

## 5.6 PUBLIC SERVICES

### INTRODUCTION

This section describes the public services (fire protection, police services, schools, and parks) currently provided in the City of Pittsburg; summarizes the relevant City of Pittsburg General Plan goals and policies and other standards for public services; and analyzes the project's potential impacts related to fire, police, schools, and parks and recreation.

### ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

#### Fire Protection

The Contra Costa County Fire Protection District (CCCFPD) provides fire prevention, suppression, and emergency medical response for advanced and basic life support to nine cities and much of the unincorporated territory in the central and western portions of Contra Costa County, including the City of Pittsburg and the project site. The CCCFPD operates 23 stations throughout its jurisdictional area and has a staff of 262 uniformed personnel (Leach 2013b). Within the Pittsburg Planning Area, there are four CCCFPD fire stations; however, one was closed in early 2013, leaving only three stations operating in the area. **Table 5.6-1, Fire Stations within the Pittsburg Planning Area** summarizes the equipment and personnel at each of these facilities along with the call volumes for each station.

**Table 5.6-1  
Fire Stations within the Pittsburg Planning Area**

| Fire Station | Location                         | Distance from Project Site (miles) | Equipment                          | Service Calls (2010) |
|--------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|
| 84           | 1903 Railroad Avenue             | 2.2 N                              | 1 Quint (truck)<br>1 Rescue Boat   | 1,883                |
| 85           | 2331 Loveridge Road              | 1.7 NE                             | 1 Type 1 Engine<br>1 Type 3 Engine | 2,685                |
| 86           | 3000 Willow Pass Road, Bay Point | 3.7 NW                             | 1 Type 1 Engine<br>1 Type 3 Engine | 1,981                |
| 87*          | 800 West Leland Road             | 2.2 NW                             | 1 Type 2 Engine<br>1 Watertender   | 1,232                |

Source: Ted Leach, Fire Inspector, Contra Costa County Fire Protection District, 2011

\* Station 87 was closed on July 5, 2013, and is no longer in operation.

While Fire Station 85 is the closest station to the project site, Fire Station 84 is the primary responding station in the event of an emergency (Leach 2011). As shown in **Table 5.6-1**, Fire Station 84 received 1,883 calls for service in 2010.

The National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) guidelines call for career fire departments to respond within 6 minutes 90 percent of the time. The average response time (not including dispatch or reaction time) for the four stations serving the City of Pittsburg is currently between 6 minutes 20 seconds and 6 minutes 59 seconds (Leach 2011). As a result, stations serving the City of Pittsburg and outlying areas are currently not meeting the guidelines for fire response time.

The Insurance Service Office—a private organization that surveys fire departments in cities and towns across the United States—awarded the CCCFPD a Class 3 rating (1 being highest and 10 being lowest) (Leach 2011). This rating considers a community’s fire defense capacity versus fire potential, and then uses the score to set property insurance premiums for homeowners and commercial property owners.

## **Police Services**

The City of Pittsburg Police Department (PPD) provides law enforcement services within City limits, and Contra Costa County Sheriff’s department provides law enforcement services to unincorporated areas in the County surrounding the City of Pittsburg, including Bay Point and the project site. Upon annexation of the main project site into the City of Pittsburg, the PPD would provide law enforcement services to the proposed project. The PPD operates out of its headquarters building located at 65 Civic Avenue, approximately 2.5 miles north of the project site, and has an authorized staff level of 76 sworn officers and 28 non-sworn employees. In 2009, the PPD responded to approximately 72,200 calls (LAFCO 2011).

The City is divided into 9 beats and officers are assigned to a specific beat for a period of time. The “beat” system operates without community substations, so that officers are continually available within the territory covered by each beat. The beat system is designed to assure rapid response to emergency calls within each beat. The closest beat to the project site is Beat 6 (Callahan 2012).

The PPD tries to maintain a 3- to 5-minute response time for emergency calls (Priority 1), 5- to 8-minute response time for priority non-emergency calls, and 10- to 20-minute response time for non-emergency calls. The average Priority 1 response time for the PPD during 2010 was 6 minutes and 8 seconds (LAFCO 2011). As a result, the PPD is not presently meeting its goal for emergency calls.

