesses.
serving the daily needs of Downtown residents. Upper-story residential and mixed commercial/residential ground-floor uses are permitted, subject to appropriate design standards. The maximum allowable FAR is 2.0, with a maximum 1.0 for non-residential uses. Limitations on the size and location of parking, coupled with building orientation and design standards, will ensure that a pedestrian-oriented environment is created. A detailed discussion of Downtown land uses is located in Chapter 5: Downtown.

**Business Commercial.** Intended to provide sites for administrative, financial, business, professional, medical, research and development, and public offices, as well as custom manufacturing, limited assembly, light manufacturing, warehousing and distribution, and support commercial uses. The maximum allowable FAR is 1.0. The Zoning Ordinance will identify areas appropriate for office/business uses vs. industrial parks. Limits on retail activities will be specified in the Zoning Ordinance, in addition to potential specific locations for hospitals, extended care and other similar facilities. Development standards and buffering requirements will prevent significant adverse affects on adjacent residential uses.

**Marine Commercial.** Business and professional services, offices, convenience sales, restaurants, public marketplaces, repair services, specialty retail (such as boat sales and repair), hotel/motel with a coastal orientation, recreational facilities, research and development, custom manufacturing, and marinas are all accommodated. Maximum allowable FAR is—0.5 for retail, recreation facilities, marinas, and eating and drinking establishments, 1.0 for offices, and 1.5 for hotels—for all (commercial and residential) uses; no separate residential density is specified.

**Service Commercial.** Intended to provide sites for commercial business not appropriate in other commercial areas because of high volumes of vehicle traffic and potential adverse impacts on other uses. Also, residential uses may be permitted above ground floor commercial uses (such as office and retail). The maximum allowable FAR is 0.5 for all (commercial and residential) uses; no separate residential density is specified. Allowable uses include automobile sales and services, building materials, nurseries, equipment rentals, contractors, wholesaling, warehousing, storage, and similar uses. Offices, retail uses,
restaurants, and convenience stores should be allowed as ancillary uses.

**Industrial**

Manufacturing, wholesale, warehousing and distribution, commercial and business services, research and development, and storage uses are permitted, in addition to agricultural, food and drug, and industrial processing. Only small restaurant and ancillary commercial uses would be appropriate, subject to appropriate design standards. The maximum FAR is 0.5, and increases in the maximum FAR may be permitted up to 0.8, for uses with low employment intensities. Performance standards in the Zoning Ordinance will minimize potential environmental impacts.

**Public/Institutional**

Intended to provide for schools, government offices, transit sites, public utilities, and other facilities that have a unique public character. Religious facilities are not called out separately on the General Plan Diagram; these facilities may or may not be specifically delineated on the Zoning Map.

**Parks/Recreation**

Provides for parks, recreation complexes, community fields, public golf courses, stadiums, and greenways. Local and regional trail network is also accommodated. Ancillary facilities such as concession stands, clubhouses, and equipment rental are also allowed.

**Open Space**

Much of the City’s Planning Area is rural privately-owned land that falls within the open space designation. This classification accommodates any greenbelts and/or urban buffer areas that may be designated in the future. Greenbelts are open space, parkland, and agricultural areas located outside urban areas, as opposed to urban parks located within developed areas. Generally, there are two primary criteria that identify lands as open space:
• **Resource Conservation.** Includes sites with environmental and/or safety constraints, such as riparian corridors, sensitive habitats, and wetlands. Development is limited to one housing unit per existing legal parcel, and no construction is allowed on land within the parcel that is unsuitable for development.

• **Agriculture and Resource Management.** Includes orchards and cropland, grasslands, incidental agricultural or related sales, and very low-density rural residential areas, not to exceed one housing unit per 20 acres. One housing unit may be built on each existing parcel, and agriculture is allowed with fewer restrictions on keeping animals than in the residential classifications.

Permitted residential development may be clustered in locations with little or no environmental constraints. However, land area with the open space designation is not to be used in calculating allowable density.

**Utility/ROW**

Intended to designate land area dedicated to utilities, infrastructure or road right-of-way.

### 2.3 GENERAL PLAN BUILDOUT

Development consistent with the General Plan resulting from application of assumed average densities and intensities is described in Tables 2-5 and 2-6. The time at which full development (“buildout”) will occur or areas where redevelopment may occur are not specified in or anticipated by the Plan. Designation of a site for a certain use does not necessarily mean that the site will be built/redeveloped with the designated use over the Plan horizon.

**BUILDOUT POPULATION**

Buildout of the General Plan, at the assumed densities shown in Table 2-5, will result in approximately 31,690 housing units located within the City limits. An estimated population of 93,340 will reside within the City limits, while approximately 15,730 people will live within Bay Point by 2020; resulting in a
total Planning Area population of 109,060. Nearly 11,450 housing units are proposed within City limits (which includes the San Marco development), in addition to 1,300 units approved as of 1999.

Table 2-5
Population and Housing: 2020, Pittsburg Planning Area*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Housing Units</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Employed Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>19,600</td>
<td>57,710</td>
<td>26,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>1,890</td>
<td>870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>11,450</td>
<td>33,730</td>
<td>15,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Pittsburg 2020</td>
<td>31,690</td>
<td>93,340</td>
<td>42,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>6,190</td>
<td>14,990</td>
<td>8,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Point 2020</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>15,730</td>
<td>8,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Planning Area 2020</td>
<td>38,190</td>
<td>109,060</td>
<td>51,370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See Housing Element (Chapter 13) for updated information

Note: Items may not sum up to total due to independent rounding.

Assumptions:
City of Pittsburg = Housing Units based on City's GIS database; Population based on 3.1 persons per household and 5% vacancy; Employed Residents based on 46% of population.
Bay Point = Housing Units, Population, and Employed Residents based on LUIS 99 database.


1 City of Pittsburg buildout projections based on land use development assumptions (see Table 2-5), while Bay Point buildout projections based on LUIS 99 Contra Costa County TAZ Estimates.
BUILDOUT EMPLOYMENT

Buildout of all commercial and industrial sites within the Planning Area would result in approximately 14.9 million square feet of commercial space and 6.4 million square feet of industrial space. This increase in non-residential building area, in conjunction with increased populations and business expansion throughout East County, will result in a total of 54,170 commercial jobs and 10,470 industrial jobs at buildout (see Table 2-6).
### Table 2-6
Employment: 2020, Pittsburg Planning Area*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Commercial Sq Ft</th>
<th>Commercial Jobs</th>
<th>Industrial Sq Ft</th>
<th>Industrial Jobs</th>
<th>Total Jobs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing</strong></td>
<td>4,799,330</td>
<td>17,450</td>
<td>3,735,620</td>
<td>4,150</td>
<td>21,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approved</strong></td>
<td>1,443,250</td>
<td>5,250</td>
<td>491,180</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>5,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed</strong></td>
<td>8,124,570</td>
<td>29,540</td>
<td>2,193,060</td>
<td>2,440</td>
<td>31,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Pittsburg 2020</strong></td>
<td>14,367,150</td>
<td>52,240</td>
<td>6,419,860</td>
<td>7,130</td>
<td>59,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing</strong></td>
<td>467,170</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>0**</td>
<td>3,050</td>
<td>4,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed</strong></td>
<td>62,320</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>0**</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bay Point 2020</strong></td>
<td>529,490</td>
<td>1,930</td>
<td>0**</td>
<td>3,330</td>
<td>5,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Planning Area 2020</strong></td>
<td>14,896,630</td>
<td>54,170</td>
<td>6,419,870</td>
<td>10,470</td>
<td>64,630</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Items may not sum up to total due to independent rounding.
*See Housing Element (Chapter 13) for more updated information.
** Less than 10 sq. ft.

**Assumptions:**
- City of Pittsburg = Commercial and Industrial Sq Ft based on City’s GIS database; Commercial Jobs based on 275 sq ft per employee; Industrial Jobs based on 900 sq ft per employee.
- Bay Point = Commercial and Industrial Jobs based on LUIS99 database; Commercial Sq Ft based on 275 sq ft per employee; Industrial Sq Ft based on 900 sq ft per employee.

2.4 CITY-WIDE LAND USE POLICIES

GOALS: LAND USE

2-G-1 Maintain a compact urban form within the City’s projected municipal boundary. Ensure that hillside lands not environmentally suitable for development are maintained as open space.

2-G-2 Promote large-scale office/business development, and reserve sites for Business Commercial uses in designated locations accessible from regional transportation systems.

2-G-3 Emphasize concentrated commercial development, rather than linear commercial strips.

2-G-4 Provide a range of development intensities, with the highest intensities in Downtown and in areas accessible to transit and services, and lower intensities in hillsides and at the City’s southern edge.

2-G-5 Promote a diversity of housing types, including opportunities for hillside estate development, as well as smaller lot, infill, and high-density housing.

2-G-6 Maintain programs and provide incentives for use of vacant infill land and reuse and revitalization of underutilized sites.

2-G-7 Promote flexibility and diversity in land use arrangements, including mixed-use development in appropriate areas.

2-G-8 Ensure that hillside development enhances the built environment, improves safety through slope stabilization, is respectful of topography and other natural constraints, and preserves ridgelines and viewsheds.

2-G-9 Exercise leadership in securing development and preserving open space consistent with the General Plan in portions of the Planning Area that will ultimately be inside the city boundaries.
POLICIES: LAND USE

The policies in this section address city-wide land use strategies. Section 2.5 applies to specific sub-areas.

For Downtown policies, see Chapter 5: Downtown. For parks, recreation, and open space policies, see Chapter 8: Youth and Recreation.

Growth Boundaries and Procedures

2-P-1 Review the City’s Sphere of Influence every 5 years. Pursue necessary annexation and Sphere of Influence changes through coordination with the County and Local Agency Formation Commission, in accordance with Figure 2-3.

Changes to the City’s Sphere of Influence (SOI) are shown in Figure 2-3. The figure shows several areas where the City’s SOI would be expanded: the area between Bailey Road and the Concord Naval Weapons Station, and the area east of the PG&E transmission line corridor and Kirker Pass Road. Both of these areas are proposed exclusively for low-density development.

2-P-2 Update the City’s Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations for consistency with the General Plan, including the General Plan Diagram.

This revision would include:

- Establishing new base districts, consistent with the land use classifications in the General Plan;
- Revamping regulations to ensure well-designed hillside development;
- Considering use of new overlay districts for environmental protection, new review processes, and mixed-use and specific plan areas; and
- Drafting new development regulations that reflect policy direction contained throughout the General Plan, including planning sub-area standards.
2-P-3 Allow market forces, the status of agricultural preserve (Williamson Act) contracts, and the availability of urban services to determine the timing of annexation or development expansion into the hillsides.

2-P-4 Consider amendments to the current Sphere of Influence for properties along the eastern and western edges of the City, to take advantage of providing City services for the development of adjacent vacant lands.

The undeveloped Chevron East site has historically been considered part of Pittsburg, and is a logical extension of the Highlands Ranch development. Developable sites west of Bay Point can also be served by extending existing City services.

**Planned Development and Compatibility**

2-P-5 Undertake planned development as a means to achieve high community design standards, not to circumvent development intensity standards.

Planned Development (PD) zoning has been used fairly extensively in the City. While the use of PD regulations in itself is not a problem, the PD mechanism should not be a vehicle to circumvent policies, regulations, and standards embodied in the General Plan and the Zoning Ordinance.

2-P-6 Ensure provision of community amenities within planned development projects, including parks and recreation facilities, streetscaping and pedestrian paths, transit facilities, parking areas, and public safety facilities. Ensure construction of amenities at a time that is in balance with the needs of the development.

2-P-7 During development review, consider project compatibility with existing surrounding land uses. Ensure that sensitive uses—such as residences, schools, and parks—are not subject to hazardous or unhealthy conditions.
Land use compatibility occurs when a land use exists and functions without creating a nuisance, hazardous, or unhealthy condition with adjacent land uses.

2-P-8 In the case of resident and/or business displacement due to redevelopment activities, provide tenants/property-owners with fair market values and moving costs.

**Commercial and Industrial Development**

2-P-9 Allow development of residential uses in transition areas where real estate interest in industrial land adjacent to existing or planned residential areas has diminished. However, ensure project design avoids potential activity conflicts.

2-P-10 Reserve sites for Business Commercial uses, including but not limited to:

- Along State Route 4, focused at the Willow Pass Road/San Marco Boulevard interchange and Loveridge Road interchange;
- Adjacent to the Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station;
- Between Willow Pass Road and the BNSF Railroad tracks, west of Downtown; and
- Along Harbor Street, between State Route 4 and East Leland Road (the proposed Railroad Avenue BART Station).

2-P-11 Do not allow sites designated for Business Commercial uses to be changed to another land use designation unless it is determined that adequate sites are available elsewhere to meet the City’s office and business development objectives.

2-P-12 Discourage the conversion of existing retail and service storefronts to group assembly-type uses.

2-P-13 Ensure that buffers—including landscaping, berms, parking areas, and storage facilities—are used to separate potentially incompatible
activities.

2-P-14 Locate office and other support facilities along arterial roadways to screen heavy industrial and manufacturing activities.

Redevelopment of industrial areas should locate administrative uses along street frontage to buffer heavy industrial activities from people traveling along City roadways, such as Willow Pass Road and Pittsburg-Antioch Highway.

**Residential Development**

2-P-15 Ensure minimum residential densities, in accordance with the ranges stipulated in this Plan.

This would require update of the City’s Zoning Ordinance to ensure consistency with the General Plan, including rezoning of sites to appropriate designations so that planned development is within the designated range.

2-P-16 Develop criteria and standards for small-lot single-family residential development that:

- Promotes design and development flexibility;
- Includes design and bulk standards to ensure that development is appropriate and related to underlying lot size; and
- Ensures that residential development promotes a neighborhood orientation, with limitation on frontage that can be occupied by garages.

2-P-17 Maintain regulations to permit second units (accessory dwellings) in single-family residential developments in accordance with State law.

Requirements for this are spelled out in California Government Code Section 65852.
2-P-18 Limit all new multi-family housing to 20 units or more. Update the Zoning Ordinance to ensure that new multi-family projects are developed as large-scale, professionally maintained, high-density housing.

2-P-19 Revise the City’s Subdivision Ordinance to encourage solar access and other energy-saving devices.

2-P-20 Revise the City’s Zoning Ordinance to require undergrounding of utility service/transformer boxes, and any other type of utility boxes, in new residential subdivisions.

If switch boxes and transformer boxes cannot be undergrounded due to physical constraints, these boxes should be placed in locations that are not visually obtrusive and screened to avoid visual blight.

Hillside Development

2-P-21 Revise the City’s Hillside Preservation Ordinance to reflect General Plan policy direction. Revisions may include, but are not limited to:

- Designating protected ridgelines, creeks, and other significant resource areas, along with daylight plane or setback standards;
- Defining protected viewsheds;
- Designating location and density of low-density hillside residential development based on slope stability and visual impact;
- Provision of well-designed hillside projects that provide larger, family-oriented lots; and
- Protection of significant ridgelines and incorporation of hill forms into project design.

2-P-22 Ensure that all General Plan policies apply to hillside land irrespective of zoning – whether Planned Development or any other base district.
2-P-23 Restrict development on minor and major ridgelines (as identified in Figure 4-2). Encourage residential construction on flatter natural slopes or non-sensitive graded areas that reduce environmental and visual impacts. Minimize cut-and-fill of natural hillsides.

2-P-24 Prohibit new development on designated ridgelines. Ensure that residential developers cluster housing units to reduce both environmental and visual impact of hillside development.

2-P-25 As a condition of approval, ensure that residential developers incorporate natural creeks as open space amenities into the design of residential neighborhoods.

2-P-26 Ensure that new hillside development utilizes fire-resistant building materials, per the Uniform Building Code. Require that all residential units adjacent to open slopes maintain a 30-foot setback with fire-resistant landscaping.

2-P-27 Minimize single-access residential neighborhoods in the hills; maximize access for fire and emergency response personnel.

2-P-28 During development review, ensure that the design of new hillside neighborhoods minimizes potential land use incompatibilities with any grazing/agricultural activities in the southern hills.

Environmental Review

2-P-29 Ensure that all Environmental Impact Reports for development projects, where required and necessary, be prepared by City staff or staff-approved and managed consultants. However, require project proponents to pay for all consultant services associated with environmental review.

California Public Resource Code Section 21082.1 requires that a Draft EIR be prepared directly by or under contract to the lead agency; this
includes traffic modeling and geo-technical studies for project EIRs and program EIRs.

2-P-30 Encourage private developers to conduct geo-technical and biological studies prior to filing project applications to ensure environmentally sensitive project layout and design.
2.5 PLANNING SUBAREAS

The City’s subareas are defined geographically, following either major transportation routes—such as State Route 4 or the BNSF railroad—or City/neighborhood boundaries. Figure 2-4 shows the subareas, and Table 2-7 presents the land use distribution for each subarea by generalized use categories.

Subareas 1-11 are within existing City limits, while subareas 12-15 include the Bay Point Community and unincorporated lands outside of Pittsburg’s Sphere of Influence. With the exception of Downtown and East Leland, the subareas are generally dominated by one land use type. A description of the subareas follows:

1. **Downtown.** Retail and commercial office uses line Railroad Avenue, north of East Tenth Street. Service commercial uses are located along East Tenth Street, the old County highway. Residential neighborhoods surround the commercial corridors, with newer, higher density developments located near the waterfront. Downtown is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 5.

2. **Northeast River.** Northeast River is characterized by large-scale heavy industrial operations and vacant land. USS-Posco, Dow Chemical, and the Delta Diablo Wastewater Treatment Plant are some of the facilities located in this subarea. Wetlands comprise a small portion of the northeastern corner where Kirker Creek meets the Sacramento River. Browns Island, located across New York Slough, is a Regional Shoreline Preserve.

3. **Loveridge.** Large industrial uses and vacant sites constitute a majority of Loveridge, adjacent to the Loveridge Road/State Route 4 interchange. A variety of land uses line East Leland Road, including a community commercial center, business commercial complex, service commercial node, and several multi-family housing developments. Between the BNSF railroad tracks and State Route 4, heavy industry and business commercial parks are planned. Land dedicated to regional commercial (big-box) retailers is concentrated along Century Boulevard.

4. **East Central.** Located east of Railroad Avenue and north of State Route 4, East Central contains some of the City’s older neighborhoods; most notably the traditional Central Addition, where many industrial executives resided in
decades past. Residential uses comprise more than half of the net land area. Neighborhood commercial establishments can be found on Railroad Avenue and adjacent to State Route 4, and commercial offices on Railroad Avenue and Harbor Street. Pittsburg High School is also located in this subarea.

5. *Railroad Avenue.* The City’s major commercial corridor also serves as a major north-south arterial connecting Downtown to the southern City limits. Services and business commercial uses line the corridor north of State Route 4, while community commercial activities constitute the southern portion of the corridor. Pittsburg’s Civic Center is also located in this subarea, along with City Park, one of the City’s major recreational areas.

6. *East Leland.* Similar to Downtown, East Leland is characterized by a diverse mix of uses. However, its commercial establishments, offices, and business/industrial parks have been developed at a much larger scale, reflecting a less dense suburban land use pattern. A proposed mixed-use, business commercial node comprises nearly all land north of East Leland Road, adjacent to the proposed Railroad Avenue BART Station. Multi-family residential uses are clustered along East Leland Road and Delta De Anza Trail in the southeastern portion of the subarea. Small World Park and Los Medanos Community College are also located within the area.

7. *Buchanan.* Located along the City’s southeastern boundary, the Buchanan subarea consists of many newer single-family residential subdivisions. Additionally, this subarea features a multi-unit senior community along Kirker Creek. Two parks and three schools are located here, along with a few commercial establishments. Hillside and low-density residential acreage is available for development of new up-scale neighborhoods along the southeast boundary of the Planning Area.

8. *Woodlands.* Like Buchanan, Woodlands contains many newer single-family housing developments. A small park and one elementary school serve the subarea. Clustered, low-density neighborhoods are proposed for the small valleys adjacent to Kirker Creek.

9. *West Central.* Residential neighborhoods comprise the primary use in West Central. Two small neighborhood commercial uses serve the subarea (Fountain Plaza and Parkside Market). Two mobile home parks also lie
within the area, adjacent to the PG&E transmission corridor. Business commercial, services, and industrial parcels adjacent to and north of the BNSF railroad tracks have potential for redevelopment opportunities.

10. *West Leland.* West Leland is dominated by single-family residential neighborhoods, and the City’s joint Golf Course/Stoneman Park recreational facility. Additional public facilities include Del Monte Community Center, an elementary school, and a new fire station.

11. *Southwest Hills.* Annexed by the City in 1990, this subarea presently consists primarily of undeveloped, rolling hills. However, the area is the site of the approved 640-acre San Marco residential development, which will include both low and high-density residential units. The Oak Hills and Alves Ranch residential subdivisions are also located within this subarea. Additionally, the southern hills subarea includes the San Marco Meadows and Bailey Estates projects, which are not yet annexed to the City but are located within the County ULL. Potential sites for low-density residential neighborhoods are located outside the County ULL and may be available for development after the Restricted Federal Easement is abandoned.

Multi-family housing developments will be concentrated along the West Leland Road corridor. A mixed-use, community commercial center at the West Leland Road/San Marco Boulevard intersection will serve nearby neighborhoods, while business commercial parks will be developed along West Leland Road. A small portion of the Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station Area Specific Plan area also lies within this subarea.

**Unincorporated Areas**

Subareas 12-15 comprise the unincorporated portions of the Pittsburg Planning Area. These areas include:

12. *Northwest River.* Two major uses are located in the Northwest River: the Mirant (previously PG&E) Power Plant, and a small portion of the Concord Naval Weapons Station. The remainder of Northwest River consists of marshland.
13. Bay Point. Located west of Pittsburg, the unincorporated community of Bay Point consists primarily of residential neighborhoods. Multi-family housing is concentrated along Bailey Road north of the Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station, and commercial activities line the Willow Pass Road corridor. A large swath of industrial land lies along the railroad tracks. The Mount Diablo Unified School District operates two elementary schools within the community. The majority of the developed portion of Bay Point, while unincorporated, is nevertheless within Pittsburg’s SOI and Planning Area.

14. South Hills. South of the City limit, South Hills consists of undeveloped, rolling hills. The Keller Canyon Landfill is in the northwestern portion of the South Hills subarea, and is surrounded by an open space buffer.

15. Black Diamond. Located in the far southeastern corner of the City’s Planning Area, Black Diamond features undeveloped, rolling hills of primarily rural, privately-owned grazing land. The Black Diamond Mines Regional Preserve offers a variety of recreational opportunities, such as trails and picnic areas, and includes current ranching operations.

Several observations can be made about land uses at the subarea level:

- Medium and High Density Residential acreage can be found in the East Leland, Southwest Hills, West Central, West Leland, and Buchanan subareas. Most residential development outside City boundaries is located in the unincorporated Bay Point community.
- Commercial uses are focused primarily in the East Leland, Downtown, Loveridge, and Railroad Avenue subareas.
- Industrial facilities in the Planning Area are concentrated in the Loveridge, Northeast River, and Northwest River subareas.
- A majority of parks and open space acreage in the Planning Area is attributable to Browns Island Regional Shoreline and Black Diamond Mines Regional Preserve. Stoneman Park, in West Leland, constitutes the largest proportion of parkland within City limits.
This page intentionally left blank.
Table 2-7
General Plan Distribution, City of Pittsburg (not including Bay Point)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Black Diamond</th>
<th>Buchanan</th>
<th>Downtown</th>
<th>East Central</th>
<th>East Leland</th>
<th>Loveridge</th>
<th>Northeast River</th>
<th>Northwest River</th>
<th>Railroad Avenue</th>
<th>South Hills</th>
<th>Southwest Hills</th>
<th>West Central</th>
<th>West Leland</th>
<th>Woodlands</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillside Low Density</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>3,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Low Density</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Medium Density</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown High Density</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commercial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Commercial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Commercial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Commercial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Commercial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Commercial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>1,446</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>2,618</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>1,560</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,680</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>8,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public / Institutional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility ROW</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>4,245</td>
<td>1,277</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>1,585</td>
<td>3,073</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>3,168</td>
<td>2,197</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>20,539</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Items may not sum to total due to independent rounding.

Source: City of Pittsburg GIS. June 2010
DOWNTOWN
- Downtown Commercial
- Marine Commercial
- Downtown Low Density Residential (4-12 un/ac)
- Downtown Medium Density Residential (12-18 un/ac)
- Downtown High Density Residential (18-30 un/ac)
- Service Commercial
- Public/ Institutional
- Park
- Utility/ROW
- Mixed Use

Source: Dyett & Bhatia

Figure 2-4a
Downtown
GOALS AND POLICIES: PLANNING SUBAREAS

Goals and policies for the 16 subareas within Pittsburg are described individually on the following pages.

Downtown

Extensive goals and policies addressing commercial and residential development, urban design, waterfront access, historical resources, and parking within Downtown are included in Chapter 5: Downtown.

Goals: Downtown

2-G-10 Create a mixed-use Downtown that is a landmark and a destination point, as well as a residential neighborhood.

2-G-11 Provide increased pedestrian connections to and vistas of the Suisun Bay/New York Slough waterfront.

Policies: Downtown

2-P-31 Promote and enforce the policies outlined in the Downtown element (Chapter 5: Downtown) of this Plan.

2-P-32 Concentrate all Downtown Commercial activity—which includes specialty retail, professional offices, personal services, entertainment and other uses along the Railroad Avenue corridor. (Downtown: 5-P-2)

2-P-33 Limit commercial uses along the southern side of East Tenth Street to Service Commercial businesses – including repair and maintenance, retail sales, special trade contracting and other uses. (Downtown: 5-P-6)
2-P-34 Undertake active efforts, including land acquisition and assembly, to develop a waterfront activity center at the terminus of Harbor Street, featuring a cluster of Marine Commercial uses – such as specialty retail, services, restaurants, marine repair and docking facilities, hotels and other uses. (Downtown: 5-P-13)

2-P-35 Encourage public acquisition and/or private assembly of the neighborhood blocks surrounding West Tenth Street for redevelopment to higher density housing, including rebuilding of the existing affordable housing stock. (Downtown: 5-P-19)

2-P-36 Improve the pedestrian path along Marina Boulevard, connecting the Downtown core to the waterfront/marina area. Provide a wide path right-of-way, way-finding signage, landscaping, interpretive plaques, and street lighting. (Downtown: 5-P-42)
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Northeast River

Goals: Northeast River

2-G-12 Maintain the industrial use and character of the area.

2-G-13 Protect sensitive marshland habitats along the New York Slough waterfront.

Policies: Northeast River

For policies related to Browns Island Shoreline Preserve, see Chapter 8: Youth and Recreation.

2-P-37 Ensure that development in Northeast River is limited to industrial activities and supporting business and service uses.

2-P-38 During project review, ensure that all industrial development along public streets and in areas adjacent to Downtown maintain at least a 25 foot wide landscaped buffer (using trees and shrubs for screening) along the street.

2-P-39 Encourage the development of “clean” industries along the New York Slough waterfront. Support the modernization of all industrial uses in the area to reduce both air and water pollutant levels.

2-P-40 Encourage the development of office and support uses along street frontages in the Northeast River subarea to buffer heavy industrial activities.

2-P-41 Support the reclamation and reuse of contaminated industrial sites within the Northeast River subarea.

2-P-42 Amend the City’s Zoning Ordinance to ensure that land uses progress from heavier industrial uses inland to lighter industrial uses directly facing the New York Slough waterfront, as feasible

Table 2-9
General Plan Land Use Distribution by Acreage, Northeast River

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Commercial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility ROW</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1585</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Pittsburg GIS. June 2010
during redevelopment of industrial activities not dependent on docking access.

2-P-43 Ensure that all proposed projects in the Northeast River area complete an assessment of biological resources, including wetlands, before site layout and design is completed.

2-P-44 Ensure—through a combination of on- and off-site mitigation—that new development results in no net loss of wetlands.

Dowest Slough is an excellent example of wetlands restoration adjacent to industrial properties. See Chapter 9: Resource Conservation for further discussion of wetlands habitat preservation.

2-P-45 Pursue opportunities for a multi-use trail along the waterfront as industrial properties are redeveloped and remediated.

2-P-46 Support the permanent preservation of the wetlands and salt marsh habitats along New York and Dowest Sloughs, including Browns Island Regional Shoreline.
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Loveridge

Goals: Loveridge

2-G-14 Support the development and expansion of regionally-oriented commercial activities within this area.

2-G-15 Maintain industrial activities in appropriate, designated areas.

Policies: Loveridge

2-P-47 Encourage the development and expansion of regional commercial, auto dealerships, and professional office uses along State Route 4 at Century Boulevard.

2-P-48 Support the development of Business Commercial complexes adjacent to the State Route 4/Loveridge Road interchange, featuring professional offices, research and development, hi-tech manufacturing and production uses.

2-P-49 Ensure that as Loveridge builds out, adequate street connections are provided to efficiently move traffic through and beyond the area’s regional and business centers (as designated by the City’s traffic Level of Service standards, see Chapter 7: Transportation).

2-P-50 Work with Los Medanos Community College to provide pedestrian and bicycle access from the campus to commercial and employment centers within Loveridge.

Table 2-10
General Plan Land Use Distribution by Acreage, Loveridge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commercial</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Commercial</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Commercial</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Commercial</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility ROW</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>744</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Pittsburg GIS. June 2010
Figure 2-4d
East Central
### Goals: East Central

- **2-G-16** Maintain the existing, predominantly residential land use pattern within a grid street network.
- **2-G-17** Foster increased connectivity within the neighborhoods, and to surrounding areas.

### Policies: East Central

- **2-P-51** Explore the feasibility of direct pedestrian connections across the BNSF Railroad between Central Addition and Columbia Park Manor neighborhoods.

There is only one street connection between the Central Addition and Columbia Park Manor neighborhoods. In addition to achieving closer integration between the residential areas, one or more direct connections would improve access to the schools in the southern parts of the area, and to Central Park by residents south of the BNSF Railroad/Pittsburg-Antioch Highway.

- **2-P-52** Ensure that Service Commercial development along Solari Street provides adequate buffers (such as landscaping and parking areas along street frontage) to reduce conflicts with adjacent residential units.

- **2-P-53** Ensure that a linear park is developed along the northern and eastern boundaries of the Columbia Manor neighborhood to buffer residents from adjacent heavy industrial uses.

The land along the northern and eastern boundaries of this neighborhood is currently vacant.
1/4 and 1/2 Mile Radius from BART Station

Source: Dyett & Bhatia

Figure 2-4e

Railroad Ave
Goals: Railroad Avenue

2-G-18 Maintain Railroad Avenue as a destination point for community commercial activities, while continuing to allow other compatible uses.

2-G-19 Encourage further economic development along the Railroad Avenue corridor.

2-G-20 Support the extension of BART to Railroad Avenue, and develop a mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented village surrounding the proposed Station area.

Policies: Railroad Avenue

2-P-54 Allow redevelopment and/or expansion of Community Commercial uses along Railroad Avenue.

2-P-55 Pursue the extension of the Railroad Avenue linear park along the north side of State Route 4, providing a pedestrian/bicycle connection from the City’s major shopping corridor and to the Civic Center and City Park.

This linear park currently extends along the west side of Railroad Avenue from the Delta De Anza Trail to the State Route 4 interchange. Expanding the linear park would provide a walkable connection to the Civic Center, City Park, and Downtown in the north. However, this extension may be interrupted by lack of street width on the Railroad Avenue/State Route 4 overpass.

2-P-56 Work with Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) to develop a specific plan for the Railroad Avenue BART Station area, featuring mixed-use Business Commercial activities with extensive pedestrian amenities. Provide pedestrian linkages from this mixed-use village
to the Civic Center, City Park, high school, and other institutional uses on the north side of State Route 4.

The development of a specific plan for the Railroad Avenue BART Station area will ensure that adjacent business commercial sites are redeveloped in a manner consistent with a transit-oriented commercial node. This area has the potential for intensification as a regional employment center, accessible by the BART system.

2-P-57 Allow development at an intensity of up to 2.0 FAR along Railroad Avenue from State Route 4 to East Leland Road.

The sites south of the Railroad Avenue/State Route 4 interchange are designated for community commercial and business commercial uses in the General Plan Diagram.

2-P-58 Allow mixed-use development at an intensity of up to 1.0 FAR for non-residential uses, and additional residential development at a maximum density of 25 units per acre, on designated community commercial sites along Railroad Avenue, south of Bliss Avenue.

Such mixed-use development will be subject to review and approval by the Planning Commission, and will require provision of residential units as part of the proposal.

2-P-59 Extend Garcia Avenue to Railroad Avenue if suitable opportunity arises during redevelopment of adjacent sites, and explore the feasibility of other linkages to improve accessibility.

2-P-60 Ensure that the small business commercial center at the southern end of Railroad Avenue (at Buchanan Road) is compatible with the scale of surrounding uses.
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Figure 2-4f

Source: Dyett & Bhatia
**East Leland**

**Goals: East Leland**

2-G-21 Undertake selective improvement and intensification, while maintaining land use patterns focused on multi-family housing and commercial centers.

2-G-22 Encourage redevelopment of the existing industrial area along Garcia Avenue with higher-end business commercial activities.

2-G-23 Improve connections between Los Medanos Community College and local neighborhoods and commercial activities.

**Policies: East Leland**

2-P-61 As part of the Zoning Ordinance, incorporate incentives to promote improvement of sites along Garcia Avenue with high-amenity business commercial uses. Undertake redevelopment, as needed, with an aim to promote parcel consolidation and coordinated development.

2-P-62 Ensure that new Business Commercial centers provide pedestrian, bicycle, and transit amenities (such as walking paths, benches, bus shelters, bicycle racks, and lockers) enabling convenient use of alternative transportation modes, including the proposed Railroad Avenue BART Station.

2-P-63 Participate in the development of a specific plan for the proposed Railroad Avenue BART Station. Ensure that all uses within ½ mile radius of the proposed Station feature mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented design.

2-P-64 Pursue the development of a trail/path linking the Delta De Anza Trail to the proposed Railroad Avenue BART Station area.

---

**Table 2-13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Commercial</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Commercial</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public / Institutional</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility ROW</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>565</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: City of Pittsburg GIS. June 2010*
2-P-65  Work with Los Medanos Community College to facilitate pedestrian and bicycle connections from the campus to nearby commercial and residential areas.

2-P-66  Work with Los Medanos College and the City of Antioch to undertake a study exploring the viability of a street connection between Leland and Buchanan Roads, along the eastern edge of the College at the border of the two cities.

The proposed street would provide a connection between Loveridge and Somersville Roads, and would provide much improved access to the campus. It would also divert southwest-moving traffic from Antioch to State Route 4; however, it may need an additional highway interchange to provide increased connections without negatively impacting existing roadways.

2-P-67  Ensure that all new development—residential and non-residential—fronting the Delta De Anza trail provides pedestrian and bicycle access to the trail.
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Figure 2-4g

Source: Dyett & Bhatia
Table 2-14
General Plan Land Use Distribution by Acreage, Buchanan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hillside Low Density Residential</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Commercial</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Commercial</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public / Institutional</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility ROW</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,277</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Pittsburg GIS, June 2010

Buchanan

Goals: Buchanan

2-G-25 Ensure design of new developments as inter-connected residential neighborhoods, rather than distinct, introverted subdivisions.

2-G-26 Encourage development as a means of funding the construction of Buchanan Bypass as an alternative route for regional through-traffic.

Policies: Buchanan

2-P-68 Ensure that new residential development south of Buchanan provides both street and pedestrian connections to adjacent residential areas.

2-P-69 Encourage new residential development to contain varied architectural styles and smooth visual transitions to adjacent residential areas.

2-P-70 During development review, ensure that new development maintains views of the southern hills.

2-P-71 New residential development south of Buchanan Road should:
   - Ensure that adequate acreage is dedicated for a neighborhood park directly adjacent to Buchanan Road;
   - Not result in any net increase of peak-hour stormwater flow;
   - Preserve and enhance existing north-south creeks;
   - Respect natural topography in the design and construction of new units; and
   - Be limited to a maximum density of 3.0 du/ac.

2-P-72 Pursue construction of the Buchanan Bypass, as designated in the General Plan Diagram, providing an alternative route for commuters traveling from Kirker Pass Road to destinations east of Pittsburg.
However, because the General Plan Diagram is a generalized representation of proposed development patterns, the precise alignment of Buchanan Bypass may vary according to topographic constraints.
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Low Density Residential (1-7 un/ac)
Medium Density Residential (7-14 un/ac)
High Density Residential (14-25 un/ac)
Hillside Low Density Residential (<5 un/ac)
Public/Institutional
Park
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Utility/ROW

Ridge
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Planning Subarea
Arterial Street
Collector Street

Source: Dyett & Bhatia
Woodlands

Goals: Woodlands

2-G-27  Support new residential development in locations that do not significantly impact the natural setting.

2-G-28  

Policies: Woodlands

2-P-73  Allow Low Density Residential development in selected areas along Kirker Pass Road and other valley floors as appropriate, under the following criteria:

- Permanent greenbelt buffers be established to encompass: 1) the southerly 1/5 (approximately) of the Montreux property; and 2) the area south of the existing PG&E transmission corridor and south of the final alignment of the Buchanan Road Bypass, just east of Kirker Pass Road.

The City will consider, in conjunction with subdivision applications on these properties and related environmental analysis, general plan and/or the transfer of lost development rights as a result of these greenbelts to other portions of these properties, while not increasing the overall number of units permitted on these properties

- Natural topography be retained to the maximum extent feasible, and large-scale grading discouraged;

- No development on minor and major ridgelines (as identified in Figure 4-2), with residential construction on flatter natural slopes encouraged;

- Development designed and clustered so as to be minimally visible from Kirker Pass Road;

Table 2-15
General Plan Land Use Distribution by Acreage, Woodlands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hillside Low Density Residential</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public / Institutional</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility ROW</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>944</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Pittsburg GIS. June 2010
- Creeks and adjacent riparian habitat protected;
- An assessment of biological resources completed; and
- Be limited to a maximum density of 3.0 du/ac.

2-P-74  During review and approval of new residential uses, pursue development of a community park in proximity to the Kirker Pass Road/Nortonville Road intersection.

2-P-75  Cluster new residential development within the hills to maximize preservation of open space resources and viewsheds.

2-P-76  Ensure that new residential development along Kirker Creek preserves natural riparian habitat. New development shall be setback at least 50 feet from the top of the streambank, with continuous multi-use trail access along the west side of the creek.
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Source: Dyett & Bhatia

Figure 2-4i
West Central
Goals: West Central

2-G-29 Redevelopment and reuse of employment centers adjacent to the BNSF railroad tracks.

2-G-30 Increased connections to the neighborhoods and activity centers south of State Route 4.

Policies: West Central

For policies relating to the Range Road overpass, see Chapter 7: Transportation. For policies related to use of the PG&E powerline right-of-way for trail use, see Chapter 9: Public Facilities.

2-P-77 Allow and encourage the development of a Business Commercial complex between Willow Pass Road and the BNSF Railroad tracks, east of the PG&E transmission corridor. Encourage redevelopment and reuse of this site as an “economic opportunity area” (see Chapter 6: Economic Development).

2-P-78 Explore the feasibility of a pedestrian and bicycle bridge across State Route 4, near the Parkside and Los Medanos elementary schools.

A pedestrian and bicycle over-crossing would provide residents of the neighborhoods on either side of State Route 4 with access to nearby schools, commercial areas, and park facilities. Because State Route 4 is depressed in this area, no grade change will be needed for the bridge.
1/4 and 1/2 Mile Radius from BART Station
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Figure 2-4j
West Leland
Table 2-17
General Plan Land Use Distribution by Acreage, West Leland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Commercial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public / Institutional</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility ROW</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,185</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: City of Pittsburg GIS, June 2010*

**West Leland**

**Goals: West Leland**

2-G-31  Maintain existing residential land use patterns.

2-G-32  Improve pedestrian access and streetscape character along West Leland Road.

**Policies: West Leland**

2-P-79  Allow Low Density Residential uses on the designated school site along Range Road, if it is not needed for public school facilities.

2-P-80  During the development of a specific plan for the proposed Railroad Avenue BART Station area, ensure that pedestrian and transit amenities are provided to connect West Leland residents with the Station area.

2-P-81  Undertake a streetscape enhancement program for West Leland Road, focusing on improving the walkability and visual character of the corridor. Emphasize increased street trees and landscaping, medians, crosswalks, widened sidewalks, and benches.

2-P-82  Maintain permanent preservation of Stoneman Park for recreation and open space. Pursue accessibility to the Park, and expansion of the Park’s bicycle and pedestrian trail network.

2-P-83  Explore the feasibility of provision of pedestrian and bicycle linkages from the Delta De Anza Trail to Stoneman Park.
### Table 2-18

**General Plan Land Use Distribution by Acreage, Southwest Hills**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hillside Low Density Residential</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Commercial</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Commercial</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public / Institutional</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility ROW</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,197</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: City of Pittsburg GIS. June 2010*

---

### Southwest Hills

#### Goals: Southwest Hills

2-G-33  Maintain the general character of the hill forms.

2-G-34  Encourage development of higher-end, low-density residential neighborhoods.

#### Policies: Southwest Hills

2-P-85  Ensure extension of West Leland Road and San Marco Boulevard through the area, as shown on the General Plan Diagram, as a condition of any new approval in the area.

However, because the General Plan Diagram is a general representation of proposed development patterns, the alignment of West Leland Road and San Marco Boulevard is subject to variation as needed to serve planned and approved residential neighborhoods and mitigate environmental impacts.

2-P-86  Work with project developers to ensure that new residential neighborhoods and business commercial complexes built along West Leland Road provide transit amenities (such as pedestrian paths, bus shelters, bicycle racks) and convenient access to the Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station.

2-P-87  Ensure that all proposed residential development is set back from the edge of State Route 4 to mitigate visual and noise impacts.

2-P-88  Allow development surrounding the West Leland Road/San Marco Boulevard intersection (San Marco project) in accordance with entitled approvals. If any aspect of the approval is sought to be changed:
Allow a maximum of 1,400 Hillside Low and Low Density units, and 1,500 Medium and High Density units, with additional residential and commercial development permitted in the mixed use San Marco Village;

Require a 10-acre mixed-use pedestrian-oriented core, extending along West Leland Road. Encourage site design that provides buildings fronting along West Leland Road, with parking tucked behind buildings;

Allow a maximum of 40 acres of Business Commercial and 10 acres of Community Commercial between West Leland Road and State Route 4;

Ensure grading is kept to a minimum, all designated ridgelines are protected, and impacts to creeks are mitigated; and

 Require dedication of one school site, and two neighborhood park sites or park in-lieu fees.

Current development entitlements for the site include over 2,900 housing units. Thus, while this land use program would result in somewhat fewer housing units, because of the Business Commercial development permitted, the overall amount of development and resulting residential densities would be even higher. However, development would be required to conform to heightened environmental and design criteria.

Allow development on the site east of the proposed West Leland Road/San Marco Boulevard intersection (Alves Ranch) as follows:

A maximum of 306 Hillside Low and Low Density units, and 794 Medium and High Density residential units;

A maximum of 20 acres of Business Commercial between West Leland Road and State Route 4;

Grading to be kept to a minimum, all designated ridgelines protected, and impacts to creeks mitigated; and

Dedication of one school site.
2-P-90 Ensure that all new development in Southwest Hills provides trailheads and linkages into the multi-use trail system planned to extend from West Leland Road to Oak Hills Park.

2-P-91 Ensure as part of the development review process that any future subdivision in the southwest hills that is adjacent to the 2005 Pittsburg voter approved urban limit line, establishes a greenbelt buffer within the City's urban limit line between the proposed development and the urban limit line. The greenbelt buffer shall include all land between the City of Concord border and the first set of ridges, including the tops of these same ridges which generally run parallel to the common border. The City will consider, in conjunction with subdivision applications on these properties and related environmental analysis, general plan and/or the transfer of lost development rights as a result of the these greenbelts to other portions of these properties, while not increasing the overall number of units permitted on these properties.

2-P-92 Consider the development of a specific plan for the High Density Residential, Business Commercial, and Community Commercial areas adjacent to State Route 4, West Leland Road and San Marco Boulevard. Integrate all uses in this area into a mixed-use, transit-oriented village, featuring executive offices, research and development, entertainment, and hotel uses.

2-P-93 Allow Low Density residential development west of Bailey Road, as shown on the General Plan Diagram. Ensure that such development is minimally visible from Bailey Road, and mitigates any impacts to creeks and wetlands in the area.

