

LEAD AGENCY: CITY OF PITTSBURG Civic Center, 65 Civic Avenue

Pittsburg, CA 94565 Telephone: (925) 252-4920 • FAX: (925) 252-4814

CEQA INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

- 1. **Project title:** Old Town Park (General Plan Amendment and Rezoning)
- 2. Lead agency name and address: City of Pittsburg, 65 Civic Avenue, Pittsburg, CA 94565
- 3. Contact person and phone number: Leigha Schmidt, Associate Planner, 925-252-4920
- 4. **Project location:** The subject site is located on the block bounded by East Fifth Street on the north, East Sixth Street on the south, Black Diamond Street on the west and the Old Town Plaza fronting Railroad Avenue in the east in downtown Pittsburg, Contra Costa County. Assessor Parcel Nos. 085-166-018 and 085-166-009.
- 5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** City of Pittsburg, 65 Civic Avenue, Pittsburg, CA 94565
- 6. **General plan designation:** Mixed Use
- 6. **Zoning:** Planned Development (Ordinance No. 06-1273)
- 7. Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)

The proposed project consists of a request for a General Plan amendment from Mixed Use to Park, and re-zoning from PD-1273 (Planned Development, Ordinance 06-1273) District to GQ (Governmental/Quasipublic) District to ensure the ongoing use of the site as a public, open space.

The proposed 1.34-acre site is currently vacant and is surrounded by an approximately six-foot tall chainlink fence with slats along the east property line (facing the Old Town Plaza). The site is covered in dirt and low weeds and does not support any trees. In 2010, the City constructed an approximately 19,500-square foot pedestrian plaza on the eastern part of the block along Railroad Avenue, and installed approximately five-foot wide temporary asphalt sidewalks along the three remaining sides of the subject block. Currently, on-street parallel parking is permitted along East Fifth, East Sixth and Black Diamond streets. The project site, along with the two City blocks located immediately south of the subject site were extensively graded between 2005 and 2007 in preparation for the Black Diamond Redevelopment, a mixed use development consisting of up to 195 residential units and approximately 40,000 square feet of ground floor commercial development along Railroad Avenue. Only one block of the Black Diamond Redevelopment Project (Vidrio on the block directly south of the proposed project

site) was developed in accordance with the approved plans. Development of the southernmost block (Siena Court) was undertaken by a non-profit housing developer, and a mixed use development was completed there in 2011. The subject block remains vacant except for the Old Town Plaza, which was constructed along Railroad Avenue.

The City intends to construct a park on the subject site. A public park is permitted under the current zoning and General Plan land use designation; however, the proposed land use changes described in this initial study are intended to ensure the ongoing use of the site as a public, open space in perpetuity.

The vacant portion of the block is approximately four feet higher in grade than the Old Town Plaza and levels out to about one foot above adjacent grade at Black Diamond Street. The proposed park would include grading, installation of landscaping and pathways, and recreational equipment. The park would include a combination of the passive elements such as a large landscaped area, gardens, benches, seating, decorative lighting and pathways; and, active elements such as a playground, interactive water feature, and bocce ball court. The final design of the park would include low impact design features such as pervious pavers and concrete, landscaped bioretention areas/swales, and low impact plantings to ensure that stormwater is captured and filtered on-site. The proposed project would also include installation of utilities (electrical, water, wastewater), and construction of streetscape improvements around the proposed park including six- to eight-foot wide sidewalks, curbs with bulb outs, gutters, lighting and landscaping and on-street parking along East Fifth, East Sixth and Black Diamond streets. Because the infill site is surrounded by development, the park would tie into existing utilities surrounding the site.

8. Surrounding land uses and setting (briefly describe the project's surroundings):

The project site is located in downtown Pittsburg, just south of the boundary of the New York Landing Historical District (established in 1981). Surrounding land uses include commercial uses to the north and east; high-density, mixed commercial and residential developments to the south; and, a mix of commercial and single-family residential uses to the west.

10. Discretionary approval authority and other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)

Necessary project action and approvals are anticipated to include consideration of the following by the City Council and/or Planning Commission:

- General Plan Amendment from Mixed Use to Park;
- Rezoning from PD-1273 District to GQ District; and
- Award of Contract to construct the Park.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project. Check marks are indicated by the following symbol:						
	Aesthetics		Agriculture and Forest Resources	\checkmark	Air Quality	
	Biological Resources		Cultural Resources		Geology/Soils	
	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	\checkmark	Hazards and Hazardous Materials		Hydrology and Water Quality	
	Land Use/Planning		Mineral Resources		Noise	
	Population/Housing		Public Services		Recreation	
	Transportation/Traffic		Utilities/Service Systems		Mandatory Findings of Significance	
DETE	RMINATION: (To be complete	ed by	the Lead Agency)			
On the	e basis of this initial evaluation	n:				
			COULD NOT have a significar DECLARATION will be prepa		ect on the	
\checkmark	environment, there will not	be a s	project could have a signification in this case larged to by the project propor be prepared.	pecau	se revisions in the	
	I find that the proposed pro an ENVIRONMENTAL IMF		AAY have a significant effect of REPORT is required.	on the	e environment, and	
	I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.					
	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the Page 3 of 47					

May 23, 2014 environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required. Prepared By: Leigha Schmidt, Project Planner Reviewed By: Dana Hoggatt Ayers, Planning Manager Less Than No Potentially Less Than Significant Significant Significant Impact **Impact Impact** with Mitigation Incorporated I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project: a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a V scenic vista? The proposed project would involve a General Plan amendment and zoning change to develop a park on a currently vacant parcel in downtown Pittsburg. The proposed project site is not identified in the Viewshed Analysis as having any importance as a scenic vista or as the site from which to view a scenic vista. Therefore, the project would have no adverse effects on a scenic vista (City of Pittsburg General Plan, Figures 4-1 and 4-2). b) Substantially damage scenic V resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? The proposed project would involve a General Plan amendment and zoning change to develop a park on a currently vacant parcel in downtown Pittsburg. While there are no rock outcroppings in the vicinity of the project site, the proposed park would be developed adjacent to (south of) the New York Landing Historic District (Site Visit, East Contra Costa Habitat Conservation Plan [ECCHCP], Figure 3-3 and City of Pittsburg General Plan, Figure 9-3).

CEQA Initial Study Checklist

Old Town Park General Plan Amendment and Rezoning

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Construction of the park would result in the would not result in the introduction of incorsubstantially damage or conflict with the vision (Project Description and Staff Determination of the public space created by Old Town P successfully integrated into the fabric of doproposed project would therefore have a legentributing buildings to the New York Landau	npatible develous sual character on). Rather, the laza that front owntown Pittsb ess than signifi	opment or struct of the downtow e park would co s Railroad Aver ourg (Project De cant impact on	tures that count commerciant of an explored that leading that leading to the seription). The	uld Il district ttension has e
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				
The proposed project would involve a General Plan amendment and zoning change to develop a park on a currently vacant parcel in downtown Pittsburg. Development of the currently vacant and unimproved land would provide beneficial impacts to the surrounding community in that the underutilized land would be unfenced, landscaped and connected to the surrounding city-scape, signaling increased investment in the area (Project Description and Staff Determination).				
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			Ø	
The proposed project would involve a General Plan amendment and zoning change to develop a park on a currently vacant parcel in downtown Pittsburg. On-site decorative lighting will be included with the development of the park and would be utilized in the evening and at night (Project Description). The potential for spillover lighting from the proposed park onto adjacent commercial uses would not have a significant adverse impact on those uses because those commercial uses are lit from within at night, and installation of lighting at the park and in the commercial corridor would result in more visibility and safety on the roadways and sidewalks around the park (Staff Determination). Furthermore, all development and uses within in the City, whether publicly or privately developed and maintained must comply with performance standards related to lighting; specifically, Pittsburg Municipal Code (PMC) Section 18.82.030 (G) requires that all security lighting be indirect or diffuse and shielded or directed away from residences. Compliance with the municipal code would reduce any potential impacts related to spillover lighting to a level of less than significant.				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in the Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?				V
agricultural use? The proposed project would involve a General Plan amendment and zoning change to develop a park on a currently vacant parcel in downtown Pittsburg. The proposed site is urban infill with development on all sides (Site Visit and Google Earth). There are no agricultural or farmlands on or in the vicinity of the project site (East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan, Figure 2-1 and City of Pittsburg General Plan, Figure 2-2).				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				
See II.a above. There are no properties with Williamson Act contracts on or in the vicinity of the project site (City of Pittsburg General Plan, 9-4).				inity of
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)) or timerland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526)?				
See II.a above. There is no land identified project site (City of Pittsburg General Plan, changes and the development of the park	Figure 2-2); t	herefore, the pr	oposed land	use
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				$\overline{\checkmark}$
See II.a and II.c above.	,			
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				V
See II.a above. There is no land set aside proposed project site; therefore, changes to proposed project would not result in a convertisburg General Plan, Figure 2-2).	o the physical	environment as	ssociated with	the

ie	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				
Marcon M				
assumed under current development regulations therefore, the proposed project would resulation of the BAAQMD 2010 C	ılt in a less tha	n significant im	pact related to	conflict
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or		V		

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
projected air quality violation?				