## Schools

The Pittsburg Unified School District (PUSD) would serve the project site. The PUSD serves approximately 9,900 students in Kindergarten through 12<sup>th</sup> grade. PUSD facilities include seven elementary schools, two junior high schools, one high school, and one continuation high school. Students from the project site would attend Foothill Elementary School, Hillview Junior High School, and Pittsburg High School. **Table 5.6-2, Existing Enrollment** provides the existing student enrollment and capacity for each of the schools serving the project site. Foothill Elementary and Hillview Junior High are currently operating at or over capacity (SCI 2010).

**Table 5.6-2  
Existing Enrollment**

| Schools                     | 2010-11 Student Enrollment | Student Capacity |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|------------------|
| Foothill Elementary School  | 473                        | 475              |
| Hillview Junior High School | 1,169                      | 1,101            |
| Pittsburg High School       | 2,457                      | 2,800            |

*Source: SCI Consulting Group, 2010*

## Parks

The City has approximately 400 acres of parks and recreational facilities, as well as public trails. The Pittsburg Public Works Department manages the maintenance of the City's recreational facilities, and the Recreation Department manages the operation of the recreational facilities. The Development Services Department is responsible for acquisition and development of park facilities (Pittsburg 2011). Three parks are located within the vicinity of the project site. **Table 5.6-3, Parkland in the Vicinity of the Project Site** lists the features of these facilities.

**Table 5.6-3  
Parkland in the Vicinity of the Project Site**

| Name            | Location                     | Distance from Project Site (miles) | Type              | Size (acres) | Features  |
|-----------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|--------------|---|
| Woodland Hills  | Crestview & Alta Vista Drive | 0.9 NW                             | Neighborhood Park | 2.4          | Picnic Tables; Play Equipment/Tot Lot; Basketball Courts  |
| Buchanan        | 4150 Harbor Street           | 1 NE                               | Community Park    | 16           | BBQ Grills; Picnic Tables; Play Equipment/Tot Lot; Horseshoes; Bocce Ball; Swimming Pool  |
| Highlands Ranch | Buchanan Road                | 1.2 NE                             | Community Park    | 10           | BBQ Grills; Picnic Tables; Play Equipment/Tot Lot; Baseball/Softball Fields; Soccer Fields; Basketball Courts; Tennis Courts; Volleyball Courts |

Source: City of Pittsburg, *Parks at a Glance*  
<http://www.ci.pittsburg.ca.us/index.aspx?page=440>. Accessed June 13, 2013.

## REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

### *Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998 (SB 50)*

The Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998, also known as Senate Bill No. 50 or SB 50, governs a school district's authority to levy school impact fees. It instituted a new school facility program under which school districts can apply to the State of California for funds to construct or modernize school facilities, and limited the power of cities and counties to require mitigation of school facilities impacts as a condition of approving new development. Following the passage of SB 50, school districts have the authority to levy fees at three different levels.

- Level I fees are the basic statutory fees under Section 17620 of the California Education Code, which empowers school districts to levy a fee against residential and commercial construction for the purpose of funding school facilities construction or reconstruction. Fees vary by district for residential construction and commercial construction and are increased every two years.
- Level II developer fees (Government Code Section 65995.5) allow school districts that meet certain conditions to impose a higher fee on residential construction. The required conditions include having a substantial percentage of students on multi-track year-round scheduling, having an assumed debt equal to 15 to 30 percent of the district's bonding capacity), having at least 20 percent of the district's teaching stations housed in relocatable classrooms (portables), and having placed a local bond on the ballot in the past four years which received at least 50 percent plus one of the votes cast. To levee Level II fees, a district must demonstrate that the need for new school facilities for unhoused pupils is

attributable to projected enrollment growth from the construction of new residential units over the next five years.

- Level III developer fees (Government Code Section 655995.7) provide an alternative to state funding that becomes unavailable by authorizing school districts approved to collect Level II fees to collect a higher fee on residential construction. This fee is equal to twice the amount of Level II fees. If a district eventually receives state funding, the district may be required to reimburse the excess fee to the developers or the excess amount may be subtracted from the state funds provided to the district.