2-P-94 Pursue construction of a landscaped multi-use path along West Leland Road, from Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station to the proposed San Marco Village. Ensure that design of the linear parkway accommodates bicyclists.
2-P-95 Development in the Concord Naval Weapons Station Restricted Federal Easement area may be allowed when that Easement is abandoned.

2-P-96 Allow an overall maximum density of 3.0 du/ac within the Low Density Residential areas south of the San Marco project and outside the present Sphere of Influence line with a maximum number of 1500 residential units.
Source: Dyett & Bhatia

Northwest River

Figure 2-4l
Goals: Northwest River

2-G-35  Preserve existing wetlands and salt marshes along the Suisun Bay.

2-G-36  Allow the development of appropriate urban uses on stable areas.

Policies: Northwest River

2-P-97  Preserve the wetlands and salt marsh habitats along the Suisun Bay waterfront. Allow only the development of multi-use trails and recreation facilities.

2-P-98  Maintain the Mirant (formerly PG&E) power plant site in the Industrial designation. Pursue annexation of the power plant and adjacent PG&E properties to ensure land use control of these areas.

Opportunities for non-industrial uses—including expansion of the Downtown residential areas, mixed-use development, and a waterfront park—should be explored in the unlikely event that the plant is decommissioned in the future. Expansion of the power plant or related industrial uses to the west of the facility should be regulated by the City of Pittsburg. Such areas not considered for industrial uses should be designated Marine Commercial.

2-P-99  Work with adjacent jurisdictions and relevant agencies to determine appropriate future land uses for the portion of Concord Naval Weapons Station (CNWS) within the Pittsburg Sphere of Influence, if CNWS were to be decommissioned.

Along the Suisun Bay waterfront, this land consists of salt marshes and seasonal wetland. Therefore, development opportunities may be limited.

2-P-100  Pursue opportunities for a linear park/trail along the waterfront, connecting to Downtown. Cooperate with San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission to provide public access along Suisun Bay.

Table 2-19
General Plan Land Use Distribution by Acreage, Northwest River

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>1,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Institution</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility ROW</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,073</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Pittsburg GIS. June 2010
Bay Point

Goals: Bay Point
2-G-37 Recognize Bay Point as a distinct community.

Policies: Bay Point
2-P-101 Recognize the County’s plans for Bay Point, as well as the unincorporated Riverview Planning Area, as the official planning guides.

2-P-102 Use the Bay Point/Pittsburg BART Area Specific Plan as the guide for development in the Specific Plan area.

2-P-103 Support efforts by Mount Diablo Unified School District to establish a public high school in Bay Point.

2-P-104 Consider seeking amendment to the City’s Sphere of Influence and annexation of vacant, undeveloped lands west of Bay Point.
2: LAND USE
South Hills

Goals: South Hills

2-G-38 Preserve the rural character of the rolling South Hills area as open space, except the existing Keller Canyon Landfill.

Policies: South Hills

2-P-105 Preserve all designated hillsides as open space, according to the General Plan Land Use Diagram (Figure 2-2).

2-P-106 Work with Keller Canyon Landfill to ensure that landfill activities do not negatively impact nearby residential and open space areas.

Table 2-20
General Plan Land Use Distribution by Acreage, South Hills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>2,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility ROW</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,168</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Pittsburg GIS. June 2010
Figure 2-4o

Black Diamond
Black Diamond

Goals: Black Diamond

2-G-39 Preserve rolling Black Diamond hills as open space.

Policies: Black Diamond

2-P-107 Support permanent open space preservation of the Black Diamond Mines Regional Preserve. Retain remaining vacant acreage within the subarea as open space.

2-P-108 Work with the East Bay Regional Park District to provide linkages between the City’s trail and linear park network, and the Black Diamond Mines multi-use trail system.

Kirker Creek provides an opportunity for a trail linking Black Diamond Mines Regional Preserve with Buchanan Park. Opportunities may also exist to link such a trail with the linear park along Railroad Avenue, proposed for extension as part of this General Plan.

2-P-109 Ensure the rural character of the existing agricultural grazing lands is retained.

Table 2-21
General Plan Land Use Distribution by Acreage, Black Diamond

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>1,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>2,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility ROW</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,245</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: City of Pittsburg GIS. June 2010*
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3 GROWTH MANAGEMENT

This element establishes the goals, policies and programs intended to manage and mitigate impacts of future growth and development within the City. It provides policy framework to ensure that sufficient opportunities for housing are provided in the City and that facilities for motorists, bicyclists, pedestrians and transit are constructed in proportion to new urban development.

This element is intended to comply with the requirements of the Contra Costa County Transportation Sales Tax Expenditure Plan (Measure J). Measure J, adopted by County voters in 2004 and later amended by the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA), is a 25-year extension of the Contra Costa Transportation Improvement and Growth Management Program (Measure C) approved by voters in 1988. The Measure J Growth Management Program is intended to ensure that future development pays for the facilities required to meet the demands resulting from that growth. More particularly, it requires that each jurisdiction in the County:

- Adopt a development mitigation program;
- Address housing options;
- Participate in an ongoing cooperative, multi-jurisdictional planning process;
- Adopt an Urban Limit Line (ULL);
- Develop a five-year capital improvement program; and
- Adopt a transportation systems management ordinance or resolution.

In addition to the transportation planning goals and policies identified in this Growth Management Element, Chapter 7: Transportation, establishes goals and policies for traffic services and roadway improvements, bicycle and pedestrian movement, and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs. Chapter 13: Housing is also referenced in this Growth Management Element and includes an expanded list of policies and programs that describe the City’s efforts to foster access to safe, quality housing for people of all income levels.
3.1 GROWTH AND EXPANSION

CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

The City has a substantial inventory of residential projects with development approvals, as well as several planned commercial and industrial complexes. The two largest residential projects – San Marco and Alves Ranch – are both located in the Southwest Hills subarea and would include over 4,000 housing units at buildout. Business and Community Commercial districts are also planned for the southeastern portion of the City along State Route 4 and within the Southwest Hills subarea. Two major industrial projects are located along the industrial waterfront area – Los Medanos Energy Center and Delta Energy Center.

To track current development projects, the City maintains a list of private development projects that have been recently proposed, approved or built within the City. This list of current projects is updated periodically by Planning staff and is an informational item available to the public.

GROWTH AND ANNEXATION

The Planning Area boundaries of this General Plan largely coincide with those of the City’s last comprehensive update of the General Plan, which was adopted in 1988. The Planning Area boundaries are described in Chapter 1: Introduction. Since the 1988 General Plan was adopted, Pittsburg has witnessed eight major expansions of its City boundaries, totaling over 4,400 acres:

- Northeast River subarea. In 1990, 1,170 acres were annexed for industrial development;
- West Central subarea. In 1991, 190 acres were annexed for construction of a mobile home park;
- Buchanan subarea. In 1997, 160 acres of Highlands Ranch were annexed for residential development. In 2008, approximately 160 acres located south of Highlands Ranch were also annexed for the Sky Ranch residential development;
• **Southwest Hills subarea.** In 1990, 1,030 acres were annexed for the San Marco project. In 1992, 130 acres were annexed along the western municipal boundary. Then in 1996, 100 acres were annexed south of Oak Hills; and

• **Northwest River subarea.** In 2008, 1,467 acres were annexed, including the Mirant Power Generation Plant and adjacent wetland areas.

Full implementation of the land uses proposed in this General Plan will require additional annexations in the Woodlands, Buchanan, and Southwest Hills subareas. Policies also consider potential annexation of developable lands outside of the current Sphere of Influence (SOI) along the eastern and western edges of the City.

**URBAN LIMIT LINE**

As part of the 1996 Contra Costa County General Plan, the County delineated an Urban Limit Line (ULL) to identify areas appropriate for urban expansion and to preserve open space in the southern hills. The County amended its ULL in 2000, removing several hundred acres of the southern hills from planned urban growth area.

This General Plan seeks to define appropriate limits for urban growth based on land use considerations and environmental and topographic constraints. In 2005, the voters approved the City of Pittsburg Voter Approved Urban Limit Line and Prezoning Act. This Act amended this General Plan to establish a Voter Approved Urban Limit Line that could not be changed without a vote of the voters. The Act also prezoned certain specified lands as a necessary first step in the process of annexing those lands to the City and provided that the prezoning could be changed by a vote of the voters or by a majority vote of the City Council.

The findings and purpose section of the City of Pittsburg Voter Approved Urban Limit Line and Prezoning Act specifically stated its intent to comply with the purposes of Measure J as follows:

Ensure the preservation and protection of identified non-urban land, including agricultural, open space, parkland, and other areas, by establishing a line beyond which urban development is prohibited;
Link land use decisions with the transportation investments in Measure J by channeling future growth to locations more suitable for urban development; and

Ensure that land use policies within the Voter Approved Urban Limit Line effectively promote appropriate development that accommodates the area’s projected housing and job needs for the future.

**GOALS: GROWTH AND EXPANSION**

3-G-1 Manage the City’s growth to balance development of housing options and job opportunities, protection of open space and habitat areas, construction of transportation improvements, and preservation of high quality public facilities.

3-G-2 Realize the opportunities afforded by establishment of the Voter Approved Urban Limit Line to allow the City to grow in such a way as to diversify and expand the employment base, develop a range of housing opportunities, increase the depth of municipal fiscal resources, enhance the quality of urban life for all Pittsburg residents and prohibit urban development beyond the Voter Approved Urban Limit Line.

3-G-3 Provide a range of development intensities, with the highest intensities in Downtown and in areas approximate to transit and services, and lower intensities in hillsides and at the City’s southern edge.

3-G-4 Maintain programs and provide incentives for use of vacant infill land and reuse and revitalization of underutilized sites. (Land Use Goal 2-G-6)

3-G-5 Ensure that new residential, commercial and industrial growth within the Voter-Approved Urban Limit Line pays its share of the costs for the construction of facilities needed to serve that growth.

**POLICIES: GROWTH AND EXPANSION**

3-P-1 Allow urban and suburban development only in areas where public facilities and infrastructure (police, fire, parks, water, sewer, storm drainage, and community
facilities) are available or can be provided.

Prior to development approval, public service agencies and/or districts should be contacted and assurance gained that areas of urban expansion will have all necessary infrastructure.

3-P-2 Prior to project approval, ensure that the existing and planned transportation system will have adequate capacity to accommodate new urban development.
3.2 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

Measure J requires each jurisdiction’s participation in an ongoing process with other jurisdictions and agencies, the Regional Transportation Planning Committees and CCTA to create a balanced, safe and efficient transportation system and to manage the impacts of growth. The City must work with TRANSPLAN (east Contra Costa County’s Regional Transportation Planning Committee) to:

Identify Routes of Regional Significance, establish Multimodal Transportation Service Objectives (MTSO’s) for those routes, and develop Action Plans to achieve those objectives;

Apply CCTA’s travel demand model and technical procedures to the analysis of General Plan amendments and developments exceeding specified thresholds for their impact on the regional transportation system, including effects on Action Plan objectives;

Create development mitigation programs for both local and regional transportation facilities to ensure that new growth is paying its share of the costs associated with that growth; and

Help develop other plans, programs and studies to address other transportation and growth management issues.

In consultation with the Regional Transportation Planning Committees, each jurisdiction must use the travel demand model to evaluate changes to local General Plans and the impacts of major development projects for their impacts on the local and regional transportation system and the ability to achieve the Multimodal Transportation Service Objectives (MTSO’s) established in the Action Plans.

Jurisdictions must also participate in CCTA’s ongoing county-wide comprehensive transportation planning process. As part of this process, CCTA will support county-wide and sub-regional planning efforts, including the Action Plans for Routes of Regional Significance, and will maintain a travel demand model. Jurisdictions must help maintain CCTA’s travel demand modeling system by providing information on proposed improvements to the transportation system and planned and approved development within the jurisdiction.
GOALS: REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

3-G-6 Support efforts to establish a regional approach to transportation and land use planning.

3-G-7 Coordinate circulation system plans with other jurisdictions’ and agencies’ plans, including but not limited to Antioch and Concord, the Contra Costa Transportation Authority, and Caltrans (Transportation Goal 7-G-3).

POLICIES: REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

3-P-3 Work with Contra Costa Transportation Authority and TRANSPLAN (the transportation planning committee for East County) to develop and implement Action Plans for Routes of Regional Significance, as designated in Figure 3-1.

The City should also participate in CCTA’s conflict resolution process, as needed to resolve disputes related to the development and implementation of Action Plans.

3-P-4 Participate in cooperative regional land use and transportation planning efforts by sharing information about future development in the City with interested agencies and jurisdictions.

The City shall notify CCTA, TRANSPLAN, other Regional Transportation Planning Committees (such as TRANSPAC), neighboring jurisdictions, and transportation and transit service providers about development proposals that would generate 100 or more net new peak hour vehicle trips. The City shall require preparation of a traffic impact analysis report for private or public projects that meet or exceed the 100 trip threshold. Copies of those reports shall be made available to regional transportation planning agencies and potentially affected jurisdictions. This policy shall also apply to capital improvement projects that may have an affect on existing or planned facilities.
Note: San Marco Boulevard is a “Proposed Regional Route of Significance” proposed by the City of Pittsburg.

Source: City of Pittsburg and TRANSPLAN (2008)
3.3 DEVELOPMENT REVIEW AND MITIGATION PROGRAMS

Under Measure J, each jurisdiction in the County must consider, evaluate, and develop programs to mitigate the impacts of new development on automobile, pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities, both locally and regionally. Furthermore, Measure J directs jurisdictions to establish and adopt programs to ensure that new growth pays its share of the costs associated with that growth.

For projects that are anticipated to generate in excess of 100 net new peak hour vehicle trips, traffic studies are required to identify the project-specific transportation impacts on local and regional roadways. The City may set a lower threshold for requirements of these studies. The traffic studies shall measure the impacts of a project on roads and at intersections using Level of Service (LOS) standards, where LOS is expressed as a range of ratings from LOS A (free flow of traffic) to LOS F (long traffic delays). In addition to identifying project-related impacts, traffic studies provide a means for identifying mitigation measures—such as construction of roadway improvements or payment of a pro rata share of the cost to construct those improvements—in instances where the impacts of a project are anticipated to exceed specified LOS thresholds. Under Measure J, jurisdictions are encouraged to adopt programs that promote the use of transportation alternatives to the automobile, and a discussion of these transportation alternatives may also be incorporated into the traffic study.

Regardless of whether a traffic study is prepared for a project, project developers are still required to pay mitigation fees to help fund planned improvements to the local or regional roadway system as part of broader mitigation programs. These programs include both a local program to mitigate impacts on local streets and facilities, and a regional program to fund regional and subregional transportation projects. Where mitigation programs require payment of fees for purposes of mitigating the specific impacts of proposed development, the programs must preclude the possibility for Measure J monies to be used to offset or replace any development-related mitigation fees that would otherwise be collected from developers.
GOALS: DEVELOPMENT REVIEW AND MITIGATION PROGRAMS

3-G-8  Achieve traffic levels of service for roadway intersections that are based on the roadways’ classification and location shown in Figure 7-2. (Transportation Goal 7-G-1)

3-G-9  Encourage the provision of new and improved pedestrian, bicycle and transit facilities to serve all users of new development projects.

POLICIES: DEVELOPMENT REVIEW AND MITIGATION PROGRAMS

3-P-5  As part of development review, require preparation of a traffic impact study for all development projects expected to generate more than 100 net new peak hour vehicle trips. Ensure that traffic impact studies are prepared by professional transportation consultants selected and hired by the City, but require that project proponents pay all fees associated with development of such studies.

The traffic impact study managed by City staff should be prepared according to CCTA’s Technical Procedures, and the Institute of Transportation Engineer’s Traffic Access and Impact Studies for Site Development, Proposed Recommended Practice.

3-P-6  Apply the Contra Costa Transportation Authority’s travel demand model and technical procedures to the analysis of General Plan amendments and developments exceeding 100 net new peak-hour vehicle trips for their impact on Regional Routes of Significance and Action Plan objectives.

3-P-7  Ensure that all Regional Routes of Significance within the City maintain the following traffic levels of service (LOS) standards (applicable to non-freeway routes and routes not subject to a Traffic Management Program):

- LOS mid D (peak hour volume to capacity ratio less than or equal to 0.85) at intersections along major arterials, except for intersections along Bailey
3-P-6 Ensure that all non-Regional Routes within the City (not designated as Routes of Regional Significance in Figure 3-1) maintain the following traffic levels of service (LOS) standards based on their location in rural, semi-rural, suburban, urban or downtown areas, as designated in Figure 3-1:

- **Rural** – LOS low C (peak hour volume to capacity ratio less than or equal to 0.74)
- **Semi-rural** – LOS high C (peak hour volume to capacity ratio less than or equal to 0.79)
- **Suburban** – LOS low D (peak hour volume to capacity ratio less than or equal to 0.84)
- **Urban** – LOS high D (peak hour volume to capacity ratio less than or equal to 0.89)
- **Downtown** – LOS high D (peak hour volume to capacity ratio less than or equal to 0.89)

(Transportation Policy 7-P-8)

3-P-9 Ensure that traffic studies prepared for development projects include an analysis of the impacts of project-related traffic and roadway improvements on pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users.

When the traffic study identifies significant impacts to pedestrian, bicycle and transit users as a result of a project, the study should identify appropriate

Road;

- LOS high E (peak hour volume to capacity ratio less than or equal to 0.99) at intersections along Bailey Road between West Leland Road and State Route 4; and
- LOS mid E (peak hour volume to capacity ratio less than or equal to 0.95) at intersections on Kirker Pass Road.

(Transportation Policy 7-P-6)
mitigation measures to ensure that the level of comfort experienced by those users is restored or enhanced after construction of the project is complete.

3-P-10 **Approve proposed development projects expected to generate over 100 peak-hour trips ONLY if Findings of Consistency with adopted traffic levels of service standards are found.**

Findings of Consistency may be made only if a traffic impact analysis shows that the development project is consistent with adopted Action Plans and will not result in violation of adopted LOS standards for Basic Routes, unless:

- Projects included in the City’s five-year Capital Improvement Program will result in attainment of adopted LOS standards; or
- Findings of Special Circumstances, including appropriate mitigation measures, have been adopted by the City and CCTA

3-P-11 **Prepare, adopt and implement a Transportation Systems Management ordinance or resolution, with the purpose of ensuring attainment of adopted traffic levels of service standards.**

In accordance with court rulings on Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s Rule 13, much of the implementation will be voluntary.

**Development Impact Mitigation**

3-P-12 **Adopt and update development mitigation programs that collect fees to mitigate transportation impacts to both local and regional transportation facilities.**

3-P-13 **Review and update the City’s transportation impact fee schedule, requiring developers to pay the costs necessary to mitigate impacts of their development projects on the local and regional transportation system.**

As part of this process, the City should ensure that the cost of regional transportation improvements, identified by TRANSPLAN, along with other
improvements, are reflected in the schedule. The fees should be set at amounts that will be sufficient to cover the full cost to construct the improvements, and revenue generated from collection of the fees shall not be used to replace private developer funding of any required improvements that have or would have been committed to any project. The schedule should also differentiate fees based on location of projects within the LOS Areas (i.e., higher fees in areas where greater mitigation and high LOS standards are needed).

3-P-14  Pursue funding from the Contra Costa Transportation Authority for roadway projects intended to maintain levels of service standards, implement Action Plans for Regional Routes, or provide Special Circumstances mitigation.

In no case will revenue from the CCTA Local Street Improvement and Maintenance Fund replace private developer funding for transportation projects needed to meet or maintain LOS standards that may be adversely affected as a result of new development in new growth areas.

3-P-15  Prepare, adopt and periodically update a five-year Capital Improvement Program (CIP) that describes City-sponsored capital projects necessary to maintain and improve operations for traffic, transit, pedestrians and bicyclists within the City. Proposed funding sources, agency responsibility, and project phasing should be identified in the CIP.

3-P-16  Preserve options for future transit use when designing improvements for roadways. Ensure that developers provide bus turnouts and/or shelters, where appropriate, as part of projects. (Transportation Policy 7-P-29)

3-P-17  As part of development approval, ensure that safe and contiguous routes for pedestrians and bicyclists are provided within new development projects and on any roadways that are impacted as a result of new development. (Transportation Policy 7-P-34)
3.4 HOUSING OPTIONS

Consistent with the requirements of Measure J and state law, Chapter 13: Housing, of this General Plan establishes a range of goals, policies and programs that outline the City’s efforts to support balanced housing development in the City. Measure J expands upon the program requirements identified in the prior Measure C, and requires ongoing reporting to CCTA of the City’s progress in implementing the goals and objectives listed in the Housing Element.

GOALS: HOUSING OPTIONS

3-G-10 Foster development of a variety of housing types, densities and prices to balance the City’s housing stock and meet the City’s regional fair share housing needs for people of all income levels. (Housing Element Goal 13-G-1)

POLICIES: HOUSING OPTIONS

3-P-18 Encourage residential and mixed use development within the Urban Limit Line to meet regional fair share housing goals by focusing residential and mixed use development on sites that have been designated within Priority Development Areas (PDAs) under the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and Association of Bay Area Governments (MTC/ABAG) FOCUS Program. Assist non-profit and for profit developers to obtain grants and other capital improvement funds offered to PDAs to develop and improve those infill sites. (Housing Element program 13-P-1.1 E)

3-P-19 Comply with California Government Code Sec. 65400(b) requiring preparation of an annual report summarizing the City’s progress in implementing the General Plan, and submit copies of the report to the Contra Costa Transportation Authority biennially as part of the Authority’s Growth Management Plan Compliance Checklist.
Measure J requires that the annual report on the implementation of the Housing Element of the General Plan be submitted to CCTA every other year. The report must include the specified housing reporting period and must be submitted to CCTA in one of the following formats:

- The number of housing units approved, constructed or occupied in the City since the beginning of the reporting period, compared to the average number of units needed annually to meet the fair share regional housing need;

- A description of how the City’s adopted land use, housing, and regulatory plans and programs have provided sufficient opportunities for and removed undue constraints to the achievement of the City’s fair share regional housing need; or

- A description of how the plans and policies of the General Plan and the land use regulations of the Zoning Ordinance facilitate the improvement and development of the City’s fair share regional housing need.
4 URBAN DESIGN

This element provides hillside and ridgeline preservation policies, identifies local views and city edges, outlines improvement strategies for key corridors within the City, and contains policies relating to design and development of residential neighborhoods.

The design of key corridors and infill areas—such as the Downtown neighborhoods and BART Station Areas—will be central to fostering a livable and vital City. Many General Plan policies emphasize reuse and intensification adjacent to local activity centers. However, as development extends into the foothills, preserving ridgelines and views of hills will become increasingly critical in preserving the City’s identity.
4.1 VIEWS, RIDGES AND EDGES

VIEWS WITHIN PITTSBURG

The most identifying feature lending Pittsburg a sense of character is its location between the rolling, grassy hills to the south and Suisun Bay/Sacramento River Delta to the north. Views of both natural features are important to the visual quality of the community. From the flatland areas of Pittsburg, views of the southern hills are prominent. Rolling, grassy slopes and the larger, vegetated mountains of Black Diamond Mines Regional Preserve rise to meet the skyline. Through streets designed in a north-south configuration afford views of the hills. Larger open spaces, such as the Civic Center and Stoneman Park, also provide unobstructed views.

Figure 4-1 illustrates a View shed Analysis on ducted within the Planning Area. Using the Arc View program, four “viewpoints” throughout the City were selected, and digital elevation modeling used to determine what hills and ridgelines were visible from each. Areas visible from all four viewpoints include multiple small ridgelines in the southern hills, particularly areas southwest of existing development surrounding the Pittsburg/Bay Point BART station.

These southern hills lend Pittsburg residents a sense of identity. Drivers recognize the transition into Pittsburg as they crest the ridgeline on State Route 4 from Concord. Views of the hills to the south, and Suisun Bay to the north create an identifiable entryway for the City. Views from the southern hills include vistas of cityscape and Suisun Bay beyond.
Figure 4-1

Viewshed Analysis
MAJOR AND MINOR RIDGELINES

In order to define major and minor ridgelines within the City’s southern hills, three components were used: structure, elevation, and visibility. The structural component of ridgelines is the branching pattern of the ridge system. The major stem of the ridge system is considered a major ridgeline, while smaller branches are considered minor ridgelines. Elevation also distinguishes major—higher ridgelines, from minor—lower—peaks; all ridgelines that are delineated as major or minor are generally 500 feet or higher in elevation. Finally, the View shed Analysis described above identifies ridgelines visible from several places within the City. This visibility analysis was used to ensure continuity among ridges throughout the Planning Area. In Figure 4-2, major and minor ridgelines are delineated throughout the southern hills. A thick bar is used to identify major ridgelines, while a thin bar is used to identify minor ridgelines. However, the thickness of these bars is intended for symbolism only; it is not intended to represent the width of ridge protection zones.

Based on the View shed Analysis, the City’s hillside regulations may be modified as needed to balance the City’s goals of maintaining the aesthetic appearance of the surrounding hills, encouraging development of upscale housing, ensuring slope stabilization, providing access for public safety, developing a cohesive infrastructure plan, and implementing a workable traffic and transportation plan.

URBAN EDGES

The Suisun Bay waterfront and marshlands constitute the City’s northern boundary, while rolling, grassy hills define its southern edge. In the General Plan, new residential developments proposed for the southern hills are intended to achieve clustered neighborhoods in small valleys and areas of gentler slopes. Residential densities gradually decrease as one moves further south into the hills.

North of State Route 4, the unincorporated community of Bay Point lies at Pittsburg’s western edge, while south of State Route 4, the City of Antioch shares Pittsburg’s eastern boundary. Major transportation corridors—such as State Route 4 and the BART rail—provide access to the City from
Figure 4-2
Major and Minor Ridgelines
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Source: Dyott & Bhatia
the east and the west. Lower density residential neighborhoods fade into the hills that separate Pittsburg and Bay Point from the City of Concord. The transition between Pittsburg and Antioch is less identifiable—single-family residential subdivisions, neighborhood commercial centers, industrial and business commercial activities, and urban facilities continue from Pittsburg into Antioch.

GOALS: VIEWS, RIDGES, AND EDGES

4-G-1 Retain views of major and minor ridgelines within the southern hills, as designated in Figure 4-2.

4-G-2 Preserve minor ridgelines south of State Route 4 as open space to provide screening for hillside development.

4-G-3 Ensure that new residential development in the southern hills provides adequate transition between urban and open space uses on the City’s edge.

POLICIES: VIEWS, RIDGES, AND EDGES

Views

4-P-1 Require ridge setbacks for all new hillside development. Building pads should be located at least 150 feet away from the crest of a major ridgeline (measured horizontally from the centerline), as designated in Figure 4-3.

Limiting development within the view shed of designated ridgelines will ensure that new development retains significant views of these ridgelines.
SECTION: Major Ridge Setback

PLAN: Major Ridge Setback

Figure 4-3
Ridge Setbacks

Source: Dyett & Bhatia
4-P-2 As part of the development review process, require design review of proposed hillside development. Ensure that:

- Hillside development is clustered in small valleys and behind minor ridgelines, to preserve more prominent views of the southern hills.

- Hillside streets are designed to allow open views by limiting the building of structures or planting of tall trees along the southern edge or terminus of streets.

Many arterial and collector roadways within the City feature views of rolling, grassy hills. Sensitive layout and design of new and redeveloped sites throughout Pittsburg can retain and enhance views of these tremendous natural features.

4-P-3 As part of the development review process, limit building heights and massing where views of the hills from adjacent properties and public spaces could be preserved.

Limiting the height and massing of new structures to retain views of ridgelines over the tops of rooflines will ensure that the City’s hillside identity is preserved. These building standards should then be used to ensure views before development approval.

4-P-4 Develop and implement use of a “Design Review Checklist” for all new hillside development, to ensure that conservation and site layout policies within the General Plan are considered.

Urban Edges

4-P-5 Design and install entry features at the entrances to the City, implemented through the City’s Capital Improvement Program. Use landscaping, signs,
lighting, and other visual features to announce the gateway along regional roadways.

Potential gateway points include, but are not limited to: State Route 4, Railroad Avenue/Kirker Pass Road, Willow Pass Road, proposed West Leland Road extension, Pittsburg-Antioch Highway, and Buchanan Road. Street trees, welcome signs, decorative lighting (similar to Railroad Avenue), banners, archways, and other streetscape design elements can be used in gateway design.

4-P-6 Ensure that developers of new residential projects in the southern hills plant trees and other vegetation along collector and arterial roadways, in order to maintain the sense of “rural” open space at the City’s southern boundary.

Although residential developers should restrict planting of trees and landscaping that will block views of the hills from other areas of the City, or views of Suisun Bay from hillside streets, vegetation along new roadways will contribute to the goal of retaining a sense of open space.

4-P-7 Ensure that design treatment of new development at the City’s southern boundary retains a rural feel by:

- Discouraging the use of solid walls along these edges (fences must be visually permeable; however, discourage use of chain link in front and side yards);

- Using materials and design to promote a rural feeling (for example, wooden or other rustic materials); and

- Encouraging development at the outer edge of the City to face outwards toward the rural landscape (preventing a solid wall of residential back yard fences).
4.2 HILLSIDE DEVELOPMENT

The unique setting of the southern hills—with ridges and rolling topography, rock outcroppings and mature trees, sensitive habitats, and views—provides opportunities for creation of distinctive hillside neighborhoods. General Plan policies are designed to ensure that new hillside development is integrated into the landscape. All hillside development policies in the General Plan apply to land above the 500-foot elevation only.

GOALS: HILLSIDE DEVELOPMENT

For policies and discussion related to views of major and minor ridgelines, see Section 4.1.

4-G-4 Encourage development that preserves unique natural features, such as topography, rock outcroppings, mature trees, creeks, and ridgelines, in the design of hillside neighborhoods.

4-G-5 Encourage a sense of rural character in the design and construction of hillside development, including extensive landscaping, rooftop terraces, sloping rooflines, and use of natural materials.

POLICIES: HILLSIDE DEVELOPMENT

Preservation and Grading

4-P-8 Update the Hillside Planned Development District within the City’s Zoning Ordinance to reflect the hillside development standards and policies set forth within this General Plan.

4-P-9 Encourage new hillside development to preserve unique natural features by mapping all natural features as part of development applications, including landforms, mature tree stands, rock
outcroppings, creek ways, and ridgelines. During development and design review, ensure that site layout is sensitive to such mapped features.

4-P-10 Minimize grading of the hillsides. Amend the City’s Zoning Ordinance to allow density bonuses of 10 percent (maximum) for new hillside development that preserves 40 percent of natural hill contours.

Extensive grading of hillsides has the potential to destroy their irregular character and increase risk of geologic and landslide hazards. Encourage developers to grade only building pads, and to blend the graded area with adjacent hillside properties.

4-P-11 Limit grading of hillside areas over 30 percent slope (see Figure 10-1) to elevations less than 900 feet, foothills, knolls, and ridges not classified as major or minor ridgelines (see Figure 4-2). During review of development plans, ensure that necessary grading respects significant natural features and visually blends with adjacent properties.

4-P-12 Encourage terracing in new hillside development to be designed in small incremental steps. Extensive flat pad areas should be limited.

4-P-13 Revise the City’s development permitting requirements to include erosion control and revegetation programs as part of grading plans for new hillside development.

Where erosion potential exists, hydro-seeding, silt traps, or other engineering solutions may be required. Using revegetation as an erosion control measure also contributes to the aesthetic, natural character of a hillside.

4-P-14 Preserve natural creeks and drainage courses as close as possible to their natural location and appearance.
“Man-made” streams (manufactured drainage courses designed to simulate natural creeks) draining into natural creeks are preferable to concrete channels for ensuring adequate surface drainage in new hillside development.

**Lot Configuration**

4-P-15 Minimize the visual prominence of hillside development by taking advantage of existing site features for screening, such as tree clusters, depressions in topography, setback hillside plateau areas, and other natural features.

4-P-16 Allow flag lots with common driveways within hillside neighborhoods, in order to encourage terracing of buildings while minimizing roadway cut-and-fill (see Figure 4-4).

4-P-17 Encourage clustering of Hillside Low-Density units in the southern hills, with resulting pockets of open space adjacent to major ridgelines and hillside slopes. Allow density bonuses of 10 percent (maximum) for preservation of 60 percent or more of a project’s site area as open space.

Clustering new residential development will retain open space within the southern hills. During design review, encourage open space pockets within the most visible hillside slopes.

4-P-18 Allow flexible (for example, staggered) front and side building setbacks (including zero-lot-line and attached conditions) within clustered hillside residential areas if this allowance will protect an existing slope.
Flexible setback standards allow more creative design of residential sites to preserve natural features and steep slopes (see Figure 4-5).

4-P-19 Encourage lot configuration such that perimeter walls and fences along arterial corridors within the southern hills are not needed.

4-P-20 Discourage lot orientation that fronts onto the cross-slope of street segments on steep grades.

4-P-21 Encourage single-loaded streets parallel to steep slopes, with placement of lots on the uphill side of the street, such that homes front down-slope and allow open vistas from the public street.

4-P-22 Discourage placement of lots that allow the rear of homes to be exposed to lower elevation views.

Building Character

4-P-23 As part of the City’s Hillside Development Standards, encourage architectural design that reflects the undulating forms of the hillside setting, such as “breaking” buildings and rooflines into several smaller components (see Figure 4-6).

Designing new residences to follow topography within hillside areas both creates safer homes (by distributing structural weight across a tiered building pad) and retains view sheds from lower properties (by following the hills’ shape, rather than blocking views with taller rectangular structures).

4-P-24 Building forms should be “stepped” to conform to site topography. Encourage use of rooftop terraces and decks atop lower stories.
Discourage construction of decks elevated on poles over sloped areas; they make buildings seem more massive from downhill lots.

4-P-25 During development review, encourage residential rooflines that are oriented in the same direction as the natural hillside slope.

4-P-26 Reflect the predominant colors and textures within the surrounding landscape in selection of building materials for hillside development. Roof colors should tend toward darker earth tones, so that they are less visible from adjacent or upslope properties.

Preferred building materials include wood siding, exposed wooden structural elements, and natural-colored stucco.

Clustering new residential development will retain open space within the southern hills. During design review, encourage open space pockets within the most visible hillside slopes.

4-P-27 Maximize water conservation, fire resistance, and erosion control in landscape design through use of sturdy, native species. Use irregular planting on graded slopes to achieve a natural appearance.

Street Layout

4-P-28 Encourage developers to align and construct streets along natural grades. Minimize visibility of streets from other areas within the City (see Figure 4-7).

4-P-29 Encourage the construction of split roadways on steep hillsides, where appropriate.
Split roadways allow the integration of natural features, such as mature trees and rock outcroppings, into the street design. Additionally, landscaping is increased and medians can be used to collect drainage flows.

4-P-30 Ensure that all residential developers provide multi-use trails or trailheads connecting to local schools and parks, commercial centers, and regional open spaces.

Because housing will be clustered in hillside areas, the provision of trails through remaining open space areas will provide connections to employment, shopping, and recreation centers within the City’s flatlands.

4-P-31 Provide on-street parking along hillside roads in parking bays where topography allows.

4.3 KEY CORRIDORS

The design of several major transportation corridors within the City has a significant impact on the City’s sense of character. These key corridors—which include Railroad Avenue, Willow Pass Road, Leland Road, and State Route 4—are described below, and design improvements are suggested for each. Design focus is placed on streetscaping, redevelopment opportunities, and views.

RAILROAD AVENUE

Railroad Avenue is the City’s most important arterial corridor. Historically, Railroad Avenue was the City’s major railway corridor, used for transporting coal from the Black Diamond Mines to Suisun Bay’s deep-water ports. As the City matured and Black Diamond Mines was closed, the railway corridor was
transformed into the City’s major north-south roadway axis. The Railroad Avenue corridor also evolved into the City’s destination for commercial activities. South of the Downtown core, Railroad Avenue consists of two distinct sections:

1. **BNSF Railroad Overpass to State Route 4.** North of State Route 4, the east side of Railroad Avenue consists primarily of small, single-family units converted to independent office and commercial uses. The Civic Center, featuring a new steel city hall structure, and City Park, containing several large playing fields, constitute the western side of the corridor. Railroad Avenue then rises over the Southern Pacific railroad tracks and dips under the BNSF railroad tracks. This exchange with the railroad tracks is enhanced with landscaping, a center median, historic streetlamps, and a pedestrian path. It creates the entry into Downtown, the City’s historic commercial core. Downtown design and streetscaping is discussed in detail in Chapter 5: Downtown.

2. **State Route 4 to Buchanan Road.** Railroad Avenue, south of State Route 4, is lined with small offices, commercial centers (strip malls), parking lots, and fast food restaurants. Set in a mix along the corridor, commercial activities include small-scale structures positioned along the street frontage, and larger scale shopping centers set back behind parking areas. At the southern end of the corridor, single and multi-family subdivisions back up to the street with landscaped sound walls. Recent streetscape improvements have provided center medians with street trees, vines and trellises. The City has also installed historic streetlights along Railroad Avenue, lending a sense of history and identity to the important corridor.

A linear park extending along the west side of the corridor from State Route 4 to the Delta De Anza trail contains benches, grassy areas, and large Eucalyptus trees. Underground utilities and wide sidewalks create a peaceful, attractive setting along the heavily-trafficked arterial roadway.
Extend the Railroad Avenue linear park along the west side of the corridor to City Park.

Support and encourage redevelopment of aging commercial properties along Railroad Avenue.

Continue installation and maintenance of street trees and historic streetlights along Railroad Avenue.

Figure 4-8

Design Features along Railroad Ave, BNSF Railroad to State Route 4

Source: Dyett & Bhatia
GOALS AND POLICIES: RAILROAD AVENUE

Goals: Railroad Avenue

4-G-6 Create an attractive, walkable corridor, featuring a variety of land uses, along the City’s major north-south arterial.

4-G-7 Support and encourage redevelopment of aging commercial properties along Railroad Avenue.

Policies: Railroad Avenue, BNSF Railroad Overpass to State Route 4

Figure 4-8 illustrates the proposed urban design features along Railroad Avenue, from the BNSF railroad overpass to State Route 4.

Streetscape

4-P-32 Continue installation and maintenance of street trees, sidewalks, and historic streetlights along Railroad Avenue.

4-P-33 Pursue the extension of the Railroad Avenue linear park north along the west side of the arterial to City Park.

The Railroad Avenue linear park extends north until the roadway narrows at the Railroad Avenue/State Route 4 interchange. Extension of the linear park across the highway would provide residents with an accessible connection to the Civic Center and City Park. However, the City must work with Caltrans on reconstruction of the Railroad Avenue interchange to ensure safe and convenient pedestrian crossing.
Redevelopment Opportunities

4-P-34 Provide incentives (available through Enterprise Zone programs and local programs) for demolition and/or reuse of blighted commercial properties near the Civic Center.

Policies: Railroad Avenue, State Route 4 to Buchanan Road

Figure 4-9 illustrates the proposed urban design features along Railroad Avenue, from State Route 4 to Buchanan Road.

Streetscape and Parking

4-P-35 Create a sense of identity along Railroad Avenue by installing street amenities fabricated from similar materials and styles as existing median trellises.

Existing steel trellises tie into the historical importance of the City’s steel industry. Continuing to install pedestrian furniture, such as benches, trash and recycling receptacles, using steel fabrication would solidify this aspect of the City’s identity.

4-P-36 Ensure that new development and redevelopment projects along Railroad Avenue position new retail and office structures along the sidewalk, with parking tucked behind. Consider developing architectural guidelines for new development or redevelopment along Railroad Avenue.

4-P-37 Ensure that developers plant and maintain a minimum of one tree per six parking spaces within Community Commercial parking lots along Railroad Avenue.
Create a sense of identity along Railroad Avenue by installing street amenities fabricated from similar materials and styles as existing furniture (e.g., blue steel trellis in median).

Improve connections between the street and surrounding properties.

Clean up Contra Costa Canal: plant trees and reduce fencing.

Support and encourage redevelopment of blighted commercial properties along Railroad Avenue.

Improve connections between the street and surrounding properties.

Work with BART to create pedestrian-oriented mixed-use development in the proposed Railroad Avenue BART Station area.

Position new retail and office structures along sidewalk with parking tucked behind. Consider developing architectural guidelines for (re)development.

Ensure that developers plant and maintain at least one tree per six parking spaces within Community Commercial parking lots.

Pursue private investment in redevelopment of Railroad Square, potentially as a community or recreational facility.

Source: Dyett & Bhatia

Figure 4-9
Design Features along Railroad Ave, State Route 4 to Buchanan Road
Several existing parking areas along Railroad Avenue are barren of vegetation. Most residents perceive a higher “quality of life” when green trees cover large paved areas and provide shade.

4-P-38 Develop an entry feature at the intersection of Railroad Avenue/Kirker Pass Road and Nortonville Road to welcome residents and visitors to the City of Pittsburg.

Installation of an entry feature, which may include signage, sculpture, or landscaping, should be timed before or concurrently with construction of new Hillside Low-Density Residential units south of existing development.

Redevelopment Opportunities

4-P-39 Encourage rehabilitation and façade improvement of existing commercial centers along Railroad Avenue to ensure commercial vitality and pedestrian oriented design.

4-P-40 Continue participation with community partners in the Business Improvement District program to fund streetscape improvements, promotion programs, and special events.

Business Improvement District (BID) programs are revitalization strategies using voluntary assessment districts in older commercial areas within the city limits. BIDs address the image of the commercial areas by identifying the areas’ market niche and creating a visual identity unique to the community. Pittsburg’s BID conducts local streetscaping improvements, distributes image brochures, keeps an open dialogue with the news media, and hosts festivals.
4-P-41 Provide incentives to redevelop blighted commercial properties along Railroad Avenue. Encourage developers to provide pedestrian amenities and focus on connections between the street and surrounding properties.

4-P-42 Work with Contra Costa Water District to clean up Contra Costa Canal, including the removal of litter, and reduction and beautification of fencing.

The fencing surrounding Contra Costa Canal at Railroad Avenue is currently an eyesore. Minimizing or replacing existing chain-link with ornamental fencing, and planting vegetation, could provide a much more attractive utility corridor adjacent to the City’s major arterial.

4-P-43 Pursue private investment in the redevelopment of the Railroad Square shopping center. Consider development of a community or recreational facility on this property.

The Railroad Square Shopping Center, near the southern end of the corridor, is a tremendous opportunity for the City. The development of entertainment activities (for example, movie theater, video arcade, laser tag center) within walking distance of several existing residential neighborhoods would support the City’s goal of a pedestrian-oriented arterial corridor.

4-P-44 Work with BART to develop a pedestrian-oriented mixed-use district in the proposed railroad Avenue BART Station Area. See Section 4.4: Mixed-Use Districts, for further discussion of the proposed Railroad Avenue BART Station Area.
WILLOW PASS ROAD

The two distinct sections of Willow Pass Road are identifiable because of a railroad underpass/interchange located at Range Road:

1. **Beacon Street to Range Road.** This stretch of Willow Pass Road contains the PG&E transmission corridor, residential motels, service commercial and industrial uses. Between the PG&E transmission corridor and Range Road, Willow Pass Road is a two-lane rural highway, lacking curbs, gutters, and sidewalks.

2. **Range Road to Bay Point.** At Range Road, Willow Pass Road curves under the BNSF Railroad tracks. Autos must then navigate a poorly-marked, antiquated interchange to reconnect with the second section of Willow Pass Road, which delivers them into the unincorporated community of Bay Point. Willow Pass Road, extending west of Range Road to Bay Point, is a wide expanse of roadway lined with large Eucalyptus trees, industrial facilities, and a landscaped sound wall forming the boundary of a contemporary single-family subdivision.

GOALS AND POLICIES: WILLOW PASS ROAD

**Goals: Willow Pass Road**

4-G-8  Provide more attractive streetscaping along the Willow Pass Road corridor.

4-G-9  Encourage private investment and redevelopment of Willow Pass Road, east of Range Road.

4-G-10 Redesign Willow Pass Road and railroad interchange to provide safer, more desirable pedestrian and bicycle routes.
Initiate a tree planting program along Willow Pass Road.

Extend tree planting program along Range Road north of the railroad overpass.

Install City signage and safety features at the railroad underpass.

Pursue reconstruction of the Willow Pass Rd/Range Rd interchange.

Maintain a rural character west of the Harbor Lights subdivision with two lanes and no sidewalks.

Actively pursue redevelopment of vacant and underutilized parcels along Willow Pass Road with business and service commercial uses.

Narrow Willow Pass Road between Beacon and Range Road to two lanes with a landscaped center median with left-turn pockets.