On June 2, 2010, the BAAQMD's Board of Directors unanimously adopted thresholds of significance to assist local jurisdictions during the review of projects that are subject to CEQA. These thresholds of significance were designed to establish the level at which the BAAQMD believed air pollution emissions would cause significant environmental impacts under CEQA. On March 5, 2012, the Alameda County Superior Court issued a judgment finding that the BAAQMD had failed to comply with CEQA when it adopted the thresholds. The court did not determine whether the thresholds were valid on the merits, but found that the adoption of the thresholds was a project under CEQA. The court issued a writ of mandate ordering the BAAQMD to set aside the thresholds and cease dissemination of them until the BAAQMD had complied with CEQA. The BAAQMD has appealed the Alameda County Superior Court's decision. The appeal is currently pending in the Court of Appeal of the State of California, First Appellate District (Bay Area Air Quality Management District Updated CEQA Guidelines, http://www.baaqmd.gov/Divisions/Planning-and-Research/CEQA-GUIDELINES/Updated-CEQA-Guidelines.aspx, accessed on May 12, 2014).

Although recent court actions have reversed the writ of mandate to set aside the thresholds, the BAAQMD is still not recommending that the 2010 significance thresholds be used as a generally applicable measure of a project's significant air quality impacts. Lead agencies must determine appropriate air quality thresholds of significance based on substantial evidence in the record. Given that the court's judgment did not pertain to the scientific soundness of the significance thresholds contained in the BAAQMD 2010 CEQA Guidelines, and given that these thresholds are supported by substantial evidence, as provided by the BAAQMD in Appendix D of the Air Quality Guidelines, these thresholds are used in this initial study for the evaluation of air quality impacts of the proposed land use change from mixed use to park (Staff Determination).

Section 3, Screening Criteria, provides a conservative indication of whether a proposed project could result in potentially significant air quality impacts and is representative of new development on greenfield sites without any form of mitigation measure taken into consideration (BAAQMD 2010 CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, 3-1). If the Screening Criteria are met by a proposed project, then it is not necessary to perform a detailed air quality assessment of the proposed project's air pollutant emissions. According to Table 3-1, Operational-Related Criteria Air Pollutant and Precursor Screening Level Sizes, the proposed project to develop an approximately 1.34 acre park would fall well under the operational screening criteria for nitrogen oxide (NOX) and greenhouse gases (GHG). In addition, because the proposed in-fill park is only 1.34 acres, it falls well under the 67-acre threshold for

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

construction emissions related to particulate matter (PM10). Although the project would not be expected to violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, compliance with the BAAQMD's Basic Construction Mitigation Measures Recommended for all Proposed Projects as described in Table 8-2 of the BAAQMD 2010 CEQA Air Quality Guidelines would reduce potential construction emissions to a level of less than significant (Project Description).

Air Quality Impact 1: On-site construction activities generated by construction of the park could release fugitive dust that could contribute to a significant environmental effect according to the BAAQMD Guidelines. Incorporation of Air Quality Mitigation Measure 1 described below would reduce these impacts to a level of less than significant.

Air Quality Mitigation 1: Basic Control Measures for All Construction Sites shall be incorporated into the grading permit conditions as follows:

- 1. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.
- 2. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.
- 3. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
- 4. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.
- 5. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Concrete pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
- 6. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
- All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
8. Post a publicly visible sign with the Lead Agency regarding dust comple action within 48 hours. The Air Distriction compliance with applicable regulation	telephone nur aints. This per rict's phone nu	nber and perso son shall respo	n to contact a	corrective
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			V	
The BAAQMD measures several criteria point the atmosphere via chemical reactions of Dioxide (NO2) in sunlight. Emissions of RC as those used in motor vehicles and constrained the use of solvents and cleaners. Emistombustion engines such as those used in Particulate Matter (PM) can be divided into arise primarily from natural processes, such are less than 2.5 microns in diameter and activities. Fuel burned in cars and trucks, produce fine particles. The San Francisco federal standards for ozone and PM 2.5, at (BAAQMD, Air Quality Standards and Attai http://hank.baaqmd.gov/pln/air quality/amk2013).	of reactive organder of reaction equipments of NO2 motor vehicle of several size of the as wind-blower plants, for Bay Area Air End in nonattain ment Status, pient air qual	anic gases (RO ted from combonent, and from a are generated as and constructions. PM 10 actions, firepla asin is in nonal ment of the state.	G) and Nitrogustion enginesarchitectural of principally from tion equipment of the particles of the standard for the particles of the particle	gen s, such coatings om nt. liameter s (PM2.5) urning odstoves state and for PM10
The BAAQMD 2010 CEQA Air Quality Guid were developed such that emissions from a would result in a cumulatively considerable project region is nonattainment. The propolarge-scale, mixed commercial and resider eliminate the operational emissions associ	an individual penet increase sed project in ntial developm	oroject that exce of that criteria p volves a land us ent to a park, w	eed the threshollutant for wase change frowhich would et	nold hich the om a

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
residential and/or commercial project (Projethe proposed development of a 1.34-acre pin the 2010 BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Gonon-attainment (BAAQMD 2010 CEQA Air in III.b above, the City-initiated project wou measures for all projects in order to reduce Description). Therefore, the proposed projet a cumulatively considerable increase of non-attainment.	park would fall uidelines for creating Quality Guide ld incorporate anticipated coect would have	under the Scre riteria pollutant f lines, Table 3-1 basic construct onstruction-rela a less than sig	ening Criteria for which the). In addition, tion mitigation ted emissions gnificant impa	a set forth area in in , as noted s (Project ct related
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			$\overline{\mathbf{V}}$	
Sensitive receptors are defined as facilities (schools, hospitals) or land uses (residential neighborhoods) that include members of the population (children, the elderly, and people with illnesses) that are particularly sensitive to the effects of air pollutants. The BAAQMD recommends identifying all sources of TAC emissions within 1,000 feet of a new source of TAC or a new sensitive receptor. The proposed project includes a land use change from mixed use to open space for purposes of building a park, which is a facility that would be frequented by sensitive receptors (such as children). The BAAQMD recommends identifying all sources of TAC emissions within 1,000 feet of a new source of TAC or a new sensitive receptor; and, has set the health risk and hazards significance threshold at the following: the probability of contracting cancer for the maximally exposed individual (MEI) exceeds 10 in one million and (BAAQMD 2010 CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, 5-3).				
According to the BAAQMD Stationary Sou 2012, there are no stationary sources of ersite (http://www.baaqmd.gov/Divisions/Planand-Methodology.aspx , accessed on Octo emissions, the nearest roadway, Railroad project site, has a projected average daily 10,000 vehicles per day screening threshodeneral Plan, Table 7-3 and BAAQMD 20 the Contra Costa County PM2.5 Concentra Streets, the location of the proposed park million which is far below the 10 in one mill (http://www.baaqmd.gov/Divisions/Planninmethodology.aspx , accessed on October 2	missions withir nning-and-Resber 2, 2013). New York which traffic volume old per BAAQM 10 CEQA Air Cations and Carwould result in g-and-Researd	n 1,000 feet of to search/CEQA-GWith regard to so is approximate of 13,500 in 200 MD screening guality Guidelinater Risks General an expected cate of significance ch/CEQA-GUID	he proposed <u>SUIDELINES/</u> cources of moely 100 feet expended in the suidelines (Pitts es, 5-3). Accordancer risk of 100 ELINES/Tool	project Tools- bile ast of the seeds the sburg ording to surface 1.94 per

