This chapter of the existing conditions report provides an overview of the existing level of multimodal accessibility, connectivity, safety and provision of complete streets. This includes descriptions of the regulatory, physical, and operational characteristics affecting Pittsburg’s transportation system. An overview of the regulatory framework is presented first, followed by an assessment of the circulation network’s setting, multimodal accessibility, and connectivity.
2.1 BACKGROUND AND REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

BACKGROUND

The Transportation Element of the General Plan describes the planned citywide transportation network. It describes and illustrates the city's mobility network, and provides guidelines that will support and complement existing and planned development. The goals of the Transportation Element include ensuring that transportation and land use decisions are coordinated, promoting the safe and efficient transport of goods, making efficient use of existing facilities, and protecting environmental quality.

The transportation system's purpose is to move people and goods from one place to another, and, in doing so, it affects the community's character, natural and built environment, and economic development patterns.

REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

The City of Pittsburg General Plan, along with a variety of regional, state and federal plans, legislation, and policy directives, provide guidelines for the safe operation of streets and transportation facilities in Pittsburg. While the City of Pittsburg has primary responsibility for the maintenance and operation of transportation facilities within the City, City staff also works on a continual basis with responsible regional, state, and federal agencies including the Contra Costa Transportation Authority, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and others, to maintain, improve, and balance the competing transportation needs of the community and the region.

STATE

California Complete Streets Act

The term "Complete Streets" refers to a balanced, multimodal transportation network that meets the needs of all users of streets -- including bicyclists, children, and persons with disabilities, motorists, movers of commercial goods, pedestrians, public transportation, and seniors. A “Complete Street” is one that provides safe and convenient travel in a manner that is suitable to the local context.

The California Complete Streets Act mandates any substantive revision of the circulation element of a city or county's general plan to identify how they will safely accommodate the circulation of all users of the roadway including transit riders, pedestrians, bicyclists, individuals with disabilities, and seniors as well as motorists (California Complete Streets Act of 2008, 2008). A key goal of the General Plan update is to review and, where necessary, modify the City's current circulation network plan and policies to ensure that “complete streets” are provided.
Provision of safe mobility for all users, including motorists, bicyclists, pedestrians and transit riders, contributes to the Caltrans’s vision: “improving mobility across California”. The successful long-term implementation of this policy is intended to result in more options for people to go from one place to another, less traffic congestion and greenhouse gas emissions, more walkable communities (with healthier, more active people), and fewer barriers for older adults, children, and people with disabilities.

Economically, complete streets can help revitalize communities, and they can give families the option to lower transportation costs by using transit, walking or bicycling rather than driving to reach their destinations. Caltrans is actively engaged in implementing its complete streets policy in all planning, programming, design, construction, operations, and maintenance activities and products on the State Highway System (Caltrans, 2014).

**Senate Bill 743 and Transportation Performance Metrics**

The California legislature passed Senate Bill (SB) 743 in 2013 that requires changes to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) regarding the analysis of transportation impacts. Traffic impact criteria and transportation performance standards in most cities have typically focused on motor vehicle level of service (LOS) as the primary criterion. LOS is an analysis methodology that assesses the performance of roadways based on average motor vehicle delay at intersections. The use of motor vehicle delay to analyze traffic impacts for CEQA purposes was originally based on the assumption that reducing delay to automobiles would thus reduce the pollution caused by idling gasoline intersections. However, the longtime emphasis on reducing automobile delay when evaluating environmental impacts under CEQA had the effect of often resulting in wide intersections with high levels of traffic capacity that ultimately serve as barriers to walking and bicycling, conflict with quality of life and urban design goals. That emphasis on traffic capacity ultimately came to be viewed as contributing to increased rates of motor vehicle travel throughout the state, which ultimately produces higher levels of air pollution due to the total volume of motor vehicle travel, when expressed on a “vehicle miles traveled” (VMT) basis.

SB 743 requires the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to amend the CEQA Guidelines to provide a revised method to LOS for evaluating transportation impacts. Preliminary guidelines from OPR in 2014 recommended that vehicle miles travelled (VMT) be the primary transportation performance metric for evaluating environmental impacts statewide. The most recent Guidelines and Technical Advisory documents were issued by OPR in December 2018 (Office of Planning and Research, 2018). Key recommendations described in the OPR guidelines include:

- Vehicle miles traveled is to be the primary performance metric for evaluating transportation impacts across California. Implementation can be phased in over time, up until a statewide deadline of June 2020 for local jurisdictions to update their impact thresholds.
- Land use development near transit or in VMT-efficient areas should be presumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact.
- Transit, active transportation, and rehabilitation projects that do not add motor vehicle capacity should also be presumed to cause a less than significant impact.
- Consistent with CEQA requirements that grants discretion to cities to identify locally applicable impact thresholds: OPR’s guidelines do not require a specific methodology for measuring VMT and identifying impact thresholds, but instead defer to local jurisdictions to identify methodologies and thresholds applicable to each local setting.
- The OPR guidelines describe recommended methodologies for cities to consider when updating their transportation impact thresholds. OPR recommends that VMT be quantified on a “per capita” (per resident) basis for residential projects, and on a “per employee” for office development. For retail projects, OPR recommends that that VMT be
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evaluated based on the “net change’ in VMT (not a rate) since retail projects typically redistribute traffic within a market area rather than resulting in net new VMT (thus a net increase in VMT could be considered potentially significant). OPR provides several recommendations for mixed-use projects, including evaluating each use separately or evaluating mixed-use projects based on the appropriate methodology for the predominant land use.

• VMT impact thresholds are to be based on comparing “projects” under CEQA with area-wide averages, with project impacts evaluated under a “per capita” or “per employee” methodology considered potentially significant if project VMT exceeds the selected threshold. Establishing VMT impact thresholds that are 15 percent below existing rates has been suggested, but not required, in order to help meet statewide greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction goals. Cities can choose whether to base their VMT impacts thresholds on regional, countywide, sub-regional or citywide averages.

Caltrans - Context Sensitive Street Design
Caltrans promotes “Context Sensitive Solutions” as an approach to plan, design, construct, maintain, and operate its transportation system. These solutions use innovative and inclusive approaches that integrate and balance community, aesthetic, historic, and environmental values with transportation safety, maintenance, and performance goals. Context sensitive solutions are reached through a collaborative, interdisciplinary approach involving all stakeholders. Context sensitive solutions meet transportation goals in harmony with community goals and natural environments. They require careful, imaginative, and early planning, and continuous community involvement (Caltrans, 2001).

LOCAL

Metropolitan Transportation Commission Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Community Strategy

The current Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Community Strategy (RTP/SCS) named Plan Bay Area 2040 was jointly produced and adopted by MTC and Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) on July 26, 2017. Plan Bay Area 2040 is the strategic update to Plan Bay Area 2013, and it builds on earlier work to develop an efficient transportation network, provide more housing choices, and grow the region in a financially and environmentally responsible way. Plan Bay Area 2040 is a roadmap to help Bay Area cities and counties preserve the character of our diverse communities while adapting to the challenges of future population growth. Another update to the RTP/SCS, Plan Bay Area 2050, is expected to begin in August 2019. Plan Bay Area 2050 will outline how the Bay Area can meet its transportation needs through 2050 (Metropolitan Transportation Commission, 2019).

Cities seeking funding through the Metropolitan Transportation Commission’s (MTC) One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Program are expected to show compliance with Complete Streets policies. MTC via OBAG is a potentially major source for transportation funding. Meeting eligibility requirements would allow the City to apply for Local Street and roads preservation, safe routes to schools, pedestrians and bicycle improvements, and transportation for livable community funds (Metropolitan Transportation Commission, 2019).

Contra Costa Transportation Authority

The Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) is the designated congestion management agency for Contra Costa County. CCTA adopted the most recent Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) in 2017. The CTP provides the overall direction for achieving and maintaining a balanced and functional transportation system within Contra Costa County while strengthening links between land use decisions and transportation. It outlines the Contra Costa Transportation Authority’s vision for Contra Costa and establishes goals, strategies, projects, and actions for achieving that vision. The CTP identifies a Vision, Goals, and
Strategies; a review of issues facing the countywide transportation system; an overview of the cooperative planning process in Contra Costa; and an implementation plan for meeting the transportation goals.

CCTA most recently updated the Countywide Bicycle Plan (CBBP) in 2009. The CCTA also works to plan, fund, and implement transit programs that serve communities and residents within the region.

CCTA maintains several tools to support its transportation planning and growth management activities. CCTA also makes these tools available to local jurisdictions and agencies to support their planning efforts. These include:

- The Countywide Travel Demand Model – providing traffic forecasts through the year 2030.
- Technical Procedures – to assist local staff and consultants in conducting transportation impact studies developing Action Plans for Routes of Regional Significance, and assessing level of service on Basic Routes
- Comprehensive Transportation Project List (CTPL) – a comprehensive database of current and proposed transportation projects
- Land Use Information System (LUIS) – a database of local demographic information available at the Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZ) level
- System Monitoring – reports on how the transportation system is operating, including the monitoring of Multi-Modal Transportation Service Objective (MTSO) and the Congestion Management Program (CMP) network

Contra Costa County Vision Zero

Contra Costa County is in the process of developing a “Vision Zero” safety plan to address severe and fatal collisions on County-owned roadways, with the goal of zero fatalities. The plan will identify key collision trends on County-owned roads, priority corridors in which severe and fatal collisions occur, and an implementation strategy to address the collision trends. The implementation strategy will include engineering, education, and/or enforcement measures. Through a holistic and data-driven approach, the County and its partner agencies are implementing studies and programs to help people move safely.

City of Pittsburg General Plan

The current Pittsburg General Plan adopted in 2001 includes a number of key land use and economic development goals tied to mobility, including a desire for the city to:

- Capitalize on regional transportation improvements to attract jobs;
- Increase linkages between different parts of the city; and
- Maximize opportunities for transit-oriented development in downtown and near the BART stations.

Additional mobility-focused goals and themes consistent with “complete streets” are contained in various elements of the current General Plan, including:

- Land Use Element designates pedestrian-oriented activity centers, and emphasizes the need for connections between neighborhoods.
- Growth Management Element stresses the importance of regional transportation planning.
- Urban Design provides street design guidance, noting the importance of transportation corridor design to the City’s sense of character.
- Urban Design Element also recommends smaller blocks, narrower streets with on-street parking, street trees, traffic calming and wider sidewalks.
2.0 TRANSPORTATION

- Downtown Element Identifies pedestrian-scale design and traditional urban street pattern as key assets, and recommends emphasizes elimination of barriers, providing streetscape improvements, reinforcing the walkable street grid, and enhancing access & parking.
- Downtown Element also recommended that downtown streets should be two-way streets to encourage business development through ease of access.

The Transportation Element is provided in Chapter 7 of the current General Plan. Unlike the other elements described above that places a greater emphasis on walkability, transit access and “complete streets”: the current Transportation Element is primarily focused on motor vehicle traffic. The current adopted Transportation Element goals and performance measures are summarized below.

GOAL 7-C-1. Provide for a circulation system that allows for the efficient movement of people, goods, and services within and through Pittsburg while minimizing public costs to build and maintain the system.

POLICY 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.

POLICY 7-G-2 Work with Caltrans and the Contra Costa Transportation Authority to achieve timely construction of programmed freeway and interchange improvements.

POLICY 7-G-3 Coordinate circulation system plans with other jurisdictions' and agencies' plans, including Antioch and Concord, the Contra Costa Transportation Authority, and Caltrans.

POLICY 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.

POLICY 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.

POLICY 7-G-6 locate high traffic-generating uses so that they have direct access or immediate secondary access to arterial roadways.

POLICY 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.

Pittsburg Active Transportation Plan

In March 2018, the City was awarded grant funding from Caltrans to prepare the Pittsburg Active Transportation and Safe Routes Plan, also known as ‘Pittsburg Moves’. The purpose of the Plan is to increase walking and biking in the community by identifying and prioritizing improvements that help increase safety, accessibility, and connectivity between housing, schools, transit, parks, community centers, and commercial areas (City of Pittsburg, 2018). Adoption of the plan is expected by the end of 2019.
City of Pittsburg Capital Improvement Program
The current 5-year Capital Improvement Program (CIP) identifies 64 street projects totaling $220 million that are included as future projects. Of these, 34 street projects totaling $26 million are already funded/partially funded or are planned to be funded within the next five years (City of Pittsburg, 2017). The street projects include traffic calming, pavement improvements, landscaping improvements, provision of Bike Paths and other projects.

In addition, 20 signal projects totaling $5.3 million that are also included in the CIP. Of these, six signal projects totaling approximately $1.7 million are already funded/partially funded or are planned to be funded within the next five years.

### 2.2 EXISTING SETTING

#### Regional Context

Pittsburg has access to all modes of transportation from regional rail services, airports, state routes and more, including Pittsburg/Bay Point BART and the recent extension of eBART services towards Antioch Station. The city is well connected within the Bay Area Region. State Route 4 (SR-4) provides the regional motor vehicle access to the other major cities and towns in the Bay Area. This part of the region is characterized by rolling hills and proximity to the San Francisco Bay and Sacramento River Delta. Due to higher connectivity and multiple transportation options, coordination among the transportation system becomes crucial for the continuous growth of the City. Figure 2.1 shows the key regional transportation facilities.

#### Local Context

Much of Pittsburg has suburban spatial structure common across most suburban developments in the United States. Similarly like other suburban cities in the nation, recent major development activities such as shopping malls, restaurants, and hotels tend to occur near high-traffic locations such as interchanges on State Route 4/Railroad Avenue and State Route 4/Bailey Road.

Pittsburg continues to attract people who work or live across the Bay Area for the suburban lifestyle and affordable housing prices. Similarly, businesses are locating in the region to capitalize on land availability and the growing workforce population.

#### Pittsburg Travel Characteristics

How people get around is an important indicator of the success of a transportation system. This section summarizes travel characteristics associated with the Pittsburg transportation network.

#### Travel Modes to Work

According to the American Community Survey (ACS) 2013-17 5-year estimates, Pittsburg has a population of 69,449 in 2017, including 30,744 employed residents. The majority of the employed residents (67 percent) drove to work alone, whereas alternative modes of transportation accounted for approximately 28 percent of commute trips, with 17 percent of workers in carpools, 10 percent using public transit systems, 2 percent of commuters walking to work, 0.1 percent bicycling to work, and 3 percent of workers working at home. Table 2.2-1 provides an overview of Pittsburg’s travel to work mode split data compared to countywide statistics for Contra Costa County, Bay Area (9 County Region) and the State of California.

As shown in Table 2.2-1, employed Pittsburg residents have a higher rate of carpooling to work, resulting in a combined rate of carpooling and public transit (27 percent) among employed Pittsburg residents that exceeds the countywide average of 22 percent and Bay Area average of 20 percent.
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**Table 2.2-1: Work Commute Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>City of Pittsburg</th>
<th>Contra Costa County</th>
<th>Bay Area (9 County Region)</th>
<th>State of California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed persons</td>
<td>30,744</td>
<td>520,162</td>
<td>3,736,783</td>
<td>17,589,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mode Split</strong></td>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drove Alone</td>
<td>20,611</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>353,988</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>5,190</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>61,025</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td>3,049</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>53,698</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8,800</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
<td>2,577</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7,483</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked at Home</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>32,591</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Population includes 16 years of age or older
2 Percentages are rounded off to the nearest integer


**Place of Work**

As shown in Table 2.2-2, 33 percent of Pittsburg residents work outside the County of residence which is significantly higher than the Bay Area Region and the State of California. However, it is nine percent lower than the Contra Costa County.

**Table 2.2-2: Place of Work**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Pittsburg</th>
<th>Contra Costa County</th>
<th>Bay Area (9 County Region)</th>
<th>California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked in County of Residence</td>
<td>20,405</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>297,421</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked Outside County of Residence</td>
<td>10,099</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>220,418</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked Outside State of Residence</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2,323</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Travel Time to Work**

As higher percentage of Pittsburg residents work outside the Contra Costa County, the commute time to work is significantly higher as compared to the County, Bay Area and the State of California. Consequently, the mean travel time to work, summarized in Table 2.2-3 and shown in Chart 2.2-1, for Pittsburg residents is also higher than the County, Bay Area and the State. Higher travel time generally results in higher travel time costs which represents the additional dollar amount spent during a trip.