Encourage industrial uses along Willow Pass Road to plant landscaped screening for large facilities/tanks.

Widen sidewalks along eastern section of the corridor for local residents to walk from Downtown to adjacent neighborhoods and employers.

Source: Dvett & Bhatia

Design Features along Willow Pass Road
Typical Cross Section of Willow Pass Road

* Proposed general street design: actual construction according to City Street Standards
Policies: Willow Pass Road, Beacon Street to Range Road

Figure 4-10 illustrates the urban design features proposed for Willow Pass Road, from Beacon Street to Range Road. Figure 4-11 illustrates a proposed street layout for this arterial roadway.

4-P-45 Narrow the section of Willow Pass between Beacon Street and Range Road to one travel lane in each direction, and construct a landscaped center median with left-turn pockets.

Narrowing the roadway to one lane in each direction and providing a planted median with left-turn pockets would vastly improve the streetscape, while not significantly affecting traffic levels of service. Figure 4-10 is an example of a proposed street layout for Willow Pass Road; actual design should be based on the City’s adopted street standards.

4-P-46 Widen sidewalks along the eastern section of the Willow Pass Road corridor, for use by local residents moving between Downtown, adjacent neighborhoods, and industrial employers.

4-P-47 Maintain a rural feeling along Willow Pass Road west of the entrance to the Harbor Lights subdivision, with two travel lanes and no sidewalks.

4-P-48 Pursue the design and construction of an interchange/overpass at State Route 4 and Range Road. Work with the California Department of Transportation to design an interchange facility that will accommodate future traffic demands.

4-P-49 Initiate a tree-planting program along Willow Pass Road. Use a variety of native and locally-recognized trees with low maintenance needs.
Use of native plant species and locally-recognized non-native species will enhance the City’s overall identity. Additionally, these species should have low watering and maintenance requirements.

4-P-50 Encourage industrial uses along Willow Pass Road to plant landscaped screening for large facilities such as tanks or loading areas.

4-P-51 Actively pursue redevelopment of vacant and underutilized parcels along Willow Pass Road with business and service commercial uses.

Policies: Willow Pass Road, Range Road to Bay Point

4-P-52 Rebuild the interchange/underpass between Willow Pass Road, Range Road, North Parkside Drive, and the BNSF Railroad tracks for safe and efficient movement of auto and bicycle traffic.

4-P-53 Reconstruct the interchange/underpass between Willow Pass Road, Range Road, North Parkside Drive, and the BNSF Railroad tracks to improve accessibility, by installing City signage and safety features (for example, stop or yield signs).

Signage, safety features, and landscaping could make the Willow Pass Road interchange more attractive and less confusing, until the interchange can be rebuilt.

4-P-54 Extend tree planting on Range Road to Willow Pass Road, west of the BNSF Railroad underpass.

LELAND ROAD

Leland Road is an arterial corridor that primarily serves to move residential traffic east-west through the City. It also accommodates spillover east-west traffic from State Route 4 during peak hours. The three sections of Leland Road include:
1. **Century Boulevard to Railroad Avenue.** East Leland Road contains a well landscaped center median and marked bicycle lanes. Land uses include neighborhood commercial activities, multi-family housing complexes, and Los Medanos Community College.

2. **Railroad Avenue to Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station.** West Leland Road is fronted primarily by single-family residential units. Nearer to Railroad Avenue, older single-family homes face the roadway with small gardens and porches. However, most of the single-family homes along the corridor back onto the roadway, with aging wooden fences and concrete walls forming the boundary of the public space. The Stoneman Park, Golf Course, and PG&E right-of-way open spaces break up the residential corridor with extensive landscaping and views of the rolling hills. The Oak Hills shopping center also lies adjacent to the Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station at Bailey Road.

3. **Extension West of Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station.** With approval and construction of the proposed San Marco development project, West Leland Road will be extended west to intersect Willow Pass Road/San Marco Boulevard at State Route 4. The General Plan proposes large multi-unit housing projects, business commercial centers, and a mixed-use commercial node along the West Leland Road extension.

**GOALS AND POLICIES: LELAND ROAD**

**Goals: Leland Road**

4-G-11 Initiate streetscape improvements to create an attractive, usable, multi-modal transportation corridor along Leland Road.

**Policies: Leland Road, Century Boulevard to Railroad Avenue**

4-P-55 Maintain existing landscaping along East Leland Road. Ensure that pedestrian and bicycle circulations are considered during improvements along this corridor.
Policies: Leland Road, Railroad Avenue to Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station

Figure 4-12 illustrates the urban design features proposed for Leland Road, from Railroad Avenue to the Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station. Figure 4-13 illustrates a proposed street layout for this arterial roadway.

Streetscape

4-P-56 Construct a center median along West Leland Road, with trees and landscaping, from Railroad Avenue to the Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station Area, as street right-of-way allows. Provide left-turn pockets for access to residential neighborhoods.

The existing street layout along this stretch of Leland Road could easily accommodate a center median; existing lane markers delineate a wide center strip with left-turn pockets as needed. Figure 4-12 is an example of a proposed street layout for West Leland Road; actual design should be based on the City’s adopted street standards.

4-P-57 Provide marked, on-street bike lanes along Leland Road, west of Crestview Drive.

Bicyclists often use the West Leland Road corridor for transportation between local commercial centers, recreational activities, and residential neighborhoods. A designated bike lane, with signage, would create a safer environment for bicyclists.

4-P-58 For pedestrian safety and comfort, construct and maintain covered bus shelters at transit stops along Leland Road.

Although the provision of street trees will contribute to a better waiting environment for transit riders, covered bus shelters could both heighten visibility of local transit programs and ensure safe and comfortable waiting areas for local residents.
Construct a center median with trees and landscaping, from Railroad Avenue to Pittsburg Bay Point BART Station Area, as street right-of-way allows. Provide left turn pockets for access to residential neighborhoods.

Provide marked on-street bike lanes along Leland Road, west of Stoneman Park.

Construct and maintain covered bus shelters at transit stops along Leland Road.

Source: Dyett & Bhatia
Typical Cross Section of Leland Road

Existing Right-of-Way

Proposed Right-of-Way*

* Proposed general street design: actual construction according to City Street Standards

Figure 4-13

Source Dyett & Bhatia

West Leland Road near Golf Course.
Policies: Leland Road, Extension west of Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station

Figure 4-14 illustrates the urban design features proposed for the section of Leland Road extending west from the Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station.

4-P-59 Pursue the development of a linear parkway along West Leland Road, west of Bailey Road, linking the Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station Area to new residential neighborhoods within the southern hills.

Extensive landscaping and a multi-use (pedestrian and bicycle) path along West Leland Road will encourage greater use of BART by new residents within the southern hills.

4-P-60 Work with private developers in the San Marco project to create a pedestrian oriented mixed-use village along West Leland Road at San Marco Boulevard. Encourage buildings to be designed and oriented toward public spaces.

STATE ROUTE 4

Views of the southern hills from State Route 4 are afforded to east-bound traffic approaching from Concord at the western edge of the Planning Area. Cresting the ridgeline, drivers take in a view of the cityscape, Suisun Bay, and rolling hills. Once travelers have descended the hill into the City’s flatlands, the highway corridor features aging wooden fences and littered shrubs. East of the Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station overpass, new sound walls divide the highway from adjacent residential neighborhoods.

GOALS AND POLICIES: STATE ROUTE 4

Goals: State Route 4

4-G-12 Pursue the beautification of the State Route 4 corridor by improving highway landscaping and retaining significant views.
Pursue the development of a linear parkway along West Leland Road, linking the BART Station Area to new residential neighborhoods within the southern hills.

Work with private developers in the San Marco project to create a pedestrian-oriented mixed use village along West Leland Road at San Marco Boulevard. Ensure that buildings are designed and oriented toward public spaces.

Design Features along Leland Road, Extension west of Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station

Source: Dyett & Bhatia
Policies: State Route 4

Views

4-P-61 Retain views of the southern hills from the State Route 4 corridor, through implementation of ridgeline preservation policies (as described in Section 4.1).

4-P-62 Support local utility providers—such as PG&E—in the undergrounding of utility wires.

Views of the southern hills are interrupted by numerous utility wires crossings over State Route 4. The undergrounding of local utility wires would help reduce this distraction and create a more attractive, identifiable view of Pittsburg.

Streetscape

4-P-63 During development review, ensure that all development adjacent to State Route 4 provides landscaping along new sound walls. Encourage existing residential areas to improve landscaping along existing fenced areas.

4-P-64 Work with the California Department of Transportation to implement a uniform landscape theme along the State Route 4 corridor throughout the Planning Area.

Potential landscaping includes limiting highway planting to select native trees or identifiable non-native species.

4-P-65 Work with the California Department of Transportation to incorporate landscaping and signage and to improve views and access to the Pittsburg Civic Center and other destination points—such as the Suisun Bay waterfront—from State Route 4.
Revise the City’s sign regulations to allow larger freestanding signs along State Route 4 to identify regional commercial uses. Ensure that such signs are coordinated in design and limited in number.

### 4.4 MIXED-USE AREAS

A mixed-use area provides for an integrated mix of land uses within a distinct area, including retail, office, service, higher density residential, recreation, and/or transit uses. This General Plan proposes several mixed-use areas throughout the City: the Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station Area; the proposed Railroad Avenue BART Station Area; and the proposed San Marco Village. Although the City’s Downtown will also be redeveloped into a walkable mixed-use commercial core, it is discussed within Chapter 5: Downtown.

#### BART STATION AREAS

**Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station Area**

The Pittsburg-Bay Point BART Station presents a unique opportunity to develop high density housing, commercial, and office uses within walking distance of commuter rail. The location of the BART Station along State Route 4 provides planning opportunities found in few locations within the Bay Area. This is an ideal location for intensive uses, both in the Specific Plan Area and surrounding areas. The Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station Area Specific Plan encompasses approximately 295 acres immediately adjacent to and along major access routes to the BART Station. It includes portions of West Leland, Bailey, and Willow Pass Roads. Existing land uses in the Specific Plan area include multi-family residential neighborhoods, a mobile home community, industrial activities, retail commercial uses, vacant properties, and Ambrose Park. Land Use objectives of the Specific Plan include: encouraging mixed-use transit-oriented developments; increasing residential densities; enhancing security at the BART Station; enhancing visibility and usability of Ambrose Park; minimizing travel for work and shopping trips; and encouraging new commercial development.
**Railroad Avenue BART Station Area**

The General Plan proposes extension of BART to a new station at Railroad Avenue, east of the existing terminus at Bailey Road. However, the City is not certain as to whether BART will be extended within the General Plan timeframe, and if so, how the station will be configured. It is probable that the station configuration would be similar to that of the Pittsburg/Bay Point Station (that is, middle of the highway).

The proposed Railroad Avenue BART Station facilities (such as ticket vending machines and parking) are to be located on the southeast corner of the Railroad Avenue/State Route 4 interchange. Existing land uses include aging warehouse and light industrial structures. Proposed redevelopment activities include intensification of business commercial and office uses, development of support retail and restaurant activities, and construction of pedestrian and transit-oriented amenities. Redevelopment of the proposed BART Station Area could utilize Enterprise Zone incentives available through both State and local programs (see Chapter 6: Economic Development).

**SAN MARCO VILLAGE**

Designated along the West Leland corridor, this mixed-use core is intended to be a small, pedestrian-oriented, neighborhood commercial center. The currently approved San Marco tract map allows a limited number of residential units within the area. However, should the development plan be amended or reviewed further for inclusion of a business and/or community commercial center (as designated in the General Plan Land Use Diagram), the City should work with project proponents to ensure construction of a walkable, mixed-use commercial village.

*This panorama from the current terminus of West Leland Road (just west of BART Station) shows the backdrop of the San Marco Village.*
GOALS: MIXED-USE AREAS

4-G-13 Encourage development of pedestrian-oriented mixed-use areas as focal points of new neighborhoods, and adjacent to key transportation centers.

4-G-14 Provide permitting and incentives (such as density increases) to encourage private (re)development of viable mixed-use structures.

4-G-15 Ensure the provision of public transit and pedestrian amenities within the City’s mixed-use areas.

4-G-16 Establish the City’s BART Stations as regional focal points, surrounded by a mix of urban activities and services.

POLICIES: MIXED-USE AREAS

Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station Area

4-P-67 Develop land uses in the BART Station Area according to the Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station Area Specific Plan.

4-P-68 Pursue the development of a Transit Plaza, in cooperation with Contra Costa County, BART, Tri-Delta, and County Connection, adjacent to the BART Station. Such a Transit Plaza would link rapid transit, bus service, and park & ride lots within a walkable, mixed-use village.

4-P-69 Encourage all new development within the BART Station Area to focus building design, massing, and landscaping toward the pedestrian.
**Railroad Avenue BART Station Area**

4-P-70 Upon finalization of plans to extend BART to Railroad Avenue, develop a mixed use, transit-oriented center surrounding the proposed station. Focus redevelopment on higher-end business/office uses, with support retail, restaurant, and residential activities.

4-P-71 Upon finalization of plans to extend BART to Railroad Avenue, work with BART to develop a Railroad Avenue BART Station Area Specific Plan that addresses:

- Mixed-use structures;
- Building design that focuses on street-orientation;
- Extensive landscaping and street trees;
- Pedestrian furniture (for example, benches and trash cans);
- Street lighting; and
- Signage.

4-P-72 Encourage reuse and redevelopment of the aging industrial/warehouse structures currently located within the proposed Railroad Avenue BART Station Area, between Garcia Avenue and State Route 4. Amend the City’s Zoning Ordinance to allow commercial intensities of up to 2.5 FAR.

Reuse and redevelopment projects in the proposed BART Station Area should focus on providing a safe, attractive, and viable mix of commercial and residential activities within an environment geared toward use of alternative transportation modes (i.e., walking, bicycling, transit). Encourage redevelopment using the State and local incentives available through the Enterprise Zone program.

4-P-73 Ensure that all new business commercial employers provide safe and convenient pedestrian and bicycle connections to adjacent neighborhoods, the proposed BART Station, Delta De Anza Trail,
Railroad Avenue Linear Park, and employment and activity centers.

Clear, convenient linkages between the proposed BART Station area and the multi-use paths of Delta De Anza Trail and Railroad Avenue Linear Park would provide accessible transportation alternatives for local residents.

San Marco Village

4-P-74 Develop a mixed-use village at the intersection of West Leland Road and the proposed San Marco Boulevard.

The Community Commercial designation along West Leland Road is intended for the development of a pedestrian and transit-oriented commercial district, featuring a mix of retail, service, restaurant, office, and residential uses. This mixed-use district should be designed at a human-scale, with buildings facing the street and encouraging pedestrian traffic (for example, display windows and sidewalk cafés).

4-P-75 Encourage West Leland Road to be designed as a pedestrian-friendly street, with wide sidewalks, small plazas and benches, signaled crosswalks, pedestrian scale building massing, and parking tucked behind the buildings.

4-P-76 Pursue the development of a linear parkway along West Leland Road, connecting the Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station Area to San Marco Village.

This linear parkway, originally intended to link the BART Station Area with residential neighborhoods in San Marco, would also provide a walk able connection between the City’s western activity centers (BART Station Area and San Marco Village). This linear parkway will also enable residents of the multi-family housing along
West Leland Road to access both activity centers without the use of a car.

4-P-77 Encourage commercial and high-density residential developers to work together to provide convenient pedestrian paths and access points between San Marco Village and the High-Density residential neighborhoods to the west.

4-P-78 Allow a mix of retail and service commercial uses in ground floor spaces, and office and high-density residential uses on upper floors.

4-P-79 Provide pedestrian and transit amenities, such as bike racks, benches, signalized crosswalks, and bus shelters, within the Village setting.

4.5 NEIGHBORHOOD DESIGN

NEIGHBORHOOD FORM ANALYSIS

An evaluation of the urban form characteristics of various neighborhoods reveals the changes that took place during Pittsburg’s residential development history. This analysis gives the City an opportunity to assess its diverse neighborhood patterns. The City can then determine the types of urban form it may wish to encourage as Pittsburg continues to grow and evolve.

- **Central Addition.** This neighborhood, bordered by Solari Street to the west and East Fourteenth Street to the south, is intimately connected with Downtown. Like the Downtown neighborhoods, residential construction in Central Addition was complete by 1928. Single-family homes are the dominant housing type.

- **Pittsburg Heights.** The Pittsburg Heights neighborhood is located just west of Railroad Avenue. Originally a military housing project, the neighborhood was redeveloped in 1948. Pittsburg Heights is surrounded
by newer residential developments, and is bounded to the east by commercial establishments.

- **Buchanan.** This neighborhood forms the southeastern corner of Pittsburg in the Buchanan subarea. It is bounded to the south and east by undeveloped hills, and to the north and west by other residential neighborhoods. The neighborhood was developed during the construction boom that occurred between 1955 and 1975.

- **Oak Hills.** The Southwest Hills subarea contains Oak Hills, one of the most recent residential developments in the City. A post-1988 development, this single-family neighborhood is only partially complete. It has the advantage of being located southwest of the Pittsburg/Bay Point BART station and the Oak Hills Shopping Center.

**Comparative Evaluation**

Each study area was evaluated according to six components that contribute to the overall form and character of the neighborhood: number of intersections; number of through streets; number of access points; area of streets; average block size (in acres); and typical housing density. The results of the analysis, discussed below, are presented in Figure 4-15.

- **Overall Development Pattern.** The four neighborhoods analyzed represent residential development spanning most of this century. Central Addition’s development pattern is typical of pre-World War II neighborhoods, with a gridded street pattern and densities that are high for single-family neighborhoods in Pittsburg. Pittsburg Heights represents housing construction that occurred immediately after the War, with a warped grid, lower density, and fewer through-streets than Central Addition. The transformation of the grid to a suburban style is complete in Buchanan, which is characterized by curving streets and cul-de-sacs. This trend is continued in Oak Hills, one of the City’s most recent developments.
Figure 4-15
Neighborhood Form Analysis

100-acre Analysis Unit
(2,087 ft x 2,087 ft)

Intersections

Through Streets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Intersections (Intersections counted at 0.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dyett & Bhatia
• **Intersections.** The number of intersections is a good indication of a neighborhood’s internal level of accessibility. A higher number of intersections translates to greater availability of options for travel within the neighborhood. Both Central Addition and Pittsburg Heights have a greater number of intersections than the two more recent neighborhoods. Pittsburg Heights has the highest number of intersections at 20.5 (with T-intersections counting as 0.5 intersections). Intersection frequency steadily decreases from that point, with Oak Hills at a low of 8.

• **Through-Streets.** Through-streets provide accessibility by traversing the length of a neighborhood, connecting it with other parts of the City. The number of through-streets within a residential area is an indication of the ease with which one can travel to and from the neighborhood. Through-streets are not very frequent in any of the neighborhoods, though Central Addition with four through-streets has the greatest level of connectivity with adjacent areas. The number of through-streets generally decreases in recent, more introverted developments. While Oak Hills, the most recent of the neighborhoods analyzed, has one more through-street than Buchanan, this street does not pass through the length of the neighborhood. Rather, it forms a loop, with both ends terminating at West Leland Road.

• **Access Points.** The number of access points—or streets entering a study area that connect with at least one other street—also represents a neighborhood’s level of connectivity. Pittsburg Heights has the greatest number of access points. However, it is possible to have a large number of access points in an inward-looking development if it is composed of short streets ending in The intersections. This is the case with Buchanan—though it is an introverted neighborhood with only one through street and many cul-de-sacs, it nonetheless has the second highest number of access points (with 16).
Area of Streets. Streets comprise between 25 and 28 percent of total land area in Central Addition, Pittsburg Heights, and Buchanan. Thus, despite the lower accessibility, Buchanan’s layout does not provide more developable land area than traditional neighborhoods. With streets comprising only 17 percent of land area, Oak Hills has the largest amount of usable land, though at the expense of greater accessibility.

Average Block Size. Average block size is an indicator of the scale of development. In Pittsburg, blocks in older neighborhoods such as Central Addition and Pittsburg Heights average 3 acres, while more recent residential areas have larger blocks averaging 7 acres. This is consistent with analyses of other components of neighborhood form, which reveal a greater degree of accessibility in older neighborhoods because of more intersections and through streets.

Density. Residential densities (defined here as housing units per net acre) in the four study areas do not vary significantly, ranging between six and ten units per net acre. However, density variations do exist elsewhere within the City. For example, the Central Addition neighborhood, with mostly detached housing units, has densities that are 65 percent higher than those achieved in recent attached developments such as Bay Harbor Park.

GOALS: NEIGHBORHOOD DESIGN

4-G-17 Encourage development of diverse and distinctive neighborhoods that build on the patterns of the natural landscape and provide a sense of connection with surrounding uses.

4-G-18 Ensure that neighborhood streets provide safe and attractive connections to local schools, parks, commercial centers, and transit facilities for pedestrians and bicycles.
POLICIES: NEIGHBORHOOD DESIGN

4-P-80 Any subdivision involving more than four units, regardless of the number of parcels shall be subject to design review. Prepare a design standards checklist and/or residential design guidelines for use during review of development projects.

Housing Layout

4-P-81 Encourage neighborhood design—including components such as land use, development intensity, and street layout—to be responsive to natural and institutional elements, including:

- **Creeks.** Ensure protection of riparian corridors through building setbacks. Ensure adequate pedestrian access to creeks, and provide connections from local trails and sidewalks. Integrate parks and open space areas with creeks.

- **Urban Edges.** Ensure feathering from urban to rural intensities at City boundaries.

- **Adjacent Uses.** Promote connections with surrounding land uses by integrating street networks and visual/architectural treatments.

4-P-82 Develop and implement development standards in the City’s Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations that minimize the visual dominance of garages in residential units.

Potential strategies that can be considered as part of the City’s design standards include:

- Limiting the front width of a single-family house that can be occupied by a garage to less than one-half of the building width;
• Encouraging the location of garages towards the back of properties;

• Encouraging garages to be setback from the front edge of the house, and allowing for reductions in front yard setbacks;

• Orienting garage doors 90 degrees from the street; and

• Incorporating design elements on the second level above garages (such as bay windows or balconies) to break down the scale of the garage.

**Street Design and Connectivity**

4-P-83 Ensure that new developments provide an integrated pattern of streets and pedestrian paths that provide connections between neighborhoods. As part of the City’s Subdivision Regulations, establish street connectivity requirements.

New residential streets, particularly those adjacent to existing neighborhoods, should provide street and pedestrian connections to adjacent areas to enable more efficient movement throughout the City. Single-access neighborhoods should be avoided.

4-P-84 Use traffic calming measures to reduce speeds in residential areas, rather than limiting through-street connections.

Traffic calming measures include:

• Narrowing travel lanes and allowing on-street parking;

• Using different materials at pedestrian crosswalks;

• Planting street trees and other vegetation;
• Building corner bulb-outs and intersection round-abouts; and

• Installing stop and/or yield signage.

4-P-85 Provide safe and comfortable pedestrian routes through local neighborhoods by requiring sidewalks on both sides of residential streets, except in hillside areas, by planting street trees adjacent to the curb, and by minimizing curb cuts.
5 DOWNTOWN

This element describes the development strategy for the City’s Downtown, and provides policy framework for streetscape design, waterfront access, historical resources, and off-street parking.

Downtown Pittsburg, as identified in the General Plan, extends from the Burlington Northern and Santa Fe (BNSF) railroad tracks in the south to the Sacramento River Delta waterfront in the north. The eastern and western boundaries of Downtown, generally defined by Harbor and Beacon streets, are less distinctive. Downtown stretches about ¾-mile in either direction from Railroad Avenue, encompassing an area of approximately 350 acres. Streets, utilities, railroads, waterways, and other rights-of-way account for 104 acres, or about 30 percent of the total land area.
5.1 HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Originally a way-station during the Gold Rush, Pittsburg supported mining and manufacturing industries between the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The City’s Downtown developed at the juncture of the Suisun Bay waterfront and rail tracks (now Railroad Avenue) that were used to transfer coal from Black Diamond Mines to the Bay for shipping. Connection to the water continued to be an important aspect of Downtown following the decline in mining, when fishing emerged as the City’s industry and canneries flourished in the area. Downtown also provided services to soldiers during World War II, when the City developed a war-based economy, with as many as 45,000 soldiers stationed at Camp Stoneman. Downtown Pittsburg also served as the major retail node in Contra Costa County in the 1940’s and early 1950’s.

The departure of soldiers following the Korean War marked the beginning of Downtown’s decline. Construction of State Route 4 reduced accessibility from the eastern parts of the City to Downtown, and new regional and neighborhood shopping centers emerged throughout East County. The effort for Downtown revitalization continues to this day, although some sites remain vacant or unoccupied.

A DOWNTOWN IN TRANSITION

Historic preservation, redevelopment efforts, and construction of new residential units are improving the City’s Downtown, though vacant buildings and underutilized sites still remain. Downtown’s “transition” started with the replacement of the old cannery buildings with small-craft marinas and several new housing projects. Housing redevelopment has since included Marina Heights Apartments in the 1970s, Bay Harbor Park (townhomes) and Marina Park (single-family and townhomes) in the 1980s, and Village at New York Landing (single-family) in the 1990s. Recent revitalization efforts include facade improvements to many buildings in New York Landing Historical District (see Section 5.3), and street improvements to Herb White Way. The completion of Marina Walk residential subdivision, a pedestrian-oriented single-family development adjacent to the commercial core, will increase Downtown’s population and support for a thriving commercial center.
As of 2000, current and proposed activities include the construction of a linear park along a former portion of the Sacramento Northern Railroad tracks adjacent to Eighth Street, and renovation of historic buildings in the core commercial area. Habitat for Humanity, a non-profit housing organization, is working to provide infill housing in Downtown through the development of several affordable projects. Some live-work loft conversions have also taken place, and façade improvements to buildings such as the old California Theater have also been completed.

**ASSETS AND CHALLENGES**

Pittsburg lays claim to having one of the oldest Downtowns in Contra Costa County, and one of the few Downtowns with shoreline access. Downtown Pittsburg has many vital physical assets, including:

- Waterfront location, adjacent to Brown’s Island Regional Shoreline Preserve;
- Mix of commercial, office, and residential uses;
- Historical character, many buildings with ornate architectural features;
- Pedestrian-scale in building design, wide sidewalks, and small plazas; and
- Traditional urban street pattern, with parking tucked behind the buildings.

Thus, from a physical vantage, Downtown already possesses a structure that could help realize a vital, mixed-use, and walkable center. In addition, Downtown’s waterfront location can potentially provide a unique ambiance. However, major challenges remain:

- Several sites in Downtown are vacant, and many buildings are unoccupied and in need of exterior modifications;
- A critical mass of activity (diverse retail, service and entertainment uses within a small core area) is needed to draw new businesses and residents seeking an urban lifestyle;
- There are few physical and visual connections to the water, with residential and industrial uses dominating shoreline areas ideal for commercial uses and public access; and
• Housing, population, and employment estimates are low for a district intended to serve as the City’s historic and symbolic core.

Downtown revitalization is an issue of citywide importance. A vital Downtown can provide identity and a sense of place for all of Pittsburg.

5.2 DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

This element envisions Downtown as a mixed-use center, with specialty retail, restaurants, service uses, and professional offices integrated with residential uses. Downtown Pittsburg should serve as both a visitor destination and a neighborhood commercial center. Economic development that attracts heavy pedestrian activity—such as gift stores, clothing boutiques, restaurants and cafes, galleries, professional offices, personal services, bookstores and coffee shops—is encouraged.

Downtown’s unique characteristics—historic buildings, marina, and open space improvements—can make it a destination point, but it must be sustained by a critical mass of vital activity. Its waterfront location and marine recreation opportunities can draw visitors from the region, while Downtown’s commercial storefronts can provide them with supplies, eating establishments, and activities for a day away from home.

A mixed-use neighborhood center should provide businesses, institutions, and services meeting the daily needs of nearby residents, including convenience-oriented retail establishments (for example, grocery and drug stores) and neighborhood service uses (for example, video stores, dry cleaners, and professional services).

DOWNTOWN SUB-AREAS

The General Plan identifies five planning sub-areas within the Downtown. Each sub-area has its own set of land use strategies and development policies.

• Commercial Core.  Bound by Third Street, Cumberland Street, Tenth Street, and Black Diamond Street, this area is the historical activity center of the City. The Commercial Core area is intended to be a walkable, mixed-use district. Therefore, drive-thru restaurants, auto repair shops, and other car-oriented uses would not be appropriate. Additionally, heavy industrial uses would detract from the friendly, pedestrian-focused identity preferred for the Downtown.
• **East Tenth Street Corridor.** Extending along East Tenth Street from Railroad Avenue to Harbor Street, north to Eighth Street, this area serves as the Downtown’s service commercial node. Service, repair, and large retail (for example, furniture stores or contractors’ supplies) commercial activities are anticipated.

• **Marine Commercial Center.** Comprised of several large parcels at the terminus of Harbor Street, this area is designated for a marine/waterfront commercial village. The proposed village may feature marine-oriented repair and sales, restaurants, professional offices, industrial incubators (such as research and development), and specialty retail activities.

• **Marina/Waterfront Neighborhoods.** A majority of the residential neighborhoods north of Eighth Street have been redeveloped within the last several years, and provide a vibrant population to support retail activity within Downtown.

• **West Tenth Street Neighborhoods.** The aging residential neighborhoods south of West Eighth Street (between Railroad Avenue and Beacon Street) are proposed for redevelopment and rehabilitation to provide a more dense housing stock within the walkable Downtown area.

Figure 5-1 illustrates the planning sub-areas and land use distribution envisioned in this Plan. The uses described in Table 5-1 are representational of the types of uses to be allowed by the Zoning Ordinance; the use categories are based on North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) Listings, published in 1998. Suggested development standards—which include residential densities, Floor Area Ratios (FARs), maximum building heights, and setback requirements—for sub-areas within Downtown Pittsburg are shown in Table 5-2.
Figure 5-1
Downtown Sub-areas & Land uses

Source: Dyett & Bhatia
DOWNTOWN BUILDOUT

Buildout of General Plan land use designations would result in a total of 2,640 housing units in the Downtown area. The estimated Downtown population at General Plan buildout is 7,776, an increase of more than 45% over its population in the year 2000. Redevelopment, reuse, and intensification of the southwestern portion of Downtown will contribute to the increased population base within Downtown neighborhoods. Mixed-use residential development adjacent to commercial and office uses in the core will contribute additional housing units and population. The buildout of commercial uses, particularly the development of a Marine Commercial center, will result in approximately 8,488 jobs within the Downtown core. Table 5-3 shows population and employment estimates for the Downtown.

Table 5-1
Downtown at General Plan Buildout, City of Pittsburg (excluding 'Mixed Use' designated areas)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Assumed Density (du/ac)</th>
<th>Dwelling Units @ Buildout</th>
<th>Assumed Housing Size</th>
<th>Population @ Buildout</th>
<th>Assumed Intensity (FAR)</th>
<th>Building Area @ Buildout</th>
<th>Building Empl (per acre)</th>
<th>Empl @ Buildout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Low Density</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1,314</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Medium Density</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2,064</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>6,395</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown High Density</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1,042</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Commercial</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>198,634</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Commercial</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>574,992</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Commercial</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>114,998</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, Public, and Utility</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>304.4</td>
<td>2,892</td>
<td>8,952</td>
<td>888,624</td>
<td>6,224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Building area is based off of net acreage which is 20% less than the gross acreage presented in the table above.
ENTERPRISE ZONE OPPORTUNITIES

Identified as both an Economic Opportunity area within this General Plan and an Enterprise Zone by the State of California, the Downtown core has tremendous opportunity for redevelopment. The State’s Enterprise Zone Program targets “economically distressed areas,” providing incentives to encourage business investment and promote the creation of new jobs through State tax credits. Local incentives include fast-track permitting, fee waivers or reductions, on-the-job training, and business start-up loans.

The 1,400-acre Enterprise Zone in Pittsburg not only includes the Downtown core and the new Marine Commercial center, but also includes East Tenth Street and the commercial and industrial areas between State Route 4 and East Leland Road. (For further discussion and mapping of Pittsburg’s Enterprise Zone, see Chapter 6: Economic Development.) The inclusion of the Downtown commercial core and Marine Commercial center within this Enterprise Zone will provide further impetus for businesses and developers to rehabilitate structures within the City’s historic center. However, it must be noted that the redesignation of any commercial or industrial properties to residential uses within the Enterprise Zone would fail to take advantage of program incentives.

GOALS: DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

5-G-1 Promote Downtown as the City’s symbolic center, with a mix of residential and commercial uses in a walkable, pedestrian-oriented district.

5-G-2 Promote the development and intensification of the Downtown commercial core as both a visitor destination and a neighborhood retail center. Encourage a critical mass of visitor-oriented retail businesses, such as gift shops and galleries, as well as neighborhood retail and personal services.

5-G-3 Encourage a variety of land uses and mixed-use developments at appropriate locations within the Downtown.

5-G-4 Establish a Downtown population goal of at least 7,000 to provide vitality and support a vibrant neighborhood commercial center.
POLICIES: DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

5-P-1 Emphasize Downtown as Pittsburg’s historic center, providing an identity and a sense of place for the entire city by establishing a focused revitalization strategy that integrates the initiatives of the Economic Development Strategy.

A revitalization strategy for Downtown should incorporate the relevant initiatives proposed by the Economic Development Strategy, including:

- Monitoring of land use and development trends in Downtown to ensure a sufficient supply of land of appropriate designation and development intensity;
- Establishment of a retail and consumer services strategy to attract retail and service sector business to key locations in Downtown;
- Establishment of criteria for land assembly in Downtown for the purposes of redevelopment and revitalization;
- Consideration of the feasibility of a convention or performing arts center, amphitheater, or other public cultural amenity in or linked to the Downtown;
- Facilitation of additional attractions and events that bring both residents and visitors to the Downtown; and
- Preservation and enhancement of historic structures contributing to the unique character of the Downtown.

5-P-2 Ensure coordination between the Pittsburg Redevelopment Agency, Planning and Building, Engineering, and Economic Development Departments in order to achieve the goals and policies envisioned for Downtown.
The following policies apply to the five Downtown sub-areas, as designated:

**Commercial Core**

5-P-3  *Concentrate Downtown Commercial activity—which includes specialty retail, professional offices, personal services, entertainment and other uses along the Railroad Avenue corridor.*

The concentration of retail and service commercial uses within the Downtown, including visitor-serving and neighborhood commercial establishments, along Railroad Avenue would provide an identifiable corridor for redevelopment investment. The inclusion of the Commercial Core as an Economic Opportunity Area (see Chapter 6: Economic Development) further strengthens its identity as an up-and-coming investment area.

5-P-4  *Encourage mixed-use developments within the Commercial Core by providing incentives for residential units, such as live-work spaces or housing on upper stories.*

The development of housing adjacent to commercial and office uses will increase the level of round-the-clock activity within the Downtown core. The General Plan provides incentives for residential development by reserving at least half of the floor area ratio (FAR) in the Commercial Core for residential uses.

5-P-5  *Pursue the development and promotion of cultural activities and facilities, such as museums, meeting halls, community theatres, public art galleries and shows, located within the Commercial Core.*
Increased cultural activities, such as City festivals, will contribute to a vibrant Downtown that serves as a multi-purpose destination point for residents and visitors.

**Encourage property-owners in the Commercial Core to utilize ground-level storefronts for retail and pedestrian-oriented commercial activities (for example, restaurants, boutiques, and personal services).**

**East Tenth Street Corridor**

**Limit commercial uses along the southern side of East Tenth Street to Service Commercial businesses – including repair and maintenance, retail sales, special trade contracting and other uses.**

East Tenth Street has historically been developed with service commercial uses. With its location backing onto the BNSF Railway corridor, East Tenth Street remains an effective place for the continuance of such uses.

**Permit mixed-use projects with service commercial uses on street frontage along the northern side of East Tenth, to provide a transition to Downtown residential areas.**

Mixed-use development—service commercial, office and residential—provides a transition area between the heavy service uses to the south and residential neighborhoods to the north.

**Pursue the development of a community/public use in the large vacant lot facing East Tenth, adjacent to the brick Adventist Church.**

**Discourage the establishment of religious centers within 1,000 feet of one another.**

**Improve streetscaping along East Tenth Street with a landscaped median, wide sidewalks, pedestrian amenities (for example, benches and trash/recycling receptacles), and street trees.**
Marine Commercial Center

5-P-12 Undertake active efforts, including land acquisition and assembly, to develop a waterfront activity center at the terminus of Harbor Street, featuring a cluster of Marine Commercial uses, including specialty retail, services, restaurants, marine repair and docking facilities, hotels and other uses.

5-P-13 Develop a detailed design plan for the City’s new Marine Commercial center, featuring:

- Mixed-use village atmosphere;
- Walkable layout, with pedestrian amenities;
- Public access to the shoreline and views of Browns Island; and
- Focus on visitor attractions, as well as traditional marine services.

The planned development of the City’s new Marine Commercial center will ensure the cohesive design of a pedestrian-oriented commercial village. Additionally, it will allow the City to work with property-owners in the joint-planning of public open space and waterfront access areas.

5-P-14 Acquire land at the terminus of Harbor Street for the development of a public park and promenade, providing access to the waterfront and open space at the center of the new Marine Commercial center.

5-P-15 Encourage redevelopment of the Johns Manville property (designated Marine Commercial). Allow existing Industrial uses to operate until redevelopment occurs (including rebuild, if damaged or destroyed).

The Johns Manville site is currently used and valued as a heavy industrial activity directly adjacent to Downtown. Future redevelopment activities within Downtown and construction of a Marine Commercial Center directly across Third Street may create land use conflicts.
Marina/Waterfront Neighborhoods

5-P-16 Support the continued maintenance of redeveloped neighborhoods within Downtown.

Recently redeveloped neighborhoods in the Downtown are a sign of reinvestment within the core area. These neighborhoods must be maintained to ensure continued redevelopment in surrounding areas.

5-P-17 Pursue the dedication of public open space during the redevelopment of infill sites within the Downtown, particularly adjacent to the waterfront area.

The provision of numerous open space areas within the Downtown would promote it as a destination for day-trips, featuring such activities as shopping and picnicking along the waterfront.

West Tenth Street Neighborhoods

5-P-18 Encourage public acquisition and/or private assembly of neighborhood blocks surrounding West Tenth Street for redevelopment to higher density housing, including rebuilding of the existing affordable housing stock.

Although the older residential areas south of Eighth Street provide denser housing within the historic grid street pattern, the condition of housing and infrastructure in these neighborhoods is generally poor. The provision of high-density housing would both redevelop the aging neighborhood and offer expanded housing opportunities.

5-P-19 Encourage high-density residential development in Downtown neighborhoods, according to the density standards in Table 5-1. Ensure that the development program for the West Tenth Street Neighborhoods provides for at least 755 housing units, which is the minimum total of units that can be built under densities designated by this General Plan.

Recently constructed residential neighborhoods in the Downtown area have

Like other Marina/Waterfront Neighborhoods, the Marina Park subdivision in Downtown provides residents with private waterfront views.
lower densities and introverted street networks. Higher-density housing within the Downtown will contribute to a larger population base and active Downtown streetscape.

**5-P-20** Encourage the development of small-lot single family (SLSF) parcels in Medium Density areas of the West Tenth Street Neighborhoods and Downtown Core. Provide flexible SLSF development standards in the City’s Zoning Ordinance.

Construction of SLSF units provides single-family detached homes at affordable housing costs. Reduction of land costs in zero lot-line and small-lot development can provide reasonably-priced housing units with enough rooms for large families.

**5-P-21** Pursue acquisition and development of a new park site, as designated in Figure 5-1. Provide a variety of recreational facilities to serve residents of surrounding neighborhoods.

**5-P-22** During development review, ensure that transitional buffer areas—such as landscaped berms, parking lots, and storage areas—are placed between new residential units and the BNSF railroad tracks along the southern edge of the West Tenth Street Neighborhoods.

**5-P-23** Limit multi-family development in the West Tenth Street neighborhoods to sites more than two acres, and/or sites which encompass all High Density designated land in a given City block. Require all new multi-family residential projects to have a minimum of 20 units, unless the High Density designated land in a given City block is not adequate in size to support that number of units, or unless the City determines that less units, sized to accommodate large family households, better serves the public interest. In such cases, there shall be no less than 16 units within a project.

For new multi-family residential projects intended to replace existing units, the developer should acquire enough adjacent parcels to fulfill the minimum 30-unit requirement, at a density that is appropriate for the specific location and land use designation.
5-P-24 Improve streetscaping along West Tenth Street with a landscaped median, wide sidewalks, pedestrian amenities (for example, benches and trash/recycling receptacles), and street trees.

5.3 DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT

Downtown occupies a prominent waterfront location in the City, with good access from the surrounding neighborhoods and State Route 4. It has a well-defined street grid with a clear circulation pattern. Buildings front both Railroad Avenue and East Tenth Street, and a diversity of architectural styles are represented. Downtown is also undergoing transition and change. Façade renovations have been completed on many of the historic buildings, and residential development is being constructed.

Downtown’s urban design quality is affected by several components, including landmarks and views, streetscape, building massing and design, linkages and barriers, and historical resources. The following sections discuss each component as it relates to Downtown’s physical character.

LANDMARKS AND VIEWS

Possibly the most noticeable landmark signaling one’s arrival in Pittsburg is neither within Downtown nor City proper, but in the unincorporated area west of Downtown. The power plant built by PG&E in the mid-1950’s (now owned by Mirant), with its 450-foot tall smokestacks, is located on the bank of the Suisun Bay near Riverview Park. From State Route 4, the northerly view of the City is dominated by the structure as it rises above the horizon. The power plant is a highly visible backdrop to Downtown, and can be seen from many locations throughout the City.

Railroad Avenue offers views on either end of the street, though a slight offset at Fifth Street interrupts the visual continuity. Visible from below the curve are the open hills to the south. An art deco building and Steel Worker statue to the north of the bend give it the appearance of being the northern terminus. North of the offset, however, another statue (Fisherman) lies at the real terminus of Railroad Avenue at
Third Street. The waterfront lies just beyond the end of Railroad Avenue, and the public plaza where the Fisherman statue stands invites the possibility of redesign and expansion to allow direct access to the shoreline.

**STREETSCAPE**

Although Downtown Pittsburg was developed in a traditional grid street network, several recent residential developments have replaced the grid with introverted, curvilinear neighborhood systems. Street trees and landscaping are generally sparse in Downtown, except on certain blocks of Railroad Avenue and in Bay Harbor Park, located north of Third Street. Buildings in the Commercial Core vary between one and two stories in height. Older housing units consist of one-story bungalows and some multi-family dwellings, while more recent developments are generally two-story single-family structures and townhouses.

A number of small plazas are scattered throughout the commercial core. They are similar in design, and contain bronze statues or sculptures representing various aspects of the City’s history. These plazas are located at:

- Heritage Plaza;
- The terminus of Railroad Avenue at Third Street;
- The northeastern corner of the Railroad Avenue/Fifth Street bend; and
- The intersection of Marina Boulevard and Black Diamond Street (two plazas diagonally facing each other).

Central Harbor Park and a landscaped pathway connecting Railroad Avenue to a parking lot located between Third and Fourth streets are of the same design as the plazas. Together, these open spaces afford a greater sense of identity and character to Downtown.
BUILDING DESIGN

The most distinctive buildings in Downtown are those that make up the New York Landing Historical District, located in the northern end of the Commercial Core (see Figure 5-2: New York Landing Historical District). This district was established by the City to ensure the preservation of structures of historical value. Structures within the district generally appear as simple, rectilinear buildings set along the streetfront. Architectural details include cornices, belt courses, and decorative window heads. Large display windows are common to buildings in this area. Structures in newer, adjacent commercial areas are simpler in design, with less attention paid to ornamental details. Residential and commercial buildings are generally in better condition in the northern portion of Downtown. The redevelopment of businesses at the southern end of the Commercial Core should extend the sense of the historical core area by utilizing similar architectural detailing and display as found in the northern end.

LINKAGES AND BARRIERS

Two major design issues—linkages and barriers within Downtown—must be addressed to create a more accessible Downtown for both visitors and residents:

- **Connection to the Waterfront.** The linkage between Downtown and the waterfront could be improved, both visually and physically. The two waterfront parks—Riverview and Central Harbor—are hidden from view and have limited pedestrian access from Railroad Avenue. However, signage improvements, linear park linkages, and expanded public access points can create a more unified waterfront identity.