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
and development of the park would result i	n a laga than s	Incorporated	-	
of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations project resulting in health impacts.				
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			$\overline{\checkmark}$	
Land uses primarily associated with odorous emissions include waste transfer and recycling stations, wastewater treatment plants, landfills, composting operations, petroleum operations, food and byproduct processes, factories, and agricultural activities, such as livestock operations. The proposed project does not include any of these types of land uses (Project Description). The proposed project includes a land use change from mixed use to open space for purposes of developing a park, which is not expected to be a source of persistent odors (Staff Determination). Construction of the project is temporary and is not expected to cause an odor nuisance. Refuse associated with operation of the proposed project would be disposed of in City-maintained refuse containers, and the park would be maintained by the City's Public Works Department; therefore, no additional project specific mitigation is necessary.				
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would t	he project:			
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			V	
The proposed 1.34-acre in-fill site is located in downtown Pittsburg, and is surrounded by development on the east (Old Town Plaza and commercial beyond), west (commercial and residential), south (commercial) and north sides (commercial). The project site was previously developed with commercial uses and has been extensively graded (Goodle Earth), and it is identified as "Developed/Landscaped" in the adopted East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan (ECCCHCP, Figure 3-3). A visual inspection conducted by Planning staff resulted in no evidence of riparian habitat, sensitive natural community or wetland on-site; therefore, it is unlikely that the infill project site would support any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status, and the proposed project would have a less than				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
significant impact in this area.				
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	· 152			V
There are no water features on the site, which is designated "Developed/Landscaped" in the General Plan; therefore, no riparian habitat or sensitive natural community has been identified in the area (City of Pittsburg General Plan, Figure 9-1 and Table 9-1). Further, the ECCCHCP defines the area as part of the urban development area with no suitable land cover to support a riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community (Figures 3-3 and 9-1). Therefore, the project would have no impact related to riparian habitat or a sensitive natural community.				dentified CCCHCP support re, the
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				V
There are no water features on the project site, which is designated "Developed/Landscaped" in the City of Pittsburg General Plan (Figure 9-1, and Site Visit). Therefore, the project would have no impact on federally protected wetlands as a result of the proposed development (Contra Costa County Watershed Atlas, page 101).				
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? See IV.a above. The project site is located	in downtown	Pittsburg and is	surrounded	☑ urban
development (Google Earth, and Site Visit). Further, the	project site wou	uld not serve	as a

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
wildlife corridor and development of the site sites because does not connect to any othe Plan or in the ECCCHCP as appropriate fo Google Earth). Therefore, the proposed pro movement of any native resident or migrate	er vacant sites r species habi oject would ha	that are identifitat (ECCCHCP ove no impact re	ied in the Ger , Figure 3-3; a	neral	
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				V	
As noted in IV.a above, the site was previously developed and has been extensively graded; there are no trees on the site that would be removed as a result of the project (Google Earth and Site Visit). Further, the proposed project would have no impact related to the adopted ECCHCP because the project site is identified as Developed/Landscaped (Figure 9-1).					
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				V	
See IV.e above.			1		
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project:					
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in '15064.5?				$\overline{\checkmark}$	
The project site is currently vacant with no extant buildings, structures or foundations; therefore, the proposed project will have no impact related to historic resources (Google Earth and Site Visit).					
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to '15064.5?					

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
The proposed project site is flat and has be any of the five recorded archeological reso Earth; Site Visit; and, Pittsburg General Platsues, 178 and Figure 8-2). Although the resources in the project area, the Pittsburg Planning Issues Report identifies the entire State Route 4 as a potentially archeological Existing Conditions and Planning Issues, 1 archeological resources are found during contains policies to halt construction imme to retain a professional archeologist to dev program (City of Pittsburg General Plan, Posupported by federal regulations set forth in 800.6 (c)(6). In accordance with federal law during construction, work would be halted (SHPO) would be consulted, and implement based upon the comments of the SHPO. Viplace, the potential impacts associated with additional project specific mitigation is necession.	urce sites ider an Update: Exite are no know General Plan Planning Are ally sensitive a 79 and Figure construction of diately, conducted No. 9-P-2 of Title 36 of the y, if archeologimmediately, anting actions with these start project would recomplete to the project would recomplete to the project would recomplete to the project would recomplete recomplete to the project would recomplete recomp	ntified in the City sting Conditions on recorded a Update: Existing a extending from rea (Pittsburg Ge 8-2). In the unlet the park, the Pot an archeologic mitigation plate Code of Federical resources we state Historic I would be incorported.	y of Pittsburg is and Plannir archeological in general Plan Uikely event the ittsburg General investigation and monitor. These policies are found or preservation or dregulation and regulation and regulation.	and and the to Jpdate: at the to Jpdate: at the to Jpdate: at the to Jpdate at the ton and
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			\square	
As noted in V.b above, there are no known or recorded paleontological or unique geologic resources in the vicinity of the project site, making it highly unlikely that development of the site would result in the discovery of paleontological or unique geologic features (City of Pittsburg General Plan, Chapter 9). However, as noted above, in the unlikely event that paleontological or unique geologic resources are uncovered on-site, federal law and City policy contain provisions to halt construction immediately, conduct an archeological investigation and to retain a professional archeologist to develop a resource mitigation plan and monitoring program (City of Pittsburg General Plan, Policy No. 9-P-40 and 9-P-41 and Title 36 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 800.6 (c)(6)). Therefore, no project specific mitigation is necessary.				
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			$\overline{\checkmark}$	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
As noted in sections V.b and c above, there are no known or recorded archeological sites in the vicinity of the project site, and the site is flat and has been previously disturbed (City of Pittsburg General Plan, Chapter 9; Google Earth; and, Site Visit). In the unlikely event that human remains including those interred outside of formal cemeteries are uncovered on-site, federal law and city policy include provisions to halt construction immediately, conduct an archeological investigation and to retain a professional archeologist to develop a resource mitigation plan and monitoring program (City of Pittsburg General Plan, Policy No. 9-P-40 and 9-P-41 and Title 36 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 800.6 (c)(6)). The project would also comply with state law (California Health and Safety Code Section 7505.5 and Public Resources Code Section 5097.98) to cease construction activities immediately and halt all activity until the County Coroner determines the origin and disposition of the remains and appropriate consultation and treatment are conducted. With these policies and regulations in place, the potential impacts associated with the project would be less than significant, and no additional project specific mitigation measures are warranted.				
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?			V	
There are no Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones located in the City of Pittsburg; however the project site is located within a seismically active region. See VI.a.ii below for further discussion on this topic in general (California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones, http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/ap/affected.htm , accessed on October 2, 2013).				
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			V	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
As noted above, the project site is located within a seismically active region. The nearest active faults are the Clayton-Greenville fault and the Concord-Green Valley fault, located approximately three and six miles from Pittsburg city limits, respectively (City of Pittsburg General Plan, Figure 10-2 and Table 10-1). While there are no known faults passing through the site, an earthquake of moderate to high magnitude generated within the San Francisco Bay Region could cause considerable ground shaking within Pittsburg (California Department of Conservation, Earthquake Shaking Potential Map, http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/psha/Pages/index.aspx , accessed May 1, 2013). The proposed project involves a land use change from mixed use to open space to support development of a park (Project Description). While there may be minor structures constructed to support park programming (e.g., shed to house bocce ball equipment, arbor or other shade-giving structures), it is unlikely that any significant impacts from ground shaking would occur as a result of the development within the proposed park. However, prior to construction of any structures in the park, the proposed structures would be reviewed for compliance with applicable, current Uniform Building Code (UBC) requirements intended to provide a sufficient level of seismic safety to reduce any potential hazards to a level of less than significant. With these standard requirements, regulations and procedures in place, no additional project specific mitigation is deemed necessary.				
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				
According to the General Plan, the proposed project site is located in the flatland area of Pittsburg and is underlain by alluvial fan and terrace deposits that have a low liquefaction potential (ABAG Liquefaction Hazard Map for Pittsburg, http://www.abag.ca.gov/cgibin/pickmapliq.pl , accessed on October 2, 2013, and City of Pittsburg General Plan 10-2). The proposed project involves a land use change from mixed use to open space to support development of a park (Project Description). While there may be minor structures constructed to support park programming (e.g., shed to house bocce ball equipment, arbor or other shade-giving structures), it is unlikely that any significant impacts related to ground failure including liquefaction would occur as a result of the development of the proposed park.				
iv) Landslides?				V
The project site is flat and is not located in	an area ident	ified as suscept	tible to landsli	des;