**Table 2.2-3: Mean Travel Time to Work**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Pittsburg</th>
<th>Contra Costa County</th>
<th>Bay Area (9 County Region)</th>
<th>California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Travel Time to Work (in mins)</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vehicle Ownership
In comparison to the State, Bay Area and Countywide vehicle ownership information, it is observed that the on an average Pittsburg residents have slightly higher number of vehicles as shown in Chart 2.2-2. The higher percentage of vehicle ownership is an indicator of auto-dependency. Automobile dependency is seen primarily as an issue of environmental sustainability as it encourages higher consumption of fossil fuels.

Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)
A common indicator used to quantify the amount of motor vehicle use in a specified area is VMT. One VMT is defined as any type of motor vehicle being driven one mile. Many factors affect VMT including the average distance residents commute to work, school, and shopping, as well as the proportion of trips that are made by non-automobile modes. Areas that have a diverse land use mix and ample facilities for non-automobile modes, including transit, tend to generate lower VMT than auto-oriented suburban areas more distant from metropolitan centers.
**Roadway System**

**Roadway Classification System**

This section describes the physical characteristics of Pittsburg’s roadway network. The current General Plan Transportation Element identifies a functional classification system for each street type. Pittsburg’s roadway network is shown on Figure 2-2.

Similar to many other cities, Pittsburg’s existing adopted street classifications are primarily focused on the function of each street for purposes of accommodating motor vehicle travel. The current General Plan defines the existing street classifications are as follows, further described on Table 2.2-4:

- **Major Arterials**: Primary function is to provide mobility. Secondary function is to provide access. Provides circulation between neighborhoods, activity centers, and highways and other regional routes.
- **Minor Arterials**: Provide balance between mobility and access. Carry a mix of local and regional traffic. Provides circulation between neighborhoods, activity centers, and highways and other regional routes.
- **Collector Streets**: Provides circulation within and between neighborhoods.
- **Local Streets**: Provides access to individual sites.

**Table 2.2-4: Roadway Classifications & Street Design Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Arterial</td>
<td>2 to 6</td>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>35-50 mph</td>
<td>15,000 to 55,000</td>
<td>Discouraged</td>
<td>Not required</td>
<td>Discouraged</td>
<td>Generally not permitted, may be allowed subject to restrictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Arterial</td>
<td>2 to 4</td>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>35-50 mph</td>
<td>15,000 to 40,000</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Discouraged</td>
<td>Allow a higher level of access than major arterials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>2 to 4</td>
<td>As traffic conditions require</td>
<td>30-35 mph</td>
<td>&lt; 15,000</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Permitted subject to restrictions</td>
<td>Allowed subject to restrictions</td>
<td>Driveways allowed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>25-30 mph</td>
<td>&lt; 5,000</td>
<td>Allowed subject to restrictions</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Least restrictive.</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 WALKWAY AND TRANSIT PROVISIONS NOT SPECIFIED

Source: City of Pittsburg General Plan, 2001

Additional street design is found in other elements of the General Plan include:

- Land Use Element designates pedestrian-oriented activity centers, and emphasizes the need for connections between neighborhoods.
- Urban Design Element also recommends smaller blocks, narrower streets with on-street parking, street trees, traffic calming and wider sidewalks.
- Downtown Element Identifies pedestrian-scale design and traditional urban street pattern as key assets, and recommends emphasizes elimination of barriers, providing streetscape improvements, reinforcing the walkable street grid, and enhancing access & parking.
- Downtown Element also recommended that downtown streets should be two-way streets to encourage business development through ease of access.

Tables 2.2-5 and 2.2-6 summarizes the street network classification miles in the City of Pittsburg and the Pittsburg Planning Area.
Table 2.2-5: Street Network Miles by Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREET CLASS</th>
<th>PITTSBURG CITY (MILES)</th>
<th>PLANNING AREA (MILES)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freeways and Expressways</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Principal Arterial</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>22.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Arterial</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>10.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Collector</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>22.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Streets¹</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>132.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>146.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>195.16</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Local Streets information collected from City of Pittsburg GIS Database
Source: FHWA, Highway Performance Monitoring System, 2017

Table 2.2-6: Street Ownership Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OWNERSHIP</th>
<th>PITTSBURG CITY (MILES)</th>
<th>PLANNING AREA (MILES)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>6.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa County</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>12.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Pittsburg¹</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>146.07</strong></td>
<td><strong>195.16</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Local Streets information collected from City of Pittsburg GIS Database (includes 43.2 Miles of NHS)
Source: FHWA, Highway Performance Monitoring System, 2017

State Route 4
Caltrans operates and maintains the only state route that passes through Pittsburg, SR 4. SR 4 is an eight-lane east-west freeway with a High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lane in each direction that carries a high volume of traffic exceeding 140,000 daily vehicles in Pittsburg. The freeway’s median accommodates the Antioch BART line that connects Antioch, Pittsburg and other Bay Area Cities. SR 4 merges into I-80 in Hercules at San Pablo Avenue, connecting the City of Pittsburg with San Francisco and Oakland. SR 4 has major interchanges Willow Pass Road, Bailey Road, Railroad Avenue, Loveridge Road and Summersville Road.

Traffic Volumes
Daily (24-hour) traffic volumes on key street segments are summarized below on Table 2.2-7 below. Traffic volumes are below capacity on most streets:

- **4-lane arterials:** Daily traffic volumes on Pittsburg’s four-lane arterial segments range from 15,000 to 30,000 daily vehicles, and most segments are well below capacity. Pittsburg’s 4-lane street segments generally have an effective capacity of over 35,000 daily vehicles. Travel speeds may be higher than desired on 4-lane streets with excess capacities.

- **2-lane arterials & collectors:** Current volumes on two-lane segments of Pittsburg’s arterial and collector street network range from 6,000 to 18,000 daily vehicles, thus generally well below capacity. Two-lane arterial and collector streets can generally accommodate up to 20,000 daily vehicles where frequent left-turn pockets are provided.
## Table 2.2-7: Daily Traffic Volumes, Number of Lanes & Posted Speed Limit Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th># of Through Lanes (Motor Vehicles)</th>
<th>Posted Speed Limits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Route 4 (W/O Bailey Rd)</td>
<td>94,000</td>
<td>157,000</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 4 (W/O Railroad Ave)</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>148,000</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 4 (E/O Railroad Ave)</td>
<td>77,000</td>
<td>134,000</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 4 (E/O Loveridge Ave)</td>
<td>81,000</td>
<td>126,000</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailey Rd (N/O Leland Ave)</td>
<td>20,300</td>
<td>17,130</td>
<td>-16%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Leland Rd (E/O Range Rd)</td>
<td>13,700</td>
<td>17,770</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35, 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Leland Rd (E/O Harbor St)</td>
<td>21,100</td>
<td>24,500</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35/40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Ave (N/O Buchanan Rd)</td>
<td>15,600</td>
<td>15,130</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Ave (N/O California Ave)</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>31,140</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Ave (E/O Railroad Ave)</td>
<td>14,200</td>
<td>22,320</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35/40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 10th St (W/O Herb White Way)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9,370</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenth St (E/O Railroad Ave)</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>8,670</td>
<td>-31%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Pass Rd (W/O Bailey Rd)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>6,860</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35, 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Pass Rd (W/O Range Rd)</td>
<td>13,900</td>
<td>14,990</td>
<td>-50%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor St (S/O SR 4)</td>
<td>14,200</td>
<td>14,980</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor St (N/O Buchanan Rd)</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>14,286</td>
<td>188%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic Ave (E/O Railroad Ave)</td>
<td>10,900</td>
<td>20,940</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loveridge Rd (N/O California Ave)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>20,940</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35, 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loveridge Rd (N/O Buchanan Rd)</td>
<td>16,600</td>
<td>18,540</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan Rd (E/O Harbor St)</td>
<td>16,800</td>
<td>18,170</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburg Antioch Hwy (E/O Loveridge Rd)</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>11,960</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 14th St (W/O Pittsburg Antioch Hwy)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5,030</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirker Pass Rd (S/O Buchanan Rd)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>19,400</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40, 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somersville Rd (N/O Century Blvd)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>15,300</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solari St (S/O E 10th St)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evora Rd (W/O Willow Pass Rd)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>13,180</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 3rd St (E/O Railroad Ave)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Parkside Dr (E/O Range Rd)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>8,140</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Speed Limits data was retrieved from On Field Observations and Google Earth*

*Source: TJKM and FHWA, Highway Performance Monitoring System, 2017*
Motor Vehicle Traffic Operations

Motor vehicle traffic operations are city streets are often evaluated based on intersection level of service (LOS) standards described in the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM). LOS is a qualitative measure based on average delay to vehicles. Table 2.2-8 summarizes the LOS definitions and relative delay to motorists, and also includes a V/C ratio relevant to the LOS methodology cited in the 2001 General Plan. The 2001 General Plan identified LOS standards that were based on 1999 CCTA standards, which varied by location:

- LOS mid-D or better at intersections along major arterials, except Bailey Road
- LOS high E along Bailey Road between West Leland Road and SR-4
- LOS mid-e at intersections on Kirker Pass Road

Table 2.2-8: Level of Service Definitions for Signalized Intersections (Motor Vehicles)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL OF SERVICE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AVERAGE DELAY (SECONDS)</th>
<th>VOLUME TO CAPACITY RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Insignificant Delays: No approach phase is fully used and no vehicle waits longer than one red indication.</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>&lt;0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Minimal Delays: An occasional approach phase is fully used. Drivers begin to feel restricted.</td>
<td>&gt;10 to 20</td>
<td>&gt;0.61 to 0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Acceptable Delays: Major approach phase may become fully used. Most drivers feel somewhat restricted.</td>
<td>&gt;20 to 35</td>
<td>&gt;0.71 to 0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Tolerable Delays: Drivers may wait through no more than one red indication. Queues may develop but dissipate rapidly without excessive delays.</td>
<td>&gt;35 to 55</td>
<td>&gt;0.81 to 0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Significant Delays: Volumes approaching capacity. Vehicles may wait through several signal cycles and long vehicle queues from upstream.</td>
<td>&gt;55 to 80</td>
<td>&gt;0.91 to 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Excessive Delays: Represents conditions at capacity, with extremely long delays. Queues may block upstream intersections.</td>
<td>&gt;80</td>
<td>&gt;1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) and Previously Adopted CCTA Methodology for V/C.

Most intersections in Pittsburg operate at an acceptable LOS. Table 2.2-9 summarizes current LOS levels at select intersections based on traffic studies conducted within the last five years.
### Table 2.2-9: Motor Vehicle Traffic Level of Service at Key Intersections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Peak Hour</th>
<th>Average Delay (seconds)</th>
<th>LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan Avenue &amp; Loveridge Road</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura Drive &amp; Buchanan Road</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadows Avenue &amp; Buchanan Road</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerville Road &amp; Buchanan Road</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Avenue &amp; SR-4 WB Ramps</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Avenue &amp; SR-4 EB Ramps</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Avenue &amp; West Leland</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailey Road &amp; West Leland</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos Boulevard &amp; SR-4 WB Ramps</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos Boulevard &amp; SR-4 EB Ramps</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Avenue &amp; Buchanan Road</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loveridge Road &amp; SR-4 WB Ramps</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor Street &amp; East Leland Road</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor Street &amp; Buchanan Drive</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loveridge Road &amp; East Leland Road</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loveridge Road &amp; Buchanan Road</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somersville Road &amp; SR-4 WB Ramps</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somersville Road &amp; SR-4 EB Ramps</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Data derived from traffic studies conducted from 2014-19.*
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Truck & Rail Freight Routes

As an industrial center, Pittsburg generates a fair amount of freight and trucking activities due to major industries. State Route 4 is a terminal access route that connects the national network at Interstate 5 in the east and Interstate 680 in the west. Further, service access is provided to major industries through Railroad Avenue, Loveridge Road, and Harbor Street. Trucks typically cause a disproportionate share of damage to streets.

Figure 2-3 shows streets or portions of streets that are declared to be through truck traffic routes for the movement of vehicles exceeding a maximum gross weight of three tons, and also shows railroad corridors through the city.

There are four major at-grade railroad crossing within the Pittsburg city limits, as shown in Figure 2-3, of which one on Columbia Street is located on private property. Two major at-grade railroad crossings are located on Loveridge Road.

Public Transportation System

Pittsburg is well connected to the Bay Area with the regional and local public transportation system. Following the opening of the Pittsburg Center BART Station as part of the Antioch extension (formerly known as “eBART”), there has been an increase in the number of transit riders. Tri-Delta Transit, County Connection and Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) provides local and regional connectivity from the City of Pittsburg. In addition, Altamont Corridor Express (ACE), Greyhound and Amtrak are also operated in and around Pittsburg. Figure 2-4 depicts the transit system serving Pittsburg.

Tri-Delta Transit Bus Service

Tri-Delta Transit or the Eastern Contra Costa County Transit Authority (ECCTA) serves Pittsburg, Antioch, Oakley, Brentwood, and the unincorporated areas of East County, including Bay Point. Within Pittsburg, Tri-Delta Transit operates 12 bus routes serving all major areas in the City. The Tri-delta transit now operates 15 local weekday and five weekends & holiday buses as compared to 11 weekday and three weekend buses in 2008. The local route fare also has been increased from $1.25 in 2008 to $2.00 in 2019. In 2018, ECCTA began operating their first battery electric transit bus. All buses have bicycle racks and are wheelchair accessible.

County Connection Transit Service

The Central Contra Costa Transit Authority (CCCTA or County Connection) provides fixed-route and paratransit bus service throughout the communities of Concord, Pleasant Hill, Martinez, Walnut Creek, Clayton, Lafayette, Orinda, Moraga, Danville, San Ramon, as well as unincorporated communities in Central Contra Costa County. It operates a fleet of 121 fully accessible transit buses and 63 paratransit vehicles. Service hour starts from 6 AM to 9 PM on weekdays, and from 9 AM to 7 PM on weekends (County Connection, 2019).

Paratransit

All Tri Delta Transit and County Connection buses are accessible, and many individuals with disabilities can use the fixed route bus service. However, if an individual is unable to use fixed route transportation, he/she may be eligible for ADA Paratransit.
transportation. Tri-Delta Transit's Paratransit and County Connection LINK Paratransit, both provide paratransit, also known as door-to-door public transportation service, for people who are unable to independently use the transit system due to a physical or mental disability. Tri-Delta Transit Paratransit service is also extended to individuals who are 65 years of age or older (Tri-Delta Transit, 2019). LINK paratransit accommodates interagency travel by coordinating with other paratransit service providers in the region. Paratransit operators are required by the ADA to service areas within three-quarters of a mile of their respective, public fixed-route service.

**Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) Rail Service**

The Pittsburg/Bay Point BART station was initially opened in 1996 and includes a surface parking lot with 2,000 parking spaces and a five-acre area set aside for bus, passenger loading/unloading, and short term parking. In May 2018, service was extended ten miles to the east of the Pittsburg/Bay Point station to Antioch via the SR-4 median using smaller state-of-the-art Diesel Multiple Unit (DMU) vehicles. The eBART extension includes service to the Pittsburg Center station adjacent to the Railroad Avenue overcrossing of SR-4. The centrally located Pittsburg Center station is better accessible via non-automobile modes and provides a smaller supply of 262 motor vehicle spaces nearby. Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station thus now also serves as a transfer station for passengers served by standard BART trains operating on 15-minute weekday frequencies between San Francisco International Airport and Pittsburgh/Bay Point, transferring to DMU unit for service east of the station.

Following the opening of the Antioch station: the Pittsburg/Bay Point station now serves an average of approximately 100,000 monthly entries and 100,000 monthly exits as shown in Chart 2.2-3, which correlates to approximately 8,000 average weekday riders (4,000 entries and 4,000 exits). The Pittsburg Center station serves an additional 2,400 average weekday riders. The 109-mile BART system currently serves an average of over 10 million monthly riders, and over 410,000 average weekday riders.