- **Barriers within Downtown.** The BNSF railroad tracks represent both a visual and physical barrier to Downtown. Railroad Avenue crosses the BNSF tracks in a long overpass that isolates Downtown from southern portions of the City. The significance of this barrier has resulted in the tracks being identified as the southern edge of Downtown. However, gateway improvements and “way-finding” signage leading to Downtown can significantly improve the perception of Downtown as a separate, unique district.
TRANSITIONS AND BUFFERING

Buffering and transition is an important issue, especially at the eastern end of Downtown, where residential uses come into contact with heavy industrial uses. Streetscape improvements and buffering areas are needed to soften abrupt changes from one use to another. Buffering areas that allow transitioning between conflicting uses may include landscaped berms, parking lots and storage areas, and greenway corridors.

HISTORICAL RESOURCES

California’s Office of Historical Resources inventories buildings, structures, and objects determined to have some historical value. Historical resources found throughout the City are described in Chapter 9: Resource Conservation. To recognize and preserve the unique historical resources in Pittsburg, the City established the New York Landing Historical District in 1981. Buildings in the Historical District were constructed between 1914 and 1930, and reflect the architectural styles prevalent during that time period. Some structures, while not considered significant in and of themselves, enhance the overall character of the district. Figure 5-2 shows resources in the New York landing Historical District.

GOALS: DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT

5-G-5  Improve streetscapes within the Downtown, including:

- Clearing public views of the waterfront and southern hills;
- Providing pedestrian amenities;
- Strengthening transitions between land uses; and
- Increasing landscaping and planting more street trees.

5-G-6  Provide increased pedestrian connections to and vistas of the Suisun Bay/New York Slough waterfront.
New York Landing Historic District

Source: California Office of Historic Preservation, 1997; New York Landing Historical District
5-G-7 Maintain the grid street pattern within Downtown, and improve connections between Downtown and surrounding areas.

POLICIES: DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT

(Graphically Illustrated in Figure 5-3)

*Streetscape and Architecture*

5-P-25 Continue streetscape beautification efforts within the Downtown, focusing on improving the visual connection between the Commercial Core and the waterfront.

5-P-26 Encourage the repetition of key historical architectural features—such as windows and displays, cornice details, and roofline/pitch elements—in the redevelopment of commercial structures in Downtown.

5-P-27 Continue the preservation, rehabilitation, and reuse of historically significant structures within the Downtown (as designated in Figure 5-2).

5-P-28 Ensure that new construction and remodeling throughout Downtown (including the New York Landing Historical District) are reviewed for design compatibility by the Planning Commission.

5-P-29 Encourage property-owners of vacant Downtown structures to allow window box displays created by the Historical Society, rather than boarded-up glass storefronts.

5-P-30 Design and implement a gateway project at the Railroad Avenue underpass between Central Avenue and Tenth Street, providing an identifiable gateway into the Downtown.

The construction of a design feature at the Railroad Avenue underpass will provide a distinct entry to the City’s Downtown. A design competition to decide what sort of landmark design feature should be constructed will
Figure 5-3
Design and Development Improvements
encourage interest in Downtown redevelopment and potentially spur private investment.

5-P-31 Develop a “way-finding” system for Downtown Pittsburg. Install uniform signage and banners informing visitors of major attractions, including directions to Downtown from State Route 4 and to the waterfront from Downtown.

Another method to establishing a distinct identity for Downtown areas is developing a way-finding system. Uniform signage directing visitors and residents to and throughout the Downtown marks the core area as a special destination.

5-P-32 Require transitional buffers along the edges of new and redevelopment projects adjacent to the industrial uses east of Downtown. Such buffers may include a combination of landscaped berms, parking areas, pedestrian walkways, and storage facilities.

5-P-33 During redevelopment of the West Tenth Street Neighborhoods, require that the grid street network and pedestrian connections are maintained.

Railroad Avenue

5-P-34 During redevelopment of commercial properties along Railroad Avenue, pursue widening of sidewalks north of Eighth Street, as site configuration allows. Allow and encourage outdoor seating and services adjacent to restaurants and other food/beverage sales.

5-P-35 Retain existing pedestrian-scale lampposts and amenities along sidewalks within Downtown.

5-P-36 Plant and maintain a double row of trees on either side of Railroad Avenue, extending south to State Route 4.

5-P-37 Develop standards for placement of pedestrian amenities along sidewalks on Railroad Avenue.
Examples of amenity standards include: benches mid-way down each block; bike racks adjacent to major intersections; and planter boxes, newspaper racks, and trash/recycling bins at regular intervals.

5-P-38 Encourage developers to orient exterior design elements of Commercial Core structures toward pedestrians (for example, large display windows on street frontage, weather coverings over entryways), and extend the historical flavor of architectural features within the New York Landing Historical District to the intersection of Railroad Avenue and Tenth Street.

Open Space and Waterfront Access

5-P-39 Pursue acquisition of the Railroad Avenue terminus by transferring existing private recreation facilities due west of the adjacent Medium Density Residential neighborhood. Redesign the public plaza to ensure that both visual and physical access from Downtown is achieved.

The residential development at the terminus of Railroad Avenue provides a landscaped buffer and recreational area between the street frontage and the adjacent small-craft harbor. The redesign and reconstruction of this terminus area to allow public access to the marina would significantly improve the City’s desired connection between the waterfront and the Downtown core.

5-P-40 Encourage design of the Harbor Street terminus to provide an unobstructed view of New York Slough and a 30-foot wide promenade to the waterfront. This linear park/promenade should function as a public square, with buildings oriented toward it and pedestrian amenities leading from East Third Street to the shoreline.

The proposed redevelopment of the Harbor Street terminus will provide the City with a tremendous opportunity to enhance visual connections with the waterfront area. A well-designed marine commercial development could capitalize on the provision of public access to the shoreline.

5-P-41 Improve the pedestrian path along Marina Boulevard, connecting the Downtown core to the waterfront/marina area. Provide a wide path right-
The expansion and development of linear park features along Marina Boulevard would increase the Downtown’s connection with the waterfront/marina area, thereby further contributing to the City’s shoreline identity.

5.4 ACCESS AND PARKING

Railroad Avenue serves as the primary access route linking the marina and waterfront areas, Downtown Commercial Core, State Route 4, and southern Pittsburg. Most streets in Downtown support two-way traffic.

Downtown Pittsburg was developed in a traditional grid-iron street system, with fairly uniform blocks and 9-foot wide sidewalks. The widest streets in Downtown include Marina Boulevard, Railroad Avenue, Tenth Street, and Third Street. The new Marina Walk development maintains this grid street network. However, four large residential developments—Marina Heights, Marina Park, Bay Harbor Park, and Village at New York Landing—have replaced the original grid with inward-looking, curvilinear street systems with few access points.

**GOALS: ACCESS AND PARKING**

5-G-8 Provide sufficient parking opportunities to support a vibrant Downtown Commercial Core.

5-G-9 Encourage redevelopment projects to reinforce a walkable grid street layout, integrated with the existing grid network.
POLICIES: ACCESS AND PARKING

Street Network and Parking

5-P-42 Ensure that new Downtown residential projects preserve and continue the traditional grid street network. Consider extension of the grid street network east of Downtown as existing industrial uses are redeveloped.

The extension of the grid street network will reinforce the City’s interconnected, walkable urban core.

5-P-43 Provide public parking lots within Downtown, and limit private, single-user parking areas. However, ensure the provision of off-street parking facilities in periphery Downtown areas to encourage pedestrian movement.

Parking should be convenient and accessible in order to encourage the Downtown as a shopping area.

5-P-44 Reduce off-street parking requirements within High Density Residential neighborhoods of the Downtown to one space per housing unit. Allow further reductions in parking requirements for new residential projects that provide transit-friendly design features.

Transit-supportive design features include new transit stops/shelters within the development plan, pedestrian paths and associated signage to nearby transit stops, and bicycle storage facilities.

5-P-45 Consider making all one-way streets two-way by eliminating on-street parking, if necessary.

Two-way streets create a better “urban” character within small-city Downtowns by encouraging business development through ease of access.

5-P-46 Investigate use of diagonal on-street parking spaces on Downtown commercial streets.
Diagonal striping provides additional, easy-to-access on-street parking for commercial areas and narrows the travel lanes to encourage slower-moving traffic.

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Circulation**

5-P-47 *Continue to install and maintain crosswalks and landscaped curb extensions at heavily-used intersections within the Downtown.*

Curb extensions used as traffic calming devices should be designed to be bicycle-friendly.

5-P-48 *Design sidewalks in the Downtown Commercial Core that allow for the free flow of pedestrians, and include conveniently located rest areas with shade and seating.*

5-P-49 *Develop a bikeway along the Downtown waterfront from Central Harbor Park to the proposed Marine Commercial Center, adjacent to the proposed Marina Boulevard pedestrian path.*

5-P-50 *Develop a bikeway connecting the Downtown and waterfront areas to the Civic Center area along Railroad Avenue.*

5-P-51 *Create pedestrian and bike path linkages between existing Downtown parks.*
This element provides a policy framework for ensuring Pittsburg’s long-term economic competitiveness in the region. This element reflects business trends and available resources, and outlines the City’s economic development objectives to ensure that economic decision-making is integrated with other aspects of the City’s development.
6.1 OPPORTUNITIES AND OBJECTIVES

Pittsburg stands to benefit tremendously in the coming years from improvements in regional accessibility brought about by the recent extension of BART to the Pittsburg/Bay Point station, potential further extension to Railroad Avenue, and the ongoing widening of State Route 4. Since Eastern Contra Costa County is expected to account for about half of Contra Costa County’s population increase over the next 20 years, Pittsburg will also gain from the economic benefits that accompany population and employment growth. As with many other communities along the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, Pittsburg continues its transition from an economy historically-based in heavy industry and manufacturing to one based on residential service activities—a transition brought about recently by employment and housing trends. Since residential development brings only limited economic benefits, Pittsburg must seek ways to enhance revenues from a more diverse commercial and industrial job base. In 1997 and 1999, the City completed an Economic Vitality Report Card that included a comprehensive evaluation of economic development issues and opportunities in Pittsburg. Business outreach and market analysis surveys were conducted in 1997, 1999, and 2000. The results of these studies provide much of the basis for the policies comprising this element of the General Plan.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES

The overall economic development objectives for Pittsburg include:

- Linking land use, transportation, infrastructure, and employment growth with economic development;
- Promoting business attraction (business park/large office users), retention (manufacturing base), and expansion (retail sector);
- Encouraging employment growth to improve the jobs/housing balance;
- Promoting Downtown and waterfront revitalization; and
- Encouraging both neighborhood- and regional-scale commercial development.
6.2 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND THE CITY’S ROLE

Pittsburg’s transportation improvements, expected major population growth, and transitioning economy can result in significant benefits to the City over the life of this General Plan. While most economic development activity occurs in the private sector, the City has a significant role to play in ensuring these trends are carefully directed and the resulting benefits are maximized. Specifically, the City must:

- Ensure that City policies do not impede the needs of businesses to move or expand;
- Facilitate and act as a catalyst for development in strategic market segments;
- Coordinate and provide for infrastructure improvements; and
- Generate economic development revenue to support City activities.

A coordinated economic development strategy is also essential for supporting the City’s community development objectives, such as enhanced community character, ridgeline preservation, and increased linkages within the City. Such a strategy should include a managed program of fiscal development, strategic public improvements, and a balanced approach to land use. This element envisions two central roles for the City:

1. *Promoting development that results in fiscal benefits to the City.* The relative benefit or burden of various land uses on the City’s General Fund is important in considering how future development in Pittsburg should be prioritized. Promoting the construction of revenue-generating uses (non-residential uses that generate sales and property tax monies), as well as ensuring that each new residential development pays its fair share of the costs to provide public services, provides the City with a more diverse fiscal base.

2. *Maintaining a land use balance.* Maintaining a balanced supply of different land uses is also critical to the City’s financial health. This balance is necessary to attract businesses seeking quality housing opportunities and retail
services, in addition to ensuring that existing transportation capacity can be used more effectively. See Chapter 2: Land Use for policy direction regarding land use distribution.

**ENTERPRISE ZONE**

The California Trade and Commerce Agency (TCA) runs an Enterprise Zone program geared toward economically distressed areas throughout the State. The purpose of the program is to provide tax incentives to businesses and allow private sector market forces to revive the local economy. Pittsburg’s Enterprise Zone spans approximately 1,400-acres, including and adjacent to major portions of Downtown. The proposed Railroad Avenue BART Station area, business commercial acreage between State Route 4 and East Leland Road, and regional commercial sites at the eastern edge of town are all included within the Enterprise Zone (see Figure 6-1). The availability of deep-water port facilities and rail spurs in the City are listed by the State TCA as special advantages of the Pittsburg Enterprise Zone. State incentives geared toward the creation of new jobs include:

- One hundred percent net-operating loss (NOL) carry-forward programs;
- State tax credits for new employee hiring;
- Sales tax credits on machinery purchases;
- Up-front expensing of certain depreciable property;
- Lenders are allowed a deduction from income on the amount of ‘net interest’ earned on loans;
- Carry forward of unused tax credits to future tax years; and
- Fee waivers and/or reductions in designated areas.

Efforts to market Pittsburg as a more desirable business community feature such local incentives as:

- One-stop permitting;
- A recycling marketing development zone;
- On-the-job training programs;
Source: City of Pittsburg, Planning and Building Department, November 2002.

Figure 6-1
Enterprise Zone
• Use of the Contra Costa Small Business Development Center;
• Technical and site location assistance;
• Low interest loans; and
• Low cost electricity and steam (Power Exchange rates).

6.3 ECONOMIC TRENDS AND PROSPECTS

Three key factors set the context for the Economic Development Strategy proposed in this element of the General Plan: imbalance in the City’s jobs/housing ratio; strong job growth projected for the City; and adequate land area to meet

JOBS/EMPLOYED RESIDENTS BALANCE

The jobs/employed residents balance in Pittsburg is a major consideration of this Plan. The ideal jobs/employed residents ratio is 1.0. A ratio of less than one indicates that residents work outside the City, creating traffic congestion and economic leakage. Calculations derived from the City’s General Plan GIS Database result in a year 2000 jobs/employed residents ratio of approximately 0.74.

According to the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), Pittsburg’s population grew by 6,170, or approximately nine percent, between 1990 and 2000. During that same decade, approximately 5,800 jobs were added, an increase of 35 percent. While an imbalance with respect to jobs and residents continues in Pittsburg, a faster rate of job growth over that of population provides exciting economic opportunities.

As shown in Table 6-1, the Pittsburg Sphere of Influence (SOI) had a jobs/employed residents ratio of 0.74 in 2000—the City’s 33,000 employed residents outnumber the existing 24,300 jobs. This deficit is common to other East County cities, which also serve as bedroom communities to employment centers in Central County and elsewhere. However, ABAG projections indicate that

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jobs/Employed Residents Balance, Pittsburg and Region, 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jobs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburg*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antioch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Bay Area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure reflects Pittsburg's 2000 Sphere of Influence (SOI), which includes Bay Point.

Pittsburg’s future employment growth will continue to outpace that of its population growth.

**FUTURE JOB GROWTH**

The opportunities for job growth in Pittsburg between now and 2020 are impressive. Employment projections derived from the General Plan land use distribution resulted in a total of 64,630 jobs, an increase of approximately 170 percent. A total of 54,170 commercial jobs and 10,470 industrial jobs will be available within the Pittsburg Planning Area if all available commercial, office and industrial acreage is developed by 2020. Table 6-2 shows the net growth in the employment base in 2020.

Pittsburg is anticipating a significant increase in job growth throughout the General Plan timeframe. New business commercial centers are expected to develop and expand at three major locations:

1. Along Willow Pass Road, west of Downtown;
2. Along State Route 4, between the proposed Railroad Avenue BART Station and Loveridge Road; and
3. Along West Leland Road, between the Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station and proposed San Marco Boulevard.

Since employment growth is projected to outpace increases in population, Pittsburg’s employed residents ratio is projected to increase from the current 0.74 to 0.96 in 2020. The Countywide ratio is projected at 0.81. Simply put, the primary focus of the Economic Development Strategy will be to improve the City’s ability to carve out more than its share of the new jobs expected and rebalance the jobs/housing ratio.
LAND SUPPLY AND AVAILABILITY

The availability of industrial and commercial land that can be brought to market as quickly and as inexpensively as possible is essential to any successful economic development program. Across East County, much of the land zoned for nonresidential uses is raw, unimproved land. Most of this unimproved land will not have the investment needed to make it market-ready for many years. However, Pittsburg has quite possibly the region’s largest bank of non-residential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>4,799,330</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>3,735,620</td>
<td>4,150</td>
<td>21,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>1,443,250</td>
<td>5,250</td>
<td>491,180</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>5,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>8,124,570</td>
<td>29,540</td>
<td>2,193,060</td>
<td>2,440</td>
<td>31,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Pittsburg 2020</td>
<td>14,367,150</td>
<td>52,240</td>
<td>6,419,860</td>
<td>7,130</td>
<td>59,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>467,170</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>3,050</td>
<td>4,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>62,320</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Point 2020</td>
<td>529,490</td>
<td>1,930</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>3,330</td>
<td>5,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Planning Area 2020</td>
<td>14,896,630</td>
<td>54,170</td>
<td>6,419,870</td>
<td>10,470</td>
<td>64,630</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Items may not sum up to total due to independent rounding.
*Less than 10 sq.ft.

Assumptions:
City of Pittsburg = Commercial and Industrial Sq. Ft. based on City’s GIS database; Commercial Jobs based on 275 sq.ft. per employee; Industrial Jobs based on 900 sq.ft. per employee.
Bay Point = Commercial and Industrial Jobs based on LUIS 99 database; Commercial Sq. Ft. based on 275 sq.ft. per employee; Industrial Sq.Ft. based on 900 sq.ft. per employee.

land that is currently served by public infrastructure. In addition, Pittsburg serves as a gateway to East County with excellent regional road and transit access. These are distinct advantages, for the City’s land availability, location, and access can provide tremendous opportunities to future large-scale employers.

The Economic Development Strategy proposed in this element of the General Plan acknowledges the City’s strength in land availability and offers a managed nonresidential development program that is suited to current and future trends, maximizes revenue generating opportunities for the City, and provides for economic diversity.

6.4 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

The Economic Development Strategy outlined here provides a framework for ensuring Pittsburg’s long-term regional competitiveness. While the strategy seeks to target new businesses and build a more diverse commercial/industrial base, it also outlines measures to retain and expand existing business establishments.

GOALS: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

6-G-1 In partnership with neighboring cities, businesses, and community groups, proactively participate in the pooling of resources and development of economic opportunities.

6-G-2 Establish economic development priorities and undertake targeted investments to facilitate expansion, retention and attraction of businesses that meet the City’s economic development objectives.

6-G-3 Undertake a leadership role in the coordination and completion of infrastructure improvements, and in the facilitation of environmental remediation.
6-G-4 Maintain and enhance an attractive climate for conducting business in Pittsburg.

POLICIES: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

Land Use and Implementation

6-P-1 Monitor land use and development trends in the City, specifically in the Economic Opportunity Areas established in Policy 6-P-9, to ensure a sufficient supply of land that offers appropriate use designations and development intensities.

Monitoring of land use and development at and around strategic locations in the City will ensure that the eventual development of these locations will generate the greatest economic benefit for the community. The coordination of strategic improvements by the City—infrastructure upgrade and extension, environmental remediation, land acquisition or assembly, etc.—may also be required to provide for appropriate and orderly development at these locations.

6-P-2 Establish an implementation program that specifically outlines tasks to be undertaken, timeframes for completion, resources to be allocated, monitoring, and annual evaluation to ensure the overall success of the initiatives proposed in the Economic Development Strategy.

This program would detail the implementation of the Economic Development Strategy presented here and provide the means for measuring overall Strategy performance. Ideally, the program format would include a five-year program horizon with annual budgeting and updates. Specific components would include:

- Target investment and strategic improvements;
- Target industries;
- Revenue enhancement;
• Redevelopment;
• Enterprise Zone opportunities;
• Joint Economic Development Zone creation;
• Foreign Trade Zone creation;
• Land acquisition and assembly;
• Development monitoring;
• Land inventory;
• East County labor composition;
• Business climate; and
• Marketing.

The program would allow the City to demonstrate its commitment to business attraction—and the expansion and retention of existing business—through specific actions and investment decisions. The program would actively involve business and community groups, and property owners in Pittsburg to access community knowledge and expertise and partner in the City’s future.

6-P-3 Assume a leadership role in enhancing environmental quality in the City by coordinating the remediation of former industrial and commercial sites and by facilitating their redevelopment.

There are several large sites with high commercial or industrial redevelopment potential in the longer term. These sites, which have been identified as having leaking underground storage tanks (USTs) or as Spills, Leaks, Investigations, and Cleanup (SLIC) sites, include:

• Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station;
• Proposed Railroad Avenue BART Station;
• USS-Posco and Dow Chemical sites; and
• Interchange areas at State Route 4 and Willow Pass Road, Bailey Road, Railroad Avenue, and Loveridge Road.
The City can foster redevelopment of these sites by acting as a catalyst and facilitator, particularly where upfront private sector investment is unlikely due to perceived or actual environmental constraints or liabilities. The City could work with the California Environmental Protection Agency’s Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) to determine the eligibility of these lands for the Voluntary Cleanup Program (VCP). The VCP offers a streamlined process whereby the DTSC reviews, maintains oversight of, and signs off on specific remediation activities for voluntary participants. Successful projects receive a remedial action certification at the end of the process. While the State does not offer any financial inducements for the upfront costs associated with site assessment or remediation, the City could use tax increment financing and the Polanco Act to undertake the work and facilitate redevelopment.

6-P-4 Work with the Pittsburg Chamber of Commerce and the Contra Costa County Workforce Investment Board to promote local business successes and ventures in all parts of the City.

City Permitting and Ordinances

6-P-5 Undertake a detailed study to assess the true costs of development and establish an appropriate impact fee schedule to ensure that new development “pays its own way” with respect to infrastructure and servicing.

According to recent comparisons, Pittsburg requires lower impact fees levied on new redevelopment. However, if these fees do not cover the costs incurred by the City to service new residential development, then Pittsburg would, in effect, be subsidizing this type of development. Ideally, residential development should pay for as much infrastructure development as the market will bear and leverage the resulting infrastructure improvements for non-residential land and building projects. This is a particularly beneficial relationship since non-residential
Figure 6-2
Economic Opportunity Areas

Source: City of Pittsburg
# Table 6-3

## Economic Opportunity Areas in Pittsburg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Description/Status</th>
<th>Suggested Land Use Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Downtown</td>
<td>Addressed by Downtown Element of this Plan.</td>
<td>- Mixed-use strategy of residential development base, with supporting retail, offices, and personal services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Planned marine commercial center with retail, office, and recreational uses capitalizing on proximity to Suisun Bay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Opportunity for small-scale incubator, research and development, and high-tech manufacturing uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Specialty retail and entertainment activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Transit-oriented high-density residential development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. South Willow Pass</td>
<td>West of Downtown and South of Willow Pass Road, along Tenth Street.</td>
<td>- Small business commercial and industrial complexes, with focus on high-quality design and accessibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Allow for small-lot single family (SLSF) parcels, (see Policies 2-P-9 and 5-P-21).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Marine-related and complementary heavy industrial uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Waterfront destination (recreational, retail) activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. East State Route 4 Commercial</td>
<td>Between Pittsburg-Antioch Highway and State Route 4, East of Loveridge Road.</td>
<td>- Best near-term potential for regional commercial retail (big-box retail) and hotel development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Business commercial (e.g. research and development) uses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sources: City of Pittsburg Economic Vitality Strategy, 1996; Dyett & Bhatia, May 2004.*
development provides significantly greater economic return than does residential development. As the primary goal of the Economic Development Strategy is to attract new business and balance the jobs/housing ratio, a revised impact fee schedule should charge fees appropriate to the development’s public service needs.

6-P-6 *Maintain efficient licensing and development permitting procedures and regulations.*

Regulation should be appropriate to accomplish the City’s goals without being unnecessarily burdensome or time-consuming. Opportunities to further streamline procedures should be continuously pursued via a periodic review of the system with user input to help identify problem areas.

6-P-7 *Continue to provide incentives, encourage employment, and promote businesses within the City’s Enterprise Zone (see Figure 6-1).*

The availability of tax credits, fee waivers, and business development assistance is a tremendous opportunity for many businesses to locate within the City’s Enterprise Zone. As high-tech industries expand into eastern Contra Costa County, locating in Pittsburg may become a more worthy business venture. The City should focus on marketing as an up-and-coming business/industrial complex, featuring excellent State and local investment incentives.

6-P-8 *Continue to encourage and support home-based businesses in Pittsburg.*

As home-based businesses become more and more common, the revenue they generate and the employment they provide has become significant.
Economic Opportunity Areas

6-P-9 Establish Economic Opportunity Areas in Pittsburg, as indicated in Table 6-3 and Figure 6-2. Development in these areas must reflect both current and future trends, maximize revenue-generating opportunities for the City, and provide for economic diversity.

In 1996, seven original areas in Pittsburg were identified as reflecting the best opportunities for Pittsburg to grow a more diverse economy and better balance the jobs/housing ratio by 2020. One additional area—Railroad Avenue/ Harbor Street BART—was added in Table 6-3, while two of the original areas—North Willow Pass and South Residential—were deleted due to preservation of open space and wetlands habitat. It is important that these Economic Opportunity Areas provide for a comprehensive and integrated approach to development/redevelopment, including a full range of public finance and land use planning tools.

6-P-10 Emphasize Downtown as Pittsburg’s historic center, providing an identity and a sense of place for the entire city by establishing a focused revitalization strategy that integrates the initiatives of the Economic Development Strategy.

The importance of Downtown to the City’s evolution beyond a bedroom community cannot be overstated. While Downtown is identified as an economic opportunity area in Policy 6-P-8, this area is sufficiently different in both structure and context as to justify specific mention here. Pittsburg’s Downtown is one of the oldest in the County, and one of few with a waterfront. Downtown design is more fully discussed in Chapter 5: Downtown of this Plan.

A revitalization strategy for Downtown should build on the strengths of Downtown, while aggressively working to overcome the obstacles. Initiatives of the Downtown revitalization strategy should specify several
of the techniques proposed for the citywide Economic Development Strategy:

- Monitoring of land use and development trends in Downtown to ensure a sufficient supply of land of appropriate designation and development intensity;
- Establishment of a retail and consumer services strategy to attract retail and service sector business to key locations in Downtown;
- Establishment of criteria for land assembly in Downtown for the purposes of redevelopment and revitalization;
- Consideration of the feasibility of a convention or performing arts center, amphitheater, or other public cultural amenity in or linked to the Downtown;
- Facilitation of additional attractions and events that bring both residents and visitors to the Downtown; and
- Preservation and enhancement of historic structures contributing to the unique character of the Downtown.

**Retail and Consumer Services**

6-P-11 Develop a retail and consumer services strategy to attract regional- and local-serving non-basic industries, ensure appropriate location, and maximize growth opportunities. Incorporate initiatives to retain and expand existing retail and consumer services businesses.

The City must aggressively pursue growth in the retail and service sectors for three primary reasons. First, city residents are currently underserved in several retail categories, including automotive sales, service stations, and home furnishing and appliances. Second, a net retail sales ‘leakage’ worth approximately $30.6 million was lost to neighboring communities in 1996, sales that did not benefit the City through tax revenues. (Refer to discussion in Section 6.2 of the Pittsburg General Plan Update: Existing Conditions and Planning Issues Report, 1998). Third, as retail sales are
lost to neighboring communities, so too are the associated jobs. Overall, it is likely that the demand for additional retail space in Pittsburg over the next 20 years will range between 500,000 and 750,000 square feet. Retail and consumer service uses need to be located in areas with heavy pass-by traffic, good visibility, and image. Pittsburg has a significant advantage over neighboring communities in that it offers a significant supply of available land in locations that make the most sense for retail and service sector uses. The westward orientation of the East County population—jobs, shopping, entertainment, and services are in Bay Area communities to the west—means that Pittsburg will benefit most from traffic and consumers in communities to the east passing through the City.

**Research and Development**

*6-P-12 Develop a research and development and office attraction strategy to promote economic diversification, ensure appropriate location, and maximize growth opportunities. Incorporate initiatives to retain and expand existing R&D and office businesses.*

Research and development (R&D) industry clusters—which include multimedia, plastics, computer-related electronics, health care technology, and business services—are projected to benefit from significant growth in Contra Costa County to 2020, and would certainly provide excellent employment- and revenue-generating opportunities for Pittsburg if the City positioned itself properly to capture this growth.

Businesses in these clusters have several locational considerations. Good access from major highways and proximate amenities for employees are very important factors. Locations must project a high-quality image, typically expressed by a high-level of design, landscaping, and maintenance. Such an image is generally provided in campus-style office or business park developments. In addition, prestigious R&D and office tenants will pay a premium for space in high-profile or high-image
buildings, often a mid-rise or otherwise architecturally interesting building with visibility from a major highway.

6-P-13 Create a Research and Development Industry Advisory Council comprised of business leaders from within Pittsburg to assist the implementation of the R&D and office attraction strategy (Policy 6-P-12).

The development of an R&D and office attraction strategy would benefit greatly from the involvement of the private sector. An R&D Industry Advisory Council comprised of industry representatives and other private sector interests in Pittsburg could assist the City in the creation of the campus-style concept. Specifically, the Council would work with the City on various matters related to planning, marketing, and incentives. Planning matters include design guidelines, enhanced development standards, infrastructure improvements, parking, transit, and other issues related to campus-style development. Marketing matters include the promotion of Pittsburg as a high amenity, growth-based, industrial activity center for R&D and office uses. Finally, incentives matters relate to the appropriate use of the City’s authority to promote redevelopment and revitalization in support of its community development goals. This includes the use of land acquisition, land assembly, redevelopment financing, advance permitting, and other tools necessary to maintain a suitable inventory of ready-to-go sites for these uses.

Land Assembly and Redevelopment

6-P-14 Establish an inventory of ready-to-go non-residential sites, complete with zoning, infrastructure, and environmental clearances. If necessary, acquire or assemble sites to ensure availability of sites of adequate size to attract industry clusters that meet the City’s development objectives.

Policy 6-P-9 identifies six Economic Opportunity Areas in Pittsburg. While these areas present a variety of challenges, careful planning,
municipal incentives, and private sector involvement could provide tremendous redevelopment opportunities. The City should engage in land acquisition, assembly, and re-parcelization of sites in Economic Opportunity Areas, particularly if:

- Sites are in strategic or one-of-a-kind locations, such as the Suisun Bay waterfront;
- An inventory of ready-to-go sites are needed to attract targeted industry clusters;
- Reuse of brownfield or other contaminated sites can contribute to environmental remediation;
- Short-term market inefficiencies are overcome; or
- Quality development, attainment of higher intensities, and professional management can be achieved.

6-P-15 Maximize the City’s public financing tools and consider opportunities for enhancement in order to fund the various economic development initiatives outlined in this Element.

Amenities and Waterfront Development

6-P-16 Consider the feasibility of establishing a convention or performing arts center, amphitheater, or other public cultural amenity in or linked to the Downtown or waterfront, or in another appropriate location.

This recommendation offers three distinct, yet very important advantages. First, the location of such a facility in the Downtown, or a comparable mixed-use activity center such as the proposed Railroad Avenue BART Station Area, would generate pedestrian traffic and support retail opportunities into the evening hours. Complementary uses, such as restaurants, clubs, and coffee shops, would also tend to locate near where crowds gather.
Second, such facilities provide a strong image of culture, sophistication, and community pride. Such an image is key if Pittsburg is to evolve from bedroom community to important regional job center, particularly in the attraction of R&D and office complexes.

Third, such facilities can also result in strong growth in the visitor services sector. Guest accommodations, restaurants, movie theaters, and entertainment complexes become more economically feasible when a significant nearby attraction serves more than the communities that immediately surround it. Growth in this sector will also be an important part of Pittsburg’s transition to a regional job center, as new businesses bring in new clients, conventioneers, and suppliers from outside the area.

6-P-17 Facilitate additional attractions and events that bring both residents and visitors to the City, the Downtown, and the waterfront.

In addition to the consideration of a convention or performing arts center in Pittsburg, it is important that the City support and facilitate existing events and attractions. Some current events include the Renaissance Festival, Heritage Festival, Seafood Festival, August After Hours, Black Diamond Blues Festival, and the Pittsburg Holiday Parade. With respect to attractions, the City needs to make the most of the unique sites located nearby, such as Black Diamond Mines Regional Park and Browns Island Regional Shoreline, and integrate the promotion of these attractions with other City initiatives.

6-P-18 Ensure that new waterfront development includes enhanced shoreline access, some form of public amenity, and an appropriate mix of waterfront uses.

The Pittsburg waterfront should serve as a recreational and commercial focus of the City. As such, waterfront uses should enhance this role by supporting a mix of complementary uses that include marinas (a small
portion of which may include service and storage facilities), eating and drinking establishments, visitor accommodations, parks and open space, historic and/or natural interpretive facilities. Waterfront development should incorporate or improve connections to Downtown.
7 TRANSPORTATION

This element identifies long-range future transportation needs, primarily through policies and standards to enhance capacity and provide new linkages to further an integrated multi-modal transportation system.

The transportation system serving Pittsburg is comprised of the roadway system, public transportation, and alternative modes, including carpooling, bicycling, and walking. Several routes of regional significance provide access to Pittsburg: State Route 4, Pittsburg-Antioch Highway, Kirker Pass Road, Bailey Road, Leland Road, and Willow Pass Road. State Route 4, which runs east-west and bisects the City, connects Highway 160 in East Antioch, Highway 242 and I-680 in Concord, and I-80 in Hercules. A system of surface streets collects and distributes traffic to and from the highway and regional routes, and between the commercial, industrial, and residential areas of the City.

Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) provides commuter rail service between Pittsburg and the rest of the Bay Area via the Pittsburg/Bay Point line. The Pittsburg/Bay Point BART station is located at the southwest quadrant of the State Route 4/Bailey Road interchange. Local bus service is provided by Tri-Delta transit and the County Connection services. Existing bicycle lanes along East Leland Road, Loveridge Road, Harbor Street, Buchanan Road, and Crestview Avenue provide access throughout Pittsburg. The Delta De Anza Trail is a multi-use path connecting Pittsburg to neighboring communities.
7.1 REGULATORY CONTEXT

The City of Pittsburg has jurisdiction over all City streets and City-operated traffic signals. The freeways, freeway ramps, ramp signal lights, and State Routes (such as State Route 4) are under the jurisdiction of the California Department of Transportation. The transit service providers have jurisdiction over their services. These include BART, Tri-Delta Transit and County Connection fixed-route bus service.

Several regional agencies oversee and coordinate funding for transportation improvement programs affecting Pittsburg, including the Contra Costa Transportation Authority, TRANSPLAN Regional Transportation Planning Committee, and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission.

CONTRA COSTA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

In 1988, voters in Contra Costa County passed Measure C, increasing the sales tax by ½ percent for 20 years to finance construction of a specified set of public transit and highway improvement projects. This ballot measure created the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) that oversees the improvements contained in the Measure C Growth Management Program, including the widening of State Route 4. In 2004, County voters approved a 25-year extension of Measure C when they approved the Contra Costa County Transportation Sales Tax Expenditure Plan (Measure J). In order to qualify for Measure J funding, the CCTA requires each jurisdiction to include a Growth Management Element in its General Plan (see Chapter 3: Growth Management).

CCTA is also the Congestion Management Agency (CMA) that sets State and Federal funding priorities for improvements affecting the Contra Costa County Congestion Management Program (CMP) Roadway System. CMP roadway system components (or Routes of Regional Significance) in the Pittsburg Planning Area include State Route 4, Bailey Road (north of Leland Road), Willow Pass Road, West Tenth Street, Leland Road (east of Bailey Road), Buchanan Road, a portion of Somersville Road, and Railroad Avenue. Proposed Routes of Regional Significance include East Tenth Street, Pittsburg-Antioch Highway, Buchanan Bypass, Bailey Road (south of Leland Road), and Leland Road (west of Bailey Road). San Marco Boulevard is a Proposed Route of Regional Significance proposed by the City of Pittsburg.
TRANSPLAN

Measures C and J requires all Contra Costa County jurisdictions to participate in the preparation of Action Plans for Routes of Regional Significance to determine the appropriate measures and programs for mitigation of regional traffic impacts. TRANSPLAN is the Regional Transportation Planning Committee (RTPC) for eastern Contra Costa County, comprised of the cities of Antioch, Brentwood, Oakley, Pittsburg and unincorporated Contra Costa County. One elected official from each of these jurisdictions serves on the TRANSPLAN Committee. The Action Plans from the TRANSPLAN Committee are integrated with Action Plans from other regional transportation planning committees to form the CCTA Countywide Comprehensive Transportation Plan.

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

The transportation planning agency for the entire Bay Area is the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). MTC is the clearinghouse for both State and Federal funds for transportation improvements. Each county’s CMA, including CCTA, forwards their capital improvement project list to MTC. MTC reviews the lists submitted by all nine Bay Area counties and submits a regional priority list to the California Transportation Commission and/or the Federal Highway Administration for selection of projects to receive funding.

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) has authority over the State highway system, including mainline facilities and interchanges. Caltrans must be involved in and approve the planning and design of improvements for state highway facilities. State highway facilities in the Pittsburg Planning Area include State Route 4 and the interchanges at Willow Pass Road, Bailey Road, Railroad Avenue, and Loveridge Road.
7.2 ROADWAY SYSTEM & TRAFFIC STANDARDS

ROADWAY CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

The roadway system within the City is based around a conventional suburban hierarchy of streets. The top of the hierarchy consists of arterial streets that carry large volumes of traffic, while the bottom consists of low-volume local streets intended to provide access to adjacent property. Definitions of the roadway classifications are presented below, while more specific classification standards relating to intersections, driveways, on-street parking, and traffic volumes are presented in Table 7-1. A map of the roadway system serving the City of Pittsburg is presented in Figure 7-1.

- **Freeways.** Freeways are limited-access, high-speed travelways included in the State and Federal highway systems. Their purpose is to carry regional through-traffic (traffic passing through Pittsburg without stopping). Access is provided by interchanges spaced one mile or greater. No access is provided to adjacent land uses. State Route 4 is the only freeway connecting the City of Pittsburg to regional destinations.

- **Major Arterials.** Major arterials primarily serve through-traffic. They are generally multi-lane facilities with signalized traffic control at major intersections. Major arterials are typically divided facilities (with raised medians) that provide limited access to abutting development sites as a secondary function. Major arterial examples in Pittsburg include Railroad Avenue, Kirker Pass Road, Willow Pass Road, Bailey Road, Pittsburg-Antioch Highway, Leland Road, Loveridge Road, and Buchanan Road.

- **Minor Arterials.** Minor Arterials are intended to provide balance between mobility and access. They carry a mix of local and regional traffic, providing circulation between neighborhoods, activity centers, and highways and other regional routes. Minor arterials are typically two to four lane roadways that also provide access to adjacent development, often using signalized intersections for entry to major generators. Minor arterial examples in Pittsburg include Harbor Street, North Parkside Drive, California Avenue, and Century Boulevard.
### Table 7-1
**Roadway Functional Classifications, City of Pittsburg**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Traffic Lanes(^1)</th>
<th>Intersections</th>
<th>Driveways</th>
<th>Left-Turn Pockets</th>
<th>On-Street Parking</th>
<th>Traffic Speed</th>
<th>Traffic Volume(^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Arterial</strong></td>
<td>2-6</td>
<td>Minimum number of intersection is preferred. Traffic signals required where warranted.</td>
<td>Driveways are generally not permitted, but may be allowed subject to restrictions.</td>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>Not desirable</td>
<td>Moderate to High</td>
<td>35-50 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minor Arterial</strong></td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>Minor arterials allow a higher level of access than major arterials. Traffic signals required where warranted.</td>
<td>Driveways are generally not permitted, but may be allowed subject to restrictions. Driveways to major generators should be consolidated, preferably at signalized intersections.</td>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>Not desirable</td>
<td>Moderate to High</td>
<td>35-50 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collector</strong></td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>Allowed. Subject to restrictions.</td>
<td>Driveways are permitted subject to restrictions.</td>
<td>As traffic conditions require</td>
<td>Allowed. Subject to restrictions.</td>
<td>Low to Moderate 30-35 mph</td>
<td>Low to Moderate 15,000 VPD or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Least restrictive.</td>
<td>Driveways allowed.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Allowed. Subject to restrictions.</td>
<td>Low 25-30 mph</td>
<td>Low 5,000 VPD or less</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Bikeways shall be provided in accordance with Figure 7.2.
2. MPH = miles per hour, VPD = vehicles per day

All street design parameters (cross-sections, pavement, intersection spacing, driveways, parking, etc.) are subject to traffic evaluation and conformance to city design standards.

(See Figure 7.1 for a functional classification of Pittsburg’s street system.)

*Source: Pittsburg Community Development Department, 2000.*
Collectors. Collectors provide land access and traffic circulation within residential, commercial and industrial areas. They connect arterials with local streets. Collectors are typically designed with two travel lanes, parking lanes, planter strips, and sidewalks. Traffic control at intersections is generally signalized along these facilities, but can include all-way stop control. Collector streets in Pittsburg include Atlantic Avenue, Stoneman Avenue, Gladstone Drive, and Yosemite Drive.

- Local Streets. Local streets, also known as minor streets, provide direct access to abutting properties as their primary function. Local streets rarely have more than two travel lanes, and speed limits are generally kept low (25 mph).

LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS) STANDARDS

The CCTA/TRANSPLAN East County Action Plan (Draft; December 1999) defines Level of Service (LOS) as “a measure of traffic conditions on a road or intersection.” LOS is expressed in ratings from ‘A’ to ‘F’, with ‘A’ representing free-flow traffic conditions and ‘F’ signifying long delays and stop-and-go conditions. LOS is measured as a comparison between the amount of traffic on a road and the capacity for which the road or intersection was designed. Traffic LOS definitions are explained in Table 7-2.

Level of Service standards applicable to non-freeway Routes of Regional Significance in Eastern Contra Costa County include:

- D or better at signalized intersections along non-freeway State Route 4;
- E or better at unsignalized intersections along non-freeway State Route 4;
- E or better on non-freeway State Route 4 from Balfour Road to the San Joaquin County line;
- E or better (<95% capacity) on Kirker Pass Road;
- D or better (<85% capacity) on intersections along Major Arterials, except for intersections along Bailey Road; and
- E or better at intersections along Bailey Road between West Leland Road and State Route 4.

Table 7-2
Traffic Level of Service (LOS) Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Traffic Flow Conditions</th>
<th>MAX Volume to Capacity Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Free flow; speed is controlled by driver’s desires, stipulated speed limits, or physical roadway conditions.</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Stable flow; operating speeds beginning to be restricted; little or no restrictions on maneuverability from other vehicles.</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Stable flow; speeds and maneuverability more closely restricted; occasional backups behind left-turning vehicles at intersections.</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Unstable flow; temporary restrictions may cause extensive delays; little freedom to maneuver; at intersections, some motorists may have to wait through more than one signal change.</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Unstable flow with stoppages and delays; approaching capacity; maneuverability severely limited.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Forced flow; stoppages for long periods; low operating speeds; delays at intersections often more than one signal change.</td>
<td>&gt;1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXISTING TRAFFIC VOLUMES

Traffic data used to define existing roadway and intersection service levels include average daily traffic (ADT) and peak hour traffic. The ADT is defined as the total number of vehicles passing a point on a roadway, in both directions, on an average weekday. Peak hour is defined as the total number of vehicles passing a point on a roadway during the busiest one hour in the morning or afternoon on an average weekday. Typically, peak hour turning movement volumes are used to measure service levels at intersections.

Historically, State Route 4 has been heavily congested in the westbound direction during the weekday morning peak period (7:00 to 9:00 AM) and in the eastbound direction during the evening peak period (4:00 to 6:00 PM). The highly directional peak hours are the result of significantly more housing than employment in East County communities. Based on Caltrans’ mainline counts, volumes on State Route 4 range from nearly 80,000 to over 90,000 vehicles per day in the vicinity of Pittsburg. Weekday volumes generally peak between 5:00 to 6:00 PM, with peak hour traffic volumes at nearly 8,000 vehicles per hour. Traffic on State Route 4 has increased significantly over the past 10 years, about 48 percent, as continued housing construction occurs in Antioch and Brentwood.