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
therefore, it will have no impact related to la 1).	andslides (City	of Pittsburg G	eneral Plan, F	igure 10-
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			$\overline{\checkmark}$	
The proposed project involves a land use of developing a public park. Construction of which could subject exposed soils to erosid exceed the one-acre threshold that triggers System (NPDES) permit requirement to preprevention plan (SWPPP) (Pittsburg Munic NPDES requirements and the Pittsburg Munic NPDES requirements and the SWPPP and would be incorporated into the SWPPP and Upon completion of the park, erosion poter would be covered by landscaping, pathway equipment (Project Description). Therefore would be less than significant.	of the proposed on by water or on by water or on the National epare and imperioral Code chaunicipal Code, d implemented intial would be as, bark or other	d park would red wind. The disturbing policy wind a storm peter 15.88). In a appropriate erous during site grallow because aller ground cover	quire grading arbance footpoor arge Elimination water pollution compliance water control rading and control ading and control and recreating areas and recreating and recreating and recreating areas are areas and recreating areas are areas and recreating and recreating areas are areas are areas are areas areas are are areas are areas are areas are areas are areas are areas are are areas are areas are areas are areas are areas are areas are are areas are areas are areas are areas are areas are areas are areas are are are are areas are are are areas are are areas are areas are are areas are are areas are	activity, rint would ion on with the measures astruction. eas ional
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			V	
As noted above, the project site is generally flat, surrounded by development, and is not located within a potential liquefaction zone nor is it located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable (ABAG Liquefaction Hazard Map for Pittsburg, http://www.abag.ca.gov/cgi-bin/pickmapliq.pl , accessed on October 2, 2013, and City of Pittsburg General Plan, 10-2). The proposed project involves a land use change from mixed use to open space to support development of a park (Project Description). While there may be minor structures constructed to support park programming (e.g., shed to house bocce ball equipment, arbor or other shade-giving structures), it is unlikely that any significant impacts related to geologic instability would occur as a result of the development of the proposed park.				
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform		. 🗆	V	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				
See VI.c above.				
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				
The proposed project would not involve the wastewater disposal systems; therefore, the	e installation o e project wou	f septic tanks or ld have no impa	alternative ct in this area	1.
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:			70	
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			V	
The BAAQMD has developed thresholds of significance and methodologies for assessing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions impacts in its CEQA Air Quality Guidelines (2010). According to the BAAQMD, the significance thresholds are designed to enable the Bay Area to meet its emissions reduction goals to comply with California Assembly Bill (AB) 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. As described in Air Quality Section III.b above, although the BAAQMD CEQA thresholds are effectively set aside pursuant to a legal				

According to the BAAQMD, the significance thresholds are designed to enable the Bay Area to meet its emissions reduction goals to comply with California Assembly Bill (AB) 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. As described in Air Quality Section III.b above, although the BAAQMD CEQA thresholds are effectively set aside pursuant to a legal challenge, the thresholds have been used to evaluate the potential impacts of this project because they are supported by substantial evidence and because they represent the best information available to measure potential impacts related to Air Quality and GHG.

The BAAQMD 2010 CEQA Air Quality Guidelines recommend quantifying and reporting GHC.

The BAAQMD 2010 CEQA Air Quality Guidelines recommend quantifying and reporting GHG emissions from construction activities; however construction-related emissions thresholds are not provided. With regard to ongoing operational emissions, the BAAQMD sets two different thresholds against which the project can be measured to determine significance. The thresholds include an absolute threshold of 1,100 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents per year (MTCO2e/yr) or an efficiency standard of 4.6 MTCO2e/SP/year, where SP refers to service persons (residents plus employees) associated with the proposed project. CO2e refers to carbon dioxide equivalents, which standardize the various contributions of different

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

greenhouse gases (e.g., methane, nitrous oxide, and sulfur hexafluoride) to global warming based on their global warming potentials as compared to carbon dioxide (CO2) (BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, 2-4). A third option suggested by the BAAQMD, which is compliance with a qualified GHG reduction strategy, was disregarded as there is currently no qualified strategy applicable to the proposed project.

As described in Section III.b above, the Air Quality Guidelines contain Screening Criteria that provide a conservative indication of whether a proposed project could result in potentially significant GHG-related impacts and is representative of new development on greenfield sites without any form of mitigation measure taken into consideration (BAAQMD 2010 CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, 3-1). If the Screening Criteria are met by a proposed project, then it is not necessary to perform a detailed air quality assessment of the proposed project's air pollutant emissions. According to Table 3-1, Operational-Related Criteria Air Pollutant and Precursor Screening Level Sizes, the proposed project to develop an approximately 1.34-acre park would fall well under the operational screening criteria for nitrogen oxide (NOX), greenhouse gases (GHG). In addition, because the proposed in-fill park is only 1.34 acres, it falls well under the 67-acre threshold for construction emissions related to particulate matter (PM10).

Following the Guidelines' recommendations for quantifying and reporting GHG emissions, the City calculated emissions for the proposed land use change and park development project using URBEMIS2007 input files and the BAAQMD Greenhouse Gas Model (BGM), which models GHG emissions based on the URBEMIS2007 input files. Construction of the park is assumed to occur over the course of three summer months, with all other assumptions following the default settings provided in the URBEMIS2007 program. The estimated GHG emissions associated with construction of the proposed project total approximately 3,544.33 pounds per day of CO2; however, these emissions would be reduced by the implementation of Basic Construction Mitigation Measures Recommended for all Proposed Project as described in the project description (City of Pittsburg, Estimates Operational GHG Emissions for Proposed Park, URBEMIS2007 and BAAQMD Greenhouse Gas Model (BGM), assessed on October 7, 2013).

Operational GHG direct and indirect emissions were calculated using BGM using default assumptions. Direct emissions of GHGs emitted from operation of the proposed project were estimated at 2.77 tons per year (primarily attributed to transportation and water/wastewater use), which are well under the significance threshold of 1,100 tons per year (City of Pittsburg, Estimates Operational GHG Emissions for Proposed Park, URBEMIS2007 and BAAQMD Greenhouse Gas Model (BGM), assessed on October 7, 2013). Thus, the estimated direct and indirect operational GHG emissions for the proposed project would not exceed the

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
BAAQMD CEQA thresholds established fo therefore, have a less than significant impa	r new develop act on GHG en	ments. The pronissions.	posed projec	:t,
b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			V	
The BAAQMD GHG significance thresholds were designed to ensure compliance with AB 32, the State's GHG reduction legislation. Therefore, if a proposed project's emissions are below the significance threshold, it can be assumed to comply with AB 32 within the BAAQMD jurisdiction. As discussed in Section VII.a above, the proposed land use change to facilitate development of a park would fall well under the significance threshold and would therefore result in a less than significant impact related to GHG. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict the BAAQMD's effort to comply with AB 32.				
VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				
The proposed project involves a land use change from mixed use to open space to support development of a park (Project Description). While there may be minor structures constructed to support park programming (e.g., shed to house bocce ball equipment, arbor or other shade-giving structures), it is unlikely that any materials used during construction of the park or any recreational equipment would result in a significant hazard to the public or environment. Further, operation of the proposed park would not involve the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials (Project Description). Therefore, impacts related to routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials are expected to be less than significant.				
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release		V		

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
of hazardous materials into the environment?				