The extension of service to Antioch with the opening of the eBART extension is also anticipated to ultimately reduce the total demand for parking spaces at the Pittsburg/Bay Point station. In 2009, the City received a $150,000 T-PLUS grant from the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) and a $350,000 Focus grant from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to prepare the Pittsburg/Bay Point Master Plan that aims to ultimately consolidate the parking supply into a multi-level garage and allow for vibrant, mixed-use, transit-oriented development on portions of the station site.
AMTRAK Rail
Amtrak is a passenger railroad service provider that provides intercity connectivity across the nation. The closest Amtrak station is located in the neighboring city of Antioch about 6 miles from the City of Pittsburg. The station only serves the San Joaquin route which goes all the way from Sacramento in the north to Bakersfield in the south and Oakland in the west (Amtrak, 2019). The Amtrak rail line further connects to the ACE Rail line at Stockton and may be used as alternative to reach Fremont and San Jose (Altamont Corridor Express, 2019).

Active Transportation
The following section describes the bicycle and pedestrian network in Pittsburg as well as planned bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Pittsburg Moves is a project by the City of Pittsburg to develop a citywide Active Transportation Plan (ATP). Pittsburg Moves includes a large effort to gather input from members of the community in the planning process, gain their valuable input, and spread awareness about bicycle and pedestrian facilities in the City.

Bicycle Facilities
One of the underlying goals of statewide "complete streets" requirements is that all modes of travel, including bicycles, should be adequately accommodated on most city streets, not just streets that are designated as bikeways. Therefore, the provision of travel accommodations may occur throughout the city’s transportation network. Designated bikeways are routes where an additional level of bicycle accommodation is to be provided. There are four classifications of designated bikeway facilities in California, as defined by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans):

- **Multi-Use Paths (Class I Bikeways).** A path physically separated from motor vehicle traffic by an open space or barrier, and either: within a highway right-of-way or within an independent right-of-way used by bicyclists, pedestrians, joggers, skater, and other non-motorized travelers. Because the availability of uninterrupted rights-of-
way is limited, this type of facility may be difficult to locate and more expensive to build relative to other types of bicycle and pedestrian facilities, but less expensive compared to building new roadways.

- **Bicycle Lanes (Class II Bikeways).** A portion of a roadway that has been set aside by striping and pavement markings for the preferential or exclusive use of bicyclists. Bicycle lanes are intended to promote an orderly flow of bicycle and vehicle traffic. This type of facility is established by using the appropriate striping, legends, and signs. Buffered bicycle lanes are a further enhanced by providing a designated buffer space, typically with pavement markings, between the bicycle lane and adjacent on-street parking or motor vehicle lane. Buffered bicycle lanes provide greater separation between bicyclists and motorists and/or avoid the door zone adjacent to parked cars.

- **Bicycle Routes (Class III Bikeways).** Class III bicycle routes are facilities where bicyclists share travel lanes with motor vehicle traffic. Bike routes must be of benefit to the bicyclist and offer a higher degree of service than adjacent streets. They provide for specific bicycle demand and may be used to connect discontinuous segments of bicycle lane streets. They are often located on local residential streets.
  - *Bicycle Boulevard.* In addition, many cities have installed an enhanced type of Class III Bicycle Route, referred to as a “Bicycle Boulevard.” Bicycle Boulevards are generally installed on relatively low-volume streets and often include elements to facilitate bicycle travel, such as reorienting stop signs to reduce delays to cyclists, and/or discouraging use by motorists making through trips, such as through inclusion of traffic calming measures.

- **Separated Bikeway (Class IV Bikeways).** A Class IV Bikeway is for the exclusive use of bicycles and includes a separation between the bikeway and adjacent vehicle traffic. The physical separation may include flexible posts, grade separation, inflexible physical barriers or on-street parking. Separated bikeways generally operate in the same direction as vehicle traffic on the same side of the roadway. However, two-way separation bikeways can also be used, usually in lower speed environments.

In recent years, the City expanded bikeways to connect several parts of the City. Most streets such as Buchanan Road, Harbor Street, California Avenue, Center Avenue, Loveridge Road and Willow Pass Road have bike lanes but there are existing gaps in the bike lane network, while 35 mph motor vehicle speeds tend to reduce bicyclist comfort levels even where bike lanes are provided, such as on Harbor Street. In addition to gaps in the bikeway network and motor vehicle speeds, key constraints to bicycling in Pittsburg include a relative lack of north-south connections while most designated bikeways have a high degree of traffic stress for bicyclists. Nonetheless, over 80 percent of Pittsburg roads and paths were identified by the Pittsburg Moves project as “low-stress” streets where many people feel comfortable bicycling given lower speeds and traffic volumes.

Pittsburg currently has 43 miles of bikeways including 28 miles of Class II Bicycle Lanes and 13 miles of Class I Multi-use Paths including the 6.8-mile Delta de Anza Trail that connects with Bay Point and Antioch. Several narrower residential streets, such as Central Avenue, are designated as Class III Bicycle Routes where bicyclists may comfortably share travel lanes with motorists. Figure 2-5 shows the existing bikeways. Table 2.2-10 summarizes the existing bikeway network length by type of facility.

**Table 2.2-10: Designated Bikeway Network Miles by Type of Facility**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type OF Bikeway</th>
<th>Bikeway Class</th>
<th>Existing (Miles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use Paths</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Lanes</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Routes</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated Bikeways</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Walking Conditions
Sidewalk, Path & Crosswalk Network
Most streets in Pittsburg provide sidewalk coverage, accessible curb ramps, and crosswalks, including pedestrian signals at signalized intersections. Enhanced crosswalks and/or bulbouts have been provided at specific crosswalks to reduce crossing distances. Sidewalks are provided in most of Pittsburg’s single-family residential neighborhoods, in multi-family residential developments, and commercial developments.

Sidewalks and a variety of pedestrian amenities are particularly well-provided in downtown Pittsburg, including decorative paving and crosswalk treatments, curb extensions, benches, and street trees.

Barriers to Walking
While the pedestrian network is generally well developed in Pittsburg, there are some locations where gaps or barriers limit pedestrian circulation, including lengthy crossings of busy streets and/or discontinuous street patterns in newer developments. Sidewalk gaps exist on an estimated 13 miles of the city’s roadway network. In general, sidewalk facilities along newer arterials in Pittsburg vary depending on the level of development along the street. In some locations where adjacent parcels have not been developed, the street is not fully built-out and hence sidewalks have not been constructed. Figure 2-6 shows key constraints and barriers to walking in Pittsburg based on public input received during the PittsburgMoves project.

Transportation Safety
Collision history from the California Highway Patrol (CHP) Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS), University of California, Berkeley’s Transportation Injury Mapping System (TIMS) and City of Pittsburg Police Department records were obtained for five years (2013-2017) to determine existing motor vehicle collision trends. The locations of the motor vehicle collisions are shown in Figure 2-7. As shown in Table 2.2-11, there were a total of 694 reported collisions during the years from 2013 to 2017, of which 624 were collected from SWITRS/TIMS and 70 from the City’s Police Report. Crashes occurring on state highways were excluded from the analysis. Figure 2-8 depicts the type of reported collision by location.

- Pedestrians or bicyclists were involved in 17 percent of crashes.
- Fatalities and/or severe injuries occurred in 11 percent of reported collisions.
- Among the collisions involving fatal and/or severe injuries: 27 percent involved the influence of alcohol or drug(s).
- Most frequently cited collision factors were Unsafe Speed (24 percent) and Improper Turning (14 percent).
- Most frequently occurring crash type among all collisions, not including property-damage-only collisions, are broadside (29 percent), rear-end (26 percent) and vehicle/pedestrian (16 percent).
- Reported collisions in Pittsburg have seen a rise since 2013, with a drop in 2016 and rise in 2017 again.
- Fatal and severe injury crashes rose to a peak in 2016 but noted a drop in 2017.
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**Table 2.2-11: Total Number of Reported Collisions by Crash Severity (2013-17)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crash Severity</th>
<th>Total Crashes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatal</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Injury</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visible Injury</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint of Pain</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>694</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: SWITRS, TIMS, and City Police Department Data, 2013-2017.*

As shown in Table 2.2-12 there were 77 fatal and severe injury crashes in the City of Pittsburg, out of which 29 crashes involved pedestrians, 12 involved motorcyclists and 4 involved bicyclists. People walking and bicycling are typically the most vulnerable users of the street from a safety perspective. When collisions do occur, the extent of their injuries is typically greater and increases exponentially with the speed of the roadway. Bicycle and motorcycle crashes were prominent on Railroad Avenue and E. Leland Road.

**Table 2.2-12: Fatal and Severe Crashes by Mode of Travel**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Users Involved</th>
<th>Fatal</th>
<th>Severe Injury</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian - Vehicle</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle - Vehicle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle - Vehicle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Vehicle Collisions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>77</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: SWITRS, TIMS, and City Police Department Data, 2013-2017.*
**2.0 TRANSPORTATION**

**Chart 2.2-4: Violation Categories by Crash Severity**

![Chart showing violation categories by crash severity]

*Source: SWITRS, TIMS, and City Police Department Data, 2013-2017.*

**Bicycle/Pedestrian Collisions**

The locations of reported bicycle and pedestrian collisions are shown in Figures 2-9 and 2-10. As shown: bicycles or pedestrians were involved in approximately 17 percent of reported collisions. Chart 2.2-5 depicts the percentage of collisions involving bicycles or pedestrians by type of collision. The majority of collisions involving bicycles or pedestrians were pedestrian-vehicle collisions, accounting for 77.1% of total collisions.

Over a period of five years, 38 bicycle collisions were reported on City roadways. This represents approximately six percent of the total number of collisions reported on City streets (695). This does not include near-miss collisions or collisions that may not have been reported, as this data is based on police reports. Collisions involving bicyclists were relatively evenly dispersed between locations at or near intersections, and mid-block locations. Of the 38 reported bicycle-related collisions, seven were reported on Railroad Avenue (18 percent), five were reported on East Leland Road (13 percent), five were reported on West Leland Road (13 percent), three on Harbor street (eight percent) and three on Range Road (eight percent). Thus, about 61 percent of all bicycle related collisions during the analysis period were reported on these five streets. Three fatal and severe injury crashes involving bicyclists occurred on Harbor Street and Leland Road.

A large share of the pedestrian-involved collisions occurred on Railroad Avenue, Willow Pass Road and W. Leland Road. Most collisions involving pedestrians occurred in or near intersections. Most such collisions occurred when drivers were proceeding straight, but almost one third occurred when vehicles were turning across the crosswalk at an intersection.
2.0 TRANSPORTATION

**CHART 2.2-5: COLLISIONS INVOLVING BICYCLES OR PEDESTRIANS**

![Pie chart showing collision types](image)

- Pedestrian-Vehicle: 11.4%
- Bicycle-Vehicle: 5.9%
- Motorcycle-Vehicle: 5.9%
- Other Vehicle Collisions: 77.1%

*Source: SWITRS, TIMS, and City Police Department Data, 2013-2017.*
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Figure 2-2:
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Figure 2-3:

TRUCK ROUTES AND RAILWAY NETWORK
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Figure 2-4: TRANSIT SYSTEM
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Figure 2-5: BIKEWAY NETWORK
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Figure 2-6:

PEDESTRIAN CONSTRAINTS AND GAPS
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**Figure 2-7: REPORTED COLLISION LOCATIONS (2013-17)**
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Figure 2-8:
TYPES OF REPORTED COLLISIONS BY LOCATION
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Figure 2-9:
REPORTED BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN COLLISION LOCATIONS (2013-17)
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This chapter addresses utilities, public services, and community services within the City of Pittsburg. Public services include the provision of utilities including water services, wastewater (sewer) services, stormwater, solid waste disposal, electricity, and natural gas. Community services include fire protection, law enforcement, parks and recreation, schools, libraries, and other public facilities.
3.1 WATER SERVICES
This section describes the City of Pittsburg’s water demands, water supplies, water distribution system, and water quality.

** KEY TERMS **

Acre feet (AF): The volume of one acre of water to a depth of one foot. Each acre-foot of water is equal to 325,851.4 gallons.

GPD: Gallons per day.

Groundwater: Water that is underground and below the water table, as opposed to surface water, which flows across the ground surface. Water beneath the earth’s surface fills the spaces in soil, gravel, or rock formations. Pockets of groundwater are often called “aquifers” and are the source of drinking water for a large percentage of the population in the United States. Groundwater is often extracted using wells which pump the water out of the ground and up to the surface. Groundwater is naturally replenished by surface water from precipitation, streams, and rivers when this recharge reaches the water table.

MG: Million gallons.

MGD: Million gallons per day.

Surface water: Water collected on the ground or from a stream, river, lake, wetland, or ocean. Surface water is replenished naturally through precipitation, but is lost naturally through evaporation and seepage into soil.

** REGULATORY FRAMEWORK **

** STATE **

** California Water Quality Control Board **

The State Water Quality Control Board (Water Board), Division of Drinking Water, oversees the Drinking Water Program. The Drinking Water Program regulates public water systems and certifies drinking water treatment and distribution operators. It provides support for small water systems and for improving their technical, managerial, and financial capacity. It provides subsidized funding for water system improvements under the State Revolving Fund (“SRF”) and Proposition 50 programs. The Drinking Water Program also oversees water recycling projects, permits water treatment devices, supports and promotes water system security, and oversees the Drinking Water Treatment and Research Fund for MTBE and other oxygenates.

** Consumer Confidence Report Requirements **

California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 22, Chapter 15, Article 20 requires all public water systems to prepare a Consumer Confidence Report for distribution to its customers and to the Water Board. The Consumer Confidence Report provides information regarding the quality of potable water provided by the water system. It includes information on the sources of the water, any detected contaminants in the water, the maximum contaminant levels set by regulation, violations and actions taken to correct them, and opportunities for public participation in decisions that may affect the quality of the water provided.

** Urban Water Management Planning Act **

The Urban Water Management Planning Act has as its objectives the management of urban water demands and the efficient use of urban water. Under its provisions, every urban water supplier is required to prepare and adopt an urban water management plan. An “urban water supplier” is a public or private water supplier that provides water for municipal purposes either directly or indirectly to more than 3,000 customers or supplying more than 3,000 acre-feet of water annually. The plan must identify and quantify the existing and planned sources of water available to the supplier, quantify the projected water
use for a period of 20 years, and describe the supplier's water demand management measures. The urban water supplier should make every effort to ensure the appropriate level of reliability in its water service sufficient to meet the needs of its various categories of customers during normal, dry, and multiple dry years. The Department of Water Resources must receive a copy of an adopted urban water management plan.

**Senate Bill 610 and Assembly Bill 901**

The State Legislature passed Senate Bill (SB) 610 and Assembly Bill (AB) 901 in 2001. Both measures modified the Urban Water Management Planning Act.

SB 610 requires additional information in an urban water management plan if groundwater is identified as a source of water available to an urban water supplier. It also requires that the plan include a description of all water supply projects and programs that may be undertaken to meet total projected water use. SB 610 requires a city or county that determines a project is subject to CEQA to identify any public water system that may supply water to the project and to request identified public water systems to prepare a specified water supply assessment. The assessment must include, among other information, an identification of existing water supply entitlements, water rights, or water service contracts relevant to the identified water supply for the proposed project, and water received in prior years pursuant to these entitlements, rights, and contracts. AB 901 requires an urban water management plan to include information, to the extent practicable, relating to the quality of existing sources of water available to an urban water supplier over given time periods. AB 901 also requires information on the manner in which water quality affects water management strategies and supply reliability. The bill requires a plan to describe plans to supplement a water source that may not be available at a consistent level of use, to the extent practicable. Additional findings and declarations relating to water quality are required.

**Senate Bill (SB) 221**

SB 221 adds Government Code Section 66455.3, requiring that the local water agency be sent a copy of any proposed residential subdivision of more than 500 dwelling units within five days of the subdivision application being accepted as complete for processing by the city or county. It also adds Government Code Section 66473.7, establishing detailed requirements for establishing whether a “sufficient water supply” exists to support any proposed residential subdivisions of more than 500 dwellings, including any such subdivision involving a development agreement. When approving a qualifying subdivision tentative map, the city or county must include a condition requiring availability of a sufficient water supply. The applicable public water system must provide proof of availability. If there is no public water system, the city or county must undertake the analysis described in Government Code Section 66473.7. The analysis must include consideration of effects on other users of water and groundwater.

**LOCAL**

**City of Pittsburg Urban Water Management Plan (2015)**

The purpose of the 2015 Urban Water Management Plan is to ensure efficient use of urban water supplies in the City and promote conservation. The UWMP discusses the availability of water under normal, single dry year, and multiple dry year conditions, projected water use and reclamation and water conservation activities. The UWMP complies with the Urban Water Management Planning Act (California Water Code Section 10610 et seq.).