### ***Quimby Act***

The Quimby Act allows cities and counties to adopt ordinances requiring that developers dedicate land within their developments for local parks. Under the Quimby Act, a local agency can also allow a developer to pay an in-lieu fee equivalent to the value of the required dedication, rather than to dedicate land. Local ordinances must establish a standard for the number of acres to be dedicated (or for which an in-lieu fee may be paid).

### ***City of Pittsburg General Plan***

The Pittsburg General Plan Open Space, Youth and Recreation, Health and Safety, and Public Facilities Elements include goals and policies related to public services. The goals and policies applicable to the proposed project are listed below.

#### **Parks**

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

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

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

Policy 8-P-3                      Develop public parks and recreational facilities that are equitably distributed throughout the urbanized area, and provide neighborhood recreation facilities in existing neighborhoods where such facilities are presently lacking.

Policy 8-P-4                      Consider park accessibility, use, and character as more valuable than size in the acquisition and development of new parks.

Policy 8-P-5 Maintain park and recreation facility standards for new development to serve both residents and employees, attainable through dedication of parkland or payment of in-lieu fees.

**Education Facilities**

Goal 8-G-10 Ensure that school facilities maintain adequate capacity to provide for current and projected enrollment.

Policy 8-P-41 As part of development review for large residential subdivisions (greater than 100 units), evaluate the need for new school sites. If needed, encourage subdivision design to accommodate school facilities and cooperate with the school districts in acquisition of those sites.

**Emergency Management**

Goal 10-G-11 Ensure emergency response equipment and personnel training are adequate to follow the procedures contained within the Emergency Response Plan for a major earthquake, wildland fire, or hazardous substance event.

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

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

**Fire Protection**

Goal 11-G-8 Require development in areas of high fire hazard to be designed and constructed to minimize potential losses and maximize the ability of fire personnel to suppress fire incidents.

Policy 11-P-24 Amend the subdivision regulations to include a requirement for detailed fire prevention and control, including community firebreaks, for projects in high and extreme hazard areas.

Policy 11-P-25 Review and amend ordinances that regulate development in potentially hazardous locations to require adequate protection, such as fire-resistant roofing, building materials, and landscaping.

|                |   |
|----------------|---|
| Policy 11-P-26 | Cooperate with Contra Costa County Fire Protection District to ensure that new or relocated fire stations are constructed on appropriate sites within the 1.5-mile response radii from new or existing development. |
| Policy 11-P-27 | Cooperate with Contra Costa County Fire Protection District in obtaining sites to either relocate or establish new fire stations within City limits to provide more efficient response times.                       |
| Policy 11-P-29 | Ensure adequate road widths in new development for fire response trucks, per the subdivision regulations.   |

## ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

### Thresholds of Significance

In accordance with Appendix G of the *2013 California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines*, the impact of the proposed project related to police protection services, schools, and recreational facilities would be considered significant if it would:

- Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of 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 fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other facilities.

The impact of the proposed project related to fire protection services would be considered significant if it would:

- Be located outside the 1.5-mile response radii of an existing or planned fire station.
- Not meet the NFPA response time guideline of 6 minutes 90 percent of the time.

### CEQA Checklist Items Adequately Addressed in the Initial Study

The analysis in the Initial Study prepared for the project and circulated with the Notice of Preparation (NOP) concluded that further analysis of the following issues was not required in the EIR.

- Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of 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 police protection.

With the annexation of the main project site into the City of Pittsburg, the project site would be included in the service area of the PPD. In accordance with General Plan Policy 10-P-39, one of the City's long-term goals is to provide 1.8 sworn officers per each 1,000 residents. Based on the estimated 1,146 residents that the project would add to the City's population, there would be a need for two additional police officers. The PPD has acknowledged that the proposed project would require additional staff and has expressed concern that while the new residents of the proposed subdivision would contribute taxes to the City's General Fund, which provides funding for sworn officer positions, there is no guarantee that the General Fund revenues provided by the new development would fully fund the new positions. However, standard conditions of approval require that the developer annex new development into the Community Facilities District (CFD) 2005-1, which collects fees to provide funding for increased police protection services that would be needed within the project area. The rate of the CFD fee is subject to City Council Ordinance No. 05-1246. While the project would clearly require additional sworn officers to serve the project, the PPD did indicate that no new police facilities would be required in order to provide police services to the proposed project (Baker 2010). As the PPD does not use substations, and as no new facilities would be required in order to meet established performance objectives, no adverse physical environmental impacts would occur. In summary, while the proposed project would increase demand for police services, the increased demand would be offset by the collection of assessments in accordance with CFD 2005-1, and the increased demand would not result in the need for construction of any new facilities that could result in significant environmental impacts. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

- Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of 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 schools.

The proposed project is likely to generate between 116 to 128 new K-5 students, 56 to 64 new middle school students, and 79 to 85 new high school students.<sup>1</sup> According to the PUSD, Foothill Elementary and Hillview Jr. High are operating at or over capacity. Pittsburg High School has excess capacity to accommodate future enrollment. However, this excess capacity would be needed to serve future development within the PUSD service boundaries that has yet to be built. Therefore, the K-12 students generated by the proposed project are considered "unhoused" and new school facilities may be needed to serve the students generated by the proposed project (SCI 2010).

Development under the proposed project would be required to pay school development fees, as dictated by state law, prior to the issuance of building permits. The maximum developer fees that the PUSD

---

<sup>1</sup> Based on 375 new single-family homes.



currently collects are \$2.97 per square foot for new residential construction and \$0.47 per square foot for new commercial and industrial construction (SCI 2010). According to Government Code Section 65996, payment of such fees constitutes full mitigation of any school impacts under CEQA. Therefore, any resulting increase in school enrollment would be offset by the required payment of the PUSD's development fees. This impact is considered less than significant.

- Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of 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 parks.

Development of the main project site with residential uses would result in additional people living in the City, thereby increasing demand for recreational facilities, such as parks and sports fields. The City's park requirements are based on the adopted standard of 5 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents. Chapter 17.32 of the City's Municipal Code sets forth detailed requirements for land dedication or fee in lieu of dedication. The code also describes the criteria for combining fee and dedication as well as credits for private open space. The developer would be required to comply with the provisions of the City's Municipal Code. These requirements are considered adequate to mitigate impacts relative to provision of parks, and this impact is considered less than significant.

## Impact Analysis

**Impact PS-1      The proposed project would be located outside the 1.5-mile response radius of an existing or planned fire station and would not meet the response time guideline of 6 minutes, 90 percent of the time. (Potentially Significant)**

The proposed project would increase demand for fire services within the CCCFPD's service area. Fire Station 84, which is located 2.2 miles north of the project site, would provide primary response to the proposed project. The CCCFPD has indicated that Fire Station 84 would need to be equipped with a Type 3 Engine for wildland and wildland-urban interface firefighting to serve the proposed project during a wildland fire incident. According to the CCCFPD, with the addition of equipment capable of supporting wildland firefighting operations, Station 84 would be adequately equipped to meet the increased service demand for this development (Leach 2013a).

The proposed project would conflict with the location standard established by General Plan Policy 11-P-26, as it is located outside the 1.5-mile response radius of both Station 85, the closest station to the project site, and Station 84, which has the primary responsibility for serving the project site. The project would also conflict with the NFPA fire response time guidelines, as the total response time from Fire Station 84 to the intersection of Kirker Pass and Nortonville (which is located just south of the project site)

would be approximately 8.5 minutes (Leach 2011). As a result, even though the CCCFPD has indicated that implementation of the proposed project would not require a new or expanded fire station, the project would still conflict with location and response time standards established by the General Plan and NFPA, which is considered a potentially significant impact.

As indicated in **Appendix 1.0** of this Draft EIR, the initial study prepared for the proposed project determined that construction of the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires with the implementation of **Mitigation Measures MM HAZ-3.1** through **MM HAZ-3.3**. In addition, all residences on the main project site would be equipped with sprinklers as required by the California Building Code. In order to reduce impacts related to fire protection services, the proposed project would be required to implement **Mitigation Measures MM PS-1a** through **MM PS-1g**. These measures would require the developer to pay a Fire Facility Impact Fee, which would contribute towards station improvements (including the purchasing of new equipment), and implement various other fire prevention measures, as outlined below.