See VIII.a above related to operational conditions of the park not resulting in a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

The site was previously developed with commercial structures including a gas station on the northeast corner of the block (site of the current Old Town Plaza) that may have resulted in hazardous waste byproducts (Treadwell & Rollo, Phase II Environmental Site Assessment, Black Diamond Redevelopment Project, April 20, 2006, Table 1 and Figure 2). In order to determine if the historic use of the property could result in hazardous, unhealthy or unsafe conditions for construction workers, nearby residents and future park users, a Subsurface Environmental Investigation and Site Mitigation Plan (SMP) were prepared for the proposed project by Langan Treadwell Rollo on April 11, 2014.

The results of the environmental investigation indicate that low levels of petroleum hydrocarbons, Organochlorine pesticides (OCPs), pesticides, Polynuclear Aromatics Hydrocarbons (PAHs), lead and arsenic exist that are above current Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) Direct Exposure Soil Environmental Screening Levels (ESLs) for residential land use. According to the study, contaminants were found at three discreet sample locations at depths between one foot and two and one-half feet (Langan Treadwell Rollo, April 11, 2014, 9). Removal of the affected soil from these three locations, as is planned for the proposed project, would significantly reduce the potential impact of human health risks associated with the existing contaminants (Langan Treadwell Rollo, April 11, 2014, 9). However, there remains the potential for human health risk during site development; therefore, the report contains recommendations for mitigative actions as described in Hazards & Hazardous Materials Mitigation Measure 1 below.

Hazards & Hazardous Materials Impact 1: The results of the environmental investigation indicate that low levels of petroleum hydrocarbons, OCPs, pesticides, PAHs, lead and arsenic above ESLs and other metals are present at the site, resulting in potential health and safety issues related to construction activities at the site.

Hazards & Hazardous Materials Mitigation Measure 1: The following requirements shall be included as conditions of approval on the grading permit for construction of the proposed park, and shall be implemented prior to and during construction activities.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
1. Develop and implement a Health and Safety Plan, prepared by a certified industrial hygienist (CIH). The HASP shall provide field personnel with an understanding of the potential chemical and physical hazards at the site, provide procedures for entering the project site, provide Health & Safety procedures, and emergency response to hazards procedures should they occur. All workers shall read and adhere to the procedures established in the HASP, and a copy of the plan shall be kept at the site and must be reviewed and updated, as necessary.					
A site Health and Safety Officer (HA times during excavation work to ensemble.)	ASO) identified sure that all H	d in the HASP s &S measures a	hall be on site re implement	e at all ed.	
 The following measures shall be implemented at the site to ensure that the general public is protected during construction and grading activities: 				neral	
 The site shall be fenced; Exposed soil at the construction site shall be watered at least twice a day to prevent dust migration; Soil stockpiles shall be covered; Water shall be misted or sprayed during the loading of soil into the trucks for off haul; 					
 Trucks transporting contamicovering; The wheels of trucks leaving streets; 					
 Public streets shall be swept daily if soil is visible, and excavation and loading activities shall be suspended if winds exceed 20 miles per hour; and, The fence shall be posted with requirements of the sage drinking water and toxic enforcement act (Proposition 65). 					
With implementation of the mitigation measure described above, the potential health and safety issues will be reduced to a level of less than significant.					
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?					

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
See VIII.a and b above. The proposed project is located within one-quarter mile of the Marina Vista Elementary School (Google Map, and Site Visit). However, the site is currently vacant and does not involve any demolition activities or proposed long-term uses that would create a significant hazard to the public or environment through the release of hazardous materials into the environment (Project Description).				acant create a
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?			V	
See VIII.b above. The project site is not listed on the Spills, Leaks, Investigations, and Cleanup Sites list (Pittsburg General Plan Update: Existing Conditions and Planning Issues, Tables 13-6 and 13-7). Nor is the project site included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (California Department of Toxic Substances Control Map Locator, www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/ , accessed on October 3, 2013). Although the site was previously developed with uses that may have resulted in hazardous waste byproducts, the site was the subject of reports and remediation and it is not listed on any known hazardous materials databases; therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.				
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				V
The project site is not located within an airport land use plan nor is it located within two miles of an airport; therefore, it would have no impact (Contra Costa County Airports, http://www.co.contra-costa.ca.us/depart/pw/airport/ , accessed on October 3, 2013).				
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in				V

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				
The project site is not located within an airport land use plan nor is it located within two miles of an airport; therefore, it would have no impact (Contra Costa County Airports, http://www.co.contra-costa.ca.us/depart/pw/airport/ , accessed on October 3, 2013).				o miles
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				V
The City of Pittsburg Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) was last updated in 2005 (Resolution No. 05-10223). The EOP outlines procedures for educating the public about emergency preparedness and also establishes procedures for responding to emergency situations, including management of communication systems, provision of medical assistance, and maintenance of local financing structures and government leadership roles in the aftermath of a significant emergency event. The proposed project would not modify any provision of the EOP. Further, no existing or planned emergency shelter or evacuation facilities would be affected by the proposed project (Google Earth and Project Description). Therefore, there would be no impact with regard to the emergency evacuation or response plan.				
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?			I	
The proposed project site is an infill site and is surrounded by development (Google Earth). Further, the site is not located in close proximity to large open spaces where wildland fires would likely occur (City of Pittsburg General Plan, 11-17). In addition, the project site is located within the 1.5-mile response radius for fire services (General Plan Figure 11-2); therefore, there is a less than significant impact related to wildland fires, and no project specific mitigation is necessary.				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				
The greatest potential sources of surface of development would be erosion during the construction. Pursuant to NPDES requirem Best Management Practices to control erosimplemented as discussed in Section VI.b. The various impervious sections of the parsite, pathways and an extension of the exisin a minor increase of impervious area over Description). The majority of the site would methods including swales, buffalo grass are incorporated into the park design to retain exceed the current rate at which site runoff provision C.3 of the Contra Costa County of Description). The retention and slow release sediment to settle in the detention basins at Therefore, the site runoff would not exceed considered less than significant.	construction places on-site for nents, a SWPF sion from the sabove. The site would in sting plaza; the rand above the remain pervious part and release sife is discharged municipal storms of water would not be disconding the disconding the remain storms.	hase of the proj llowing the com PP, including co site would be de aclude sidewalk ese new, paved he existing cond ous and various avers and paver tormwater at a r l into receiving valud allow polluta charged into the	ect and urbar apletion of portrol measure eveloped and surfaces would be retained to the permit (Project ants, especial e receiving waters, as receiving waters, as receiving waters, waters, as receiving waters, especial e receiving waters, waters, as receiving waters, especial e receiving waters, waters, waters, especial e receiving waters, especial expecial expecial expecial experiments.	the park uld result esign e not quired by ect lly aters.
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				
substantially contribute to the recharge of	The proposed project site is a vacant infill site located in a developed area that does not substantially contribute to the recharge of groundwater supplies, which are taken from			

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
groundwater wells at Dover and Frontage rand Planning Issues, 208; City of Pittsburg the proposed project would have a less that groundwater supplies.	2010 Water S	System Master F	Plan, 2-1). Th	nditions erefore
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				
There are no streams or rivers on or immediately adjacent to the boundaries of the project site (City of Pittsburg General Plan, Figure 2-2). The infill site is substantially surrounded by development (Google Earth and Site Visit). In addition, the proposed project would be covered under a SWPPP and operate with low-impact design attributes intended to retain and treat stormwater run-off from the site during and post-construction (Project Description). Therefore, development of the project site as proposed would not substantially change existing drainage patterns or alter existing rivers or streams on site or in the vicinity resulting in substantial erosion.				
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?			\square	
See IX. c above.				
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	,		V	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
See IX.a and c above.				
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			V	
See IX.a above.				
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				V
The proposed project involves a land use change from mixed use to park for purposes of constructing a public park and does not include a housing component; therefore, there would be no impact (Project Description).				
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				V
See IX.g above.				
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				V
There are no levees or dams located upstream of the project site with the potential to inundate the site as the result of failure, resulting in no impact (Bay Area Dam Failure Inundation Maps, Association of Bay Area Governments, http://www.abag.ca.gov/bayarea/eqmaps/damfailure/dfpickc.html , accessed on October 3, 2013).				
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			V	
The project site is located less than one-quarter of a mile from Suisun Bay where there is only a slight possibility of small events (Pittsburg General Plan Update: Existing Conditions and Planning Issues, 285). In addition, the project site is flat and generally surrounded by				