**City of Pittsburg Water System Master Plan (2015)**

The 2015 Water System Master Plan (2015 WSMP) is intended to serve as a tool for planning and phasing the construction of future water transmission and distribution facilities, through the project horizon year of 2030. The 2015 WSMP evaluated the
City's domestic water distribution system and recommended capacity improvements necessary to service the needs of existing users and for servicing future developments. Should planning conditions change, and depending on their magnitude, adjustments to the master plan recommendations might be necessary.

The primary objective of the Pittsburg Plain Groundwater Basin Groundwater Management Plan is to provide a long-term strategy to maintain the quality, reliability, and sustainability of groundwater resources within the Pittsburg Plain Groundwater Basin (Basin). To accomplish this, the City intends to manage groundwater conjunctively with its surface water resources and support Basin Management Objectives (BMOs) directed toward the sustainability and optimal use of groundwater supplies. City of Pittsburg General Plan - Public Facilities

The existing City of Pittsburg General Plan Public Facilities Element identifies the following goals and policies related to water services, supply, and conservation:

**Public Facilities Element**
GOAL 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.

GOAL 11-G-2 Continue to implement water conservation policies to ensure adequate supplies of water in the future.

POLICY 11-P-1 Continue using the Urban Water Management Plan as the mechanism for detailed water supply planning, implementation, and conservation.

POLICY 11-P-2 Implement, as needed, replacements and/or expansions to the existing system of water mains through the City's Capital Improvement Program.

POLICY 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.

POLICY 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.

POLICY 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.

**POLICY 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.

**POLICY 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.

**POLICY 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.

**POLICY 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.

**POLICY 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.

**City Of Pittsburg Municipal Code**
The City of Pittsburg Municipal Code, Title 13 (Waters and Sewers) Chapter 13.04 (City Duties and Responsibilities), Chapter 13.08, (Water Service Connections), Chapter 13.10 (Collection of Contra Costa Water District’s Facilities Reserve Charge), Chapter 13.12 (Water Rates), Chapter 13.14 (Regulations for the Control of Backflow and Cross-Connections to the City’s Water System), Chapter 13.16 (Consumer Deposits – Service Beyond the City), and Chapter 13.18 (Water Conservation) contain regulations associated with water management and delivery.

Chapter 13.08 (Water Conservation) of the City’s Municipal Code includes mandatory prohibitions on the waste of water including:

- Permitting water to flow onto a sidewalk, driveway or street, or escape down a gutter, ditch or other service drain.
- Irrigating landscaped areas with water in excess of the minimal amount required to sustain plant life, as determined by a staff water audit.
- Failing to repair a controllable leak of water.

**City Of Pittsburg Water Resolutions**
In 2015, the City passed Resolution 15-13030 “Water Conservation Program” in response to ongoing drought conditions experienced in the State and a request from CCWD to reduce water use by 15%. This resolution defines ‘prohibited non-essential uses’ and outlines the four water shortage stages and their respective customer reduction goals.
In addition, the City passed Resolution 15-13051 “Increase Water Rates and Establish Penalties for High Water Use” in response to the State’s emergency regulations requiring the City to reduce its total water use by 20% for the months of June 2015 through February 2016. This resolution defines tiered water rates for residential customers and a flat rate for all other customers, as well as the penalties for excessive use.

Coordination With Other Agencies
The City has actively participated for many years in integrated regional water management (IRWM) planning efforts with the East Contra Costa County (ECCC) IRWM Region. The ECCC IRWM Region is shown in Figure 3.1-1. Water agencies, wastewater agencies, flood control districts, and watershed management groups within the ECCC Region have a long history of cooperative planning. In the early 1990s, agencies joined together as the East County Water Management Association and undertook an ECCC Water Supply Management Study, a comprehensive water management plan, and this group continues to coordinate on water management issues for the region.

Existing Conditions

Potable Water System
The City is a retail water purveyor that obtains the majority of its potable water supply under a wholesale contract with Contra Costa Water District (CCWD). This water is diverted as raw water from CCWD’s Contra Costa Canal. The remainder of the potable water supply is obtained from the City’s two groundwater wells. In 2015, 87% of the City’s potable supply was provided by CCWD and 13% was from local groundwater wells. The Pittsburg Water Service Area shown on Figure 3.1-2 comprises the majority of the area within the City limits. Within the Planning Area, approximately 37 percent of the land lies within the City’s Service Area. The Planning Area includes lands served by Golden State Water Company, lands within the CCWD’s service area, and lands that are not served by a public water agency as shown on Figure 3.1-2.

The City purchases untreated water from CCWD, treats it in a City-owned treatment plant, and delivers it to customers through the City’s distribution pipes. In addition to the water it buys from CCWD, the City is able to pump water from two local wells (Bodega well and Rossmoor well).

The City’s water system operates and maintains a thirty-two million gallon per day water treatment plant, two wells, eight distribution reservoirs and five booster stations. The reservoirs serve four pressure zones and have a total capacity of 17 million gallons. They provide operational, emergency, and fire flow storage.

The City averages 8.5 million gallons per day of water use with a peak of 14 million gallons in the summer. The City’s distribution system includes approximately 258 miles of water mains, 6,246 distribution system valves, 18,500 customer service lines and meters, and 1,951 fire hydrants to maintain system reliability.

Water System Supplies

Surface Water Supply
The City is within the CCWD service area and purchases Central Valley Project (CVP) water pumped from the Delta by CCWD, its wholesale supplier. CCWD has a contract with the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) for 195,000 acre feet per year (AFY) of CVP water. In March 2005, CCWD renewed its water service contract with the USBR for a period of 40 years, through February 2045.

The City obtains 85% to 95% of its water supply from CCWD pursuant to a contractual arrangement allowing the City to obtain water as is necessary to meet its needs, subject to rationing restrictions in the event of drought or other extraordinary
circumstances. CCWD’s future supply projections indicate adequate availability of surface water sources delivered through its contract with the USBR, along with other available sources and short-term purchases under normal conditions. The current and projected wholesale supply from CCWD to the City is presented in Table 3.1-1 and Table 3.1-2.

### Table 3.1-1: Water Supplies – Actual (AFY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Supply</th>
<th>Additional Water Supply Detail</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual Volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased or Imported Water</td>
<td>Purchased from CCWD</td>
<td>7,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater</td>
<td>Extracted from Pittsburg Plain Groundwater Basin</td>
<td>1,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycled Water</td>
<td>Produced by Delta Diablo for the City of Pittsburg</td>
<td>6,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,428</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: City of Pittsburg 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (June 2016)*

### Table 3.1-2: Projected Water Supplies (AFY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Supply</th>
<th>Projected Water Supply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reasonably Available Volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased or Imported Water</td>
<td>10,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater</td>
<td>1,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycled Water</td>
<td>6,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18,330</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: City of Pittsburg 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (June 2016)*

### Groundwater Supply

The City owns and operates two municipal groundwater wells, Dover and Bodega, which together produce approximately 1,500 AFY. These relatively shallow wells (approximately 200 feet deep) deliver approximately 1,200 (Dover) and 1,200 (Bodega) gallons per minute. The total amount of groundwater pumped by the City from the Pittsburg Plain Groundwater Basin in 2015 was 1,180 AFY. Groundwater volume pumped from 2011 through 2015 is included in Table 3.1-3.

The City published the Pittsburg Plain Groundwater Management Plan (GWMP) in October 2012. The GWMP was established to manage and protect groundwater resources within the City and the underlying groundwater basin. The primary objective of the GWMP is to provide a long-term strategy to maintain the quality, reliability, and sustainability of groundwater resources within the Pittsburg Plain Groundwater Basin. To accomplish this, the City manages groundwater conjunctively with its surface water resources and supports Basin Management Objectives directed toward the sustainability and optimal use of groundwater supplies.

The Pittsburg Plain Groundwater Basin has not been adjudicated. Hydrographs created from DWR well data in the Pittsburg Plain Groundwater Basin indicate that groundwater levels have remained fairly stable over the period of record, with the exception of static water level drops and subsequent recovery associated with the 1976–1977 and 1987–1992 drought periods. DWR has not identified that overdraft conditions will occur if present groundwater conditions continue.

According to DWR’s list of critically overdrafted basins, released on August 6, 2015, Pittsburg Plain Groundwater Basin is not a critically overdrafted groundwater basin. Groundwater levels in the basin have historically been stable because the majority of water demand in areas overlying the basin has been met by surface water (Pittsburg, 2012).


Recycled Water
The Delta Diablo Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) serves the cities of Antioch and Pittsburg and the unincorporated county area of Bay Point. In 2015, Delta Diablo collected 14,169 AF of wastewater, with approximately 49% of the treated wastewater used for recycled supply for various uses. The remaining treated wastewater is disposed of through a river outfall into the Delta at New York Slough. Since 2010, the proportion of wastewater used for recycled water supply has increased by 9%, and it is expected that the amount of recycled water used in the Delta Diablo service area will increase in the future.

Recycled water connections within the City’s service area are the Delta Energy Center, the Los Medanos Energy Center, the Delta View Golf Course, three Pittsburg Unified School District schools, Mt. Diablo Resource Recovery Park, and various city parks and street side landscaping. The largest recycled water users receiving recycled water from Delta Diablo are the Delta Energy Center and Los Medanos Energy Center. In 2000, Delta Diablo and CCWD reached an agreement for Delta Diablo to provide recycled water to these energy centers for turbine cooling at the energy facilities. Additional treatment of wastewater to comply with California Department of Public Health requirements is performed onsite at a 12.8 MGD reclamation plant owned and operated by Delta Diablo. In 2015, the Los Medanos Energy Center used 3,113 AFY and the Delta Energy Center used 2,975 AFY of recycled water.

Given the large amount of recycled water that was supplied to these industrial facilities and that the City will not be required, even in a back-up role, to supply water for these facilities, these projected uses are not included in the estimated City demand calculations in the City’s UWMP. The back-up water supply for these industrial customers is provided by CCWD.

The total recycled water use in calendar year 2015 was 7,060 AF, with 449 AF used for irrigation purposes and 6,611 for industrial reuse, as shown in Table 3.1-4.

Table 3.1-4: Recycled Water Uses (AFY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE TYPE</th>
<th>2015 ACTUAL USE (AFY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landscape irrigation (excluding golf courses)</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf course irrigation</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial use</td>
<td>6,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,060</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: 1 THE GOLF COURSE IS CURRENTLY SHUTDOWN AS OF THIS WRITING.*

Source: City of Pittsburg 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (June 2016)

Current and Projected Water Demands and Supplies
The City’s projected available groundwater supply is based on average groundwater extraction between 1993 and 2015. Projected available recycled water supply is based on Pittsburg’s projected recycled water demands, which the existing Delta Diablo RWF can meet. Projected raw water supply is based on percentage of City’s total potable water demand CCWD can meet.

Table 3.1-5 compares total supply available in a normal year and a single dry year to projected demand totals, with the difference showing a projected surplus during the planning horizon of the UWMP.

Table 3.1-3: Groundwater Volume Pumped (AFY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUNDWATER TYPE</th>
<th>BASIN NAME</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alluvial Basin</td>
<td>Pittsburg Plain</td>
<td>1,694</td>
<td>1,883</td>
<td>1,663</td>
<td>1,418</td>
<td>1,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,694</td>
<td>1,883</td>
<td>1,663</td>
<td>1,418</td>
<td>1,180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: City of Pittsburg 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (June 2016)*
### Table 3.1-5: Normal Year AND Single Dry Year Supply and Demand Comparison (AFY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>18,330</td>
<td>18,968</td>
<td>19,654</td>
<td>20,370</td>
<td>21,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>16,987</td>
<td>17,625</td>
<td>18,311</td>
<td>19,027</td>
<td>19,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>1,343</td>
<td>1,343</td>
<td>1,343</td>
<td>1,343</td>
<td>1,343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*City of Pittsburg 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (June 2016)*

Table 3.1-6 compares total supply available in multiple dry years to projected demand totals. As shown in Table 3.1-6, the third year of the multiple dry year period in 2035 and 2040 is the first time the City can expect to see a supply deficit, according to the demand and supply projections and the assumptions developed to formulate UWMP projections. For the analysis, groundwater supply has been assumed to be at the average 1,343 AFY of groundwater extraction between 1993 and 2015, as noted in Table 3.1-6. However, the maximum annual extraction in this period was 2,092 AF in 2008.

### Table 3.1-6: Multiple Dry Years Supply and Demand Comparison (AFY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>18,330</td>
<td>18,968</td>
<td>19,654</td>
<td>20,370</td>
<td>21,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>16,987</td>
<td>17,625</td>
<td>18,311</td>
<td>19,027</td>
<td>19,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>1,343</td>
<td>1,343</td>
<td>1,343</td>
<td>1,343</td>
<td>1,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>18,330</td>
<td>18,968</td>
<td>19,654</td>
<td>20,125</td>
<td>20,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>16,987</td>
<td>17,625</td>
<td>18,311</td>
<td>19,027</td>
<td>19,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>1,343</td>
<td>1,343</td>
<td>1,343</td>
<td>1,098</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>17,307</td>
<td>17,881</td>
<td>18,499</td>
<td>18,898</td>
<td>19,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>16,987</td>
<td>17,625</td>
<td>18,311</td>
<td>19,027</td>
<td>19,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>(129)</td>
<td>(610)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*City of Pittsburg 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (June 2016)*

The City has developed a four stage rationing plan for implementation during declared water shortages. The rationing plan includes voluntary and mandatory rationing, depending on the causes, severity, and anticipated duration of the water supply shortage.

As the retail water purveyor, the City must provide the minimum health and safety water needs of the community at all times. The water shortage response is designed to provide a minimum of 50% of normal supply during a severe or extended water shortage. Rationing stages may be triggered by a shortage in one water source or a combination of sources. Although an actual shortage may occur at any time during the year, a shortage (if one occurs) can usually be forecasted by the City and/or CCWD by April 1st of each year. Rationing stages may be triggered by a supply shortage, a natural disaster (e.g., canal failure due to earthquake) or by contamination in one source or a combination of sources. In the worst-case scenario of a 50% reduction of water supplies, the City, in coordination with CCWD, would resolve any potential supply shortfalls through a combination of a short-term conservation program and/or short-term water purchases. Stages of water shortage contingency planning are shown in Table 3.1-7.

### Table 3.1-7: Stages of Water Shortage Contingency Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Percent Supply Reduction</th>
<th>Water Supply Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Up to 10%</td>
<td>Water Alert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>11-20%</td>
<td>Water Warning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>21-35%</td>
<td>Water Emergency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>36-50%</td>
<td>Water Crisis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*City of Pittsburg 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (June 2016)*
During Stages I and II, rationing is voluntary, while during Stages III and IV, rationing is mandatory. During Stages I, II, III, and IV, customer water use reduction goals would up to 10%, 11-20%, 21-35%, and 36-50%, respectively.

References


Pittsburg Groundwater Management Plan 2012. Available at: apps.ci.pittsburg.ca.us/sirepub/cache/2/t5jsxq55paxh1kzre0srpwix/285085706062019042355442.PDF.
3.2 WASTEWATER

This section describes the City of Pittsburg’s wastewater infrastructure, wastewater flows, treatment, regulatory requirements, and infrastructure planning.

Key Terms

**Effluent**: In the context of wastewater treatment plants, effluent is wastewater that has been through a treatment process to remove pollution and undesirable constituents from the water.

**NPDES**: Water pollution degrades surface waters making them unsafe for drinking, fishing, swimming, and other activities. As authorized by the Clean Water Act, the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program controls water pollution by regulating point sources that discharge pollutants into waters of the United States. Point sources are discrete conveyances such as pipes or man-made ditches. Individual homes that are connected to a municipal system, use a septic system, or do not have a surface discharge do not need an NPDES permit; however, industrial, municipal, and other facilities must obtain permits if their discharges go directly to surface waters.

**WWTP**: Wastewater treatment plant. Treatment of wastewater may include the following processes: screening to remove large waste items; grit removal to allow sand, gravel, and sediment to settle out; primary sedimentation where sludge can settle out of the wastewater; secondary treatment to substantially degrade the biological content of the sewage; tertiary treatment to raise the quality of the effluent before it is discharged; and, discharge.