Along City streets, traffic volumes have also increased over the past 10 years. Traffic volumes along the major arterials in Pittsburg have experienced significant increases due to current congestion levels on State Route 4, with many drivers finding alternative access along local streets to avoid the congestion. Pittsburg experiences substantial through-traffic on local arterials and collectors as commuters from adjacent communities use these streets to access Kirker Pass Road, a regional connection to Concord, Walnut Creek and the Highway 24/I-680 junction. Railroad Avenue, Buchanan Road, and Leland Road accommodate the greatest amounts of through traffic in Pittsburg.
PROJECTED TRAFFIC VOLUMES

Traffic projections for buildout of the General Plan were developed using the East County Travel Demand Forecasting Model. This model was developed and adopted by CCTA for regional transportation planning. It produces both average daily traffic projections and peak hour turning movement projections at key intersections. The model encompasses the entire County, but is focused on the communities of North Concord, Bay Point, Pittsburg, Antioch, Oakley and Brentwood. The General Plan Diagram (Figure 2-2) and associated buildout projections (Section 2.3) constitute model assumptions for Pittsburg. Within the remainder of the region, land use assumptions equal year 2025 employment and population projections developed by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). Additionally, the traffic projections reflect planned and improved street, highway and interchange improvements within Pittsburg and throughout the region.

Table 7-3 compares existing average daily traffic volumes with year 2025 traffic projections. Substantial increases in traffic are projected for key roadway segments in Pittsburg. Traffic volumes on State Route 4 will double over the next 25 years, due partly to growth in Pittsburg, but primarily due to substantial growth in the Eastern Contra Costa County communities of Antioch, Oakley, Brentwood, and growth in other communities along State Route 4 such as Discovery Bay. Regionally important through routes such as Bailey Road, Railroad Avenue/Kirker Pass Road, Leland Road, and Pittsburg-Antioch Highway will experience substantial growth in traffic volumes, with increases ranging from 35 percent to over 200 percent. Other key streets in Pittsburg will also experience growth ranging from 15 percent to nearly 300 percent. This growth on local Pittsburg streets is a combination of locally generated traffic and through traffic seeking alternative routes to congested highways and regional routes.

According to the CCTA East County Model used to generate projected traffic volumes for year 2025, increases in freeway traffic in Contra Costa County are expected to be most substantial along State Route 4 in the vicinity of Pittsburg and Antioch. Table 7-4 shows projected vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and vehicle hours traveled (VHT) for Pittsburg and Contra Costa County under buildout of the proposed General Plan. Total VMT are expected to exceed 18,250 on roadways within the Planning Area.
**Table 7-3**  
Existing and Projected Average Daily Traffic Volumes, City of Pittsburg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Segment</th>
<th>Existing 1997</th>
<th>Projected 2025</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Route 4 (west of Bailey Rd.)</td>
<td>94,000</td>
<td>172,200</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 4 (west of Railroad Ave.)</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>164,500</td>
<td>106%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 4 (east of Railroad Ave.)</td>
<td>77,000</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>101%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 4 (east of Loveridge Rd.)</td>
<td>81,000</td>
<td>161,000</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailey Road (north of Leland Rd.)</td>
<td>20,300</td>
<td>48,300</td>
<td>138%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Leland Road (west of Bailey Rd.)</td>
<td>8,600</td>
<td>21,700</td>
<td>152%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Leland Road (east of Range Rd.)</td>
<td>13,700</td>
<td>24,600</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Leland Road (east of Harbor St.)</td>
<td>21,100</td>
<td>31,800</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Avenue (north of Leland Rd.)</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>40,600</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Avenue (north of Buchanan Rd.)</td>
<td>15,600</td>
<td>25,200</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Avenue (north of California Ave.)</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>49,800</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Avenue (north of 10th St.)</td>
<td>9,900</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenth Street (east of Railroad Ave.)</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Avenue (east of Railroad Ave.)</td>
<td>14,200</td>
<td>16,400</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Pass Road (west of Range Rd.)</td>
<td>13,900</td>
<td>23,100</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor Street (south of SR 4)</td>
<td>14,200</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>125%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor Street (north of Buchanan Rd.)</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>20,700</td>
<td>298%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic Avenue (east of Railroad Ave.)</td>
<td>10,900</td>
<td>10,100</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loveridge Road (north of Buchanan Rd.)</td>
<td>16,600</td>
<td>20,200</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan Road (east of Harbor St.)</td>
<td>16,800</td>
<td>11,400</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta-Fair Boulevard (east of Loveridge Rd.)</td>
<td>14,800</td>
<td>35,500</td>
<td>140%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburg Antioch Highway (east of Loveridge Rd.)</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>28,900</td>
<td>204%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLANNED TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS

The City and regional transportation authorities have several planned transportation improvements within the Planning Area which are expected to meet Pittsburg’s transportation needs to 2020:

- **1995 CMP Capital Improvement Program – Projects with committed funding:**
  - Widen State Route 4 to 6 lanes plus 2 High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes between Bailey Road and Railroad Avenue.
  - Provide a transit corridor for future BART extensions.

- **1995 CCTA Countywide Comprehensive Transportation Plan & East County Action Plan (currently being updated) – MTC Track 1 projects are included in the regional transportation plan and could be funded with expected revenues. Candidate Track 2 projects are those without forecast funding. MTC is exploring potential funding sources for these projects:**
  - Construct a Park and Ride Lot near the State Route 4/Railroad Avenue interchange (already built at Harbor Street and Bliss Avenue).
  - Modify State Route 4/Loveridge Road interchange and construct parallel truck facility (MTC Track 1).
  - Widen State Route 4 to 6 lanes plus HOV lanes between Railroad Avenue and State Route 4 Bypass at Antioch (Candidate Track 2).
  - Construct 2-lane Buchanan Bypass (Candidate Track 2).
  - Construct truck-climbing lanes on Kirker Pass Road between Clearbrook Road and Buchanan Road (Candidate Track 2).
  - Extend BART to Hillcrest Avenue in Antioch (Candidate Track 2).

- **Caltrans-approved Project Study Report (PSR) – Potential funding sources include local sales tax (Measure C) and East County Regional Fee and Finance Authority (ECRFFA):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7-4</th>
<th>Projected VMT and VHT, Pittsburg and Contra Costa County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td><strong>VMT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pittsburg Planning Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway</td>
<td>96,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressway</td>
<td>13,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Arterial</td>
<td>62,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Arterial</td>
<td>8,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>1,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>182,521</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contra Costa County</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway</td>
<td>1,167,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressway</td>
<td>190,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Arterial</td>
<td>763,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Arterial</td>
<td>345,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>57,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,524,429</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Modify State Route 4/Railroad Avenue interchange to increase the interchange’s capacity and improve operations of the existing closely spaced ramp intersections.

- Widen existing median on State Route 4 to accommodate future travel lanes, the BART extension, and a BART Station at Railroad Avenue.

- CCTA Major Investment Study (MIS) – CCTA Major Investment Study projects are those without forecast funding:
  - Continue preliminary engineering work on State Route 4 East, between Railroad Avenue and Route 160.
  - Investigate in greater detail the issues surrounding future BART Stations.

- 1997 Pittsburg Traffic Mitigation Fee Study – Traffic Mitigation Fee Study projects are being funded by a mitigation fee imposed as a result of this study:
  - Widen California Avenue to four lanes from Railroad Avenue to Loveridge Road.
  - Extend West Leland Road (four lanes) from terminus to Avila Road.
  - Widen Avila Road to four lanes from Willow Pass Road to West Leland Road.
  - Widen Willow Pass Road to four lanes from Loftus Road to Range Road.
  - Improve East Third Street.
  - Connect North Park Plaza to Century Boulevard.
  - Construct the Bailey Bypass (San Marco Boulevard) from State Route 4 to Bailey Road.
  - Construct 4-lane Buchanan Bypass.
  - Construct an interchange at Range Road/State Route 4.
− Implement signal interconnection (synchronization of intersection signals to improve traffic flow) on Leland and Buchanan Roads.
− Install traffic signals and construct intersection improvements, as needed.

• Regional Traffic Mitigation Fee (TRANSPLAN) – Regional Traffic Mitigation Fee projects are being funded by the regional fee:
  − Widen State Route 4 to 6 lanes plus 2 High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes between Bailey Road and Railroad Avenue.
  − Construct 2-lane Buchanan Bypass.
  − Construct the State Route 4 Bypass from Antioch to Brentwood.

GOALS: STREET SYSTEM & TRAFFIC STANDARDS

7-G-1  Achieve service level standards for roadway intersections that are based on the roadway’s classification and location shown in Figure 7-2.

7-G-2  Work with Caltrans and the Contra Costa Transportation Authority to achieve timely construction of programmed freeway and interchange improvements.

7-G-3  Coordinate circulation system plans with other jurisdictions’ and agencies’ plans, including Antioch and Concord, the Contra Costa Transportation Authority, and Caltrans.

7-G-4  Work with the Contra Costa Transportation Authority to manage morning commute traffic from East to Central Contra Costa County by studying and implementing arterial metering management plans.

7-G-5  Provide adequate capacity on arterial roadways to meet LOS standards and to avoid traffic diversion to local roadways or the freeway.

As congestion increases on State Route 4, monitor and evaluate the need to implement neighborhood traffic management controls on local streets to eliminate or minimize the impact of diverted traffic.
Figure 7-2
Transportation Service Level Areas

Note: San Marco Boulevard is a “Proposed Regional Route of Significance” proposed by the City of Pittsburg.

Source: City of Pittsburg and TRANSPLAN (2008)
7-G-6  Locate high traffic-generating uses so that they have direct access or immediate secondary access to arterial roadways.

7-G-7  Complete arterial roadway improvements required to mitigate traffic impacts of an approved project before the project is fully occupied. Arterial improvements should be completed by creating funding sources, which include but are not limited to Traffic Mitigation Fees, Development Agreements, and Assessment Districts.

POLICIES: STREET SYSTEM AND TRAFFIC STANDARDS

7-P-1  Require mitigation for development proposals that are not part of the Traffic Mitigation Fee program which contribute more than one percent of the volume to an existing roadway or intersections with inadequate capacity to meet cumulative demand.

Development projects that contribute to future traffic congestion on existing roadways shall provide mitigation to ensure adequate future capacities. Traffic analysis of development plans will determine the proportion of cumulative impact each project is creating.

7-P-2  Use the adopted Regional and Local Transportation Impact Mitigation Fee ordinances to ensure that all new development pays an equitable pro-rata share of the cost of transportation improvements. Review the Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee schedule annually and update every five years at a minimum.

7-P-3  Review and update the City’s Engineering Design Standards for each functional roadway classification, according to Table 7-1.

Roadway standards are illustrated in the City’s Engineering Design Standards for typical midblock applications. Additional right-of-way may be needed for turn lanes at some intersection approaches.
7-P-4 Require that all traffic studies be conducted by professional transportation consultants selected by the Planning and Building and Engineering Departments, with the City acting as the lead agency. Ensure that all costs associated with the traffic study are paid by the applicant.

7-P-5 Apply for federal Congestion Mitigation Air Quality grant funding, designed to improve air quality through roadway improvement projects.

Level of Service (LOS) Standards

7-P-6 Ensure that all Regional Routes of Significance within the City maintain the following traffic levels of service (LOS) standards (applicable to non-freeway routes and routes not subject to a Traffic Management Program):

- LOS mid D (peak hour volume to capacity ratio less than or equal to 0.85) at intersections along major arterials, except for intersections along Bailey Road;
- LOS high E (peak hour volume to capacity ratio less than or equal to 0.99) at intersections along Bailey Road between West Leland Road and State Route 4; and
- LOW mid E (peak hour volume to capacity ratio less than or equal to 0.95) at intersections on Kirker Pass Road.

7-P-7 Endeavor to implement Transportation Element improvements prior to deterioration in levels of service below those set forth in Goal 7-G-1.

Development approvals should require reasonable demonstration that traffic improvements necessary to serve the development will be in place in time to accommodate trips generated by the project.

7-P-8 Ensure that all non-Regional Routes within the City (not designated as Routes of Regional Significance in Figure 7-2) maintain the following traffic levels of service (LOS) standards based on their location in rural,
semi-rural, suburban, urban or downtown areas, as designated in Figure 7-2:

- Rural – LOW low C (peak hour volume to capacity ratio less than or equal to 0.74)
- Semi-rural – LOS high C (peak hour volume to capacity ratio less than or equal to 0.79)
- Suburban – LOS low D (peak hour volume to capacity ratio less than or equal to 0.84)
- Urban – LOS high D (peak hour volume to capacity ratio less than or equal to 0.89)
- Downtown – LOS high D (peak hour volume to capacity ratio less than or equal to 0.89)

Specific improvements should be identified and implemented on the basis of detailed traffic studies or Environmental Impact Reports. Improvements may include intersection approach lane expansion, related channelization improvements and traffic signal installations.

7-P-9 Implement the intersection improvements (including signalization and additional or reallocated lanes) as illustrated in Appendix A.

7-P-10 Require mitigation for development proposals which result in projected parking demand that would exceed the proposed parking supply on a regular and frequent basis.

**Highways and Arterial Streets**

7-P-11 Maximize the carrying capacity of arterial roadways by controlling the number of intersections and driveways, minimizing residential access, implementing Transportation Systems Management measures, and requiring sufficient on-site parking to meet the needs of each project (see also Table 7-1).
Additional guidelines for arterial access include providing smooth ingress/egress to development. This includes designing parking areas so that traffic turning into the parking areas does not stack up on the arterial roadway; combining driveways to serve small parcels; and maintaining adequate distance between driveways and intersections to permit efficient traffic merges. In the built environment, roadway right-of-way may not be available to increase arterial capacity. Therefore, improving the efficiency of existing arterials through Transportation Systems Management (TSM) measures should be one of the first considerations to meet level of service standards. TSM measures include signal coordination, channelization and signal improvements at intersections, and implementation of new traffic control technology.

7-P-12 Continue to collect fees, plan and design for the future construction of Buchanan Bypass. Ensure preparation of a feasibility and environmental impact study to determine the precise alignment, costs, mitigation measures, and impacts on adjacent uses.

7-P-13 Upgrade or extend the hillside access routes from Bailey Road, Buchanan Road, Kirker Pass Road, and proposed San Marco Boulevard, as development potential warrants.

7-P-14 Increase access to alternative north-south routes providing connection to State Route 4, other than Railroad Avenue.

7-P-15 Support Caltrans’ planned improvements to the Railroad Avenue and Loveridge Road interchanges in conjunction with State Route 4 widening projects. Work with Federal, State and regional authorities to ensure timely completion of these projects needed to adequately serve local circulation needs.

7-P-16 Continue to collect fees for the extension of West Leland Road to Willow Pass Road, subject to the Traffic Mitigation Fee program. As established by nexus, require new development adjacent to the extension to dedicate right-of-way and construct or fund new intersections and frontage improvements.
7-P-17 Pursue the design and construction of an interchange/overpass at State Route 4 and Range Road. Work with Caltrans to design an interchange facility that will accommodate future traffic demands.

7-P-18 Approve construction of the proposed San Marco Boulevard (Bailey Bypass). Ensure preparation of a feasibility and environmental impact study to determine the precise alignment, costs, mitigation measures, and impacts on adjacent uses. Evaluate topographic and geologic constraints, and projected traffic generation rates. Consider a road alignment within the Restricted Federal Easement area, if abandoned, for access to potential residential neighborhoods.

7-P-19 Rebuild the interchange/overpass between Willow Pass Road, Range Road, North Parkside Drive, and the BNSF Railroad tracks for safe and efficient movement of auto and bicycle traffic.

7-P-20 Encourage motorists to use State Route 4 for the peak-hour commute, rather than using arterial streets in Concord and other East County cities.

Collectors and Local Streets

7-P-21 Design local residential streets and implement traffic-control measures to keep traffic below 5,000 vehicles per day.

7-P-22 Avoid adding traffic roadways carrying volumes above the standards, and consider traffic control measures where perceived nuisance is severe.

7-P-23 Develop procedures and guidelines to mitigate neighborhood traffic impacts in areas where traffic speeds or volumes exceed posted speed limits or standards established above.

Measures that may be considered include:

- Installation of way-finding signs on arterial routes that encourage motorists to use routes that do not pass through residential areas.
• Operational changes such as signalization, turn lanes and extended turning bays on arterial streets that encourage their use as inter-community connectors.

• Traffic calming measures such as curb extensions or gateway features at intersections on streets leading into residential areas to inform motorists that they are entering a neighborhood area.

• Community educational and awareness programs to promote selection of routes within the City that do not pass through residential areas.

**Goods Movement**

7-P-24 Continue to designate appropriate truck routes, and discourage unnecessary through traffic in residential areas.

7-P-25 Require trucks accessing the industrial land uses east of Downtown to use the Pittsburg/Antioch Highway in order to bypass the Creeds/Central Addition neighborhood.

### 7.3 TRANSIT AND PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

Figure 7-3 depicts existing and proposed transit services within the City.

**TRI-DELTA TRANSIT BUS SERVICE**

Tri-Delta Transit serves Eastern Contra Costa County including the cities of Pittsburg, Antioch, Oakley, Brentwood, and the unincorporated areas of East County, including Bay Point. All buses have bicycle racks and are wheelchair lift equipped. Within Pittsburg, Tri-Delta Transit operates seven bus routes serving all areas of Pittsburg. The primary lines serving Pittsburg carry approximately 3,400 passengers per day.

Tri-Delta’s future service plan includes expanding service near the Railroad Avenue junction with State Route 4 (the location of the proposed Railroad Avenue BART Station). Tri-Delta’s short-range transit plan indicates improvements to
transit service, including five additional buses to implement 7,100 more hours of service, and early morning service to the Pittsburg/Bay Point BART station.

COUNTY CONNECTION TRANSIT SERVICE

The County Connection transit service, operated by the Contra Costa County Transit Authority (CCCTA), serves most Contra Costa County cities, with limited service to East County areas. County Connection operates Line 930 through Pittsburg, which originates in Walnut Creek and travels on Ygnacio Valley Road/Kirker Pass Road to Buchanan Road. Its terminus is at the Hillerest Park & Ride Lot in Antioch. Route 930 serving Pittsburg has consistently fallen below CCCTA’s productivity thresholds, resulting in service reductions in 1997. County Connection has no immediate plan to increase its service in the East County.

BART Service

The Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station is located at the southwest quadrant of the State Route 4/Bailey Road interchange. During weekdays, scheduled trains complete 75 round-trips between the Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station and other Bay Area destinations. The Pittsburg/Bay Point line had an average weekday ridership of approximately 7,200 passengers in 1997, an increase of 23 percent since the station opened in 1996. BART projects ridership at this station is anticipated to grow 6 percent annually through the year 2005. BART also provides express bus service between the Pittsburg/Bay Point Station, Antioch and Brentwood (Routes PE and PE1).

BART’s future service plan includes adding 30 new trains to its present 43 online trains and reducing headways to accommodate the increase in service. In addition, BART expects to provide an additional 350 parking spaces at the Pittsburg/Bay Point Station by the year 2005. BART’s short-range transit plan (1997-2005) does not include extension of the line further east; this proposed extension is considered a long-range improvement.

The Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station, which connects the City to a variety of Bay Area destinations, is pictured here from its parking lot.
Figure 7-3
Transit Facilities

Source: Fehr & Peers Associates
GOALS: TRANSIT AND PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

7-G-8 Cooperate with public agencies and other jurisdictions to promote local regional public transit serving Pittsburg and provide an express bus system between Pittsburg, Brentwood, Oakley, Antioch, and the Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station.

The City should encourage transit development, expansion, coordination and aggressive marketing throughout eastern Contra Costa County to serve a broader range of local and regional transportation needs including commuter and express service.

7-G-9 Continue to support public and private organizations’ efforts to provide paratransit service for the elderly and disabled.

POLICIES: TRANSIT AND PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

7-P-26 Require mitigation for development proposals which increase transit demand above the service levels provided by public transit operators and agencies.

7-P-27 Support the expansion of the existing transit service area and an increase in the service levels of existing transit. Support increased Tri-Delta and County Connection express bus service to the Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station to reduce traffic demand on State Route 4.

7-P-28 Encourage the extension of BART to Railroad Avenue within the median of State Route 4. Cooperate with BART and regional agencies to develop station area plans and transit-oriented development patterns.

7-P-29 Preserve options for future transit use when designing improvements for roadways. Ensure that developers provide bus turnouts and/or shelters, where appropriate, as part of projects.
7-P-30 Work with Tri-Delta and planning area residents to plan for local bus routes that more effectively serve potential riders within local neighborhoods.

7-P-31 Work with Tri-Delta and County Connection to schedule signal timing for arterials with heavy bus traffic, where air quality benefits can be demonstrated.

7-P-32 Support efforts by public agencies and/or private interests to promote regional heavy and light passenger rail transit as an alternative or adjunct to BART, with connections to BART and other multi-modal transit.
7.4 BIKEWAYS AND PEDESTRIAN MOVEMENT

BICYCLE FACILITIES

The City of Pittsburg maintains limited bikeways and storage facilities for local residents. Existing on-street bicycle facilities include portions of East Leland Road and Railroad Avenue, Kirker Pass Road, Buchanan Road, Harbor Street, Willow Pass Road, Crestview Drive, and Loveridge Road. Additionally, the Delta de Anza Trail, which runs east-west throughout the length of the City, provides a multi-use trail that local bicyclists may use. Local bicycle facilities include bike paths, bike lanes, and bike routes:

- **Bike paths** are paved facilities that are physically separated from roadways used by motor vehicles by space or a barrier and are designated for bicycle use. Existing bike paths in Pittsburg are multi-use paths and permit not only bicycles, but also pedestrians, skaters, scooters, and handicapped persons in wheelchairs. (Caltrans Class I facility)

- **Bike lanes** are lanes on the outside edge of roadways reserved for the exclusive use of bicycles. Bike lanes are designated with special signage and pavement markings. (Caltrans Class II facility)

- **Bike routes** are roadways recommended for use by bicycles and often connect roadways with bike lanes and bike paths. Bike routes are designated with signs only. (Caltrans Class III facility)

In 2001, TRANSPLAN and the City adopted the East Contra Costa County Bikeway Plan, which designates on-street bike facilities (bike lanes and/or routes). Bicycle lanes are planned for all major streets, including West Leland Road, proposed San Marco Boulevard, Montezuma Street, and Century Boulevard. Table 7-5 and Figure 7-4 describe existing and planned future bike lanes in Pittsburg.
### Table 7-5

**Bicycle Facilities, Pittsburg Planning Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Existing Class</th>
<th>Proposed Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avila Road</td>
<td>West City Limits</td>
<td>West Leland Road</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailey Road</td>
<td>State Route 4</td>
<td>Willow Circle</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Side Drive</td>
<td>River Park Drive</td>
<td>Marina Boulevard</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bliss Avenue (north of)</td>
<td>Railroad Avenue</td>
<td>Harbor Street</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Diamond Street</td>
<td>West 10th Street</td>
<td>East 5th Street</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan Road</td>
<td>Ventura Drive</td>
<td>East City Limits</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan Road</td>
<td>Heights Avenue</td>
<td>Ventura Drive</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan Road</td>
<td>Railroad Avenue</td>
<td>Heights Avenue</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Avenue</td>
<td>Loveridge Road</td>
<td>Markstein Drive</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC Canal Trail</td>
<td>County/ Bay Point</td>
<td>Antioch City Limits</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Avenue</td>
<td>Railroad Avenue</td>
<td>Harbor Street</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Avenue</td>
<td>Railroad Avenue</td>
<td>Columbia Street</td>
<td>II/III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Century Boulevard</td>
<td>East Leland Road</td>
<td>CCC Wasteway</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Avenue</td>
<td>Railroad Avenue</td>
<td>Columbia Street</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crestview Drive</td>
<td>West Buchanan Road</td>
<td>Olympia Drive</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crestview Drive</td>
<td>Olympia Drive</td>
<td>Frontage Road</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crestview Drive</td>
<td>Frontage Road</td>
<td>Buchanan Road</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland Street</td>
<td>East 10th Street</td>
<td>East Third Street</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davi Avenue</td>
<td>Civic Avenue</td>
<td>Power Avenue</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta DeAnza Trail (EBMUD ROW)</td>
<td>County/ Bay Point</td>
<td>Antioch City Limits</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East 3rd. Street</td>
<td>Marina Boulevard</td>
<td>Harbor Street</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Leland Road</td>
<td>Railroad Avenue</td>
<td>Antioch City Limits</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontage Road</td>
<td>Los Medanos School</td>
<td>Crestview</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7-5

**Bicycle Facilities, Pittsburg Planning Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Existing Class</th>
<th>Proposed Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frontage Road</td>
<td>Railroad Avenue</td>
<td>West of Burton Avenue</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor Street</td>
<td>Buchanan Road</td>
<td>East 10th Street</td>
<td>III/II*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor Street</td>
<td>Buchanan Road</td>
<td>Contra Costa Canal</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor Street</td>
<td>Contra Costa Canal</td>
<td>East Third Street</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herb White Way</td>
<td>W. 10th Street</td>
<td>Marina Boulevard</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirker Pass Road</td>
<td>Buchanan Road</td>
<td>South City Limits</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leland Road</td>
<td>Railroad Avenue</td>
<td>Bailey Road</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lander Creek Road</td>
<td>Buchanan Road</td>
<td>Pittsburg Waterfront Road</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loveridge Road</td>
<td>Buchanan Road</td>
<td>Road</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina Boulevard</td>
<td>Herb White Way</td>
<td>Pelican Loop</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markstein Drive</td>
<td>California Avenue</td>
<td>Northpark Boulevard</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New North/South Roadway</td>
<td>Bliss Avenue (north of)</td>
<td>Leland Road</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northpark Boulevard</td>
<td>Markstein Drive</td>
<td>Century Boulevard</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Parkside Drive</td>
<td>Range Road</td>
<td>Railroad Avenue</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburg-Antioch Highway</td>
<td>Columbia Street</td>
<td>East City Limits</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polaris/Power Ave</td>
<td>Range Road</td>
<td>Railroad Avenue</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Avenue</td>
<td>State Route 4</td>
<td>East Eighth Street</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Avenue</td>
<td>Frontage Road</td>
<td>Delta De Anza Trail</td>
<td>I**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range Road</td>
<td>West Leland Road</td>
<td>Willow Pass Road</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marco Boulevard</td>
<td>State Route 4</td>
<td>West Leland Road</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marco Boulevard</td>
<td>West Leland Road</td>
<td>Rio Verde Circle</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marco Boulevard</td>
<td>Rio Verde Circle</td>
<td>Bailey Road</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Street</td>
<td>Railroad Avenue</td>
<td>Harbor Street</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventeenth Street</td>
<td>Davi Avenue</td>
<td>Parkside Elementary School</td>
<td>II/III***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR4/Frontage Road</td>
<td>Crestview Avenue</td>
<td>Railroad Avenue</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7-5  
Bicycle Facilities, Pittsburg Planning Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Existing Class</th>
<th>Proposed Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR4 (north of) Railroad Avenue</td>
<td>Range Road</td>
<td>Range Road I/II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneman Avenue Loveridge Road</td>
<td>Harbor Street</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West/East Eight Street Herb White Way</td>
<td>Harbor Street</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPRR ROW Herb White Way</td>
<td>Willow Pass Road</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Buchanan Road Crestview Avenue</td>
<td>Railroad Avenue</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Leland Road Avila Road</td>
<td>Bailey Road</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Leland Road Bailey Road</td>
<td>Burton Avenue</td>
<td>III II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Leland Road Burton Avenue</td>
<td>Railroad Avenue</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West 10th Street Herb White Way</td>
<td>Black Diamond Street</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Pass Road West City Limits</td>
<td>Range Road</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Pass Road Range Road</td>
<td>Herb White Way</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Existing Class III facility, planned Class II;  
** Multi-use pedestrian and bicycle pathway proposed to be located in the existing greenway along the west side of Railroad Avenue from Delta De Ana Trail to State Route 4;  
*** Depending on available right-of-way.

Source: City of Pittsburg, September 2004; Railroad Avenue Specific Plan, 2009
Proposed Figure 7-4

Bicycle Facilities

Source: City of Pittsburg, September 2004
PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES

Pedestrian facilities include sidewalks, paths, pedestrian bridges, crosswalks, and crossing signals. Most streets in Pittsburg have sidewalks on both sides with signals and crosswalks at signalized intersections to accommodate pedestrian circulation.

The grid street pattern in Downtown, coupled with appropriate pedestrian facilities and linkages to waterfront paths, enable a walkable urban core. However, some older streets in the City contain sporadic pedestrian facilities. Pedestrian facility improvements will improve safety for pedestrians and also encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation.

GOALS: BIKEWAYS AND PEDESTRIAN MOVEMENT

7-G-10 Study the feasibility of a comprehensive network of on- and off-road bike routes to encourage the use of bikes for commute, recreational and other trips.

A continuous network of safe and convenient bikeways has the potential to connect neighborhoods with major activity centers, parks, schools, employment centers, civic uses, the waterfront, and the County bicycle system.

7-G-11 Coordinate with neighboring communities and regional agencies to establish a continuous regional system of bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

7-G-12 Seek assistance from major employers and developers in implementing programs to encourage use of bikes for commute purposes.

7-G-13 Continue to support programs to improve the mobility of the elderly and handicapped, and ensure that new development is accessible to those with physical impairments, as required by State law.
7-G-14 Develop urban design and streetscape standards and guidelines to improve pedestrian environments and accessibility in new development projects and in Downtown.

7-G-15 Encourage walking as a regular means of transportation for people who live within a half-mile walk of school, work, or routine shopping destinations.

7-G-16 Ensure that current bicycle-friendly roadways, featuring wide shoulders or marked bicycle lanes, are not redesigned to improve traffic LOS, unless all other alternative roadways possible to alleviate congestion are exhausted.

POLICIES: BIKEWAYS AND PEDESTRIAN MOVEMENT

Bicycle and Pedestrian Access

7-P-33 Require mitigation for development proposals which result in potential conflicts, or fail to provide adequate access, for pedestrians and bicycles.

7-P-34 As part of development approval, ensure that safe and contiguous routes for pedestrians and bicyclists are provided within new development projects and on any roadways that are impacted as a result of new development.

7-P-35 Work with school districts, school administrators and parents of elementary school students to develop a “suggested routes to school” program for students who bicycle and walk.

7-P-36 Ensure continued compliance with Title 24 of the Uniform Building Code, requiring removal of all barriers to disabled persons on arterial and collector streets.

7-P-37 Designate a Bicycle and Pedestrian Program Coordinator for the City of Pittsburg.
**Pedestrian Facilities**

7-P-38  Develop a series of continuous pedestrian systems within Downtown and residential neighborhoods, connecting major activity centers and trails with City and County open space areas.

Sidewalks should be creatively designed to invite safe use by pedestrians, and be free of obstacles, such as newspaper racks, bus benches, utility poles, and fire hydrants.

7-P-39  Ensure that residential and commercial developments provide pedestrian pathways between lots for direct routes to commercial centers, schools, and transit facilities.

7-P-40  Ensure provision of sufficiently wide sidewalks and pedestrian paths in all new residential development.

7-P-41  Ensure the provision of multi-use trails or trailheads within new hillside developments, preferably connecting to the regional trail network.

7-P-42  Improve pedestrian crossing safety at heavily used intersections by installing crossing controls that provide adequate time for pedestrians to cross the street.

**Bicycle Lanes, Paths and Facilities**

7-P-43  Provide adequate roadway width dedications for bicycle lanes, paths, and routes as designated in Figure 7-4.

7-P-44  Coordinate with Contra Costa County to develop a city-wide Bicycle Master Plan by year 2005. Cooperate with the Contra Costa County RTPC in implementing construction of bicycle facilities within the Bicycle Action Plan.

7-P-45  During review of development projects, encourage secure bicycle facilities and other alternative transportation facilities at employment sites, public facilities, and multi-family residential complexes.
7-P-46 Construction or expansion of roadways and intersections within the City shall not result in the severance of an existing bicycle route, unless an alternative exists or is provided.

7-P-47 Develop a multi-use bicycle path (approx. 2.5 miles) along the abandoned railroad tracks north of Willow Pass Road, providing linkage between Downtown and the Stake Point/Marina area.

7-P-48 Ensure that construction of bulb-outs and curb extensions at intersections for pedestrian safety does not endanger bicyclists by forcing them into traffic lanes.

7-P-49 Pursue construction of a bicycle path connecting Railroad Avenue to North Parkside Drive through City Park. Include appropriate signage and storage facilities.

7-P-50 Improve signage, notifying vehicles of bicyclists at dangerous intersections and underpasses, such as the Railroad Avenue/State Route 4 interchange.

7-P-51 Consider redesigning the Railroad Avenue linear park to accommodate bicycles. Ensure that future greenways throughout the City contain multi-use paths.

7-P-52 Require that new arterial and collector streets accommodate bicyclists.

7-P-53 Require that any grind and overlay of existing arterial and collector streets consider that needs of bicyclists.

7-P-54 Amend Engineering standards to require the use of bicycle grates on all new catch basins and storm drain inlet replacements on streets.
7.5 TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs are intended to reduce the amount of peak period (rush hour) traffic on City roadways and highways. Employees are encouraged to reduce their use of the single-occupant automobile as the primary mode of transportation to the workplace, and to travel during non-peak times. In order to fulfill the requirements of the CMP and the growth management requirements of Measure J, all jurisdictions within Contra Cost County must adopt a TDM Ordinance or Resolution.

Many major employers in East County have TDM programs, although the requirements for these programs have been overturned in the state legislature\(^1\). Employers should be encouraged to have TDM programs and new employment centers should be designed to incorporate on-site showers, bicycle storage facilities, and transit shelters where appropriate.

The City should consider developing a program of bicycle circulation improvements, including bike paths, bike lanes, and bike routes. Opportunities to connect private development to bicycle facilities should be included in future planning studies. Adding bicycle lanes to roadway widening projects and bicycle detection loops with new signal installations should be considered as part of the City’s Capital Improvement Program.

Typical components of TDM programs include:

- A carpool/vanpool match program
- Preferential parking for carpools and vanpools
- Secure bicycle storage facilities
- On-site shower facilities
- Flex-time or staggered work hours that begin and/or end outside the peak commute hours

\(^1\) Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s Regulation 13, Rule 1, requiring employers with over 100 employees to decrease the average vehicle ridership was overturned.
On-site shuttle bus service to transit stations
A commitment to future shuttle bus service to BART stations

GOALS: TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT

7-G-17 Encourage major employers to develop and implement Transportation Demand Management programs to reduce peak-period trip generation.

POLICIES: TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT

7-P-55 Encourage major employers (for example: USS-POSCO, DOW Chemical, City of Pittsburg) to adopt Transportation Demand Management programs that would reduce peak-period trip generation by 15 percent or more.

7-P-56 Favor Transportation Demand Management programs that limit vehicle use over those that extend the commute hour.

Programs such as ridesharing and public transit reduce overall vehicle travel while flex-time and staggered work hours simply shift traffic to less congested times of day.

7-P-57 During review of development plans, encourage major employers to establish designated carpool parking areas and secure bicycle facilities in preferable on-site locations (for example, under parking shelters or closest to main entryways).

7-P-58 Allow the reduction of transportation impact fees on new non-residential development commensurate with provision of Transportation Demand Management measures.

Project proponents taking advantage of reductions must agree to adopt and implement specified TDM measures as a condition of project approval.
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This element outlines the City’s policy approach to developing parks, open spaces, and trails, in addition to supporting recreational, cultural, and educational programs and facilities.

The City’s park system provides a variety of community and neighborhood parks and facilities for local residents. The majority of the open space acreage within the Planning Area (4,590 acres) consists of three large passive recreational areas – Black Diamond Mines Regional Preserve, Browns Island Regional Shoreline, and Stoneman Park. Local and regional trails traversing the City provide connections to and from local neighborhoods, commercial districts, and parks. In addition, the City provides limited access to the Suisun Bay shoreline.

Expansion of recreational/educational programs for local youth, and provision of additional recreational/cultural facilities is projected within buildout of this General Plan. Other public facilities, including water and sewer, solid waste, and fire protection, are discussed in Chapter 11: Public Facilities.
OPEN SPACE CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

A well-planned open space system includes a variety of sizes and types, from neighborhood parks to regional open spaces. These park, recreation, and open space areas serve different purposes and usually offer facilities corresponding to their purposes. They can meet active and passive recreational needs, or facilitate resource conservation. The City’s park and open space system currently includes the following types of facilities (see Figure 8-1):

Parks and Recreation

- **Regional Trails.** Regional trails provide opportunities for hiking, biking, and jogging along open space corridors throughout the region. The Delta De Anza Trail runs approximately 4.8 miles along the East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) right-of-way through Pittsburg.

- **Community Parks.** Community parks are developed primarily to meet the recreational needs of a large portion of the City. Community parks range in size from 2 to 300 acres according to purpose, and often feature one-of-a-kind community facilities or natural resources. For example, Riverview Park offers paths and amenities along the Delta waterfront, while Small World Park features small replicas of a fort, mission, railroad ride, lagoon, riverboat, and a full-scale carousel. Community parks, such as Buchanan Park, may also contain a greater variety of recreational facilities, such as swimming pools, community centers, public rest rooms, bocce ball and horseshoe areas, trails, athletic fields, and pond fishing.

- **Neighborhood Parks.** Neighborhood parks primarily serve a small portion of the City, usually within one-half mile radius of the park. These parks are generally oriented toward the recreational needs of children and youth. For example, Marina Park provides playground equipment, as well as softball, baseball, and soccer fields.

Figure 8-1
Parks and Open Space
- **Linear Parks.** Often located along natural or man-made corridors such as rivers or rail lines, linear parks provide landscaped paths for walking and biking. Ideally, linear parks create linkages between other parks, community facilities, and neighborhoods. The City is currently developing a linear park along the Eighth Street portion of the former Sacramento Northern Railroad right-of-way.

- **Mini-Parks.** Mini-parks are usually small play areas or green spaces designed for small children or for visual purposes. When designed for special groups, mini-parks should be located near those populations, such as family housing areas or senior centers. There are currently five mini-parks in Pittsburg, as well as the Heritage Plaza corridor system in Downtown.

### Open Space

- **Regional Preserves.** The primary purpose of Regional Preserve areas is the conservation of natural resources. Browns Island Regional Shoreline, which is accessible only by boat, is a refuge for migrating shorebirds. The Black Diamond Regional Preserve, located south of Pittsburg in Contra Costa County, offers tours of abandoned coal mining tunnels and many miles of hiking trails. Both preserves under the jurisdiction of the East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD) are within Pittsburg’s Planning Area.

- **Open Space.** Open space, as designated by the General Plan, consists of privately-owned, undeveloped land. Steep, unstable hillside areas in new residential developments are considered open space areas, as well as large tracts of open land beyond the proposed limits of urban growth. Most open space areas consist of natural grassy slopes, cattle grazing, and/or wildlife habitat.
8.2 PARKS

Pittsburg’s Public Works Department manages the maintenance of the City’s park facilities, while the Recreation Department manages the operation of the parks. The Planning and Building and Engineering Departments are responsible for acquisition and development of park facilities. Pittsburg has approximately 312 acres of parkland within the City’s local park system, ranging in size from quarter-acre mini parks to the 190-acre Stoneman Park. Pittsburg’s park facilities are described in Table 8-1.

All of the City’s neighborhood parks are located near collector streets in residential neighborhoods, while community parks lie along arterial roadways to serve the larger City population. Central Harbor Park is located along the waterfront adjacent to Downtown, providing public access to this tremendous aquatic resource. City Park is a valuable community park that lies between the Civic Center and Downtown Pittsburg, featuring several baseball diamonds, volleyball courts, and a large group picnic area with bandstand. Stoneman Park consists primarily of picnic facilities and passive recreational facilities, including hiking trails along grassy canyons, directly adjacent to Pittsburg’s Delta View Golf Course.

The pace of parkland acquisition in Pittsburg has decreased in the last decade. Although the City’s park standard remains at five acres per 1,000 residents, only 2.9 acres of additional parkland per 1,000 new residents has been achieved since 1988. However, currently proposed park sites will provide the City with additional neighborhood parks intended to serve the residential population. The addition of the proposed park sites listed in Table 8-2 will increase the City’s parkland to approximately 404 acres. Consideration of the City’s linear park facilities (Eighth Street, Sante Fe, and Columbia) brings the City’s parkland total to 417 acres, resulting in a total of 4.5 acres of parks per 1,000 residents in 2020 (assuming a buildout population of 93,340).
**Table 8-1**  
Park Facilities, City of Pittsburg, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Picnic/Passive</th>
<th>Play Areas</th>
<th>Sports Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Parks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Harbor</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Park</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Monte Center</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverview</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small World</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneman</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneman North</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Parks Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>261</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood Parks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Seasons</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central¹</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeAnza</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlands</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsdale</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina Walk</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Hills</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peppertree</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village at New York Landing</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland Hills</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood Parks Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8-1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Facilities, City of Pittsburg, 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Park Name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mini Parks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown/Railroad Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Plazita 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninth and Montezuma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village (2 x 0.25 acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mini Park Subtotal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Local Parks Acreage</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Leased to the City of Pittsburg.

Source: City of Pittsburg, Leisure Services Dept.

PARK DEDICATION AND IMPROVEMENTS

The City currently maintains a neighborhood and community park standard of five acres per 1,000 residents, the maximum permitted under the Quimby Act, which also forms the basis of the City’s dedication and park fee requirements. Virtually all parkland over the last 10 years has been acquired through dedication and not through active acquisition. While this process has allowed the City to acquire developed parkland, in many instances the parks dedicated by residential developers are not highly visible or accessible. Land dedication has been useful in ensuring provision of pockets of open space as part of planned developments; however, these open spaces generally do not include park amenities.

The two street lighting and landscaping maintenance districts in the City help to ensure that City parks are improved and maintained as needed, by assessing a voter-approved $77.18 per unit. Revenues from the maintenance districts are very limited and other sources have been, and will continue to be, necessary for further park improvements.
GOALS: PARKS

8-G-1  Develop a high-quality public park system for Pittsburg that provides varied recreational opportunities accessible to all City residents.

8-G-2  Provide parks that reflect the diversity of Pittsburg’s natural setting, including creeks and waterways, tree stands, rock outcroppings, and topography.

POLICIES: PARKS

Standards and Accessibility

8-P-1  Maintain a neighborhood and community park standard of 5 acres of public parkland per 1,000 residents.

8-P-2  Pursue the development of park and recreation facilities within reasonable walking distance of all homes.

8-P-3  Develop public parks and recreational facilities that are equitably distributed throughout the urbanized area, and provide neighborhood recreation facilities in existing neighborhoods where such facilities are presently lacking.

8-P-4  Consider park accessibility, use and character as more valuable than size in the acquisition and development of new parks.

The City’s current park classification system (see above) is based more on the use and character of park facilities than their size. For example, many community parks that fulfill important community needs, such as shoreline access, are smaller than those proposed by national and regional recreation agencies.

8-P-5  Maintain park and recreation facility standards for new development to serve both residents and employees, attainable through dedication of parkland or payment of in-lieu fees.

SUMMARY OF PARK DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

Table 8-3
Park Development Standards, City of Pittsburg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood and Community Parks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>− 5 acres of community and neighborhood parkland per 1,000 residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>− Within reasonable walking distance of all residential development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>− Minimum 2 acres in size in new residential developments (target of 5 acres)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The demand by new residential development for parks and open space facilities is a well-known calculation among Californian cities, but the additional demands on park facilities by employees of local businesses (for example, eating lunch in a park or jogging along the waterfront after work) who are not residents must also be considered.

8-P-6 Revise the City’s Park Dedication Ordinance to define useable area for parkland dedication requirements. Proposed park sites should be:

- Designed such that 80 percent of the site has slopes of less than 3 percent that are suitable for active recreational play;
- Sized according to the City’s park standard of 5 acres per 1,000 residents (for example, a 200-unit subdivision would yield about 600 residents, and a dedication requirement of 3 acres);
- Available for year-round use, so that detention basins are not designated as parkland or shared park facilities; and
- A minimum of 2 contiguous acres in new residential neighborhoods.

8-P-7 Encourage the development or provision of facilities that cater to diverse recreational interests.

These facilities could provide hard-surface courts in-lieu of turf areas, which include but are not limited to activities such as tennis, skateboarding, hand/racquetball, bocce ball, basketball, volleyball, badminton, and roller hockey. These may be provided within existing parks or constructed as specific-use facilities.

Design and Natural Resources

8-P-8 Preserve areas of riparian and other wildlife habitat, oak woodland, and other significant biotic resources within parks. Design park improvements to be compatible with the preservation of such resource areas.
Any improvements, including paving or installation of recreation equipment, made in parks should be located and constructed in such a way as to ensure the long-term preservation of natural resource areas.

8-P-9  **Design the layout of new park facilities in accordance with the natural features of the land.** Where possible, preserve such natural features as creeks and drainage ponds, rock outcroppings, and significant topographic features.