	Significant Impact	Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Significant Impact	Impact	
development and would therefore not be su Existing Conditions and Planning Issues, 25 than significant impact related to seiche or	85). Therefore	e, the project wo	General Plan U Bould result in a	Jpdate: a less	
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:					
a) Physically divide an established community?				\square	
The proposed project includes a land use change from mixed use to open space for purposes of constructing a public park on a currently vacant, fenced, 1.34-acre infill lot (Google Earth and Project Description). The proposed project would result in no impact related to physically dividing an established community. Rather than divide the community, a public park is intended to bring together the residential and commercial community of downtown Pittsburg and is therefore likely to result in positive impacts related to community development (Staff Determination).				Earth nysically staburg	
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?					
The project site has a General Plan land use designation of <i>Mixed Use</i> , which is intended to provide sites for mixed high-density residential and commercial development to support a walkable and lively downtown atmosphere. The site is located within the downtown Commercial Core where policies call for a concentration of retail and neighborhood commercial establishments (5-P-3), mixed-use developments to increase around-the-clock activity (5-P-4), and the development and promotion of cultural activities and other public facilities to support community and cultural development (5-P-5). Public parks are a permitted use in the Mixed Use land use designation and within the CP (Pedestrian Commercial) District in which the site is located; therefore, the proposed project would be permitted and is deemed compatible with the surrounding area. While the proposed land use changes and development					

would result in a less than significant impact because they do not conflict with applicable land use plans, the proposed land use change is being undertaken to ensure the continued public

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
use of the land for civic and cultural purpos	ses in perpetui	ty (Project Desc	cription).	
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				$\overline{\checkmark}$
See IV.e above.				
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project:	-			
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				V
There are no known mineral resources or deposits identified in the vicinity of the project site; therefore, the proposed project would have no impact (Pittsburg General Plan Update: Existing Conditions and Planning Issues, Figure 12-3).				
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				V
There are no known mineral resources or deposits identified in the vicinity of the project site; therefore, the proposed project would have no impact (Pittsburg General Plan Update: Existing Conditions and Planning Issues, Figure 12-3).				
XII. NOISE – Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards			V	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
of other agencies?				
Noise levels are typically described in terms of decibels. A decibel (dB) is a unit of measurement which indicates the relative amplitude of a sound. The zero on the decibel scale is based on the lowest sound level that the healthy, unimpaired human ear can detect. Sound levels in decibels are calculated on a logarithmic basis. An increase of 10 decibels represents a tenfold increase in acoustic energy, while 20 decibels is 100 times more intense, 30 decibels is 1,000 times more intense, and so on. There is a relationship between the subjective noisiness or loudness of a sound and its decibel level, and each 10-decibel increase in sound level is perceived as approximately a doubling of loudness over a fairly wide range of intensities.				
There are several methods of characterizing sound. The most common in California is the A-Weighted Sound Level (dB(A)), which gives greater weight to frequencies of sound to which the human ear is most sensitive. According to the City of Pittsburg General Plan Noise Element, noise levels in exterior use areas used for parks and playgrounds are considered normally acceptable if noise levels remain at 67 dB(A) or less, normally unacceptable if noise levels range from 67 to 72 dB(A), and clearly unacceptable if noise levels exceed 72 dB(A) (City of Pittsburg General Plan, Figure 12-3).				o which e dered e if noise
The proposed project consists of a General Plan amendment and rezoning from Mixed Use to Open Space for purposes of constructing a public park. The proposed park would be located on a vacant 1.34-acre parcel approximately 100 feet from Railroad Avenue (Google Earth). According to General Plan Figure 12-2, the projected noise contours on Railroad Avenue north of East Tenth Street would reach up to 60 dB, which is within the normally acceptable range for parks and playgrounds; therefore, the proposed project would not result in the exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of City of Pittsburg established standards.				
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			V	
The proposed project involves a land use change from Mixed Use to Open Space for purposes of developing a public park. The site is surrounding by a mix of commercial and high density residential development that would not expose future users of the park to excessive				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
groundbourne vibration or noise (Site Visit and Project Description). The proposed project is not expected to produce excessive construction-related groundborn vibration or noise that is typically caused by blasting, pile driving, demolition and drilling and excavation. The primary and most intensive vibration source associated with the developme of the project would be the use of heavy construction equipment during grading operations (Conversation with Richard Abono, City of Pittsburg Senior Civil Engineer, October 4, 2013) Grading activity would occur approximately 60 feet from noise-sensitive residential uses (mramily residential uses along East Sixth Street and single family development along Black Diamond Street (Google Earth). Construction of the project would involve the temporary use construction equipment, such as excavators, loaders, haulers and cranes, none of which are considered "impact devices " (Conversation with Richard Abono, City of Pittsburg Senior Citengineer, October 4, 2013, and Construction Noise Handbook, U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/construction noise/handbook/handbook/9.cfm , accessed on October 4, 2013). There could also be some very limited jackhammering of asphalt and concrete on existing sidewalks and near utility boxes that would involve impact devices; however, all of the activity would be conducted in accordance with General Plan policies and municipal code requirements to limit construction activity to certain hours to averany significant, temporary construction-related noise increases, and therefore, no additional project-specific mitigation is warranted (Conversation with Richard Abono, City of Pittsburg Senior Civil Engineer, October 4, 2013; Pittsburg Municipal Code section 9.44.010 (J); and, City of Pittsburg General Plan Policy 12-P-9).				and elopment ations 2013). Sees (multislack ary use of nich are nior Civil g of mpact Plan s to avoid ditional sburg
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			V	
The proposed project consists of a General Open Space for purposes of constructing a ambient noise levels in the area over what activity; however, the increase would be midowntown commercial core (Staff Determinincrease in noise levels above the existing significant.	a public park the currently existed inor considering tation). Thereton	nat would result is, due to increa ng that the proje fore, the propos	in an increas ased pedestria ect is surround sed project's r	se in an ded by a

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				
See XII.b and c above.				
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				V
The project site is not located within an airpof an airport; therefore, it would have no im costa.ca.us/depart/pw/airport/, accessed or	pact (<u>http://wv</u>	ww.co.contra-	ated within tw	o miles
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				V
The project site is not located within an air of an airport; therefore, it would have no im costa.ca.us/depart/pw/airport/ accessed or	npact (<u>http://w</u> v	ww.co.contra-	ated within tw	o miles
XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				V