Regulatory Framework

**Federal**

**Clean Water Act (CWA) / National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permits**

The CWA is the cornerstone of water quality protection in the United States. The statute employs a variety of regulatory and non-regulatory tools to sharply reduce direct pollutant discharges into waterways, finance municipal wastewater treatment facilities, and manage polluted runoff. These tools are employed to achieve the broader goal of restoring and maintaining the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the nation’s waters so that they can support “the protection and propagation of fish, shellfish, and wildlife and recreation in and on the water.”

The CWA regulates discharges from “non-point source” and traditional “point source” facilities, such as municipal sewage plants and industrial facilities. Section 402 of the Act creates the NPDES regulatory program which makes it illegal to discharge pollutants from a point source to the waters of the United States without a permit. Point sources must obtain a discharge permit from the proper authority (usually a state, sometimes EPA, a tribe, or a territory). NPDES permits cover industrial and municipal discharges, discharges from storm sewer systems in larger cities, storm water associated with numerous kinds of industrial activity, runoff from construction sites disturbing more than one acre, mining operations, and animal feedlots and aquaculture facilities above certain thresholds.

Permit requirements for treatment are expressed as end-of-pipe conditions. This set of numbers reflects levels of three key parameters: (1) biochemical oxygen demand (BOD), (2) total suspended solids (TSS), and (3) pH acid/base balance. These levels can be achieved by well-operated sewage plants employing “secondary” treatment. Primary treatment involves screening and settling, while secondary treatment uses biological treatment in the form of “activated sludge.”
3.0 COMMUNITY SERVICES AND FACILITIES

All so-called "indirect" dischargers are not required to obtain NPDES permits. An indirect discharger is one that sends its wastewater into a city sewer system, so it eventually goes to a sewage treatment plant. Although not regulated under NPDES, "indirect" discharges are covered by another CWA program called pretreatment. "Indirect" dischargers send their wastewater into a city sewer system, which carries it to the municipal sewage treatment plant, through which it passes before entering surface water.

STATE
State Water Resources Control Board/Regional Water Quality Control Board
In California, all wastewater treatment and disposal systems fall under the overall regulatory authority of the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and the nine California Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs), who are charged with the responsibility of protecting beneficial uses of State waters (ground and surface) from a variety of waste discharges, including wastewater from individual and municipal systems. The City of Pittsburg is within the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (SFBRWQCB).

The RWQCB's regulatory role often involves the formation and implementation of basic water protection policies. These are reflected in the individual RWQCB's Basin Plan, generally in the form of guidelines, criteria and/or prohibitions related to the siting, design, construction, and maintenance of on-site sewage disposal systems. The SWRCB's role has historically been one of providing overall policy direction, organizational and technical assistance, and a communications link to the State legislature.

The RWQCBs may waive or delegate regulatory authority for on-site sewage disposal systems to counties, cities or special districts. Although not mandatory, it is commonly done and has proven to be administratively efficient. In some cases, this is accomplished through a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), whereby the local agency commits to enforcing the Basin Plan requirements or other specified standards that may be more restrictive. The RWQCBs generally elect to retain permitting authority over large and/or commercial or industrial on-site sewage disposal systems, depending on the volume and character of the wastewater.

Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act
The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act is California's statutory authority for the protection of water quality. Under the Porter-Cologne Act, the State is required to adopt policies, plans, and objectives that will protect the State's waters for the use by and enjoyment of Californians. In California, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) has the authority and responsibility for establishing policy related to the State's water quality. Regional authority is delegated by the SWRCB to a Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The Porter-Cologne Act authorizes the SWRCB and RWQCB to issue NPDES permits.

Under the RWQCB NPDES permit system, all existing and future municipal and industrial discharges to surface water within the city would be subject to regulation. NPDES permits are required for operators of municipal separate storm sewer systems, construction projects, and industrial facilities. These permits contain limits on the amount of pollutants that can be contained in each facility's discharge.

LOCAL
City of Pittsburg General Plan
The existing City of Pittsburg General Plan Public Facilities Element identifies the following goals and policies related to wastewater services:
Public Facilities Element

GOAL 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.

GOAL 11-G-4 Maintain environmentally appropriate wastewater management practices.

GOAL 11-G-5 Reduce rainfall-dependent infiltration and inflow, in order to maintain capacity of existing collection system, and prevent Sanitary Sewer Overflows (SSO).

   POLICY 11-P-11 Work with Delta Diablo Sanitation District in planning the expansion of the wastewater treatment plant.

   POLICY 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.

   POLICY 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.

   POLICY 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.

   POLICY 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.

   POLICY 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.

   POLICY 11-P-17 Require that all wastewater dischargers within the City conform to the ordinances of the Delta Diablo Sanitation District.
POLICY 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.

City of Pittsburg Municipal Code
The City of Pittsburg Municipal Code, Title 13 (Waters and Sewers), Chapter 13.20 (Industrial Waste Disposal), Chapter 13.24 (Sewer Service Charges), Chapter 13.26 (Sewer Maintenance and Repair), and Chapter 13.28 (Stormwater Management and Discharge Control) contain regulations associated with wastewater and sewer management.

Utility Management Plans
The City of Pittsburg maintains a Sewer System Management Plan document that guides the design, development, and maintenance of the sewer utilities within the City.

Existing Conditions
Wastewater System
Sewer services in the Planning Area are provided by the City and the Delta Diablo. The City maintains and owns the local sewage collection system that serves the City’s municipal users and the City’s wastewater is conveyed to Delta Diablo facilities for treatment. Delta Diablo’s service area encompasses Pittsburg, Bay Point, and Antioch. Delta Diablo owns and operates the collection system that serves the Bay Point community. Delta Diablo provides wastewater treatment and owns and operates the regional interceptors and the sewage treatment plant located north of the Pittsburg-Antioch Highway.

The City’s collection system consists of approximately 174 miles of sewer lines ranging in diameter from 6 to 36 inches, and one sewage lift station. 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 Delta Diablo’s Pittsburg Pump Station located south of Marina Park; wastewater from developments south of State Route 4 enters the Delta Diablo interceptor system on Pittsburg-Antioch Highway.

Wastewater Quality Control Facility
The Delta Diablo wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) located north of Pittsburg-Antioch Highway, just east of Pittsburg City limits has a 54 square mile service area with an average wastewater flow of 12.4 million gallons per day (mgd). The Delta Diablo system includes the following components:

- 18.5 miles of sewer forcemain and 14 miles of interceptors
- 5 pump stations and 5 equalization storage facilities with 4 million gallons (MG) of storage
- 174 miles of sewer lines in the Bay Point collection system (Antioch and Pittsburg own and operate approximately 130 miles and 300 miles, respectively, of their own satellite systems that feed into the District)
- WWTP with a 2.2 MG flow equalization basin and 12 MG of storage
- Recycled Water Facility
- 16 miles of recycled water pipeline
The water resource recovery services consist of conventional treatment of wastewater, recycled water production and distribution, pollution prevention, energy recovery, beneficial reuse of biosolids, street sweeping, and household hazardous waste collection.

The conventional treatment process consists of screening, grit removal, primary and secondary clarification, biological treatment by trickling towers and/or aeration basins, chlorination, and de-chlorination. Solids are anaerobically digested, centrifuged, and beneficially reused as fertilizer. Treated wastewater is discharged through a deep water outfall to New York Slough.

**CURRENT AND PROJECTED WASTEWATER FLOWS**

The Delta Diablo WWTP has an average daily wastewater flow of 12.4 mgd (2018) and the capacity to treat approximately 19.5 mgd. The WWTP has a 2.2 mgd flow equalization basin, a 12.8 mg emergency retention basin, and a 1.0 mg emergency storage basin. Bay Point’s sewer system consists of 43 miles of gravity sewer.

The Delta Diablo 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. Delta Diablo expects to initiate and update of the Master Plan soon.

**REFERENCES**


3.3 STORMWATER

The section provides a discussion of the stormwater/flood control systems that serve the City of Pittsburg. The City’s existing drainage system is comprised primarily of channelized creeks fed by surface runoff and underground storm drains. The City maintains the system within incorporated areas. In the unincorporated parts of the Planning Area, the Contra Costa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (CCCFCWCD) maintains major channels and creeks over which they hold land rights, while the County Department of Public Works maintains road drainage systems and several detention basins.

REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

FEDERAL

Clean Water Act

The Clean Water Act (CWA) regulates the water quality of all discharges into waters of the United States including wetlands, perennial and intermittent stream channels. Section 401, Title 33, Section 1341 of the CWA sets forth water quality certification requirements for “any applicant applying for a federal license or permit to conduct any activity including, but not limited to, the construction or operation of facilities, which may result in any discharge into the navigable waters.” Section 404, Title 33, Section 1344 of the CWA in part authorizes the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to:

- Set requirements and standards pertaining to such discharges: subparagraph (e); Issue permits “for the discharge of dredged or fill material into the navigable waters at specified disposal sites”: subparagraph (a);
- Specify the disposal sites for such permits: subparagraph (b);
- Deny or restrict the use of specified disposal sites if “the discharge of such materials into such area will have an unacceptable adverse effect on municipal water supplies and fishery areas”: subparagraph (c);
- Specify type of and conditions for non-prohibited discharges: subparagraph (f);
- Provide for individual State or interstate compact administration of general permit programs: subparagraphs (g), (h), and (j);
- Withdraw approval of such State or interstate permit programs: subparagraph (i);
- Ensure public availability of permits and permit applications: subparagraph (o);
- Exempt certain Federal or State projects from regulation under this Section: subparagraph (r); and,
- Determine conditions and penalties for violation of permit conditions or limitations: subparagraph (s).

Section 401 certification is required prior to final issuance of Section 404 permits from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

The California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and RWQCBs enforce State of California statutes that are equivalent to or more stringent than the Federal statutes. RWQCBs are responsible for establishing water quality standards and objectives that protect the beneficial uses of various waters. The cities of Clayton, Concord, El Cerrito, Hercules, Lafayette, Martinez, Orinda, Pinole, Pittsburg, Pleasant Hill, Richmond, San Pablo, San Ramon, and Walnut Creek, the towns of Danville and Moraga, Contra Costa County, and the Contra Costa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (the Contra Costa Permittees) have joined together to form the Contra Costa Clean Water Program. The Contra Costa Permittees are currently subject to National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit No. CAS612008, issued by Order No. R2-2009-0074 on October 14, 2009, which pertains to stormwater runoff discharge from storm drains and watercourses within their jurisdictions.
Federal Emergency Management Agency
The City is a participant in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP), a Federal program administered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Participants in the NFIP must satisfy certain mandated floodplain management criteria. The National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 has adopted as a desired level of protection, an expectation that developments should be protected from floodwater damage of the Intermediate Regional Flood (IRF). The IRF is defined as a flood that has an average frequency of occurrence on the order of once in 100 years, although such a flood may occur in any given year. Communities are occasionally audited by the Department of Water Resources to insure the proper implementation of FEMA floodplain management regulations. The City adopted the Model Floodplain Management Ordinance within the City in order to maintain eligibility within the National Flood Insurance Program.

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NPDES permits are required for discharges of pollutants to navigable waters of the United States, which includes any discharge to surface waters, including lakes, rivers, streams, bays, the ocean, dry stream beds, wetlands, and storm sewers that are tributary to any surface water body. NPDES permits are issued under the CWA, Title IV, Permits and Licenses, Section 402 (33 USC 466 et seq.)

The RWQCB issues these permits in lieu of direct issuance by the Environmental Protection Agency, subject to review and approval by the Environmental Protection Agency Regional Administrator. The terms of these NPDES permits implement pertinent provisions of the CWA and its implementing regulations, including pre-treatment, sludge management, effluent limitations for specific industries, and anti-degradation. In general, the discharge of pollutants is to be eliminated or reduced as much as practicable so as to achieve the CWA's goal of “fishable and swimmable” navigable (surface) waters. Technically, all NPDES permits issued by the RWQCB are also Waste Discharge Requirements issued under the authority of the CWA.

These NPDES permits regulate discharges from publicly owned treatment works, industrial discharges, stormwater runoff, dewatering operations, and groundwater cleanup discharges. NPDES permits are issued for five years or less, and are therefore to be updated regularly. The rapid and dramatic population and urban growth in the Central Valley Region has caused a significant increase in NPDES permit applications for new waste discharges. To expedite the permit issuance process, the SWRCB has adopted several general NPDES permits, each of which regulates numerous discharges of similar types of wastes. The SWRCB has issued general permits for stormwater runoff from industrial and construction sites statewide. Stormwater discharges from industrial and construction activities in the Central Valley Region can be covered under these general permits, which are administered jointly by the SWRCB and RWQCB.

STATE
Department of Water Resources
The Department of Water Resources' (DWR) major responsibilities include preparing and updating the California Water Plan to guide development and management of the State's water resources, planning, designing, constructing, operating, and maintaining the State Water Resources Development System, protecting and restoring the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, regulating dams, providing flood protection, assisting in emergency management to safeguard life and property, educating the public, and serving local water needs by providing technical assistance. In addition, the DWR cooperates with local agencies on water resources investigations; supports watershed and river restoration programs; encourages water conservation; explores conjunctive use of ground and surface water; facilitates voluntary water transfers; and, when needed, operates a State drought water bank.
California Water Code

California’s primary statute governing water quality and water pollution issues with respect to both surface waters and groundwater is the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act of 1970 (Division 7 of the California Water Code) (Porter-Cologne Act). The Porter-Cologne Act grants the SWRCB and each of the RWQCBs power to protect water quality, and is the primary vehicle for implementation of California’s responsibilities under the Federal Clean Water Act. The Porter-Cologne Act grants the SWRCB and the RWQCBs authority and responsibility to adopt plans and policies, to regulate discharges to surface and groundwater, to regulate waste disposal sites and to require cleanup of discharges of hazardous materials and other pollutants. The Porter-Cologne Act also establishes reporting requirements for unintended discharges of any hazardous substance, sewage, or oil or petroleum product.

Each RWQCB must formulate and adopt a water quality control plan (Basin Plan) for its region the regional plans are to conform to the policies set forth in the Porter-Cologne Act and established by the SWRCB in its State water policy. The Porter-Cologne Act also provides that a RWQCB may include within its regional plan water discharge prohibitions applicable to particular conditions, areas, or types of waste.

The Water Code Section 13260 requires all dischargers of waste that may affect water quality in waters of the state to prepare and provide a water quality discharge report to the RWQCB. Section 13260a-c is as follows:

(a) Each of the following persons shall file with the appropriate regional board a report of the discharge, containing the information that may be required by the regional board:

(1) A person discharging waste, or proposing to discharge waste, within any region that could affect the quality of the waters of the state, other than into a community sewer system.

(2) A person who is a citizen, domiciliary, or political agency or entity of this state discharging waste, or proposing to discharge waste, outside the boundaries of the state in a manner that could affect the quality of the waters of the state within any region.

(3) A person operating, or proposing to construct, an injection well.

(b) No report of waste discharge need be filed pursuant to subdivision (a) if the requirement is waived pursuant to Section 13269.

(c) Each person subject to subdivision (a) shall file with the appropriate regional board a report of waste discharge relative to any material change or proposed change in the character, location, or volume of the discharge.

Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary

The watershed of the Bay-Delta Estuary provides drinking water to two-thirds of the State’s population and water for a multitude of other urban uses, and it supplies some of the State’s most productive agricultural areas, both inside and outside of the Estuary. The Bay-Delta Estuary itself is one of the largest ecosystems for fish and wildlife habitat and production in the United States.

The Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary (Basin Plan) includes a summary of beneficial water uses, water quality objectives needed to protect the identified beneficial uses, and
implementation measures. The Basin Plan establishes water quality standards for all the ground and surface waters of the region. The term "water quality standards," as used in the Federal Clean Water Act, includes both the beneficial uses of specific water bodies and the levels of quality that must be met and maintained to protect those uses. The Basin Plan includes an implementation plan describing the actions by the RWQCB and others that are necessary to achieve and maintain the water quality standards.

The RWQCB regulates waste discharges to minimize and control their effects on the quality of the region’s ground and surface water. Permits are issued under a number of programs and authorities. The terms and conditions of these discharge permits are enforced through a variety of technical, administrative, and legal means. Water quality problems in the region are listed in the Basin Plan, along with the causes, where they are known. For water bodies with quality below the levels necessary to allow all the beneficial uses of the water to be met, plans for improving water quality are included. The Basin Plan reflects, incorporates, and implements applicable portions of a number of national and statewide water quality plans and policies, including the California Water Code and the Clean Water Act.