The preservation of natural features in open space areas (even active recreational facilities) reflects the setting in which the City has developed and provides variety to the urban landscape.

8-P-10  **Comprehensively update the City’s Parks Recreation and Open Space Master Plan to implement General Plan policies and facilitate detailed planning for parks, trail systems and special recreational facilities.** Ensure that this update includes planning for the development of active recreational uses at Stoneman Park.

The City’s Parks Recreation and Open Space Master Plan is intended to bridge the gap between the policies set forth in this General Plan and the actual detailed planning and development of park and recreation facilities.

**Dedications and Maintenance**

8-P-11  **Encourage dedication of fully developed parks rather than in-lieu fees.** When in-lieu fees are collected, ensure that they are spent acquiring and developing new park sites or enhancing existing park facilities.

Due to significant increases in land values over time, the City’s purchasing power can be diminished as time lapses between the collection of in-lieu fees and the actual acquisition of parkland. Dedication of usable parkland prevents the potential depreciation of park fees while the City searches for appropriate and affordable parkland.
8-P-12 Ensure that all parks acquired through dedication are at least 2 acres in size within new residential developments (target 5 acres). Accept smaller visual open space areas in new commercial and industrial development for parkland dedications.

Several of the newer mini-parks contained within residential developments lack necessary park amenities, such as benches. The provision of visual open space as parkland dedication in commercial developments is reasonable. However, residential developments must provide more usable open space areas.

8-P-13 Limit parkland dedications to flat, usable parcels within new residential neighborhoods (see Policy 8-P-6 above). Ensure that such park sites provide open, grassy areas for informal recreational play (such as football or soccer).

8-P-14 Develop a maintenance-funding plan for all City parks. Consider participation in parkland maintenance districts as a condition of development approval for new residential subdivisions.

Maintenance of existing and new parks is essential in the on-going use of developed parkland. A citywide plan for funding the maintenance and improvement of all City parks will ensure that the citizens of Pittsburg derive the full benefits of City parkland. Requiring new residential development to secure funding sources for the maintenance of new parks will allow the City to continue developing and maintaining recreational facilities on a limited budget.

8-P-15 Work with PG&E to obtain ownership of lands within the transmission corridor, south of State Route 4 (as designated on Figure 2-2), for development of a community park.

8-P-16 Encourage dedication of public parks in new residential developments with more than 150 units.

Current and proposed parks are not sufficient to meet City’s park standard (See Policy 8-P-1). In addition to the parks identified in Figure 8-1 and Table 8-2, the City should consider new sites to add to its park system.
8.3 TRAILS AND OPEN SPACE

Regional open spaces within the Planning Area include Browns Island Regional Shoreline and Black Diamond Mines Regional Preserve, both owned by EBRPD. Browns Island Regional Shoreline is a tidal marshland area directly across New York Slough from the City’s Downtown. The island preserve provides habitat for a variety of the region’s waterfowl and wetlands animals. Black Diamond Mines Regional Preserve was a profitable source of coal for many miners during the mid to late 1800s. Riddled with underground mining tunnels, the hills on Pittsburg’s southern border now provide valuable wildlife habitat and recreational open space acreage. Table 8-4 gives open space acreages for both of Pittsburg’s regional preserves.

Several trails within the Planning Area provide access to regional open spaces, as well as connections to various neighborhoods within the City, as described in Table 8-4. The Delta De Anza Trail runs east-west through the Planning Area for nearly 4.8 miles along the Mokelumne Aqueduct, an East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) right-of-way. Approximately 78 acres of the Delta De Anza Trail lie within the city limits, connecting single-family residential neighborhoods throughout the southern portion of the City. The Stoneman Park trailhead offers access to a trail through the canyons of Stoneman Park. The Eighth Street Linear Park provides a linear greenway through the City’s older neighborhoods in and near Downtown, and will connect to other multi-use trails along the waterfront.

Vacant, rolling hills in the southern portion of the Planning Area are used intermittently for livestock grazing. The preservation of local hillsides as open space areas is important for several reasons: marginal agricultural value resulting from grazing activities; undisturbed grasslands habitat; preservation of ridgeline views from developed areas within the City; and quality-of-life value due to open space acreage accessible to local residents.

Proposed trails and open space within the Planning Area include the Contra Costa Canal, Kirker Creek riparian corridor, and PG&E power line right-of-way. Although these proposed trail easements are currently owned by local property-owners or utility companies, the City may actively pursue use of the rights-of-way for recreational activities.

Table 8-4
Trails & Open Space: Pittsburg Planning Area, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trails / Trailheads</th>
<th>Miles Long</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delta De Anza Trail</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor Street trailhead</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneman Park trailhead</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Hills trailheads (2 x 0.5 acres)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth Street Linear Park*</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe Linear Park*</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Linear Park*</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trails Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>93</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Open Space**

| Black Diamond Regional Preserve           | 3,700      |
| Browns Island Regional Shoreline          | 700        |
| **Open Space Subtotal**                   |            | **4,400**   |
| **Total Trails & Open Space Acreage**     |            | **4,493**   |

* Currently (year 2000) under construction.

Source: City of Pittsburg, Leisure Services Dept
GOALS: TRAILS AND OPEN SPACE

8-G-3 Promote a local trail and linear park system to provide access to regional open space areas, as well as connections between neighborhoods.

8-G-4 Support and promote the active use of regional open space areas, such as Black Diamond Mines Regional Preserve, by local residents.

POLICIES: TRAILS AND OPEN SPACE

8-P-17 Work with East Bay Regional Parks District to explore the possibility of developing passive recreation uses and educational programs on Browns Island, such as boating excursions to view waterfowl nesting areas.

Because it consists almost entirely of marshlands and channels, Browns Island could provide the City with a remarkable resource for wetlands education programs. Informational kiosks may be developed along the City’s waterfront to inform visitors of wildlife species and educational programs associated with the island.

8-P-18 Cooperate with regional agencies to develop a “Bay to Black Diamond” trail through the City, providing a diversity of passive recreational opportunities and unique vistas.

The passive recreational uses currently available at Black Diamond Mines include miles of hiking, biking and jogging trails. The City should promote the extension of these trails north through the City, connecting local park facilities with the Suisun Bay waterfront and Black Diamond Mines Regional Preserve.

8-P-19 Cooperate with East Bay Municipal Utility District to ensure continued public access to the Delta De Anza Trail, along the Mokelumne Aqueduct right-of-way.

8-P-20 Pursue the development and extension of local and regional trails throughout the Planning Area by utilizing available public utility rights-of-way including:
• **Kirker Creek.** The Kirker Creek easement could be developed as a creekside trail, connecting other trails and open spaces throughout the City with the hiking trails in the Black Diamond Mines Regional Preserve.

• **Contra Costa Canal.** The Contra Costa Canal provides a meandering right-of-way throughout the southern portion of Pittsburg. A trail along this right-of-way could link several neighborhoods with the Railroad Avenue commercial corridor.

• **PG&E Utility ROW.** PG&E holds a right-of-way for the power/utility lines that run north-south from the southern hills to the power plant on the waterfront, an ideal corridor for public access.

These rights-of-way are all considered privately owned open space, but may have development potential for recreational trails. Where possible, use trails and linear parks to connect other parks and recreational facilities within the Planning Area.

8-P-21 **Encourage new residential development in hillside areas to develop public trails and/or trailheads providing connections to other regional and local open spaces.**

Hillside residential subdivisions are developed using clustering techniques to avoid steep, unstable slopes. Recreational trails, however, can be provided through the open space pockets to provide residents with access to the larger trails network within the Pittsburg Planning Area.

8-P-22 **Preserve land under Williamson Act contract in agriculture, consistent with State law, until urban services are available and expansion of development would occur in an orderly and contiguous fashion.**
8.4 WATERFRONT ACCESS

Parks and recreation areas along the City’s waterfront can take advantage of one of Pittsburg’s most identifiable resources, the Delta shoreline. Historically, Pittsburg’s waterfront was used for docking, fishing and canning, and shipping of coal. Black Diamond Mines was the first source of fossil fuel discovered in California, and railways bisected the Planning Area to transport coal and cargo to Suisun Bay. Later, steel, chemical production, and other heavy industries developed along the eastern shore, while Concord Naval Weapons Station spread out to the west.

Currently, the small portion of waterfront adjacent to Downtown consists of small-craft marinas. However, both physical and visual public access to and along the shoreline is lacking. Although nearly three miles of shoreline lie within the city limits, only two small recreational areas—Central Harbor Park and Riverview Park—provide public access to the waterfront. Along the City’s shoreline east of Downtown, heavy industrial uses on privately-owned land continue to dominate. Public access, in the form of shoreline trails or smaller park access points, would maximize the City’s use of this limited natural resource. Waterfront development standards may require wider setbacks from both residential and industrial development projects to provide the City with desired waterfront access.

Views from the public spaces, including Downtown and street rights-of-way, to the Delta shoreline are also limited. Waterfront development standards should also ensure that new development projects are designed to provide maximum views of the shoreline. Increasing the shoreline’s presence within Pittsburg can provide local residents with an improved sense of community identity.
GOALS: WATERFRONT ACCESS

8-G-5 Maximize public access to and recreational facilities along the City’s waterfront areas.

8-G-6 Improve linkages between the waterfront, Downtown core, and other recreational open spaces within the City.

8-G-7 Promote improved views of the shoreline from public parks and rights-of-way.

POLICIES: WATERFRONT ACCESS

8-P-23 Develop standards for all new waterfront development that ensure adequate setbacks from the mean high tide line. Encourage, where possible, provision of public access to the shoreline.

A waterfront development setback will ensure that new development along the water provides adequate space for a shoreline trail allowing residents access to the Suisun Bay.

8-P-24 During review of development plans, pursue preservation of lands where streets terminate at the waterfront. Such lands should be improved as public open space, ensuring that undisturbed views of Suisun Bay and New York Slough are preserved.

The development of lands at street terminuses for waterfront parks will provide City residents with views of and identifiable public access to the Delta shoreline.

8-P-25 Emphasize the importance of public views of the shoreline (from public spaces and rights-of-way) when reviewing new development projects along the water.

Work with developers to ensure that new development along the waterfront, particularly adjacent to Downtown, provides both site tenants and the larger public with views of the Delta shoreline. Inform developers of this City policy
early in the development review process to ensure quality design of new projects.

8-P-26 Explore all potential improvements to fully integrate the City’s shoreline into the urban fabric, including:

- **Waterfront Parks.** Pursue and develop small pockets of open space that provide physical and visual access to the waterfront.

- **Waterfront Trail/Bikeway.** A linear park along the shoreline, featuring a path for both walking and biking, would encourage more vibrant activity along the waterfront.

- **Landscaping.** Plant low-growing and flowering greenery near waterfront access points to extend streetscaping to the shoreline.

- **Linear Trail Connections.** The City’s current linear trail network within Downtown and adjacent residential neighborhoods could be extended to provide convenient access to waterfront parks and activities.

Increased shoreline access, improved landscaping and amenities in accessible areas, as well as linkages to nearby neighborhoods and Downtown, would draw more residents and visitors to Pittsburg’s Downtown area. Any linear park connection made to provide access to the shoreline will improve residents’ sense of identity with the waterfront.
8.5 RECREATIONAL AND CULTURAL PROGRAMS

Pittsburg’s Recreation Department administers and operates youth and adult sports, aquatics, art classes, excursions, and other recreational programming for the community. Because of Pittsburg’s ethnic and socio-economic diversity, the City must provide a wide variety of recreational and education programs at low costs. Fortunately, Pittsburg maintains a variety of recreational facilities, including community centers, a swimming pool, baseball diamonds and basketball courts, a golf course, nature trails, and a community theatre.

Nearly one-third of Pittsburg’s population is age 17 or younger. A high proportion of youths, who are free from classes in mid-afternoon, creates a definite need for recreational and cultural programs within the City. The development of teen facilities and programs is important to the well-being of local youth; examples of successful City facilities and programs include the proposed Skateboard Park and the Pittsburg Summer Youth Corp, a community service program that rewards volunteers with field trips and camping excursions.

Additionally, as Pittsburg’s population ages, there is likely to be a greater demand for senior services and activities. The development of a Senior Center provides local seniors with a space in which to continue and expand exercise classes, music lessons, health and diet programs, and social events.

There are many private cultural programs and groups within Pittsburg that need significant cultural facilities in which to meet and perform. However, local community centers are aging and library collections are becoming antiquated. High priority should be placed on the development of such facilities, potentially in cooperation with Los Medanos Community College, which features an expansive library and performing arts center. The City’s Recreation Department also works closely with the Pittsburg Chamber of Commerce to bring several special events and festivals to local residents every year, including the Renaissance Festival in August. There is also Small World Park – a fantasy playground featuring small replicas of a Children’s Days.
GOALS: RECREATIONAL AND CULTURAL PROGRAMS

8-G-8  Provide a diversity of recreational and cultural opportunities, including facilities and programs targeted toward local youth and senior residents.

8-G-9  Promote the arts as an integral component of Pittsburg’s quality of life, economic vitality, and efforts to build a safe and healthy community.

POLICIES: RECREATIONAL AND CULTURAL PROGRAMS

8-P-27  Locate community facilities in and adjacent to public parks, where possible. Encourage community organizations to utilize these and other park facilities for recreational and cultural activities.

8-P-28  Pursue the development of recreational facilities and programs specifically geared toward youth and teens, including:

- Teen Center. A teen center would provide a safe environment for local youth to meet and interact, or to participate in after-school, athletic, or cultural activities.

- Gymnasium. A large gymnasium would provide the City with more opportunity to get youth involved in local sports leagues and after-school drop-in games, such as basketball.

- Skateboard Park. Construction of a skateboard park would provide challenging topography in a controlled environment for local skateboarders. The City is currently working on the development of such a facility.

8-P-29  Enable private and non-profit programs to use City recreational facilities, as needed.

8-P-30  Continue to develop programs for the Senior Center, featuring cultural and recreational programs, classes and special events geared toward the community’s seniors.
The location and development of a Senior Center, where older residents can meet for recreation programs and classes, will be an important consideration in Pittsburg’s future.

8-P-31  Improve public cultural facilities, including community centers, theatres, and libraries. Cooperate with Los Medanos Community College to provide City residents with access to local cultural facilities.

8-P-32  Participate in partnership and collaborative efforts with local art groups and service organizations to strengthen local, regional, and State art advocacy efforts.

8-P-33  Provide incentives to encourage investments in public art on historic properties.

8-P-34  Explore and develop new funding options for maintenance of public art, in partnership with private developers.

8-P-35  Encourage collaboration among artists, art organizations, and other community partners, including businesses, educational institutions, and individuals, for acquisition and maintenance of public art.

8-P-36  Utilize art and cultural programs as a revitalizing force for renewal of the Downtown.

8-P-37  Work in partnership with artists, art organizations, and educational institutions to educate youth in the arts.

8-P-38  Support the preservation, maintenance, and development of community cultural facilities that provide gathering places for cultural exploration, expression, and inspiration.
8.6 EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES

Educational facilities within Pittsburg include elementary and secondary schools, a community college, and a public library. All of the public schools in Pittsburg are within either Pittsburg Unified School District or Mount Diablo Unified School District. However, a few residential blocks in the southeast portion of the City are located within the Antioch School District boundaries. Public school district boundaries and facilities are identified in Figure 8-2.

In addition to elementary and secondary schools, two continuation schools, two private parochial schools (Saint Peter Martyr School and Lighthouse Christian Center School), and Los Medanos Community College operate within the Planning Area. Table 8-5, lists enrollment and capacity figures for all school facilities within Pittsburg.

PITTSBURG UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Pittsburg Unified School District (PUSD) currently operates seven elementary schools (grades K-5), two middle schools (grades 6-8), and one high school (grades 9-12). Additionally, the school district provides adult education programs, independent study, home teaching, and special education. Many of the schools within PUSD have reached or are nearing capacity.

MOUNT DIABLO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Mount Diablo Unified School District (MDUSD) spans several cities within Contra Costa County. District facilities in the community of Bay Point (within the Pittsburg Planning Area) include three elementary schools (grades K-5), one middle school (grades 6-8), and one continuation school. Several MDUSD schools within the Pittsburg Planning Area have reached or are nearing capacity. The expansion of residential development into the southern hills will also result in the need for additional MDUSD school sites within city limits. Proposed schools include San Marco Elementary School, and potential conversion of an existing school site within the Planning Area to a high school facility.
Figure 8-2: Public School Facilities

Source: City of Pittsburg, 1998
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LOS MEDANOS COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Los Medanos Community College, opened in 1974 as Contra Costa Community College District’s third campus, serves as a valuable educational and recreational resource to local residents. Los Medanos, loosely translated from Spanish, means “The Sand Dunes.” The College serves adults of all ages from central and eastern Contra Costa County. In addition to general education classes, Los Medanos provides career training to a student body numbering approximately 8,500. The College also features a Public Safety Training Center for local law enforcement and fire response personnel.

Total enrollment for 1999-2000 was 21,338 students, including PUSD, MDUSD, Los Medanos Community College, private schools, and alternative education. Analysis of enrollment figures versus school capacities indicates that a majority of schools are currently operating above capacity (eight elementary schools, two middle schools, and Pittsburg High School). On average, Pittsburg Unified School District is operating at 113 percent of capacity.

Table 8-5
Schools, Enrollment and Capacity, Pittsburg Planning Area: 2003-2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>% Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pittsburg Unified School District</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elementary (K-5)</strong></td>
<td>Foothill Elementary</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>105%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heights Elementary</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highlands Elementary</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>109%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Medanos Elementary</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>116%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parkside Elementary</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>101%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stoneman Elementary</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>104%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willow Cove Elementary</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>122%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intermediate (6-8)</strong></td>
<td>Central Junior High</td>
<td>1,178</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>168%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hillview Junior High</td>
<td>1,048</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>105%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School (9-12)</strong></td>
<td>Pittsburg High</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>103%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8-5 (continued)
Schools, Enrollment and Capacity, Pittsburg Planning Area: 2003-2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>% Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Education</td>
<td>Martin Luther King Preschool</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adult Education Center</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Riverside Continuation High</td>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent Study (GRASP)</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home Teaching</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Day School</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,602</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,470</strong></td>
<td><strong>113%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Diablo Unified School District</td>
<td>Bel Air Elementary</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary (K-5)</td>
<td>Shore Acres Elementary</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>104%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rio Vista Elementary</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>104%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate (6-8)</td>
<td>Riverview Middle</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Education</td>
<td>Gateway Continuation High School</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,936</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,936</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Schools</td>
<td>Saint Peter Martyr Parochial (PreK-8)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Medanos Community College</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,845</strong></td>
<td><strong>99%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Schools</td>
<td><strong>Total Schools</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,338</strong></td>
<td><strong>20,251</strong></td>
<td><strong>105%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS

Enrollment projections based on California Department of Finance age cohort projections and General Plan buildout estimates result in an increase of approximately 4,415 students within PUSD and MDUSD by 2020. Table 8-6 shows that the student body of PUSD will increase by 13 percent, while new residential development proposed for the southwestern portion of the City will double MDUSD enrollment.

Table 8-6
Projected School Enrollment, Pittsburg Planning Area, 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>High School</th>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburg USD</td>
<td>5,643</td>
<td>1,822</td>
<td>2,850</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>11,028</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Diablo USD</td>
<td>2,502</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>1,263</td>
<td>1,352</td>
<td>5,925</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,145</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,631</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,113</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,064</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,953</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Department of Finance K-12 Enrollment Projections, Pittsburg General Plan 2004 Buildout Projections, Dyett & Bhatia.

Retaining all existing school sites in PUSD will allow future classes to drop below capacity limits within most PUSD facilities. However, MDUSD must begin planning the construction or conversion of school sites in order to accommodate anticipated population growth – two additional elementary schools and one high school will be needed by General Plan buildout. Proposed school sites are listed in Table 8-7. Additional school sites may be identified through negotiations with the school districts to accommodate population growth within the Southwest Hills subarea.
Table 8-7  
Potential School Sites, Pittsburg Planning Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Location</th>
<th>School District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed San Marco Development</td>
<td>Mt. Diablo Unified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Alves Development</td>
<td>Mt. Diablo Unified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range Rd @ West Leland Rd, City of Pittsburg</td>
<td>Pittsburg Unified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: City of Pittsburg General Plan Land Use Diagram*

**LIBRARY SERVICES**

The Pittsburg branch of the Contra Costa County Library is located at 80 Power Avenue. It is one of 23 branches within the County Library system. Programs held at the Pittsburg branch include Story Time for children ages three to five, an Introduction to Guide Dogs family program, and other special events. The Friends of the Pittsburg Library hold various book sales and fund-raising events to keep the library collection up-to-date, as well as volunteer with restocking and organizing book shelves during library hours.

**GOALS: EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES**

8-G-10 Ensure that school facilities maintain adequate capacity to provide for current and projected enrollment.

8-G-11 Develop land uses, activities and connections surrounding Los Medanos Community College to foster linkages between the campus and the community.

**POLICIES: EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES**

8-P-39 Work with Mount Diablo Unified School District to ensure that the timing of school construction and/or expansion is coordinated with phasing of new residential development.
The distribution and growth of residential land uses as projected by the General Plan have a significant effect on projected school enrollment. The City is currently reviewing a number of proposed residential subdivisions in the southern portion of the City. Mount Diablo Unified School District must ensure that adequate school facilities are provided for the youth population of these growing areas. The Schools Master Plan should consider the General Plan land use distribution and plan school locations and improvements accordingly.

8-P-40 Encourage the MDUSD to reopen the former Pacifica High School or cooperate with MDUSD to identify possible sites for the construction of a new high school facility and/or middle school facility, or both.

Current residents of the Pittsburg Planning Area located within MDUSD boundaries use high school facilities that are located within adjacent communities, such as Concord.

8-P-41 As part of development review for large residential subdivisions (greater than 100 units), evaluate the need for new school sites. If needed, encourage subdivision design to accommodate school facilities and cooperate with the school districts in acquisition of those sites.

8-P-42 Cooperate with local school districts to develop joint school/park facilities, which provide an increased variety of recreational opportunities close to many residential areas. Additionally, work with school districts to develop public parks adjacent to school facilities.

Joint school/park planning provides more opportunity for recreational uses near residential areas with reduced design, construction, and maintenance costs to both parties. Cooperation with the school districts on the four proposed school sites listed in Table 8-7 would provide a dramatic increase in recreational facilities for local youth.
8-P-43 Emphasize the integration of land uses and activities surrounding Los Medanos Community College. Encourage physical connections between the College and surrounding neighborhoods, commercial areas, and open space resources.

As planned expansions of the campus take place, connections between the college and surrounding residential and commercial areas become more important. Encourage use of the Delta De Anza Trail by students, since the bikeway provides excellent connections to residential areas within the City. As the area between State Route 4 and East Leland Road is redeveloped, such connections can help the new urban uses and Los Medanos Community College complement one another.

8-P-44 Pursue joint-planning of recreational and cultural facilities on Los Medanos Community College campus. Work with the community college Board to allow public access to recreational facilities and programs.

College campuses often provide exceptional recreational and cultural facilities for use by enrolled students. Partnering with the community college Board may tremendously increase the facilities and programs available to local residents.

8-P-45 Promote use of the educational and cultural resources available at the Pittsburg Library.
9 RESOURCE CONSERVATION

This element describes the City’s environmental and geological setting, and outlines policies relating to biological resources and habitat, drainage and erosion, water quality, air quality, and historical resources conservation. Resource-protection regulations enacted by ordinance will establish specific regulations to protect natural features and ensure compatible project design.
9.1 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES AND HABITAT

Pittsburg’s setting in the Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta region, along with varied topography and habitats, give it a diverse range of plant and animal life. Pittsburg is located on the southern border of Suisun Bay, in the northern portion of Contra Costa County. The area’s Mediterranean climate supports a mosaic of grasslands, wetland communities, and scattered stands of trees.

OPEN SPACE

The Planning Area contains a significant amount of open space, which is valuable as both a visual resource and as habitat for oak woodlands, wetlands and riparian wildlife. Intermittent streams and uninhabited areas also contribute to air and water quality in the hills and tidelands. The East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD) manages two regional preserves within the Planning Area: the Browns Island Regional Shoreline and the Black Diamond Mines Regional Preserve. The remaining natural Delta shoreline habitat on Browns Island and grasslands habitat at Black Diamond Mines are preserved for threatened or endangered species, habitat enhancement for other rare species, and protection of the unique and diverse ecology of the areas as a whole.

The topography of the southern portion of Pittsburg is such that relatively smaller ridgelines filter into and merge with larger ridgelines. These larger ridgelines, which are designated as major ridgelines in Figure 9-1, are the highest and most visually prominent ridgelines along the southern skyline. Preserving these ridgelines from development will help preserve the aesthetic value of the viewshed.

RESOURCE PRODUCTION

The Planning Area contains one of the only two places in the San Francisco Bay Area where coal was mined. The discovery of coal in the 1850s led to construction of Black Diamond Mines, the first source of fossil fuel in California. Sand mining was also conducted starting in the late 1920s. Due to competition from other energy sources, the mines closed in 1949. Historical remnants of Black Diamond’s
Vegetation & Creeks

Source: City of Pittsburg, Planning & Building Department, 2004
mining operations, as well as the former mining towns of Nortonville and Somersville, can still be found in the southern hills. While coal mining no longer takes place, livestock still graze in the hills.

There are currently no significant mineral deposits or active mining operations in the Planning Area. The hills south of City limits may contain mineral deposits, though their significance is not known. A small portion of the hills is considered farmland of local importance. Over 3,500 acres of land in the Planning Area is currently under Williamson Act contracts, which entitle landowners to property tax reductions in exchange for preserving their land as agricultural or open space. Williamson Act contracts are automatically renewed each year for at least 10 years, unless cancellation is sought. These lands are considered agricultural preserves.

VEGETATION AND WILDLIFE

Historic vegetation in Pittsburg included native grassland, oak woodlands, riparian communities, and coastal salt and brackish marshes. Figure 9-1 shows the vegetative communities within the Planning Area.

The Planning Area hosts an abundance of vegetation types, with a diverse population of plant species. Vegetative communities can be divided into two categories based on habitat sensitivity:

- **Level One** communities are those that are or most closely resemble (in form and function) native habitats. Within the Planning Area, these include grassland, salt marsh-pickleweed series, seasonal wetland, riparian woodland, and the open waters of Suisun Bay.

- **Level Two** communities are areas that have been significantly altered by humans and include development and landscaping. These areas provide minimal habitat for native vegetation and wildlife.

Human intervention and development have altered the landscape, restricting natural vegetation primarily to undeveloped hillside areas. The southern third of the Planning Area is largely undeveloped open space with large expanses of
rolling grassy hills, while the northern edge consists of salt and brackish marshlands at New York Slough. These natural areas may be suitable for several threatened and endangered plant and animal species, such as the Western pond turtle, California red-legged frog, San Joaquin kit fox, Berkeley kangaroo rat, Tricolored blackbird, White-tailed kite, Mt Diablo manzanita, Alkali milk-vetch, Diamond-petaled poppy, and Mason’s lilaeopsis. Areas of particular biological concern within the Planning Area include Browns Island Regional Shoreline and Black Diamond Mines Regional Preserve and environs. Special status species which may be found within the Planning Area are listed in Table 9-1.

WETLANDS

Wetlands are ecologically productive habitats that support a variety of both plant and animal life. The importance and sensitivity of wetlands has increased with population growth as a result of their role as recharge areas and filters for water supplies. However, much of the region’s wetlands have been filled for urban development. Two types of wetlands occur within the Planning Area:

- **Fresh emergent wetlands** within Pittsburg occur in Kirker Creek, Lawlor Ravine, and several of their tributaries located in the Mount Diablo foothills. This habitat is generally considered one of the most productive habitats for wildlife because it offers water, food and cover. Habitat modification in the northern planning area has severely reduced the vegetative structure of the habitat and its overall value for wildlife.

- **Saline emergent wetlands**, found along tidal salt marshes, serve as an important habitat for many threatened species such as the California clapper rail, salt marsh harvest mouse, and California black rail.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name (Scientific Name)</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>General Habitat (Habitat Type Abbreviation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Invertebrates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antioch dunes anthicid beetle (Anticus antiochensis)</td>
<td>FSS/ --</td>
<td>Presumed extinct – known only from the Antioch Dunes (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin dune beetle (Coelus gracilis)</td>
<td>FSS/ --</td>
<td>Fossil dunes along the western edge of San Joaquin County; extirpated from Antioch Dunes; requires sandy substrates. (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molestan blister beetle (Lyttia molesta)</td>
<td>FSS/ --</td>
<td>Central Valley from Contra Costa to Kern and Tulare Counties; collected at Brentwood. (CG/ CH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antioch cophuran robberfly (Cophura hurdi)</td>
<td>FSS/ --</td>
<td>Only specimen known collected at Antioch. (CG/ CH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antioch efferian robberfly (Efferia antiochi)</td>
<td>FSS/ --</td>
<td>Not available. (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow banded andrenid bee (Perdita hirticeps luteocincta)</td>
<td>FSS/ --</td>
<td>Visits flowers of Gutierrezia californica. (CG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antioch andrenid bee (Perdita scituta antiochensis)</td>
<td>FSS/ --</td>
<td>Visits flowers of Eriogonum, Gutierrezia californica, Heterotheca grandiflora, and Lessingia glandulifera. (CG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antioch multilid wasp (Myrmosula pacifica)</td>
<td>FSS/ --</td>
<td>Not available. (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antioch specid wasp (Philanthus nasilis)</td>
<td>FSS/ --</td>
<td>Known only from the Antioch Dunes. (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langes metalmark butterfly (Apodemia mormo langei)</td>
<td>FE/ --</td>
<td>Stabilized dunes along the San Joaquin River. Endemic to the Antioch Dunes; primary host plant is Eriogonum nudum var. auriculatum. (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlekaufs shieldback katydid (Idiostatus middlekaufi)</td>
<td>FSS/ --</td>
<td>Not available. (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reptiles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western pond turtle (Clemmys marmorata)</td>
<td>FSS/ CSC</td>
<td>An aquatic turtle of streams, ponds and marshes; requires basking sites. Potential habitat occurs in large drainages and preserves in the Planning Area. (OW/ FW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda whipsnake (Masticophis lateralis euryxanthus)</td>
<td>FT/ CT</td>
<td>Valley foothill hardwood habitat; south-facing slopes with a mosaic of shrubs, oaks and grasses. (RW/ CG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giant garter snake (Thamnophis gigas)</td>
<td>FT/ CT</td>
<td>Freshwater and low-gradient streams; highly aquatic. The planning area occurs on the fringe of this species’ range. (RW/ FW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amphibians</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California tiger salamander (Ambystoma californiense)</td>
<td>FC/ CSC</td>
<td>Annual grasslands with underground refugia &amp; seasonal water for breeding. Suitable habitat includes the grassland hills in the southern portion of the planning area. (FW/ CG)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Table 9-1 (continued)
## Special Status Species Known to Occur or Potentially Occurring within Pittsburg Planning Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name (Scientific Name)</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>General Habitat (Habitat Type Abbreviation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California red-legged frog (<em>Rana aurora draytonii</em>)</td>
<td>FT/ CSC</td>
<td>The Planning Area’s wetlands provide limited breeding habitat for this species. Occurrences of the red-legged frog have been reported in Stoneman Park and along Kirker Pass Road. (FW/ RW/ CG)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mammals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Habitat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin kit fox (<em>Vulpes macrotis mutica</em>)</td>
<td>FE/ CT</td>
<td>Resident of California grasslands, particularly along creeks. Reported at Black Diamond Mines Regional Preserve and surrounding foothills, including areas near Kirker Pass Road. (CG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt marsh harvest mouse (<em>Reithrodontomyomys raviventris</em>)</td>
<td>FE/ CE</td>
<td>Salt marshes along the Planning Area’s northern fringe provide suitable habitat. (SM/ BM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin pocket mouse (<em>Perognathus inornatus inornatus</em>)</td>
<td>--/ CSC</td>
<td>Grasslands and blue oak savannas; friable soils. Suitable habitat includes the grassland hills in the southern portion of the planning area. (CG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley kangaroo rat (<em>Dipodomys heermanni</em>)</td>
<td>--/ SA</td>
<td>Open grassy hilltops and clearings in chaparral; require fine, deep, well-drained soils. Suitable habitat includes the grassland hills in the southern portion of the planning area. (CG)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Birds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Habitat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great blue heron (<em>Ardea herodias</em>)</td>
<td>--/ SA</td>
<td>Local salt marshes provide foraging habitat for herons. (RW/ FW/ BW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-eared owl (<em>Asio flammeus</em>)</td>
<td>--/ SA</td>
<td>Local salt marshes provide foraging habitat for this owl. (SM/ BW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern harrier (<em>Circus cyaneus</em>)</td>
<td>--/ CSC</td>
<td>Suitable nesting habitat could include grassy meadows and margins within the planning area. (RW/ CG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt marsh common yellowthroat (<em>Geothlypis trichas sinuosa</em>)</td>
<td>FSS/ CSC</td>
<td>Local marshes provide suitable foraging habitat for this yellowthroat. (FW/ BW/ SM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California black rail (<em>Laterallus jamaicensis coturniculus</em>)</td>
<td>FSS/ CT</td>
<td>Salt marshes on Stake Point and the eastern fringe of the Planning Area provide habitat for rails. (SM/ MF/ BW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California clapper rail (<em>Rallus longirostris obsoletus</em>)</td>
<td>FE/ CE</td>
<td>Cordgrass salt marshes on the eastern fringe of the Planning Area provide habitat for rails. (SM/ MF/ BW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California least tern (<em>Sternula antillarum browni</em>)</td>
<td>FE/ CE</td>
<td>Colonial breeder on bare or sparsely vegetated, flat substrates. Nests near the Mirant power plant and Concord Naval Weapons Station. (SM/ MF/ BW/ OW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California brown pelican (<em>Pelecanus occidentalis californicus</em>)</td>
<td>FE/ CE</td>
<td>California brown pelican is a seasonal visitor to the region. (OW)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 9-1 (continued)
**Special Status Species Known to Occur or Potentially Occurring within Pittsburg Planning Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name (Scientific Name)</th>
<th>Status1 Fed/ CA/ CNPS</th>
<th>General Habitat (Habitat Type Abbreviation) 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tricolored blackbird</strong> (<em>Agelaius tricolor</em>)</td>
<td>FSS/ CSC</td>
<td>Nests colonially near fresh or brackish water marshy areas with dense tules, cattails or thickets. Brackish marshes along the Delta provide suitable habitat for this species. (FW/ BW/ RW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White-tailed kite</strong> (<em>Elanus leucurus</em>)</td>
<td>--/ SA</td>
<td>Grassland foothills with scattered oaks for nesting and perching; open grasslands or marshlands for foraging. Suitable habitat includes the grassland hills in the southern Planning Area. (CG/ RW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suisun song sparrow</strong> (<em>Melospiza melodia mazillaris</em>)</td>
<td>FSS/ CSC</td>
<td>Resident of brackish water marshes on Suisun Bay. Frequents cattails, tules, and pickleweed vegetation, and also vegetative tangles in sloughs. (BW/ FW/ SM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Burrowing owl</strong> (<em>Athene cunicularia</em>)</td>
<td>--/CSC (burrow sites)</td>
<td>Annual grasslands with mammal burrows, especially those of California ground squirrel. (CG)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Plants

<p>| Large-flowered fiddleneck (<em>Amsinckia grandiflora</em>) | FE/ CE/ 1B | Valley and foothill grasslands, open oak woodland, on light soils. Known from only three natural occurrences. (CG) |
| Mt. Diablo manzanita (<em>Arctostaphylos auriculata</em>) | --/ --/ 1B | Canyons and slopes, on sandstone, in chaparral. (CH) |
| Alkali milk-vetch (<em>Astragalus tener var. tener</em>) | --/ --/ 1B | Alkali playa, valley and foothill grassland, vernal pools. Low ground or alkali flats and flooded lands; in annual grassland, playas or vernal pools. (CG/ FW) |
| Suisun Marsh aster (<em>Aster lentus</em>) | FSS/ --/ 1B | Marshes and swamps, both freshwater and brackishwater, in the San Joaquin and Sacramento River Delta. (FW/ BW) |
| Heartscale (<em>Atriplex cordulata</em>) | FSS/ --/ 1B | Saline or alkaline places in valley and foothill grassland or alkali scrub. (SP) |
| San Joaquin spearscale (<em>Atriplex joaquiniana</em>) | FSS/ --/ 1B | In seasonal alkaline meadows or alkali sink scrub. (SP) |
| Big tarplant (<em>Blepharizonia plumosa ssp. plumosa</em>) | --/ --/ 1B | Dry hills and plains in valley and foothill grassland. (CG) |
| Soft bird’s-beak (<em>Cordylanthus mollis ssp. mollis</em>) | FE/ CR/ 1B | Coastal salt marsh; within the tidal zone. (SM/ BM) |
| Dwarf downingia (<em>Downingia pusilla</em>) | --/ --/ 2 | Vernal pools in valley and foothill grasslands. (FW) |
| Mt. Diablo buckwheat (<em>Eriogonum truncatum</em>) | --/ --/ 1A | Dry, exposed clay or rock surfaces; 1000-2000 ft.; chaparral, coastal scrub, valley and foothill grasslands. (CG) |
| Contra Costa wallflower (<em>Erysimum capitatum ssp. angustatum</em>) | FE/ CE/ 1B | Stabilized dunes near Antioch along the San Joaquin River. (D) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name (Scientific Name)</th>
<th>Status 1 Fed/ CA/ CNPS</th>
<th>General Habitat (Habitat Type Abbreviation) 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diamond-petaled poppy (<em>Eschscholzia rhombipetala</em>)</td>
<td>FSS/ --/ 1A</td>
<td>Valley and foothill grassland; Inner Coast Ranges. (CG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stink bells (<em>Fritillaria agrestis</em>)</td>
<td>--/ --/ 4</td>
<td>Valley and foothill grasslands, oak woodlands; on clay flats; sometimes on serpentine. (CG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diablo rock-rose (<em>Helianthella castanea</em>)</td>
<td>FSS/ --/ 1B</td>
<td>Openings in chaparral and broadleaved upland forest. (SP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewer’s dwarf-flax (<em>Hesperolinon breweri</em>)</td>
<td>FSS/ --/ 1B</td>
<td>Grassland, open oak woodland, and openings in chaparral, often on serpentine. (SP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California hibiscus (<em>Hibiscus lasiocarpus</em>)</td>
<td>--/ --/ 2</td>
<td>Moist, freshwater-soaked river banks and low peat islands in sloughs. (FW/ RW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta tule-pea (<em>Lathyrus jepsonii var. jepsonii</em>)</td>
<td>FSS/ --/ 1B</td>
<td>Freshwater and brackishwater marshes. (BW/ SM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason’s lilaeopsis (<em>Lilaeopsis masonii</em>)</td>
<td>FSS/ CR/ 1B</td>
<td>Riparian scrub and freshwater or brackishwater marshes; in tidal zones in muddy or silty soil formed through river deposition or river bank erosion. (FW/ BW/ RW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta mudwort (<em>Limosella subulata</em>)</td>
<td>--/ --/ 2</td>
<td>Mud banks of the Delta in marshy or scrubby riparian vegetation. (BW/ FW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showy madia (<em>Madia radiata</em>)</td>
<td>--/ --/1B</td>
<td>Grassy slopes in valley and foothill woodland and cismontane woodland. (CG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colusa grass (<em>Neostapfia colusana</em>)</td>
<td>FPT/ CE/ 1B</td>
<td>Relatively deep vernal pools. (FW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antioch Dunes evening-primrose (<em>Oenothera deltoides ssp. howellii</em>)</td>
<td>FE/ CE/ 1B</td>
<td>Known from remnant river bluffs and partially stabilized sand dunes near Antioch and on Brown’s Island. (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Diablo phacelia (<em>Phacelia phacelioides</em>)</td>
<td>FSS/ --/ 1B</td>
<td>Chaparral cismontane woodland, on rock outcrops and talus slopes, 2,000-3,800 ft. (SP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock sanicle (<em>Sanicula saxatilis</em>)</td>
<td>FSS/ SR/ 1B</td>
<td>Broadleaved upland forest, chaparral; bedrock outcrops and talus slopes 2,000-4,100 ft. (SP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rayless ragwort (<em>Senecio aphanactis</em>)</td>
<td>--/ --/ 1B</td>
<td>Cismontane woodland and coastal scrub; 90-2,400 ft. (SP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most beautiful jewelflower (<em>Streptanthus albidus ssp. peramoenus</em>)</td>
<td>FSS/ --/ 1B</td>
<td>Chaparral, valley and foothill grassland; serpentine outcrops on ridges and slopes; 450-3,200 ft. (SP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caper-fruitd tropidocarpum (<em>Tropidocarpum capparidium</em>)</td>
<td>--/ --/ 1A</td>
<td>Alkaline hills in valley and foothill grassland; last seen in 1889. (SP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Status Codes:
FEDERAL: (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)
FE = Listed as Endangered (in danger of extinction) by the Federal Government.
FT = Listed as Threatened (likely to become endangered within the foreseeable future) by the Federal Government.
FPE/FPT = Proposed for Listing as Endangered or Threatened.
FC = Candidate information now available indicates that listing may be appropriate.
### Table 9-1 (continued)

**Special Status Species Known to Occur or Potentially Occurring within Pittsburg Planning Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FSS</td>
<td>Former category 2 candidates for listing as threatened or endangered. Now unofficially considered federal sensitive species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP</td>
<td>Fully Protected by the Marine Mammal Protection Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEPA</td>
<td>Bald Eagle Protection Act (1940) (50 CFR 22).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE:</td>
<td>(California Department of Fish and Game)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Listed as Endangered by the State of California.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Listed as Threated by the State of California.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Listed as Rare by the State of California (plants only).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC</td>
<td>California Species of Special Concern. This is a management designation used to track animal species with declining breeding populations in California.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Considered a Special Animal by the California Department of Fish and Game.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3503.5</td>
<td>Protection for nesting species of Falconiformes (hawks) and Strigiformes (owls) under California Fish and Game Code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA NATIVE PLANT SOCIETY:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List 1A</td>
<td>Plants presumed extinct in California.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List 1B</td>
<td>Plants rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List 2</td>
<td>Plants rare, threatened, or endangered in California but more common elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List 3</td>
<td>Plants about which more information is needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List 4</td>
<td>Plants of limited distribution (“watch list”).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Habitat Type Abbreviations:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Salt marsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>Mud flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OW</td>
<td>Open water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FW</td>
<td>Freshwater wetland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BW</td>
<td>Brackish water wetland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td>Riparian woodland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG</td>
<td>California annual grassland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Dunes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td>Chaparral/coastal scrub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>Specific habitat information provided in text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: California Department of Fish and Game, 1997; California Native Plant Society, 1995.*
GOALS: BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES AND HABITAT

9-G-1  Protect conservation areas, particularly habitats that support special status species, including species that are State or Federally listed as endangered, threatened, or rare (see Table 9-1).

9-G-2  Guide development in such a way that preserves significant ecological resources.

9-G-3  Support the reclamation of wetlands and marshlands along local industrial waterfronts.

POLICIES: BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES AND HABITAT

9-P-1  Ensure that development does not substantially affect special status species, as required by State and federal agencies and listed in Table 9-1. Conduct assessments of biological resources as required by CEQA prior to approval of development within habitat areas of identified special status species, as depicted in Figure 9-1.

Development located in or adjacent to these ecologically sensitive areas must complete a site-specific assessment of biological resources as part of the development review process. The City’s environmental review process would be used to impose appropriate mitigation measures as required by State and federal agencies to reduce impacts on sensitive habitat and special status species.

9-P-2  Establish an on-going program to remove and prevent the re-establishment of invasive species and restore native species as part of development approvals on sites that include ecologically sensitive habitat.

Non-native vegetation originally introduced as landscaping, such as giant reed, currently threaten habitat for threatened and endangered plant and animal species within the City. Guidelines should be developed that include a list of native species that may be planted as part of landscaping associated with future development. Drought tolerant and low maintenance species should be emphasized. Removal of invasive species may also be required if they are a notable fire hazard in parks or open space.
9-P-3  Participate in the development of a regional Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) and consider its adoption for preservation of native species throughout eastern Contra Costa County.

**Hillside Protection**

9-P-4  Revise and readopt the City’s Hillside Planned Development District to regulate urban growth in the southern hills. Include development standards as part of the zoning district, and refer to it during project review.