#### *Mitigation Measures*

- MM PS-1a** The developer shall pay a Fire Facility Impact Fee in the sum of \$591.00 per single-family unit.
- MM PS-1b** The developer shall complete and submit for approval to the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District a fire protection plan for the proposed project, prior to approval of the first final map. The fire protection plan shall include details for a fuel modification zone around the subdivision and detail for the organization that will be responsible for ongoing maintenance of the fuel modification zone.
- MM PS-1c** All homes shall have not less than a Class "A" fire-rated roof assembly.
- MM PS-1d** Only fire resistant exterior building materials shall be used.
- MM PS-1e** In deed disclosures, the developer shall notify all property owners/buyers that the site is currently outside the 1.5-mile fire department response radius specified by the General Plan.
- MM PS-1f** The developer shall provide a minimum fire flow on-site of 1,500 gallons per minute (gpm). Required flow must be delivered from not more than one hydrant flowing for a duration of 120 minutes, while maintaining 20-pounds residual pressure in the main.

**MM PS-1g** Flammable or combustible liquid storage tanks used for fueling grading equipment, shall not be located on the site without first obtaining necessary approvals and permits from the Fire District.

### *Residual Impacts after Mitigation*

Even with the implementation of mitigation identified above, this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

## **Cumulative Impacts**

**Impact PS-2:** Future development in the cities of Pittsburg and Antioch could require new or physically altered fire facilities the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. However, the project's contribution to the cumulative impact would not be cumulatively considerable, as the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District has indicated that no new facilities would need to be constructed in order to serve the proposed project. (*Less than significant*)

Future development in the City of Pittsburg, including Tuscany Meadows, Sky Ranch II and the James Donlon Boulevard Extension Project, and in the City of Antioch, including the Black Diamond Ranch, would increase population in the area, thus resulting in an increase in demand for fire facilities through the CCCFPD's jurisdiction. As the result of increased demand, future growth in the area may require new or physically altered fire facilities to accommodate staff and equipment to meet increased demand, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. Future projects would be subject to CEQA requirements, including requirements to assess and mitigate potential impacts to public services. However, the project's contribution to the cumulative impact would not be cumulatively considerable, as the CCCFPD has indicated that no new facilities would need to be constructed in order to serve the proposed project.

### *Mitigation Measures*

No mitigation measures are required.

## **REFERENCES**

Baker, Aaron. 2010. Chief, Pittsburg Police Department. Personal communication via electronic mail with Jason Burke, City of Pittsburg, July 19. (Baker 2010)

Callahan, Dan. Pittsburg Police Department. Personal communication via phone with Paul Stephenson, Impact Sciences, February 9. (Callahan 2012)

- City of Pittsburg. 2004. *City of Pittsburg General Plan*. (Pittsburg 2004)
- City of Pittsburg. 2011. *Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Master Plan Final Environmental Impact Report* SCH No. 2010122023. June 9 (Pittsburg 2011)
- City of Pittsburg. 2011. Parks at a Glance. Accessed October 26, 2011. <http://www.ci.pittsburg.ca.us/index.aspx?page=440>.
- Contra Costa County. 2008. *Contra Costa Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO), East County Sub-Regional Municipal Services Review*. December 10. (LAFCO 2008)
- Leach, Ted. 2011. Fire Inspector, Contra Costa County Fire Protection District. Personal communication via electronic mail with Paul Stephenson, Impact Sciences, December 15. (Leach 2011)
- Leach, Ted. 2013. Fire Inspector, Contra Costa County Fire Protection District. Personal communication via electronic mail with Paul Stephenson, Impact Sciences, June 26. (Leach 2013a)
- Leach, Ted. 2013. Fire Inspector, Contra Costa County Fire Protection District. Personal communication via telephone and electronic mail with Kristin Pollot, City of Pittsburg, October 29. (Leach 2013b)
- SCI Consulting Group. 2010. Comment by Pittsburg Unified School District on the Montreux Annexation and Subdivision Application. October 5. (SCI 2010)