**LOCAL**

**City of Pittsburg Municipal Code**

Chapter 13.28 (Stormwater Management and Discharge Control) of the Pittsburg Municipal Code addresses stormwater and water quality. In compliance with the City’s National Pollutant Elimination System (NPDES) permit, and consistent with the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, and the Federal Clean Water Act, the intent of this chapter is to protect and enhance the water quality in the City of Pittsburg’s watercourses. In addition, this chapter also requires projects to prepare a stormwater control plan and construct and implement stormwater management and discharge control measures and comply with best management practices during project construction and operation.

**City of Pittsburg General Plan**

The existing City of Pittsburg General Plan Resource Conservation Element identifies the following goals and policies related to stormwater quality, drainage and erosion (for additional policies and information specifically related to flooding see Section 4.5 Flooding):

**Resource Conservation Element**

**GOAL 9-G-4** Minimize the runoff and erosion caused by earth movement by requiring development to use best construction management practices (BMPs).

**GOAL 9-G-5** Preserve and enhance Pittsburg’s creeks for their value in providing visual amenity, drainage capacity, and habitat value.

**GOAL 9-G-6** Preserve and protect the Contra Costa Canal from storm drainage and runoff contaminating the City’s municipal water supply.

**POLICY 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.

**POLICY 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.

POLICY 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.

POLICY 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.

POLICY 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.

POLICY 9-P-20 As part of project review and approval, establish maintenance districts to ensure uniform maintenance for selected channels and creeks.

POLICY 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.

GOAL 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.

GOAL 9-G-8 Ensure that soil and groundwater pollution is addressed during redevelopment and reuse projects.

POLICY 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.

POLICY 9-P-23 Require new urban development to use Best Management Practices to minimize creek bank instability, runoff of construction sediment, and flooding.
POLICY 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.

POLICY 9-P-24 Reduce sedimentation and erosion of waterways by minimizing site disturbance and vegetation removal along creek corridors.

POLICY 9-P-25 Encourage rehabilitation and revegetation of riparian corridors and wetlands throughout the City to contribute to bioremediation and improved water quality.

POLICY 9-P-26 Monitor water quality in the local creek and reservoir system to ensure clean supplies for human consumption and ecosystem health.

POLICY 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.

City of Pittsburg Clean Water Program
As a member of the Contra Costa Clean Water Program, the City is governed by the City’s NPDES permit. The NPDES permit limits and controls the types and amounts of pollutants entering our waterways to keep them safe and clean. The City’s program includes:

- Public Outreach and Education
- Oversight of New Developments
- Illicit Discharge Inspection and Response
- Trash Load Reduction
- Heavy metals and Legacy Pollutant Controls
- Street Sweeping
- Storm Drainage Cleaning and Maintenance
- Creek Clean Up and Protection

Existing Conditions
Stormwater flows and Storm Drains
The City’s existing drainage system is comprised primarily of channelized creeks fed by surface runoff and underground storm drains. The City maintains the system within incorporated areas. In the unincorporated parts of the Planning Area, the Contra Costa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (CCCFCWCD) maintains major channels and creeks over which they hold land rights, while the County Department of Public Works maintains road drainage systems and several detention basins.
Storm drains throughout the city are used to collect rainwater and divert it, untreated, into the Delta. The City's storm drains do not connect to the sewer system, and all stormwater that flows into a storm drain system flows directly into the Delta. As discussed previously, The SFBRWQCB requires all municipalities within Contra Costa County (and the County itself) to develop restrictive surface water control standards for new development projects as part of the municipal regional NPDES Permit. Known as “Provision C.3,” new development or redevelopment projects that disturb one or more acres of land area must contain and treat stormwater runoff from the site.

**FLOODING AND FLOODPLAIN MAPPING**

FEMA identifies Special Flood Hazard Areas (SFHA). FEMA publishes Flood Insurance Rate Maps that depict floodplains. Flooding and flood hazards are addressed in greater detail in Section 4.5. The FEMA 100-year flood plain is shown on Figure 4.5-1.

**REFERENCES**


City of Pittsburg Stormwater Brochure. Available At:  

3.4 SOLID WASTE

Mt. Diablo Resource Recovery (MDRR - Pittsburg) formally known as Pittsburg Disposal Service is a private firm that provides solid waste collection under a City franchise agreement. Both residential and commercial solid waste is currently transported to, and disposed of at the Keller Canyon Landfill southwest of the city; industrial waste is also disposed of at the Keller Canyon Landfill.

**Key Terms**

**Class I landfill:** A landfill that accepts for disposal 20 tons or more of municipal solid waste daily (based on an annual average); or one that does not qualify as a Class II or Class III municipal solid waste landfill.

**Class II landfill:** A landfill that (1) accepts less than 20 tons daily of municipal solid waste (based on an annual average); (2) is located on a site where there is no evidence of groundwater pollution caused or contributed by the landfill; (3) is not connected by road to a Class I municipal solid waste landfill, or, if connected by road, is located more than 50 miles from a Class I municipal solid waste landfill; and (4) serves a community that experiences (for at least three months each year) an interruption in access to surface transportation, preventing access to a Class I landfill, or a community with no practicable waste management alternative.

**Class III landfill:** A landfill that is not connected by road to a Class I landfill or a landfill that is located at least 50 miles from a Class I landfill. Class III landfills can accept no more than an average of one ton daily of ash from incinerated municipal solid waste or less than five tons daily of municipal solid waste.

**Transfer station:** A facility for the temporary deposition of some wastes. Transfer stations are often used as places where local waste collection vehicles will deposit their waste cargo prior to loading into larger vehicles. These larger vehicles will transport the waste to the end point of disposal or treatment.

**Regulatory Framework**

**Federal**

**Resource Conservation and Recovery Act**

The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) was enacted in 1976 to address the huge volumes of municipal and industrial solid waste generated nationwide. After several amendments, the current Act governs the management of solid and hazardous waste and underground storage tanks (USTs). RCRA was an amendment to the Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965. RCRA has been amended several times, most significantly by the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments (HSWA) of 1984. RCRA is a combination of the first solid waste statutes and all subsequent amendments. RCRA authorizes the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to regulate waste management activities. RCRA authorizes states to develop and enforce their own waste management programs, in lieu of the Federal program, if a state’s waste management program is substantially equivalent to, consistent with, and no less stringent than the Federal program.

**State**

**California Integrated Waste Management Act (AB 939 and SB 1322)**

The California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (AB 939 and SB 1322) requires every city and county in the state to prepare a Source Reduction and Recycling Element to its Solid Waste Management Plan that identifies how each jurisdiction will meet the mandatory state waste diversion goals of 25% by 1995 and 50% by 2000. The purpose of AB 939 and SB 1322
is to “reduce, recycle, and re-use solid waste generated in the state to the maximum extent feasible.” The term “integrated waste management” refers to the use of a variety of waste management practices to safely and effectively handle the municipal solid waste stream with the least adverse impact on human health and the environment. The Act has established a waste management hierarchy, as follows: Source Reduction; Recycling; Composting; Transformation; and Disposal.

**AB 341 (75 Percent Solid Waste Diversion)**

AB 341 requires CalRecycle to issue a report to the Legislature that includes strategies and recommendations that would enable the state to divert 75 percent of the solid waste generated in the state from disposal by January 1, 2020, requires businesses that meet specified thresholds in the bill to arrange for recycling services by January 1, 2012, and also streamlines various regulatory processes.

**SB 1374 (Construction and Demolition Waste Materials Diversion)**

Senate Bill 1374 (SB 1374), Construction and Demolition Waste Materials Diversion Requirements, requires that jurisdictions summarize their progress realized in diverting construction and demolition waste from the waste stream in their annual AB 939 reports. SB 1374 required the CIWMB to adopt a model construction and demolition ordinance for voluntary implementation by local jurisdictions.

**AB 2176 (Montanez, Chapter 879, Statues of 2004)**

This law requires the largest venue facilities and events (as defined) in each city and county to plan and implement solid waste diversion programs, and annually report the progress of those upon the request of their local government. In turn, local jurisdictions must report to the CIWMB waste diversion information for the top 10 percent of venues and events by waste generation.

A large event is defined as:

1. Serves an average of more than 2,000 individuals per day of operation (both people attending the event and those working at it—including volunteers—are included in this number); and
2. Charges an admission price or is run by a local agency.

The bill specifically includes public, nonprofit, or privately owned parks, parking lots, golf courses, street systems, or other open space when being used for an event, including, but not limited to, a sporting event or a flea market in addition to events that meet both of the above.

A large venue is defined as:

_A permanent facility that annually seats or serves an average of more than 2,000 individuals within the grounds of the facility per day of operation (both people attending the event and those working at it—including volunteers too—are included in this number)._  

Venues include, but are not limited to airports, amphitheaters, amusement parks, aquariums, arenas, conference or civic centers, fairgrounds, museums, halls, horse tracks, performing arts centers, racetracks, stadiums, theaters, zoos, and other public attraction facilities.
California Integrated Waste Management Board Model Ordinance
Subsequent to the Integrated Waste Management Act, additional legislation was passed to assist local jurisdictions in accomplishing the goals of AB 939. The California Solid Waste Re-use and Recycling Access Act of 1991 (§42900-42911 of the Public Resources Code) directs the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) to draft a “model ordinance” relating to adequate areas for collecting and loading recyclable materials in development projects. The model ordinance requires that any new development project, for which an application is submitted on or after September 1, 1994, include “adequate, accessible, and convenient areas for collecting and loading recyclable materials.” For subdivisions of single family detached homes, recycling areas are required to serve only the needs of the homes within that subdivision.

California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen)
CALGreen requires the diversion of at least 50 percent of the construction waste generated during most new construction projects (CALGreen Sections 4.408 and 5.408) and some additions and alterations to nonresidential building projects.


As of January 1, 2017, in all jurisdictions including those without a construction and debris ordinance requiring the diversion of 65 percent of construction waste, the owners/builder of construction projects within the covered occupancies are required to divert 65 percent of the construction waste materials generated during the project. Additionally, CALGreen allows a disposal reduction option that can be met when the project’s disposal rate is less than 2.0 pounds per square foot for non-residential and high rise residential, or less than 3.4 pounds per square foot for low-rise residential.

LOCAL
City of Pittsburg Municipal Code, Title 8 Health And Sanitation
Title 8 of the Pittsburg Municipal Code includes the following chapters related to solid waste topics and standards: Chapter 8.04 (Rubbish Removal and Disposal), Chapter 8.05 (Solid Waste Facility Regulation), Chapter 8.06 (Collection of Recyclable Waste Materials), and Chapter 8.07 (Plastic Bag Regulation).

City of Pittsburg General Plan
The existing Pittsburg General Plan Public Facilities Element includes the following goals and policies related to solid waste:

Public Facilities Element
GOAL 11-G-6 Continue reduction and recycling efforts within the City to divert increasingly larger portions of the waste stream from local landfills.

GOAL 11-G-7 Manage solid waste so that State diversion goals are met.

   POLICY 11-P-19 Support the implementation of program tasks within the Source Reduction and Recycling Element.

   POLICY 11-P-20 Work with Pittsburg Disposal Services to increase participation in curbside recycling programs for residential neighborhoods.

   POLICY 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.

**POLICY 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.

**POLICY 11-P-23** Encourage builders to incorporate interior and exterior storage areas for recyclables into new or remodeled residential, commercial, and industrial structures

---

**Existing Conditions**

**Waste Collection Services**

Pittsburg is served by Mt. Diablo Resource Recovery (MDRR - Pittsburg) formally known as Pittsburg Disposal Service, for solid waste pick-up and disposal services. Republic Services (formally Allied Industries) provides disposal services for some areas in Bay Point.

The Environmental Services Department, in conjunction with MDRR - Pittsburg, coordinates the curbside recycling, and green waste programs. MDRR - Pittsburg provides a container for garbage, recycling and green waste separately.

**Waste Disposal Facilities**

**Keller Canyon Landfill**

Keller Canyon Landfill disposes of industrial non-recyclable waste from Pittsburg. The Keller Canyon Landfill has a maximum permitted throughput of 3,500.00 tons per day, and a maximum permitted capacity of 75,018,280 cubic yards with a remaining capacity of 63,408,410 cubic yards.

Keller Canyon Landfill is a Class II facility designed to accept mixed municipal, Construction/demolition, agricultural, sludge (Bio-Solids), and other designated industrial solid waste. Although the total acreage of the site is 1,399 acres, the allotted disposal footprint is 244 acres to allow for a boundary between the facility and surrounding developments. estimated cease of operation date for this facility is 2030.

**Recycling Center & Transfer Station**

Located at 1300 Loveridge Road, the Mt. Diablo Resource Recovery Park accepts and recycles all types of material. The facility also accepts regular household waste, wood, green waste, and construction debris.

The RCTS contains Mt. Diablo Recycling the area’s largest state-of-the-art recycling processing center, with a goal of keeping all recyclable items, including paper, metals, cardboard, yard waste, urban wood waste, construction materials and used oil, out of the landfill so as much material as possible can be recycled and reused. The facility also includes the region’s largest construction and demolition recycling operation, resulting in thousands of tons of material being kept out of the landfill. The facility serves residential and commercial collection services to the cities of Concord, Pittsburg, Oakley, Rio Vista and unincorporated areas throughout Contra Costa and Solano Counties.

**Hazardous Waste Disposal**

Delta Household Hazardous Waste Collection Facility located at 2550 Pittsburg-Antioch Hwy in Pittsburg is open Thursdays, Fridays and Saturdays from 9 a.m. – 4 p.m. The facility is available to the residents of the East Contra Costa County communities.
including: Antioch, Bay Point, Bethel Island, Brentwood, Byron, Discovery Bay, Knightsen, Oakley, and Pittsburg. Proof of residency is required to use this facility. Table 3.2-1 shows examples of hazardous waste accepted.

Table 3.2-1: Hazardous Waste Accepted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home &amp; Garden Products</th>
<th>Automotive Care Products</th>
<th>Paint &amp; Paint Related Products</th>
<th>Personal Care Products</th>
<th>Misc. Products</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liquid cleaners</td>
<td>Oil</td>
<td>Latex paint</td>
<td>Pharmaceuticals</td>
<td>Light Bulbs (all types)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerosols</td>
<td>Oil Filters</td>
<td>Oil based paint</td>
<td>Hair care products</td>
<td>Electronic Waste (TV's computers, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drain openers</td>
<td>Antifreeze</td>
<td>Stains</td>
<td>Lotions</td>
<td>Mercury thermometers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solvents</td>
<td>Brake Fluid</td>
<td>Varnishes</td>
<td>Soaps</td>
<td>Thermostats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grouts</td>
<td>Transmission Fluid</td>
<td>Glazes</td>
<td>Cosmetics</td>
<td>Sharpss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cements</td>
<td>Gasoline</td>
<td>Waxes</td>
<td>Nail polish removers</td>
<td>Propane tanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caulking</td>
<td>Car Wax</td>
<td>Wood oils</td>
<td>Perfumes</td>
<td>Helium Tanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sealants</td>
<td>Car Polish</td>
<td>Paint thinner</td>
<td>Colognes</td>
<td>Household batteries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhesives</td>
<td>Car Batteries</td>
<td>Epoxy resins</td>
<td>Insect Repellent</td>
<td>Cooking Oil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighter fluid</td>
<td>Degreasers</td>
<td>Wall paper products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesticides</td>
<td>Solvents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecticides</td>
<td>Wheel Cleaners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbicides</td>
<td>Road Flares</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool chemicals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fertilizers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Delta Diablo Household Hazardous Waste Information

Unacceptable Hazardous Waste includes:

- Appliances (see Contra Costa Waste Recycling Center & Transfer Station)
- Asbestos (contact Altamont Landfill)
- Compressed Gas Cylinders, except propane and helium (contact local gas suppliers)
- Infectious or Biologically Active Materials (contact Contra Costa County Environmental Health Department)
- Radioactive Materials (contact Contra Costa County Environmental Health Department)
- Railroad Ties/Treated Wood (contact Altamont Landfill)
- Tires (Call 1.800.750.4096 or visit http://www.cccrecycle.org.)
- Explosives or Ammunition (contact local law enforcement agency)

Solid Waste Generation Rates and Volumes

The California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) tracks and monitors solid waste generation rates on a per capita basis. Per capita solid waste generation rates and total annual solid waste disposal volumes for the City between 2015 and 2017 are shown in Table 3.2-2 below.
As shown in the Table 3.2-2, the 2017 per capita disposal rate in Pittsburg, which is the most recently approved disposal rate, was 5.5 pounds per day (ppd) per resident.