Development standards within the Hillside Planned Development District should limit development in hillside areas, emphasizing 1) retention or stabilization of unstable slopes, 2) major and minor ridgelines as designated by Figure 4-2, and 3) creeks, swales, and wetlands that contribute to hillside drainage (See also Chapter 10: Health and Safety for discussion on slopes and drainage).

9-P-5  Work with Contra Costa County, the East Bay Regional Park District, and the City of Antioch, to expand the regional open-space system in the southern hills to preserve California annual grasslands habitat.

9-P-6  In order to preserve viewsheds of the southern hills, preserve major ridgelines (shown in Figure 9-1) throughout the Planning Area. Revise the Municipal Code per Policy 4-P-1: building pads and structural elements shall be located at least 150 feet away from (horizontally) the crest of a major ridgeline.

9-P-7  During the design of hillside residential projects, encourage clustering of housing to preserve large, unbroken blocks of open space, particularly within sensitive habitat areas. Encourage the provision of wildlife corridors to ensure the integrity of habitat linkages.

9-P-8  As a condition of approval of new development, ensure revegetation of cut-and-fill slopes with native plant species.
In addition, planting on some existing slopes could contribute to Pittsburg’s image and would be a justified public cost.

**Creekways and Wetlands**

**9-P-9** Establish creek setbacks along riparian corridors, extending a minimum of 50 to 150 feet laterally on each side of the creekbed. Setback buffers for habitat areas of identified special status species and wetlands may be expanded as needed to preserve ecological resources.

**9-P-10** Prohibit development within creek setback areas, except as part of greenway enhancement (for example, trails and bikeways). Encourage developers to reserve space outside of the creek setbacks where endangered species habitat makes trail development inappropriate.

**9-P-11** Ensure that riparian corridor characteristics are retained. Encourage the retention and/or reestablishment of creeks in the design of new development.

**9-P-12** Protect and restore threatened natural resources, such as estuaries, tidal zones, marine life, wetlands, and waterfowl habitat.

While much of the marshland and mudflats in the Planning Area are intact, potential for reclamation exists in areas where these have been destroyed, especially along the industrial waterfronts. Potential for this reclamation may exist as some of these sites are converted to other uses.

A potential way to promote the value of Pittsburg’s natural resources is through education. The City could heighten public awareness of the importance of local marshlands for roosting and nesting sites for migrating waterfowl by creating interpretive facilities with educational displays along the marshlands when possible.

**9-P-13** Ensure that special-status species and sensitive habitat areas are preserved, as required by State and federal agencies, during redevelopment and intensification of industrial properties along the
Suisun Bay waterfront. Limit dredging and filling of wetlands and marshlands, particularly adjacent to Browns Island Preserve.

9-P-14 Work with industrial property-owners along the waterfront to improve urban runoff and water quality levels within Suisun Bay wetlands.

9.2 DRAINAGE AND EROSION

The developed portions of the Pittsburg Planning Area are within two major watersheds: the western portion of the Lawlor Creek watershed, which drains into Suisun Bay, and the central and eastern portions of the Kirker Creek watershed, which drains into the New York Slough. In addition, there are six minor watersheds. Major and minor watersheds within the Planning Area are shown in Figure 9-2.

The existing drainage system in Pittsburg is comprised primarily of channelized creeks fed by groundwater, surface runoff, and underground storm drains. The City maintains the system within incorporated areas. In unincorporated areas, responsibility for storm drain maintenance lies with the Contra Costa County Flood Control District. Development within the watersheds has the potential to lead to erosion of sediment and increases in surface water run-off entering the City’s storm drainage system.

The storm drain facilities under the Contra Costa Canal also have the potential to become impaired if sedimentation were to occur from new upstream development. Obstruction of storm drains could cause sedimentation and debris to enter the Canal right-of-way, and potentially overtop into the Canal and/or exert pressure and damage the Canal lining or other facilities. This would result in contamination of Contra Costa Water District’s potable water supply.

Pittsburg’s creeks are also a key part of the City’s open space network. They are valuable physical, aesthetic, recreational, and ecological assets. Protection of creeks not only preserves surface water quality, but also reduces flood risks, preserves bio-diversity and habitat, minimizes erosion of stream banks, and prevents downstream siltation.
GOALS: DRAINAGE AND EROSION

9-G-4 Minimize the runoff and erosion caused by earth movement by requiring development to use best construction management practices (BMPs).

9-G-5 Preserve and enhance Pittsburg’s creeks for their value in providing visual amenity, drainage capacity, and habitat value.

9-G-6 Preserve and protect the Contra Costa Canal from storm drainage and runoff contaminating the City’s municipal water supply.

POLICIES: DRAINAGE AND EROSION

9-P-15 As part of development plans, require evaluation and implementation of appropriate measures for creek bank stabilization, as well as necessary Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce erosion and sedimentation. Encourage preservation of natural creeks and riparian habitat as best as possible.

9-P-16 Establish development standards for new construction adjacent to riparian zones to reduce sedimentation and flooding. Standards should include:

○ Requirements that low berms or other temporary structures such as protection fences be built between a construction site and riparian corridor to preclude sheet-flooding stormwater from entering the corridors during the construction period.

○ Requirements for installation of storm sewers before construction occurs to collect stormwater runoff during construction.

9-P-17 To prevent flood hazards in the Kirker Creek watershed, ensure that new development minimizes paved areas, retaining large blocks of undisturbed, naturally vegetated habitat to allow for water infiltration.
Additional flood control mitigation may include intermixing areas of pavement with the naturally vegetated infiltration sites to reduce the concentration of stormwater runoff from pavement and structures.

9-P-18 Require an encroachment permit from Contra Costa Water District (CCWD) for any storm drain facility crossing or encroaching onto Contra Costa Canal rights-of-way. Require all crossings to be constructed in accordance with CCWD standards and requirements.

9-P-19 As part of the City’s Zoning Ordinance, establish regulations for the preservation of mature trees. Include measures for the replacement of all mature trees removed.

Trees are valuable along creeks and watersheds because their root systems help stabilize topsoil and reduce erosion.

9-P-20 As part of project review and approval, establish maintenance districts to ensure uniform maintenance for selected channels and creeks.

9-P-21 As part of project review and CEQA documentation, require an assessment of downstream drainage (creeks and channels) and City storm-water facilities impacted by potential project runoff.

Calculate potential sedimentation and runoff based on the maximum storm event and determine necessary capacity of the downstream drainage system. If the project presents potential downstream sedimentation, runoff or flooding issues, require additional mitigation including but not limited to limitations on grading, construction only in dry seasons, and funding for downstream improvements, maintenance, and repairs.
9.3 WATER QUALITY

POINT SOURCES

“Point” sources—fixed structures or land uses—can potentially affect surface and groundwater supplies by discharging into the local storm drain system. These discharges consist mostly of effluent from industrial facilities and municipal wastewater systems, and are regulated under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1972, more commonly known as the Clean Water Act. Waste discharges are regulated through the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), with specific requirements established in each NPDES permit. NPDES permits are required for stormwater runoff in urban areas, and are administered by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).

Because watersheds are not limited to municipal boundaries, regional watershed protection and pollution prevention efforts are important to maintaining the health of the local water supply. Pittsburg participates in a joint municipal NPDES permit with all other cities in Contra Costa County, under the County’s Clean Water Program. In addition to these regulations, the San Francisco Bay Region Basin Plan stipulates that discharges into cold or warm water habitats should not increase the natural temperature of the receiving waters by more than five degrees Fahrenheit.

Many of the City’s industrial and service commercial sites are sources of soil and groundwater contamination. Examples of substances released by these businesses are petroleum hydrocarbons, metals, and volatile organic compounds. Contamination may be due to leaking underground storage tanks, surface chemical releases, and accidental spills. The RWQCB identifies and monitors contaminated sites, and publishes listings of sites known to cause soil and groundwater pollution.

NONPOINT SOURCES

“Nonpoint” sources of pollution include general pollutants from streets, open areas, and urban lands. Runoff from these sources is generally not collected and directed into a wastewater treatment plant because it is difficult to regulate and
manage. This includes runoff from roads and parking lots due to leaking cars and exhaust emissions, as well as industrial emissions and erosion.

The hills south of the city limits consist primarily of rangeland. Thus, the only potential sources of surface water pollution are organic waste produced by cattle, runoff from the area’s few inhabitants, and residue and debris from vehicles traveling on Kirker Pass Road. These materials are ultimately washed into local stream and drainage channels and carried by Kirker Creek through the City and into the Delta.

**BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES**

In order to address several potential pollution sources, the City has developed a set of Best Management Practices (BMPs). The southern portion of Kirker Creek, New York Slough, and Suisun Bay are all identified as resources of special recreational and habitat value, and have been assigned high priority for their restoration. The focus of the BMPs is to ensure the City’s water resources are not degraded by stormwater runoff. These practices include street sweeping, storm drain stenciling, above and below ground facility inspections, household hazardous waste programs, spill cleanup, reduction of herbicide and pesticide use, diversion and treatment of runoff, and annual catch basin maintenance.

The City must also implement BMPs to the maximum extent practicable in order to comply with the joint municipal NPDES permit, under the County’s Clean Water Plan. The City has developed a Stormwater Management Plan to help ensure compliance with the NPDES permit.

**GOALS: WATER QUALITY**

9-G-7  Comply with Regional Water Quality Control Board regulations and standards to maintain and improve the quality of both surface water and groundwater resources.

9-G-8  Ensure that soil and groundwater pollution is addressed during redevelopment and reuse projects.
POLICIES: WATER QUALITY

9-P-22 Continue working with the Regional Water Quality Control Board in the implementation of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), with specific requirements established in each NPDES permit.

9-P-23 Require new urban development to use Best Management Practices to minimize creek bank instability, runoff of construction sediment, and flooding.

The City’s BMPs will ensure that new development projects consider the effects of construction debris and sediment on local water supplies. However, it is imperative that the City review and update the BMPs to promote state-of-the-art construction practices.

9-P-24 Reduce sedimentation and erosion of waterways by minimizing site disturbance and vegetation removal along creek corridors.

9-P-25 Encourage rehabilitation and revegetation of riparian corridors and wetlands throughout the City to contribute to bioremediation and improved water quality.

9-P-26 Monitor water quality in the local creek and reservoir system to ensure clean supplies for human consumption and ecosystem health.

9-P-27 Protect water quality by reducing non-point sources of pollution and the dumping of debris in and near creeks, storm drains, and Contra Costa Canal. Continue use and implementation of the City’s storm drain marking program in newly developed or redeveloped areas.

The quality of groundwater and water flowing into the City’s creeks is most likely to be affected by non-point pollution sources in Pittsburg. Urban development can potentially pose a threat to surface and groundwater quality through construction sediment, use of insecticides and herbicides, and related increases in automobile use.
9-P-28 Prepare and disseminate information about the harmful effects of toxic chemical substances and safe alternative measures.

Brochures and a page on the City’s Web site describing the harmful effects of toxic chemicals and alternatives, including information about safe alternatives to toxics for home and garden use, should be made available to residents of Pittsburg.

9.4 AIR QUALITY

Three types of air pollutants affect air quality in Pittsburg – criteria air pollutants, toxic air contaminants, and odors and nuisances. The major source of air pollutants in Pittsburg is motor vehicle emissions. Heavy commute patterns throughout the San Francisco Bay Area have resulted in poor regional air quality levels. However, newer model vehicles are producing ‘cleaner’ auto emissions, and will counteract the negative air quality impacts associated with increased vehicle use.

Criteria and toxic air contaminants (as described below) are controlled by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). The City has a more direct role in regulating odors and nuisances, and the release of particulate matter at construction sites.

CRITERIA AIR POLLUTANTS

Criteria air pollutants—carbon monoxide, ozone, and particulate matter, including nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide, PM-10, and lead—are most pervasive in urban environments, and state and national ambient air quality standards have been established for them. The Bay Area’s topographical and wind factors reduce local concentrations of criteria air pollutants in Pittsburg. Motor vehicles are expected to continue to be a major source category for regional emissions.

Residential, industrial and commercial development in Pittsburg contributes to regional emissions. Emissions are also generated through industrial and
commercial operations and building energy use. Residents and workers may experience occasional violations of PM-10 standards due to construction activities and other local dust sources, and may experience elevated concentrations of carbon monoxide along congested freeway segments and at congested intersections.

The primary role of cities in achieving and maintaining regional air quality is through land use decision-making, which can affect vehicle miles traveled, and through other measures to manage the emission of pollutants. BAAQMD identifies specific Transportation Control Measures (TCMs) which, together with other approaches, may help reduce emissions in Pittsburg, contributing to regional pollution control efforts.

**TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANTS**

Toxic air contaminants are those pollutants that occur at relatively low concentrations and are associated with carcinogenic or other adverse health effects, but for which no ambient air quality standards have been established. These pollutants are typically carcinogens, mutagens, or reproductive toxins. Regulation of toxic air contaminants is achieved through federal and State controls on individual sources. The preferred technique for reducing toxic air emissions is source reduction, and as part of a local control strategy in the Bay Area, all applications for new stationary sources are reviewed to ensure compliance with required emission controls and limits.

The ambient background of toxic air contaminants is the combined result of many diverse human activities, including gasoline stations, automobiles, dry cleaners, industrial operations, hospital sterilizers, and painting operations. In general, mobile sources contribute more significantly to health risks than do stationary sources. Generally, ambient concentrations of toxic air contaminants are similar throughout the urbanized area of the Bay Area. BAAQMD regulates toxic air contaminants from stationary sources through their permit process; mobile sources of toxic air contaminants are regulated indirectly through vehicle emissions standards and through fuel specifications. Cities have a role in reducing public exposure to toxic air contaminants through ensuring sufficient buffer zones around stationary sources and by reducing vehicle trips.
ODORS AND NUISANCES

Odors and nuisances include those emissions which occur infrequently but which have the potential to generate citizen complaints. BAAQMD records indicate that certain industrial facilities in Pittsburg occasionally generate citizen complaints. Increased buffering of incompatible uses and control of dust from construction are potential local approaches to controlling odors and nuisances.

AIR QUALITY MONITORING STATIONS

BAAQMD operates a regional network of air pollution monitoring stations that provide information on ambient concentrations of criteria air pollutants and toxic air contaminants. The City’s main monitoring station is located at 583 West Tenth Street, near the Mirant (formerly PG&E) power plant. This monitoring station was built after the power plant went into commission, to ensure that the plant did not negatively affect air quality levels on adjacent sites.

SENSITIVE RECEPTORS

Some people are more sensitive than others to air pollutants. Heightened sensitivity may be caused by health problems, proximity to the emissions source, and duration of exposure to air pollutants. Sensitive receptors are facilities that house or attract children, the elderly, people with illnesses, or others who are especially sensitive to the effects of air pollution. Hospitals, schools, convalescent facilities, and residential areas are examples of sensitive receptors which should be not be located near point sources, such as the heavy industrial uses east of Downtown.

GOALS: AIR QUALITY

9-G-9 Work toward improving air quality and meeting all Federal and State ambient air quality standards by reducing the generation of air pollutants from stationary and mobile sources.

9-G-10 Reduce the potential for human discomfort or illness due to local concentrations of toxic contaminants, odors and dust.
9-G-11 Reduce the number of motor vehicle trips and emissions accounted to Pittsburg residents and encourage land use and transportation strategies that promote use of alternatives to the automobile for transportation, including bicycling, bus transit, and carpooling.

POLICIES: AIR QUALITY

9-P-29 Cooperate with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District to achieve emissions reductions for ozone and its precursor, PM-10.

9-P-30 Cooperate with Bay Area Air Quality Management District to ensure compliance with dust abatement measures during construction.

These measures would reduce particulate emissions from construction and grading activities.

9-P-31 Encourage preparation of Transportation Demand Management plans for major employers in the City.

The City should institute a variety of land use and design policies to promote transit use, such as increased land use density in the vicinity of transit centers, mixed uses, creation of pedestrian-oriented spaces through building design, orienting buildings entrances toward transit routes, reducing parking requirements, provision of bus shelters, and promoting energy-efficient building design (potentially adopting a standard of 10 percent greater energy-efficiency than required by the state’s Title 24 building codes).

9-P-32 Minimize emissions and air pollution from City operations by using alternative-fuel vehicles, as feasible.
9-P-33  

**Encourage new residential development and remodeled existing homes to install clean-burning fireplaces and wood stoves.**

Residential woodburning is a growing source of localized air pollution. Woodsmoke released from fireplaces and wood stoves contains carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, and PM-10. Pollution can be reduced by installing gas fireplaces or EPA certified wood heaters.

---

**9.5 HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCES**

Pittsburg is the site of a number of historical and archeological resources. While only about one-third of Pittsburg has been studied for cultural resources, five archeological sites are known to exist. In addition, historical resources from Pittsburg’s coal and steel eras are still present. The existence of both historical buildings and archeologically sensitive areas in Pittsburg speak to the importance of policies that preserve such aspects of the City’s heritage.

**HISTORICAL RESOURCES**

Pittsburg played an important role in the history of Contra Costa County. As one of the earliest industrial centers in the County, the City’s historical resources encompass a broad range of activities. Resources from various aspects of the City’s history reflect its role in industry, transportation, the military, and entertainment:

- **Industry.** The discovery of coal in the 1850s led to construction of Black Diamond Mines, the first source of fossil fuel in California. In 1911, Columbia Steel Company (later US Steel, now USS-POSCO) opened its doors within Pittsburg.

Then in 1916, production began at the Western Chemical plant (now DOW Chemical), which has become the largest non-refinery chemical production complex in the western United States. Small-scale fishing fleets docked out of Pittsburg Marina throughout the 1920s, and several canneries sprung up along the waterfront to accommodate the fishing industry.
• **Transportation.** Early railroads were constructed along Railroad Avenue and across the Pittsburg-Antioch Highway to transport coal from Black Diamond Mines to the San Joaquin River for shipment. Shipping operations were conducted from a small wharf on New York Slough.

• **Military.** Built in 1942, Camp Stoneman served as a staging and embarkation facility for troops during World War II and the Korean conflict. The base was deactivated in 1954.

• **Entertainment.** The Black Diamond Theater (1909) and the Palace Theater (1910), both on York Street, were the first theaters to present movies in Contra Costa County. Vogue Theater (circa early 1930's) on Railroad and Central Avenues is also historically significant.

**New York Landing Historical District**

To recognize and preserve the unique historical resources in Pittsburg, the City established the New York Landing Historical District in 1981. District boundaries were determined by researching the history and architectural significance of buildings in the area. Buildings in the Historical District were constructed between 1914 and 1930, and reflect the architectural styles prevalent during that time period. Some structures, while not considered significant in and of themselves, enhance the overall character of the district.

The Historical District is located at the core of Downtown Pittsburg. Railroad Avenue forms the central spine of the district, which has the following boundaries: Third Street to the north, Sixth Street to the south, Cumberland Street to the east, and Black Diamond Street to the west. This area is associated with many significant historical events, including the Rancho Los Medanos land grant, the first post office in Contra Costa County (built in the 1840s and initially located at Second and Black Diamond Streets), and sites of early fishing canneries, steamboat shops (for loading coal) and steel mills. The City’s historical resources are listed in Table 9-2 and illustrated in Figure 9-3 (except Resources 27-33, which are located outside of the New York Landing Historical District vicinity).
### Table 9-2

**Pittsburg Historical Resources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date Constructed</th>
<th>National Register Status</th>
<th>Building Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>E. Third St.</td>
<td>New York Landing Historical District</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Eligible for Separate Listing</td>
<td>refurbished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>150, 160 E. Third St.</td>
<td>Greenberg Building</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Historical District Contributor</td>
<td>refurbished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>190 E. Third St.</td>
<td>Green Building</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Historical District Contributor</td>
<td>refurbished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>200 E. Third St.</td>
<td>Liberty Hotel</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Historical District Contributor</td>
<td>refurbished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10 E. Fourth St.</td>
<td>Burlessas Building</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>Historical District Contributor</td>
<td>refurbished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>515 Railroad Ave.</td>
<td>Post Dispatch</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Local Listing Only</td>
<td>refurbished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>153 E. Fourth St.</td>
<td>King Parker Building</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Historical District Contributor</td>
<td>existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>163 E. Fourth St.</td>
<td>Montgomery Ward Building</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Historical District Contributor</td>
<td>refurbished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>190 E. Fourth St.</td>
<td>Aiello Building</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Historical District Contributor</td>
<td>existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>200 E. Fourth St.</td>
<td>National Building</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>Historical District Contributor</td>
<td>refurbished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10 E. Fourth St.</td>
<td>Martinetti Building</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Historical District Contributor</td>
<td>refurbished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>306 Railroad Ave.</td>
<td>National Dollar Store</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Historical District Contributor</td>
<td>refurbished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>323 Railroad Ave.</td>
<td>Lazio Building</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Historical District Contributor</td>
<td>refurbished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>356 Railroad Ave.</td>
<td>Royce Building</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Historical District Contributor</td>
<td>existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>368 Railroad Ave.</td>
<td>Demetrakopoulos Building</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Historical District Contributor</td>
<td>existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>371 Railroad Ave.</td>
<td>California Theater</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Historical District Contributor</td>
<td>façade rehab only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>395 Railroad Ave.</td>
<td>Sols Clothing Store</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Historical District Contributor</td>
<td>refurbished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>415 Railroad Ave.</td>
<td>Contra Costa County Bank</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Historical District Contributor</td>
<td>refurbished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>430 Railroad Ave.</td>
<td>Bank of America</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Historical District Contributor</td>
<td>refurbished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>485 Railroad Ave.</td>
<td>Woulf &amp; Ury Building</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Historical District Contributor</td>
<td>refurbished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>W. Eighth St.</td>
<td>Black Diamond School</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>May Become Eligible</td>
<td>existing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Pittsburg Planning Area encompasses a number of environmental settings including those where archeological sites may be found. Most Native American archeological sites in Pittsburg are in the form of small to large shell middens, some of which may contain human remains. These sites tend to be situated on alluvial flats and along historic margins, as well as near sources of water.

The Planning Area contains a number of Native American archeological and historical areas that may be considered sensitive. An area that may be considered sensitive could mean one or more of the following:

- Archeological sites have been identified in these areas;
- Based on current knowledge, there is a high probability of identifying unrecorded archeological sites; or
- Archeological sites have been identified in this area and there is a high potential for identifying additional sites.

Table 9-2 (continued)
Pittsburg Historical Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date Constructed</th>
<th>National Register Status</th>
<th>Building Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>E. Ninth St.</td>
<td>Pittsburg 7th Day Adventist Church</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Appears Eligible</td>
<td>refurbished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>W. Eighth St.</td>
<td>St. Peter Martyr Church</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Appears Eligible</td>
<td>existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Black Diamond Wy.</td>
<td>Coulter Pine</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Local Listing Only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Buchanan Rd.</td>
<td>Fages Crespie Turnback Camp</td>
<td>1772</td>
<td>Local Listing Only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Harbor St.</td>
<td>Camp Stoneman Military Chapel</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>Local Listing Only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Nortonville Rd.</td>
<td>Mine Shafts</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Local Listing Only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Nortonville Rd.</td>
<td>Latimer Ranch &amp; Home</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Local Listing Only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Pittsburg-Antioch Hwy.</td>
<td>Pittsburg Mine Railroad</td>
<td>1866</td>
<td>Local Listing Only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Railroad Ave.</td>
<td>Camp Stoneman Gates</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>Local Listing Only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Office of Historic Preservation, 1997; City of Pittsburg.
Figure 9-3

Historic Resources

Pittsburg's waterfront location and industrial history make the existence of additional archeological resources likely. Archeological surveys are appropriate for specific plans and large project development activities. If site conditions indicate the presence of archeological resources, all building activity should cease until appropriate mitigation measures are in place.

**GOALS: HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCES**

9-G-12 Encourage the preservation, protection, enhancement and use of structures that:

- Represent past eras, events and persons important in history;
- Provide significant examples of architecture;
- Embody unique and irreplaceable assets to the City and its neighborhoods; and
- Provide examples of the physical surroundings in which past generations lived.

9-G-13 Encourage municipal and community awareness, appreciation, and support for Pittsburg’s historic, cultural, and archeological resources.

**POLICIES: HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCES**

9-P-34 Encourage the preservation of varied architectural styles that reflect the cultural, industrial, social, economic, political and architectural phases of the City’s history.

9-P-35 Expand the role of the City’s Historical Resources Commission, currently responsible for only the New York Landing Historical District, to include all historical resources. The Commission should be responsible for designating historical resources, and acting as the community’s liaison on these issues. However, the role of reviewing development proposals and remodelings in the Historical District should be transferred to the Planning Commission.
Provide for the educational and cultural enrichment of this and future generations by fostering knowledge of our heritage.

Education and cultural enrichment of Pittsburg’s citizens will be a key element in the preservation of Pittsburg’s historical and cultural resources. The Historic Resources Commission should implement interpretive facilities within the Historical District, including displays and signs to promote education and understanding of existing historical resources.

Redefine the New York Landing Historical District to designate and preserve historical structures not currently located within the district boundaries.

There are several structures outside the geographically distinct boundaries of the Historical District (See Figure 9-3: Historical Resources) that are important reflections of the City’s history: for example, Black Diamond Grammar School (West Eighth and Black Diamond Streets), Pittsburg Seventh Day Adventist Church (East Ninth and Los Medanos Streets), Saint Peter Martyr Church (West Eighth and Black Diamond Streets), Presbyterian Church (East Leland Road), and Hindu Temple (Crestview Drive). While these are not part of the Historical District, these resources are important and should be protected accordingly.

Explore mechanisms to incorporate Pittsburg’s industrial heritage in historic and cultural preservation.

Pittsburg is one of the few Bay Area communities with a strong industrial past. The City’s past can be preserved through adaptive reuse of buildings, as is already occurring in downtown, and incorporation of aspects and relics of old structures in new public parks and open space. Emphasis should be placed on the preservation of relics from the coal, steel and canning industries that provided the base upon which the City developed.

Ensure the protection of known archeological resources in the City by acquiring a records review for any development proposed in areas of
known resources. If such resources are found, limit urban development in the vicinity or account for the resources.

9-P-40 In accordance with State law, ensure the preparation of a resource mitigation plan and monitoring program by a qualified archeologist in the event that archeological resources are uncovered.

CEQA requires the evaluation of any archeological resource on the site of a development project. State law also protects these resources. City involvement in the identification, mitigation, and monitoring of project impacts on these resources will ensure the protection of Pittsburg’s cultural heritage.

9-P-41 If archeological resources are found during ground-breaking for new urban development, halt construction immediately and conduct an archeological investigation to collect all valuable remnants.

9-P-42 Develop an identification and preservation system for cultural resources—those places or structures that qualify as “important” or “unique” to local community, ethnic, or social groups.

9-P-43 During redevelopment and rehabilitation of older residential units, ensure that the development process complies with the lead testing requirements established by Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Contra Costa County Environmental Health District, and Housing and Urban Development.
10 HEALTH AND SAFETY

This element intends to identify and mitigate risks posed by geologic and seismic conditions, prevent man-made risks stemming from use and transport of hazardous materials, and ensure that local emergency response agencies are prepared for potential disaster relief. Fire protection in urban and wildland areas is addressed in Chapter 11: Public Facilities (Section 11.4: Fire Protection).
10.1 GEOLOGY AND SEISMICITY

The Pittsburg Planning Area is part of the geologically young and seismically active San Francisco Bay Area region. The composition of geologic material, topography, and groundwater conditions affect the severity of geologic hazards. In some soils, earthquake waves may be amplified and other areas may be susceptible to liquefaction and/or landslides.

GEOLGY

Pittsburg consists of two general topographic zones: the lowland zone and the hillside zone. The lowland zone corresponds to estuarine and flatland soils, and the hillside zone includes steep slopes and rocky soils.

- **Lowland zone:**
  - *Estuarine (coastal) areas* are underlain by Bay Mud, which consists of unconsolidated silt and clay with abundant organic material, local peat, sand, and gravel lenses or discontinuous beds (USGS, 1973). Local deposits of artificial fill occur along the margins of Suisun Bay, particularly around the power plant and in filled channels. Old fill (generally placed before the 1950s) typically consisted of heterogeneous material. Engineering challenges associated with coastal areas include weak compressible soils and risk of liquefaction.
  - *Flatland areas* of Pittsburg are underlain by alluvial deposits, unconsolidated flood-plain deposits, sand, silt, gravel, and clay, irregularly interstratified.

- **Hillside zone:**
  - *Hillside areas* of the City consist primarily of tilted marine sedimentary and volcanic rocks that range in age from Paleocene to Pliocene. Hillside areas in the western and southern portions of the Planning Area contain steep slopes, weak bedrock, and local landslide deposits. The following discussion of landslides, soil creep, debris flow, and hazards associated with historic coal mining pertains mainly to the hillside zone.
Landsliding

Sedimentary rocks in the hillside zone have variable composition. These rocks are generally weak and susceptible to erosion. Consistent weathering has further weakened the rocks in many locations. Landslide deposits often occur along deeply incised stream channels where erosion has undercut the channel banks. Fracture planes occur throughout the southern hills and cuts made in these areas are particularly susceptible to slope failure.

The strong ground motions that occur during earthquakes are capable of inducing landslides where unstable soil conditions already exist. The portions of the Planning Area having the greatest susceptibility to landsliding are hilly areas underlain by weak bedrock units on slopes greater than 15 percent. Figure 10-1 illustrates lands within the Planning Area that are unstable; significant portions of the southern hills are identified. Figure 10-1 also identifies those areas with slopes greater than 30 percent. Residential and other sensitive development located within these areas is at risk of property damage due to geologic accidents.

Soil Creep and Debris Flow

Expansive soils on moderate to steep slopes are subject to soil creep—a downslope movement that occurs gradually as the soil shrinks and swells over several years. Tilted fences observed in the southeastern Planning Area indicate that soil creep has occurred. Construction practices that steepen existing slopes, add weight to slopes by placing fill, or increase the rate of natural soil saturation through landscape irrigation, can accelerate natural soil creep or induce it in areas where it might not otherwise occur.

Slopes greater than about 20 percent are also susceptible to debris flows, sudden soil slumps that occur when the ground is fully saturated by heavy rainfall. Although debris flows can occur on any type of slope, they are more likely to occur when runoff is concentrated within swales and gullies. Unlike soil creep, debris flows can pose an immediate hazard to life and property.
**Historic Coal Mining**

The Black Diamond area coal deposits (within the Domingene Formation) are located in the southeastern portion of the Planning Area. Past mining activities followed two principal coal seams to a depth of more than 550 feet below the ground surface.

Access tunnel and ventilation shafts constructed as part of the mining operation were generally located at the heads of ravines, where erosion had naturally worn away portions of the hillside overlying the coal. Most access tunnels were well documented, and have been relocated and sealed over the years. Ventilation shafts, however, are more numerous and their locations are poorly documented. These shafts were typically sealed through construction of timber floors placed about ten feet below the ground surface and then backfilled to grade during closure of the mine. The timber floors deteriorate over time and ventilation shafts can collapse, creating soil slumps. Remaining mine openings provide a connection to a labyrinth of subsurface tunnels which can contain cave-ins and unexpected drop-offs. Pockets of poisonous carbon monoxide or methane gas may also be present.

**Seismic Hazards**

Eastern Contra Costa County, like the San Francisco Bay Area as a whole, is located in one of the most seismically active regions in the United States. Major earthquakes have occurred in the vicinity of Pittsburg in the past and can be expected to occur again in the near future. Fault recurrence and slip rate data are being obtained from marsh core samples, while uplifted fault areas are being interpreted by detailed mapping of landform features and historical aerial photography.

Table 10-1 describes the fault hazards located in the region, while Figure 10-2 illustrates fault hazards within the Pittsburg Planning Area. Historically active faults (exhibiting evidence of movement in the last 200 years) in Contra Costa County include the Concord, Hayward, and Clayton-Marsh Creek-Greenville
Table 10-1
Faults In The Vicinity Of Pittsburg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fault</th>
<th>Location and Direction from Planning Area</th>
<th>Recency of Movement</th>
<th>Fault Classification</th>
<th>Historical Seismicity</th>
<th>Maximum Credible Earthquake</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Andreas</td>
<td>40 miles west</td>
<td>Historic (1906; 1989 ruptures)</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>7.1, 1989. 8.25, 1906 7.0, 1838. Many &lt;6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>20 miles west</td>
<td>Pre-Historic (1868 rupture) Holocene</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>6.8, 1868 Many &lt;4.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calaveras (Northern)</td>
<td>15 miles south</td>
<td>Historic (1861 rupture) Holocene</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>5.6-6.4, 1861 4-4.5 swarms 1970, 1990</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concord-Green Valley</td>
<td>6 miles west</td>
<td>Historic (1955 rupture) Holocene</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Historic active creep</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton-Greenville</td>
<td>3 miles south</td>
<td>Holocene</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>None known</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsh Creek-Greenville</td>
<td>10 miles south east</td>
<td>Historic (1980 rupture) Holocene</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>5.6 1980</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Fault</td>
<td>10 miles west</td>
<td>Late Pleistocene</td>
<td>Potentially active</td>
<td>None documented</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Diamond Area</td>
<td>Southeastern portion of Planning Area</td>
<td>Pre-Quaternary</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Scattered seismicity</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antioch</td>
<td>4 miles east</td>
<td>Quaternary</td>
<td>Potentially active</td>
<td>Reported creep</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 An "Active Fault" is defined by the State Mining and Geology Board as one that has had surface displacement within Holocene time (about the last 11,000 years).
2 As defined by the Modified Mercalli Scale, described in the text above.
3 The Maximum Credible Earthquake (MCE) is the strongest earthquake that is likely to be generated along a fault zone, based on the geologic character of the fault and earthquake history.

Sources: Jennings, 1994; Mualchin and Jones, 1992.
Source: Environmental Science Associates, 1997
faults. Two potentially active faults (showing evidence of movement within the last two million years) in the Planning Area include Franklin and Antioch faults. The largest active fault in the region, the San Andreas Fault, is located about 40 miles west of Pittsburg.

Geologic records indicate that there has been extensive differential movement along a series of northwest-trending splays of the Clayton and Black Diamond Area faults. These splays are centered within the Mount Diablo foothills, but extend into the southern portion of the Planning Area. These isolated faults are currently considered to be inactive. For planning purposes, however, these fault branches should be considered possible earthquake sources. Seismic activity on these relatively minor faults would not be expected to generate earthquakes of large magnitude and would probably not cause surface faulting.

*Groundshaking*

The intensity of groundshaking that would occur in Pittsburg as a result of an earthquake in the Bay Area would depend on the magnitude of the earthquake, the distance from the City, and the response of the geologic materials at the site.

Ground shaking intensity is described using the Modified Mercalli Scale, which ranges from I (not felt) to XII (wide-spread devastation). When various earthquake scenarios are considered, groundshaking intensities will reflect both the effects of strong ground accelerations and the consequences of ground failure.

According to the distribution of groundshaking intensity mapped by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), a large earthquake on the Concord-Green Valley fault would produce the maximum ground shaking intensities in the City with Modified Mercalli intensity IX in Bay Mud deposits along Suisun Bay, north of State Route 4. Modified Mercalli intensity IX would cause damage to buried pipelines and partial collapse of poorly built structures. Strong ground shaking of Mercalli intensity VIII would occur locally along creek beds in inland portions of the City. However, most of Pittsburg is projected to experience ground shaking of intensity VII on the Modified Mercalli scale, which is associated with non-structural damage.
Landsliding is also likely to result from strong groundshaking, primarily where unstable soil conditions already exist. Steep slopes underlain by weak bedrock, particularly on northerly facing hillsides, are most susceptible to earthquake-induced landsliding (please see discussion of landsliding in above Geology section).

**Liquefaction**

Liquefaction is the rapid transformation of saturated, loose, fine-grained sediment to a fluid-like state because of earthquake groundshaking. Liquefaction has resulted in substantial loss of life, injury, and damage to property. In addition, liquefaction increases the hazards of fires because of explosions induced when underground gas lines break, and because the breakage of water mains substantially reduces fire suppression capability.

Liquefaction hazard in Pittsburg ranges from very low to high. ABAG has identified most of the lowland areas adjacent to Suisun Bay as being highly susceptible to liquefaction hazards (see Figure 10-1). Alluvial fan and terrace deposits that underlie most of Pittsburg have low liquefaction potential, and upland areas that are underlain by bedrock have very low liquefaction potential.

**Inundation from Seiche and Tsunami**

Earthquakes can cause tsunami (“tidal waves”) and seiches (oscillating waves in enclosed water bodies) in the Bay. Portions of the City located adjacent to Suisun Bay are susceptible to potential tsunami or seiche inundation. However, projected wave height and tsunami run-up is expected to be small in the interior portions of the San Francisco Bay. Some coastal inundation and damage could occur if a tsunami or seiche coincided with very high tides or an extreme storm.
GOALS: GEOLOGY AND SEISMICITY

10-G-1 Minimize risk to life and property from geologic and seismic hazards.

10-G-2 Establish procedures and standards for geotechnical review of projects located in areas of steep slopes, unstable soils, or other geologic or seismic risks.

10-G-3 Minimize the potential for soil erosion by wind and stormwater runoff.

10-G-4 Mitigate potential seismic hazards, including landsliding and liquefaction, during the design and construction of new development.

10-G-5 Limit urban development in high-risk areas (such as landslide areas, flood zones, and areas subject to liquefaction) to low-occupancy or open forms of land use.

10-G-6 Limit development on slopes greater than 30 percent (as delineated on Figure 10-1) to lower elevations, foothills, and knolls.

POLICIES: GEOLOGY AND SEISMICITY

Slopes and Erosion

10-P-1 Ensure preparation of a soils report by a City-approved engineer or geologist in areas identified as having geological hazards in Figure 10-1, as part of development review.

10-P-2 Restrict future development from occurring on slopes greater than 30 percent (as designated in Figure 10-1) over the 900 foot elevation contour, and on major and minor ridgelines (as delineated in Figure 4-2).

10-P-3 Regulate the grading and development of hillside areas for new urban land uses. Ensure that such new uses are constructed to reduce erosion and landsliding hazards:
• Limit cut slopes to 3:1, except where an engineering geologist can establish that a steeper slope would perform satisfactorily over the long term.

• Encourage use of retaining walls or rock-filled crib walls as an alternative to high cut slopes.

• Ensure revegetation of cut-and-fill slopes to control erosion.

• Ensure blending of cut-and-fill slopes within existing contours, and provision of horizontal variation, in order to mitigate the artificial appearance of engineered slopes.

10-P-4 Limit future extension of development into the southeast hills, where there are high levels of risk due to previous coal mining. Ensure proper geotechnical analysis and mitigation for proposed development on slopes less than 30% south of Buchanan Bypass.

10-P-5 Ensure that Bay Area Air Quality Management District requirements are implemented around construction sites to reduce wind velocity and soil transport at the sites.

10-P-6 Encourage the use of water-sprinkling trucks at large construction sites to keep the exposed soil moist during construction.

10-P-7 As part of the development approval process, restrict grading to only those areas going into immediate construction as opposed to grading the entire site, unless necessary for slope repair or creek bed restoration. On large tracts of land, avoid having large areas bare and unprotected; units of workable size shall be graded one at a time.

10-P-8 During development review, ensure that new development on unstable slopes (as designated in Figure 10-1) is designed to avoid potential soil
creep and debris flow hazards. Avoid concentrating runoff within swales and gullies, particularly where cut-and-fill has occurred.

**Geologic Hazards**

10-P-9 Ensure geotechnical studies prior to development approval in geologic hazard areas, as shown in Figure 10-1. Contract comprehensive geologic and engineering studies of critical structures regardless of location.

10-P-10 As part of development approval, ensure that a registered engineering geologist be available at the discretion of the City Engineer to review reports submitted by applicants in the geologic hazard areas identified in Figure 10-1. Project proponents shall pay all costs associated with engineering studies related to geologic hazards.

10-P-11 Form geological hazard abatement districts (GHADs) prior to development approval in unstable hillside areas (as designated in Figure 10-1) to ensure that geotechnical mitigation measures are maintained over the long-term, and that financial risks are equitably shared among owners and not borne by the City.

10-P-12 Evaluate the feasibility of implementing a hazard reduction program for existing residential development in unstable hillside areas (as designated in Figure 10-1). This would include inspection of structures for conformance with the Building Code.

10-P-13 During rehabilitation and redevelopment of industrial properties along the Suisun Bay waterfront, ensure that geotechnical mitigation measures are used to prevent collapse of structures in the event that liquefaction occurs.

10-P-14 Review and amend City ordinances, including the Building Code, that regulate development in potentially hazardous locations to ensure adequate protection from geologic hazards.
Seismic Hazards

10-P-15 Develop standards for adequate setbacks from potentially active fault traces (as designated in Figure 10-2) for structures intended for human occupancy. Allow roads to be built over potentially active faults only where alternatives are impractical.

10-P-16 Ensure compliance with the current Uniform Building Code during development review. Explore programs that would build incentives to retrofit unreinforced masonry buildings.

Unreinforced masonry buildings are particularly vulnerable to earthquakes. Possible programs to encourage retrofit could include transfer taxes on property sales, which can be used by the owner to pay for seismic retrofit work; reduced permit fees; and grants or low-interest loans to offset retrofit costs. However, special consideration should be given to masonry buildings that are in the City’s historic core. The City’s Building Division should work with building owners to maintain and reserve such structures.

10-P-17 Ensure detailed analysis and mitigation of seismic hazard risk for new development in unstable slope or potential liquefaction areas (as designated in Figure 10-1). Limit the location of critical facilities, such as hospitals, schools, and police stations, in such areas.
10.2 FLOOD CONTROL

The developed portions of the Pittsburg Planning Area are within two major watersheds: Kirker and Lawlor creeks. The western portion of the Planning Area is within the Lawlor Creek watershed, which drains into Suisun Bay. Kirker Creek encompasses the central and eastern portions and drains into New York Slough. There are six minor watersheds in addition to Kirker and Lawlor creeks. Figure 10-3 shows the major and minor watersheds in the Planning Area.

The Kirker Creek watershed has an overall area of 8,539 acres and is the most significant watershed in the Planning Area. Approximately seven miles in length, the creek originates in the southern hills and flows north along Nortonville Road through the City. In the southern hills, the creek and its tributary channels have sufficient capacity to carry peak stormwater flows. Further downstream, however, natural flow capacity declines as the creek channel flattens. Urbanization north of Buchanan Road further decreases capacity as the channel becomes restricted and enclosed by storm drain culverts. Reduction in permeable soils caused by development also increases the total volume and rate of runoff.

Most of the Lawlor Creek watershed south of Bay Point is undeveloped, though some residential development exists south of State Route 4. Most runoff is conveyed by natural channels except for storm drains located in developed areas and culverts under State Route 4. Minor watersheds are located west of Lawlor Creek, between Lawlor and Kirker Creeks, and adjacent to the northeastern boundary of the Kirker Creek watershed north of State Route 4. Local minor watersheds are drained by small natural channels with no official names.

100-YEAR FLOOD PLAIN

According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), a majority of Contra Costa County’s creeks and shoreline lie within the 100-year flood plain. Areas with high flood hazards are the islands and adjacent mainland in the San Joaquin-Sacramento River Delta in East Contra Costa County. Certain portions within the Pittsburg Planning Area, located along Suisun Bay, are particularly susceptible to floods. However, most flood-prone areas in Pittsburg are marshland,
and are not potential development sites under the General Plan. Areas within the 100-year flood plains, as shown in Figure 10-3, include:

- Browns Island;
- Shoreline and adjacent uninhabited marshland north of the BNSF Railroad tracks in Bay Point;
- Portions of the industrial area in northeast Pittsburg beginning at the shoreline, including Kirker Creek, then following the creek upstream to its terminus in the hills south of the City; and
- Along Lawlor Creek in the northwestern portion of the City.

Additionally, many of the culverts between State Route 4 and the Contra Costa Canal are undersized, which cause floodwaters to pond and overflow the banks of Kirker Creek. Local areas potentially affected by the flooding of Kirker Creek include residential neighborhoods, two parks (Buchanan and Small World) and two schools (Highlands Elementary and Hillview Junior High). Further upstream, inadequate channel capacity causes localized flooding at the USS-Posco and Dow Chemical plants.

**FLOOD CONTROL MANAGEMENT**

The City is responsible for maintaining the flood control system within the incorporated area, including Kirker Creek. In the unincorporated parts of the Planning Area, the County Flood Control District (FCD) maintains major channels and creeks over which they hold land rights. The County Department of Public Works maintains road drainage systems and several detention basins. However, most of the Planning Area, particularly the Kirker Creek Watershed, is not managed by FCD. The City’s Stormwater Management Plan identifies deficiencies and improvements to the storm drain system, while the Storm Drain Maintenance Plan addresses maintenance requirements for Lawlor and Kirker Creek watersheds.
GOALS: FLOOD CONTROL

10-G-7 Locate development outside of flood-prone areas unless mitigation of flood risk is assured.