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
The proposed project consists of a General Open Space for purposes of constructing a Because it does not contain a residential coby development, construction of the proposerelated to inducement of population growth	a public park fo omponent and sed park would	or use by the co I the infill park is d not be expect	mmunity at la s already surr ed to have an	irge. ounded
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				V
There are no residential uses that would be site; therefore, the project would not result elsewhere (Google Earth).	e displaced as in the need fo	a result of con r construction o	struction on th f replacemen	ne project t housing
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				
See XII.b above.	al .			
XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:			-) -
a. Fire protection?			$\overline{\checkmark}$	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
The proposed project is located within the 1.5-mile response radii of the newly constructed Fire Station 84 located at 1903 Railroad Avenue (City of Pittsburg General Plan, Figure 11-2). The proposed project consists of a General Plan amendment and rezoning from Mixed Use to Open Space for purposes of constructing a public park for use by the community at large. It would not be expected to cause an increase in response times and would not significantly impact acceptable service ratios for the surrounding fire stations (Staff Determination).				
b. Police protection?				
The proposed project consists of a General Plan amendment and rezoning from Mixed Use to Open Space for purposes of constructing a public park for use by the community at large. The proposed project site is within the jurisdiction of the Pittsburg Police Department and will result in a need for increased police protection above current demand due to the added human presence at the currently vacant site; however, the proposed project would incorporate crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) principles in that the park would be designed to be seen by all streets (Staff Determination). Therefore, the proposed park would not be expected to have substantial adverse effects related to police services.				
c. Schools?				V
The proposed project consists of a General Plan amendment and rezoning from Mixed Use to Open Space for purposes of constructing a public park for use by the community at large. School aged children and families will benefit from the proposed park, but development of the park would have no impact related to school services or facilities.				
d. Parks?			V	
The proposed project consists of a General Plan amendment and rezoning from Mixed Use to Open Space for purposes of constructing a public park for use by the community at large thereby increasing the park acreage in the City. Maintenance of the park would fall under the responsibility of the Public Works Department, which has participated in the planning and design process to ensure that the park design and facilities can be easily and efficiently maintained.				
e. Other public facilities?				$\overline{\checkmark}$

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
There are no other foreseeable government project; therefore, there would be no impact				
XV. RECREATION				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			V	
The proposed project consists of a General Plan amendment and rezoning from Mixed Use to Open Space for purposes of constructing a public park for use by the community at large, thereby increasing the park acreage in the City and reducing the demand placed on other park and recreational facilities in the City. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact related to deterioration of other park facilities in the City.				
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			V	
The proposed project consists of a General Open Space for purposes of constructing a a currently vacant 1.34-acre parcel at the h Description). The proposed park site is infliconstruction of the park would likely not restraction, installation of the proposed park would be pr	a public park w neart of the do Il and could tie sult an adverse	vith various recr wntown comme e into existing ut e physical effec	eational ame rcial core (Pr ility lines; the t on the envir	nities on oject refore, onment.
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would the project:				
a) Exceed the capacity of the existing circulation system, based on an applicable measure of effectiveness (as designated in a general plan policy.			V	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
ordinance, etc.), taking into account all relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?				
The proposed project consists of a land us for development of a public park. Accordin Trip Generation (7 th Edition), the proposed five new vehicle trips daily. Trip generation proposed park is quite small at 1.34 acres; small (ITE Trip Generation, 631). Further, surrounding sidewalk and bicycle network to the site; therefore, the proposed project existing circulation system.	g to the Institu development for City Parks therefore, the the infill projec and would not	te of Transporta is expected to g is is based on a resultant trip g t site would be inhibit mass tra	ation Enginee generate no n creage, and the eneration rate connected to ansit access a	rs (ITE) nore than he is also the adjacent
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			V	
As discussed in Section XVI.a above, the proposed infill project would result in a minor increase of vehicle trips to the site and would be fully connected to the surrounding network of sidewalks (Project Description); therefore, a conflict with the applicable congestion management plan would not occur, and this impact is less than significant.				
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				V
The project site is not located within an airport land use plan nor is it located within two miles of an airport; therefore, it would have no impact (http://www.co.contracosta.ca.us/depart/pw/airport/ , accessed May 2, 2013).				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			V	
The proposed project consists of a land use for development of a public park. The Citythe City's design standards (for sidewalks at the Uniform Fire Code, if applicable. Requiprevent hazardous design features and we a less than significant impact related to has Determination).	initiated project and walkways red complianc ould ensure ad	ct would be requenced as well as the see with these exequate and safe	uired to comp design standa isting standar e access, res	ly with ards in ds would ulting in
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				
The proposed project consists of a land use change from Mixed Use to Open Space to allow for development of a public park. The park would be visible and accessible from all surrounding streets, and the park would be reviewed for compliance with all applicable building, fire, and safety codes and would be subject to review and approval by the City of Pittsburg Engineering and Public Works departments, and the CCCFPD to ensure that the proposed circulation system around project site does not inhibit emergency access (Project Description and Staff Determination). Any temporary road closures due to construction of the park would be subject to a traffic control plan that would be reviewed and approved the City's Engineering Department as part of the standard engineering permit review process; therefore, there would be a less than significant impact related to this criterion.				e ity of at the Project n of the ne City's
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?			V	
The proposed project consists of a land use change from Mixed Use to Open Space to allow for development of a public park in the downtown commercial core. There are three Tri-Delta Transit lines that pass in the vicinity of the project: Route 387 on weekdays and Routes 392 and 394 on weekends and holidays (Tri-Delta Transit System Map, http://www.trideltatransit.com/local_bus.aspx , accessed on October 4, 2013). Development of the proposed project would not result in changes to the surrounding roadways and would therefore not conflict with existing bus transit (Project Description). Rather, the proposed				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
project would provide beneficial impacts re result in the construction of sidewalks and Further, the proposed project does not con which does not show bicycle lanes in the v Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, Fehr and Pedestrian Plan,	streetscape in oflict with the a icinity of the p	nprovements (P dopted Bicycle roject site (Cont	roject Descrip and Pedestria tra Costa Cou	otion). an Plan, ıntywide
XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			\square	
Wastewater is conveyed to and treated at the Delta Diablo Sanitation District (DDSD) wastewater treatment plant, located north of the Pittsburg-Antioch Highway in the City of Antioch (City of Pittsburg General Plan, 11-9). The proposed project consists of a land use change from Mixed Use to Open Space to allow for development of a public park. Wastewater from the proposed project would include minor sanitary flow from irrigation water and potentially restrooms, and would not include flows from industrial or manufacturing operations that generate large flows of wastewater (Project Description). In addition, as noted in Section IX (Hydrology/Water) above, the proposed project would be designed to capture and treat all stormwater runoff from the project site (Project Description). Therefore, flows from the proposed project are not anticipated to result in the treatment plant exceeding its treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).				of d use astewater perations Section treat all
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			V	
Raw (untreated) water supplies for the City of Pittsburg are provided by the Contra Costa Water District (CCWD) and supplemented by two municipal wells (City of Pittsburg 2010 Water System Master Plan, 2-1). Raw water supplies are treated at the City's Water Treatment Plant. The most recent Pittsburg Water System Master Plan (2010) considered development of the site as a large-scale mixed use commercial and residential development (Water System Master Plan, Akel Engineering Group, 2010, Figure 3.1, General Plan Land Use). Some water supplies will be utilized at the proposed park for irrigation and potentially recreational activities (water feature, fountain); however, the land use change from Mixed Use				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
to Open Space for purposes of developing a public park would result in a significantly smaller water demand than was anticipated under the Water System Master Plan; therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact related to the expansion of water facilities.				
Wastewater generated in the City of Pittsburg is conveyed to and treated at DDSD's wastewater treatment plant, which has an average dry weather flow capacity of 16.5 million gallons per day (mgd). DDSD collects Capital Facility Capacity Charges to build capacity as new connections are added to its conveyance system. Capacity is provided through facilities constructed by DDSD as prescribed in the Conveyance and Treatment Master Plans, which use General Plan land use data for the communities in the DDSD service area. The project site is identified in the Pittsburg sewer collection system planning documents as sewer basin DP307 in the City of Pittsburg 2007 Wastewater Collection System Master Plan (Amendment No. 2). According to that document, the land use projections for the site would be a mix of residential (up to 111 residential units) and up to 11 acres of commercial square footage (Appendix C). The proposed project would result in a change in General Plan and zoning map designations, from Mixed Use to Open Space, for purposes of constructing a public park on a vacant 1.34-acre parcel that was entitled for 66 multi-family residential units and approximately 12,000 square feet of ground floor commercial development (Black Diamond Redevelopment Project Draft EIR, Lamphier-Gregory, August 2005, Figure 2.3). The proposed land use change and development would generate a much smaller quantity of wastewater than that envisioned under the current land use type as envisioned and accounted for in the Wastewater Master Plan, and would therefore not result in the need for expanded wastewater services or facilities.				
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			V	
As noted in XVII.a and Section IX (Hydrology/Water) above, the proposed project would be designed to capture and treat all stormwater runoff generated from the project site; therefore, the proposed project will not result in significant environmental effects necessitating the expansion of or construction of new wastewater facilities (Project Description).				erefore,
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				
See XVII.b above.				
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				
See XVII.b above.				
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			V	
The City of Pittsburg is served by Pittsburg Disposal Service, which provides solid waste pick-up and disposal services to most of Pittsburg. Solid waste generated within the City of Pittsburg is disposed of at the Potrero Hills landfill (General Plan, 11-12). The Potrero Hills landfill has a permitted capacity of 83.1 million cubic yards, with 69.2 million cubic yards (83 percent) used and 13.9 million cubic yards (65 percent) remaining (CalRecycle, Facility and Site Summary Details, http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/48-AA-0075/Detail/accessed on October 4, 2013).				
The proposed project would result in a charfrom Mixed Use to Open Space, for purpo acre parcel (Project Description). The proposition and would be serviced regularly by the would be some trash and recycling waste would be far less than the waste that would residential and commercial development to designations and land use entitlements (B Lamphier-Gregory, August 2005, Figure 2 Estimated Solid Waste Generation Rates	ses of constructionsed project versions of Pulper November 1 page	cting a public par would include gather blic Works Deption activities at the penerated by a laccommodated by Redevelopments of the penerated pener	ark on a vaca arbage and re artment. While proposed par arge-scale, may existing may exist Drafe exist D	nt 1.34- ecycling le there k, it ixed apping ft EIR, nt:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
4, 2013); therefore, this impact is considered	ed less than si	gnificant.		
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				V
The proposed project is not of a class of protential to violate applicable statutes and would be no impact.				
XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?			V	