The per capita waste generation rate increased from 5.2 to 5.5 lbs/person/day over the 3 year (2015-2017) period, and, the total annual disposal tonnage in the city increased by 8,141 tons over the 2015 to 2017 time span. With the passage of SB 1016, per capita disposal rate is used to determine the diversion progress of a city and not the jurisdictional diversion rates. Therefore, a population increase resulting in the generation of more overall city waste does not affect the jurisdiction's ability to meet its waste goals. The City's waste disposal rate targets are shown in Table 3.2-3.

### Table 3.2-2: Solid Waste Generation Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Waste Generation Rate (LBS/PERS/DAY)</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Total Disposal Tonnage (TONS/YEAR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>67,628</td>
<td>63,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>68,133</td>
<td>67,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>71,342</td>
<td>72,064</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: CalRecycle. Accessed: May, 2019*

The City’s target rate on the above table represents a 50% diversion rate. In accordance with AB 939, which required municipalities to aggressively pursue MSW source reduction and recycling, the City continues to meet and exceed all AB 939 goals. The various solid waste management actions adopted by the City include, but are not limited to, recycling and yard waste programs for residents and businesses, public education and public outreach awareness events, and school recycling and composting.

### Table 3.2-3: City of Pittsburg Waste Disposal Rate Targets (Pounds/Day)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: CalRecycle. Accessed: May, 2019*

### References


3.5 ELECTRICITY AND NATURAL GAS

Regulatory Framework

STATE

Public Utilities Commission

The California Public Utilities Commission (PUC) is the primary State agency that regulates privately owned public utilities in California. These utilities include telecommunications, electricity, natural gas, water, railroad, rail transit, and passenger transportation companies. A primary role of the PUC is to authorize utility rate changes. It also establishes service standards and safety rules, monitors the safety of utility and transportation operations, prosecutes unlawful marketing and billing activities, and oversees the merger and restructure of utility corporations.

Bioenergy Action Plan – Executive Order #S-06-06

Executive Order #S-06-06 establishes targets for the use and production of biofuels and biopower, and directs State agencies to work together to advance biomass programs in California while providing environmental protection and mitigation. The executive order establishes the following target to increase the production and use of bioenergy, including ethanol and biodiesel fuels made from renewable resources: produce a minimum of 20% of its biofuels within California by 2010, 40% by 2020, and 75% by 2050. The executive order also calls for the State to meet a target for use of biomass electricity, including biomass cogeneration facilities.

Senate Bill 14 and Assembly Bill 64

Prior to the passage of SB 14 and AB 64 in 2009, California law required investor-owned utilities (IOUs) and energy service providers (ESPs) to increase their existing purchases of renewable energy by 1% of sales per year such that 20% of their retail sales, as measured by usage, are procured from eligible renewable resources (including biomass cogeneration) by December 31, 2010. This is known as the Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS).

SB 14 and AB 64 require IOUs, POUs, and ESPs to increase their purchases of renewable energy such that at least 33% of retail sales are procured from renewable energy resources by December 31, 2020. For IOUs and ESPs, this is required only if the PUC determines that achieving these targets will result in just and reasonable rates.

Title 24

Title 24, Part 6, of the California Code of Regulations is also known as California’s Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings. Title 24 was established in 1978 in response to a legislative mandate to reduce California’s energy consumption. The standards are updated periodically to allow consideration and possible incorporation of new energy efficiency technologies and methods. The 2008 Energy Efficiency Standards went into effect on January 1, 2010. Title 24, Part 11, of the California Code of Regulations establishes the California Green Building Standards Code (CalGreen). Initially, the code requirements were voluntary; however, CalGreen became mandatory in 2011. CalGreen addresses five areas of green building: 1) planning and design, 2) energy efficiency, 3) water efficiency and conservation, 4) material conservation and resources efficiency, and 5) environmental quality. The mandatory requirements are separated into non-residential and residential projects. CalGreen also includes two optional tiers: Tier 1 and Tier 2. The tiers employ higher thresholds that jurisdictions may adopt or that projects may meet voluntarily.

City of Pittsburg General Plan

The existing Pittsburg General Plan includes the following goals and policies related to energy and natural gas:
Public Facilities Element

GOAL 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.

POLICY 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.

POLICY 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.

POLICY 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.

POLICY 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.

Existing Setting

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E)

The Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) provides electrical and natural gas service to residences and businesses throughout the City of Pittsburg. As a privately owned public utility, PG&E has a service area that covers most of northern and central California. PG&E generates electric power from many sources, including hydroelectric powerhouses, Diablo Canyon Power Plant (active until 2025) and a few small fossil-fired power plants. PG&E also purchases power from independent power producers. Generation sources from these producers can range from large fossil power plants to smaller renewable and cogeneration plants. After the power is produced or bought, it goes into PG&E’s electric transmission and distribution systems to get to the homes and businesses of PG&E’s customers. PG&E’s infrastructure is in place to distribute natural gas and electricity to Pittsburg and PG&E typically can accommodate new developments upon request.

The existing PG&E power line corridor bisects the City 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.

MCE Community Choice Aggregation

On June 5, 2017, the Pittsburg City Council adopted Resolution 17-13321; electing to join MCE Clean Energy, a “Community Choice Aggregation” energy program. MCE is a public, not-for-profit electricity provider that gives all PG&E electric customers (residential, commercial, and municipal) the choice of having 60% to 100% of their electricity supplied from renewable
sources, such as solar, wind, bioenergy, geothermal, and hydroelectric. MCE was formed in 2008 and service was launched to customers on May 7, 2010, as California’s first Community Choice Aggregation program. As of 2015, MCE provides renewable energy to more than 470,000 customer accounts and more than 1 million residents and businesses in 34 member communities across four Bay Area counties: Napa, Marin, Contra Costa, and Solano. The local electric utility, PG&E, will continue to provide energy delivery, metering and billing services as before. California law gives ratepayers the option to opt-out of MCE and return to PG&E energy service if desired.

**References**


3.6 PUBLIC SAFETY

This section addresses the provision of public safety services in the City of Pittsburg, including fire protection, law enforcement, and other local safety provisions.

Regulatory Framework

STATE

California Occupational Safety and Health Administration

In accordance with California Code of Regulations Title 8 Sections 1270 "Fire Prevention" and 6773 "Fire Protection and Fire Equipment" the California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal/OSHA) has established minimum standards for fire suppression and emergency medical services. The standards include, but are not limited to, guidelines on the handling of highly combustible materials, fire hose sizing requirements, restrictions on the use of compressed air, access roads, and the testing, maintenance, and use of all firefighting and emergency medical equipment.

The State of California passed legislation authorizing the Office of Emergency Services (OES) to prepare a Standard Emergency Management System (SEMS) program, which sets forth measures by which a jurisdiction should handle emergency disasters. Non-compliance with SEMS could result in the State withholding disaster relief from the non-complying jurisdiction in the event of an emergency disaster.

Emergency Response/Evacuation Plans

The State of California passed legislation authorizing the Office of Emergency Services (OES) to prepare a Standard Emergency Management System (SEMS) program, which sets forth measures by which a jurisdiction should handle emergency disasters. Non-compliance with SEMS could result in the State withholding disaster relief from the non-complying jurisdiction in the event of an emergency disaster.

California Fire Protection Code

The California Fire Code contains regulations relating to construction and maintenance of buildings and the use of premises. Topics addressed in the Code include fire department access, fire hydrants, automatic sprinkler systems, fire alarm systems, fire and explosion hazards safety, hazardous materials storage and use, provisions to protect and assist first responders, industrial processes, and many other general and specialized fire safety requirements for new existing buildings and premises.

International Fire Code

The International Fire Code (2015) with the State of California Amendments contains regulations relating to construction, maintenance, and use of buildings. Topics addressed in the California Fire Code include fire department access, fire hydrants, automatic sprinkler systems, fire alarm systems, fire and explosion hazards safety, hazardous materials storage and use, provisions intended to protect and assist fire responders, industrial processes, and many other general and specialized fire-safety requirements for new and existing buildings and the surrounding premises. The Fire Code contains specialized technical regulations related to fire and life safety.

California Health and Safety Code

State fire regulations are set forth in Sections 13000 et seq. of the California Health and Safety Code. This includes regulations for building standards (as also set forth in the California Building Code), fire protection and notification systems, fire protection
devices such as extinguishers and smoke alarms, high-rise building and childcare facility standards, and fire suppression training.

**NFPA 1710**

The NFPA 1710 Standards are applicable to urban areas and where staffing is comprised of career Firefighters. According to these guidelines, a career fire department needs to respond within six minutes, 90 percent of the time with a response time measured from the 911 call to the time of arrival of the first responder.

The standards are divided as follows:

- Dispatch time of one minute or less for at least 90 percent of the alarms
- Turnout time of one minute or less for EMS calls (80 seconds for fire and special operations response)
- Fire response travel time of four minutes or less for the arrival of the first arriving engine company at a fire incident and eight minutes or less travel time for the deployment of an initial full alarm assignment at a fire incident
- Eight minutes or less travel time for the arrival of an advanced life support (ALS) (4 minutes or less if provided by the fire department)

**LOCAL**

**Contra Costa County Fire District Fire Facility Impact Fees**

In October 2005, the CCCFPD prepared the Fire Facilities Impact Fee Study and Report. The report documented a reasonable relationship between new development and the need for funding of new facilities. Under the Mitigation Fee Act (Government Code Section 6600 et. Seq.) the CCCFPD has the legal authority to impose impact fees providing that certain legal requirements are met. The Fire Facilities Impact Fee Study and Report details the need for impact fees, quantifies such fees, and provides sufficient legal justification for the fees. Residential projects within the CCCFPD are subject to CCCFPD Fire Facilities Impact Fees on a per unit basis.

**City of Pittsburg Municipal Code**

Title 15 (Buildings and Construction) of the City of Pittsburg Municipal Code, includes Chapter 15.20 Fire Code – Regulations includes enforcement and fire code amendments specific to the city. Additionally, Chapter 15.92 includes Community Facility Fees – Fire Protection Facilities fees to provide a method for financing fire protection facilities required by the goals and policies of the General Plan and necessitated by the needs of new construction and development for adequate fire protection facilities and services.

**City of Pittsburg General Plan**

The existing City of Pittsburg General Plan Public Facilities Element has the following policies related to fire and police protection services:

**Public Facilities Element**

GOAL 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.

POLICY 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.

POLICY 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.

GOAL 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.

POLICY 10-P-36 Maintain, modernize, and designate new sites for emergency response facilities, including fire and police stations, as needed to accommodate population growth.

POLICY 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.

POLICY 10-P-39 Strive to maintain a ratio of 1.8 sworn police officers per 1,000 residents.

**Existing Conditions - Fire Protection**

**Costa County Fire Protection District**

The Contra Costa County Fire Protection District (CCCFPD), provides fire protection services to the Pittsburg Planning Area. The CCCFPD boundaries encompass the central and northern portions of Contra Costa County (CCC), extending from the City of Antioch in the east to the eastern border of the City of Richmond in the west, and as far south as the northern border of the City of Moraga. The CCCFPD has a boundary area of approximately 257 square miles. The CCCFPD provides fire suppression (structural, vehicle, and vegetation fires) and prevention, Advanced Life Support (ALS) for medical emergencies, rescue, dispatch, initial hazardous materials response, fire inspection, plan review, and education. The CCCFPD has 25 fire stations and employees 288 professional firefighters across its service area.

The CCCFPD has three fire stations within the Pittsburg city limits (stations 84, 85, and 87) and one station (Station 86) within the Bay Point Area within the SOI. CCCFPD fire station locations within the city and surrounding area are shown in Figure 3.7-1. Each fire station is staffed with three personnel 24 hours a day.

Stations are generally staffed by one captain, one engineer, and one firefighter. The CCCFPD employs 11 Battalion chiefs, one Fire Chief, one Deputy Chief, four Assistant Fire Chiefs and one Fire Marshall. The CCCFPD maintains a minimum daily staffing of 82 personnel, and the total number of employees within the CCCFPD, including both sworn and non-sworn employees, is currently 333 individuals. In 2018, the CCCFPD received over 60,000 emergency and non-emergency calls for service. The CCCFPD’s current response time goal for emergency and non-emergency calls is five minutes to 90 percent of all calls received. According to CCCFPD, the average ambulance response time, as of 2018, was 4 minutes and 38 seconds.
The Insurance Service Office (ISO), an advisory organization, classifies fire service in communities from 1 to 10, indicating the general adequacy of coverage. Communities with the best systems for water distribution, fire department facilities, equipment and personnel and fire alarms and communications, receive a rating of 1. CCCFPD has an ISO rating of 3.

**FIRE STATIONS**

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.

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. The CCCFPD Fire Department facility locations within the City are shown on Figure 3.7-1.

**FIRE CONCERNS**

Areas in Pittsburg representing the greatest risk are in the hills south of the City, which consist of dry grasslands 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. Additional information related to local wildfire threats is included in Chapter 6.0.

**EXISTING CONDITIONS - POLICE PROTECTION**

**PITTSBURG POLICE DEPARTMENT**

The Pittsburg Police Department (PPD) is responsible for providing law enforcement services in the City, including patrol, crime prevention, parking and traffic control, community awareness, investigations, and temporary holding facilities. The PPD is located at 65 Civic Avenue as shown on Figure 3.7-1. The Department is responsible for community policing, has a Special Weapons and Tactics Team, and conducts Emergency Preparedness training. Similar to other cities, the PPD relies on the Sheriff’s Office for search and rescue services and long-term holding facilities, County Animal Control for animal services, and the City of Walnut Creek for bomb squad services. Additionally, PPD contracts with the Sheriff’s Office for dispatch services.

**Organization**

The PPD is organized into Operations and Support Services and contains numerous divisions, special teams and programs as described in detail below. The PPD’s 85 sworn police officers serve 72,319 Pittsburg residents in 2018, or approximately 1 sworn officer for every 850 residents.

**Patrol Division**

The PPD Patrol Division is a 24/7 operation with more than 35 officers assigned to one of five patrol shifts. Pittsburg is broken up into five separate beats to provide equal police coverage to the entire city. The Patrol Division is supported by the Traffic Division, which encompasses three officers plus a supervisor, five School Resource Officers assigned to Pittsburg High School and the Junior High Schools located throughout the City, a Community Response Team that focuses on providing outreach services to our homeless population, as well as five Community Service Specialists who assist with parking enforcement, booking of in custody suspects and investigating certain misdemeanor crimes. Each of the five shifts is supervised by a
Sergeant with a Lieutenant, known as a Watch Commander, who oversees all patrol related activity. The Pittsburg Police Department's Patrol Division Statistics are shown in Table 3.6-1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.6-1: Pittsburg Police Department's Patrol Division Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calls for Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Arrests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Arrests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Arrests</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Pittsburg Police Department Annual Report 2019

Traffic Division

The PPD Traffic Unit is comprised of one sergeant, four officers, and one community service specialist who proactively patrol 346 miles of roadway within the City of Pittsburg. The mission of the Traffic Unit is to ensure the safety of our community who use our roadways by enforcing both the California Vehicle Code and the Pittsburg Municipal Code. Additionally, the Traffic Unit investigates all major collisions that occur in the city. The unit is constantly involved in multi-jurisdictional enforcement operations that occur throughout the year, to include the 4th of July Fireworks Event and the Seafood Festival. In 2018 the Pittsburg Police Department received a $100,000 grant from the Office of Traffic Safety (OTS). As a result of this grant, (8) officers were able to receive advanced training on identifying individuals under the influence of alcohol and drugs. The grant also provided funding to conduct (39) separate traffic enforcement operations throughout the year. These operations included DUI checkpoints and saturation patrols, targeted enforcement of problem traffic locations throughout the city, distracted driving enforcement, seatbelt enforcement, pedestrian safety operations and collaborative traffic enforcement with allied agencies. The Pittsburg Police Department Traffic Unit statistics are shown in Table 3.6-2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.6-2: Pittsburg Police Department Traffic Unit Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Collision Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Collisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatal Collisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury Collisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUI Collisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle vs. Pedestrian Collisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Pittsburg Police Department Annual Report 2019

Investigations Division

The Investigation Division is tasked with thoroughly investigating serious crimes. Detectives evaluate and prepare criminal cases for appropriate clearance and submission to a prosecutor. The division is comprised of one lieutenant, one sergeant, twelve detectives, a CSI investigator, a records clerk, a community service specialist and a cold case homicide investigator.