10-G-8 Ensure that new development mitigates impacts to the City’s storm drainage capacity from storm water runoff in excess of runoff occurring from the property in its undeveloped state.

POLICIES: FLOOD CONTROL

10-P-18 Evaluate storm drainage needs for each development project in the context of demand and capacity when the drainage area is fully developed. Ensure drainage improvements or other mitigation of the project’s impacts on the storm drainage system appropriate to the project’s share of the cumulative effect.

10-P-19 Assure through the Master Drainage Plan and development ordinances that proposed new development adequately provides for on-site and downstream mitigation of potential flood hazards.

10-P-20 Develop and implement a Storm Flooding Mitigation Fee Program to fund required drainage improvements during construction of new development.

Cooperate with the County Flood Control District in developing a Storm Flooding Mitigation Fee Program for incorporated and unincorporated lands within the City’s watersheds.

10-P-21 Encourage the formation of flood control assessment districts for those areas within the 100- and 500-year flood plains (as designated in Figure 10-3). Encourage new hillside developments to form flood control assessment districts to accommodate runoff and minimize downstream flooding, if determined to be necessary.
10-P-22 Ensure that pad elevations on newly constructed habitable buildings are one foot above the 100-year floodplain, as determined by FEMA.

10-P-23 Ensure that all new development (residential, commercial, or industrial) contributes to the construction of drainage improvements in the Kirker Creek and other watersheds in the Planning Area, as required by the City’s adopted ordinances.

10-P-24 Allow the construction of detention basins as mitigation in new developments. Ensure that detention basins located in residential neighborhoods, schools, or child-care facilities are surrounded by a gated enclosure, or protected by other safety measures.

The enclosure of detention basins, particularly in areas where small children are present, is necessary to ensure the safety of local residents when recessed areas are saturated with floodwaters.

10-P-25 Ensure adequate minimum setbacks to reduce potential for property damage from storm flooding.

10-P-26 Reduce the risk of localized and downstream flooding and runoff through the use of high infiltration measures, including the maximization of permeable landscape.

10-P-27 Adopt practices for development and construction on sites where the erosion potential is moderate to severe.

10-P-28 Bench terraces should be used where areas of long slopes may create a stormwater gradient flow. Berms should be constructed between any riparian corridor and the construction site to preclude sediment-laden stormwaters from entering riparian zones.

10-P-29 During the review of development plans, require all commercial projects to construct on-site retention facilities. Such facilities could be in the form of landscape features or underground swells.
Ensure that all development projects build on-site retention basins during initial site preparation to store run-off water generated by construction activities.

10-P-30 Encourage residential development that includes post-construction Best Management Practices to minimize runoff from the site to the stormdrain system (for example, using permeable surfaces for parking lots, sidewalks, and bike paths, or using roof runoff as irrigation).

10.3 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Contra Costa County is one of the largest generators of hazardous waste in the state. The majority of this waste comes from industries located along waterfronts. Approximately two-thirds of hazardous waste generated in the County is treated on-site, while one-third is transported to hazardous waste management facilities.

HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT IN PITTSBURG

Many industrial operations in Pittsburg involve the use or production of hazardous materials. Most significant are the petroleum and chemical processing plants in the northeastern portion of the City. According to the City’s Hazardous Waste Management Plan (HWMP), 11 large-quantity generators produced approximately 79,500 tons of hazardous waste in 1989. Of this, about 45 percent was treated on-site and 55 percent was shipped off-site for treatment or recycling. Potential hazards include the toxicity, flammability, and explosivity of petroleum and chemical materials.

The HWMP estimates that about 2,300 metric tons of hazardous waste is produced by small-quantity generators per year (projected in 1990). The majority is in the form of waste oil from vehicle maintenance shops. Hazardous waste reduction efforts by large generators are estimated to have decreased the amount of waste produced by more than 80 percent since 1990. This primarily resulted from improved production processes at industrial facilities, such as USS-Posco.
HAZARDOUS WASTE STORAGE AND LEAKAGE SITES

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board annually reports sites in the Bay Area with leaking underground storage tanks and sites with environmental problems due to leaks and spills. There are approximately 54 sites in Pittsburg included in the Leaking Underground Storage Tank list, which are identified as having soil and/or groundwater contamination resulting from leaks or other discharges from tanks and/or associated piping. There are also 12 Spills, Leaks, Investigations, and Clean-up (SLIC) sites within the City, which are large sites with environmental problems due to accidental releases of toxic substances such as metals, volatile organic compounds, and petroleum hydrocarbons.

The State requires the upgrade or replacement of tanks and piping installed before 1984, when California's Underground Storage Tank (UST) program and more stringent tank requirements came into effect. This requirement was established by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency ten years ago to ensure that facility owners, especially those depending on petroleum for providing critical services (e.g., hospitals, police and fire departments), have their USTs upgraded.

TRANSPORT OF HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The California Highway Patrol and California Department of Transportation have primary responsibility in regulating the transportation of hazardous waste and materials. Recently, the City designated roadways within Pittsburg that are acceptable for transport of hazardous materials. These roadways are all located within the industrial areas north of State Route 4, including:

- Loveridge Road
- Pittsburg-Antioch Highway
- Tenth Street/Willow Pass
- North Parkside Drive

For many years, explosive materials were regularly shipped to Concord Naval
Weapons Station by highway and rail, including the BNSF and Southern Pacific railroads. Pipelines traversing the Planning Area carry natural gas, crude oil, and refined petroleum products. These pipelines, found throughout Contra Costa County, cross fault lines, unstable slopes, and areas underlain by soft mud and peat. While the County Office of Emergency Services has prepared emergency and disaster plans, the proximity of hazardous materials to populated areas nonetheless represents a potential safety threat.

**GOALS: HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

10-G-9 Minimize the risk to life and property from the generation, storage, and transportation of hazardous materials and waste by complying with all applicable State regulations.

10-G-10 Encourage redevelopment of areas with potential hazardous materials issues. Pursue a leadership role in the remediation of brownfield sites throughout Pittsburg.

**POLICIES: HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

10-P-31 Cooperate with other public agencies in the formation of a hazardous-materials team, consisting of specially-trained personnel from all East County public safety agencies, to address the reduction, safe transport, and clean-up of hazardous materials.

Contra Costa Water District is supportive of the formation of a hazardous materials team, particularly as it relates to the Contra Costa Canal system and Suisun Bay/Sacramento River Delta water quality.

10-P-32 Designate and map brownfield sites to educate future landowners about contamination from previous uses. Work directly with landowners in the clean-up of brownfield sites, particularly in areas with redevelopment potential.
10-P-33 Prevent the spread of hazardous leaks and spills from industrial facilities to residential neighborhoods and community focal points, such as Downtown.

10-P-34 Identify appropriate regional and local routes for transport of hazardous materials and wastes. Ensure that fire, police, and other emergency personnel are easily accessible for response to spill incidences on such routes.

10-P-35 Require historical assessments and/or sampling as part of the environmental review process for redevelopment projects in the Loveridge and Northeast River subareas. Ensure that contamination from industrial waste is mitigated before redevelopment occurs.

10.4 EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

In 1999, Pittsburg approved an update to the 1996 Emergency Response Plan that addresses potential impacts from a major earthquake, hazardous materials incident, flood, national security emergency, wildfire, landslide, or dam failure. The objectives of the plan are to reduce injury, loss of life, and destruction of property through effective management of emergency forces.

The Emergency Plan indicates that a major earthquake in the San Francisco Bay Region would result in widespread damage, large numbers of casualties, and disruption of infrastructure such as transportation, utility service, emergency services, and medical response. It is likely that Pittsburg would experience non-structural property damage and utility service interruptions following strong seismic activity on the Concord-Green Valley Fault. However, the potentially catastrophic effects of an earthquake on the Hayward Fault would more than likely exceed the response capabilities of both the City and the County.

A particular concern for the City is the possibility of an earthquake triggering an industrial disaster. The density of petroleum and chemical industries and the trans-shipping of military explosives result in large quantities of potentially explosive, flammable and poisonous materials being stored, processed and transported
through Pittsburg and throughout the County. The City works together with industry to encourage modernization and seismic retrofit of industrial facilities.

GOALS: EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

10-G-11 Ensure emergency response equipment and personnel training are adequate to follow the procedures contained within the Emergency Response Plan for a major earthquake, wildland fire, or hazardous substance event.

POLICIES: EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

10-P-36 Maintain, modernize, and designate new sites for emergency response facilities, including fire and police stations, as needed to accommodate population growth.

10-P-37 Prepare and disseminate information to local residents, businesses, and schools about emergency preparedness and evacuation routes, including hazardous materials spills.

10-P-38 Ensure that critical facilities, including medical centers, police and fire stations, school facilities, and other structures that are important to protecting health and safety in the community, remain operative during emergencies.

10-P-39 Strive to maintain a ratio of 1.8 sworn police officers per 1,000 residents.
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11 PUBLIC FACILITIES

This element addresses the provision of public services and facilities, including water supply and distribution, wastewater collection and treatment, solid waste collection and disposal, fire protection, and public utility corridors. Figure 11-1 illustrates major public facilities within the City’s Planning Area. Parks and recreation facilities are discussed in Chapter 8: Youth and Recreation.
Figure 11-1
Public Facilities
11.1 WATER SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION

Pittsburg obtains raw water from the Contra Costa Water District (CCWD), through the Central Valley Project (CVP). The CCWD’s current contract for its entire service area is for 195,000 acre-feet per year (af/y), or 174 million gallons per day (mgd). However, these allocations are subject to regulatory or other temporary restrictions that may be imposed arising from drought or other conditions. In addition to its CVP contract, CCWD has negotiated water rights with a number of local districts and private entities, including the East Contra Costa Irrigation District. These agreements bring CCWD’s total annual supply to 242,700 af/y. The City also supplements its CCWD water supply with two wells, located at City Park and at Dover Way and Frontage Road. Combined yield of both wells in Pittsburg is 1,500 af/y.

The City operates its own water treatment plant and associated infrastructure facilities, which primarily serve customers within City limits. The Pittsburg treatment plant currently operates at 16 to 18 mgd for City accounts. Although it is restricted to 24 mgd by State Health Department permitting and stringent water quality regulations, the plant has a hydraulic design capacity of 32 mgd. This design capacity is sufficient to meet the 2020 maximum day requirements of 30.5 mgd.

Treated water is distributed throughout Pittsburg via a 122-mile system of pipeline, in addition to several pump stations and seven reservoirs. Recent construction of the Oak Hills IV Reservoir and Highlands Reservoir, both along the City’s southern boundary, bring the City’s year 2000 reservoir capacity to 16.9 mgd.

HISTORIC WATER USE

In the last decade, water consumption in Pittsburg ranged from a high of 208 gallons per capita per day (gpcd) in 1988 to a drought-induced low of 138 gpcd in 1991. The greatest amount of water use occurs during the summer months, when usage is heavily influenced by extensive landscape irrigation. Population growth is the primary factor affecting the City’s water demand. In 1995, per capita water use
was approximately 170 gallons per day, totaling 3,000 million gallons per year (mgy).

The rate of water consumption by different uses in the City is not proportional to the number of accounts by corresponding uses. As shown in Charts 11-1 and 11-2, residential users represented 95 percent of total accounts, but only 65 percent of total water usage in 1995. Although industrial users held less than one percent of all accounts, they represented 12 percent of total water consumption. Such disparities in usage should be considered when analyzing the potential impacts of different types of development on the City’s water supply.

PROJECTED WATER DEMAND

Water demand projections are primarily dependent on increases in the City’s population base (see Table 11-1). Average demand per day (gpcd) is based on the per capita water consumption rate of 180 gpcd, established by the Pittsburg Water System Master Plan (2000). By 2020, Pittsburg residents will be demanding approximately 16.8 mgd and 504 million gallons per month (mgm), for a total annual water demand of 6,132 mgy. Maximum daily demand during peak season is anticipated to reach 35.3 mgd, or 39,559 af/y, by 2020.

According to the Pittsburg Water System Master Plan (2000), additional storage needs by year 2020 include a minimum combined capacity of 7 million gallons in order to meet operational, fire flow, and emergency storage demands. Water storage capacity will total 23.9 million gallons by General Plan buildout.

Expansion of Water Service Area

For new areas outside of CCWD to be serviced by CCWD water supplies, annexation must be approved by the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo). Additionally, inclusion of the new areas into the CVP contractual service area must be approved by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (USBR). CCWD annexation is normally included as part of a reorganization application by the City of Pittsburg to the LAFCo. USBR’s review of the inclusion application includes meeting federal statutes and regulations, including the Endangered Species Act.
Table 11-1
Water Demand Projections, Pittsburg: 1990-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Average Demand per Day (mgd)*</th>
<th>Maximum Demand per Day (mgd)</th>
<th>Average Demand per Month (mgm)</th>
<th>Total Demand per Year (mgy)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>46,500</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>51,500</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>56,800</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>3,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>68,980</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>4,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>77,100</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>5,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>82,513</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>5,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>93,340</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>6,132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on assumed 180 gallons per capita per day (gpcd).
** Calculated by applying a multiplier of 2.10 to the Average Day Demand.


For CCWD to issue a Confirmation Letter (of water supply) to the City of Pittsburg for new annexation areas, CCWD needs: (1) inclusion approval from USBR, and (2) issuance of a de minimis determination that the cumulative increase in water demand does not exceed 5 percent of the projected buildout water demands as presented in the Los Vaqueros Project (LVP) EIR/S (1993; Table 1). The projected buildout water demands for the eight areas currently outside the LVP Planning Area is 930 af/y, or half of one percent (0.005) of LVP critical year buildout demand. This demand, when combined with other known projects, currently falls within the acceptable five percent deviation; however, development timing with respect to other future projects will be a factor for issuance of de minimis determinations for future Pittsburg projects.

1 Written correspondence: Gregory Gartrell, Contra Costa Water District, March 12, 2001, “Comment on Draft EIR for the Pittsburg General Plan Revision”.
WATER CONSERVATION

Water conservation first became an issue during the 1976-77 drought, and then again with the 1991 drought. Initial conservation measures involved requiring the installation of water meters and increasing the use of drought-tolerant plants in public landscaping. In addition, residents voluntarily reduced water use. The City also implements various Best Management Practices aimed at water conservation, as a signatory to the Urban Water Management Council.

Pittsburg’s current water conservation program includes education and public information, municipal water management programs, regulations involving landscaping and requirements for efficient water use during shortages, and an increased capacity of its water treatment plant. Six additional conservation measures are currently being implemented by the City, including a water rate structure to encourage conservation, stricter plumbing codes, public education, water-efficient landscaping, studying expanded reclaimed water usage, and a leak detection survey and repair program. Finally, the construction of the new Delta Diablo Sanitation District Reclamation Plant will provide residential, business, and City-owned properties with recycled water supplies for landscaping.

GOALS: WATER SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION

11-G-1 Available water supply and distribution capacity should grow proportionally with development patterns and water usage trends. Update City’s Water Master Plan to implement General Plan growth projections.

11-G-2 Continue to implement water conservation policies to ensure adequate supplies of water in the future.

POLICIES: WATER SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION

11-P-1 Continue using the Urban Water Management Plan as the mechanism for detailed water supply planning, implementation, and conservation.

11-P-2 Implement, as needed, replacements and/or expansions to the existing system of water mains through the City’s Capital Improvement Program.
11-P-3  Continue water district and user conservation efforts to help reduce demand in light of recent Contra Costa Water District raw water reductions.

In an attempt to preserve Delta species and habitat, the Central Valley Project mandated reductions in the amount of raw water available to the CCWD. Current water conservation efforts in the City include:

- Implementation of a water rate structure that encourages conservation;
- Implementation of plumbing code changes requiring ultra-low-flow toilets in new construction;
- Continuance of public education on water conservation;
- Passage of a Water-Efficient Landscape Ordinance for new large-scale landscaping;
- Study of expanded reclaimed water usage; and
- System-wide water audit/leak detection survey and repair program.

11-P-4  Work with Contra Costa Water District to develop a program ensuring adequate provision of raw water supplies during potential emergency water demands.

Although the current available supply is adequate to accommodate future growth under normal conditions, the City should continue to stress water conservation policies in case of unforeseen shortfalls or periods of drought.

11-P-5  Work with Contra Costa Water District in planning the development of new pressure zones as needed to ensure adequate fire flows in hillside areas.

As the City expands into the southern hills, additional water pressure zones may be required to provide higher elevations with sufficient water for fire protection, particularly as these areas are more susceptible to urban/wildland fire hazards. The need for these should be examined as part of the next update of the Urban Water Management Plan.
11-P-6  Continue water conservation efforts from industrial facilities.

Water conservation efforts by industrial users can significantly decrease water consumption, especially during peak demand periods. Measures relevant to industrial users include continued enforcement of the 1992 Water-Efficient Landscape Ordinance and participation in a wastewater reclamation feasibility study. If proven feasible, implementation of the Landscape Ordinance in conjunction with use of reclaimed wastewater for landscape irrigation can help to reduce industrial water demand.

11-P-7  Ensure that new residential, commercial, and industrial development equitably shares costs associated with providing water services to areas of urban expansion within the Planning Area.

11-P-8  Develop and implement a Recycled Water Ordinance, requiring the installation and use of recycled water supplies from the new Delta Diablo Sanitation District Reclamation Plant.

11-P-9  Cooperate with Contra Costa Water District to ensure compliance with District regulations and State law for new development requiring annexation to the Contra Costa Water District service area. Cooperate with Contra Costa Water District in processing all necessary information to allow a determination if Los Vaqueros facilities can be used to service new annexation areas.

11-P-10 Cooperate with federal agencies to ensure that new development requiring inclusion in the Contra Costa Water District Central Valley Project contract service area addresses all requirements of federal statutes and regulations, including the National Environmental Policy Act and Endangered Species Act. Encourage project developers to provide all required information for consultation purposes, if necessary, under Endangered Species Act Sections 7 or 10, or a Habitat Conservation Plan.
11.2 WASTEWATER COLLECTION AND TREATMENT

Sewer services in the Planning Area are provided by the City and the Delta Diablo Sanitation District (DDSD). The City maintains and owns the local sewage collection system, and DDSD owns and operates the collection system in Bay Point. The District also owns and operates regional interceptors and the sewage treatment plant located north of the Pittsburg-Antioch Highway. DDSD’s service area encompasses Pittsburg, Bay Point, and Antioch.

The oldest portions of Pittsburg’s sewage collection system were constructed in the early part of this century to serve what is now Downtown. The system has since evolved into two distinct sections: the older portion north of State Route 4, and the portion serving newer areas south of the highway. Sewer lines serving residential, commercial, and industrial development north of State Route 4 drain to DDSD’s Pittsburg Pump Station located south of Marina Park; wastewater from developments south of State Route 4 enters the DDSD interceptor system on Pittsburg-Antioch Highway.

The City’s collection system consists of approximately 95 miles of sewer lines ranging in diameter from 6 to 36 inches, and one sewage lift station. The DDSD treatment plant—located north of Pittsburg-Antioch Highway, just east of Pittsburg City limits—has the capacity to treat approximately 16.5 million gallons of sewage per day (mgd). The annual average flow treated in 1999 was 13.6 mgd. The DDSD has adopted a district Master Plan that includes phased treatment plant expansion to ultimately provide 24.0 mgd (average dry weather flow) capacity in order to accommodate anticipated General Plan buildout for the communities of Pittsburg, Antioch, and unincorporated Bay Point.

PROJECTED WASTEWATER DEMAND

Wastewater flow projections are based on the amount of residential units, commercial and industrial acreage, and student population estimated at buildout of the General Plan (see Table 11-2). The City’s Collection System Master Plan (September 1990) identifies the wastewater flow units factors used for the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th># of Units at Buildout</th>
<th>Unit Flow Factor (gpd/unit)</th>
<th>Total GPD at Buildout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>dwelling units</td>
<td>25,421</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>5,592,62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>dwelling units</td>
<td>6,271</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>1,066,07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>acre</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>921,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>acre</td>
<td>1,337</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>802,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>student</td>
<td>16,953</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>254,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>8,636,185</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

projection. Residential units are projected to generate 5.8 mgd, while commercial and industrial users are projected at 1.7 mgd.

The City has an agreement with DDSD that provides for the concurrent annexation on new urban lands into both City and District boundaries, and authorizes the City to collect annexation fees on the District’s behalf.

GOALS: WASTEWATER COLLECTION AND TREATMENT

11-G-3 Plan for expansion of the City’s wastewater collection system, in order to provide necessary infrastructure for projected urban growth through 2020.

11-G-4 Maintain environmentally appropriate wastewater management practices.

11-G-5 Reduce rainfall-dependent infiltration and inflow, in order to maintain capacity of existing collection system, and prevent Sanitary Sewer Overflows (SSO).

POLICIES: WASTEWATER COLLECTION AND TREATMENT

11-P-11 Work with Delta Diablo Sanitation District in planning the expansion of the wastewater treatment plant.

11-P-12 Pursue replacement and/or expansion of the City’s trunk sewer system, as demand increases, particularly in newer portions of the system south of State Route 4.

New development south of State Route 4 places increased demand on the City’s aging sewer collection system. The expansion of the trunk sewer system would ensure adequate capacities for future growth, particularly during heavy rainfall when inflow/infiltration levels are high.

11-P-13 Address deficiencies in the capacity, safety and reliability of the collection system as identified in the 1990 and subsequent Collection System Master Plans.
11-P-14  **Restrict construction of sensitive receptors, such as residential units, schools or churches, within 1000 feet of wastewater treatment units. Prohibit construction of sensitive receptors within 0.5 miles of the wastewater treatment plant.**

This policy maintains the District’s current buffer for both safety and odor impacts. Although not currently in use, the District stores large volumes of acutely hazardous materials on-site for potential use in wastewater treatment that could cause extensive harm to receptors upon accidental release. Furthermore, this policy will contribute to the reduction of costs the District pays for extensive odor control.

11-P-15  **Work with Delta Diablo Sanitation District to promote the use of recycled water for irrigation of large planted areas, such as business/industrial campus projects, City parks, and street medians.**

The District is constructing a Reclamation Plant and significant pipelines, with a scheduled start-up date in late 2000, to deliver recycled water to two power plants and several parks in the City of Pittsburg. Discovery of safe uses of reclaimed wastewater will ultimately result in using less potable water for landscape irrigation and reducing overall raw water demands. Both the Delta Energy Center and the Los Medanos Energy Center will use large amounts of DDSD reclaimed water, while the City will be using it for irrigation at Central Park, the Pittsburg-Antioch Highway, and the Eighth Street Corridor.

11-P-16  **Work with Delta Diablo Sanitation District to ensure that industrial discharge is monitored and that wastewater quality continues to meet various Federal, State, and regional standards.**

11-P-17  **Require that all wastewater dischargers within the City conform to the ordinances of the Delta Diablo Sanitation District.**

11-P-18  **Ensure that new residential, commercial, and industrial development equitably share costs associated with providing wastewater services to areas of urban expansion within the Planning Area.**
11.3 SOLID WASTE

Solid waste pickup and disposal for Pittsburg and a small portion of Bay Point is provided by Pittsburg Disposal Services (PDS). Allied Industries provides disposal services for the remaining areas of Bay Point. Residential and commercial solid waste is disposed at Potrero Hills Landfill, located east of Suisun City, while non-recyclable industrial waste is transported to Keller Canyon Landfill, located southeast of City limits within the Planning Area. These landfills replaced the now closed Contra Costa Sanitary Landfill.

Potrero Hills Landfill, a regional waste disposal facility, serves portions of Solano and Contra Costa Counties. A Class III landfill, it began operation in 1986 and has a projected life of 17 to 20 years. However, Potrero Hills Landfill Company owns adjacent acreage that may allow expansion of the existing facility. In 1996, 53 percent (194,157 tons) of waste disposed at Potrero Hills Landfill originated from the Contra Costa Recycling Center and Transfer Station located in Pittsburg. Of this amount, approximately 62,010 tons were from Pittsburg.

Keller Canyon Landfill services eastern and central portions of Contra Costa County. A Class II facility, it opened in 1990 and has a projected lifespan of 40-years. Of the 244 acres permitted for disposal, 40 acres are currently in use. Pittsburg disposes approximately 3,000 tons of industrial solid waste annually at this site.

CURBSIDE RECYCLING

A voluntary curbside recycling program is in place in Pittsburg. The program is operated by PDS, which expanded in 1990 to serve 11,000 single-family households. Materials accepted for recycling include plastic, glass, aluminum, tin, newspaper, white and colored paper, magazines, and cardboard. Recyclables are picked up once a week along with regular waste, and then processed at a facility owned by PDS. In addition, yard waste collection services are provided every other week.
The City’s Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE), pursuant to the California Integrated Waste Management Act (1989), documents how source reduction, recycling, composting, and public education will contribute to the diversion of solid wastes from local landfills. In 1990, the curbside recycling program diverted 10.5 percent (2,350 tons) of the residential waste stream and five percent of waste generated by all uses. Table 11-3 describes diversion rates for specific materials.

The City has been aggressive in implementing the programs outlined in the SRRE to reach the mandated 50 percent diversion goal set by the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989. The City has reached this goal, but continues to use source reduction, recycling, composting, and public education programs to maintain this goal.

**GOALS: SOLID WASTE**

**11-G-6** Continue reduction and recycling efforts within the City to divert increasingly larger portions of the waste stream from local landfills.

**11-G-7** Manage solid waste so that State diversion goals are met.

**POLICIES: SOLID WASTE**

**11-P-19** Support the implementation of program tasks within the Source Reduction and Recycling Element.

**11-P-20** Work with Pittsburg Disposal Services to increase participation in curbside recycling programs for residential neighborhoods.

**11-P-21** Promote the importance of recycling industrial and construction wastes.

Industrial and commercial uses create significantly higher waste streams than do residential uses. The diversion of recyclable materials from commercial and industrial uses would greatly reduce the waste tonnage sent to local landfills each day.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Diversion Rate</th>
<th>Tons</th>
<th>Percent of Waste Stream</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>1490</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PET Plastic</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluminum Cans</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Pittsburg Source Reduction and Recycling Element, 1992
11-P-22 Prepare and distribute informational handouts to the public regarding opportunities to reduce waste at homes and businesses, as well as methods of safe disposal of hazardous materials.

11-P-23 Encourage builders to incorporate interior and exterior storage areas for recyclables into new or remodeled residential, commercial, and industrial structures.

11.4 FIRE PROTECTION

The risk of both urban and wildland fires exists in the Planning Area. The Contra Costa County Fire Protection District (CCCFPD), which provides fire protection services to the Pittsburg Planning Area, receives approximately 42,000 urban fire calls per year from within the district. About 10,500, or 25 percent, of these calls are from East County, which includes Pittsburg. The District operates out of 29 fire stations located throughout its jurisdictional area. CCCFPD also maintains mutual-aid agreements with the East Diablo Fire Protection District, East Bay Regional Park District, California Department of Forestry, and private industrial companies located within its jurisdiction. These agreements provide the CCCFPD with emergency response assistance on an as-needed basis.

The response time goal for the CCCFPD is to provide service within five minutes of notification. Generally, service can be provided in this time frame to areas located within 1.5 miles of a fire station. The Insurance Service Office (ISO)—a private organization that surveys fire departments in cities and town across the United States—awarded the CCCFPD a Class Three ratio (One being highest and Ten being lowest). This rating considers a community’s fire defense capacity versus fire potential, and then uses the score to set property insurance premiums for homeowners and commercial property owners.

Fire Protection Facilities

Battalion 8 of the CCCFPD provides fire protection and suppression services for Pittsburg, Antioch, and surrounding unincorporated areas such as Bay Point. There are a total of eight stations in the battalion. Four fire stations—Stations 84,
85, 86, and 87—currently serve Pittsburg and Bay Point. While Table 11-4 lists station facilities, Figure 11-2 shows station locations and 1.5-mile response radii.

The CCCFPD operates a countywide early warning system for industrial fires. Called the Community Warning System (CWS), sirens installed at industrial facilities automatically sound when an incident occurs. The system alerts residents via television and radio announcements.

### Table 11-4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Station 84 200 East Sixth Street, Pittsburg</td>
<td>Quint, Powerwagon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 85 2555 Harbor Street, Pittsburg</td>
<td>Engine, Powerwagon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 86 3000 Willow Pass Road, Bay Point</td>
<td>Engine, Powerwagon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 87 800 West Leland Road, Pittsburg</td>
<td>Engine, Powerwagon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Contra Costa County Fire Protection District*

### Fire Hazard Areas

Wildland fire risk can be determined through a system developed by the California Division of Forestry. The system rates fire risk by analyzing three conditions:

- Frequency of critical fire weather;
- Percentage of slope within a given area; and
- Existing vegetation (density and type).
Source: Contra Costa County Fire Protection District

Figure 11-2
Fire Station Locations

- ★ Station Number
- ★ Approved Station Relocation Site (Stations 84 & 85)
- ○ 1.5 Mile Response Radii
- ○ 1.5 Mile Response Radii for Relocated Stations 84 & 85
Areas in Pittsburg representing the greatest risk are in the hills south of the City, which are brown and dry for much of the year. Wildland fires in East Contra Costa County are a continuous threat, with the highest risk occurring during the wildland fire season, from June to October. Much of the threat is due to open grasslands abutting residential developments. As Pittsburg continues to expand, more of these urban-rural interface areas are created.

**GOALS: FIRE PROTECTION**

11-G-8 Require development in areas of high fire hazard to be designed and constructed to minimize potential losses and maximize the ability of fire personnel to suppress fire incidents.

**POLICIES: FIRE PROTECTION**

11-P-24 Amend the subdivision regulations to include a requirement for detailed fire prevention and control, including community firebreaks, for projects in high and extreme hazard areas.

Areas of high and extreme fire hazard include the Planning Area’s southern hills. Preparation of detailed fire prevention plans will ensure that new development in extreme hazard areas accounts for potential fire hazards and control measures. The construction of fire-breaks in areas of extreme fire hazard, such as estate residential development in hillside areas, will increase the District’s chances of halting and subduing a potential wildland fire incident.

11-P-25 Review and amend ordinances that regulate development in potentially hazardous locations to require adequate protection, such as fire-resistant roofing, building materials, and landscaping.

Using fire-resistant construction materials and landscaping will both slow the pace at which fire spreads and improve the likelihood that the structure will survive a fire incident.
Cooperate with Contra Costa County Fire Protection District to ensure that new or relocated fire stations are constructed on appropriate sites within the 1.5-mile response radii from new or existing development.

Further development in the southern hills may necessitate the construction of a new fire station by 2020. Additional fire protection facilities may be necessary to ensure the safety of residents within urban-rural interface hazard areas.

Cooperate with Contra Costa County Fire Protection District in obtaining sites to either relocate or establish new fire stations within City limits to provide more efficient response times.

Cooperate with Contra Costa County Fire Protection District in obtaining a site for a new fire station (or relocation of Station 86) in the vicinity of State Route 4 and west of Bailey Road.

Ensure adequate road widths in new development for fire response trucks, per the subdivision regulations.

11.5 PUBLIC UTILITIES

Construction of City-owned capital facilities and infrastructure must keep pace with the rate of urban development. The provision of public utilities, such as electricity, telephone, and cable connections, is integral to the development of urban land uses.

MULTI-USE OF UTILITY CORRIDORS

The existing PG&E power line corridor bisects the City of Pittsburg from the Mirant (formerly PG&E) Power Plant along Suisun Bay in the north to the rolling hills in the southern portion of the Planning Area. This corridor is currently used only as an open space area over which power transmission lines and towers stand. The City could work with Mirant to transform this underutilized corridor into more useful public space, such as open space habitat or trails, parks and playing fields.
GOALS: PUBLIC UTILITIES

11-G-9 Assess the adequacy of public utilities in existing developed areas, and program needed improvements to coordinate with developing portions of the Planning Area.

11-G-10 Encourage buffer landscaping and multi-use of utility sites and rights-of-way to harmonize with adjoining uses.

POLICIES: PUBLIC UTILITIES

11-P-30 Continue to rely on the five-year Capital Improvement Program to provide for needed utilities in relation to the City’s financial resources.

11-P-31 Work with Mirant Power Plant to acquire and/or develop transmission line corridors for attractive, community-serving, compatible uses, such as:

- Open space habitat. More intensive planting would provide a wildlife habitat corridor within the City.
- Recreational uses. Parks, playing fields, and trails linked to the regional network would be a tremendous opportunity for the City.

11-P-32 Ensure the designation of service corridor easements or routes when required for tentative map or specific plan approval.

Ensure the provision of public utilities to all new urban development by requiring utility corridor easements in development plans.

11-P-33 As a condition of approval, ensure that all new and redevelopment projects underground utility lines on and adjacent to the site.

Undergrounding of all utilities in new and redeveloped areas will significantly improve the appearance of City streets and views.
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This element outlines a comprehensive program of achieving acceptable noise levels throughout Pittsburg, and ensures compliance with State noise requirements. Significant noise sources in Pittsburg include major transportation corridors, such as State Route 4 and arterial roadways.
12.1 NOISE MEASUREMENT

Noise can be defined as a sound or series of sounds that are intrusive, irritating, objectionable and/or disruptive to daily life. Noise varies widely in its scope, source, and volume, ranging from individual occurrences such as a lawn mower to the intermittent disturbances of rail yard whistles to the fairly constant noise generated by traffic on freeways.

Noise is primarily a concern when in the vicinity of noise-sensitive uses such as residences, schools, churches, and hospitals. Noise is controlled around other uses as well, although levels rarely exceed the recommended maximum. The known effects of noise on humans include hearing loss, communication interference, sleep interference, physiological responses, and annoyance.

NOISE MEASUREMENT

Three aspects of community noise are important in determining responses, and are therefore measured and described when assessing the noise environment:

1. Level (that is, magnitude or loudness) of the sound. Sound levels are measured and expressed in decibels (dB), with 10 dB roughly equal to the threshold of hearing and 120 dB the threshold of pain.

2. Frequency composition or spectrum of the sound. Frequency is a measure of the pressure fluctuations per second, measured in units of hertz (Hz).

3. Variation in sound level with time, measured as noise exposure. Most community noise is produced by many distant noise sources, including identifiable events of brief duration, such as power plant stack “blows”, which cause the community noise level to vary from instant to instant. A single number called the equivalent sound level or Leq describes the average noise exposure level over a period of time.

When noise levels are reported, they are expressed as a measurement over time in order to account for variations in noise exposure. Levels also account for varying degrees of sensitivity to noise during daytime and nighttime hours. The
Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) and Day-Night Noise Level (Ldn) both reflect noise exposure over an average day with weighting to reflect this sensitivity. The CNEL is the reference level for State Noise Law and is used to express major continuous noise sources, such as aircraft or traffic.

Knowledge of the following relationships is helpful in understanding how changes in noise and noise exposure are perceived:

- Except under special conditions, a change in sound level of 1 dB cannot be perceived;
- A 3 dB change is considered a “just-noticeable” difference;
- A 5 dB change is required before any noticeable change in community response would be expected. A 5 dB change is often considered a significant impact; and
- A 10 dB change is subjectively heard as an approximate doubling in loudness and almost always causes an adverse community response.

### 12.2 EXISTING NOISE

The major sources of noise in Pittsburg include auto traffic on arterial streets and State Route 4, and railroad pass-bys. Noise produced by industrial facilities has an insignificant effect on the City’s noise environment. As part of the General Plan Update process, a community noise analysis was performed to evaluate existing noise conditions in the City, as shown in Figure 12-1.

#### TRAFFIC NOISE

Traffic noise depends primarily on the speed of traffic and the percentage of truck traffic; traffic volume does not have a major influence on traffic noise levels. The primary source of noise from automobiles is high frequency tire noise, which increases with speed. In addition, trucks and older automobiles produce engine and exhaust noise, and trucks also generate wind noise. While tire noise from autos is generally located at ground level, truck noise sources can be located as
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high as to 15 feet above the roadbed due to tall exhaust stacks and higher engines; sound walls are not effective for mitigating such noise unless they are very tall.

According to common practice, maximum noise levels of 60 dB are considered “normally acceptable” for unshielded residential development. Noise levels from 60 to 70 dB fall within the “conditionally unacceptable” range, and those in the 70 to 75 dB range are considered “normally unacceptable.”

**Traffic Noise Levels**

The Pittsburg Planning Area is subject to noise impacts from a number of transportation corridors. Roads and highways, or portions thereof, that impact sensitive receptors (that is, produce noise levels greater than 60 dB) include:

- State Route 4;
- Port Chicago Highway;
- Pittsburg-Antioch Highway;
- Bailey Road;
- Willow Pass Road;
- East Leland Road;
- Railroad Avenue;
- Buchanan Road;
- Harbor Street; and
- Loveridge Road.

By far the greatest contributor to noise in the Planning Area is traffic on State Route 4, producing noise levels exceeding 60 dB over approximately 2,000 feet (more than one-third mile) both north and south of the highway. This area includes adjacent neighborhoods throughout the length of the highway. Neighborhoods located at the convergence of State Route 4, Railroad Avenue, and
the BNSF railroad tracks are particularly susceptible to noise levels above 60 dB. Much of Bay Point is also susceptible to high noise levels due to its proximity to the BNSF and Southern Pacific railroads, State Route 4, Bailey Road, and Port Chicago Highway.

**RAILROAD NOISE**

Activity on the BNSF and Southern Pacific railroads represents significant sources of noise in the Planning Area. Noise levels reaching 70 dB exist along the length of both railroads, affecting adjacent noise-sensitive uses. Residential neighborhoods are located south of the railroad tracks in both Pittsburg and Bay Point, and north of the tracks in Pittsburg’s Downtown. Factors that may influence the overall impact of railroad noise on noise-sensitive uses include its intermittent nature and the lack of sound walls or other barriers between the tracks and adjacent uses.

**Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station**

The Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station, which began operations in 1996, is located at the southwest corner of the State Route 4/Bailey Road interchange. On a typical weekday, 75 trains provide service from this station to other stations in the BART system. BART rail tracks are located in the median of State Route 4, contributing to the general noise environment of the Planning Area between the western city limits and the BART station. A new station, proposed for the State Route 4/Railroad Avenue intersection, would extend the BART noise corridor over three miles into the center of the City.

BART has established maximum pass-by exterior noise levels for its transit operations. These noise levels are higher than typical standards for noise sensitive uses because they are based on individual noise events rather than average noise levels over a period of time. The impact of BART pass-by noise on CNEL levels will depend on the frequency and duration of the train pass-bys.

**INDUSTRIAL NOISE**

Intermittent noise occurrences from local industrial activities are by themselves insignificant, but contribute to overall noise levels within the City. Truck traffic generated by local industrial uses also contributes to noise levels along arterial
roadways within the eastern portion of the City. The Mirant (formerly PG&E) Power Plant located along the northern waterfront emits stack “blows” which can be heard in Downtown and adjacent areas.

12.3 PROJECTED NOISE

Traffic forecasts to accommodate projected growth in the City were used to generate noise projections at General Plan buildout. Projected noise levels on local roadways are shown in Table 12-1. Two separate measurements (100 feet and 1,000 feet) were used to determine noise severity. The projected noise contours in Figure 12-2 reflect these measurements; however, the scale of the map restricts placement of additional contours above 70 dB along major transportation corridors.

Highest noise levels in Pittsburg will result along the State Route 4 corridor (90 dB), while above-acceptable noise levels will also result along many major arterial roadways (75 to 80 dB). The excessive noise levels estimated along State Route 4 result from two primary factors: 1) BART rail lines running down the center median, with train pass-bys increasing average daily noise levels; and 2) heavy vehicle traffic along the highway corridor, which lies within a narrow right-of-way with residential development built up on either side. If train activity along the BNSF railroad right-of-way is increased, noise-sensitive land uses in proximity to the line could be exposed to excessive noise levels. Noise levels along the route would depend on the type of train vehicle and track improvements, the frequency of train pass-bys, and the location of train stations.

### Table 12-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affected Roadway Segments</th>
<th>Projected Noise Level at 100 ft. (Ldn)</th>
<th>Projected Noise Level at 1,000 ft. (Ldn)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  State Route 4</td>
<td>90 dB</td>
<td>75 dB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Pittsburg-Antioch Highway</td>
<td>79 dB</td>
<td>64 dB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Railroad Avenue</td>
<td>79 dB</td>
<td>64 dB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Willow Pass Road</td>
<td>79 dB</td>
<td>64 dB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Buchanan Road</td>
<td>78 dB</td>
<td>63 dB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  East Leland Road</td>
<td>77 dB</td>
<td>62 dB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  Bailey Road</td>
<td>77 dB</td>
<td>62 dB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  Loveridge Road</td>
<td>75 dB</td>
<td>60 dB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12-2
Projected Noise Contours

Source: Charles Salter Associates
12.4 NOISE POLICIES

GOALS: NOISE

12-G-1 Protect public health and welfare by eliminating or minimizing the effects of existing noise problems, and by preventing increased noise levels in the future.

12-G-2 Encourage criteria such as building design and orientation, wider setbacks, and intense landscaping in lieu of sound walls to mitigate traffic noise along all major corridors, except along State Route 4.

12-G-3 Continue efforts to incorporate noise considerations into land use planning decisions, and guide the location and design of transportation facilities to minimize the effects of noise on adjacent land uses.

POLICIES: NOISE

12-P-1 As part of development review, use Figure 12-3 to determine acceptable uses and installation requirements in noise-impacted areas.

Figure 12-3 is based on land use and noise exposure compatibility levels in Appendix A of the State of California General Plan Guidelines. The table is consistent with the provision of State law that requires special noise insulation for new multi-family housing units within 60 dB Ldn noise exposure contours. The table’s land use categories do not correspond to the land use classifications on the General Plan Land Use Diagram, but to actual uses in development projects.

12-P-2 Work with Caltrans to provide sound walls designed to reduce noise by 10 dB in residential areas along State Route 4.

12-P-3 Support implementation of State legislation that requires reduction of noise from motorcycles, automobiles, trucks, trains, and aircraft.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Exterior Day/Night Noise Levels DNL or Ldn, dB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential–Single Family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential–Multiple Family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient Lodging–Motels, Hotels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools, Libraries, Churches, Hospitals*, Nursing Homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditoriums, Concert Halls, Amphitheaters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Arena, Outdoor Spectator Sports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds, Parks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Courses, Riding Stables, Water Recreation, Cemeteries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Buildings, Business Commercial and Professional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial, Manufacturing,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INTERPRETATION**

- **Normally Acceptable:** Specified land use is satisfactory, based upon the assumption that any buildings involved are of normal conventional construction, without any special noise insulation requirements.

- **Conditionally Acceptable:** New construction or development should be undertaken only after a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements is made and needed noise insulation features included in the design.

- **Normally Unacceptable:** New construction or development should generally be discouraged. If new construction or development does proceed, a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements must be made and needed noise insulation features included in the design.

- **Clearly Unacceptable:** New construction or development clearly should not be undertaken.


*Because hospitals are often designed and constructed with high noise insulation properties, it is possible for them to be satisfactorily located in noisier areas.*
12-P-4 Require noise attenuation programs for new development exposed to noise above normally acceptable levels. Encourage noise attenuation programs that avoid visible sound walls.

12-P-5 Require that applicants for new noise-sensitive development, such as schools, residences, and hospitals, in areas subject to noise generators producing noise levels greater than 65 dB CNEL, obtain the services of a professional acoustical engineer to provide a technical analysis and design of mitigation measures.

12-P-6 Ensure that new noise-sensitive uses, including schools, hospitals, churches, and homes, in areas near roadways identified as impacting sensitive receptors by producing noise levels greater than 65 dB CNEL (Figure 12-1), incorporate mitigation measures to ensure that interior noise levels do not exceed 45 dB CNEL.

12-P-7 Require the control of noise at the source through site design, building design, landscaping, hours of operation, and other techniques, for new development deemed to be noise generators.

12-P-8 Develop noise attenuation programs for mitigation of noise adjacent to existing residential areas, including such measures as wider setbacks, intense landscaping, double-pane windows, and building orientation muffling the noise source.

12-P-9 Limit generation of loud noises on construction sites adjacent to existing development to normal business hours between 8:00 AM and 5:00 PM.

12-P-10 Reduce the impact of truck traffic noise on residential areas by limiting such traffic to appropriate truck routes. Consider methods to restrict truck travel times in sensitive areas.
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