The proposed project would involve a land use change from Mixed Use to Open Space to allow for development of a 1.34-acre public park on a currently vacant infill parcel in downtown Pittsburg that has previously been graded and disturbed (Project Description and Google Earth). The site is identified as part of the urban development area (East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan, Figure 3-3), and is not located on potential infill development sites that could potentially support wildlife (East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan, Figure 9-1). In addition, there are no species identified as candidate, sensitive or special status known to occur in the immediate area (City of Pittsburg General Plan, Figure 9-1 and Table 9-1). Finally, there is no evidence that important examples of major periods of California history occurred on the proposed site; however, in the unlikely event that remains or resources are found, the City's contractors would be required to follow federal and state law and General Plan policies that require construction be halted and the materials be investigated prior to continuance of construction. Therefore, overall environmental impacts

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
associated with the proposed project would	be less than	significant.		
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?			V	
In 2005, the project site was envisioned as Block A of the Black Diamond Redevelopment Project, and approval was granted to construct a large-scale mixed use development with 66-residential units, 119 residential parking spaces and up to 12,000 square feet of ground floor commercial development along Railroad Avenue. The proposed land use change from Mixed Use to Open Space to allow for development of a park would result in far fewer cumulatively considerable impacts than those envisioned as part of the Black Diamond Redevelopment Project. Specifically, the site is surrounded by existing development, and development of a park would not require expansion of existing utilities beyond the boundaries of existing urbanized areas. The proposed project is not anticipated to contribute to cumulative traffic impacts in the vicinity of the site; it would mitigate any stormwater related impacts from development of the currently vacant site (Project Description); and, it would not be expected to contribute significantly to Air Quality or Greenhouse Gas emissions due to the small size of the project. The project would not require an expansion of emergency response service areas or contribute to an incremental decrease in an agricultural or mineral resource; therefore, these cumulative impacts related to the project would be considered less than significant.				
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		V		
As explained in the responses above, the Materials. An environmental investigation hydrocarbons, OCPs, pesticides, PAHs, le present due to historic activities at the projissues related to construction activities. The	of the site did i ad and arseni ect site, result	indicate that low c above ESLs a ing in potential	v levels of pet and other met health and sa	roleum als are fety

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

less than significant with the implementation of **Hazards & Hazardous Materials Mitigation Measure 1**, detailed above.

The proposed park would not emit odors, would not interfere with approved emergency services response times and would not be located in an area that is susceptible to floods, landslides or earthquakes. The proposed park is not expected to generate any impacts related to noise, traffic or air quality that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly for all of the reasons explained in the analysis above. Further, no other project impacts were identified that would have a substantial adverse effect on human beings.

References/Sources Cited

- 1. Bay Area Air Quality Management District, 2010 Clean Air Plan, September, 2010.
- 2. Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Air Quality Standards and Attainment Status, http://hank.baaqmd.gov/pln/air_quality/ambient_air_quality.htm, accessed on October 2, 2013.
- 3. Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, 2010.
- 4. Bay Area Air Quality Management District Tools & Methodology, http://www.baaqmd.gov/Divisions/Planning-and-Research/CEQA-GUIDELINES/Tools-and-Methodology.aspx, accessed on October 2, 2013.
- 5. Bay Area Air Quality Management District Updated CEQA Guidelines, http://www.baaqmd.gov/Divisions/Planning-and-Research/CEQA-GUIDELINES/Updated-CEQA-Guidelines.aspx, accessed on September 26, 2013.
- 6. Bay Area Dam Failure Inundation Maps, Association of Bay Area Governments, http://www.abag.ca.gov/bayarea/eqmaps/damfailure/dfpickc.html, accessed on October 3, 2013.
- 7. Black Diamond Redevelopment Project Draft Environmental Impact Report, Lamphier-Gregory, August 2005.
- 8. California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones, http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/ap/affected.htm, accessed on October 2, 2013.
- 9. California Department of Conservation, Earthquake Shaking Potential Map, http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/psha/Pages/index.aspx, accessed May 1, 2013.

- California Department of Toxic Substances Control Map Locator, www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/, accessed on October 3, 2013.
- 11. CalRecycle, Facility and Site Summary Details, http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/48-AA-0075/Detail/ accessed on October , 2013.
- 12. CalRecycle, Residential Development: Estimated Solid Waste Generation Rates http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/wastechar/wastegenrates/Residential.htm, accessed on October 4, 2013.
- 13. City of Pittsburg, Estimates Operational GHG Emissions for Proposed Park, URBEMIS2007 and BAAQMD Greenhouse Gas Model (BGM), assessed on October 7, 2013.
- 14. City of Pittsburg General Plan, 2004.
- 15. City of Pittsburg General Plan Update: Existing Conditions and Planning Issues, Dyett and Bhatia, June 1998.
- 16. City of Pittsburg Municipal Code (PMC) and Zoning Map.
- 17. City of Pittsburg Emergency Operations Plan (EOP), City Council Resolution No. 05-10223.
- 18. City of Pittsburg 2007 Wastewater Collection System Master Plan (Amendment No. 2), MWH, February 2007.
- 19. City of Pittsburg 2010 Water System Master Plan, Akel Engineering Group, October 2010.
- 20. Construction Noise Handbook, US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/construction_noise/handbook/handbook09.cfm, accessed on October 4, 2013.
- 21. Contra Costa County Airports, http://www.co.contra-costa.ca.us/depart/pw/airport/, accessed on October 3, 2013.
- Contra Costa Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, Fehr and Peers/Eisen I Letunic, October 2009, Figure D-14.
- 23. Contra Costa County Watershed Atlas, Contra Costa County Community Development Department, January 2004.
- 24. Conversation with Richard Abono, City of Pittsburg Senior Civil Engineer, October 4, 2013
- East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan, December 2006.
- Google Earth

- 27. Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation (7th Edition), Volume 2 of 3, 631.
- 28. Liquefaction Hazard Map for Pittsburg, http://www.abag.ca.gov/cgi-bin/pickmapliq.pl, accessed on October 2, 2013.
- 29. Old Town Park Environmental Investigation and Site Mitigation Plan (SMP). Langan Treadwell Rollo, April 11, 2014.
- 30. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment for the Black Diamond Redevelopment Project. Treadwell & Rollo, October 25, 2004.
- 31. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment for the Black Diamond Redevelopment Project. Treadwell & Roll, April 20, 2006.
- 32. Tri-Delta Transit System Map, http://www.trideltatransit.com/local_bus.aspx, accessed on October 4, 2013.