Other Divisions and Teams

The PPD also operates property and evidence, records, code enforcement, and marine unit divisions, maintains crisis negotiation, canine, bike patrol, mental health evaluation, and community response teams, implements a school resource officer program, and has a chaplaincy program. The Code Enforcement Division addresses potential violations of the Pittsburg Municipal Code and their statistics in 2018 are shown in Table 3.6-3.
TABLE 3.6-3: PITTSBURG POLICE DEPARTMENT CODE ENFORCEMENT DIVISION STATISTICS (2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Complaints</th>
<th>Voluntary Compliance</th>
<th>Citations Issued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Nuisance</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeds, Rubbish, Garbage</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Violations</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Code Violations</td>
<td>2,574</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,599</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,454</strong></td>
<td><strong>963</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Pittsburg Police Department Annual Report 2019*

**FBI CRIME STATISTICS**

In 2018, the PPD responded to 80,133 calls for service, which resulted in more than 2,800 arrests. The FBI Uniformed Crime Reporting (UCR) Program began in 1930 and encompasses approximately 14,000 law enforcement agencies nationwide. Participating agencies voluntarily provide crime data to the Department of Justice to generate a standardized and reliable set of crime statistics. The Pittsburg Police Department is committed to providing accurate crime statistics to the DOJ and to our citizens. As a result, in 2017 the Pittsburg Police Department added a full-time Crime Analyst to its staffing. The analyst’s role is to identify, prepare and disseminate statistical trend data for law enforcement, City and public use. By FBI definition, Part I Crime is comprised of the following violent and property crimes: Murder, Rape, Robbery, Aggravated Assault, Burglary, Larceny, Vehicle Theft and Arson. Over the past 20 years, Pittsburg has experienced an overall decrease in total Part I Crimes reported. As shown in Table 3.6-4, the majority of crimes committed in Pittsburg consist of property crimes, have been decreasing since 2016 from 2,000 to 1,699 total crimes. However, in the past five years (2014-2018) the number of violent crimes has increased from 176 in 2014 to 416 in 2018. Several factors must be taken into consideration when looking at crime trends, including: population increases, State law implementation, and crime definition updates. The violent crime trend in Pittsburg over the past 5 years may be a direct result of these factors. Pittsburg specifically experienced an increase in the reporting of sexual assaults after the FBI broadened the definition of rape. That change, along with recent public dialogue on sexual assault crimes and the #MeToo movement, has empowered victims to safely speak out about the violence perpetrated against them.

Crime trends in Pittsburg during the past five years from 2014 to 2018, as reported by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) Criminal Justice Information Services Division, are shown in Table 3.6-4 below.

**TABLE 3.6-4: PITTSBURG CRIME STATISTICS (2014-2018)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crimes (Homicide Rape Robbery Assault)</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Crimes (Burglary Larceny Vehicle Theft Arson)</td>
<td>2,378</td>
<td>2,430</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,795</td>
<td>1,699</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3.7 PARKS AND RECREATION

The City of Pittsburg Recreation Department is responsible for the administration and operation of a diversified, year round recreation program and park maintenance activities.

REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

STATE

Quimby Act

The Quimby Act (California Government Code Section 66477) states that “the legislative body of a city or county may, by ordinance, require the dedication of land or impose a requirement of the payment of fees in lieu thereof, or a combination of both, for park or recreational purposes as a condition to the approval of a tentative or parcel map.” Requirements of the Quimby Act apply only to the acquisition of new parkland and do not apply to the physical development of new park facilities or associated operations and maintenance costs. The Quimby Act seeks to preserve open space needed to develop parkland and recreational facilities; however, the actual development of parks and other recreational facilities is subject to discretionary approval and is evaluated on a case-by-case basis with new residential development.

LOCAL

City of Pittsburg General Plan

The existing Pittsburg General Plan includes the following goals and policies related to parks and recreation:

Open Space, Youth and Recreation Element

GOAL 8-G-1 Develop a high-quality public park system for Pittsburg that provides varied recreational opportunities accessible to all City residents.

GOAL 8-G-2 Provide parks that reflect the diversity of Pittsburg’s natural setting, including creeks and waterways, tree stands, rock outcroppings, and topography.

POLICY 8-P-1 Maintain a neighborhood and community park standard of 5 acres of public parkland per 1,000 residents.

POLICY 8-P-2 Pursue the development of park and recreation facilities within reasonable walking distance of all homes.

POLICY 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.

POLICY 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.

POLICY 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. 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.

POLICY 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.

POLICY 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.

POLICY 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.

POLICY 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.

POLICY 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.

POLICY 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.
POLICY 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.

POLICY 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).

POLICY 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 ongoing 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.

POLICY 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.

POLICY 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.

**Existing Conditions**

**City Parks**
The City’s Parks and Recreation Department manages the maintenance of the City’s park facilities. The Community Development Department is responsible for acquisition and development of park facilities. The primary source of funding for park maintenance comes from the Citywide Landscaping and Lighting Assessment District, developer impact fees, and the General Fund. The City currently maintains a neighborhood and community park standard of five acres per 1,000 residents.

**Community Parks**
Community parks are developed primarily to meet the recreational needs of a large portion of the city. Community parks range in size 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. Neighborhood 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. All of the City’s neighborhood parks are located near collector streets in residential neighborhoods.

**Special Use Parks and Trails**

In addition to City parks, regional trails provide opportunities for hiking, biking, and jogging along open space corridors throughout the region. The Delta De Anza Regional Trail is a paved multiuse hiking, bicycling and equestrian trail currently spanning over 15 miles of the planned 25-mile length. When completed, the Delta De Anza Regional Trail would generally follow the East Bay Municipal Utility District’s corridor and the CCWD’s canal. The trail also connects the cities of Concord, Bay Point, Pittsburg, Antioch, and Oakley and provides access to Contra Loma Regional Park (and Black Diamond Mines Regional Preserve) through Antioch Community Park. The Black Diamond Mines Regional Preserve offers tours of abandoned coal mining tunnels and many miles of hiking trails. The Delta De Anza Regional Trail and the Black Diamond Mines Regional Preserve are under the jurisdiction of the East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD).

The City currently manages approximately 340 acres of developed park space. With an approximate population of 72,000, the City’s parkland totals approximately 4.7 acres of City parkland per 1000 residents (excluding trails and County facilities). The location of parks within the City is shown on Figure 3.7-1. Table 3.3-1 summarizes the City’s park facilities by acreage.

**Table 3.7-1: SUMMARY OF LOCAL PARK FACILITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARK NAME</th>
<th>ACRES</th>
<th>PARK TYPES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8th Street Greenbelt</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambrose Park</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americana Park</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan Park</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Seasons Park</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Addition Park</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Harbor Park</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Park</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Park</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Linear Park</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Anza Park</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Park Plaza</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlands Park</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlands Ranch Park</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsdale Park</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Buckley Square</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Henry Johnson Park</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Lasater Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina Walk Park</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariner Park</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Hills Park</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Hills Park II</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Giacomelli Park</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverview Park</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>CP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Regional and County Parks

On a regional scale, the city is located near several recreational areas and facilities, which includes both water-based, and passive recreational opportunities. The location of regional parks and recreational areas within the Planning Area are shown on Figure 3.7-1. Table 3.7-2 summarizes the local regional facilities by acreage.

#### Table 3.7-2: Summary of Regional Parks and Recreational Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARK NAME - COUNTY PARKS</th>
<th>ACRES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baypoint Regional Shoreline</td>
<td>178.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Diamond Mines Regional Preserve</td>
<td>4,627.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anuta Park</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambrose Park District</td>
<td>8.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diablo Rod and Gun Club</td>
<td>8.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynbrook Park</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** City of Pittsburg; Contra Costa County; Google Maps, 2019.
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3.8 SCHOOLS, LIBRARIES, AND OTHER PUBLIC FACILITIES

Regulatory Framework

State
California Code of Regulations
The California Code of Regulations, Title 5 Education Code, governs all aspects of education within the State.

Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998 (SB 50)
The “Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998,” also known as Senate Bill No. 50 or SB 50 (Chapter 407, Statutes of 1998), governs a school district’s authority to levy school impact fees. This comprehensive legislation, together with the $9.2 billion education bond act approved by the voters in November 1998 known as “Proposition 1A,” reformed methods of school construction financing in California. SB 50 instituted a new school facility program by which school districts can apply for State construction and modernization funds. It imposed limitations on the power of cities and counties to require mitigation of school facilities impacts as a condition of approving new development and provided the authority for school districts to levy fees at three different levels:

- **Level I** fees are the current statutory fees allowed under Education Code 17620. This code section provides the basic authority for school districts to levy a fee against residential and commercial construction for the purpose of funding school construction or reconstruction of facilities. These fees vary by district for residential construction and commercial construction and are increased biannually.

- **Level II** fees are outlined in Government Code Section 65995.5, allowing school districts to impose a higher fee on residential construction if certain conditions are met. These conditions include having a substantial percentage of students on multi-track year-round scheduling, having an assumed debt equal to 15–30% of the district’s bonding capacity (percentage is based on revenue sources for repayment), having at least 20% of the district’s teaching stations housed in relocatable classrooms, and having placed a local bond on the ballot in the past four years which received at least 50% plus one of the votes cast. A Facility Needs Assessment must demonstrate the need for new school facilities for unhoused pupils is attributable to projected enrollment growth from the construction of new residential units over the next five years.

- **Level III** fees are outlined in Government Code Section 65995.7. If State funding becomes unavailable, this code section authorizes a school district that has been approved to collect Level II fees to collect a higher fee on residential construction. This fee is equal to twice the amount of Level II fees. However, if a district eventually receives State funding, this excess fee may be reimbursed to the developers or subtracted from the amount of State funding.

The Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2002 (Prop 47)
This act was approved by California voters in November 2002 and provides for a bond issue of $13.05 billion to fund necessary education facilities to relieve overcrowding and to repair older schools. Funds will be targeted at areas of greatest need and must be spent according to strict accountability measures. Funds will also be used to upgrade and build new classrooms in the California Community Colleges, the California State University, and the University of California in order to provide adequate higher education facilities to accommodate growing student enrollment.
California Department of Education
The California Department of Education (CDE) School Facilities Planning Division (SFPD) prepared a School Site Selection and Approval Guide that provides criteria for locating appropriate school sites in the State of California. School site and size recommendations were changed by the CDE in 2000 to reflect various changes in educational conditions, such as lowering of class sizes and use of advanced technology. The expanded use of school buildings and grounds for community and agency joint use and concern for the safety of the students and staff members also influenced the modification of the CDE recommendations.

Specific recommendations for school size are provided in the School Site Analysis and Development Guide. This document suggests a ratio of 1:2 between buildings and land. CDE is aware that in a number of cases, primarily in urban settings, smaller sites cannot accommodate this ratio. In such cases, the SFPD may approve an amount of acreage less than the recommended gross site size and building-to-ground ratio.

Certain health and safety requirements for school site selection are governed by State regulations and the policies of the SFPD relating to:

- Proximity to airports, high-voltage power transmission lines, railroads, and major roadways;
- Presence of toxic and hazardous substances;
- Hazardous facilities and hazardous air emissions within one-quarter mile;
- Proximity to high-pressure natural gas lines, propane storage facilities, gasoline lines, pressurized sewer lines, or high-pressure water pipelines;
- Noise;
- Results of geological studies or soil analyses; and
- Traffic and school bus safety issues.

LOCAL
City of Pittsburg General Plan
The existing Pittsburg General Plan includes the following goals and policies related to schools:

Open Space, Youth And Recreation Element
GOAL 8-G-10 Ensure that school facilities maintain adequate capacity to provide for current and projected enrollment.

GOAL 8-G-11 Develop land uses, activities and connections surrounding Los Medanos Community College to foster linkages between the campus and the community.

POLICY 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.
POLICY 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.

POLICY 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.

POLICY 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.

POLICY 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.

POLICY 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.

POLICY 8-P-45  Promote use of the educational and cultural resources available at the Pittsburg Library.

**Existing Conditions - Schools**

The City of Pittsburg is served by three School Districts:

- Pittsburg Unified School District;
- Antioch Unified School District;
- Mt. Diablo Unified School District.
Pittsburg Unified School District (PUSD) is a K-12 district that serves the community of Pittsburg, California. The school system is committed to providing an excellent opportunity for all students to learn. PUSD is approximately 50 minutes from downtown San Francisco with a direct line on Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART). Our school community has a close relationship with Los Medanos Community College, which is located in the heart of Pittsburg.

Pittsburg Unified School District serves more than 11,500 students in kindergarten through twelfth grade. The District also provides our community with an outstanding public preschool program and award-winning adult education school (PAEC).

The District Comprises: 8 Elementary Schools, 3 Junior High Schools, 1 Comprehensive High School, and 1 Alternative Education High School, and includes programs for adult education, independent study programs, alternative learning experiences, and early childhood education.

Mount Diablo Unified School District (MDUSD) is a public school district in Contra Costa County that currently operates 29 elementary schools, 9 middle schools, and 5 high schools, with 7 alternative school programs and an adult education program. MDUSD is one of the largest school districts in the state of California. The district has over 36,000 K-12 students, over 20,000 adult education students, and over 3,500 employees, including over 2,000 certificated educators. The district covers 150 square miles, including the cities of Concord and Clayton; as well as most of Pleasant Hill and portions of Walnut Creek, Pittsburg, Lafayette, and Martinez; and unincorporated areas, including Pacheco, Clyde, and Bay Point.

Antioch Unified School District serves approximately 17,000 students in the city of Antioch, California and small portions of the city of Oakley, and the eastern most portions of Pittsburg.

Schools within the Pittsburg Planning Area are shown on Figure 3.7-1.

**Existing Conditions - Library Services**

The 10,000 square foot Vincent A. Davi Memorial Library is the Pittsburg branch of the County Library system. The building at 80 Power Avenue adjacent to the Civic Center is owned by the City but the library is operated by the CCC Library with supplemental funding from the City. The library offers a variety of programming for all ages particularly children and teens. In order to meet the needs of Pittsburg’s large Spanish speaking community, the library houses adult and children’s Spanish language materials, and bilingual staff are on hand. Besides providing a variety of materials in a variety of formats, the library is home to a large cookbook collection due to an endowment from the Vincent A. Davi family. Access to the internet is also available. The Library’s Community Meeting Room managed and maintained by the City is available for rent on an hourly basis.

**Existing Conditions - Other Public Facilities**

**Civic Center**

The Pittsburg Civic Center includes City Hall and the City’s government offices and also serves as the center for several other government functions and offices including: the Pittsburg Superior Court Courthouse, the Pittsburg Police Department, the Pittsburg Library, and the Pittsburg School District offices.

**Pittsburg Community Center (Senior Center)**

The Pittsburg Community Center (Senior Center) is located just off the southwest corner of E. Leland and Harbor Street, directly across from Small World Park and next to Stoneman Village. This 10,500 sq. ft. facility houses many activities ranging from
wellness services, arts and crafts to local and regional excursions. The center has available rental spaces for daily and hourly rentals with a capacity up to 506 people.

References


Figure 3.1-1:

ECCC IRWM REGION

Legend
- Pittsburg City Limits
- Pittsburg Sphere of Influence
- Planning Area
- County Boundary
- Neighboring City
- East Contra Costa County (ECCC)
- Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Region

Figure 3.1-2:
WATER SERVICE AREAS

Legend
- Pittsburg City Limits
- Pittsburg Sphere of Influence
- Planning Area
- Neighboring City

Water Districts
- Contra Costa Water District
- Golden State Water Company-Bay Point
- City of Pittsburg Service Area

Sources: DWR; City of Pittsburg, Contra Costa County. Map date: May 3, 2019.
PARKS AND PUBLIC FACILITIES

Legend

- Pittsburg City Limits
- Pittsburg Sphere of Influence
- Planning Area
- Neighboring City

Public Facilities

- Fire Station
- Police Station
- BART Station
- Public Place
- School
- City Park
- County Park

Sources: City of Pittsburg; Contra Costa County; Google Maps. Map date: June 4, 2019.